

Exam #1 Review Guide  
Philosophy of Mind

The first exam will take place in class on Wednesday, January 31st. It is worth 18% of the final grade (36 points). Notes or books may not be consulted during the examination. The exam will consist of two parts: (1) *Explanation*, in which you will be asked to explain approximately five technical terms, concepts, or arguments in about one paragraph each, and (2) *Evaluation*, in which you will be asked to write an essay of about 7-10 paragraphs in length. The question will be chosen from the list on page 2 of this review guide.

The following list of terms may help you as you begin to review for the exam. It is not an exhaustive list of important terms.

I. Some Things to Study:

1. Substance Dualism
2. Physicalism
3. Reduction
4. Realization
5. The Cartesian Modal Argument (aka, Descartes's Mind/Body Asymmetry Argument) for Substance Dualism
6. Type Identity Theory (aka Type Physicalism)
7. Smart's Occam's Razor Argument for Physicalism
8. "Nomological Dangers"
9. Criticisms of Type Identity Theory (especially the Multiple Realizability Objection)
10. Kripke's Modal Argument Against Identity Theory
11. Token Identity Theory (aka Token Physicalism)

II. Essay Questions: Some—but perhaps not all—of the following three questions (A, B, and C) will appear on the first exam. You will have to answer one of those questions. Here are the possible essay questions:

- A. Explain Descartes's Mind/Bodies Asymmetry Argument for Dualism. Critically evaluate Smart's argument.
- B. Explain Smart's Occam's Razor Argument for the type-identity theory. Critically evaluate Smart's argument.
- C. Explain Kripke's argument against the type-identity theory. Critically evaluate Kripke's argument.

Whichever essay topic you write about, I will ask you the following five questions:

1. What is this argument? Explain each part of it in detail and in your own words. (Don't just write what was on the handout or whiteboard during lecture.) Give examples to illustrate each premise. Make sure to define all fancy terms.

2. What is the weakest single premise of the argument? Give a reason to believe that this premise might be false. (Alternately, you may choose to object to the logical validity of the argument.)
3. What is the best way for a defender of the argument described in #1 to respond to the criticism just described in #2?
4. Do you agree with the criticism you described in #2? Or do you think that the response just described in #3 is adequate to meet the challenge? *Explain and justify your verdict.* (For example, if you agree with the criticism in #2, then explain why the response in #3 fails.)
5. Finally, explain the significance of this debate. Why might somebody care about the topic of the author's argument?