Instructor's Manual and Test Bank for

The Great Conversation

A Historical Introduction to Philosophy

EIGHTH EDITION

Norman Melchert

Professor Emeritus, Lehigh University

David R. Morrow

Visiting Fellow, George Mason University

New York Oxford

Oxford University Press

Contents

18. Hobbes, Locke, and Berkeley: Materialism and the Beginnings of Empiricism

19. David Hume: Unmasking the Pretensions of Reason

20. Immanuel Kant: Rehabilitating Reason (within Strict Limits)

21. Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel: Taking History Seriously

22. Kierkegaard and Marx: Two Ways to "Correct" Hegel

23. Moral and Political Reformers: The Happiness of All, Including Women

24. Friedrich Nietzsche: The Value of Existence

25. The Pragmatists: Thought and Action

26. Ludwig Wittgenstein: Linguistic Analysis and Ordinary Language

27. Martin Heidegger: The Meaning of Being

28. Simone de Beauvoir: Existentialist, Feminist

29. Postmodernism: Derrida, Foucault, and Rorty

30. Physical Realism And The Mind: Quine, Dennett, Searle, Nagel, Jackson, and Chalmers

Student Paper Topics

Preface

This eighth edition of *The Great Conversation* again offers an Instructor's Manual and test bank, as well as a Computerized Test Bank for both Mac and PC use that includes approximately double the number of multiple choice questions available to students. Although some users may not feel the need for such an aid, it seems to have proved useful to the harried instructors among us, and may even enrich somewhat the teaching of all. I do not imagine that as an instructor you will rely solely on the materials in this little manual. You should regard it as supplementary, some suggestions that may help you do a bit better what you no doubt even now do well.

Here let me make some general comments about how I teach *The Great Conversation*. I'm sure there are many good ways to do it, so you should regard this as only one possibility.

1. I have taught it both as a full-year course and as a one-semester course, using one of the paperback volumes. Descartes gets taught in both terms. The entire book can be used in one semester, too, though much will have to be omitted. This does

give the instructor (you) a lot of flexibility to shape the course as you like.

2. Classes are—as is appropriate for this particular text—intensely interactive. To make this work, students must have read the assignments ahead of time, so I make a big point of the importance of this. I make sure to learn the students' names (at least in classes smaller than fifty). Asking them to always sit in the same place—their choice, but always the same—helps me in this regard. It sometimes takes a few weeks before they get the idea that discussion will predominate, but eventually the classes are very lively.

3. To break the material into chunks students can master, I usually give five short quizzes during the term. Dates for the quizzes are announced in the syllabus—no surprises. A quiz occupies the first fifteen minutes of a class period. The best four of these quizzes are counted toward the grade, and I do not offer make-ups on quizzes unless a student misses more than one, in which case the make-up is an oral quiz in my office.

4. Note that the multiple-choice questions supplied in this manual have just one correct answer, which is indicated by an "x".

5. Mostly I use short-answer questions on the quizzes. I find these more satisfactory than multiple-choice questions for determining if students actually understand the material. Grading five short answers (out of a choice of seven or eight) doesn't take that long for forty students. When I have had much larger classes, the department hired graders—previous students who did well in the class. With model answers before them, and me available for questions, these students do quite a good job. And they enjoy it.

6. I always give back model answers to quiz questions when I return the quizzes (nearly always in the next class period). This allows students to compare their answers with good answers, is educationally sound, I think, and removes the need to go over the quizzes in class. It also has the side benefit of reducing arguments about the scoring virtually to zero. It does mean that quizzes cannot be used over and over again, one

semester after another. But that seems a small price to pay for the benefits.

7. Typically there is also a midterm and a comprehensive final exam. These always include one or two essay questions (some choice allowed), typically of a comparative nature. I also give back model answers for the midterm.

8. A paper is assigned (sometimes two) with a quite different aim from that of the quizzes and exams. In the paper, students are to philosophize, not report their understanding of someone else's philosophizing. Some sample paper assignments are included at the end of this manual.

Well, that's how I do it. I'm sure you will find your own way to make the class interesting, challenging, and even fun.

1

Before Philosophy

Myth in Hesiod and Homer

Essential Points

- Myth as stories, typically about beginnings and the gods
- Hesiod: War among the gods

  Hesiod claims inspiration from the muses

  The origins of all things from chaos

  The Titans, overthrown by Zeus and his allies

  The (relative) orderliness of the Olympians and their rule over the universe
- Homer: Heroes, gods, and excellence

  The war against Troy

    The anger of Achilles

    Its terrible consequences

  Moderation the chief virtue

  Justice as each getting his due; the quest for honor

  The role of the gods

  Mortals are not gods.

  Hubris

Teaching Suggestions

1. There is plenty of occult stuff around these days to convince students the quarrel between philosophy and myth is not over. Hesiod may seem arcane, but it should not be hard to get them to see that the reasons for accepting Hesiod are about the same as the reasons many widely popular schemes are accepted today. For clues to some examples, you might take a look at Martin Gardner's *The New Age: Notes of a Fringe Watcher,* Prometheus Books, 1988.

2. There should be enough in the chapter to get students to appreciate the dramatic and wonderful story of the *Iliad*—maybe even to persuade some of them to read it. The morals drawn by Homer will reverberate through Greek philosophy.

Exam Questions

A. Multiple-Choice Questions

1. Hesiod claimed to write his poems

a. after exhaustive study of the heavens and the earth.

b. by collecting stories that had been passed down from the ancestors.

x c. through divine inspiration.

d. because he was bored while herding sheep on holy Helicon.

2. Zeus came to be “father of gods and men,” according to Hesiod,

a. by swallowing a stone and vomiting it up again.

x b. through war against his father.

c. by general acclamation of all the other gods.

d. because he was the first-born son of Earth and Heaven.

3. The quarrel between Achilles and Agamemnon began when

x a. Agamemnon demanded that Achilles give him the woman Achilles had been awarded as spoils from a battle.

b. Hector killed Achilles' friend, Patroclus.

c. Achilles wanted the woman Agamemnon had been awarded as spoils from a battle.

d. Apollo sent a plague on the army.

4. The gods, in Homer's poem,

a. urge men to be more like themselves.

b. live in delight and splendor on Olympus, scarcely ever thinking about the affairs of men.

c. function as moral ideals for human beings, who have a hard time living up to the gods' standards.

x d. care about the honor given them by men.

5. Homer

a. advises humans to live well, so as to merit eternal life.

x b. praises moderation.

c. disparages the quest for honor and glory, since it leads to quarrels and disaster for so many.

d. portrays gods and men as immortal.

