

PHILOSOPHY TRIPOS Part II

Tuesday 27th May 2014

09.00 – 12.00

Paper 8

PHILOSOPHICAL LOGIC

*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. What must a theory of meaning explain?
2. 'Anti-realism about the past is like solipsism: internally coherent, but untenable.' Discuss.
3. Do considerations about rule-following undermine the idea that our words have meaning?
4. EITHER (a) What is the best account of the indicative conditional?

OR (b) How do subjunctive conditionals (counterfactuals) differ from indicative conditionals? What, if anything, do the two have in common?
5. EITHER (a) Is talk about some things essentially equivalent to talk about the set of them?

OR (b) 'Plural descriptions can easily be eliminated in a Russellian way, since "the *F*s *G*" reduces to "there are some *F*s and every *F* *G*s"'. Discuss.
6. Is there any problem about logic and mathematics for which conventionalism provides a good solution?
7. Does the fact that second-order arithmetic is derivable from Hume's Principle show that Hume's Principle is synthetic?
8. 'Non-eliminative structuralism holds that mathematical objects are positions in structures. Traditional platonism holds that mathematical objects give rise to systems having a certain structure. This is a difference only of emphasis.' Discuss.
9. If mathematics is indispensable for science, ought we to believe that there are mathematical objects?
10. Should the logic of set theory be intuitionistic?

END OF PAPER