**Question Set Worksheet**

*Beginning Week 2, students will complete and upload a Question Set Worksheet on Canvas prior to Wednesday’s class. Of the 8 possible Question Sets, the top 6 will be counted. These sets will help you brainstorm for your two essays and also rock your citations.*

A. (1pt) The 2-3 Mon/Wed sources that most activated me this week are (use author or short title):

**1.**

**2.**

**3.**

B. (2pts) Create Works Cited entries for the above sources using *The Bedford Handbook* (free pdf in syllabus “Resources”)

1. Kind of source\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Page no. in *The Bedford Handbook*\_\_\_\_\_\_

Type Works Cited entry here:

2. Kind of source\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Page no. in *The Bedford Handbook*\_\_\_\_\_\_

Type Works Cited entry here:

3. (if applicable)

Kind of source\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Page no. in *The Bedford Handbook*\_\_\_\_\_\_

Type Works Cited entry here:

+++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++

C. (3pts) Your Question Sets (Tips and guidance are below)

**Description:** A question set includes two typed questions that you have developed in response to 2-3 of this week’s assigned readings from Monday and Wednesday. Question sets are intended to do four main things: (1) they provide a (relatively) non-burdensome mechanism for maintaining reading accountability; (2) they enable you to think in advance about the ideas that come up in lectures and discussions; (3) they generate brainstorms for your short papers; (4) they allow me to stay tuned into to what students are interested in or puzzled about as the course proceeds.

My question #1

My question #2

**Question Tips:** Questions are more than surface curiosity or free association with other ideas that come to mind; a good question reflects careful reading, context, and interrogates the logic of a particular view on its own terms before forcing a thin comparison. Questions should not re-ask a question raised in the text, though one may choose to identify a gap or lack in the provided answer/s in pursuit of greater clarity or depth.

If you directly reference an author’s idea or direct quote in your question, please include an in-text citation such as (Michaelson 23) which is great practice for your upcoming short papers.

Here are three Question Set examples from different courses (your questions will address perspectives on evil and suffering):

**Example 1a of a thin surface question**: How will we ever really be able to test intelligence in animals? (This is a vague curiosity, detached from the detailed views provided in course readings).

**Example 1b of more penetrating question:**Tom Regan's identity-based "subject-of-a-life" approach emphasizes inherent value in all beings who meet certain criteria of moral patients (24). However, does Regan undermine this inherent value by seeing animals as *always* moral patients? Don't animals sometimes make active choices as moral agents even if they are not held responsible in a courtroom for them? Derrida’s suggestion that there is no category of “animal” makes me think that Regan is just coming up with a new defining criteria of being a moral patient that forces diverse beings back into “definition of animal” box.

*\*this question references a key idea in a text and defines it, identifies a possible logic/experiential gap and compares it to another theorist; this question also includes a good attempt at an in-text citation*

**Example 2 of more penetrating question:** I think some aspects of the Jain tradition are extremely admirable, for example, Acharya Mahapragya’s insistence that to achieve peace we must train people in nonviolence to the same extent that we previously trained people in violence (Seraph 201). Yet, there are other connected aspects I am much less inclined to admire or emulate such as the refusal to light a fire because extinguishing a fire harms fire-bodied beings. Similarly, I am not certain how to accept that all eating and farming involve violence. So I’m left wondering if one can adopt aspects of a particular view piecemeal or are these models of transformation wholesale deals? And how can I pick and choose when aspects of the Jain tradition that resonate with me the most are meaningful for a Jain because they are within a context I somewhat reject?

*\*this question references a key figure and their claim in a text, offering additional support to clarify that figure’s position. This is juxtaposed with perspectives from other readings and unified in a larger question about cultural differences and ethical transformation; this question also includes a good attempt at an in-text citation*

**Example 3 of more penetrating question:** Given the early Buddhist philosophical view of “no-self,” why should anyone be Buddhist? And further, why would a Buddhist share their tradition with another? I keep finding a tension between detaching from a fixed self while also having certain commitments or identity-related practices such as rituals, reading texts, etc. Maybe I don’t understand detachment fully enough, but it seems that the authors this week accept a tension between using yourself to get over yourself, if that makes sense. My question is, does Buddhist practice help one to let go of the Self, or does letting go of the Self enable one to engage in Buddhist practice, or are both/neither true?

*\*this question names a particular tension with a philosophical concept, recognizing how different authors approach or emphasize the issue. Even as the student recognizes a possible gap in their personal understanding of a less familiar tradition, they creatively imagine how a tension could exist productively without having to be cleanly reconciled.*