

1. Aristotle

- A) What does it mean that all agents act for the good? How does this account for murder?
- B) Why may we not consider ethics to be of nature (i.e. physical nature, *phusis*)? Can you explain how this may effect domains such as genetics?
- C) Explain why there are no absolute virtues in Aristotle.
- D) Do you agree that happiness is only found in the exercise of reason? Why or why not?

2. Epicurus

- A) Epicurus is a hedonist, and yet he defines pleasure as absence from pain. How does this accord with your understanding of hedonism? Do you think that Epicurus has done justice to what most people experience as pleasure?
- B) How does Epicurus define death? What assumptions are made by his definition?
- C) How does the death of someone else fit into Epicurus' theory?
- D) What does this text teach you about the importance of defining the terms within a philosophical discussion?

3. Kant

- A) Why does Kant think that ethics is nothing natural? How is his view different from that of Aristotle on this question?
- B) Elaborate on Kant's concept of the three imperatives.
- C) Explain the difference between analytic and synthetic propositions. Why is the categorical imperative "synthetic a priori"?
- D) What does it mean to treat others as an end and not merely as a means? How do you think that this can apply to your interaction with, for instance, doctors or bar-tenders?

4. Bentham

- A) What is the principle of utility?
- B) Contrast Bentham's understanding of "interest" with that of Kant. With whom, if either, do you agree?
- C) How do the four sanctions relate to the principle of utility?
- D) Do you see any value in Bentham's utilitarian calculus of Chapter IV? That is, do you ever deliberate activity in this manner?

5. Mill

- A) Why does Mill consider Epicurus to be a utilitarian thinker [p. 262]? Do you agree with his assessment?
- B) What is Mill's understanding of what utilitarianism is? What is the main difference between his and Bentham's understanding?
- C) How does Mill prove the principle of utility?
- D) Do you think that it is consistent with utilitarianism to distinguish between higher and lower pleasures? Why or why not?

6. Plato

- A) What do you think is the message of the Ring of Gyges myth?
- B) What role does the concept of interest play in Plato's Socrates' refutation of Thrasymachus? Do you agree with the Kantian, the utilitarian, or the Socratic understanding of interest, if with any?
- C) How does Plato's Socrates refute the idea that pleasure is simply the absence of pain? How does this argument prove that the philosopher is more happy than the lover of gain and the lover of fame (i.e. discuss the three parts of the soul and the pleasures proper to each)?
- D) What is Plato's concept of the Good? Why is the Good beyond being?

7. Hobbes

- A) For Hobbes, everything is matter in motion. This is a theory of physics. How, then, does this apply to his Ethics? Do you see a relation between Hobbes and Epicurus?
- B) What are the relations between power, value, honour, and dignity?
- C) Why does Hobbes not agree with Plato and Aristotle that felicity (happiness) lies in contemplation?
- D) What is the primal condition of humanity, and through what artifice do we overcome it? What effect does this artifice have on our instincts?

8. Nietzsche

- A) Why, for Nietzsche, are the nobility the excellence of society? What does this belief share with Thrasymachus' belief regarding the nature of rulers?
- B) What is the will to power?
- C) Explain master morality and slave morality. Why is it impossible for masters to be vain?
- D) §§ 263-264 suggest that Nietzsche sees masters and slaves as different species, one noble and one ignoble, and furthermore that Nietzsche sees this separation as genetic (or at least hereditary). Do you agree with Nietzsche's apparent affront to humanism? Why or why not?

9. Schopenhauer

- A) What is pleasure for Schopenhauer? Do you agree with him?
- B) Outline the reasons for Schopenhauer's pessimism.
- C) What are Schopenhauer's conceptions of the good and the bad? Why is the good relative? Why is the bad egoistic?
- D) How does knowledge lead to salvation from the overwhelming Will?

10. Bradley

- A) Why may we never refer to a person as an individual? How does the idea of "my station and its duties" relate to Bradley's destruction of the "fiction" of individuality?
- B) What is the "moral organism"? How does it destroy what Bradley sees as a false dichotomy between despotism and individualism?
- C) Why does Bradley consider there to be no absolute morality?
- D) Why does Bradley say that morality is not normally discursive (i.e. attained through reasoning)?

11. Socrates

- A) Trace each definition of piety found in the dialogue. Explain the transition to each definition.
- B) Restate in your own words Socrates' argument that the gods love what is pious because it is pious and that it is not pious because the gods love it.
- D) What does Socrates see as the major failing of Euthyphro's definitions of piety?
- D) Do you agree with the editor's introduction that the point of the dialogue is the debate between morality and religion? Why or why not?

12. Epictetus

- A) What is under my control, and what is not? What is your opinion of Epictetus' conception of the self and its relation to that which is its own? Do you agree with his conception of that which is not my own?
- B) What role does "nature" play in his ethics? What is the nature of a dinner invitation? Of death? Of competing in the Olympic games?
- C) § 34 sounds like utilitarianism, but is in fact not. What do think the main difference is?
- D) Explain Epictetus' organic understanding of the three parts of philosophy. Which part is superior, and why are the others subordinate to it?

13. St. Augustine

- A) What is happiness, according to St. Augustine? Why may not happiness be found in anything inferior?

- B) Outline the argument in which St. Augustine shows that God is the chief good.
- C) Outline St. Augustine's theodicy (i.e. the vindication of God's goodness despite existence of evil). How is St. Augustine's theory of the good an ontology (i.e. a theory of being)?
- D) Is St. Augustine a mind-body dualist? In your opinion, may we subordinate one to the other? Is a corpse a person? Is a brain (i.e. a mind) frozen in cryogenic solution a person?

14. St. Thomas Aquinas

- A) Did God have to produce the world? Why or why not?
- B) Why does every agent act for an end? What is the significance of this to his ethics?
- C) Explain why human happiness lies in contemplating God in the next life. Do you agree with St. Thomas? Do you agree with his reasoning?
- D) What is Natural Law? What is the role of reason within Natural Law?

15. Kierkegaard

- A) What does "either/or" mean? To which kind of decisions does it apply, and why?
- B) Describe the dialectic that leads from aesthetics to ethics and on to faith (the answer lies within the text but you may need to consult secondary literature).
- C) Discover and briefly relate who the following people are: Cato, Jephthah, Agamemnon and Iphigenia, Brutus, Abraham and Isaac. What is the role of each in Kierkegaard's text? What is the role of Hegel in the opening paragraphs of *Fear and Trembling*?
- D) What is the teleological suspension of the ethical? How did Abraham exemplify such, and what is the resulting paradox?

16. Sartre

- A) What does it mean that existence precedes essence? How does this relate to Sartre's claim that there is no human essence? Do you agree with him?
- B) What is Sartre's concept of anguish?
- C) What is the impact of the death of God on existentialist ethics?
- D) Sartre believes that there is a "human condition." What does he see as the difference between this and human nature? Is his distinction successful?

17. Desmond

- A) Explain briefly the following senses of being: the univocal, equivocal, dialectical, and metaxological.
- B) What is, briefly, the role each sense of being plays in Desmond's open-dialectic of ethics?
- C) What are first and second loves? How do both contribute to being good?
- D) What does Desmond mean by idiocy? Have you seen any parallels to this concept in any of the above thinkers?
- E) What do malign(ed) others teach us about ethics? How do they point beyond ethics, or at least to the limits of ethics?