

PHILOSOPHY TRIPOS Part II

Tuesday 28 May 2002

9 to 12

Paper 3

HISTORY OF MODERN PHILOSOPHY I

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.

**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 How well does Descartes justify his reliance on clear and distinct ideas in proving God's existence?
- 2 Does Descartes' real distinction between body and mind cohere with his account of thinking and sensation?
- 3 Is Spinoza's distinction between finite and infinite modes of God consistent with his view that nothing is contingent?
- 4 'The object of the idea constituting the human Mind is the Body' (SPINOZA). Discuss.
- 5 How should we interpret Leibniz's claim that all truths are analytic?
- 6 According to Leibniz, monads are 'windowless', yet they also perceive the world they are in. Is this combination of views consistent?
- 7 Compare the treatment of substance by **two** of the following: Descartes, Spinoza, Leibniz, Locke.
- 8 'If things have nothing in common with one another, one cannot be the cause of the other' (SPINOZA). Discuss.
- 9 Compare and contrast the views of Locke and Leibniz on innate ideas.
- 10 Critically discuss Locke's distinction between nominal and real essence.
- 11 Which of Locke and Berkeley has the better theory of the meaning of general terms?
- 12 How well does Berkeley counter scepticism?
- 13 'Hume's real innovation in the theory of causality was to deny that causal connections need to be intelligible.' Discuss.
- 14 **Either** (a) "'Tis vain to ask whether there be body or not.' But doesn't Hume ask just that question?
Or (b) How does Hume's naturalistic approach to psychology fit with his critical stance towards some ways of forming belief?
- 15 **Either** (a) 'Early modern philosophers owed much more to Aristotle and his medieval readers than they admitted.' Discuss in relation to **one or two** philosophers.
Or (b) What do you understand by 'occasionalism' as a doctrine about causality? What features of 17th Century thought were conducive to occasionalism?

END OF PAPER