

Course Companion

for AS and A Level Year 1 OCR Religious Studies

Component 1: Philosophy of Religion

zigzageducation.co.uk

POD 10149

Publish your own work... Write to a brief... Register at **publishmenow.co.uk**

 \mathcal{L} Follow us on Twitter **@ZigZagRS**

Contents

Product Support from ZigZag Educationii
Terms and Conditions of Useiii
Teacher's Introduction1
Key Terminology1Philosophical Language and Thought2The Existence of God3God and the World4
Section 1: Philosophical Language and Thought5
1A: Ancient Philosophical Influences
Section 2: The Existence of God24
2A: Arguments Based on Observation

Is God the First Cause?35	5
Actual and Possible Infinities36	5
Does the Idea of a Necessary Being Make Sense?38	3
Is the Universe Contingent?39	9
Does the Universe Require an Explanation?39)
The Argument from Contingency and Actual Infinities .40)
2B: Arguments Based on Reason	Ĺ
The First Formulation (Chapter 2)42	2
The Second Formulation (Chapter 3)42	2
Malcolm's Ontological Argument45	5
Plantinga's Ontological Argument46	5
What next for the Ontological Argument?48	3
Section 3: God and the World49)
3A: Religious Experience	
The Importance of Religious Experience51	L
William James51	1
Rudolph Otto53	3
Mystical Experience54	
Conversion Experiences54	
Individual and Corporate Religious Experiences55	5
The Difficulties of Testimony56	
Psychological Challenges to Religious Experience58	3
Neuroscientific Challenges to Religious Experience58	3
3B: The Problem of Evil60)
The Logical Problem of Evil63	1
The Evidential Problem of Evil62	2
Evil and the Fall63	3
Evaluating the Augustinian Theodicy63	3
Hick and the 'Vale of Soul-making'64	1
Philosophical Implications of Soul-making65	5
Evaluating the Irenaean Theodicy65	5
Denying Benevolence67	7
Denying Ominpotence67	7
Answers68	
Activities68	3
Quick Quizzes69)

Teacher's Introduction

This course companion is written for the AS and A Level Year 1 OCR Religious Studies specification and is designed to offer students a comprehensive introduction to the material within that academic course. The sections and topics, therefore, mirror OCR's specification headings, and every care has been taken to not only help students to understand the key concepts and ideas within the course, but also sharpen their critical thinking skills.

Alongside the main bulk of the writing there are also a number of other features to help students with their learning and revision. Self-guided and group activities are included throughout the writing to better engage students with the material, and I have also provided glossaries, textual references and information on key thinkers where appropriate.

I hope you enjoy working through this resource and that it benefits both you and your students throughout the academic year.

Note on Suggested Reading

- Stretch and Challenge

Any reading in these boxes is not strictly required for the specification. However, it is appropriate, creditable information students could include in an exam context.



January 2020



KEY TERMINOLOGY IN PHILOSO LANGUAGE AND THOUGH

Reason	The capacity of beings to use logic and critical reflection decision-making.
Rationalism	The view +' te solis the primary source of knowled
Empiricis 799	he view that sense experience is the primary source
Analogy	A comparison made between two or more things in or properties or behaviour.
The Forms	An immaterial, unchanging, transcendent reality which objects in the world.
Telos	A Greek word meaning 'end'; and denotes the purpos
Aetion	A Greek word meaning cause' or 'explanation', used to occurred in the way that it has.
Metaphysics	A branch of philosophy that questions and explores the reality.
The Prime Mover	Also known as the unmoved mover, it is the first cause and the reason why all things motion.
Monism	The view that the scale one substance in the world
Substance Dualism	there are two different substances in the land matter).
Materialis Education	A form of monism that claims that matter is the only s
Soul	The immaterial or incorporeal part of a human being, responsible for the mental abilities of a person, and to personal identity.
Consciousness	The state of awareness about oneself and the world the abilities to beings who possess it.
Category Error	A fallacious form of reasoning where one mistakenly p to a different category from the one it belongs to.
Behaviourism	A philosophical and psychological view that puts forwabehavioural states or dispositions.
Metaphor	A figure of speech whe case is a phrase or word to
79 INSPECTION	



INSPECTION COPY



KEY TERMINOLOGY IN THE EXISTEN

Knowledge arrived at through reason alone, independe
Knowledge that depends a' prtially on experience
A type of rousion. here the premises of the argume of the forestion.
ype of reasoning where the premises provide strong guarantee, the truth of the conclusion.
An object or being that depends on something else for into and out of existence.
An object or being that does not depend on anything e cannot come into existence, or cease existing.
The arrangement of objects or things, such that they be according to certain laws or principles.
The state or arrangement of a thing that possesses ma and functions.
A comparison made between two or more things in ord properties or behaviour.
The part of a sentence that giver formation about its
A form of reasoning with a set of observations.
i e idea that all effects must have specific and sufficie
A philosophical idea that claims the universe possesses that explain or are compatible with the existence of co
A never-ending chain of reasoning or explanation.
The philosophical idea that all things require a sufficier existence or state.
A fallacy where properties of the parts of an object are to its whole.
A form of philosophical argument which attempts to shor position inevitably leads to an absurd or impossible



INSPECTION COPY



KEY TERMINOLOGY IN GOD AND

Religious Experience	An experience or encounter that involves God or anoth
Ineffable	Refers to ideas or experiences cannot adequately ordinary language.
Noetic	The element of the abilities of normal intellect.
Transiem 79	Refers to an experience or event being short-lived or b
Mystical	A form of religious experience centred around a non-se union with God, the soul or nature.
Conversion	The process of a person significantly changing their persocial beliefs.
Corporate	Relating to a sizeable or large group of people.
Credulity	The willingness to believe in things or events without r
Numinous	A term used to capture the distinctive emotional proper which cannot be expressed in ordinary language.
Authenticity	A measure of how genuine or resident of measure of how genuine or resident of the second of the seco
Neurophysiology	The study of the condition and the nervous system.
Testimony 79	1 e itements given by a person who has undergone witnessed an event.
Theodicy	A defence of theism against the problem of evil.
Free Will	The ability to choose between different courses of acticoerced or restrained.
Soul-making	Theodicies which emphasise the importance of moral of the existence of evil.
The Fall	The event or process by which human beings transform to one of disobedience and sin.



INSPECTION COPY



SECTION 1: PHILOSOPHICAL LANGUAGE

What you will learn in this section:

The philosophical views of Plato, including:

- His ideas regarding the primacy of reason and the ur worthiness of the s
- The **Forms**, how they are hierarchically order who) by they interact with t
- The analogy of the cave and how it 5 Fixed's philosophical world view
- Plato's beliefs regarding the round with tripartite nature.

The philoso 75 vice s. Aristotle, including:

- Aristot. Sological understanding of the world and the importance of the
- The four causes and how they can be applied to the material world.
- The Prime Mover and its connection to material events.
- Aristotle's beliefs regarding the soul and its hierarchical nature.

Different philosophical views of the soul, including:

- Descartes' substance dualism and its associated issues.
- Materialist views of the **soul**, with reference to Gilbert Ryle's behaviourism.
- The different interpretations of the term 'soul' and whether it should be under

Starter Activity:

Turn to the 'Key Terminology in Philosophical Language and Thought' section at companion and look up the words in **bold** from the bullet points above.

1A: ANCIENT PIUSOPHICAL INFLU

Key Thinker	- OF CITY
Name	
Born 79	28 BC (estimated)
Died Education	348 BC (estimated)
Key text	Republic (380 BC estimated)
Why are they important?	Plato is one of the most influential figures in the history of ph
	to define and shape philosophical discourse in the present da
	all of his writings have survived until the present day, meanin
important:	understanding of his world view and his ideas regarding a wid
	metaphysics, epistemology, ethics and politics.
	Plato liked to include his relatives as characters in his philoso
Did you know?	propensity means that historians have been able to broadly
	despite the slimmest of archaeological evidence!

Key Thinker	
Name	Aristotle
Born	384 BC
Died	320 BC
Key text	Physical Jown date); Metaphysics (unknown date)
719	is soue is perhaps the only philosopher to truly rival Plato in
Why are to Education	within the Christian faith. Despite being initially a student of P
important?	of his greatest critics, putting forward a new systematic appro
	questions and developing what is now recognised as the begin
	Aristotle had a habit of walking around the campus in Lyceur
Did you know?	his students to walk behind him in order to hear the lectures
	known as 'peripatetics', meaning 'people who travel about'.

INSPECTION COPY



Introduction

Take a moment and look up from this companion. Undoubtedly you will see a vas own shape, texture and colour. There might be chairs and tables, walls surrounding to other places. In everyday life, the existence and categorisation of these things it possible to question what makes a chair actually a chair, or how the idea of 'a chapeople would regard such questions as trivial. Chairs are objects on.

However, philosophers take things in her For example, it is possible to place similarly sit on a table. They inherent in the chair that suggests that it is similarly nothing in the table to suggest it is for holding objects. The bechairs are consisting, and tables are chosen to hold things. Yet to say that simply 'chair simply chair is like an error in reasoning, or what philosophers often term as the premises of an argument simply assume the conclusion, rather than arguing for

So there seems to be a strange difficulty in defining what makes a chair actually a answer this difficulty, how do we know something is a chair when we see it? Simil principles we distinguish chairs from tables, and how we arrive at knowledge of an might possess **properties** such as legs, a platform to sit on and a backrest in a specino obvious principles that human beings use to develop the general idea of 'chair' beings encounter a variety of different objects throughout their lives that they we

These kinds of question have perplexed human beings since the beginning of write beyond)! In the Western philosophical tradition, many of the ideas and issues still in the works of ancient Greek writers. In fact, the philosopher Alfred N Whitehead philosophy is simply a series of footnotes to Plato, the moust hinker in Classifigure in the development of modern philosophic and can be addressed separately from particular issues that are unique for any and can be addressed separately from

Metaphysic is principal field looks at the nature of 'reality'; what can be principles by real things are established. When discussing questions about time or the nature of change, one is engaging in metaphysics! Metaphysics is often epistemology, for what is real is often thought to be related to the nature of existing and what is real and what is not.

Ontology – This philosophical field looks at the nature of being and existence; where exist and how the beings of things are related to others. It is closely related to me it is often thought to be real! Typical discussions in ontology are often focused are particular thing or group of things, with one party claiming they do exist (usually to claiming they do not (antirealists).

Epistemology – This philosophical field is concerned with what human beings kno how human beings come to acquire knowledge. Epistemology can address general beliefs justified?' or it can focus on specific areas, and now do human beings most famous conflicts in philosophy is the distribution of tween rationalism and empirecylored in the next section where at the deeper look at the ideas of Plato and

Plato and the image ason

Think back a the questions posed at the beginning of the introduction. It will idea about what a 'chair' is, as well as individual properties of a potential chair. But properties and ideas to the objects of our experience? And what exactly is a proper metaphysical question known as the problem of universals, and one which Plato be attempting to solve.

INSPECTION COPY



Take the property of 'redness'. Throughout everyday experience, it may be commas a red ball, a red cushion or even blood. Yet this experience of red is always part connected to different objects and it is not possible to simply experience red abst something. However, it is possible to conceive of red in an abstract sense in the mexperience. So how do human beings come to arrive at this general idea of 'redne always particular, and how are these general ideas or properties related to the wo

Plato believed the solution to these questions lay in the specific of this theory, it's worth to k. The nature and form of Plaview. In the case of the property of the property of the property. It was noted how experience in and cannot easily account for the existence of 'redness' made on the basis of the eximultiple recommendation of the existence is a classic example of human such an inference is a classic example of human such as the specific of the existence of the existence is a classic example of human such as the specific of the s

Plato believed that reason was the primary source of knowledge for human being argued that the world of the senses is ever-changing, and were human beings to retheir senses, it would be impossible to gain a lasting understanding of the world it we're seeking true knowledge, then, the senses seem to be a poor candidate. Yet reason, Plato claimed that permanent and lasting knowledge was possible, and it that allows human beings to truly grasp concepts and ideas. As such, Plato is ofter described as a **rationalist**.

But why does the use of reason deliver lasting knowledge? This is where Plato's the as a justification of the importance of reason and a solution to the problem of unit

The Forms

Plato details his theory of the Forms in his most famour and during work, Republic. However, this work doesn't read like miny for philosophical texts. Instead, Plato outlines his ideas the senes of dialogues between the protagonist Socrates and various the Greek figures that represent other philosophical belief the senes of dialogues. Through these dialogues, For each stream to the philosophical issues, but also on ethics and the role philosophers have to play in society.

It has been mentioned already that Plato did not believe the senses could deliver 'world of appearances', as he terms, it is ever-changing, and human beings cannot perceiving is a reflection of the true nature or form of things. Plato, therefore, pro appearances, there is a non-material, unchanging reality; a 'world of Forms'.

This world of Forms contains perfect versions of all the ideas and concepts that he world. In contrast, the world of appearances only contains imperfect replications when one observes any object through the senses, one is only witnessing an infer Moreover, every object or quality potentially possesses its own Form, whether it such as red, or more abstract ideas such as love or justice. Plato altogether is cont world with a more 'real' non-physical world, and it is only through understanding the use of pure reason that one can come to have true to la ting knowledge.

HOW MANY FORMS?

existence of perspective, this proposal might seem a bit of existence of perspective, and how do the Forms actually relate to the work answers to puestions in his writings aren't entirely clear. However, the Forms solution to the problem of universals that was explored earlier. As they are singularly explain why one general concept can be applied to many different things. In different types or builds of chair observed in the world are simply imperfect reflect Similarly, with the colour red, the various shades and hues of redness embedded in Form of red.

INSPECTION COPY



However, a number of difficulties emerge with this idea. Plato cites the principles of Forms, along with abstract ideas such as truth, justice and beauty. But he is less corresponding Form for every kind of object in the world. For example, is there an could there also be Forms for categories such as 'sofa' or 'armchair'? In the case of forms for the colours of magenta, crimson or maroon, or are these simply imperfeintuitive appeal of Plato's idea potentially breaks down on further investigation, a potentially unlimited number of Forms.

Yet it may be that the solution to this issue and through reason itself. Plato a knowledge comes from reasoning and it. World of Forms, and if it is the case the and unchanging represent a continuous different objects, it may be reasonable to only necess their own Full and their

THE FORM OF THE GOOD

Plato also argues in *Republic* that the Forms do not all exist on an equal level. Rath form is the Form of the Good. This is what all philosophers should aspire to gain keall other Forms and is the basis for understanding them. For Plato, the Form of the knowledge, and also the thing which allows human beings to gain knowledge of the Sun, illuminating all things and allowing for human beings to see them.

However, the Form of the Good is not an easy thing to grasp. It resists explanation reasoning about its existence requires abstraction beyond the physical world. Yet truth, beauty and justice are all derived from the Form of the Good, and understaknow how to think and act in their own lives. Contemplation of the Form of the Gactivity for the philosopher, and knowledge of it separates the inexperienced philosopher-king.

The Forms, especially that of the contribute s description seem almost inaccerigorous contemplation. The picture that Plato himself argued for. He believed do not contribute the true nature of reality, and instead are believed of approached the true nature of a particular story the analogy cave. This will be the focus of the next section.

Discussion Activity:

In groups or pairs, look through the following potential Forms and discuss whether own Form, or whether they should be considered to be part of a larger Forfair way of conducting this process and are there any which shouldn't be considered.

- 1. Oak trees
- 2. Penguins
- 3. Compassion
- 4. Sofas
- 5. Teachers
- 6. Teeth

Analogy of the Cave

The analogy and allegorical tale told by Socrates in *Republic* to anothe encompassion ber of important aspects of Plato's philosophy, including his public beliefs. However, it is primarily told to contrast his description of the world of apprenance, with the world of the Forms, discoverable by reason, with the aim of show former are living lives of ignorance.

USPECTION COPY



Imagine a cave where a series of people are chained to a rock, such that their he fixed and facing one direction. They have been chained to the rock since birth, ar the others chained around them, or any other aspect of the cave.

Behind the prisoners is a fire, and between them and the fire is a platform where shadows on the wall in front of the prisoners. This activity is unknown to the prisoned shadows being cast on the wall and the sounds behind they which they attribute

Imagine then that one prisoner is freed from the following they no longer have to fact the objects casting the shadow on the fire would wish to return to their lives in the walls. They would not easily understand who

But then in the price or by will, the freed prisoner was dragged up the row would be considered ensely difficult climb, one which would cause the prisoner great would begin to perceive the sunlight streaming in from the outside world.

Eventually they would make it outside, where the bright sunlight would overwhe them unable to see anything at all. However, over time, their eyes would adjust; them, and how the sunlight casts shadows on them. Eventually they would be abunderstanding how it illuminates all things and realising fully the nature of the

Upon this realisation they would think the other prisoners in the cave were living educate them about the truth. However, on re-entering the cave, they would be to the sun. The chained prisoners would think the freed individual had been harmabout their plight, choosing to remain facing the wall in the dark.

What does Plato wish to impart through this tale? There are a number of importathroughout.

THE NATURE OF REALITY

The prisoners chained facing is a swift as the shape with a later in the world as it really is, and understand their protection is also a strong separation between the world of appearances and the world straightforward path between the two and understanding the latter involves facult

THE DIFFICULTY OF ATTAINING REAL KNOWLEDGE

The freed prisoner's journey to the outside world is not an easy one in Plato's tale may well choose to remain in the cave facing the shadows, and the road out of the blinding. Even outside of the cave, it takes great time and effort to begin to perceive Plato, this difficult journey represents the hard intellectual path towards discoverive requires accepting ideas that are not easily reconciled with one's instincts, and may of the philosophical work needed to attain real knowledge. For it not only involve reality, but also the nature of oneself and the very beliefs the give meaning to one

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE PARTY SUPHER

The analogy of the cave elevate the introduction of the philosopher, as Plato claims individual capable of the philosopher in the truth about the nature of reality. The chained passit is and introduction they cannot understand or even listen and may well even kill any them out of the cave. In this way the philosophers are in a precarious position; they reveal the true nature of reality, but to do so may be their downfall. There is a strong analogy of the cave and Plato's belief that the **philosopher-king** is the person best someone trained in using their reason, human beings may never escape their nature

INSPECTION COPY



Socrates in Plato's Writing

As you will have noted reading *Republic*, Plato uses the figure of Socrates as a wiviews about the world. Yet at the same time, elements of Plato's writing seem to historical character and ideas. This creates a large number of difficulties for historical works, and there is still great disagreement about who Socrates was, considering existence and person comes from Plato's works the results works.

One interesting way this blurring in the emerges is in the analogy of the cathe difficulties the philosopher is not careful they may end up even be here that as referencing the death of Socrates himself, who was tried and Athenian a continuous for 'corrupting the youth'. As such, while by and large Socrates Plato through Republic, there are interesting ways Plato brings in historical event throughout.

Discussion Activity:

In groups or pairs, read through the analogy of the cave together and discuss ho real life. Is Plato overstating the role of philosophers and the hardships they face believe that attaining real knowledge about the nature of the world is as difficult

Evaluating Plato

Thinking about Plato's philosophy is difficult, especially outside the context of the ideas were most prominent. Many of his beliefs may so in haic, especially the sceptical about the existence of a non-material realism of gives the material wo However, Plato's philosophical views still realism on portant metaphysical questions importantly, one can ask whet the east a world that exists beyond the senses, philosopher immanual and term it). Plato notes the fallibility of our ordinal an unchang the realism beneath it. But is this necessary, and if so, what

There are those philosophers who claim the project of looking for such a reality is conceives of the world of the Forms, he does not give evidence for its existence of key philosophical questions. Could the way human beings develop ideas and concobservations of the natural world? If this is the case, then the Forms may well be untrue at worst. Moreover, reason would not be a faculty that discovers any distinbut rather a way of understanding and organising sense experiences.

This way of thinking reflects a philosophical view often known as **empiricism**, which primarily comes from sense experience. It is often sceptical of truths that are suppression alone, and emphasises the importance of empirical evidence in developing world. In the next section, we will look at a figure who is often considered to be thought; Aristotle.

Aristotle and the Importance of the Street

Aristotle was a student of 5 - 1 c. 1 on in his life at his academy in Athens. Howeverntually depend on the of traditional Platonic philosophy, and, later in life very difference on many subjects. In particular, Aristotle is often praise the most important figures in the development of the natural sciences, as he was interested in empirical study of the world, more so than abstract contemplation a philosophical issues. This led him to write extensively on physical and biological quhis overall metaphysics was more influenced by his study of the natural world than ability to answer many conventional philosophical questions posed at the time.