B. Short-Answer Questions

1. How, according to Hesiod, did Zeus come to be king of the gods?

He was born of Rhea and Kronos, both Titans, together with numerous brothers and sisters. Kronos, jealous of his power, was swallowing each of his children after birth, but Rhea hid Zeus and gave Kronos a stone to swallow instead. When he grew up, Zeus freed his siblings and together with some allies waged war on the Titans, dethroning them from power and becoming ruler himself.

2. What brought on the quarrel between Agamemnon and Achilles?

The daughter of a priest of Apollo had been captured in a raid on a Trojan ally and awarded to Agamemnon. He refused to return her to her father when ransom was offered. Apollo sent a plague to teach them to honor the god; to rid the army of the plague, Agamemnon gave the girl back. He demanded in return, however, the woman of Achilles. And Achilles was furious.

3. How does *The Iliad* end?

After Achilles' friend Patroclus is killed by Hector, Achilles reenters the battle. In single combat, he kills Hector and drags his body behind his chariot back to his tent. At night, disguised, Hector's father, King Priam, sneaks through the Greek lines, goes to Achilles, and begs for the body of his son. Achilles and Priam weep together, and Achilles gives him what he asks.

4. What virtues are praised in *The Iliad*?

Courage, cleverness, physical prowess, and moderation—the latter because it was the lack of moderation in Achilles' anger that brought near destruction to the Greeks.

5. Describe the gods of Olympus as Homer portrays them.

They are powerful, jealous of the honor due them, and interested in the affairs of men, about which they often take sides and quarrel among themselves. They form a kind of family, many of them being related to one another. They are the immortals, and as such enjoy a kind of happiness denied to mortals. Zeus is king among them and the most powerful, though he is not all-powerful.

C. Essay Questions

1. What can we learn from Homer's poem about how to be excellent human beings?

2. What does the term "theogony" mean? Relate several central events in Hesiod's theogony.

2

Philosophy Before Socrates

Essential Points

- Basic problems of early philosophy:

  The one and the many

  Reality and appearance

  The place of humans in the universe

- Thales: The One as water

  Looking to this world for explanation

    Water as the cause and element of all things

    All things are filled with gods

- Anaximander: The One as the Boundless

  Problems with Thales' hypothesis

  The argument for the Boundless

  Differentiation through a vortex motion

  Things make reparation to each other for injustice

- Xenophanes: The gods as Fictions

  The gods are immoral

  The gods are made in the image of mortals

  One god, not similar to mortals

Humans' relation to the truth

- Heraclitus: Oneness in the *Logos*

  All things are in flux and in opposition

  The world-order, fire, the *logos*

  Wisdom is understanding the *logos*

  Learning through sight, hearing, understanding

  Happiness and moderation: Internal opposition is essential

- Parmenides: Only the One

  The premises of his argument: Thought and being are the same; nothing is not; nothing cannot be thought

  The conclusions:

    There is not a many

    There can be no change

    Even time must be an illusion

  Characteristics of the One

  Rationalism

- Zeno: The paradoxes of common sense

  How Zeno means to pay back Parmenides' critics "with interest"

  Three sample arguments

  The structure of these arguments: *Reductio ad absurdum*

- Atomism: The One and the Many reconciled

  The Key: An ambiguity

    Critique of Parmenides' argument

  The world

  Explaining phenomena in terms of atoms and the void:

    Light and heavy, soft and hard, flexible and rigid, change

    Mechanism and the problem for free will

  The Soul

    The soul is material, too

    Mental phenomena explained: sensations

    We are cut off from the real by the nature of sensation, but we can reason to it

  How to live

Teaching Suggestions

1. It is important that this chapter not be taught as just one view after another. I try to stress how every subsequent thinker sees a problem in a previous one and tries to solve it. Karl Popper cited these pre-Socratics as displaying the method (which he favored)

of “conjectures and refutations,” and that seems a promising hook on which to hang the discussions.

2. In teaching Parmenides, I have found it best to start with his conclusions: There are not many things, and nothing ever changes. These are startling enough that students wonder why anyone would ever believe such things, and they are then engaged.

Exam Questions

A. Multiple-Choice Questions

1. In saying that all things are full of gods, Thales apparently meant that

a. Homer was right in saying that what happens can be attributed to the will of the gods.

b. traditional religious views could be defended after all.

x c. explanations of events in the world could be explained in terms of events in the world.

d. science has its limits.

2. Anaximander's argument for the Boundless as that out of which all things come

a. appeals to the infinite quality of the universe.

x b. assumes that observable features of the world all need explaining.

c. holds that explanations can go back and back infinitely far.

d. identifies the Boundless with the gods of Homer's poems.

3. How does Anaximander explain the generation of the many things in our experience?

x a. By positing a cosmic swirl or vortex which spins like things to like.

b. By a theory of evolution.

c. By an appeal to one god, unlike us in any way.

d. By an infinite regress argument.

4. Xenophanes criticizes the Homeric gods

a. for not coming to our aid when we need them.

x b. as unworthy of our admiration and respect.

c. and says there are no gods at all.

d. and substitutes other gods from more moral traditions.

5. Xenophanes says that with respect to the truth,

a. humans have never known it and will never know it.

b. it was revealed to us from of old.

x c. even if we knew it, we couldn't know for sure that we knew it.

d. if we seek it, not relying on the stories of the poets, we will be sure to find it.

6. What, according to Heraclitus, is wisdom?

a. Minding your own business and being content with what you have.

b. Satisfying your every desire.

c. Recognizing that life in this world is but a dream.

x d. Understanding the thought that steers all things.

7. Most people, Heraclitus says,

a. but not all, are in daily contact with the *logos*.

x b. live as though their thought were private to themselves.

c. are willing and unwilling to be called Zeus.

d. fight against impulse, for what it wants it buys at the expense of the soul.

8. Parmenides is rightly called a rationalist because

a. he rationalizes and deceives himself about the truth.

b. he gives reasons explaining all things, even change.

c. unlike his predecessors, he was a rational person.

x d. he is willing to follow the argument wherever it leads.

9. The One of Parmenides is

a. in continuous flux and opposition.

x b. unchanging, all alike, and eternal.

c. identical in concept with the Boundless of Anaximander, which spins the many out of its own substance.

d. a useful fiction, Parmenides says, that confers unity on the many diverse things in the universe.

10. Democritus says that sweet and bitter exist by convention. By this he means that

a. if we came to agree they didn't exist, they would disappear.

b. the words "sweet" and "bitter" (or their Greek equivalents) were agreed to by humans at a convention in Athens.

x c. their nature depends as much on us as on the things themselves.

d. convention is an avenue into the real.

B. Short-Answer Questions

1. In what way is Thales' statement that water is the origin and element of all things a criticism of the Homeric tradition?

