

**ANCIENT PHILOSOPHY**  
**M.A. Examination**  
**Spring 2010**

Answer three of the following questions, each from a different section. In each case you should defend your claims and make your answer as detailed as possible. You have two hours, so you should spend about forty minutes on each question.

**I. Socrates**

1. Socrates has been charged with contributing to philosophy a style of mistaken thinking, known as the Socratic Fallacy. How plausible is this charge? Defend your answer.
2. Defend an interpretation the Socratic *elenchus* against what you take to be the best competing interpretation? As you do so, use a specific example from the dialogues.
3. Does Socrates think that virtue is knowledge? Defend your answer to this question against the best objections.

**II. Plato**

1. What is the conversation with the slave in the *Meno* meant to show or establish? How successful is it in meeting its goal? Defend your answers.
2. In *Republic* IV Plato puts forward a definition of justice in the city and justice in the individual. What are these definitions? Critically evaluate Plato's arguments on their behalf.
3. Critically evaluate one of Plato's arguments in any of the dialogues for the immortality of the soul.

**III. Aristotle**

1. In the *Categories* Aristotle distinguishes between the 'present in' relation and the 'said of' relation. What does this distinction amount to and how plausible is it?
2. Critically discuss Aristotle's theory of change. How does it lead to the introduction of the hylomorphic analysis of the primary substance?
3. It has been claimed that Aristotle's conception of happiness, and hence his eudaemonistic ethical theory, depends on his theory of the soul and the human soul in particular. Why would anyone think this? Do you agree or disagree?

#### **IV. Miscellaneous**

1. Critically discuss Parmenides' argument for Parmenidean monism.
2. It has been claimed that all Greek ethical theories are eudaimonistic. How plausible is this claim? Defend your answer.
3. Critically discuss the distinction between Academic and Pyrrhonian skepticism.