INSPECTION COPY



In fact, across his main works, including *Physics* and *Metaphysics*, one of Aristotle's traditional Platonic thought (and its commitment to the existence of a real, unchang shifting, in-flux natural world. Aristotle not only wanted to explain why things change through this change and the best principles by which to describe this change. This incredibly influential metaphysical theories about motion and causation that were development of mechanical physics in the Enlightenment period.

As you might, therefore, expect, Aristotle rejecter (1) of elief about the world was not necessary to look beyond the move in order to understand how and ideas. The use of theoretical (1) by itself, or pure reason, was also not and real knowledge about 10 miles. While Plato's Forms hold an obvious intuitive we explored (1) and the plato's forms hold an obvious intuitive empirical of the plato's representation.

Aristotle, therefore, holds that sense experience has primacy over reason. Practicobservation of the natural world, should be the foundation from which our ideas abstract contemplation. As such, Aristotle is much more of an **empiricist** than Platultimately is the source of knowledge about the world.

However, as Plato noted, the world is constantly undergoing change. How can the about the world in the face of this change, and how can they explain why things a they do? Aristotle, in seeking to answer such questions, put forward what are now

The Four Causes

As noted in the last section, Aristotle thought that empirical investigation into the natural world should be the starting point of philony. One of the main questions that arises during such investigation which the things undergo change. Answering such a question is, he must difficult than it appears at first, as for any event, we have the multiple reasons why it has occurred and why it continuous.

For example strike a match against the side of a matchbox and it ignites. I me through my conflictions; unless I had struck the match it would not have ignited explanation for the fire. I might say that it is the red phosphorous undergoing frict phosphorous that begins a chain reaction leading to the wood below igniting. I mi ignites as it is a small enough piece of wood to catch fire; any bigger and it would that matches are designed to ignite when struck; that is the match's purpose and ignited. Were it designed for anything else, this outcome would not have occurred

Now, you might favour one of the explanations above, but it doesn't necessarily in fact, this is what Aristotle observed when he began to analyse change and moti searching for what in Greek is termed the 'aetion' (or 'aitia'). This is most common the Greek more accurately means the explanation or origin of something; why this they are. From this search for aitia he noted, just as we did to he the match, that the explaining the existence or origin of things. In fact, whenever we observe four potential ways of explaining its cause.

The material cause – Thir is planation refers to what the things involved a its parts, material of an object may explexample, a planation refers to what the things involved a its parts, material of an object may explexample, a planation refers to what the things involved a its parts, material of an object may explexample, a planation refers to what the things involved a its parts, material of an object may explexample, a planation refers to what the things involved a its parts, material of an object may explexample and the parts of the parts of

The formal cause – This kind of explanation refers to characteristics of a thing, sur Reference to the formal cause may explain change. For example, a match might b structure of its parts, such as its wooden handle and phosphorous tip.

INSPECTION COPY



The efficient cause – This kind of explanation refers to the agents or beings which starting points, of change in something. The efficient cause is often necessary to effor example, the ignition of a match might be explained by an individual striking if

The final cause – This kind of explanation refers to the purpose or end (telos) of soften formal cause can often explain why change has occurred. In the case of the match order to ignite and set fire to other things. Or, to take an example, a chair is have somewhere to sit; providing a place of rest is set.

Activity:

Consider the things by wat would you identify as their material, formal, eff down you feet the note any difficulties with Aristotle's philosophical process.

- 1. A loan Education ad
- 2. A motorbike
- 3. Mobile phones

ARISTOTLE AND THE TELEOLOGICAL VIEW

From looking at the four causes above, one in particular might stand out. Aristotle not mutually exclusive and it may be possible to give multiple causes for any even particular may seem unusual. In fact, thinking of things as possessing an inherent from a modern scientific perspective. While we are used usually to explaining thin principles, we do not readily explain things much by reference to whether they full

However, the final cause forms an important of Aristotle's thought. All things in nations (a goal or an end) and the study of teleology can help explain a wide variety Aristotle, the reason a seed grows into a plant is because a is its end goal, and continually move from imperfect to more perfect that is man attempt to fulfil this question such as 'why did the caterpillar or proose into a butterfly?', one extelos of a caterpillar.

Therefore, the end to whice strive to, and things are regularly created by beings towards the towards human beings; Aristotle's ethical views are informed by what he believes beings. Yet a set of interesting questions are raised when Aristotle turns the four disself. What is the efficient cause of the universe, and does it have an end? These in next section when we look at Aristotle's concept of the **Prime Mover**.

Teleological Language

You might think it easy to poke holes in Aristotle's system. For does anything reacouldn't the universe just be a set of meaningless causes and effects? Well, the idifficult to dispel than you might think, even if you are not religious.

Think about any moral principle you have. Why should some one endorse that particularly, it is because that principle (or more accurate virtue) contributes town Similarly, think about any political view way to some desired end state in the way way we examine the world ones by their faults and failures.

Teleologica guage, therefore, surrounds us, and it is possible to disagree with a final cause while still endorsing the idea of final cause in some situations. As we study, what can appear to be wrong might be much more complex on a deeper

ISPECTION COPY



The Prime Mover

Thinking about the existence of the universe, it is at least intuitively easy to present While disagreements are possible, the universe exists because it contains substant has a certain size and shape. However, its efficient and final causes are less obvious responsible for the change of the universe itself and what is the end of the universe simply natural and occurs by itself, or that there is an endless cycle of change. However, its efficient and final causes are less obvious responsible for the change of the universe itself and what is the end of the universe simply natural and occurs by itself, or that there is an endless cycle of change. However, its efficient and final causes are less obvious responsible for the change of the universe itself and what is the end of the universe simply natural and occurs by itself, or that there is an endless cycle of change. However, its efficient and final causes are less obvious responsible for the change of the universe itself and what is the end of the universe itself and universe itself and universe itself and universe itself and universe

Aristotle, therefore, proposes that the same movement in the universe fection. It is both the first cause of the universe, initial movement movement ways the final answer as to why change occurs in the universe; a eventually end in reference to its power or being.

THE NATURE OF CHANGE

The Prime Mover for Aristotle is not just the initial force which sets change in motio for Aristotle, this would mean the Prime Mover would be affected by such a force it Instead, Aristotle envisions the Prime Mover as a static entity which pulls all things to causes change and motion in beings as a result, such as the circular motion of the state.

However, this pull is also not arbitrary, and arises out of the perfection of the Prin all things aspire to perfection; they wish to reach their end as a result of this aspir are naturally attracted to the Prime Mover, the pure embodiment of perfection. The Prime Mover exerts on things is perhaps not best conceived of as even a force; it sall things change and move towards.

Discussion Activity:

Now you've begun learning to his stotle's Prime Mover, it is worth thinking a modern Christian Compare the Prime Mover with the traditional Chris similaritie in ifferences. What do you think is the key difference between the

This is a difficult picture of the world to grasp and can be seen as convoluted whe perspective. However, the idea of the Prime Mover greatly influenced many Chris God, particularly in the works of Thomas Aquinas. While the Prime Mover in Arist difficult set of questions about the cause of the universe, it potentially helps form constant change and motion Aristotle observed in the natural world, which to the appear to occur in mysterious ways. For not knowing about the genetics or interngrowth of a plant, there can be endless speculation about why seeds develop the

However, the framework of the four causes is still an intuitive way to analyse charmaterial and efficient causes still guide the way that many scientists approach new be argued that the very framework of Aristotle's thought still etains validity today. Mover deviate from a strictly empiricist approach to the order and stray into meta

The Prime Mover A Siment Causes

We've location the Diveas about the Prime Mover come about in Aristotle's the the final catalog the universe. Yet in his works Aristotle does not directly address deduction; that the efficient cause of the universe could also be the Prime Move of contention for many scholars of Aristotle, and great debate has emerged as the regard the Prime Mover as the effective efficient cause of the universe as well. Mover, it is worth being wary of this issue!

INSPECTION COPY



Evaluating Aristotle

While useful parts of Aristotle's thought remain, there are a number of key criticis thought. Most notably, many philosophers have disagreed with Aristotle's teleological modern scientific theories such as evolution, which propose that organisms simply environment and do not possess a specific or defined end. In fact, criticisms of tell itself; many empiricist philosophers – such as Bertrand Russali (who you will study appropriate question to ask what the cause or explands, of the universe is.

Aristotle's cosmology is also difficult and complete with modern scientific knowledge infinite regress of change 3 in , or that the beginning of this change occurr Bang and it is not invoke a being to explain why it continues. What the Aristotle en To hir self are misleading when looking at the world. While it is po through idea throu whether they are useful ways of understanding the laws of nature that guide the

However, these are questions that will be explored in greater depth later in this arguments for the existence of God. In the next section we look at an issue closer beings possess a soul.

Quick Quiz

- 1. What are the Forms?
- 2. Where does Plato detail his analogy of the cave?
- 3. Why is Plato a rationalist?
- What is the ultimate Form for Plato? 4.
- What does the Greek word 'aetion' ('ai+'a\n 62) 5.
- What are the four causes? 6.
- 7. Why does Arista '4 5. ose the existence of the Prime Mover?
- Prime Mover cause change in the universe? 8.





1B: SOUL, MIND AND BODY

Key Thinker	
Name	René Descartes
Born	1596
Died	1650
Key text	The Principles of Philosophy (1647
Why are they important?	Descartes is one of the root in the We with the cogite in the ways one of the best known philosophis substitution alignment and a substitution in the way for the modern understated in the substitution in the way for the modern understated in the substitution in the way for the modern understated in the substitution in the way for the modern understated in the substitution in the way for the modern understated in the substitution in the way for the modern understated in the substitution in the way for the modern understated in the way for the way for the modern understated in the way for the way
Did you know?	Descartes in 1619, early in his life, claimed to have a series of revealed to him a new philosophical system, combining analy philosophical logic. However, some commentators now beliefrom the symptoms reported, was simply a case of exploding

Introduction

What is it that makes you 'you'? Is it your genetics combined with environmental experiences and memories of those experiences? Or is it your particular mental fa

These questions evade easy answers. Throughout history thinkers across the world to understand the self. Yet while there have been different theories, one of the mathematical three is a central, non-material part of human beings which not only gives the them from other beings, such as animals. It has been used upport arguments and God, and, despite the rise of more scientific, and rish thinking, it is still a contract the such as a simple scientific that thinking it is still a contract the self-scientific throughout throughout throughout throughout throughout the self-scientific throughout thro

This idea is that of the **soul**. As will be the **read** in this section, there have been no composition; some have with the some materials as a spiritual perspective, others have seen in while some materials to the role of the role of

Discussion Activity:

In groups or pairs, discuss among yourselves whether you believe there is a soul believe it takes, and how does it influence human lives and actions?

Plato and the Soul

Before there was a more extensive scientific understanding of the natural world, would have been undoubtedly more mysterious. While the G peks held a surprising human physiology, there was still a distinctive mental and the human life that we human beings have thoughts or the ability to the asymptotic phenomenhuman beings experience the world and they do, and how best to experience, especially since an intuitive so radically separate from the management of the second separate from the management of the second secon

Plato believe to the questions were answered by positing a strict division between person. On the hand, there was the immaterial, permanent soul. This was independent the true essence of human beings. On the other hand, there is the temporary phy which the soul temporarily inhabits and is united with during the life of a person, physical body, returning to the immaterial world to contemplate the Forms. There human life itself, responsible for our thoughts and feelings, and this is why human be separate from the material world.

NSPECTION COPY



THE COMPOSITION OF THE SOUL

Plato goes further in this description of the soul. In being the source of the human three elements, or parts; **appetite**, **emotion** and **reason**. The appetite is the part produces pleasure, while conversely the emotion is what produces anger, or high parts is then reason, which for Plato seeks what is true and real. Any human action down into the influences from these three parts of the soul, and, depending on the above the others in decision-making.

Plato illustrates this picture a little more as a metaphor of a chariot. The charand guiding the two horses of etit and emotion. What Plato ultimately wishe of the soul is necessary in the it be appetite and emotion in motivating action, these motivations are considered.

THE MYTH OF ER

Plato doesn't provide any explicit philosophical arguments for the existence of a sideas at the end of *Republic* with a story now called the 'Myth of Er'. Although in twriting, it is worth noting that 'myth' here is better translated as 'word' or 'account how literally the myth should be interpreted, it greatly influenced philosophical subsequent centuries.

Plato's story details the journey of a soldier (named Er) through the afterlife. It be death in battle and the recovering of his body 10 days later, when it is found to be significant time in the elements. Two days later, while he is being arranged on his up and recounts his journey through the different stages of the afterlife, including spheres of the astral plane before being reincarnated.

The Myth of Er, however, is not just intended to be a fire a justification of the exdefence of Plato's ethics and cosmology thought it is reinforced that the action during their lives are not meaning to one's moral decision-making has been incredit plato's controlled their lives are not meaning to one's moral decision-making has been incredit plato's controlled their lives are not meaning to one's moral decision-making has been incredit plato's controlled their lives are not meaning to one's moral decision-making has been incredit plato's controlled their lives are not meaning to one's moral decision-making has been incredit plato's controlled their lives are not meaning to one's moral decision-making has been incredit plato's controlled their lives are not meaning to one's moral decision-making has been incredit plato's controlled their lives are not meaning to one's moral decision-making has been incredit plato's controlled their lives are not meaning to one's moral decision-making has been incredit plato's controlled their lives are not meaning to one's moral decision-making has been incredit plato's controlled their lives are not meaning to one one of their lives are not meaning to one of the one of their lives are not meaning to one of the one of their lives are not meaning to one of the one of their lives are not meaning to one of the one of their lives are not meaning to one of their lives are not meaning to one of their lives are not meaning to one of th

However, while these ideas have been prominent in religious discourse since, the which thinkers have attempted to classify and categorise the **soul**. One major differentiately, who is the focus of the next section.

Aristotle and the Soul

Throughout the examination of Aristotle's beliefs in **ancient philosophical influen** favoured a much more empirical approach to understanding the nature of being a for his invesitgation into the soul. Rather than instinct the sifying it as a separately physical human person, Aristotle attempts to the inclusion of the soul in a beings. This involves looking at what the architics, whether they be material or beings from other animals and allowed the inique dimensions of their experience.

However, to the difficult question than it might appear. What characteristic beings from creatures? Many animals, such as chimpanzees or dolphins, are human-like intelligence, while human beings themselves aren't born exactly the showever, takes quite a holistic approach to this question. He contends that the so a 'nature' or 'essence' that persists in an individual throughout their life and compacities, form and being.

INSPECTION COPY



Aristotle uses an example of an eye to illustrate this idea. While an eye is essential body part, one identifies an eye by its capacity to see. Were it not able to perform possible to reasonably state that it would not be an eye. Aristotle argues that the applying this same philosophical framework. One simply has to question what cap beings perform, and how these reflect a particular human nature or essence.

THE THREE ELEMENTS OF THE SOUL

Similarly to Plato, Aristotle advocates a tripartice level the soul. However, the theory different and also provide a way of the living beings, not just hun Aristotle identifies are:

The vegeta 79 ul rms is held by all living beings and enables them to survive environmen ever, the vegetative soul provides no powers of reason or thou and instincts to creatures.

The appetitive soul – This is held by all animals and gives rise to emotions, appetitions of basic thoughts, thus enabling living beings who possess the appetitive sour make basic decisions.

The intellectual soul – This is only held by human beings and grants the ability to experience, including the different perceptions, appetites and desires that form it perceived to be at the top of a **hierarchy** of capacities and functions, possessing t

Discussion Activity:

Aristotle's hierarchy of souls has proved influential in more ways than one. For n that human beings are greater than animals, who do not sess rationality and experience the world in the same way.

However, new scientific evidence of a large points towards animals having kee awareness. In light of the point, is it right to still uphold Aristotle's hierarchy yourselve to but it.

Plato or Aristotle?

It is possible to contrast Plato's and Aristotle's approaches to the soul. Plato favour approach; there are two different substances that comprise a human being. One is other is the material body. On the other hand, Aristotle's view of the soul is much not immortal and is characterised simply by the material elements and functions of Aristotle's criticism of Plato includes Plato's ideas about different realms and the soul. However, Aristotle is still largely dualist; he does advocate a distinction between a distinction between a distinction of the does not believe that the soul can persist through desired.

Which, however, is more plausible? Plato's view might be intuitive without prior of the human brain, but it is difficult to accept that human brains possess an imm. For how can this be empirically proved? And how was chain immaterial soul if Yet Aristotle's view risks making the idea of the manneless altogether. If the explained simply by material functions with the latest about a soul at all?

These are queriens in a prague both religion and philosophy. While religious existence of the place of the posed a difference question; namely, what is the mind? This will be the focus of the examined whether philosophical arguments about the mind can also support talk of

INSPECTION COPY



The Relationship between the Soul and the Mind

We talked previously about the strange and potentially unique nature of human existingly react to the world, but seem to reason about it and make thoughtful decision seem to have our own **inner lives**, inaccessible to those around us. Within this inner **mental states**, which seem to possess peculiar qualities. They are not intuitively maperson perspective, seem to exist independently from the rest of our body. Yet it may guide our philosophical thought about the mind may singly one a mistake, and, from mental states might simply just be **physical states** is the argive the illusion of being seem to the mind may singly exist the illusion of being seem to the mind may singly exist the illusion of being seem to the mind may singly exist the illusion of being seem to the mind may singly exist the illusion of being seem to the mind may singly exist the illusion of being seem to the mind may singly exist the illusion of being seem to the mind may singly exist the illusion of being seem to the mind may singly exist the illusion of being seem to the mind may singly exist the illusion of being seem to the mind may singly exist the illusion of being seem to the mind may singly exist the mind may singly exi

However, if the mind is separation the pody, what kind of thing is it? This questover the years, as we will a mind is a different kind of substatement may to be substated then it may to be substated the mind is a different kind of thing is it? This questower the years, as we will not be substated to the mind is a different kind of substated the mind is a different

But there is some more aspect to the mind that proves troubling and seems to conciousness. In Plato's and Aristotle's theories about the soul, they both identify conscious rational thought, but both make different conclusions as to how it arise range of competing theories about the nature of consciousness and how to under interactions in the brain.

One natural difficulty is that 'consciousness' itself is a broad term, encompassing and processes, but most commonly it is viewed as a kind of self-awareness that all reflection on the world and self. In fact, philosophy itself can be argued to be a propossible to ask these questions about the soul and mind because we are conscious existence of consciousness and inner mental lives gives good grounds for believing different substance or property from the body. Such arguments are often based properties of the mind and body; if they possess different properties, how could the basic form of the argument that Descartes gives for such a properties.

Descartes and Substance Dustim

Substance dualism is possible position that the mind and the body are differer and are s; one is an immaterial, thinking, indivisible thing while the otterward non-thinking, material, extended thing. The alternative to this theory is **monism**, the view that there is only one kind of substance (generally thought to be physical/material). As such, those supporting monism about the mind are usually materialists (or physicalists). They believe that all things are material in nature, including the mind.

A famous philosopher who argued for substance dualism was René Descartes. He is perhaps best known for his proposal of the 'cogito', which is often summed up as 'I think therefore I am' (although the full extent of his thought is a bit more complicated!). More simply, it is a philosophical proposition by Descartes about the foundation of all human knowledge.

Descartes was primarily determined to find out what he could know for certain. This might seem like an abstract project, but it is argued for a trivial concern. As noted, the senses present a world that is every heard and so it is fair to ask whe are any beliefs that could be considered for a liable (impossible to doubt).

Descartes, building off the day, indertook what are known as three waves of doubt arguments to find what Descartes knew, in an attempt to find what could first wave, however, the world is a constant trick by an evil demon. At every turn, Descartes realises it is and thinking except for one proposition; that he is a thinking being. For, in the very existence, he is simultaneously reinforcing his existence as a thinking thing. Try as it impossible to doubt he is a thinking being. This results in the famous declaration of the doubt he is a thinking being. This results in the famous declaration of the doubt he is a thinking being.

NSPECTION COPY



The important thing to take from this process is that the cogito is the beginning of is of a different kind from the body. For it appears initially from the cogito that the without the body, if not vice versa. This implies that the mind is effectively a different can persist or exist in ways the body cannot.

THE MIND AND THE BODY

Descartes provides two arguments for the mind and the ping separate substates the cogito. They are developed from Descartes' no for clear and distinct ideas. That, like the cogito, cannot be doubted and in one's mind. Descartes propose under this principle, including the place of geometry and his ontological arguments.

Descartes' To substance dualism, however, rely on another principle nethodically ulated by Leibniz later as the 'Identity of Indiscernibles'. This ho if, and only if, they share the same properties. If they do not share the same properties ontologically distinct. These properties might include everything including size, po case of the mind and the body, if they were one substance, Descartes argues they same properties.

