

M.A. EXAMINATION 2003

for Internal Students

PHILOSOPHY**Philosophy of Religion**

Wednesday, 28 May: 10.00 - 1.00.

Answer THREE questions. Avoid overlap in your answers.

1. EITHER (a) Can the existence of the world be explained? Answer with reference to one version of the Cosmological Argument.

OR (b) 'The Design Argument proves only the existence of a design-producing being.' Discuss.
2. Do religious experiences make religious beliefs *prima facie* reasonable?
3. Are there two versions of Anselm's Ontological Argument? Is there a sound version?
4. Is the concept of omnipotence incoherent?
5. EITHER (a) "God is timeless" and "God is omniscient" jointly entail "Time does not exist." Discuss.

OR (b) 'Only what is inevitably true can be infallibly known.' Discuss.
6. EITHER (a) 'In the absence of a reason to think that there is an all-good, all-powerful, and all-knowing God, it is reasonable – in the light of the existence of apparently pointless evils – to conclude that there is not such a God.' Discuss.

OR (b) 'Once we see that there are higher-order goods, we can see that there is no reason to suppose that if there were an all-powerful, all-knowing, and all-good God, there would be no evil.' Discuss.
7. EITHER (a) Did Hume show that belief in miracles is unreasonable?

OR (b) What would make an event a miracle?

8. How, if at all, might we survive death?

TURN OVER

9. 'Either we can recognise the truth of a revelation independently, which makes the revelation unnecessary, or we cannot recognise the truth of a revelation independently, in which case we cannot be sure that the revelation is genuine.' To what extent does this represent a fair criticism of the teaching of Aquinas on the relationship between faith and reason?
10. 'It is wrong always, everywhere, and for everyone, to believe anything upon insufficient evidence.' Discuss.
11. Is there any good reason to think that no term can be applied univocally to God and to creatures?
12. Does verificationism still pose a challenge to religious belief?
13. 'Any interpretation of religious belief which has no "supernatural" content is necessarily reductionist.' Discuss with reference to the work of D.Z. Phillips and/or I. Murdoch.

END OF PAPER