**Goal:** The following review guide should test your knowledge of the material covered this far in the course, as well as your ability to apply the material. It also provides an opportunity to practice properly forming an answer to short-answer exam questions. These questions are not necessarily what you might see on the mid-term, and these questions might also be more extensive and challenging than an exam question. However if you can complete the questions on this sheet, you should be on track to do well on the midterm, regardless of the form the questions take.

**Death: Thomas Nagel**

*Readings: T. Nagel, “Death”.*

1. What does Thomas Nagel mean by “Evil”?
2. Why does Thomas Nagel think death is an evil?
3. What does Thomas Nagel consider the “Positive Features” of death to be?
4. What is the Minding Problem? How does Nagel reply*? (essay 1 question, likely not to be on exam)*
5. What is the Subject Problem? How does Nagel reply? *(essay 1 question, likely not to be on exam)*
6. What is the Symmetry Problem? How does Nagel reply? *(essay 1 question, likely not to be on exam)*
7. Another possible problem posed to Nagel’s claim that death is an evil is to say that death us not an evil, just a limitation of the species. Explain how this is a problem. How does Nagel reply? (Hint: Consider Keats at 24 and Tolstoy at 82)
8. What is the difference between a subjective/first person point of view and a objective/third person point of view? Give an example.

**Death: Brueckner & Fischer**

*Reading: A. Brueckner and J. M. Fischer: 'Why is death bad?'*

1. Why is death bad/evil according to Brueckner & Fischer?
2. What is Brueckner & Fischer’s solution to the asymmetry problem?

**Personal Identity: John Perry**

*Perry: ‘A Dialogue on Personal Identity and Immortality’*

1. Explain the distinction between *possible* and *impossible*. Give an example of each.
2. Explain the distinction between *necessary* and *contingent truths*. Give an example of each.
3. Explain the distinction between *type* and *token*. Give an example of each.
4. Explain the distinction between *Identical* and *Exactly Similar*. Illustrate with an example.

*The First Night*

1. What is the context of the dialog (where does it take place, between whom, and why are they talking about personal identity)?
2. Explain the example of the box of Kleenex. What is it meant to show?
3. On the first night, Miller attempts to argue that Personal Identity consists in identity of an Immaterial Soul. Explain the three regressions (“stages” or “tries”) of this argument, and how Weirob replies to each.
4. Explain the example of the caramel candy. What is it meant to show?
5. Explain the example of the river. What is it meant to show?

*The Second Night*

1. On the second night, the idea that Personal Identity consists in identity of a material body is proposed. What is Miller’s concern with this?
2. What is the analogy of the baseball game suppose to show about personal identity?
3. On the second night, Miller suggests memory at the appropriate relation criteria for personal identity. Provide three possible problems with this view.
4. How does Cohen propose to break the circularity of the memory criterion?
5. In lecture, we discussed how identity is i) reflexive, ii) symmetric, and iii) transitive. Explain what each of these means with examples.
6. Explain how there being two Gretchen Weirobs in heaven is a problem for the “memories caused in the right relation” account of personal identity? How are we to modify this account of personal identity in light of the two Gretchen Weirobs in heaven example?

*The Third Night*

1. Explain the case of Julia North, and how this is a puzzle for personal identity.

**Personal Identity: Ship of Theseus**

*90 Second Philosophy Video:* [*https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kVAHXiKjgRo*](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kVAHXiKjgRo)

*Video:* [*https://www.khanacademy.org/partner-content/wi-phi/metaphys-epistemology/v/ship-of-theseus*](https://www.khanacademy.org/partner-content/wi-phi/metaphys-epistemology/v/ship-of-theseus)

1. Explain the Ship of Theseus puzzle/paradox. (Hint: be sure to motivate what is so paradoxical with the two principles and transitivity of identity).
2. One possible approach to resolving the puzzle of Ship of Theseus is to reject the first principle. Explain how this resolution is to work and its implications.
3. One possible approach to resolving the puzzle of Ship of Theseus is to reject the second principle. Explain how this resolution is to work and its implications.
4. One possible approach to resolving the puzzle of Ship of Theseus is to reject the Transitivity of Identity. Explain how this resolution is to work and its implications.
5. One possible approach to resolving the puzzle of Ship of Theseus is to think about the ship as a “worm”. Explain how this resolution is to work and its implications.
6. Which resolution do you find the most compelling? Why?

**Personal Identity: Locke**

*Video:* [*https://www.khanacademy.org/partner-content/wi-phi/the-history-of-philosophy/v/locke-personal-identity-part-3*](https://www.khanacademy.org/partner-content/wi-phi/the-history-of-philosophy/v/locke-personal-identity-part-3)

1. What is Locke’s position on using memory at the appropriate relation criteria for personal identity? What are its implications? (Hint: the breakfast problem will help explain this).
2. Explain the problem of the boy that became a young officer and a senior general in relation to the memory criterion of personal identity. Is there a fix?