However, there are two aspects of the mind that intuitively seem to differ from the Descartes gives is that the mind is a thinking, non-extended thing, while the body thing. This is often known as the **conceivability argument**. Why does Descartes dr Well, it can be set out roughly in the following syllogistic form:

- P1. One can conceive of oneself as a thinking being, existing without one's body.
- P2. Anything that can be conceived is logically possible.
- P3. If it is logically possible that one can be a thinking thing without a body, then the
- C1. Therefore, the mind is not identical to the body.

There are a number of interesting aspects of the scartes' argument. The most importangues that if something can be increased then it is logically possible. For example, but not that 2 + 3 = 4. The increase conceivable and logically possible, but the latter mind truly 'the increased the problem is that a doesn't necessarily mean that it is actually possible, especially if one does not have the ideas or things involved. There is a fundamental difference between conceiving where the meaning of the terms are fully known, and conceiving of natural phenounknown or unobservable properties.

What Can be Conceived?

Philosophers have traditionally divided between **analytic** and **synthetic** stateme are true by virtue of the meaning of the terms involved, while synthetic stateme meaning of the terms relates to the world itself. Typically through the history of thought that analytic statements are necessarily a priori, while synthetic statements

However, the twentieth-century philosopher Saria price challenged this idea, co some analytic, or necessary, statements in the discovered a posteriori. For about atoms, one could conceive and water were different substances. molecular nature of water to a tatement would be false. It is necessarily true indicates in the same of t

What does mean for Descartes' argument? Well, Descartes can logically concern different things, just as it might have been possible once upon a time to conceive separate substances. However, it may be that mind and body are metaphysically that H_2O and water refer to the same substance. Logically, conceivability, therefore metaphysical conceivability. We may one day find out for certain that mind and both

INSPECTION COPY



Descartes, therefore, has to provide another argument to support his substance divisibility argument. This is a simpler argument in form, and can be written as su

- P1. All extended things can be divided, or are divisible.
- P2. The mind cannot be divided, and is not divisible.
- C1. The mind cannot be an extended thing.

Once again, Descartes asserts two different properties (f) mind and body. Yet P2 does Descartes determine the mind is in the while it doesn't make sense states are divisible, if one is a matter is a more is asserting that the mind is essentially subtly assuming the truth of subthile Descartes is simply subtly assuming the truth of subthile Descartes is simply subtly assuming the truth of subthile Descartes is simply subtly assuming the truth of subthile Descartes is simply subtly assuming the truth of subthile Descartes in the mind is in the mind is in the mind is easily assuming the truth of subthile Descartes in the mind is easily assuming the truth of subthile Descartes in the mind is easily as much divisible.

FURTHER ISSUES WITH SUBSTANCE DUALISM

While substance dualism provides a simple explanation for the unique properties number of difficult-to-overcome issues. One major problem which plagued Descalinteraction problem. Simply put, if the mind is an immaterial, non-extended substinteract with and influence the material, extended body? There has to be a hypot least; but without invoking an arbitrary mechanism, this question is difficult to anothe interaction may occur in the pineal gland, but many of his critics at the time throughout the interaction answer and Descartes himself never truly addressed the issue.

Second, substance dualism just seems at odds with conventional scientific practicular uncovering ways in which our thoughts and feelings are influenced by the brain its not necessarily refuted by such studies, it does raise questions about whether it is there are materialist explanations for a wide variety of mental phenomena. The unmental lives may well turn out to be the result of small patterns and prese a wide variety of other beings too in various the graph of the case separate substance is simply an error of the large and reasoning. This was the view see in the next section, claim and committed at the control of the second substance is simply an error of the large and reasoning. This was the view see in the next section, claim and committed at the large at the large

Property Jualism

Some philosophers have expanded on Descartes' proposals with a slightly difference property dualism. This theory states that while there is only one substance (phybetween physical systems give rise to certain mental properties that cannot be ophysical interactions. Therefore, while there is one substance (physical), there are (mental and physical).

How this works is not fully understood or spelled out, even by proponents! The of **emergence**; the belief that properties of the whole can be greater than its paininght be able to perceive, grasp and understand ideas about colour that cannot of how neurons are firing in their brain.

Property dualism in philosophy of religion is mo cp. while ndorsed by Rich while it is clear that human beings do row; an immaterial mind or soul in the there are complex, emergent ope tos of the human mind that can persist through and this is enough of a meaningful account of how human beings ent

COPYRIGHT



Ryle and the 'Ghost in the Machine'

Imagine the following situation. A tour guide in Oxford city begins showing a group of rather belligerent tourists around the different colleges. At the start they had rather rudely requested to see the university, so they skip seeing some of the other historical landmarks around the city and instead focus on visiting as many colleges as possible, as well as the libraries of the end the tour guide is exhausted from running around the city of the have at least succeeded in showing the tourists the vast response to the colleges, libraries and of the tour start of the colleges, libraries and colleges, to his chagrin, after he had to the tour and given his final remarks 'But where is the university'.

The tourists at a rally are mistaken; the university is just the assortment of round, but the aveing in their mind that Oxford University must be a single place generally called a **category error**. They assumed on the basis of the language used or set of properties that did not actually belong to it. These errors are surprisingly although on a much smaller scale. The very language we use to describe things cathings actually are. We looked briefly before at the issue of consciousness; we migname it is an actual mental phenomenon or state, but there are some materialist is wholly wrong and consciousness can be explained by reference to different phy

DESCARTES AND HIS CATEGORY ERROR

Gilbert Ryle, in his famous 1949 work *The Concept of Mind*, levelled this charge ag that substance dualists have misinterpreted talk of the mind as indicating it is a sephenomenon that requires explanation. These misinterpretations have created plants of the should, in fact, be none, and introduced a whole set of hidden errors about talk of

More specifically, he states that Descartes' sul states that Descartes' and body as two different substances in the section, we looked at Descartes' he claimed that what is conceive (e is legically possible. This, Ryle believes, is the philosophical program of the case. Rather it is just the erroneous use of language the mind and because substances.

To go back to the example of the university, one could draw a similar example with neuroscientist and ask him to show me the human mind. He draws out a brain in a the brain encodes information and transfers it via neurons, and how these process and behaviour. At the end of what would be quite a long and exhausting talk, I go where is the mind?' While this question can be asked, it is still a mistake. It may be the brain that the neuroscientist gives is a full description of the mind, but I have that the mind must possess separate properties, or is a separate substance.

RYLE AND BEHAVIOURISM

It is important to note that Ryle does not explicitly deny that all fulk of the mental is fathat it cannot be assumed that talk of the mental means as specific 'mental sul was a **behaviourist** (although he didn't always life to is seates of human beings was mistaked what properties the mind not be in the mental states with talk of **behaviour** and **dispositi**

This might study uite radical, and at the time it was. But thinkers such as Ryle we study of the mind precise and measurable, and the growth of psychology as an incovariety of ways in which the behaviour of human beings was conditioned by their special mental powers. Ryle as such can be described as a materialist at heart, but processes underwrote human behaviour, just that study of the mind should focus

INSPECTION COPY



THE LIMITS OF BEHAVIOURISM

There is plenty of evidence that human beings are conditioned by their environment every part of human mental lives able to be turned into talk of behaviours? Plenty of way human beings do reason and reflect on their choices beyond behavioural impusuch as feeling, believe, desire, although rooted in the possession of an inner mental why humans act in the way that they do. If this is the case then Ryle has perhaps go substance dualism and failed to acknowledge both the

But if we acknowledge this kind of increase. If if then it appears that Ryle has spectre of dualism. For there are till the questions about why human beings expected they do. In particular till a state of qualia.

Qualia are a versial proposition, but refer to the unique qualities of first-personething is like or how it 'feels'. For example, qualia might include how a personeels pain. While the occurrence of both can be explained by the interaction betwoes ubstances and forces, such an explanation does not include what it is like for the There is great debate as to whether qualia actually exist or whether, similar to subtresult of an error in reasoning, but they are the kind of phenomena that behaviour difficulty explaining. Moreover, they are the kind of phenomena that, throughout attributed to the soul.

However, materialism as a position is more popular than ever among modern phil a difficult task explaining how certain mental states could be identified as physical of **reduction**, and we will briefly look at the case for materialism in the next section

Discussion Activity:

Behaviourism even at the time it was formulated to be controversial theoretical psychological practice today. In groups or the second system of the mind. If not, how to a you defend a materialist view of the

Materialism REV 2527

If materialisted ecorrect view of the mind, then it must be possible to translate physical states. To some degree, this translation already occurs. I might explain moderate and department of the physical states. To some degree, this translation already occurs. I might explain moderate and department of the physical indepartment of the physical states of the brain functions on the level of individual neurons. As such, there show physical states of the brain give rise to the mental states we commonly expended.

In fact, key to a materialist perspective is the possibility, or viability, of **reduction**. or equivocating higher-level mental states with their corresponding lower-level permay not be a simple translation. Feelings, desires and intentions may not be represented a complex pattern of, or connection between, multiple areas is far from complete, and may require shifts in the way a sabout mental state assert is that reduction is in principle viable, since it is possible to change any asbrain without changing a being's mental state.

Dualists, however, ofte the some aspects of mental life which cannot be reduced, being a different betance or property. This is also, in effect, what could be the mental characteristics which cannot be explained via physical mechanisms and ca a separate immaterial part of the human person. However, the fact that successfus isn't necessarily a strong argument for dualism! Scientific advances in understand found and it might be premature to claim materialist perspectives have failed to eas consciousness.

INSPECTION COPY



Activity:

The process of reduction can be tricky at times and it is perhaps easiest to get \sqrt{s} exercise. Take the example of someone looking up and perceiving a blue sky. Ho experience using:

- a) psychological terms?
- b) neuroscientific terms?
- c) biological terms?
- d) physical terms?

LION COP Once you have completed in Janink about your answers. Is the experience of lo meaningf ytu (a by these descriptions? Or is there something missing?

How Should We Talk about the Soul?

Many religions still talk about the real existence of an immaterial soul. Often for endeavours in understanding the brain is less important than the belief that God physical aspect of human identity. Yet, the different perspectives on the mind and the term should be used in modern-day thought.

For both the secular dualist and the religious individual, talk of a soul might be a illuminating the fundamental differences between the mind and the body. While form is important for individuals across the world, and forms a significant part of that captures the unique mental life of human beings is very useful. Others, howe views, might claim the soul is an outdated term for such mental life, and that new be more appropriate in describing mental states.

On the other hand, materialists might also pos es a : ge of perspectives on the might explicitly reject it, arguing that it is to becure accurate talk of the mind as Furthermore, it risks human by a sor countering category errors, as using a term viewing it as a separs a his

However, sc aterialists might also accept that the soul is a useful metaphor position of Richard Dawkins, who in his writings distinguishes between what he te is the idea of the soul as a spiritual substance, commonly found in religious writing of the soul as a collection of a person's capacities, nature and motivations as dete interactions with the environment. It is, in effect, a shorthand that illuminates a until that point. Therefore, Soul 2 does not point towards the existence of a real, instead a metaphorical idea about physical identity, closer to Aristotle's perspecti

Quick Quiz

- 1. What are the three parts of the soul for Plato?
- 2. What are the three parts of the soul for Aristotle?
- 3. What is monism?
- 4. What is Descartes' conceivability and ine
- 5. What is the mind-body
- 6. Why doe rei \ to the immaterial soul as a 'ghost in the machine'?
- 7. What is be
- 8. In what way might talk of the soul be acceptable to a materialist?



SECTION 2: THE EXISTENCE O

What you will learn in this section:

Philosophical views regarding the teleological argument, including:

- Aquinas' Fifth Way, the argument from intelligence.
- William Paley's watchmaker analogy.
- David Hume's criticisms of design ar \(\) \logr
- Scientific challenges to the tree of argument.
- Richard Swinburne':
 α communication of the teleological argument.

Philosophical argument, including:

- Aquinas first three ways.
- Traditional versions of the causal argument and the argument from continge
- David Hume's criticisms of the causal principle and the cosmological argumer
- Bertrand Russell's criticism of the argument from contingency.
- Modern discussion around the nature of the cosmos and the possibility of an

Philosophical views regarding the ontological argument, including:

- Anselm's two formulations of the ontological argument and the importance
- Gaunilo's criticisms of Anselm through the counterexample of the perfect is
- Kant's criticisms of the ontological argument.
- Malcolm's and Plantinga's modern formulations of the ontological argument

Starter Activity:

Read through the extracts for both Aquinas and this ir usted in the anthology main differences in their approach to a go for the existence of God.



INSPEC

79 INSPECTION COPY

NSPECTION COPY



2A: ARGUMENTS BASED ON OBSERV

Key Thinker	
Name	Aquinas
Born	1225
Died	1274
Key text	Summa Theologiae (1485)
	There are few figures who have hore influence on the Cat
Why are they	priest St Thomas Ann hand there are few institutions which
important?	the share of vory lastory than the Catholic Church. As such,
	f र र र र राजार, the moral and intellectual landscape for large r
79	s pelieved that Aquinas' relatives, disapproving of his decis
Education	friar, once forcibly imprisoned him in the family castle in an a
Did you know?	Legend has it that his brothers even resorted to hiring a prost
	Thomas away from a life of religious chastity. Not one to be
	the flesh, Aquinas is said to have driven her from his bedroon

Key Thinker	
Name	William Paley
Born	1743
Died	1805
Key text	Natural Theology (1802)
Why are they important?	Paley was one of the important figures in natural theology and eighteenth century and his thought was influential across multihelped provide rational defences of religious beliefs that were academic students at the time and robustly challenge evolution became more with a cated.
Did you know?	Despite Charles (ir) theories refuting a large portion of the world (will actually read Paley as a student and was in [] y jiming about God and the natural world.



The idea that God can be observed in nature has been prevalent throughout almost through direct intervention, such as miracles, or through indirect effects of divine God did create the world then it should be expected that he could be known through this kind of approach forms the basis for **natural theology**; a field known through observation and rational reflection on the natural world.

Two different kinds of argument will be detailed in this section which both follow **teleological argument**, which puts forward that the presence of design in the natural inference to a designer God. The second is the **cosmological argument**, which corfeatures of the universe, such as the principle of cause and effect, show that a crefrom different starting points, but ultimately wish to show that the existence of G and features observed across the world.

However, there are also critics of the set g) ents, both religious and secular, whether world are really revealing of the world or are just human projections. More generating for states of a transcendent God is a philosophical step too far from small part of the lateral universe. Beyond questions about the reliability of the case that arguments from observation are simply too ambitious to succeed.

Nevertheless, the philosophical debate about these kinds of argument took its mode Aquinas presented his Five Ways as part of his influential work *Summa Theological* looking at both the teleological and cosmological arguments.

ISPECTION COPY



Aquinas and the Five Ways

The Five Ways only take up a few pages of the *Summa Theologaie*, a vast text which covers a huge number of philosophical and theological questions. But they are perhaps some of the most well-known pages in the philosophy of religion and have potentially caused greater debate than any other writing in the field.

The Five Ways are Aquinas' attempts to demo state in existence of God based he observed around him. While many that they were developed more to we have taken these to be standard they were developed more to we have taken these to be standard they were developed more to we have taken these to be standard they were developed more to we have a such as a such as such as such as such, the Five Ways should be taken primathe existence and is a reasonable assertion, considering the structural features

Within the Five Ways are five different arguments for the existence of God. Only f this section, but all five are presented in a similar style and possess a similar form observations about the nature and structure of the world. This means that the Fively on experience to prove their conclusions. Second, Aquinas presents his argumenasoning; he sets out the arguments such that the truth of the conclusion is guar are also true. However, not all cosmological arguments involve deductive reasoning proposed variations based on **inductive reasoning**. This is where the truth of the evidence for the conclusion, but does not guarantee its truth.

The Fifth Way: The Teleological Argument

Aquinas, in the last of his Five Ways, puts forward a version of what is now known derives from the Greek word 'telos', meaning 'end' (as in a in Aristotle's works existence of God from perceived evidence of designal in the last 200 was a someometric of the column and the last 200 was a someometric or the column and form Aquinas presents. This can be

- P1. It is po to see non-intelligent beings exhibiting regular and ordered
- P2. This be cannot be the product of chance, otherwise it would not be
- C1. Therefore, the behaviour of these non-intelligent beings must be 'set'.
- P3. However, since these beings are non-intelligent, they cannot be the source of
- P4. All intelligent behaviour must have an intelligent source.
- C2. Therefore, there must be an intelligent source guiding the behaviour of these
- C3. That intelligent being is best understood to be God.

As you can see, there are multiple parts to Aquinas' argument. The first looks at hexhibited in many beings across the world, while the second part looks to argue the originate in a higher being such as God. An example of this idea is a seed growing Aquinas would argue, does not possess the intelligence to guide its tree-forming behaviour has to come from an outside source, such as a creator God, who design

You might well remember this seed example from each of a companion in the Aquinas actually draws on Aristotle's idea of a fire a companion in the Aquinas actually draws on Aristotle's idea of a fire a companion in the Aquinas actually draws on Aristotle's idea of a fire a companion in the Aquinas actually draws on Aristotle's idea of a fire a companion in the Aquinas actually draws on Aristotle's idea of a fire a companion in the Aquinas actually draws on Aristotle's idea of a fire a companion in the Aquinas actually draws on Aristotle's idea of a fire a companion in the Aquinas actually draws on Aristotle's idea of a fire a companion in the Aquinas actually draws on Aristotle's idea of a fire a companion in the Aquinas actually draws on Aristotle's idea of a fire a companion in the Aquinas actually draws on Aristotle's idea of a fire a companion in the Aquinas actually draws on Aristotle's idea of a fire a companion in the Aquinas actually draws on Aristotle's idea of a fire a companion in the Aquinas actually draws on Aristotle's idea of a fire a companion in the Aquinas actually draws on Aristotle's idea of a fire a companion in the Aquinas actually draws on Aristotle's idea of a fire a companion in the Aquinas actually draws on Aristotle's idea of a fire a companion in the Aquinas actually draws on Aristotle's idea of a fire a companion in the Aquinas actually draws on Aristotle's idea of a fire a companion in the Aquinas actually draws on Aristotle's idea of a fire a companion in the Aquinas actually draws on Aristotle's idea of a fire a companion in the Aquinas actually draws on Aristotle's idea of a fire a companion in the Aquinas actually draws on Aristotle's idea of a fire a companion in the Aquinas actually draws on Aristotle's idea of a companion in the Aquinas actually draws on Aristotle's idea of a companion in the Aquinas actually draws on Aristotle's idea of a companion in the Aquinas actually draws on Aristotle's idea of a companion in the Aquinas actually draws on Aristotle's idea of a companio

These are the kinds of question we will turn to now as we look at William Paley's takes a different approach from Aquinas, looking at properties such as complexity intelligent behaviour. This potentially opens new doors for the proponent of the t questions what 'design' might truly look like in the natural world.

INSPECTION COPY



Discussion Activity:

Read through Aquinas' Fifth Way in detail once more and, in pairs or groups, disthe main issues with Aquinas' argument. How would you potentially improve it?

Paley and The Watchmaker Analogy

Imagine you're walking along a countryside path a o' ump your foot into a rock. In anger you pick up the rock and the rock and the rock and the rocks. In anger you pick up the rock and the rocks are so the field, thinking nothing of it, because, well, it's a collection of the path and you crack your foot again into a solid the rocks. But a few minutes later you're the rock and you pick it up and see it's a watch, largely intact. In factorial paths are represented in the rock and th

This scene is (partially) the basis for Paley's version of the teleological argument. It the same scene but with a person without prior knowledge of what a watch is. Excindividual would not conclude it was designed for any particular purpose, but if the would conclude the exact opposite. The intricate parts and their movement reveau order to the watch; that it was designed for a particular purpose. Paley's argument split into two parts. The first is that the universe displays design qua purpose (it was the second is that it displays design qua regularity (the universe is designed to be watchmaker primarily addresses design qua purpose; for evidence of design qua natural laws and aspects of the universe that demonstrate order.

But what Paley ultimately wishes to illustrate with this world, one would observe a similar level of functic all prexity and order to that are a great many beings that are seem from lowers, and fish effortlessly glide throughout into energy, bees harvest now from lowers, and fish effortlessly glide throughout many design that could not have arisen simply by chance that there is the support of the functional complexity and order, one would not have arisen simply by chance that there is the support of the functional complexity and order, one would not have a risen simply by chance that there is the support of the functional complexity and order, one would not have a risen simply by chance that there is the support of the function of the funct

ARGUMENTS FROM ANALOGY

Paley's argument is often taken to be an **argument from analogy**. An analogy is a foinductive argument, which attempts to use the similar properties present in two or things in order to explain the nature or behaviour of them. This means arguments analogy are stronger when there is a high degree of similarity between the two thin being compared. For if two things share a large number of properties, it is potential more likely that they share an additional one, or exhibit similar behaviours. However, similarities also have to be relevant, and of a similar degree. I could compare birds a bees because they both have wings, but this similarity is unlikely to be relevant, or the same degree, in comparing their foraging habits.

