

Indian Institute of Technology, Bombay
Department of Humanities & Social Sciences
Ph. D. Entrance Examination
Philosophy

Note: Attempt all three sections.

Section A:

Q. Write a critical essay on a philosophical theme that is of interest to you. [20 marks]

Section B:

Attempt all of the questions in this section. [15+15 = 30 marks]

Please read the two passages carefully and answer all of the questions that follow each of the passages [40 marks]

Q. B1

Passage from the *Bhadāranyaka Upaniṣad* 4:5:6. [15 marks]

Yajñavalkya said: "Truly the husband is dear (to the wife) not for the sake of the husband, my dear, but it is for her own sake that he is dear. Truly wife is dear (to the husband) not for the sake of the wife, my dear, but is for his own sake that she is dear. Truly sons are dear (to the parents) not for the sake of sons, my dear, but it is for the sake of parents that they are dear. Truly wealth is dear not for the sake of wealth, my dear, but it is for one's own sake that it is dear. Truly animals are dear not for the sake of animals, my dear but it is for one's own sake. Truly the Brāhmaṇa is dear not for the sake of Brāhmaṇa, my dear, but it is for one's own sake that he is dear. Truly the Kṣatriya is dear not for the sake of the Kṣatriya, my dear, but is for one's own sake that he is dear. Truly worlds are dear not for the sake of worlds, my dear, but it is for one's own sake that they are dear. Truly the gods are dear not for the sake of the gods, my dear, but it is for one's own sake that they are dear. Truly the Vedas are dear not for the sake of the Vedas, my dear, but it is for one's own sake that they are dear. Truly beings are dear not for the sake of beings, my dear, but it is for one's own sake that they are dear. Truly all is dear not for the sake of all, my dear, but for one's own sake that all is dear. The Self, my dear Maitreyī, should truly be realized: should be heard of, reflected on and meditated upon. When only the Self, my dear, is realized by being heard of, reflected on and meditated upon, all this is known" (*Ātmā vā are draṣṭavyaḥ: śrotavyo mantavyo nididhyāsītavyo Maitreyī; Ātmāni khalvare drṣṭe śrute mate vijñāta idam sarvam viditam*).

Questions for the above Passage:

1. Based on the above passage explain the notion of *Self (Ātman)* in the Upaniṣadic tradition that gets more elaborated in Vedāntic philosophy.
2. From the above passage, we gather that the *Ātman* doctrine of the Upaniṣadic tradition contends that *Ātman* exists. Does it answer or raise the question as to where it is, or what it is in our experience?
3. On the basis of the above passage how do you respond to the *Anātman* doctrine in Buddhist thought.

Q. B2

Passage from Nietzsche's *On Truth and Lie in an Extra-Moral Sense*. [15 marks]

Insofar as the individual wants to preserve himself against other individuals, in a natural state of affairs he employs the intellect mostly for simulation alone. But because man, out of need and boredom, wants to exist socially, herd-fashion, he requires a peace pact and he endeavors to banish at least the very crudest **bellum omni contra omnes** [war of all against all] from his world. This peace pact brings with it something that looks like the first step toward the attainment of this enigmatic urge for truth. For now that is fixed which henceforth shall be "truth"; that is, a regularly valid and obligatory designation of things is invented, and this linguistic legislation also furnishes the first laws of truth: for it is here that the contrast between truth and lie first originates. The liar uses the valid designations, the words, to make the unreal appear as real; he says, for example, "I am rich," when the word "poor" would be the correct designation of his situation. He abuses the fixed conventions by arbitrary changes or even by reversals of the names. When he does this in a self-serving way damaging to others, then society will no longer trust him but exclude him. Thereby men do not flee from being deceived as much as from being damaged by deception: what they hate at this stage is basically not the deception but the bad, hostile consequences of certain kinds of deceptions. In a similarly limited way man wants the truth: he desires the agreeable life-preserving consequences of truth, but he is indifferent to pure knowledge, which has no consequences; he is even hostile to possibly damaging and destructive truths. And, moreover, what about these conventions of language? Are they really the products of knowledge, of the sense of truth? Do the designations and the things coincide? Is language the adequate expression of all realities?

[Friedrich Nietzsche, "On Truth and Lie in an Extra Moral Sense," *The Portable Nietzsche*, ed. and trans. Walter Kaufmann (New York: Penguin Books, 1982), 44-45]

Questions for the above passage

Explicate as faithfully as you can the argument that Nietzsche is making in this passage.

Present in your own words the theory of truth is Nietzsche attacking in this passage.

Do you think Nietzsche's attack is well founded? Explain as clearly as you can why or why not?

Section C

Attempt *any* 2 of the following questions: [10 + 10 = 20 marks]

- C1. Justified true belief has been a standard way to formulate the traditional analysis of knowledge. Spell out some of the difficult issues in this analysis in the light of the recent debates on knowledge.
- C2. Following Thomas Kuhn's distinction between "normal science" and "revolutionary science" discuss how his "rational reconstruction" of scientific progress could be called an alternative to the orthodox account of science.
- C3. Discuss how in Merleau-Ponty the body-subject becomes central to phenomenological analysis.
- C4. Discuss hetvābhāsa.
- C5. How does Mill's account of utilitarianism differ from that of Bentham?
- C6. Explain Kant's opposition to Hume's account of causality.

C7. Explain how emotivism and prescriptivism respond to the is-ought divide in their own way.