Homer tended to explain things in terms of the will of the gods. For instance, the plague that fell on Agamemnon's army was caused by an angry Apollo. Thales, in contrast, holds that events in the world have an explanation in terms of some perfectly natural, worldly, cause—water and its variants. If Thales is right, then Homer must be wrong.

2. What does Thales mean when he says that all things are filled with gods?

He means that we do not have to look beyond things to find the explanations for their behavior. Gods were understood as the movers, those who made things happen. Thales says that the principles that account for the action, change, qualities, and movements of things are immortal and are resident in the things themselves.

3. What is Anaximander's argument for his belief that it cannot be water that is the final explanation of all things, but something Boundless?

Since water is just one of the many things we experience, it too needs explanation. If water originates in something else, call it A, then A also requires explaining. Suppose A is explained by B. But B calls for explanation as well. Then B must originate in C—and so on and on. But this regress cannot go on to infinity. So there must be something not requiring an origin, something that *is* an origin but doesn't *have* an origin. This must be something without beginning or end, something limitless, infinite, or Boundless.

4. What is Anaximander's explanation of how the many things of our experience emerge from the Boundless?

The Boundless is swirling in a great vortex motion. What happens in such a swirl is that things tend to cluster with things like themselves, and the heavier they are the closer to the center of the swirl they come. So the cold and heavy earth is deposited at the center and a very hot and fiery sphere is at the periphery, with water and air between. More specific changes occur because of the interactions among these basic elements.

5. State Xenophanes' two criticisms of the Homeric gods.

(1) Homer portrays the gods as doing shameful things. (2.) Since different images of gods are found in different cultures, it is evident that they are fictions, invented by the people of some particular culture.

6. How—and how not—according to Xenophanes, are we to learn the truth?

Xenophanes says that the truth has not been revealed to us by the gods. So we have to seek for it. He adds that our aim should be to make our opinions more and more like the truth, since we can never be certain that we do have it—even when we do.

7. How does Heraclitus use the concept of the *logos* to solve the problem of the one and the many?

Why is this world of many things not just a chaos, but one world, a *uni*-verse? Because there is a rational structure or pattern in which everything has its proper place. This structure is the *logos*, which makes one out of many; it does not come into being or pass away; it is divine.

8. Explain Heraclitus' saying that "War is the father and king of all."

By "war" Heraclitus means opposition, which is essential to the nature of each thing. Everything is a unity or harmony of elements in tension with one another—the river, the lyre, a just society. If one aspect or force were to gain the upper hand, there would be no distinct things at all. So war is "father" of all in that it brings things into being, and "king" of all in that it rules over their existence as long as they last.

9. What is Parmenides' argument that there cannot be any change in reality?

If there were change, it would involve a transition from what is not to what is, or from what is to what is not. When water is brought to the boil, for instance, it leaves the state of not boiling and moves to the state where it is boiling. But what is not cannot be thought, and not being cannot be. So, despite the testimony of our senses, in reality there cannot be any change. There is only the One, eternal, immutable, indivisible.

10. What is Parmenides' argument that there cannot be many things in reality?

Whatever is, is. If there were many things, what could separate one thing that is from another that is? Only what is not. But what is not *is* not, and cannot be thought. So it is impossible for one thing to be separated from another; so there cannot be, nor be thought to be, many things.

11. Sketch Zeno's paradox of the arrow, and explain why he thought it paid back Parmenides' critics "with interest."

If an arrow moves, it must move either in the space it occupies or in a space it does not occupy. It can do neither, so it cannot move. Zeno thought this argument showed that commonsense beliefs were contradictory, since (1) common sense holds that the arrow does move, and (2) from commonsense premises it can be deduced that it does not move. So common sense is not only false, but worse: Necessarily false.

12. Sketch the argument of the atomists—Democritus, for instance—that they claim undermines Parmenides' proof that there cannot be many things.

The atomists claim to find an ambiguity in the proof of Parmenides. He argues that nothing is not, and in one sense that is correct, but in another incorrect. It is correct for *absolutely* nothing, or *nothing at all*; but in the sense of No-thing (that is, no body) it can perfectly well exist. As such, it is the void, or empty space, that can separate one thing from another and make possible the existence of many things.

13. What, according to Democritus, explains the great variety of things in the world?

The things that we are familiar with are all composed of atoms, those tiny, indissoluble, eternal bits that differ from each other in shape, size, and position. Atoms hook into each other in a great variety of ways, thus constituting things soft and hard, large and small, etc. When they lose their usual connections, the things we know pass away, though the atoms of which they are composed do not.

14. What problem does Democritus' atomism raise for free choice?

If atomism is true, then everything that exists is made up of atoms and the void—including human beings. Atoms interact in a purely mechanical fashion, without any purpose or intention. So what happens is a strict consequence of the laws of motion and the prior state of things. And this applies to our choices, too. So if atomism is correct, it is a kind of illusion that we initiate actions; all our choices are but a necessary result of a prior state of the world. This view is called "determinism."

C. Essay Questions

1. Sum up Heraclitus' solution to the problem of the one and the many.

2. Heraclitus says, "Wisdom is one thing: To understand the thought which steers all things through all things." Explain.

3. How does Parmenides resolve the problem of reality and appearance? Why does it turn out the way it does?

4. Write a dialogue in which a Parmenidean and an atomist debate about the nature of reality.

5. On atomist principles, what happens to the notion of a cosmic intelligence (a god)? And why?

3

Appearance and Reality in Ancient India

Essential Points

- Vedas and Upaniṣads

  Development of philosophy out of mythical explanations of nature

  Move from polytheism to monotheism and monism (*brahman*)

  Upaniṣadic self (*ātman*) – immaterial, eternal, conscious perceiver

  The cycle of rebirth (*saṃsāra*) as a product of *karma*

  The self (*ātman*) may be identical to *brahman*; difference is illusory

- The Buddha

  Rejected authority of Vedas and Upaniṣads

  Aim: Cessation of all suffering

  The Four Noble Truths –

  the existence, origination, cessation, and path to cessation of suffering (*duḥkha*)

The cause of suffering = attachment; the cause of attachment = false understanding of self and reality

Eightfold Noble Path –

right view/intention/speech/conduct/livelihood/effort/mindfulness/concentration

Four Divine Abidings

Lovingkindness, compassion, joy, equanimity

Cessation of suffering = escape from cycle of rebirth (*saṃsāra*) = *nirvāṇa*

Nirvāṇa without remainder = total escape upon death of the body

All things are aggregates of momentary elements (*skandha*)

Five skandhas:

material form, sensation, perception, habitual mental activity, consciousness

Anātman = non-self, rejection of enduring soul, unitary agent

Clinging to the delusional idea of self is the source of attachment

Anitya = impermanence, all things are constantly arising and ceasing

Dependent origination = all events are fully caused by preceding events

How do non-self and impermanence cohere with rebirth and karma?