Arguments from analogy are often easy to crit is rewo things are the same, so difficult to determine whether the critical sappropriate without some prior of all the objects being compact of all the objects being compact of the sample, if I claimed that Mars can support like Earth, it has an in a source, water and regular sunlight, this might appear to But Mars is the same of the same of

INSPECTION COPY



DESIGN AND ABDUCTIVE REASONING

Paley draws the comparison between the Earth and a watch in his book *Natural T* many other apologetic (defensive) arguments for Christian beliefs, and his overall philosophical steps that the existence of God is a reasonable prospect from lookin that, how can the comparison between a watch and the Earth be considered a str the Earth is nothing like a watch; huge numbers of factors are involved in life form that it does and it seems overly simplistic to say that he is, lay similar levels of

The answer is that Paley isn't using a first and a watch to argue at the Earth and a watch to argue at the Earth exhibits functional complexity and but these properties a libery ved in the natural world regardless of the complexity that the two complexity argues are then these properties require an explanation, as it is very chance. Moreover, if they do require an explanation, then it would seem the best creating a functionally complex and ordered world.

Paley, therefore, is employing much more **abductive reasoning** in his argument th reasoning is also known as inference to the best explanation, and is a form of reas of evidence with the aim of drawing out the most likely explanation for its cause of functional order and complexity observed in the world by Paley, it may well be the possible, but on balance of probabilities the best explanation is that there is a bein way, just as the best explanation for the existence of a watch is a watchmaker.

Abductive Reasoning and the Scientific Method

One typical objection to the design argument, as we analyse later, is that it too much about events such as creation which the typical party have no experience contrasted with a strictly empirical party of the property of

Yet such a potentially ignores the incredibly important role of abduenquiry. We ductive reasoning is important, for the most part astrophysics abductive reasoning, since scientists are viewing the night sky in the past and try explanation for the universe as it exists from our perspective. Therefore, while it and measurement, much of scientific enquiry, when talking about the beginning potentially similar methodologies to the design argument. Denying the validity of teleological argument employs may also be ironically denying the validity of key

Additional Challenges

Paley also recognises that his argument can be challenged in a number of ways. For whether invoking the idea of an intelligent designer commits anthropomorphism qualities are imposed on other things, often without justification. It might be that is a step too far; all that could be said at most is that some in g or someone design recognises this and does not claim the designer need at a list the Christian God, of Other arguments or evidence is needed to premis assertion (although Paley this is plentiful).

Similarly, Property of the Earth is perfectly understood, or even perfectly understood underst

NSPECTION COPY



Philosophical and Scientific Challenges

Paley's arguments were very influential at the time of writing, but might seem data beings possess significantly more scientific knowledge about the world. However, philosophically challenge many aspects of Paley's argument. One critic was David number of years before Paley, provided a number of quite damning and difficult the teleological argument in his work *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion*. With areas of critique. First is the observations of design in an yould, and second is the observations to a designer.

HUME AND THE PRINCIPLE

Before we retiques, however, it is worth looking at one of the main Hume's analytic the principle of cause and effect (or the causal principle). Previous taken this principle to be a metaphysical law; events could not happen without a explanation. But Hume pointed out that this principle could not be known a priori any event could happen without a cause, or even a variety of different causes from example, while the Sun has risen every day so far in my life, it is perfectly logically tomorrow. So, how do human beings arrive at the principle of cause and effect?

Hume argues that the causal principle is developed through people's experiences events. When I strike a billiard ball towards others, they clash and move in regular performing actions in a similar manner, I come to believe that striking billiard balls to the same results. In this way, I come to believe the future will resemble the past conjunctions of events, through habit, into a mental principle of cause and effect, we know are simply from experience. Beyond that, it is impossible to know for cerpossess like causes.

Now Hume isn't suggesting that we should abone in the guiding principle by which we into the guiding principle. Where hu experienced certain country to the graph of the guiding and principles we have observed on Earth. This will also for the guiding argument, as we will see later, but it also poses a number argument. Simply put, accepting Hume's conclusions about the causal principle, the more from observations of the world than it is justified in doing so.

HUME'S CRITIQUE OF THE TELEOLOGICAL ARGUMENT

Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion is, as it states, written as a dialogue, using its three protagonists, Demea, Philo and Cleanthes, to present various views about the nature of God and his relationship to the world. However, despite its more informal presentation, Hume provides roughly five criticisms of the teleological argument, which we will explore below:

- Hume's analysis of the causal principle in the last on Simply because procan be observed in both a watch and the following not mean that they both simply, just because one can object the simply, just because one can object the simply and the simply of th
- 2. The design argument commits the fallacy of composition. The fallacy of composition belonging to the parts of something are mistakenly assigned to the whole thing wall is made out of bricks does not mean the wall itself is a brick. Another famous Russell, is that every human being has a mother, but this does not mean that he

INSPECTION COPY



In the context of the teleological argument, Hume argues that proponents classigned from observations of design in small parts of it. However, this conclumates we was the soft the universe that are chaotic and unordered, and human presuming that their small section of the world represents the whole universext point Hume makes, about spatial order.

- 3. Spatial order is not reliable evidence for God. One commain aspects of the developing the idea that the functional command order of objects indicated is that there is no way of known the mer this complexity and order the arrangement of parts in the world could always be random. To determining what is ordered, but this assumption cannot be extended to
- 4. A design is not necessarily God. There is no good justification for believing would have to be the Christian God. It may be that there are multiple designed Since the creation of the world is beyond human experience and comprehend designer is arguably just speculation.
- 5. The teleological argument is guilty of anthropomorphism. Hume notes that the human endeavours. If there is a God who created the world, it is arguably project onto him in claiming he is a designer. Could God's action even be considered estauggested in the last criticism, it is impossible to know what a designer would learn anthropomorphism isn't fatal to the teleological argument, it does question where the link between design and a designer is just and a designer is just a suppropriate and whether the link between design and a designer is just a suppropriate and whether the link between design and a designer is just a suppropriate and whether the link between design and a designer is just a suppropriate and whether the link between design and a designer is just a suppropriate and whether the link between design and a designer is just a suppropriate and whether the link between design and a designer is just a suppropriate and whether the link between design and a designer is just a suppropriate and whether the link between design and a designer is just a suppropriate and whether the link between design and a designer is just a suppropriate and whether the link between design and a designer is just a suppropriate and whether the link between design and a suppropriate and whether the link between design and a designer is just a suppropriate and whether the link between design and a design and a design and a suppropriate and whether the link between design and a design and a suppropriate and whether the link between design and a design and a design and a suppropriate and whether the link between design and a design and a design and a suppropriate and whether the link between design and a design and a suppropriate and a suppropriate

Activity:

Read through the five criticisms of Hume given about would you respond to proponent of the design argument? Write 'c vr a hort reply to each, noting who difficult criticism to defend against

THE CHARLES EVOLUTION AND BEYOND

While there ilosophical issues with the teleological argument in its tradition the theory of evolution is often thought to be the nail in the coffin. For, as we look the section on Paley, the inference to a designer God relies on him being the best explanation for the design in the world. However, as Darwin first comprehensively detailed in his work *On the Origin of Species*, the reason animals and other creaturappear to display design is that through the processes of genetic mutation and na selection they change and adapt to environments. As evidence for evolution is no beyond question, it simply is the case that a designer is no longer the best explanation appearance of design in the natural world.

Furthermore, changing the design argument to fit areas not explained by the theo evolution threatens to end up in a 'God of the gaps'-style argument, where the coa designer is simply made to fit phenomena science has y explain. For, while have contended that evolution might just be an ir of the principle designed by have argued that ascribing any sort of division intelligence is just speculat

Going deeper, however or how suggested that the design argument can order of elegation in the dut also the fundamental laws and constraints the for example the **anthropic principle** as of great importance in the debate. The strongest form, suggests that the universe is specifically designed or constructed as such, there needs to be an explanation for why the universe does in fact support

However, at the same time it can be pointed out that adopting the anthropic principle really answer Hume's objections from spatial order. Even if the world was random an

INSPECTION COPY



evolved in an ordered bubble of sorts, they may well look at the world and claim it is because they exist. Nevertheless, there is a more precise argument often developed in

Many have noticed that there are certain laws and constants which are very precifor life. If they were adjusted ever so slightly, the universe would not be as it is too or being rendered incapable of supporting human life. For proponents, this is clear can explain the existence of life via natural processes and in the existence of life via natural processes and in these very natural an explanation for their functional order and company to his is potentially a much philosopher Richard Swinburne development.

Modern Formulations (1) I be ogical Argument

As we saw re your section, the universe potentially exhibits evidence of deworld aroun fact, new scientific and cosmological evidence potentially suprather than disconfirms it. This is what Swinburne claims in his modern formulation

He begins by distinguishing between **regularities of co-presence** and **regularities** regularities are those that Paley identified. They originate in the ordering of parts always subject to philosophical criticisms that this order might be random in natural the order might be better explained by natural processes. However, the latter regularier. They are the order exhibited by objects conforming to natural laws and example, any significant body of mass will possess a gravitational force drawing the on any planet similar to Earth, objects will always drop in an ordered and regular to the control of th

Swinburne contends that these kind of regularities are much better candidates for many of Hume's criticisms. One is not looking for function or purpose, which is a land instead focusing on specific real patterns that exist ir in universe. Important that these regularities are in need of explanation, at it is same time cannot be scientific knowledge. For, if scientists we can explanation for natural more laws, principles or constrair at a curn would require an explanation. In proposes that scientific and an explanation for natural which it can be supported by the scientific and the scientific and

However, in head of a scientific explanation for regularities of succession, Swinburr look for a 'personal explanation'. This is the existence of some regularity which ca some being or agent rather than by underlying mechanical principles. This kind of ordinary life and beyond when particular events or occurrences are described via involved. In looking for this 'personal explanation', Swinburne contends that one of an intelligent designer or being who has created the universe such that it is ord laws and principles which regulate the behaviour of objects within.

Swinburne acknowledges, similar to Paley, that it is not possible to infer that this the Christian God. However, it is potentially a stronger form of the teleological argadvances in scientific knowledge of the universe and the regularities that underpipossesses a few weaknesses, which we will note in the final ction.



INSPECTION COPY



What are Natural Laws?

A big part of Swinburne's argument relies on identifying and seeking explanation what he terms 'regularities' of succession. But what are natural laws exactly? The contention for many philosophers. Some believe that in identifying regularities commit oneself to viewing natural law as real things; constructions on the univer in any situation. However, those who are strict empty is say this move is unwasimply generalisations based on observations it is una not be assumed natural

How does this fit into Swin are just generalisations. Since there is no real regularities awa, there may be no strict requirement to seek an explanation statistical process which help human beings understand the universe. However, these regularities require explanation, meaning he does have to commit to saying or constraints. This means that Swinburne may not avoid Hume-style criticisms, speculating too far about entities we can't be sure exist.

Should We Still Look to Design?

There are a number of aspects of Swinburne's argument that can be called into quatural laws and regularities do, in fact, require explanation. Some philosophers, simply claimed the universe is a brute fact. For them it is not a reasonable or valid explanation for it as it is not a question that can be answered in any meaningful requestioned whether it is right to suggest science cannot explain natural laws. It memerges in an unexpected fashion during the course of scientific enquiry, or ideas a satisfactory response.

Perhaps the biggest issue with Swinburne's art unlend, metheless, is that many personal explanation' is necessarily and meaningful proposition in the contargue that in the absence of tiffs apparation there simply is no explanation, is only a reasonable reasonable

It is important to note also that Swinburne views his teleological argument as part argument for God's existence. As part of this he takes the different forms of evide miracles, religious experience or reason, and claims that, taken together, they for presence of a single intelligent being. This means that although Swinburne cannot designer is necessarily God from the teleological argument alone, this limitation is his cumulative case argument. Whether design is conclusive proof of God's existe important focus of the teleological argument and, instead, it may simply be important to consistent with the idea of an intelligent designer.

The Cosmological Argument

The cosmological argument by Sat Immar point to the teleological argument; specific features of the Wever, it draws upon much more abstract, meta teleological features of the Within this section, we will look at two different forms, who principle, has ortant differences in approach and content. The first kind are some form of the causal principle as their starting point, arguing that it points tow best thought of as God. The second kind are arguments from contingency, which objects in the universe require a **necessary being** in order to explain their existence these terms mean, but for the moment we can revisit Aquinas' first three ways as arguments and their potential flaws.

INSPECTION COPY



AQUINAS' FIRST THREE WAYS

Aquinas gives a number of variations of the cosmological argument, each beginning with a slightly different starting point. All of them are **a posteriori**, drawing on features of the universe known by experience, and Aquinas presents them in a **deductive** form. If you accept the premises, then you have to accept the conclusion The first Three Ways can be summarised as such:

The Argument of the Unmoved Mover (The First Na

It is possible to observe change and movement cannot be in the change and movement cannot be in the change. However, any chain of change and movement cannot be in the change of the change over the change of the c

The First Cause Argument (The Second Way)

All events in the world are caused by other events prior to themselves. But no eventhis would mean it exists prior to the moment it was caused. There also cannot be causes, meaning there must be a first uncaused cause, God.

The Argument from Contingency (The Third Way)

For all observable things, it is possible for them to exist or not to exist. But if it is pexist, and an infinite amount of time had passed, then nothing would exist now, a existence would be realised. However, things do exist now and so there must be existence; a necessary being, God.

Aquinas built upon Aristotelian thinking for a lot of the Five ' ays and you might refirst three. The First Way is built upon Aristotle's idea and thange and movement upon his concept of efficient cause. However, the other potential ways Aquimuch of the criticism of the cosmological and a summer to the cosmological and the upon when presenting the cosmological and the upon when the upon when the upon when presenting the upon when presenting the upon when the upon wh

For the mode can note two important aspects of Aquinas' cosmological arg of the Three featured above. The first is that the arguments don't directly in Christian monotheistic God. Rather, this requires a separate step that may be con Way, what Aquinas concludes is there is a source of movement that is unmoved it Way, Aquinas concludes there is a first cause, and in the Third Way, a necessary bave to be God; instead God is inferred to be the being who most appropriately

The second is that all the arguments rely on the unsatisfactory nature of an **infinit** into whether there are truly issues with actual infinities, but for now, take a monthle nature of infinity. Is an infinite regress of cause and effects truly impossible, o imagination? How might such a debate impact Aquinas' arguments? Such question important once we begin going in depth into causal arguments in the next section

Discussion Activity:

Which of the three ways do you think is the os invincing? In groups or pairs, why you might believe one way in a constronger than the others.



INSPECTION COPY



Causal Arguments

Aquinas' Second Way presents a classic version of what is generally referred to as argument. It takes the principle of cause and effect to be a metaphysical truth, argument. It takes the principle of cause and effect to be a metaphysical truth, argument and their cannot be an infinite regress of causes, there must be a first uncaused. However, there are two difficult aspects to this argument. The first is whether metaphysically true principle. Could there be effects or thing without causes in the an infinite regress of causes should be rejected. However, we can set the stage for more modern version of the causal argument and by William Lane Craig.

THE KALAM COSSIL ARGUMENT

The kalam a pen is upon an additional premise to strengthen Aquinas' or the Big Ban, a longside the principle of cause and effect in order to justify the formulated as follows:

- P1. All things that begin to exist have a cause.
- P2. The universe began to exist.
- C1. The universe must have a cause.
- P3. The beginning of the universe was the beginning of space, time and material.
- C2. Therefore, the cause of the universe must be uncaused, immaterial, timeless
- C3. This cause is God.

The first part of the argument, therefore, establishes that a first cause of the universal analyses the properties of the universe and uses these to establish the kind of cauway, Craig's argument is less philosophically abstract than Aquinas; it uses convenabout the universe to justify God as the first cause. However, we can go a bit further argument, and note where there may be potentially as seen.

i. All things that begin to exist he come

We've noted earlier in the cause and effect to be used that the cosmological argument. The causal principle is instead, evident enterprise is never questioned, so it can be asked why it is put into questions to be used.

ii. The universe began to exist

Craig argues this proposition is supported by numerous scientific theories and of thermodynamics and the Big Bang. However, as we will look at later, there about whether the Big Bang represents the beginning of all things, or just the be phenomena beyond our universe which brought it into existence, and so i whether the universe genuinely can be thought to have a beginning.

However, as a final note, it is important that Craig also views the kalam argument the universe is consistent with the idea of a first uncarriage and so also the buniverse ex nihilo. Despite this more moderate at 1, in enext section we will disprinciple, and whether it supports the idea of a first uncarriage is enext section we will disprinciple, and whether it supports the idea of a first uncarriage is enext section we will disprinciple, and whether it supports the idea of a first uncarriage is enext section we will disprinciple.

The Limits of the Control of the Control

We briefly explained some of the difficulties with the causal principle in the section. Hume contended that cause and effect was not an a priori truth. As such, it is not effect has a cause. Instead, Hume argues that cause and effect is a principle devel regularly observing different events in constant conjunction and elevating these rather than the section of the priority of the section of the priority of the section of t

INSPECTION COPY



This is a difficulty for Aquinas and Craig as their arguments rely on the causal prince metaphysical truth. Yet while it might seem intuitively right to think all things must means that it is perfectly logically possible that there are effects that do not have there is great scientific evidence for the regularity of nature and all things possess not necessarily apply to the universe itself, which may be subject to different kind all). This is particularly true since human beings have no knowledge or experience Proponents of the cosmological argument are simply illeging tely extrapolating a where it might justifiably apply.

RUSSELL AND THE COMPLEMENT

Bertrand Russell build's Hume's analysis, developing a number of critiques of cosmologic me based on the limits of the causal principle. The first issue to out is that it based and effect is taken to be a metaphysical truth, then it is fallacion the idea of an uncaused cause to explain the beginning of the universe. If the logic causal principle means that all events have a cause, then God himself must have a is possible for something to not have a cause, in this case God, then anything coul potentially be the uncaused cause of the universe and the theist would fail to procause is necessarily God.

In fact, what Russell states is that it is not a legitimate or meaningful question to a caused the universe, as one is always applying ideas and concepts to a realm in where evidence that they apply. As such, the cosmological argument is simply engaging if there could be any number of causes for the universe and there is no reliable way correct. Russell, therefore, states that the existence of the universe is simply a 'br condition for philosophical investigation, it is not a meaningful target for such investigation.

IS GOD THE FIRST CAUSE?

Another related issue is whether it is valided as the first cause of the unhave raised with the cosmological and since the total state of the total a cause, the cosmological and since does not justify positing God as the first cause multiple against the universe, or that the current universe one in a cyclopic process. While there is plenty of evidence for the Big Ba of what may a may not have occurred prior to it. It may be that the universe was material, or that there is another kind of greater universe which contains ours.

Craig argues that the Big Bang is the best explanation of how the universe began, began at the moment of the Big Bang, it is right to suppose the cause has to be an itself. However, at the same time, he also has to acknowledge that alternative hyperithe universe do exist and so has to give reasons why an infinite series of cause and This means that even though Craig wishes to support the cosmological argument he still in many ways hasn't progressed beyond Aquinas' original form of the argument exploring in depth the philosophical issues with infinite regress, a discussion that whether an 'actual infinity' is logically possible.

Infinities and Causality

Imagine a hotel where there was an in the lumber of rooms and each room was case one would think the house of the lumber of rooms and each room was case one would think the house of the lumber of rooms and each room was case one would think the house of the lumber of rooms and each room was case one would think the house of samples of the lumber of rooms and each room was case one would think the house of lumber of rooms and each room was case one would think the house of lumber of rooms and each room was case one would think the house of lumber of rooms and each room was case one would think the house of lumber of rooms and each room was case one would think the house of lumber of rooms and each room was case one would think the house of lumber of rooms is occupied, no more guests imagine then are any room up with an lumber of lumber of rooms down. Since rooms, there would like the lumber of rooms possible. So every guest he lucky new guest takes his place in the first room.

However, disaster strikes again. An infinite number of guests suddenly turn up to room. The hotel staff panic at first but then realise again there is no limit to the number of guests.

INSPECTION COPY



might be an infinite number of guests seeking a room, but there is also an infinint. So they once again shift all the guests down an infinite number of rooms and fit the in the spare rooms.

