

第一部分：哲學英文 (共 50 分)

請註明大題及子題之題號，字跡請力求清晰。

Please answer all of the following questions in English unless specified.

**Part A**

Please read the following two passages by David Lewis and Michel Foucault:

**David Lewis:**

One comes to philosophy already endowed with a stock of opinions. It is not the business of philosophy either to undermine or to justify these preexisting opinions, to any great extent, but only to try to discover ways of expanding them into an orderly system. It succeeds to the extent that (1) it is systematic, and (2) it respects those of our pre-philosophical opinions to which we are firmly attached. There is some give-and-take, but not too much: some of us sometimes change our minds on some points of common opinion, if they conflict irremediably with a doctrine that commands our belief by its systematic beauty and its agreement with more important common opinions.

**Michel Foucault:**

After all, what would be the value of the passion for knowledge if it resulted only in a certain amount of knowledgeableness and not, in one way or another and to the extent possible, in the knower's straying afield of himself? There are times in life when the question of knowing if one can think differently than one thinks, and perceive differently than one sees, is absolutely necessary if one is to go on looking and reflecting at all. What is philosophy today – philosophical activity, I mean – if it is not the critical work that thought brings to bear on itself? In what does it consist, if not the endeavor to know how and to what extent it might be possible to think differently, instead of legitimating what is already known?

1. Compare the two views. What are the similarities and/or differences between them? (15 points)

**Part B**

Please read the following passage by Elliott Sober:

Many philosophers now regard David Hume's *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion* (1779) as the watershed in this argument's career. Before Hume, it was possible for serious people to be persuaded by the argument, but after the onslaught of Hume's corrosive skepticism, the argument was in shambles and has remained that way ever since. Biologists with an interest in the history of this idea often take a different view (e.g., Dawkins 1986), seeing the publication of Darwin's *Origin of Species* as the watershed event. For the first time, a plausible, nontheistic explanation of adaptation was on the table. After Darwin, there was no longer a need to invoke intelligent design to explain the adaptedness of organisms. It is possible to pose the question about the history of the design argument in two ways.

見背面

The first is sociological: When (if ever) did educated opinion turn against the design argument? With respect to this question, it is quite clear that Hume's *Dialogues* did not put a stop to the argument. In the years between Hume's posthumous publication and the appearance of the *Origin of Species*, the argument fostered a cottage industry. A series of volumes called the *Bridgewater Treatises* appeared, in which some of the best philosophers and scientists in Britain took the design argument very seriously indeed. However, this sociological fact leaves unanswered the second historical question we can ask about the design argument. When (if ever) was the argument shown to be fatally flawed? Many philosophers nowadays think that Hume dealt the deathblow. In their view, the ideas presented in the *Bridgewater Treatises* were walking corpses; the design argument was propped up and paraded even though it already had entered rigor mortis. Part of the problem is that Hume had no serious alternative explanation of the phenomena he discusses. It is not impossible that the design argument should be refutable without anything being provided to stand in its stead. For example, this could happen if the hypothesis of an intelligent designer were incoherent or self-contradictory. But I see no such defect in the argument. It does not surprise me that intelligent people strongly favored the design hypothesis when the only alternative available to them was random physical processes. But Darwin entirely altered the dialectical landscape of this problem. His hypothesis of evolution by natural selection is a third possibility; it requires no intelligent design, nor is natural selection properly viewed as a "random physical process." Paley argued that likelihood considerations favor design over randomness; it is a separate question whether likelihood favors design over evolution by natural selection.

2. Sober thinks that there are two important questions about the history of the design argument. Please explain the two questions and the difference(s) between them in Chinese. (10 points)
3. With regard to the two questions, what role(s) did Hume's *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion* play in the history of the design argument? Please explain Sober's view in as much detail as possible. (15 points)

### Part C

Please read the following passage by Rush Rhees:

So we cannot say of all we do that it were better if it were done scientifically. Nor should we be more adult if we adopted a scientific outlook in these things. There may have been attempts and there will be more, to bring something which men call 'scientific method' into them. But this only shows how a preoccupation with the manners and achievements of science may help to make men stupid. The achievements of science have been enormous; but I do not think they have made men wiser-not the generality of men, at any rate. There is wisdom in science, but that is of another kind, as I shall try to show. There is no reason to think that the methods which have been successful in science will be of help in the face of other difficulties which are not scientific problems at all. If men think that scientific methods must help here, they generally ignore or falsify the difficulties. And the result can only be to weaken men's thinking in those questions that most concern them and their lives.

4. Please explain the main point of the passage in plain English. (10 points)

## 第二部分：邏輯 (共 50 分)

請註明大題及子題之題號，字跡請力求清晰。

一、請使用題目中的符號，將以下語句符號化為述詞邏輯(predicate logic)中的語句(注意：可能需要使用等同符號)(每題 5 分)

5. 張三如果有車，他會開去上班。

( $a = \text{“張三”}$ ,  $Cx = \text{“}x \text{是車”}$ ,  $Hxy = \text{“}x \text{擁有 } y\text{”}$ ,  $Dxy = \text{“}x \text{開 } y \text{去上班”}$ )

6. 張三如果有車，他會有至少兩台車。

( $a = \text{“張三”}$ ,  $Cx = \text{“}x \text{是車”}$ ,  $Hxy = \text{“}x \text{擁有 } y\text{”}$ )

7. 張三唯一的車是黑色的。

( $a = \text{“張三”}$ ,  $Cx = \text{“}x \text{是車”}$ ,  $Hxy = \text{“}x \text{擁有 } y\text{”}$ ,  $Bx = \text{“}x \text{是黑色的”}$ )

8. 張三的車都只載那些沒有車的人。

( $a = \text{“張三”}$ ,  $Cx = \text{“}x \text{是車”}$ ,  $Hxy = \text{“}x \text{擁有 } y\text{”}$ ,  $Lxy = \text{“}x \text{載 } y\text{”}$ )

二、請證明以下論證為有效論證 (每題 10 分)

9.  $(x) \sim Rxx$

$(x)(\exists y)Rxy$

$\therefore (\exists x)(\exists y)(x \neq y)$

10.  $(x)(y)(z)([Rxy \cdot Rxz] \supset Ryz)$

$(x)(\exists y)Ryx$

$\therefore (x)Rxx$

11.  $(x)(y)(z)([Rxy \cdot Rxz] \supset Ryz)$

$(x)Rxx$

$\therefore (x)(y)(Rxy \supset Ryx)$