Buddhists' answer = causal connections between bundles of skandhas

- Nāgasena

  Mereological argument against the existence of wholes over and above their parts, against selves over and above the skandhas. Names are just conventional designations for skandhas arranged in a certain way.

- Vaiśeṣika

  Realists about the diversity of selves and objects in the world

  Four atomic material elements (water, air, fire, earth)

  Fifth omnipresent material element = ether

  Atomic and composite material substances

  Inherence and conjunction relations

Composite wholes inhere in their conjoined parts

Attributes – e.g., color, taste, magnitude – inhere in substances

Particularity (*viśeṣa*) – distinguishes individual substances from each other

Universals inhere in substances, attributes, and motions

Selves (*ātman*) = non-material substances in which mental states inhere

Mind = internal sense organ distinct from the self

- Nyāya

  Developed logic and epistemology to complement Vaiśeṣika metaphysics

  Pramāṇa = source of knowledge

    Four pramāṇas = perception, inference, analogy, testimony

  Perception = arises from connection between sense faculty and object; non-linguistic, inerrant, and definitive

  Tarka = supports one view by showing another incompatible view to contradict evidence from a *pramāṇa*

Arguments against anti-realists about composite wholes, objects in general, and the self:

Composite wholes are directly perceived

No basis for claiming that objects we experience while awake are unreal just like the objects we experience while dreaming

An enduring, substantial self can be inferred from the existence of mental states, multi-sensory perception of a single object, karma, and rebirth

Teaching Suggestions

1. Major theoretical differences aside, every branch of Brahmanical and Buddhist philosophy shares two basic goals – the elimination of suffering, and liberation from the cycle of rebirth (*saṃsāra*). In addition to examining the Buddha's claim that all is suffering, it can be worthwhile to reflect with students about why philosophers in India took rational analysis to be an essential method for achieving the elimination of suffering, in tandem with the practices of yoga and meditation that are more commonly associated with Indian

traditions. Useful parallels can be drawn with ancient Greek and Hellenistic conceptions of philosophy as *therapeia*.

2. One way to motivate the Indian philosophical tenets of karma and rebirth is to discuss their implications in the context of moral agency and motivation, that is, as answers to the question, "Why be moral?" The notion of karma can be used as a response to the Myth of Gyges in Plato's *Republic*, in comparison with Plato's own notions of psychic justice and harmony. A point of contrast worth discussing could be that, whereas the Greeks motivate moral action by appealing to considerations of individual flourishing (*eudaimonia*), the Buddhists' rejection of a substantial individual self allows karma to serve as a more altruistic foundation for moral action: If the person who receives future karmic consequences of my actions is no more "my self" than other persons are, then I have no reason to privilege the karmic consequences of my actions for my future self over the consequences of my actions for other persons.

3. Have students come up with their own examples of knowledge that would arise from the knowledge sources (*pramāṇa*) outlined by Nyāya. Have them judge whether their examples can meet the

Nyāya criteria for what should count as perceptual, inferential, testimonial, or analogical knowledge, and whether these four sources exhaust the whole scope of knowledge.

Exam Questions

A. Multiple-Choice Questions

1. Within the Vedas, philosophical reflections on Vedic myths, hymns, and rituals are found primarily in the
   A) Saṃhitas.
   B) Brāhmaṇas.
   C) Āraṇyakas.
   D) Upaniṣads.
   Ans: D

2. In the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad*, the god Indra finally discovers that the true self (*ātman*), which is free from all evils, sorrows, old age and death, is
   A) the body.
   B) that which wanders around freely in dreams.
   C) that which experiences perceptions and thoughts through the senses and mind.
   D) that which undergoes dreamless sleep.
   Ans: C

3. Because the self is that which perceives the whole world, the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* claims that the self
   A) cannot itself be perceived.
   B) is reducible to a set of biological processes.
   C) is affected by the objects that it perceives.
   D) is eternal and unchanging.
   Ans: A

4. For the *Bhagavad Gītā*, the cycle of *saṃsāra* entails that
   A) you are likely to be born as an animal in the next life.
   B) after your death, you can choose what your future life will be like.
   C) it is the same self which loses its body in one life and takes on a new body in its next life.
   D) your karma is reset with each new reincarnation.
   Ans: C

5. The doctrine of karma fundamentally holds that when people perform good actions,
   A) they will tend to live good lives.
   B) they will experience good consequences as a causal result of those actions.
   C) God will look upon them favorably.
   D) they are guaranteed to become Brahmins in their next lives.
   Ans: B

6. Even if we are able to acquire whatever we desire in life, the Buddha will consider our lives to involve suffering because
   A) we won't get to fully enjoy what we've acquired until we reach heaven.
   B) the threat of loss and lack of control over what we've acquired causes us anxiety and unease.
   C) other people will become jealous about what we've acquired.
   D) we should never be complacent and should always strive to acquire more.
   Ans: B

7. The Buddha thought that we have attachments to things because, fundamentally,
   A) society conditions us to desire more and more things.
   B) attachments make life worth living.
   C) we are inherently selfish.
   D) we have a false understanding of reality.
   Ans: D

8. According to the Buddhist doctrine of impermanence,
   A) the self only exists for one lifetime, and not beyond.
   B) objects exist as long they are perceived.
   C) all objects are streams of momentary skandhas.
   D) there is an unchanging essence to all things.
   Ans: C

9. To refute the idea that there is a self who is an autonomous author of one's actions, the Buddha cites the doctrine of
   A) dependent origination.
   B) karma and rebirth.
   C) emptiness.
   D) the Eightfold Path.
   Ans: A

10. To explain how someone can experience the karmic consequences of their actions in another rebirth, the Buddhists claim that
    A) it is the same self which performs the action in this life and experiences the consequences of that action in its next life.
    B) there is a causal connection between the bundle of skandhas that performed the action in this life and the bundle of skandhas that exists in the next life.
    C) God ensures that you will experience what you deserve.
    D) your experience of these consequences in another life is due to random chance.
    Ans: B

11. When an enlightened person achieves the first stage of *nirvāṇa*, that person
    A) no longer experiences strong desires or aversions.
    B) ceases to exist altogether.
    C) will come back in future lives to remove the suffering of others.
    D) stops experiencing any pain or pleasure at all.
    Ans: A

12. One reason that Nāgasena uses the chariot example is to illustrate how
    A) a whole is the sum collection of its parts.
    B) a whole can be identified with its most essential parts.
    C) there are no such things as wholes which exist over and above their parts.
    D) it makes no sense at all to talk about chariots as existing in the first place.
    Ans: C

13. Having failed to identify Nāgasena with any of his body parts or any of the five skandhas, King Milinda initially thinks that
    A) Nāgasena is identical with his unchanging *ātman*.
    B) Nāgasena must not exist at all, and is lying about his own existence.
    C) Nāgasena is being indecisive about his own true identity.
    D) Nāgasena is being humorous.
    Ans: B

14. According to Nāgasena, the name "Nāgasena" is
    A) a conventional designation for skandhas arranged in a certain way.
    B) a totally meaningless sound.
    C) used to refer to the same person across time.
    D) a rigid designator.
    Ans: A

15. One reason why a chariot cannot be identical with all of its parts is that
    A) the chariot is not reducible to its parts.