This thought experiment is called the Hilbert Hotel. Don't be surprised if it seems is the aim. It is intended to show that what we can term as 'actual infinities' are abut also potentially impossible. To take a step back, though ts define what we re

ACTUAL AND POSSIBLE INTO S

An actual infinity is an infinity is an infinity is one that is unbounded and new universe, the period infinity is one that is unbounded and new universe, the period in fact have a beginning (and an end), then there can be infinite series in a potential infinity is one that is unbounded and new universe, the period in fact have a beginning (and an end), then there can be infinite series in a potential infinity is one that is unbounded and new universe, the period in fact have a beginning (and an end), then there can be infinite series in a potential infinity is one that is unbounded and new universe, the period in fact have a beginning (and an end), then there can be infinite series in fact have a beginning (and an end), then there can be infinite series in fact have a beginning (and an end), then there can be infinite series in fact have a beginning (and an end), then there can be infinite series in fact have a beginning (and an end), then there can be infinite series in fact have a beginning (and an end), then there can be infinite series in fact have a beginning (and an end), then there can be infinite series in fact have a beginning (and an end), then there can be infinite series in fact have a beginning (and an end), then there can be infinite series in fact have a beginning (and an end), then there can be infinite series in fact have a beginning (and an end), then there can be infinite series in fact have a beginning (and an end), then there can be infinite series in fact have a beginning (and an end), then there can be infinite series in fact have a beginning (and an end), then there can be infinite series in fact have a beginning (and an end), then there can be infinite series in fact have a beginning (and an end), then there can be infinite series in fact have a beginning (and an end), then there can be infinite series in fact have a beginning (and an end), then there can be infinite series in fact have a beginning (and an end), then there can be infinite series in fact have a beginning (and an end), t

A similar vein of thought is present in the Hilbert Hotel example. If there were an and space then many conventional concepts seem to break down. The issue, there of infinity itself; there are many different unbounded infinities used in everyday life are seemingly deeper issues with reconciling actual infinite series with our observed have a definite beginning and is bounded by spatial and temporal limits.

Nevertheless, thought experiments such as the Hilbert Hotel are controversial. Fo whether they show that actual infinities are impossible, or that if they did exist the properties. There are plenty of new mathematical and it is a both accurate infinities shouldn't simply because they are difficult to both as within conventional modes of the

Bertrand Russiana hourgument, contending that those who refute the idea and effects lack imagination, rather than making a sound philosophical point infinities existent ature in ways human beings aren't aware of, or find difficult to true when one thinks about new theories such as the multiverse, which propose robserve and may be constrained by a whole different set of laws or restrictions. Thas many examples of advances in knowledge and understanding that, at the time struggled to grasp or to reconcile with their pre-existing beliefs.

Discussion Activity:

In groups or pairs, discuss whether you believe an infinite regress is possible. Are to doubt an infinite regress can exist? Or is the failure to understand them simplimagination?

The Future of the Causal Argument

It may appear in many ways from the last ferring ages in the causal argument is in hand, proponents of the argument is in a trained at least a first cause (that could well be Gopoint out that it is not a proposed an infinite series to argue the principle may sound to apply such conventional thinking to the principle may be a universal metaphysical truth and it may well be that an infinite although universal metaphysical truth and it may well be that an infinite although universal metaphysical truth and it may well be that an infinite series to argue the principle may be a universal metaphysical truth and it may well be that an infinite series to argue the principle may be a universal metaphysical truth and it may well be that an infinite series to argue the principle may be a universal metaphysical truth and it may well be that an infinite series to argue the principle may be a universal metaphysical truth and it may well be that an infinite series to argue the principle may be a universal metaphysical truth and it may well be that an infinite series to argue the principle may be a universal metaphysical truth and it may well be that an infinite series to argue the principle may be a universal metaphysical truth and it may be the series of the principle may be a universal metaphysical truth and it may be the principle may be a universal metaphysical truth and it may be the principle may be a universal metaphysical truth and it may be the principle may be a universal metaphysical truth and it may be the principle may be a universal metaphysical truth and it may be the principle may be a universal metaphysical truth and it may be a universal metaphysical truth

While this deadlock may exist, there might well be ways to push it in one direction Philosophically, what status the causal principle has is still up for debate, but scient quantum mechanics might well one day shift people's perspectives about it. Some

INSPECTION COPY



indicate the quantum world is fundamentally **indeterministic**; this means the every explanatory causes, and raises questions about how and when the causal principle cosmological science and maths may one day reveal realities beyond the universe Bang should be construed as a beginning at all.

However, there is still another form of the cosmological argument that needs to be a different property of objects; contingency.

Arguments from Contingency

The argument from conting the existence of God is similar to causal arguments its own set of its losophical issues. It fundamentally draws a distinction contingent, which can come into being and cease to exist, and 'necessary into existence of God is similar to causal arguments in the existence of God is similar to causal arguments are to exist in the existence of God is similar to causal arguments are to exist out the existence of God is similar to causal arguments are to exist out the existence of God is similar to causal arguments.

This distinction was not made precisely by Aquinas in his Third Way, but the contifoundation for his argument. If you remember, he contended that it is possible for not exist. However, if this is the case and an infinite amount of time passed, it wo would eventually realise this possibility and cease to exist. But since objects do ex 'necessary' being which sustains all contingent ones. For theists, any necessary be possesses 'necessary existence'.

Modern formulations of this argument have followed a similar line of thought. Go forward his own version in his work *Monadology* based upon what is generally ter**reason**. In brief, this principle puts forward that every thing or event in the world existence and current state. Or, as Leibniz puts it, 'no fact can be real or existing a sufficient reason for its being so and not otherwise' (*Mor pay* §32). In other w reason is a philosophical demand for intelligibility and it is external world and is scientific enquiry.

With that in mind we carried and others:

- P1. There exists in the universe contingent beings.
- P2. These contingent beings have a cause of (or explanation for) their existence.
- P3. The cause (or explanation) of contingent beings must be other beings, contin
- P4. Giving a causal account (or explanation) of contingent beings by reference to to an infinite regress of causes (or explanations).
- P5. An infinite regress of causes (or explanations) is impossible.
- C1. Therefore, a causal account (or explanation) of contingent beings must include necessary, being.
- C2. This necessary being is God.

The main thrust of the argument then comes from the perceived impossibility of contingent objects purely by reference to other contingent objects. This is a little especially as it can sound very similar to the cause of the ca

However, there are a number of issues with the contingency argument, and many that its very metaphysical foundations might be flawed. These issues are what we next section.

INSPECTION COPY

COPYRIGHT



DOES THE IDEA OF A NECESSARY BEING MAKE SENSE?

The argument from contingency relies on the idea that a metaphysical distinction contingent and necessary beings or objects. However, while it is possible to argue that can be observed to exist in a myriad of things, critics have argued the same is

Hume, for example, argued that the idea of a 'necessary being' was meaningless directly conceivable, implies a contradiction. Whatever, it is ceive as existent, we existent.' (Dialogues). What Hume effectively of she is that the idea of necess observed, nor is it something that logically was from the existence of continge to conceive of the non-exister. If a exessary being, and this conception isn't its means the statement 'a sample statement's sample statement 'a sample statement's and the notion of existence by adding the term 'necessary'.

What does this mean for the argument for contingency? Well, it means that propose a necessary being as an explanation for the existence of contingent beings. For it is these necessary beings not existing and so one can still ask the reason for their exinvocation of necessary beings is an arbitrary philosophical leap if the idea of 'necessary beings is an arbitrary philosophical leap if the idea of 'necessary beings is an arbitrary philosophical leap if the idea of 'necessary beings is an arbitrary philosophical leap if the idea of 'necessary beings is an arbitrary philosophical leap if the idea of 'necessary beings is an arbitrary philosophical leap if the idea of 'necessary beings is an arbitrary philosophical leap if the idea of 'necessary beings is an arbitrary philosophical leap if the idea of 'necessary beings is an arbitrary philosophical leap if the idea of 'necessary beings is an arbitrary philosophical leap if the idea of 'necessary beings is an arbitrary philosophical leap if the idea of 'necessary beings is an arbitrary philosophical leap if the idea of 'necessary beings is an arbitrary philosophical leap if the idea of 'necessary beings is an arbitrary philosophical leap if the idea of 'necessary beings is an arbitrary philosophical leap if the idea of 'necessary beings is an arbitrary philosophical leap if the idea of 'necessary beings is an arbitrary philosophical leap if the idea of 'necessary beings is an arbitrary philosophical leap if the idea of 'necessary beings is an arbitrary philosophical leap if the idea of 'necessary being it in the idea of

Bertrand Russell builds on this point in his radio debate with Frederick Coplestor, form of the argument from contingency to Leibniz. Russell argues that the term 'n statements or propositions such as 'all bachelors are unmarried', not to objects. Tunwarranted philosophical leap in the argument from contingency. One is attemp posteriori observation about the contingency of things to a proposition about the could only be derived a priori. Simply put, the observation of contingent beings debeings exist, or are even possible. What proponents of the contingent from contingency large transfer are unmarried', not to objects. Tunwarranted philosophical leap in the argument from contingency of things to a proposition about the could only be derived a priori. Simply put, the observation of contingent beings exist, or are even possible. What proponents of the contingency of things to a proposition about the could only be derived a priori. Simply put, the observation of contingent beings exist, or are even possible. What proponents of the contingency of things to a proposition about the could only be derived a priori. Simply put, the observation of contingent beings defined by the contingency of things to a proposition about the could only be derived a priori. Simply put, the observation of contingent beings defined by the contingency of things to a proposition about the could only be derived a priori. Simply put, the observation of contingency of the contingency of things to a proposition about the could only be derived a priori. Simply put, the observation of contingency of the contingency of things to a proposition about the could only be derived a priori.

However, there is another is the argument from contingency that is perhadestructive the Hu is ussell's critiques of necessity. This will be explored in

Proving Contingency

We've looked at how there are issues with necessity when applied to beings, but contingency may also be a flawed concept. The central premise of the argument there is a significant degree of contingent beings which require explanation. How something to potentially not exist and be dependent on the existence of other to be understood in the context of modern physics?

Such questions are important as, while it is possible to conceive of the non-exist conception may not necessarily indicate that such non-existence is possible. It mestate we do not understand before the Big Bang, or that matter itself cannot possible analysing the argument from contingency, therefore it was reth analysing also we contingency and necessary are potentially an oversion of a much more



USPECTION COPY



IS THE UNIVERSE CONTINGENT?

Another major criticism Russell makes of the argument from contingency is that it composition. You might remember this fallacy from the section on the design argument an object is mistakenly assumed to possess the properties of its parts.

Where this enters in the contingency argument is in P1 'There exists in the universalthough it is possible to observe contingent objects a contingent. In fact, what the proponent of the argument or contingency needs to contingent, including the universe itself simply be

But this step is more and at a than it sounds. For to claim that the universe its claim that the universe its claim that the property of the fallacy of the

Here the fallacy of composition does not mean that the universe is strictly not con Rather it indicates that proponents of the cosmological argument cannot make the basis of its contingent parts. As Russell states, the universe may well be a 'brute fargrounds empirical investigation into the world. Therefore, while this criticism is not proponents of the argument from contingency to escape. For it is not possible to the universe is contingent, and, if it is not, then it may be the end of the chain of principle of sufficient reason.

However, there may be a few responses to this issue. If you remember the fine-tunature or cosmological constants are very precisely 'tuned' such that if they were universe might not exist in the way that it does. If this is the case, it potentially incontingent in a meaningful way; it can be conceived to the case, it potentially incontingent in a meaningful way; it can be conceived to the case, in possessing a beginning

DOES THE UNIVERSAL EXPLANATION?

Another rough in the can criticise the argument from contingency is focusing of sufficient. While it is a good heuristic for everyday scientific practice, is it a applied to all unings? The argument from contingency in particular requires that the a metaphysical status; all things specifically require an explanation for their existence.

Yet Russell pointed out with the causal argument, if this is the logic of the principl explanation for the existence of necessary beings is, in the same way one can ask particularly pertinent if one also accepts Hume's criticism, since, if true, it is alway necessary being not existing.

However, it is also possible to ask whether the principle should be given this statuphenomena rely on contingent facts but are considered sufficient. For example, if certain compounds, the answer may be due to its combination of hydrogen and obelieves there is a more fundamental explanation from other contingent facts is be foundational to scientific enquiry, not whether if the principle before, contends that it is not a proper or so that it is not a p



NSPECTION COPY



THE ARGUMENT FROM CONTINGENCY AND ACTUAL INFI

You may have noticed that the argument from contingency also relies on the important programment from t explanations. This means it can potentially be criticised on the same grounds as the that there is an endless chain of explanations going backwards and a need for a 1 contingent explanations. Therefore, the argument from contingency can be critical causal argument. It may simply be that time and the universe are infinite in ways human beings, and that looking for a 'necessary' explanation has due to a lack of un about the nature of existence.

What is the Future of the Caralla Argument?

th was last section, the cosmological argument has a numb piples that are generally widely accepted in everyday life. But wh predicated (important beliefs on Earth might not necessarily be valid or justified when it comes questions about the nature of metaphysical laws themselves, it may be that the cos jumps to conclusions about a creator without sufficient evidence or explanation, es about the moment of creation. The Big Bang, although the perceivable beginning of overall beginning, and there are those critics who will naturally contend the cosmo so long as it attempts to apply criteria from parts of the universe to its whole.

Nevertheless, in the next section we turn to perhaps an even more radical arguments that contends no observations of the universe are necessary, for God himself can reason alone.

Quick Quiz

- 1. What is an argument from analogy?
- 2. What analogy does Paley draw in his teleological ar 1 ment?
- What scientific theory poses an issue the electrological argument? 3.
- What kinds of order does a not is a uraw a distinction between in his telection 4.
- 5.
- What principle declared argument from contingency draw upon?

 What principle declared argument state is unsatisfactory or imposite the causal argument state is unsatisfactory or imposite the causal argument state. 6.
- 7. ame criticise the argument from contingency?
- Why does Russell argue the universe does not require an explanation? 8.





2B: ARGUMENTS BASED ON REAL

Key Thinker	
Name	Anselm of Canterbury
Born	1033
Died	1109
Key text	Proslogion (1077–78)
Why are they important?	Anselm was one of the najer scholastic figures in Christian thought with anily such and rationalist views to develop a system of the confistion faith. He is best known now for his onto mutured greatly to ideas about God's omnipotence and omn time.
Did you know?	Anselm regularly clashed with the kings of England while he will be ended up being exiled twice and having to travel to Rome position and title.

Key Thinker	
Name	Immanuel Kant
Born	1724
Died	1804
Key text	Critique of Pure Reason (1781)
Why are they important?	Kant is one of the best known philosophers in the Western trace discourse in a wide number of disciplines across the last few conforting of 'transcendental realism', though ambitious in attempting to empiricism, helped influence ideas at place, time, causation human experience.
Did you know?	There's a common report in the never travelled more than city Königg region of the structure of the structur

Introduction

It may seem strange now, but throughout much of Western history, the existence evident. However, even if this belief was not readily questioned, many religious the formalised. Naturally, this led to a posteriori arguments, where thinkers looked world to deduce the existence of God. However, some thinkers went further and existence of God could be deduced through reason alone. This idea ended up becontological argument and is perhaps one of the most controversial proposals in the

Before we begin delving into the nature of the ontological argument, it is worth exterm itself. In philosophy, ontology is a term referring to the 'being' of something questioning what 'being' is and what it means to be or to exist. This might sound down, and you wouldn't be wrong! Many philosophical requestioning to abstract terms is somewhat of a futile exercist in the modern era particularly, mathought to be best approached from the philosophical reflection.

However, in the nature of questions of God, ontology takes on a new dimension easily specular that the nature of his existence would be very different from the Furthermore, on reflection, it could be that certain properties that God possesses effect 'necessary'; a world cannot be imagined in which God began or ceased to process is the main thrust behind the ontological argument; a logical move from to necessary existence, and in the next section we will look at the first thinker to device the section of the sec

NSPECTION COPY



Anselm and the Ontological Argument

Though the ontological argument has existed in many different guises, the most faby Anselm of Canterbury in his 1078 work, *Proslogion*. However, it's not presented whole of *Proslogion* instead is written as an address directly to God by Anselm, wi ideas littered throughout. As such he presents two different versions of the ontol and 3, with each taking a slightly different approach. Yet both employ **deductive** rexistence of God **a priori**; through reason alone.

THE FIRST FORMULATION (PAPTER 2)

Anselm begins his ontological mement by first providing a definition of God. He states that fair and which nothing greater can be conceived. Whatever property God bught to possess, he possesses it maximally. This idea fits the classical interpretation of God as omnipotent, omniscient and benevolent for Anselm, while setting up the second part of the argument. For next, Anselm asks whether it would be greater for God to exist in the mind (in intellectu) or in reality (in re). This is quite an abstract question, but Anselm argues that things existing in than those imagined, just like a painting that has been painted is greater than one Therefore, if God is the greatest conceivable being, it is greater for God to exist in meaning God must exist.

Reading the ontological argument at first, it can appear as if Anselm has somewhat the question, 'is it greater for God to exist than to not?' and answered in the affirmative. Yet there are a number of steps one can criticise, which can be more clearly seen by laying out the argument in syllogistic form.

- P1. God is the greatest conceivable being.
- P2. It is greater for something to exist in reality transher mind
- C1. Therefore, it is greater for God to y si . . . ality than in the mind.
- C2. Therefore, God exists.

At first it m there are two points at which one can criticise the ontological represent; either the first or the second premise. In particular, it can be greater for something to exist in reality than in the mind; can ideas about 'greater of existence? Whether unicorns exist or not to some may not be a matter of greater Aquinas, Anselm is not starting from a position of agnosticism. Instead, he is concurred understanding'; in other words, trying to show how reason supports faith in theel

At the same time, he is also addressing 'the fool'. This, Anselm contends in Chapte conceive of the non-existence of God. Anselm puts forward that if one truly under it is impossible to conceive of his non-existence; it simply results in an absurdity. It the second formulation of the argument, found in Chapter 3.

THE SECOND FORMULATION (CHAPTER 3)

In the second version of Anselm's ontological argume and be gins by asking whet be conceived not to exist, or whether it is greater that it is better that it is incorporated for God to not exist, meaning God many control of the second version of Anselm's ontological argume and be gins by asking whether the gins by as

If you thought the fixed latter. It still parally on P2 of the first formulation, but also draws upon an philosophy described on; necessary existence. For, taking the logic of Anselm's argumeverything be reasoned to exist if it is greater that its existence is inconceivable? takes pains to note that it is God's maximal greatness that ensures this argument don't possess maximal greatness can be conceived not to exist and so the same logormulation does not apply.

INSPECTION COPY



Therefore, in deploying the second formulation, Anselm contends that God posse of his being, compared to all other things which possess contingent existence. This important later, both when we discuss Kant's objection and when we examine most ontological argument. However, for the moment, we shall turn to a more direct of contemporaries; Gaunilo.

Discussion Activity:

In groups or pairs, discuss whether you think the one group argument presents existence. Is there a formulation of A yell ou prefer, or are there key flaws versions of the argument?

Gaunilo and The Yeal act Island' Objection

Despite its subsequent influence, Anselm's ontological argument being very influential across the last 1,000 years, it was not wholly accepted by his peers who the *Proslogion* was published. One pointed objection was made by Gaunilo, a mor at Marmoutier in France, who contended more generally that empirical evidence was needed to prove the existence of things. Things cannot simply be reasoned in existence, no matter what properties they have. Not much else is known about Gaunilo beyond his work *On Behalf of the Fool*, which criticised Anselm, but these to this day.

His famous example was that of an island; more specifically, the greatest conceivathat if this is the greatest conceivable island, then it is greater that this island exist. Therefore, the greatest conceivable island must exist. Naturally this is somewhat a Gaunilo seems to demonstrate that any object can be reasoned into existence so greatest conceivable version of that object. Anselm's property is the conceivable of the conceivable with a property of the conceivable version of that object. Anselm's property is a same thing to exist in reality than in the mind, the conceivable version of the conceivable version of that object.

