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Paper 1

METAPHYSICS AND PHILOSOPHY OF MIND

*Answer three questions only.*

*Write the number of the question at the beginning of each answer. If you are answering an either/or question, indicate the letter as well.*

STATIONERY REQUIREMENTS

*20 Page Answer Book x 1*
*Rough Work Pad*

You may not start to read the questions printed on the subsequent pages of this question paper until instructed that you may do so by the Invigilator.
1 'No testimony is sufficient to establish a miracle, unless the testimony be of such a kind, that its falsehood would be more miraculous, than the fact, which it endeavours to establish.' Discuss.

2 Is it true that our ordinary perceptual beliefs about the external world can be justified only if we are justified in denying the sceptical hypothesis that we are brains in vats?

3 'A type of inference is reasonable or unreasonable according to the relative frequencies with which it leads to truth and falsehood. Induction is reasonable because the world is so constituted that inductive arguments lead on the whole to true opinions.' Is this a good solution to the problem of induction?

4 Is there anything more to causation than regularity?

5 Either  
   (a) 'The fact that I can clearly and distinctly understand one thing apart from another is enough to make me certain that the two things are distinct, since they are capable of being separated, at least by God.' Discuss with reference to the metaphysics of mind.

   Or  
   (b) 'A person is a vast arrangement of physical particles, but there are not, over and above this, sensations or states of consciousness.' Discuss.

6 Either  
   (a) Give the best defence you can of the view that the existence of evil is compatible with the existence of God.

   Or  
   (b) 'Whatever we conceive as existent, we can also conceive as non-existent. There is no being, therefore, whose non-existence implies a contradiction.' Discuss.

7 Describe a situation in which a being acts freely, and make clear why the acting is indeed free. If there are no such possible situations, say why.

8 Either  
   (a) Fill in the blank: X is a person if and only if ___________. Defend your answer, which should be informative.

   Or  
   (b) What is the difference between adventures that would bring an end to you and adventures that would not?
'It is now true, or it is now false, that there will be a sea-battle tomorrow. But if it is now true that there will be a sea-battle tomorrow, then there will be a sea battle tomorrow, and nothing I do can change this. And if it is now false that there will be a sea-battle tomorrow, then there will not be a sea-battle tomorrow, and nothing I do can change this. So nothing I do can change whether there is a sea-battle tomorrow.' Is this reasoning sound? If not, where or how exactly does it go wrong?

Does the concept of knowledge admit of definition in terms of necessary and sufficient conditions? If not, why not? If so, how so?