B) the word "chariot" does not refer to all of its parts.
C) the chariot supposedly has properties which the chariot-parts lack.
D) both the chariot and its parts are totally unreal.
Ans: C

16. Against the Buddhists, the Vaiśeṣika school develops the notion of inherence to explain how
A) composite substances exist intrinsically.
B) a substance is nothing but a collection of parts arranged a certain way.
C) attributes belong to a substance intrinsically.
D) a whole can arise as a new object when its parts are combined in the right way.
Ans: D

17. The role of particularity (*viśeṣa*) in the Vaiśeṣika system is to
A) distinguish general properties from individual substances.
B) represent the object of perception.
C) individuate one attribute from another.
D) mark a substance as being numerically distinct from every other substance.
Ans: D

18. According to Vaiśeṣika, the self (*ātman*) is
A) identical with *brahman*.
B) composed of physical atoms.
C) a substance in which mental states like knowledge and feeling inhere.
D) a substance in which the mind or internal sense organ inheres.
Ans: C

19. Which of the following is **not** a genuine source of knowledge (*pramāṇa*), according to Nyāya?
A) perception
B) memory
C) testimony
D) inference
Ans: B

20. The author of the *Nyāya Sūtra* defines perception as "not depending on language" because
A) perceptual knowledge is fundamentally ineffable.
B) acquiring perceptual knowledge does not require the ability to verbally articulate that knowledge.
C) the meanings of words are not perceptible.

D) the nature of ultimate reality cannot be captured in language.
Ans: B

21. The method of *tarka* is not itself a genuine source of knowledge (*pramāṇa*) because
A) it only suggests that a certain view is consistent with what is known to be true through a *pramāṇa*.
B) it cannot decide which view is the most likely to be true.
C) it is only used to negate an opponent's view without establishing one's own view as correct.
D) it can only be used when there is no fact of the matter.
Ans: A

22. For Nyāya, the existence of desire, aversion, effort, pleasure, pain, and knowledge are inferential marks which prove the existence of
A) the self.
B) God.
C) suffering.
D) the external world.
Ans: A

23. The Vedas are composed of hymns devoted solely to the polytheistic worship of nature deities.
A) True
B) False
Ans: B

24. For the Upaniṣads, the self is eternal and ultimately identical with *brahman*, the single deity that comprises the whole world.
A) True
B) False
Ans: A

25. The Buddha's teachings are where the notions of karma and rebirth first appear in ancient India.
A) True
B) False
Ans: B

26. The Buddha taught a kind of pessimism that suggests there is no possible escape from the pervasive suffering of life.
    A) True
    B) False
    Ans: B

27. For the Buddha, one's intentions determine the moral quality of one's action.
    A) True
    B) False
    Ans: A

28. The Buddhist doctrine of non-self (*anātman*) entails that there is no entity which can constitute or belong to a person's identity or essence.
    A) True
    B) False
    Ans: A

29. Nāgasena is trying to convince Milinda that the name "Nāgasena" refers just to one specific type of skandha, and not any others.
    A) True
    B) False
    Ans: B

30. All Brahmanical schools of Indian philosophy agree with the Upaniṣadic teaching that everything is identical with Brahman.
    A) True
    B) False
    Ans: B

31. According to Vaiśeṣika, a universal property of redness inheres in an individual instance of red color, the red color inheres in a substance, and all three of these entities can be perceived by our sense faculties.
    A) True
    B) False
    Ans: A

32. Vaiśeṣika claims that particularities (*viśeṣa*) individuate and differentiate all existing things by inhering in them.
    A) True
    B) False

Ans: B

33. Nyāya characterizes perceptual knowledge as "definitive" because it is not only redundant but impossible for an object known through perception to be known through any other source of knowledge.
A) True
B) False
Ans: B

34. On Vātsyāyana's explanation of the Nyāya theory of testimony, someone is a trustworthy authority when that person has direct knowledge of some fact and has a desire to communicate that fact.
A) True
B) False
Ans: A

35. Nyāya argues that because the eyes cannot perceive an object through touch, and fingers cannot perceive an object through sight, the experience that I touch what I saw is an illusion.
A) True
B) False
Ans: B

B. Short-Answer Questions

1. What are the reasons why the Upaniṣads claim that the self (*ātman*) is immortal?

One reason the self is immortal is because it must be distinct from the physical body. The self is that which perceives and thinks, and hence is to be distinguished from the material sense faculties which it uses to perceive and think. Only physical things like the body are subject to death and decay; because the self is not physical like the body, it is hence not subject to death and decay. The self must also be immortal in order to explain the continuity of karmic consequences across lifetimes. Given that my actions in this life will affect the circumstances of my rebirth in another life, my self must be identical with the self

that is reborn in the next life. So, the self must endure beyond the death of my physical body in this life.

2. In what sense did early Buddhists claim that all things are impermanent (*anitya*)?

All things are impermanent in that they are reducible to aggregates of skandhas that constantly come into and pass out of existence. Skandhas are ultimately momentary – that is, a skandha is both produced and destroyed in a single moment. Thus, everything is radically impermanent, in that nothing can endure for more than one moment. An object may seem to persist across time, but it is actually nothing more than an aggregate of momentary skandhas which arise and perish in a successive stream.

3. How do the Upaniṣads and the Buddha differently understand the notions of karma and rebirth?

The Upaniṣads posit an eternal, immortal self which persists throughout different lifetimes of embodied existence. It is the same self that, after having cast off its body after death, is reborn into a new body in another life. By positing a self that remains identical across lifetimes, the Upaniṣads can explain how my actions in this life can have karmic consequences for my future lives. For the Buddha, however, there is nothing which persists or remains identical across lifetimes. Instead, there is a constant changing stream of momentarily existent mental and physical aggregates which constitute what is conventionally known as my "self." Buddhists explain the transfer of karmic consequences across lifetimes by appealing to causal connections between streams of aggregates in this life and the next life. The causal continuity between these streams allows us to speak of actions in this life having karmic consequences for "my self" in another life.