There is a number of further is a set play here. One is that it seems to be the case things requires some of all proof. Gaunilo himself argues that in the case of a island it ne per pown 'first that the hypothetical excellence of this island exifact, and in the case of a second in the case of a second in the case of a second in the case of a island in the case of a island in the case of a island it ne per pown 'first that the hypothetical excellence of this island exifact, and in the case of a island it ne per pown 'first that the hypothetical excellence of this island exifact, and in the case of a island it ne per pown 'first that the hypothetical excellence of this island exifact, and in the case of a island it ne per pown 'first that the hypothetical excellence of this island exifact, and in the case of a island it ne per pown 'first that the hypothetical excellence of this island exifact, and in the case of a island it ne per pown 'first that the hypothetical excellence of this island exifact, and in the case of a island it ne per pown 'first that the hypothetical excellence of this island exifact, and in the case of a island it ne per pown 'first that the hypothetical excellence of this island exifact, and in the case of a island it ne per pown 'first that the hypothetical excellence of this island exifact, and in the case of a island it ne per pown 'first that the hypothetical excellence of this island exifact, and in the case of a island it ne per pown 'first that the hypothetical excellence of this island exifact, and in the case of a island it ne per pown 'first that the hypothetical excellence of this island exifact. The case of a island it ne per pown 'first that the hypothetical excellence of this island exifact. The case of a island it ne per pown 'first that the hypothetical excellence of this island exifact. The case of the case of a island it ne per pown 'first that the hypothetical excellence of this island exifact. The case of the case of a island it ne per pown 'first that the hypothetical ex

This will prove an important insight in the next section. However, it is worth noting Gaunilo's criticism. He claimed that Gaunilo did not fully grasphis distinction between the continuous of the Proslogion. Since, for Anselm, God is the onnecessary existence through his maximal greatness, he is the only being to which argument can apply. Islands, as contingent things, cannot be argued to exist simplification one can conceive of, since even the greatest island would be contingent!

Nevertheless, despite this distinction, there are rease is a think Anselm's responsing might remember from the section on the contention. However, and it is one idea of a necessary being, saying the anything with necessary it. e. a can be conceived not to exist. This means that in saying a ground not exist! One philosopher, Immanuel Kant, take questions any large enature of existence, he instead questions whether existence meaning, as we will analyse in the next section.

NSPECTION COPY



Kant and the Ontological Argument

Kant puts forward what is now a famous objection to the ontological argument. very simple at heart, but initially can take some time to get your head around. In particular, it is important to first think about sentences themselves and the way meaningfully describe things in the world.

Whenever we make a proposition about the world y a subject. This is what the proposition is centred around and, in or a cope meaningful, proposition typically have to claim something the subject. However, propositions, there also have to have what is a suitcate. A predicate is the part of a sentence provides information he subject and states something important about the properties, 7 ou or nature of the subject. For example, in the sentence 'zebr have black a Educ ite stripes', the 'black and white stripes' part is the predicate, claims that zebras do possess that particular property.

But what Kant argues is that the ontological argument falsely treats existence as s that can be meaningfully predicated about a subject. In Anselm's argument, for expenses that can be meaningfully predicated about a subject. states that God must possess existence since he is the greatest conceivable being for this to be meaningful, existence must be a property that God can possess as p allows an a priori inference from the concept of God to his actual existence in the example of zebras, it may well be contradictory to state 'zebras are blue' in conju and white stripes'. The two statements cannot both be true and that is what allow 'zebras have black and white stripes' to 'zebras cannot be blue'.

Yet if, as Kant states, existence is not a predicate, it cannot grant any further infor God itself, so stating that 'God exists' is not the same as s' . g that 'God is omnis This means that it is perfectly logically consistent ' as at) Soo is the greatest con conceivable being does not exist', as existing a property that can be predicted as a property that the 'existence' represents is the occurrence particular thing in the world.

ul() , ...ate of God every property to its maximal end, but one Therefore, 2 ant states: 'If I cogitate a being as the highest reality, without question still remains – whether this being exists or not.' (The Critique of Pure Rea correct about existence, God cannot be proved through reason alone. The crux of showing that existence has to necessarily be part of God's essence, but Kant's crit inference is ultimately fallacious.

What now for the ontological argument? Well, despite Kant's objection proving in the ontological argument and more recently modern theologians have put forwar potentially avoid the pitfalls of Anselm's version. It is these modern variants that

Activity:

It is useful to understand not only what predicates are but how they function. As predicates in each of the sentences below. The beach ball was round and bulb.
 Everything I touch is soft and the soft and the

- (Set in Jur?
- ost finished this exercise?



Modern Versions of the Ontological Argument

As we have analysed so far, the ontological argument relies upon being able to argument of God's being; it is contained within his essence so that to understand the contained that he must necessarily exist. If this philosophical move is not possible, then one God from his maximal greatness or perfection.

Most philosophers now do not believe Anselm's form the valid. The critiques Kant show the pitfalls in treating existence the same there properties which miles the idea that existence cannot which rejected as a predicate. One thinker in paragued that Kanthan are amportant distinction within the *Proslogion*, one existence, and a ry precise form, could be predicated of God. It is Malcolm' argument we examine first, before turning to a similar variation proposed by

MALCOLM'S ONTOLOGICAL ARGUMENT

Malcolm begins his version of the ontological argument by claiming many of Anse important distinction in Chapter 3 of the *Proslogion*. As we noted earlier, Anselm between necessary and contingent existence, arguing because God possesses the candidate for the ontological argument. Malcolm argues that this distinction is included and arguing that existence has to be part of God's maximal greatness, he is not ordinary contingent existence. Necessary existence is different; it is an idea deconcept of an unlimited God and can in fact be predicated of God because of this contingent existence, which, as Kant notes, only refers to the occurrence of objections.

This means that the ontological argument, in referring to necessary existence instruction not necessarily making an unwarranted inference from the cure of God to his eximitless and possessing of necessary existence, it is a transfer to analyse his bettings in the world and Kant's criticism property of the complete.

This idea can be difficult to mead around. What is important to understant the world, notice it is ally added to our understanding of those things by class unicorn, knowing Goodsessesses necessary existence does change our concept of a knowing Goodsessesses necessary existence does change our concept of him. It gis what it means to be an unlimited being, as it outlines that an unlimited being can its existence, nor can it begin or cease to exist. Therefore, it can be argued that ne predicated of things, even if contingent existence cannot.

Looking at necessary existence in this way is the starting point for Malcolm's versi even though he defines God very similarly to Anselm. Broken down, it can be sum

- P1. God is an unlimited being nothing greater than God can be conceived.
- P2. Either God exists, or he does not exist.

These are the basic reconstructed premises about God with which Norman Malcobroadly the same as Anselm's original starting points. However, accepting these p Malcolm develops his argument differently:

- P3. A being who was caused or hand of come into existence is a limited being for its existence.
- C1. If God cannot come into existence.
- C2. If God perist then God necessarily does not exist.

What these premises indicate is that if God is unlimited and nothing can bring him where God does not exist, nothing could make him exist. It would be a world alwawords, God's existence would be impossible. This means, however, that Malcolm (5) and (6).

INSPECTION COPY



- C3. If God does exist, then God cannot come into existence, nor cease existing.
- C4. If God exists, then God exists necessarily.
- C5. God's existence is either necessary or impossible.

Therefore, Malcolm seeks to force the reader into accepting one of two conclusion possibly exist or God must exist. Naturally, the atheistic critic will simply argue the impossible. However, Malcolm counters this, arguing:

P4. The existence of a being is impossible to the being is self-contradic

We will re-examine short this premise holds up, but so long as this premise helieves he two fundamental conclusions below:

- P5. God is not a self-contradictory being.
- C6. Therefore, the existence of God is not impossible.
- C7. Therefore, the existence of God must be necessary.

At first this argument might seem more convincing than Anselm's. It draws out diff acknowledges the important distinction between necessary and contingent exists what is called 'modal logic' in this formulation. Modal logic is a field of philosophic is meant by terms such as 'possibility' and 'necessity', often with reference to one in C4 and C5, Malcolm's argument hinges on identifying the existence of God as extra means it is of great importance that these terms are used accurately.

However, it may be that Malcolm has conflated two uses of 'impossibility', one log conflation forms the first issue often presented against Malcolm's formulation. He being is impossible if, and only if, the being is self-contact, i.e. y, but this is not necessificant adictory being can be supposed not to e (ist to many other beings that contradictory can be thought to be in (s_1)). Iso. For example, unicorns are not way, but this does not mean it (s_2) and unicorns exist. Similarly, there is no H_2O and water are different unicones, but it is impossible that they exist separate

What this lire ought potentially confirms is that Malcolm hasn't truly escaped argument. Although God may have to exist necessarily, this does not guarantee that is not self-contradictory! What makes God self-contradictory is whether there is an not whether he can or cannot come into existence. This means that P4 in Malcolm's mistaken, and the best his argument can state is 'If God exists, he exists necessarily'

However, even if we agree with Malcolm that P4 is acceptable, there is still the iss contradictory being'. As you will learn in your Y2 studies, there are many theoretic unlimited being, whether it be with attributes such as omnipotence or reconciling with the state of the natural world. Therefore, it is possible to criticise Malcolm's is a logically consistent and coherent concept. If he is not, then it may be that the impossible and the argument effectively defeats itself.

However, there is another version of the ontologi are of hent that employs mod proposed by Alvin Plantinga. It is this for a converse on we shall briefly look at next.

PLANTINGA'S CALL ARGUMENT

Plantinga's o he ontological argument is similar to Malcolm's, although begins at a subject of different starting point. Instead of adopting Anselm's concept of God, he argues that the key defining characteristic of God is his 'maximal greatness Importantly, he claims that if a being does possess maximal greatness, then it must be maximally great across all possible worlds, not just one.

INSPECTION COPY



What does Plantinga mean here by possible worlds? Well, the easiest way to look world to be an arrangement or a way things might have been. So across any possi universe, or even outside of it. If the world could have been another way, then it is step for Plantinga, however, is to claim that a maximally great being would require every possible world. This means that God, being maximally great, would have to regardless of the arrangement or state of affairs of the universe. Taking these two summarise Plantinga's argument as follows:

- P1. There is a possible world X where A possib
- P2. Maximal greatness requires was a scellence in all possible worlds.
- P3. Maximal excellence and resuming omnipotent, omniscient, etc. in all possible
- C1. Theref where exists a maximally excellent being in all possible
- C2. Therefore vorld X, the proposition 'there is no maximally excellent being'

This is the first part of Plantinga's argument. In short, he is drawing once again on existence; if God does exist in some possible world, God cannot be limited to that greatness requires that he exists in all possible worlds.

- P4. If something is impossible in a possible world, then it is impossible in all poss
- C3. Therefore, the proposition 'there is no maximally excellent being' is impossib
- C4. Therefore, in the actual world, there exists a maximally excellent being.

The second part of Plantinga's argument is similar to Malcolm's. Plantinga wishes impossibility extends across all possible worlds, so if it is impossible for God not to impossible across all worlds. To put it another way, if God exists in some possible in the actual world due to his maximal excellence.

Yet it can be asked, is Plantinga's version and roller concing than Malcolm's? We whether Plantinga's metaphysics is so the liftyou're keen-eyed, you might have Plantinga potentially conflates (call) solidity with metaphysical possibility through the case, it is a maximally excellent that the best Plantinga can state is 'if a maximally great being possible worlds'.

However, there's also another weakness and that is a premise one. We can ask, is possible in the first place? This is a similar criticism to Malcolm's argument, where logically coherent and consistent being. In a similar fashion, it can be asked wheth a being could possess. In fact if there is a possible world where non-maximality is great being is impossible. This means that Plantinga cannot draw C1 or C2 and the

Importantly, it may be that the premise that there is a world where non-maximality plausible one than one where maximal greatness is. As noted before, there are mar great being, such that it may be more rational to accept a premise which states the maximal greatness is impossible. This is the view of critic limit skie, who argues und a simpler and more rational view to accept a possi' retail to a where non-maximality

Discussion Activity:

Do you think the minimum tradations address and solve the issues in Anselm's Is there a resulting of the ontological argument? Discuss in groups or

NSPECTION COPY

COPYRIGHT



WHAT NEXT FOR THE ONTOLOGICAL ARGUMENT?

The more modern formulations of the ontological argument are very abstract, and Anselm's original formulation. However, they also draw out the hidden premises make clear the dimensions of necessary existence that enable it to be predicated about the nature and extent of his existence. As such, even though it is not necess depth analysis of both Malcolm's and Plantinga's formulations, they can and shou how to critically examine the ontological argument as

Importantly also, the proponents of record of the ontological argument than Anselm. Plantinga himself central sargument does not prove God outright possible, and even resolved, as contest the first premise and so the foundation however, contest the first premise and so the foundation however, contest the first premise and so the foundation however, contest the first premise and so the foundation however, contest the first premise and so the foundation however, contest the first premise and so the foundation however, contest the first premise and so the foundation however, contest the first premise and so the foundation however, contest the first premise and so the foundation however, contest the first premise and so the foundation however, contest the first premise and so the foundation however, contest the first premise and so the foundation however, contest the first premise and so the foundation however, contest the first premise and so the foundation however, contest the first premise and so the foundation however, contest the first premise and so the foundation however, contest the first premise and so the foundation however, contest the first premise and so the foundation however, contest the first premise and so the foundation however, contest the first premise and so the foundation however.

Nevertheless, as we have examined, there are still pressing reasons to doubt whethis claim. Many contend there are deeper issues about whether the existence of simply using reason alone, especially when existence itself is a hotly contested ter affirm the existence of things at heart using empirical evidence. In the next section closer to this ideal – that of religious experience – and analyse whether there are can be wholly understood through the senses.

If you're keen-eyed, you may have already contended that the same criticism of Nogical possibility with metaphysical or existential possibility, applies to Plantinga. existence is impossible in a possible world, this impossibility must extend across a sense if one takes possibility in a logic sense. It is perfectly conceivable to imagine world but not another. It may be that the best Planting and attack is 'if a maximal all possible worlds'.

Quick Quiz

- 1. Is the 19 ic. Largument a prior or a posteriori?
- 2. What is selm's definition of God?
- 3. What counterexample does Gaunilo draw upon when criticising Anselm?
- 4. What does Anselm argue is mistaken about Gaunilo's criticism?
- 5. Why does Kant argue the ontological argument is flawed?
- 6. What kind of logic do modern ontological arguments draw upon?
- 7. What attribute of God does Plantinga's ontological argument draw upon?



INSPECTION COPY



SECTION 3: GOD AND THE W

What you will learn in this section:

Philosophical views about the nature and authenticity of religious experience, incl

- The different forms of religious experience, including provinced and conversion
- The views of William James and Rudolph Otto (grave) g the qualities of religion
- The difficulties in veryifing the auther of gious experience.
- How religious experience can 's s an argument for the existence of Good
- Alternative interpret in a ligious experience, including psychological and

Philosophic 7 s about the problem of evil, including:

- The difference or mulations of the problem, including the logical and evidential
- Augustine's theodicy, and its appeal to Christian ideas such as the Fall.
- Irenaeus and Hick's soul-making theodicies.
- Criticisms of these theodicies and and whether they truly explain the existence
- Alternative ways of solving the problem by changing or adjusting the tradition

Starter Activity:

Read through the extracts from *The Varieties of Religious Experience* by William Jabelieve is missing in or incorrect about his characterisation of religious experience

3A: RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE

Key Thinker	
Name	William James
Born	1842
Died	1910
Key text	The Yangious Experience (1902)
Why are the ducetton important?	did James write extensively about philosophy, but he nounding thinkers in psychology who helped establish it as an inparticularly well known in philosophy for his pragmatist beliefs interest in the nature of religious and mystical experiences, he well-rounded investigations of these phenomena.
Did you know?	Although James was quite scientific in many areas of research investigation into psychical phenomena. This extended to phe and he wrote later in his life that he was convinced future resexistence of this phenomenon.

Key Thinker	
Name	Rudolph Otto
Born	1869
Died	1937
Key text	The Idea of the Holy (1917)
Why are they important?	Otto is one of the months in Jerual philosophers of religion an
	century, by knc which his ideas about the numinous: a uniq
	intriduce, smence at the heart of religious enterprise. This i
	t 15 ods experience but also his writings defending the reaso
	of naturalistic criticisms.
Did you know?	Otto's ideas about the numinous were not just intellectual spe
	ecumenical activities, trying to bring together different Christ
	his suggestions was adding a Quaker-style moment of silence t
	that people get time during prayer and religious practice to ex

INSPECTION COPY



Introduction

For many individuals, the existence of God is not an abstract idea but a real lived of through going to church, through private prayer or through a vast number of other numbers of human beings believe they encounter God on a daily basis. In fact, refeature of human lives stretching back as far as written records go, and for many spiritual life.

Yet outlining the nature and form of religiou. (prince is a much more tricky prexperience exist and manifest itself; and that it does? Can it be ever be object to be experience is caused by a display. While religious answers to these question only in the last ow in the last ow is presented to the more secul. The property is poking at the nature of religious experience, with some robust religious experiences consist of genuine contact with God or another spiritual dimensional dimensions.

Furthermore, the issue has been complicated with the rise of modern neuroscient our modern understanding of the brain, there are numerous potential procedures effects of religious experience, suggesting that at heart there may be a naturalistic previously an inexplicable phenomenon. However, these secular explanations are religious individuals claim that even if a naturalistic explanation for religious experience invalidate it as genuine evidence for the existence of God.

Before we delve into these deeper questions, it is useful to look at the nature of redifferent forms that potentially occur among human beings. For not all are agreed religious experience and some kinds may prove better evidence for the existence

Discussion Activity:

Have you ever had a religious experience? Or ar for kind of weird experience religious in nature? In groups or pair is these experiences and see if there held in common by all.

The Nature 7% lig. Jas Experience

At heart, religious experience can have quite a simple definition. Generally the terexperience or encounter that involves God or another spiritual dimension. However, nature of such an experience is much more difficult to elucidate. What does it fee experience? What does one typically encounter during a religious experience, and of religious experiences seem to vary across individuals and cultures?

On the one hand, there are the religious experiences that are **direct** in nature. The and contact with God; for example, visions. On the other hand, some religious expronot manifest themselves as particular sights or sounds, but rather consist of an introduced something beyond the material world. This might be a sense of religious awe or we certain kind of conscious reflection that occurs during meditative moments.

The initial difficulty is that these kinds of experience (reconstruction) are not part of the matery to get feelings of wonder or the insociety, there are wider questions about demarcate and the prevalence of religious mentic religious experiences from those that might be

Furthermore, it is impossible to distinguish between real and illusory religious experience or reliable evidence for God? While it is not in question that religious experience mighis existence, this kind of proof is different from the objective kind which philosopultimately is that an argument for God from religious experience can convince the his existence, or who have not had religious experiences themselves.

INSPECTION COPY



THE IMPORTANCE OF RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE

There is a deeper question, however, about why it is important to establish religious authentic. Well, aside from philosophical speculation, religious experience on the important factor in the development of religious thought across the world. In fact in all major world religions, even contributing to their beliefs and theology in the

Furthermore, on an everyday level, religious experience is the noredited by many particular religion. In this sense, it is not just a religious experience is the noredited by many particular religion. In this sense, it is not just a religious experience is past, but a persistent phonon many of the philosophical arguments for Gold and have learned about. Whether or rationally justified is often of some of the philosophical arguments for Gold and provided in the philosophical arguments for Gold and Gold

Moreover, respectively sexperience often encourages great change in people, whethe beliefs. These changes are perceived to be important by many and are often held experiences are authentic or genuine. Therefore, while a religious experience migneeded for individuals who have undergone one, it is arguably important to estable experiences when they play such a pivotal role in religious enterprise across the

The Different Forms of Religious Experience

So far we've noted some basic issues that arise when it comes to outlining the nat what are the specific properties of religious experience that make it so difficult to

One major aspect is to do with the subject matter of religious experience itself. God transcendent, omnipotent, omniscient and as such far beyond the natural compreh human beings were to encounter God, it might be expected that they would natural encounter in ordinary language. The same is true perhaps the if the religious expedimension. Most of language and the terms within are the around describing and material world, whether it be of the proportion of material things or the relations be potentially a natural quandary by week human language and the subject matter of

Many think describe it is essential ineffable describe it is linary language. This aspect, along with the fact that religious eprivate, and mable to be publicly scrutinised, means that there is a naturally diffine whether particular religious experiences are genuine. There might always be the an ordinary experience for a religious one, or even lying about having the experience

Despite these obstacles, many thinkers have studied the occurrence and nature of drawn up essential properties that are common to all of them. It is these framework experience we shall look at next, with reference to two well-known voices on the

WILLIAM JAMES

James is perhaps the most well-known academic thinker on religious experience. In fact, his work *The Varieties of Religious Experience* laid the template for how the phenomenon was studied in the two the century. His work here was motivated by two main interests. The vastrying to discover the common properties underly gious experience and how these manifested themselves are the conditional transitional transitions. The second was analysing when the century is the century of the conditional transitions are the conditional transitions. The second was analysing when the century of the century of the century of the century. His work here was motivated by two main interests. The century is a strying to discover the common properties underly the century of the century. His work here was motivated by two main interests. The century is a strying to discover the common properties underly the century. His work here was motivated by two main interests. The century is a strying to discover the common properties underly the century of the century. His work here was motivated by two main interests. The century is a strying to discover the common properties underly the century of the century. His work here was motivated by two main interests. The century is a strying to discover the common properties underly the century of the century is a strying to discover the common properties underly the century of the

When The Victions of Religious Experience was published, it was somewhat of an Whereas in the past, study on religious experience had been conducted from a pr James approached it from a secular one. His aim was to study people's testimonic experience impartially, attempting as much as possible to divorce particular religionattempt to draw out the key features common to all forms.

