This exam will be given over to essay questions that ask you to describe the motivation for and the content of various arguments that are offered in the Republic. To do this well you will need to exercise good judgment as to what is relevant to the question asked and what is not: throwing in irrelevant information is as bad as leaving out relevant information. So in preparing for the exam be sure to keep an eye on relevance. Also, of course, you should work in advance to make sure that your answers are not only accurate but clear and concise. On the exam, I will indicate the relative weight of the questions (and so, correspondingly, the amount of detail that should go into your answers) by noting the points each answer is worth.

The questions on the exam will all be taken from this list:

1. What is the difference between something being good for its own sake and it being good because of its consequences? How is the difference relevant to the concerns that sparked Glaucon's challenge? (To answer this well you will need to identify the concerns in a clear and compelling way.)

2. What must one do in order to show successfully that something is good because of its consequences? What must one do in order to show successfully that something is good because of something other than its consequences?

3. Adeimantus considers two objections to the position he and his brother are setting out. What are the objections? Adeimantus replies to each individually but does not point out, as he could, that the objections share a difficulty that renders them ineffective as objections to the position he is defending. What is that difficulty?

4. Socrates sets out to show that the human soul has three parts. Why does he set out to show this? How does he (try to) show it -- what are the two arguments he mobilizes?

5. Towards the end of Book IV Socrates finally discovers, to his satisfaction, the nature of justice. What, according to Socrates, is the connection between being a just person and performing just actions? (To answer this well you need to describe (i) Socrates' view of justice and (ii) his view of what makes an action count as a just action.)

6. In Book II of the Republic, Glaucon issues a challenge to Socrates regarding the value of justice. By the end of Book IV, Socrates claims to have identified what justice is in the individual soul, and Glaucon evidently believes that he has also established that justice is good for its own sake. What argument has convinced Glaucon? (The heart of the argument is found between 444a and 445e, though you will need to bring in a little from what comes before to make your answer clear and coherent. In thinking through your answer note that the argument offered is an argument by analogy. To describe it accurately you need to have a good handle (i) on the supposed analogues and (ii) on what is assumed to be true of one analogue in order to establish that it is true of the other.)

7. In Book IX of the Republic, at 580d, Socrates concludes the main argument he has to offer for thinking that justice is good for its own sake and not only because of what it produces. Describe that main argument. Assume, for the sake of the exam, that Socrates has correctly identified the nature of justice. (You may, and almost surely should, leave out completely any mention of how Socrates arrived at his view concerning its nature.) The heart of the argument is found between 577 and 580d, though you will need to bring in a little from what comes before to make your answer clear and coherent.

8. In book IX of the Republic, following 580d, Socrates offers a second argument (580d-583b), for thinking that the person who is just is better off than one who is not. Describe this additional argument. Assume, for the sake of the exam, that Socrates has correctly identified the nature of justice. (You may, and almost surely should, leave out completely any mention of how Socrates arrived at his view concerning its nature.)

9. In book IX of the Republic, following 583b, Socrates offers a third argument (583b-588), for thinking that the person who is just is better off than one who is not. Describe this third argument. Assume, for the sake of the exam, that Socrates has correctly identified the nature of justice. (You may, and almost surely should, leave out completely any mention of how Socrates arrived at his view concerning its nature.)