

This exam will have two sections: (I) Greek Philosophical Terms, and (II) Essays.

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

This section will ask you to discuss Aristotle's use or coinage of Greek philosophical terms. There will be three questions, and each question will ask either about one term or one set of terms chosen by me from the list below. 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:

κατηγορία	σχῆμα	φύσις, φυσικά, φυσικός	τύχη, τὸ αὐτόματον
οὐσία	ἐπιστήμη	κίνησις	δύναμις, ἐντελέχεια
εἶδος, γένος, διαφορά	συλλογισμός, ἀπόδειξις	αἰτία	τέχνη
καθόλου, τὸδε τι	συλλογισμός, ἐπαγωγή	ἕλη	νοῦς
λόγος, τί ἐστι, ὀρισμός	δόξα, ἔνδοξα	μορφή	τὸ νῦν
πρότερον	ἀπλῶς	κινεῖν	ἄπειρον, πέρας
ἀνάγκη	ἀρχή	τέλος	θεός

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

This section will ask you to answer two essay questions, which I shall choose from the following list of twelve. Endeavor to write clearly and legibly, 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. The *Categories* discusses different kinds of predication, with the goal of determining the necessary conditions of primary substance. After all, once we know the necessary conditions of primary substance, we shall locate it more easily when the time comes to look for it. What, then, are these necessary conditions, and what is Aristotle's rationale for choosing them? Be sure to discuss the following distinctions: homonymy versus synonymy, predications that are 'said of' versus those that are 'said in,' genus versus species, and universals versus particulars.
2. Socrates sought definitions of the virtues, and Plato developed a theory of Forms to explain what those definitions were defining. Aristotle cannot accept Plato's theory of Forms, for several reasons, including the famous 'Third Man' argument at the end of the *Topics*. What is this argument? Without Platonic Forms, next, how does Aristotle understand the task of definition, which he nonetheless preserves? What role, moreover, do definitions play in his philosophy? Be sure to distinguish the four predicables, as well as the differences between nominal and real definition, genus, species, and differentia.

3. What is the so-called “Square of Opposition”? Draw one and label the logical relationships between its four corners. Be sure to explain these labels, especially contraries and contradictories. Discuss examples of statements at each corner and their logical relationships with one another in order to demonstrate your understanding. Also, name each corner with an ‘A,’ ‘E,’ ‘I,’ or ‘O,’ explaining the medieval Aristotelians’ reasons for doing so. Now, what are categorical syllogisms, as Aristotle developed them in his (*Prior Analytics*)? What role do they play in his (*Posterior Analytics*)? Briefly, how did the medievals’ names for the corners of the square of opposition help them to analyze these arguments, assessing their validity?
4. 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).
5. What was the epistemological paradox presented in Plato’s *Meno*? Be sure to present it as a dilemma. If this dilemma is a sound argument, what conclusion must we draw about knowledge? How did Plato respond to this dilemma? Did he accept it as sound, or did he challenge its soundness? Why can Aristotle accept neither the conclusion of the dilemma nor Plato’s response to it? What solution does he therefore offer to it in his (*Posterior Analytics*)? Be sure to introduce the distinction between potentiality versus actuality, better known to us versus better known without qualification, and induction versus deduction.
6. What are first principles, 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 assume that all premises must be demonstrated? How does Aristotle resolve this dilemma? Be sure not only to distinguish induction, deduction, and demonstration, but also to discuss a scientific example, even if it is a caricature of scientific practice, just as Aristotle himself does.
7. We spent the first third of our course on the *Organon*. What are the treatises in this collection of difficult texts, what main subject does each address, and why are they collected together, let alone in this order? How would you characterize Aristotle’s super-ordinate goal in this collection? And how do these individual texts—not to mention their individual distinctions and arguments—contribute to the achievement of this goal? Do you see, yet, any relation between the goal and arguments of the *Organon*, on the one hand, and the *Physics*, on the other? What role, in short, does Aristotle’s logic and epistemology play in his wider philosophy?
8. The subject of the *Physics* is natural objects, and thus change. What is this relationship—i.e., between natural objects and change—according to Aristotle? Why was change considered a problem in Greek philosophy before Aristotle, especially thanks to Parmenides? Generally speaking, how does Aristotle propose to solve this problem? You

- should recall or introduce at least the following concepts: form versus matter, actuality versus potentiality, substance versus accident. Taking his own examples, what does Aristotle think to be the nature of a bed? Or an animal, such as a raccoon? What is the difference between these ‘natures,’ and what is his reason for drawing this supremely important distinction?
9. Which two English words translate Aristotle’s concept of *αἰτία*, and why are both important to remember when discussing this concept? Using this concept, as he develops it in the *Physics*, first explain a house, and then explain a giraffe. Be sure to articulate all four *αἰτίαι* for each, implicitly showing the versatility of Aristotle’s way of explaining things, whether artificial or natural. Then, by contrast, highlight the differences between the way he would explain an artifact, on the one hand, and an organism, on the other. Using the notion of ‘focal homonymy,’ next, explain which of the four *αἰτίαι* is the most explanatory. Finally, recalling the necessary conditions of primary substance stipulated by Aristotle in *Categories*, what sort of things now seem to meet those conditions?
  10. How does Aristotle understand luck and chance, as distinct from one another, but more importantly in opposition to events that happen neither by luck nor by chance? How does his understanding of these notions reveal, by its reliance upon, his deep belief in natural teleology—the view that there is purpose in nature? What are some of his arguments that there is indeed such purpose? What arguments does he consider to the effect that there is no purpose in nature, only necessity and chaos? How does he claim to refute these arguments? In your estimation, does he succeed? Is there purpose in nature?
  11. What are two paradoxes raised by Aristotle for the notion of the present (in time)? Similarly, what are two paradoxes about motion (in space) that he borrows from Zeno? How does he propose to solve all of these paradoxes? In short, what fundamental error do all of these paradoxes make, and how does he propose to correct that error? What technical distinction from his wider philosophy does he bring to bear on these problems of space and time? Does he thus solve these problems in a principled manner, coherent with his wider philosophy, or are his solutions *ad hoc*? How, in other words, does Aristotle’s philosophy of space and time fit with his wider philosophy?
  12. What is an unmoved mover, and why does Aristotle think there must be one?