4. According to Nāgasena, what are the three possible ways in which a whole could be related to its parts? Why are each of these three ways rejected by him?

If wholes existed, then they would either be (1) different from their parts, (2) identical to one of their parts, or (3) identical with all of their parts. Using the chariot example, (1) is rejected because there is obviously no separate entity that is the chariot which exists separately from the chariot-parts. (2) is rejected because the chariot cannot be identified with any of its individual parts, such as the wheels or axle. (3) is not possible because the whole set of parts has different properties than that of the ostensible chariot – for instance, the parts together have the property of being "many" parts, while the chariot has the property of being "one" thing. If two entities do not share all of the same properties, then they must not be identical.

5. How are attributes different from universals in the Vaiśeṣika system? Use an example to illustrate the difference.

An attribute is a particular, individual instance of a certain quality, while a universal is the general property which characterizes the particular attribute as being the type of quality that it is. For instance, a red apple will have a particular shade of red; this specific color is an attribute that inheres in the apple. Another red apple may have a slightly different shade of red, or it may have the exact same shade. Nonetheless, each apple has its own particular shade of red which are distinct attributes. There is one universal property of redness, on the other hand, which each particular attribute of red possesses, making them all unique instances of the same color *red*. The Each red attribute inheres in a respective apple-substance, and the universal redness inheres equally in each red attribute.

6. What is an inferential mark, and what are three types of inference according to the *Nyāya Sūtra*? Give your own examples for each of the three types.

An inferential mark is some object whose presence reliably indicates the presence of another object. More precisely, something is a legitimate inferential mark if its presence is always accompanied by the presence of the inferred object, and it is absent where the inferred object is absent. The *Nyāya Sūtra* mentions three types of inference based on the perception of a present inferential mark: (1) inference of a past object; (2) inference of a future object; (3) and inference of another present but unseen object. (1) lets us infer a cause from its effect – e.g., from seeing the swollen river, we can infer that it has rained upstream. (2) lets us infer a future effect from its cause – e.g., seeing dark storm clouds, we can infer that it will rain. (3) lets us infer something that is non-causally associated with the mark – e.g., from the ripe color of a mango, we can infer its sweet taste.

7. How is the Nyāya refutation of the claim that "nothing exists" an instance of *tarka*?

Tarka is a method of refuting some possible claim by showing that it is incompatible with another competing claim for which there is independent evidence furnished by an established source of knowledge (*pramāṇa*). The method of *tarka* does not, however, establish on its own that some claim is true. *Tarka* is used to refute the claim that nothing exists by showing that the it faces an inescapable dilemma, and hence should be rejected in favor of the opposite claim, "Something exists," for which we have much evidence. If the claim that nothing exists is known to be true, then that knowledge would originate from a *pramāṇa*, which means that at least one *pramāṇa* must exist, thus contradicting

the original claim. On the other hand, if there is no *pramāṇa* by which the claim can be known to be true, then there can be no reason to accept it. Thus, the claim that nothing exists is either contradictory or unprovable, and thus should be rejected in favor of the more plausible claim that something exists.

8. How do Vaiśeṣika and Nyāya argue from the existence of external substances to the existence of a substantial self?

Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika argue that there are external substances which can possess multiple types of perceptible attributes. For instance, I can see the yellow color of a mango, taste its sweet flavor, smell its ripe aroma, etc. I can further recognize that the mango which I just saw and smelled is the same mango that I am now tasting. Accordingly, there must be some particular substance to which all these perceived properties must belong. Now, that same awareness of tasting what was seen and smelled further requires that there be some particular substance to which these different perceptions belong. The bodily sense organs themselves can't become aware of each other's objects – the eyes cannot taste, the tongue cannot see color, and so on. So, there must be some substance other than the bodily sense organs which possesses these different perceptions, and which can thereby recognize each perception as being of the same external substance.

C. Essay Questions

1. Explain the doctrine of karma that is common to both the Upaniṣads and Buddhism. Contrast their respective accounts of how karma and rebirth operate. Which of the two accounts do you find more justified, and do you ultimately agree with either? Why or why not?

2. Explain what the Buddha meant by the claim that "all is suffering." Is the Buddha correct in his assessment? How is the notion of the self relevant to the Buddha's further claims about the cause of suffering? What does the doctrine of non-self prescribe for eliminating suffering? Are these prescriptions likely to cure the suffering that the Buddha has identified?

3. Contrast Nāgasena's and Vaiśeṣika's arguments for and against the reality of wholes over and above their parts. How does Nāgasena show that wholes are ultimately unreal? How does the Vaiśeṣika notion of inherence respond to Nāgasena's challenge, and is this response successful?

4. Choose two of the strongest arguments given by Nyāya for the existence of the self (*ātman*), and explain why you find them plausible. Then, consider possible objections which can be raised by Buddhists against these two arguments. Discuss whether you think Nyāya can respond to these objections, and articulate which position you think is ultimately more sound.

4

The Sophists

Rhetoric and Relativism in Athens

Essential Points

- Democracy
- The Persian Wars

  Marathon in 490 B.C.

  Thermopylae and Salamis in 480 B.C.

  The Athenian Empire

  Pericles on the glory of Athens
- The Sophists

  Modern education for democratic Athens

  Rhetoric

    The principles and the practice of persuasive speaking

    Techniques for teaching

    Making the weaker argument into the stronger

    Skeptical implications

  Relativism

    Protagoras: Man the measure

    The impact of acquaintance with other cultures

  Physis and *nomos*

How to make the distinction

Applying the distinction: To the god; to justice

Is there a justice distinct from convention?

Heraclitus and Sophocles: Yes, and conventional law should conform to it

Antiphon: Yes, but natural justice is antithetical to human law

"The victory goes to the best speaker"

Callicles on the origin of conventional justice

- Athens and Sparta at war

  Internal struggles in Athens

  Moderation abandoned

  Euripides' *Hippolytus* and the influence of rhetoric

- Aristophanes and reaction

  Socrates as portrayed in *The Clouds*

  The story, and what Pheidippides learns

  The question posed: Is it always just a question of who wins?

Teaching Suggestions

Many students find in the Sophists an early anticipation of views they strongly hold (usually without having examined them). So the

issue between the Sophists and Socrates is a live one for them. In teaching this chapter I do not raise critical questions about rhetoric or relativism (though Euripides and Aristophanes do), but I try to make sure they see the point of the question at the end of the chapter.

Exam Questions

A. Multiple-Choice Questions

1. On which point does Pericles *not* express pride in Athens?

a. The government of Athens is a model for neighboring city-states to copy.

b. Athenians obey their laws.

c. Athenians love what is beautiful without becoming soft.

x d. Athens has conquered most of the known world.

