

This exam has two sections: (I) Greek Philosophical Terms, and (II) Essays. Please answer the questions in each of these sections by writing *legibly* in the exam booklets provided.

### I. Greek Philosophical Terms (15 minutes total; 5 minutes each)

This section asks you to discuss Aristotle's use or coinage of the Greek philosophical terms below. There are three questions, and each question asks either about one term or one set of terms. In each case, provide some English approximation(s) of each term. Then, in a paragraph, discuss their significance: that is, mention the Aristotelian context in which they occur, draw precise distinctions between them and neighboring terms, briefly show how they function in major Aristotelian arguments, provide some illustrative examples, where appropriate, and so on:

- i. εἶδος, γένος, διαφορά
- ii. αἰτία
- iii. δύναμις, ἐντελέχεια

### II. Essay Questions (60 minutes total; 30 minutes each)

This section asks you to answer the two essay questions below. Endeavor to write clearly, providing sufficient details to demonstrate the depth of your understanding of Aristotle's philosophy. These details will often include distinctions and arguments, examples and analogies. Also, do not fail whenever called for to place the question in a wider context. What is its philosophical significance—for Aristotle, and for philosophy more generally?

1. What argument for fatalism does Aristotle present in *De Interpretatione*? First of all, why does this argument—which is of such importance to ethics, for instance—occur in a treatise about the logic of statements? Recapitulate this argument, using his famous example of the sea-battle tomorrow. Is this argument sound? How does Aristotle object to it? How does he think a proponent of fatalism would reply to this objection? How does Aristotle think he refutes this reply? In the final analysis, what is the value of this argument? At some point in your analysis you should introduce the Law of Excluded Middle, showing how it is a necessary and sufficient condition for the Law of Non-Contradiction (if not by logical symbolism, then at least by a persuasive example).
2. What are first principles, according to the *Posterior Analytics*, and what distinguishes them from ordinary deductive premises? How did Aristotle think scientists achieve understanding of first principles, and how should science operate, according to him, once it has achieved this understanding? What paramount role does demonstration thus play in science? That said, what dilemma arises if one assumes that all premises must be demonstrated? How does Aristotle resolve this dilemma? Be sure not only to distinguish induction, deduction, and demonstration, and any other relevant Aristotelian terms, but also to discuss a scientific example, even if it is a caricature of scientific practice, just as Aristotle himself does.