INSPECTION COPY



For example, Friedrich Schleiermacher, a nineteenth-century theologian, argued t rooted in a feeling of 'absolute dependence', where one recognises one's own life from the existence of a higher being. As such, for Schleiermacher, religious experiaffirmed itself as genuine, and no external test was needed to verify whether or nobjectively genuine. However, such an analysis may be problematic. Schleiermach religions possess this feeling of absolute dependence? How, in the face of difference self-authenticating?

In comparison, James did not claim religioner inces were self-authenticating he left all ideas about their auther act your his study, and instead highlighted for characteristics of religioner in the comparison.

- 1. Ineffab. The religious experience's contents or the feelings it produces in an in While metaphorical, or even analogical, language can be used, these still fall s giving a reliable and complete insight into the content of an individual's religious experience.
- 2. **Noetic quality** Religious experiences provide insight or knowledge into areal the normal realms of human intellect. This is essential for James to distinguish experience. If religious experiences simply provided us with more information world, they would not necessarily have a specifically religious dimension.
- 3. **Transience** This refers to the short time span of religious experiences. James not last long and, if they do, one is more likely to attribute the religious experient rather than a specific encounter with a spiritual dimension.
- 4. **Passivity** This refers to the way religious experiences make the individual feet being willed by, another power or in the whole whether this be God or an altern key for James is that religioner experiences involve a lack of agency; the experience of the counter a spiritual error but are, in effect, pulled by some other force

It might see James here is outlining strict criteria for religious experiences, such. In fact, he stated that religious experience at heart is best viewed as 'the fee individual men in their solitude, so far as they apprehend themselves to stand in reconsider the divine'. What these criteria represent are the common features James individuals who claimed to have religious experiences.

So, in light of these criteria, what value do religious experiences have for James? Cearly on is that the spiritual value of religious experiences is not explicitly underm explanations. Even if there is a psychological explanation for religious experiences religiously minded remains the same, as at heart all things can have a naturalistic world. Beyond this contention, however, James argued that the best test for the experience was whether it effected genuine change in the person who claimed to ultimately that a person who had a religious experience was have long-term eff developments in their character and outlook.

Furthermore, it is not a true critic smile regious experience that these changes of cultural views and values of a particular culture, just as all experiences are. This is not any changes of any change

INSPECTION COPY



Where James stops short, however, is claiming that religious experiences are object of God or a spiritual dimension. From his analyses, he concludes that it is perfectly religious experience to believe in the things they experience, especially if it involves the lives of human beings. Nevertheless, as private and ineffable, they cannot for argument for the existence of God; at best they might be a field for further philosis.

Activity:

One of the easiest ways to understand James' think is to apply his ideas about experiences to specific historical experience James' criteria:

- 1. The c poor of Saul on the road to Damascus.
- 2. Mothe of Norwich and her 16 visions of Christ in 1373.
- 3. The enlightenment of the Buddha.

RUDOLPH OTTO

Otto puts forward a slightly different definition from James, reflective of his theological background and desire to understand the way people themselves 'experience' religious experiences. This aim was framed within Otto's wider theological views. While he believed that religious experience was fundamental to a spiritual life, he also contended that individuals should understand the rational reasons for believing in God beforehand. Therefore, his vi have a much more theological flavour to them; Otto wished to show how religious of God, not just the wider qualities that define them.

His fundamental description of religious experience is an experience that encomp awe in the face of the divine, or, as he puts it, 'myster and religious experiences:

- 1. Mystery Otto argues the nature of nature and being the benully understood or comprehended by human being the period of the period of the strikes at a deeper point; it is not that themsel the strikes at a deeper point; it is not that themsel the strikes at a deeper point; it is not that the strikes at a deeper point it is not that the strikes at a deeper point it is not that the strikes at a deeper point it is not that the strikes at a deeper point it is not that the strikes at a deeper point it is not that the strikes at a deeper point it is not that the strikes at a deeper point it is not that the strikes at a deeper point it is not that the strikes at a deeper point it is not that the strikes at a deeper point it is not that the strikes at a deeper point it is not that the strikes at a
- 2. **Ultimate significance / tremendous** Otto argues also that religious experien greatest power and importance. This means anyone witnessing him realises the dependence and awe during their experiences. Again, this is similar to James' connects this passivity to God's own nature and being.
- 3. **Fascinating** Otto finally argues that despite this awe in the face of God, ther connection to him during religious experiences. One does not feel fright or fee one understands that one does not have control over God himself. This is a magnetic perhaps the most contentious, as it essentially puts forward that religious experiences of the divine.

While all these three aspects are important, Otto arguing at eligious experience. They concern phenomena that reach beyond and imprehension of the worlexperience as a whole being ineffable of the worley, Otto believes that any encount part of the meaning of life to the factor of the such a task is impossible.

Whether or use a favour James' or Otto's understanding of religious experience inclinations. In comparison to Otto, James' description may well seem a bit dry an and presence of religious experiences in people's lives. Yet their descriptions in m complementary, and both agree by and large that religious experiences are essent to some degree. However, we can delve further into the different forms of experience affect the individual. Thus we turn next to mystical experience.

INSPECTION COPY



MYSTICAL EXPERIENCE

So far, we've not looked extensively at the different ways individuals have underg beyond general descriptions of their qualities or properties, some thinkers throug a key type of religious experience from other forms; that of **mystical** experience.

Mystical experience has its roots in **mysticism**, the belief that one can achieve directional particular practices and thoughts. Mystical experience is this belief and is conon-sensuous experience of God. Therefore cire of such as sensuous visions mystical experience, which instead employed as a notividuals developing a unity with contemplation and meditation

A famous e proposition of pastical experiences in Christian thought is St Teresa of Ávil century nun fluential figure within the Catholic Church, she wrote extensive after undergoing numerous periods of religious ecstasy during her life where she Christ. These did not involve visual experiences, but often were accompanied by bodily change, and even at the time she was a controversial figure when she eluci

More modern thinkers, however, have also undertaken analysis of mystical experience examined the nature of mystical experience in depth, looking at its prevalence acrand religions from a culturally neutral perspective. Overall, he argued there were experiences:

- 1. A belief that the physical world does not constitute all the dimensions of reali ground' to reality. This can come in many forms, but experiants on the whole realm operating beneath the material world that potentially subtly influences
- 2. A belief that reason is not the only important parton be luman intellect. Also intuition and experience that do not drawn a mailty, but instead directly the world.
- 3. A belief the an inclusions about the external world. The other is the spiritual truer selections part of the individual looks to directly access the non-material
- 4. A belief that the truly important part of life is accessing and realising one's spi meaning to existence, and understanding oneself in this way is also understant it relates to the individual.

These criteria do potentially help to understand mystical experience, although mothey are still quite vague. For there are a number of difficult questions proponent answer. One is how one can distinguish mystical experiences from potentially mist he world. Another is how to verify mystical experiences as evidence of God if the interpretation and understanding. It may be that mystical experience is too abstrateven too abstract to be subject to tests of authenticity.

Extension: Famous examples include Saint Joh o the oss and his visions of the and 1577; Mother Julian of Norwich and 1577

CONVER LEDERIENCES

An important entirety of religious experiences are what are often referred to as correligious experiences that cause an individual to convert to another religion or walideas and practices in the process. James drew attention to conversion experience argued that the fundamental basis of a conversion experience was the adoption of focus in a person's life which previously would not have been of much significance.

INSPECTION COPY



conversion experience could be measured by the effects it had upon a person. If a conversion experience became happier and more caring of others, there are good experience was genuine or authentic,

A classic example of a conversion experience is the conversion of Saul on the road by Jesus, he converted to Christianity and changed his name to St Paul, becoming the reconstruction of Saul on the road by Jesus, he converted to Christianity and changed his name to St Paul, becoming the reconstruction of Saul on the road by Jesus, he converted to Christianity and changed his name to St Paul, becoming the reflect an authentic up for debate. Human beings regularly change the responsibility of the part of th

Bertrand Russell and Religious Experience

We've looked at how James and others contend that the authenticity of an expecan be measured at least in part by the effects it has on a person. Yet Bertrand Reference Copleston, famously disagreed with this suggestion. He argued 'the farmoral effect upon a man is no evidence whatsoever in favour of its truth'.

What Russell is contending is that the veracity of an experience is a separate judiupon a person. He gives the example of being influenced by the character Lycurg might very well be affected by their words, but one would be mistaken still in claim individual. In the same way, one might have a profound experience of God that world, but this is not necessarily an indication that God does exist, or that the example of the exa

INDIVIDUAL AND CORPORATE RELIGICATION XPERIENCES

A final distinction often made by thinkers is be were majority of religious experience is contained having the same religious experience. corporate religious corporat

However, as noted, they are much less common and are often poorly documented example is the Toronto Blessing in 1994, where many people claimed to have a shippirit over a period of months. Yet, despite many similarities in witness reports, crearify whether individuals had truly, genuinely shared in the same experience. In people came to believe they had the same experience through subconscious suggivere already highly religious and so susceptible to bias.

Some critics have even claimed that corporate religious experience may be more manifestation of mass hysteria, especially if it regularly occurs in situations where emotionally charged, such as in churches. Even theologians have noted that it is described religious experience to theological teaching. Whether certain hiblical events, such count as corporate religious experience is up for debate and eligious experience hysteria are often rejected (e.g. 1 Corinthians 14) Whether certain hiblical events, such count are often rejected (e.g. 1 Corinthians 14) Whether certain hiblical events, such count are often rejected (e.g. 1 Corinthians 14) Whether certain hiblical events, such count as corporate religious experience is up for debate and eligious experience hysteria are often rejected (e.g. 1 Corinthians 14) Whether certain hiblical events, such count as corporate religious experience is up for debate and eligious experience hysteria are often rejected (e.g. 1 Corinthians 14) Whether certain hiblical events, such count as corporate religious experience is up for debate and eligious experience hysteria are often rejected (e.g. 1 Corinthians 14) Whether certain hiblical events, such count as corporate religious experience is up for debate and eligious experience hysteria are often rejected (e.g. 1 Corinthians 14) Whether certain hiblical events, such count as corporate religious experience is up for debate and eligious experience hysteria are often rejected (e.g. 1 Corinthians 14) Whether certain hiblical events are considered as a corporate religious experience is up for debate and eligious experience hysteria are often rejected (e.g. 1 Corinthians 14) Whether certain hiblical events are considered as a corporate religious experience hysteria are often rejected (e.g. 1 Corinthians 14) Whether certain hiblical events are considered as a corporate religious experience hiblical events are corporate religious experience and corporate religious experience hiblical events are corporate religious experience and corporate

Discussion Amilia

Do you be 750 privorate religious experiences are more or less reliable than inc the existence God? Discuss in groups or pairs.

Nevertheless, even though we have raised issues for religious experience in this see be developed as a reliable argument for the existence of God. It is to these argumenticisms that we will turn to in the next section.

INSPECTION COPY



Religious Experience as an Argument for God

We've already examined numerous ways one may doubt the authenticty of religion fundamentally ineffable and misguided, it cannot be ruled out a person undergoing mistaken or even lying. From a naturalistic perspective, religious experience could delusion and fail to be anything more than a malfunctioning brain. Furthermore, to simply mirror the pre-existing ideas of a person's culture a way of life. How, ar religious experience be evidence for God?

Well, one advantage is the sheer process of people who have had religious experioverwhelming amount of the process of the vidence such that while it is possible to do is more difficult to cit. In or populace's lived exeprience. Furthermore, the characteristic peligious experience, whether it be its noetic or numinous qualit explanation described by the fundamental reliability of experience as a whole can be as on our senses to gather information about the world and rarely question what we should there be such scepticism about religious experience?

These factors mean it is possible to build a philosophical argument for God based any argument relies on sense experience, it is naturally **a posteriori**. Furthermore inductive reasoning (although deductive variations exist), where the premises of the conclusion, but do provide strong evidence for it.

Put together, the argument can be summarised as such:

- P1. Human beings commonly report religious experiences where they perceive G
- P2. These experiences share a number of unique characteristics not found in ord
- P3. These unique characteristics are best explain A (v) rence to the perceived
- C1. Therefore, there exists a God or spir musion causing these religious e

Typically, criticism has for the phenomenon. However, it is also possible religious experience explain the phenomenon. However, it is also possible really have unique characteristics, or is this due to a failure of is no widesplaced agreement on the nature of religious experience might undermitted differences between it and ordinary experience cannot be agreed on. In the perhaps the strongest initial challenge to religious experience, arising out of the

THE DIFFICULTIES OF TESTIMONY

The argument from religious experience as a posteriori and generally inductive relie to support its conclusion. The more reports and testimonies of religious experience conclusion. Yet, regardless of the nature or content of religious experiences, it is poreports of religious experience are truly accurate. Religious experience, being ineffa via ordinary language. Furthermore, the private nature of it means that it may well lying or mistaken about their experiences, especially when they arise in a church or experience may even be a form of wish fulfilment, where by duals so desperately they subconsciously come to believe they have The property issue, therefore, is that see whether a religious experience is gen and a how can such experiences be emp Richard Swinburne enters here and the principles he argues support religious ex He contends that the data day against religious experience are on the whole to of life, whe periences a phenomenon and reports on it, they are mo than doubte their reports are taken as evidence for the existence of that ph religious experience concerns spiritual matters does not mean it should be treater proposes a number of guidelines for evaluating religious experience:

INSPECTION COPY



The principle of credulity – This puts forward that if someone has experienced so should be accepted that it is likely that the person has genuinely experienced it ur are convincing reasons to suggest otherwise.

The principle of testimony – This puts forward that it should generally be the case people's accounts and descriptions of an event should be taken as probably true, the case there are genuine reasons to believe someone miss be lying or mistaken

These principles support the argument frequency experience as they suggest of its unique characteristics are frequency reliable. While there may be cases suspect that individuals reports of reports of rece.

Swinburne, however, can be perceived to be going further than simply stating that experience is reliable. Rather, he can be interpreted as contending religious expert for knowledge just as another form of experience is, and so is not subject to the satisfication when the subject to other claims. Furthermore, religious experience cannot be received experiences or ideas; it is a natural phenomenon that occurs in and of itself

However, is this really the case? Religious experience, while common on a large so of human lives compared to ordinary sense experience. Furthermore, the claims of seem to clash with the knowledge and ideas gained from ordinary sense experience in a similar fashion. These clashes in understanding of the world are typically the further investigation. Peter Vardy here criticises Swinburne similarly, arguing that to question the evidence for their experiences, religious or not, and it would be worf religious experience by referring to other publicly verifiable forms of experience.

This puts Swinburne in a potentially difficult position of the one hand, he may be not assume that religious experience in fine an antheway it is reported seem to demand reliability than ordinary in the ce.

In the next state of though, we will turn to more modern challenges for religious naturalistic explanations born out of advances in psychology and neuroscience mifor its unique characteristics and content.

Psychology, Neuroscience and Religious Experience

One way critics have challenged religious experience as evidence for God is wheth better explained through naturalistic interpretations. In this way, they question printed previous section, suggesting that there is not a God causing religious experineuroses, brain patterns and physiological changes. We can broadly divide such of psychological and neuroscientific. Both potentially hold promise, but both also has shall examine.



INSPECTION COPY



PSYCHOLOGICAL CHALLENGES TO RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE

One early and well-known challenge to religious experience comes from Freud. He whole developed out of individuals' neuroses, rather than rational reflections on to case, then there are broad psychological explanations for religious experience that existence of a God or spiritual dimension. Religious experience is simply one form human life.

But why does this wish arise in the first place? Fre ad the state human beings exfirst glance seems chaotic. There are in the causes of suffering that without random and unforgiving. This makes in a constant state of world; it is never known and men or why affliction might strike them.

Freud argue nxiety leads to human beings developing a subconscious wish that and this wish manifests itself in the form of a creator God, who sustains the universal that the lives of human beings. Appealing to or appearing this creator God allows hum them and potentially control the seemingly chaotic natural world. Religious expersives as human beings desire to be closer to and truly experience this God to quelled.

Freud does not give direct empirical evidence for this view, but he does point to a support it. For example, he notes that God often seems to be modelled on natura the Judaeo-Christian tradition God is often referred to as Father, mimicking the sayoung age. Donald Winnicott expands on this idea further, contending that religio brought out by a human desire for this childlike comfort and safety in their adult a self-reliant. If this is the case, then religious belief and experience simply reflect doccasionally bubble to the surface.

However, it is also possible to question whether such psyricingical explanations a truly threaten arguments for the existence of Gordal explanations are right about such subconditions, their views aren't truly a God did create human beings and a highest this contact of the fact human beings wish for religious expetite idea that can experience. Rather it would be worrisome if religious some emotions of spiritual fulfilment!

Furthermore, it is possible to question whether psychological views of religious exverifiable themselves. It was noted that scientific evidence for Freud's ideas is scale different explanations for psychological phenomena based on speculation. In part Freud's ideas could ever be tested. This is perhaps more damaging than expected, of the argument from religious experience is that there are no easy ways to test the psychological explanations it may be that one has simply replaced one unverified

NEUROSCIENTIFIC CHALLENGES TO RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE

For all the criticisms of a psychological approach, there are underlying reasons to sumight be able to be explained by states of the brain. Throughout history, individuals experiences using plants, drugs and other hallucinogenic means als. Moreover, religiously at times of stress, hunger or despair. The quantum be raised, therefore, as experiences have some underlying neuror approach explanation. There might be influenced by one's genetics and repositions are satisfact and reposition and the properties of the brain. Throughout history, individuals experiences using plants, drugs and other hallucinogenic means also Moreover, religious explanation. There might be influenced by one's genetics and repositions are satisfact and repositions are satisfact and repositions are satisfact.

Numerous of religious experience itself, have been hard to test. How do you know the religious experience to test for and how should one attempt to correlate neurobic experiences? These difficulties mean identifying a single cause is difficult; one still testimony, and moreover religious experience might be a complex phenomenon might be influences, both hormonal and neurological, in nature that vary person to

INSPECTION COPY



Moreover, studies so far into neuroscientific causes have been less than conclusive did studies on individuals using a device he dubbed the 'God Helmet', which, throelectromagnetic fields, he claimed could induce the symptoms of religious experies. However, these experiments were criticised for not being rigorous. Bias could have researchers suggesting the device could replicate these kinds of experiences, and not match the kind of intensity ascribed to many reports of religious experiences.

However, it is not just inconclusive evidence whic' and is start neuroscientific of than intuitively thought. Religious thinke in pointed out, that similar to psychiating neuroscientific causes of ranging periences doesn't really refute them acreated the world to be a common to natural laws then it would be expected neurophysic and the periences, just like any other experiences of the pointed out, that similar to psychiating neurophysic start neuroscientific causes of the pointed out, that similar to psychiating neurophysic start neuroscientific causes of the pointed out, that similar to psychiating neurophysic start neuroscientific causes of the pointed out, that similar to psychiating neurophysic start neuroscientific causes of the pointed out, that similar to psychiating neurophysic start neuroscientific causes of the pointed out, that similar to psychiating neurophysic start neuroscientific causes of the pointed out, that similar to psychiating neurophysic start neu

Nevertheless, what psychological and neurophysiological explanations do potential plausible reasons for religious experience that do not require invoking the existent do not completely undermine religious experiences, they do potentially cast doublooking for the simplest explanation, why not simply eliminate God from the equal note there are other forms of evidence for the existence of God that bolster the but it might also be the case that God exists without him causing religious experies

How Should we Interpret Religious Experience?

Everyday religious experiences give individuals personal and private reasons to be have examined, whether they can provide an objective argument for God is still of are rebuttals from theists to various psychological and neuroscientific explanation religious experience potentially run the risk of making it consists ively uncriticisable. It is possible to the planation for religious experience, it is possible to the planation for religious experience, experience can always be explain at 1 and God.

On the other tical about the entirety of our experience. What Swinburne and least on an everyday level, we trust our experiences and the reports of other peopreligious experience based on its content may be arbitrary since we do not apply to other experiences. What may matter is finding a balance between accepting religion interpretation of the world, but not assuming it necessarily represents the world.

Quick Quiz

- 1. What are the four characteristics of religious experience detailed by James?
- 2. What is the term Otto gives to describe the emotional core of religious exper
- 3. What is a conversion experience?
- 4. What is corporate religious experience?
- 5. Why does Swinburne argue that reports of religious experience should be true
- 6. Why does Freud argue religion a local same the result of delusion?
- 7. What scientific excess of are there for religious experiences?