2. What does Protagoras promise to teach Hippocrates?

x a. Proper management of his own affairs and the affairs of the city.

b. Cleverness in speaking so he can avoid paying his debts.

c. Geometry, astronomy, and flute playing.

d. The traditional Greek virtues, as exemplified in the works of Homer.

3. The key idea in rhetoric is that

a. one should speak the truth, no matter how it affects one's interests.

x b. one should be able to make a persuasive case for any position.

c. with its help, one can avoid sleepwalking through life and align oneself with the *logos.*

d. no one should take advantage of another because of rhetorical skill.

4. When Protagoras says that man is the measure of all things, he means that

a. it is only man, of all the animals, that has devised measures for distance, weight, temperature, etc.

b. what exists must be measured by what all men have in common.

x c. there is no objective criterion available to humans by which to judge truth and goodness.

d. measuring is important to man for building all sorts of things.

5. When Herodotus quotes Pindar's saying that custom is king over all, he means that

x a. each group thinks its own native religion and culture to be the best.

b. nobody would ever question his own customs, which rule supreme in his habits and actions.

c. relativism is a mistake.

d. the king decides what customs his people should adopt.

6. The relation between *nomos* and *physis* is that

a. the former indicates what is true by nature and the latter does not.

b. nothing true by *nomos* could contradict anything true by *physis.*

x c. we can change the former, but not the latter.

d. *nomos* is divine and *physis* is human.

7. Antiphon argues that

a. most of the things that are lawful (in the sense of *physis*) are hostile to nature.

b. it is better to suffer injustice than to do injustice.

c. if you break the rules of society for some advantage to yourself, *physis* will see that you are punished.

x d. in any case, victory goes to the best speaker.

8. In his comic play *The Clouds,* Aristophanes portrays Socrates as

a. a critic of the Sophists

b. the one who burns down the Thinkery

c. the father of Pheidippides, who wants him to learn how to make the weaker argument into the stronger

x d. someone who teaches for pay

9. Which of the following is *not* a theme expressed in Euripides' play *Hippolytus*?

a. Rhetoric corrupts virtue.

b. Humans are merely pawns in the hands of powers that care nothing for them.

x c. Nothing can harm the truly innocent.

d. Fortune is ever veering and nothing can be relied upon.

B. Short-Answer Questions

1. What did the Sophists claim to teach their students?

They claimed to teach *arete,* excellence. They promised to instruct students in all those skills and arts that would make them successful in their city and in their private affairs.

2. What does Protagoras mean when he says, "Of all things the measure is man. . . ."?

A "measure" is a standard or criterion to judge by. In saying that man is the measure, Protagoras is denying that there is any objective point of view from which we can "measure" our opinions for truth. All we have is how things seem to ourselves or to our culture, to other persons or cultures, and so on. If things seem one way to Jones and another way to Smith, that may be the end of the matter—unless one of them can rhetorically persuade the other to change his or her mind. Taking Protagoras seriously lands one in relativism.

3. What does Protagoras say about belief in the gods?

He expresses an agnostic point of view, saying that the subject is difficult and human life is short. He says he doesn't know, and isn't in a position to know whether there are gods or not, nor what they are like if they exist.

4. What is rhetoric? And what consequence does it seem to have for our ability to know the truth?

Rhetoric is the art and practice of persuasive speaking. If a rhetorically convincing case can be made for just about anything, then how can we ever tell what is true? It looks like rhetorical skill may land us in skepticism.

5. The Sophists claim that rhetorical skills allow a person to "make the weaker argument into the stronger." What does that mean?

A weak argument is one that doesn't have much going for it, one that is not likely to persuade if it is presented bare. Turning it into a stronger argument means transforming it so that it does persuade. A strong argument, according to the Sophists, is simply a winning argument, one that succeeds in convincing the hearer. Rhetorical skills can turn an unpersuasive argument into a persuasive one.

6. Explain the difference between *nomos* and *physis,* offering an example of each (different from any example discussed in the text or in class).

Whatever is a matter of *nomos* depends on convention or agreement for its reality. It is true that you can't get credit toward graduation for this course unless you pay your tuition. But that is true because of the institutional arrangements in our society, and this might be changed. On the other hand, it is a matter of *physis* that if you cross Packer Avenue carelessly and are struck by a car traveling 30 mph, you will be injured. Nothing we could agree on could alter that connection.

7. Contrast Heraclitus and Sophocles' character Antigone, on the one hand, with Antiphon the Sophist, on the other hand, about the existence and character of natural justice.

Heraclitus says there is a natural justice (by *physis*) that expresses the *logos* and governs what ought to happen among humans. Human law, when it is doing its job, he says, is nurtured by and reflects this justice. Antigone agrees and appeals to the unwritten laws of justice against an unjust decree of the king.

Antiphon also thinks there is a natural justice, but it is not the friend of conventional law; it is its enemy. The basic law of natural justice is self-preservation, and if you violate *nomos* in order to preserve or further your life, you do nothing naturally unjust.

8. Characterize Socrates as he is portrayed in Aristophanes' comic play *The Clouds.*

As the play opens, Socrates is portrayed as a Sophist, hanging in a basket studying things in the heavens. He runs a school called the Thinkery and accepts students for pay. He promises to teach students how to make the weaker argument into the stronger, and he is a thorough rascal.

9. What is Callicles' theory about the origin of laws of justice in society?

It is the weak who band together to frame the laws of justice. They write them to their own advantage, of course, in order to keep the strong from dominating over them. Trying to bring everyone down to their own level, they preach equality, and call it wrong and shameful and unjust if anyone should seek an advantage over the weak. Callicles, however, thinks that true justice is exemplified by the strong taking whatever they can take.

Essay Questions

1. How is the practice of rhetoric, as taught by the Sophists, related to philosophical relativism and skepticism?

2. Compare Heraclitus, who says that we are all in daily contact with the *logos*—though most of us live in private worlds of our own—with Protagoras, who says that of all things, man is the measure.

3. Is it more important to be just or to appear just? In answering this question, be sure to indicate clearly whether and when you mean to be speaking of justice by *physis* and when of justice by *nomos*.

5

Reason and Relativism in China

Essential Points

- Philosophies born of conflict

The Spring and Autumn Period and the Warring States Period

Introspective questioning of correct human conduct

Attempts to explain and correct bad behaviors and attitudes

Search the past for direction toward a peaceful future

Past conceived as a blend of history and allegory

Peace is ideally achieved through unification

Successful unification preserves differences

The exemplary model of the ancient sages

Finding humaneness in times of war

Not being fooled by appearances or rhetoric

Reconciling the things one may control and the things one cannot

The shaping of the world by extra-human and metaphysical forces, i.e. Heaven

Rulers are chosen to rule: The Mandate of Heaven

Human affairs and natural affairs, such as the revolution of the seasons, are intertwined

Humans must choose who and how they want to be

There is a correct path (*dào*) appropriate to each individual

Political ideals give rise to and define moral ideals

Humans can only thrive in an organized system

Human-organized or Nature-organized systems of bureaucracy and rulership

- Confucius

Aim: To pragmatically define a contemporary moral person using the model of exemplary sages of the past.

