

**BA EXAMINATION 2002**

for Internal Students

This paper is also taken by Combined Studies Students

**PHILOSOPHY**

Optional Subject (j): Mediaeval Philosophy

Wednesday, May 7th, 2003, 10.00 am - 1.00 pm.

Answer THREE questions. Avoid overlap in your answers.

1. In his *de Libero Arbitrio*, does Augustine explain how there can be evil in the world despite the fact that there is an all-good and all-powerful God?
2. How, according to Boethius, does the distinction between relation and essence help us defend the consistency of the doctrine of the Trinity? Is Boethius right to think the distinction is helpful in that way?
3. How does Abelard distinguish between essential identity and numerical identity, and between essential diversity and numerical diversity? How defensible are those distinctions?
4. Outline and assess Eriugena's theory of human nature in the *Periphyseon*.
5. Explain and assess Anselm's ontological argument for the existence of God.
6. What, according to Aquinas, is prime matter? How and how well does he argue for its existence?
7. 'A thing can have many accidental forms, just as it can have many accidental *esses*; but a thing can have only one substantial form, just as it can have only one substantial *esse*.' How and how well does Aquinas argue for this claim?
8. In what sense, according to Aquinas, are the past and present necessary? How defensible is Aquinas's view?
9. Does Aquinas's doctrine of analogy explain convincingly how we can speak about God?
10. Critically assess the claim that Latin Averroists like Siger of Brabant and Boethius of Dacia held that reason and revelation both provide truths, but that those truths sometimes conflict.

11. Do Averroes and his Latin followers have any good reason for thinking that there is only one intellect for all humans?
12. Does al-Ghazâlî argue convincingly that the created world is not eternal?
13. Assess Duns Scotus' proof for the existence of God based on the impossibility of an infinity of essentially ordered things.
14. Ockham thinks that, in reconciling omniscience with the openness of the future, it is crucial to distinguish those statements that are merely verbally about the past from those statements that are genuinely about the past. Why does he think that? Is he right?

**END OF PAPER**