

Aquinas, "The Five Proofs of God" – pp. 348-351 (the first three arguments are all versions of the "Cosmological Argument" in favor of God's existence)

1) In your own words, explain the Cosmological Argument for God's existence in terms of motion and (similarly) cause and effect.

Everything that is in motion must have been put into motion by something else. The Universe is in motion therefore the motion there must have been put there by God or something else. God is the reason for why everything is in motion and exists today and God can exist outside of that. The universe must have a cause that's outside itself and points to a supernatural being. (whatever is in motion is moved by something else'. Aquinas then argues that this sequence can- not continue back ad infinitum, and 'hence it is necessary to arrive at a first mover which is moved by nothing else' - and this everyone thinks of as God.)

2) What does an "infinite regress" mean, and why is it so central to the Cosmological argument?

Infinite regress refers to a situation where a problem or question leads to an endless sequence of further problems or questions, with no ultimate resolution. It is a concept that is often encountered in philosophy and mathematics but can also be found in other fields.

3) How is the "third" of the five ways about the contingent existence of everything in the universe?

The third way argues from the contingency of things in the universe. Aquinas observed that some things in the universe are capable of coming into existence and going out of existence, and that therefore they must not be necessary beings. In other words, they depend on something else for their existence. But if everything in the universe is contingent, then there must be some necessary being that exists independently of anything else. (The third proof (sometimes called the proof 'from the contingency of the world') starts from the fact that some things come into being and pass away, and are hence contingent (they can either be, or not be) as opposed to necessary) (348)

Anselm, "The Existence of God", pp. 345-347 (this is the "Ontological Argument" for God's existence)

1) Explain in your own words what Anselm means by a being "that than which nothing greater can be conceived". When Anselm is saying this, he is saying that God is the greatest being that one can conceive of. He believes that God is a perfect and powerful being that possesses all perfections such as omnipotence, omniscience, and perfect goodness. (Instead it focuses simply on the concept or definition of God as the utterly supreme being - or as Anselm puts it, 'that than which nothing greater can be thought) (the definition of God as the sum of all perfections, and main- tained that existence could no more be separated from such a being than the

property of having its angles equal to 180 degrees could be separated from the essence of a triangle.)

2) On 346, what is Anselm's argument about why this greatest possible being *must* exist in reality, by its very nature? Anselm argues that the very concept of God, as the greatest possible being, implies that God must exist in reality, since existence in reality is a greater perfection than existence only in the mind. Therefore, if we truly understand the concept of God, we cannot deny his existence, since existence is an essential part of his nature as the greatest possible being. (For God is that than which a greater cannot be thought. And if someone understands this clearly, he understands that this being exists in such a way that he cannot not exist, even in thought. Hence he who understands that God exists in this way cannot think that he does not exist.)

I

Hume, "The Argument from Design", pp. 365-370 (this is Hume's criticism of the "Teleological Argument" for God's existence...)

1) Describe the Teleological Argument as presented on pages 365-366.

The teleological argument is also known to be called an argument of design because of the organisms and other designs and purposes that are seen in the natural world. There is complexity, beauty, and order that can be seen in the universe, because of this and the organisms this suggests that there is a higher being that creates the design. The argument is often illustrated with examples from nature, such as the intricate structures of cells, the complexity of the human eye, or the precision of the laws of physics that allow life to exist on Earth. The argument suggests that these examples cannot be explained by random chance or natural processes alone, but instead point towards the presence of an intelligent designer. (Every indication of contrivance, every manifestation of design ... in the watch, exists in the works of nature)

2) On 367, Hume, through Philo, states that for all we know, "matter may contain the source or spring of order originally within itself, as well as mind does". What do you think he means by this statement and the paragraph it's found in?

Philo is stating that the idea of matter itself may produce order without needing to have external organizing force such as a divine being. He is also suggesting that the source of origin may not necessarily be rooted in order of the mind or consciousness but could also be found in the material world.

3) What are some of the problems Hume presents concerning the comparison of the universe to a machine and the assumption that it must also be designed?

Hume's argument challenges the assumption that the universe must be designed by an intelligent being and raises important questions about the limitations of human knowledge and understanding.