Human nature leads us to gradually better ourselves

There are ways of organizing society that enhance one's ability to self-cultivate

Societal organization is based on systems edified in the past (the Zhou and Shang dynasties)

Meritocracy

Exemplary persons in charge

If the King is not benevolent, then the subjects too will be selfish

Morality is spread by good example, not by abstract principles

Confucius's ideas were the backdrop of early Chinese philosophizing.

He is a common interlocuter among the early Chinese schools

- Hundred Schools of Thought

  The era of Pre-Han Chinese intellectual history based on a list compiled by ancient Chinese historians Sima Tan and Sima Qian

  The names given by the authors are the names we use to refer to these traditions today

- The *Mozi*

  Aim: To supply explanations and reasons that are logically sound and understandable by everyone

  What are the criteria best used to verify statements?

  The relationship between evidence and anecdotes

Societal cohesion depends on the acceptance of some beliefs

Believing in ghosts

Caring for everyone equally

Preference and priority create imbalance in society

Not caring for strangers as much as your family leads to harm

Caring only for yourself and your family diminishes compassion

As evident in *Mozi*'s time, focusing moral attention on one's family has not been enough to keep families together.

Only universal love can forge a peaceful society

There is an appropriate way to treat others based on love

- School of Names

  Aim 1: To show the absurdities of logical disputation popular at the time

  Aim 2: To show the vagueness in how we refer to things thought to be straightforward and simple

  Hui Shi

The Ten Theses about relativity in space and time

Finitude and unboundedness

Classical problem of "hardness and whiteness"

What sorts of properties can be shared by different things?

What sorts of properties are inextricable from the objects themselves?

Admissible and inadmissible statements

The impossibility of knowing for sure which exercises of reasoning and argumentation are valid and true

A statement and its denial are logically bound together

- Mohism

  Aim: to answer the questions posed by the School of Names and create a standard for logical reasoning based on the philosophical argumentation in the *Mozi*

  Formulations of "admissible and inadmissible" similar to the law of non-contradiction (a statement and its denial cannot both be true at the same time) and the law of the excluded middle (either a statement or its denial is true)

Deconstructed Hui Shi's paradoxes

Logical reasoning can lead us to what is actually true when used correctly

Knowing what to deem acceptable is necessary for a successful society

Inference: knowledge of the appropriate connections and relations between things

Defense of the *Mozi* as a logically consistent political and moral work

Principles that cannot be proven true are weaker than those that can

Question the reasoning and consistency of Confucian thought

- Daoism

  One of the Hundred Schools of Thought, but not an actual collection of teachers and students

  Comprised of two main works (the *Laozi* and the *Zhuangzi*) and others that incorporate similar ways of understanding the world

All Pre-Han Chinese philosophies incorporate the idea of *dào,* which means path or to tread along a path, but the thinkers classified as Daoist put it at the center of their thought

Daoists have a distrust of language and its ability to truthfully and felicitously describe the world.

- The *Zhuangzi*

  Aim: To encourage humans to find their natural place in the world. The awkwardness and strife that plagues humanity is a sign that they are not following the right path

  Includes writings of Zhuang Zhou himself ("zi" means Mister or Master) and those who replicated or expanded on his ideas.

  Narrative and anecdotal rather than logical approach

  Answered to the examples and disputation style of Hui Shi as well as the Confucians

  Unlike Confucians and Mohists, not concerned with participation in the government bureaucracy

  Argues for naturalness and the accomplishment of effortless, non-artificial, and not over-

thought action

No differentiation between the natural world and the human world

Non-preferential to the desires and needs of humans

The actions scripted by social norms may not be the most natural expression of our humanity

What do you do when the rituals don't feel right? Don't do them!

Why deem death bad if it is natural? Why mourn someone or something that was destined to die?

Our confidence in finding the truth might be an illusion

If things are always changing, then why do we make definitions and compile facts as if things will never change?

Meaning is conventional and subject to the change that transforms everything else

There are those among us who have achieved a way of life that perfectly conforms to the processes that shape the world

Not always sages, but butchers, craftspeople, pearl-divers

Those who have cultivated a skill to the point where they cannot describe to others how they excel with apparently little effort

- The *Laozi*

Aim: To describe the *dào* that shape the world and our ability to cultivate our conduct in accordance with these *dào*

Vagueness and simplicity of language prevents expression of fundamental truths

Words only capture part of the true meaning

Linguistic meaning is never fully actual meaning

This is especially true when speaking about *dào*, which is not only the source of all things but the path humans ought to strive to thread.

Human life is just as simple as the lives of other beings.

A life lived simply is the one most attuned to *dào*

Non-materialistic and non-competitive

Principles and systems that require disputation and elaboration or the more questionable for it

Until humans right themselves, the world with be disordered

Humans must incorporate themselves into the natural

Humans must not cleave too stubbornly to the distinctions that create difference among things, e.g. beauty and ugliness, rich and poor

Instead of trying to understand things by breaking them down in order to make sense of them, accept what goes on, in all its complexity, as the way things are.

Teaching Suggestions

1. Facilitate discussion about the similarities and differences between *Mozi*'s description of universal caring and utilitarianism or Enlightenment-inspired liberalism. Ultimately, even though the *Mozi* argues for the logical coherence of universal love (or perhaps humaneness is more accurate), it is not at the expense of unique and particular relationships.
2. The *Zhuangzi* can be used to problematize discussions about contemporary environmentalism and activism. What would characterize a natural and *wúwéi* response to such unnatural changes as increased pollution?

3. The Chinese philosophical debates about logic and language are never far from political and moral concerns. They recognized the importance of being precise with words as well as, for the Daoists, inconsistency and vagueness of words. Bring in Chad Hansen's discussion on the philosophy of language in the *Zhuangzi* and the *Laozi* to facilitate comparison with early Wittgenstein and the logical positivists. Chad Hansen, *A Daoist Theory of Chinese Thought: A Philosophical Interpretation*, Oxford University Press (1992). Alternatively, this is a good opportunity to discuss propaganda and rhetoric as ways to facilitate (or dissolve) moral and societal cohesion.
4. Discussion of *wúwéi* benefits from the idea of "being in the zone" in the sense that one can in a way see what is going to happen before it does. This prescience is essential to acting without artifice. For example, Cook Ding describing his experience of the ox already being in pieces as soon as it is brought to him.