## **STUDY QUESTIONS FOR THE SECOND EXAM** Philosophy 3300 University of Utah, Fall 2002

- (1) I. T. Oakley argues that there are no basic beliefs. Respond to each of the following:
  (a) What is a basic belief? (b) According to Oakley, what *two* kinds of beliefs are candidates for basic beliefs? (c) Explain why, according to Oakley, *neither* of these two kinds of beliefs can be basic.
- (2) (a) What is foundherentism? (b) Explain how foundherentism incorporates elements of coherentism. (In providing this explanation, you may appeal to Haack's crossword-puzzle analogy.) (c) Explain how Haack's foundherentism can incorporate elements of coherentism without becoming susceptible to the criticisms that plague coherentism.
- (3) (a) According to Goldman, what is missing from the traditional analysis of knowledge?
  (b) State Goldman's *first* revision of the traditional analysis of knowledge. (c) How does Goldman's first revision account for knowledge via perception? How does it account for knowledge via testimony? (d) Explain how knowledge of the future generates a problem for Goldman's first revision of the traditional analysis of knowledge.
- (4) (a) What is the Relevant Alternatives Theory of Knowledge? (In answering this question, make sure that you say what an *alternative* is and what *relevance* is.) (b) What is contextualism, and how is it different from the Relevant Alternatives Theory of Knowledge? (In responding to this question, make sure that you say what *subject factors* are and what *attributor factors* are. Also, make sure that you explain how these factors contribute to the differences between Contextualism and the Relevant Alternatives Theory.) (c) Explain the advantages, as DeRose sees them, that Contextualism has over the Relevant Alternatives Theory.
- (5) (a) Explain both the notion of certainty and the notion of indubitability. (The conjunction of these two notions is the Cartesian standard for knowledge.) (b) Describe one of the scenarios suggested by Descartes that is supposed to lead us to believe that we have no perceptual knowledge, or no mathematical or geometrical knowledge. (c) State Descartes' argument—the one that incorporates the scenario you described in the second part of this question—that is supposed to show that we have no perceptual knowledge, or no mathematical or geometrical knowledge, or no mathematical or geometrical knowledge.
- (6) (a) What, according to Putnam, is required for reference? (b) Explain how this account of reference helps to show that the claim that you might be a brain-in-a-vat is self-refuting. (c) Given the self-refuting nature of the claim that you might be a brain-in-a-vat, what can we say about the brain-in-a-vat skeptical argument?

## TERMS

Basic beliefs The circular view of justification (a.k.a. linear coherentism) The infinite regress view of justification The foundational view of justification (a.k.a. foundationalism) Nonlinear coherentism Cognitively spontaneous beliefs BonJour's Observation Requirement Incorrigible beliefs Self-justifying beliefs Immediately justified beliefs Mediately justified beliefs Minimal foundationalism Foundherentism

The traditional analysis of knowledge The causal analysis of knowledge (either the first or the second version will do) The defeasibility analysis of knowledge Defeat (either the first or the second version will do) The relevant alternatives theory of knowledge Alternative Subject factors Attributor factors Contextualism

Certainty Indubitability