ISPECTION COPY



3B: THE PROBLEM OF EVIL

Key Thinker	
Name	Augustine
Born	354
Died	430
Key text	The City of God (early fifth ce (1)
Why are they important?	Augustine is one of t' timportant figures in the early Chr Catholic faith which developed many key theological conce partial, work around original sin and humanity's fall from Modern Christian thought around the nature of evil and human beings through the grace of God.
Did you know?	Augustine might have eventually formulated what seems to be human sin and disobedience but his own aversion to immoral innocent experience. In his autobiography, <i>Confessions</i> , he we felt when as a young boy he went out with others and stole permost of them to pigs, simply because it was illegal.

1	
Key Thinker	
Name	John Hick
Born	1922
Died	2012
Key text	Evil and the God of Love (1966)
	Hick is perhaps simultaneously one of the most influential and
Why are they	religion of the twentieth century. Although Protestant, he argu
important?	thought of as myth, and that and concentious ideas, such as a
	pluralism, be adopte in ristans.
	Hick in the 's e 1 5 saccepted a place at Cornell University
	wa An ginore liberal at that time and he faced severe
Did you kr 79	havative academics, with many even accusing him of her
Zog Education	doctrine of the virgin birth. This hostility eventually led to him
	a place at Cambridge University in the early 1960s.

Introduction

When you think about the traditional challenges to religion, it is likely the problem pressing, and this perhaps hasn't changed in the last few millenia. While many phreligion are highly abstract, the problem of evil concerns one of the most fundame beings have in their lives. This is especially true for those one might describe as lubenevolent can be seen perhaps as farcical to people whose lives are afflicted by human hands or by natural phenomena. Yet, at the same time, there has been a vresponse to the problem, which often focuses on the unexpected benefits of evil, will or the possibility of moral growth. There are also those who have simply chan and being of God as a result. Nevertheless, on an evil you level, there is an ongoing and secular communities about whether evil is a locallenge to traditional monsatisfactory response.

Yet before we see in housider philosophical debate, we shall first look at what and solution not evil rest on defining what evil is, a much trickier task than it although we dentify things we might consider evil, drawing out an abstract not instances can be a fraught process. The pain of a toothache might be considered a tooth being treated for decay and the prevention of illness, it may well be considered we shall, therefore, begin this section by looking at the two main types of evil con and natural evil.

NSPECION COPY



The Nature of Evil

A basic definition of evil can be said to be something that inflicts unnecessary or uncreatures. Even this definition is contentious, however. Throughout history most panimals as unsuitable candidates for evil, with only suffering inflicted on human be However, it will function for the time being, as regardless we can draw a distinct evil might be manifested.

The first is what can be called **moral evil**. This is a first arises as a result of huma evil might be murder, but what this can specified agency, or free will. Moral evil and the contrasted with **natural evil**, who phenomena and every specified agency, an earthquake.

Yet while the action is important for many philosophers, it has also been chapart of the natural world, and there are many actions human beings can perform outside of their control. Should these cases be counted as moral or natural evil?

Going deeper, there are philosophical questions about whether free will exists at that if the world is **determinsitic**, such that every event can be explained by its print this case, human beings' actions are wholly determined by prior events, and hupowers to change the course of history. This means that there may be no such this classification just espoused is meaningless.

However, the distinction for many theologians is important, as it justifies many the look at. Theodices are arguments that seek to defend a traditional monotheistic problem of evil. They often vary in scope and application depending on the version addressing, but most generally attempt to show that there is some greater good at that would not be present if evil did not exist.

First, though, we shall look at two versions to be problem of evil, known as the local beach holds different ramification for the business thought and each can be addressed Both, nonetheless, are the local beach traditional business for any thinker looking to defend traditional business of the local busines

THE LO PROBLEM OF EVIL

The logical problem of evil proposes that there is a logical contradiction between omnipotent, benevolent God. This means that if either exists, it is logically imposs logical problem of evil is, therefore, a case of deductive reasoning, and many put of an **inconsistent triad**, such that all three of the below statements cannot be true.

- God is benevolent/all-loving
- God is omnipotent/all-powerful
- Evil exists

The logical problem of evil was perhaps best supported by the atheist philosopher as long as one accepted the existence of evil as a real phenomenon and also accepted the existence of evil as a real phenomenon and also accepted the existence of evil as a real phenomenon and also accepted the existence of evil as a real phenomenon and also accepted the existence of the inconsistent triad.

The strength of he is a poblem of evil is also that, if true, it necessarily require conception as there is no reality in which all three premises could be true. Interpretation to whether particular events are truly evil, or whether there exaffairs, however unlikely, where a benevolent, omnipotent God and evil coexist. It the downside for proponents of the logical problem. For all that is required to effect the problem is to show there is a possible (and preferably plausible) state of affairs which inconsistent triad do exist.

INSPECTION COPY



THE EVIDENTIAL PROBLEM OF EVIL

The evidential problem of evil, however, takes a different approach. Rather than claim a benevolent, omnipotent God cannot exist alongside evil, it takes an induct claiming that although there is a possible state of affairs where both do exist, the universe means this state of affairs is highly unlikely.

The evidential problem, therefore, calls more upon the sum and characteristics its simple existence. The reasons why evil seer is for adict the existence of a much is because so often evil appears to be suitous and unnecessary. For while possibility, perhaps, that some very loes serve a greater purpose, it is hard evinatural disasters or in the moral or spiritual growth of human being the moral or spiritual growth of human being

Therefore, the proponent of the evidential problem of evil looks to build a case the evidence available, that it is more reasonable to believe that God is either not ber believe there is some sort of a higher purpose to evil. Many suggest that the evidentian the logical problem of evil, but it does possess a few issues. Most notably, it and purpose of evil. As we noted earlier, what may look evil to some might appead disguise to another. Furthermore, is it at all possible to quantify the amount of evil whether this is excessive or necessary?

Such questions will be addressed in the next few sections, where we will take a deresponse to these problems, the Augustinian and Irenaen theodicies.

Discussion Activity:

Do you think the logical or evidential problem of evil nc greater problem for Discuss in groups or pairs and give your reasoning.

The Augustinian Theodicy

Augustine of the early Christian Church and Togother used potentially more than anyone to Christian theology and doctrine in heavy. His theodicy is still part of many denominational beliefs and he spite of its heavy religious leanings, helped contribute to many different modern theodicies, especially those that discuss free will.

Before we get into it deeper, however, it is important to understand how Augustin viewed evil itself. Contrary to many people's natural intuitions, Augustine argued evil was not a 'real' phenomenon; a separate entity that influenced people's lives. Rather evil was simply a privation or absence of good, or, as he termed it, a 'privationi'. This means that where evil exists is simply where good has failed to material

There are some grounds to suggest this idea has merit, even now. In many situated simply where a good action has failed to take place. When a reason starves to deatheir death as evil is simply due to others' failure to give the food. However, the potentially hard to overcome. How can nature ever anderstood as a privation of deterministic laws? What good is mind to what an earthquake happens?

Such questions really gustine, despite his ingenious definition of evil, cannaltogether. The private of gustine, despite his ingenious definition of evil, cannaltogether. The private of gustine, despite his ingenious definition of evil, cannaltogether. The private of gustine, despite his ingenious definition of evil, cannaltogether. The private of gustine, despite his ingenious definition of evil, cannaltogether. The private of gustine, despite his ingenious definition of evil, cannaltogether. The private of gustine, despite his ingenious definition of evil, cannaltogether. The private of gustine, despite his ingenious definition of evil, cannaltogether. The private of gustine, despite his ingenious definition of evil, cannaltogether. The private of gustine, despite his ingenious definition of evil, cannaltogether. The private of gustine, despite his ingenious definition of evil, cannaltogether. The private of gustine of gustine, despite his ingenious definition of evil, cannaltogether. The private of gustine of gustine, despite his ingenious definition of evil, cannaltogether. The private of gustine, despite his ingenious definition of evil, cannaltogether. The private of gustine of gustine

INSPECTION COPY



EVIL AND THE FALL

The Augustinian theodicy primarily draws on Genesis 1–3 for support. If you are not familiar with this well-known passage, it is highly recommended that you read it to give context to Augustine's views (remember he lived during the fourth and fifth centuries!). What is important to initially understand, however, is that Augustine never swayed from his belief that God is ultimately perfect. This meant that he contended that evil itself is nething that could actions. Instead it had to arise from some ever to a mot willed by God, and to Augustine's thought.

The Fall in Genesis is the tree of knowledge, they fell prey to a snake's suggest disobedience tively caused human self-awareness; Adam and Eve ceased to corrupted. This corruption persisted and was passed down through childbirth, me results of Adam and Eve's disobedience; what Augustine terms 'original sin'.

The result of possessing this original sin is that human beings are naturally imperfect steered to what is good; they have a degree of free will in which they can either che perceived the choice of good as what is reasonable. Any human being would rational perfection so would choose what is good. However, human beings also can fall prey 'concupiscence'; strong emotional desires and appetites (often sexual in nature) the

In short, evil is the result of imperfect human beings using their free will to what A ends. However, you might still ask where natural evil fits in. Well, Augustine did not had fallen. There were angels and other beings too who had also fallen from grace cosmic in nature, directly or indirectly cause the natural evil vie observe in everyd omnipotent and benevolent for Augustine. Instead it is a large state of human responsible for evil and the problems it causes.

EVALUATING THE ACTINIAN THEODICY

To those who have a strain, or who are are ligious, Augustine's theodicy might obvious street at it preserves a traditional monotheistic conception of God as but beyond that it has a large number of pressing issues.

The first is that it leans heavily upon religious dogma. Using the Bible as evidence atheistic sceptic and might easily prompt the criticism that Augustine is somewhat For, in trying to explain how the Christian God can be reconciled with the existence Christian teaching which speculates about a specific unprovable event (the Fall) at unprovable human imperfection (original sin). Moreover, even if one accepts the there is a deeper question about why an omnipotent, benevolent God would not from occurring and human beings from becoming corrupted.

Schleiermacher picks up on this point, arguing that the Augustinian theodicy is fall somehow a perfect world became corrupted without cause. logical contradiction not have caused the Fall, yet if humans once were that I am existed in a state of have done so either. Therefore, either Godinariose.

Many would district that have idea that evil is a privation. For while it might appeal, the leaves to be some force to the claim that evil is a real and persistent evil is just a privation, Augustine is not just making a claim about evil, but the nature whole, when human beings claim that an action is wrong or evil, they are making nature and value of that act, not just about the lack of good within.

INSPECTION COPY



However, what Augustine does highlight is a potential solution to the logical probit may seem). For while evidentially it is scant, it may well be possible that the Fall by the corruption of free human beings and angels. This idea was highlighted mor Alvin Plantinga, who argues that the existence of free will and the possibility of free greater good than human beings simply acting good out of pre-programmed impumight not develop a wholly objective response to the problem of evil, there are at rounded, philosophical theodicy within.

Activity:

List three ways you would update it will be theodicy to make it more convincing individual. Does this material across more convincing as a whole?

The Irenael Foundation licy

We noted in the last section that Augustine leans heavily on Christian teaching an in his theodicy. In contrast, Irenaeus' theodicy, while still heavily indebted to Christideas, is perhaps more philosophical than theological in nature. For one, Irenaeus not make the difficult claim that evil is simply a privation of good. Rather he aims entertain a more holistic notion of evil, arguing that it is necessary in order for hubbeings to morally and spiritually grow.

The central idea behind the Irenaean theodicy is that God created human beings i image, but at an immature or undeveloped level. The seeds of divinity are, therefore within human beings, but in order for human beings to grow closer and eventually become united with God, they have to be nurtured through moral and spiritual development. This growth occurs through human beings, out of their own free wiface of a difficult and unjust world, where hardship and suffering are prevalent. By learning from it and acting justly, human beings mature of the control of

A key idea in the Irenaen theodicy, the control and solution of the control and spiritual perfection were granted in cally. Yet this struggle requires experience of evaluation where is a greater good in the same way one could potentially not know experiencing the control of t

HICK AND THE 'VALE OF SOUL-MAKING'

John Hick is a modern Protestant philosopher, who greatly expanded on Irenaeus' proposal. He contends that the overriding purpose of life is not simple pleasure, but rather the realisation of the greater virtues and characteristics of the human personality. This is why we don't just celebrate when someone is happy, but also when they are brave, compassionate or just. These aspects define what is morally important and great about human beings, are based upon the ideal moral character; we strive for moral perfection, not just hap

Yet someone cannot be brave unless there is a difficult and a manding situation of fact, Hick contends that all the greater characteristics and quelities of human being kinds of hardships. Without these difficulties of human beings would simply live dulives. Therefore, in order for these and labely qualities to emerge, human beings of the cannot simply be, as Hill and the property of the cannot simply be, as Hill and the property of the cannot simply be, as Hill and the property of the cannot simply be, as Hill and the property of the cannot simply be, as Hill and the property of the cannot simply be, as Hill and the cannot simply be, as Hill and the cannot simply be as a simply be as a

This kind of encouraging environment Hick calls the 'vale of soul-making'. necessary in order that the human person can develop, mature and eventually be to Irenaeus, free will is of vital importance; growth requires choosing good over excapacities, and Hick argues human beings could never have a truly loving relations relationship was predetermined by God. Instead, union with God has to be enterebeings themselves.

INSPECTION COPY



PHILOSOPHICAL IMPLICATIONS OF SOUL-MAKING

It is important when judging Hick's ideas to understand his wider philosophical state forward is that God maintains an epistemic distance between himself and human human beings can freely choose to enter into a relationship with God. If God mad beings, this would prevent human beings from making a meaningful choice to gro never appeared at all, human beings would equally never have such a meaningful maintains a distance such that human beings are at because yeartially aware of himself.

Another key point is that Hick is a **unit** in this means that Hick believes all his achieve salvation. He contend at the ersalism as a whole is a philosophically not believes God to be heard at the ersalism as a whole is a philosophically not believes God to be heard at the ersalism as a whole is a philosophically not believes God to be heard at the ersalism as a whole is a philosophically not believes God to be heard at the ersalism as a whole is a philosophically not believes God to be heard at the ersalism as a whole is a philosophically not believes God to be heard at the ersalism as a whole is a philosophically not believes God to be heard at the ersalism as a whole is a philosophically not believes God to be heard at the ersalism as a whole is a philosophically not believes God to be heard at the ersalism as a whole is a philosophically not believes God to be heard at the ersalism as a whole is a philosophically not believes God to be heard at the ersalism as a whole is a philosophically not believes God to be heard at the ersalism as a whole is a philosophically not believes God to be heard at the ersalism as a whole is a philosophically not believes God to be heard at the ersalism as a whole is a philosophically not believes God who is wholly good would never conditions and the ersalism as a whole is a philosophically not believed in beings will a god would never conditions and the ersalism at the ersalism

EVALUATING THE IRENAEAN THEODICY

Hick provides the most developed version of the Irenaean theodicy and his though greatly influenced by a more scientific, materialist perspective on the world. God a non-interventionist figure who does not attempt to interfere in the lives of hum and instead creates a natural world which human beings have to navigate and least hemselves. If God were interventionist, then his acts, especially if they helped so human beings over others, would seem arbitary and potentially cruel, as they would unfairly rewarding some over others.

To some extent, Hick's ideas are consistent with how with no beings experience lift daily basis. Many do believe that hardship me degree is important and helps Similarly, virtues such as bravery nedection as valuable because they are the right such hardship. More so the hardship have strength as they provide does not reduce the hardship of the hardship potentially wider philosophical appeal.

Another potential advantage is that Hick's ideas are potentially compatible with modes not argue that human beings have an immaterial soul which is the seat of the simply monitors human beings as a material whole and creates a 'replica' on deat commas as it is not meant to simply mean copy). This means that Hick's ideas mig who have a more materialist outlook and do not favour taking scriptural stories lit

Nevertheless, there are a number of deeper issues. A key problem is that the Irena lot unexplained. Why is evil created in the way that it is? Couldn't soul-making still is a lot of suffering that does not seem to serve any greater purpose and has the opmoral growth. Naturally this criticism is somewhat subjective in nature, but for extra Holocaust, many people would struggle to see the benefit of the senseless death of therefore, why God could not have created a world in the still allows for



INSPECTION COPY

COPYRIGHT



Swinburne and the 'Toy World'

The interplay between human free actions and evil is important to understandin making theodicy. It is not enough for proponents of the argument that evil exists be able to freely grow in response to it. Swinburne argues similarly to Hick that is which human beings have meaningful choices. It is better that human beings have do evil than if they did not have freedom at all year desthat a world in which human beings would be a 'toy world'; one that a cations of human beings we face of difficulty. In short, moral and the wrong ones. Human beings do not just also the wrong ones. Human beings do not just also the wrong ones. Human beings do not just also the make mistakes and learn soul-making and the wrong ones. Human beings do not just also the wrong ones. Human beings do not just also the wrong ones. Human beings do not just have to be able to make mistakes and learn soul-making and the wrong ones.

However, even such evil is necessary and justified, proponents of the Irenaean tawkward position. For in essence it states that any evil is justified as a means to the growth. D Z Phillips argues that this position is anathema to Christian teaching and itself. He contends that soul-making theodicies treat evil as **instrumental** rather that always justified in the world because it serves a great good, rather than being a plown right and should be eliminated.

The trouble with this attitude, he argues, is that it promotes the view that evil is a greater purpose, and this kind of thinking has led to many of conflicts, injustices a decry in our everyday lives. It reduces people's lives down to mere instruments su death of a child as something positive rather than the evil that it is. Phillips argues viewed as essential, or intrinsically bad. The constant intellectual speculation about of armchair philosophy that attempts to solve an abstract problem rather than en of evil in real life.

This leaves the Irenaean theodicy with an in the state of a memma. On the one hand, problem of evil as there are many six and problem of evil as there are many six and problem. On the other hand, in attempting evil might be in tifled to a new problem. On the other hand, in attempting evil might be in tifled to a new problem. On the other hand, in attempting evil might be in tifled to a new problem.

Difficulties such as these have led some thinkers to simply declare that the tradition is mistaken. Rather than try to search for convoluted ways an omnipotent, benevolevil, the best route might be to deny one of the premises of the inconsistent triad briefly look at in the final section.

Discussion Activity:

Do you think Augustine's or Hick's theodicy provides a better response to the progroups or pairs and write down the pros and cons for each from your perspective

Reconciling God with the Existence of Evil

While each of the theodicies we have studied does have it alties, you might have one. Certainly debate is very much alive as to what does theodicies answer the thinkers are still offering novel ways to green the control of the cont

As we noted that, on an evidential level, evil is not an abstract phenomenon but a lives. To the person who has suffered injustice, an intellectual answer may appear existence is defined and continually re-evaluated on the basis of the hardships per theodicy has to address these existential elements to the problem. Therefore, evelogical problem of evil, the evidential problem of evil is always looming large in the

INSPECTION COPY



DENYING BENEVOLENCE

Among theists, this position is less adopted, and it is more common to those who is benevolent may well give a potentially rational explanation for why there is evil undermines most of the foundation of religious thought. However, this does not who have endorsed a more neutral perspective regarding the moral nature of God argued that the most coherent picture of God is deism; the view that God created any personal involvement or investment in it beyond the all act.

Under a deistic perspective, God might not be sold specifically to create evil universe that, although functioning, a provided and unforgiving from the person disasters may simply be the mend point of various natural laws and process in. An beings. However, because God has no personal in created, the moral obligation for him to prevent such events.

DENYING OMINPOTENCE

This is a more popular option among some theists, especially process theologians that God is much more restricted in power than commonly thought under tradition able to control the world and its events, God simply has powers of persuasion to avoid evil. However, these powers are not absolute. Many process theologians be own power to resist God's influence. If this is the case, then evil exists simply because God does not possess the requisite power.

This was, and still is, quite a radical proposal, especially since the God of process well with the biblical God, unless scripture is suitably reinterpreted. Many Christia God limited in power; salvation is generally seen to only be possible if God does God is not omnipotent in this way, it is questionable whether God can save huma within scripture. Therefore, while process theology potential, gives an intuitive a problem of evil, it comes at too great a cost for m my e gous individuals.

Can the Problem Ever be Try's solve

he \ \ \ \ \ of evil is an issue often depends upon an individual's individuals ase of intellectual speculation and nothing more. The problem limited hum erspective on the world, and, for these thinkers, if we had God's existence of evil would be revealed.

Yet for other individuals the problem of evil is an existential concern and a true te problem of evil as a mere intellectual concern is to deny the real effect evil and su and the way that affects their belief in a benevolent deity. Overall, there is a real subjective elements of the problem of evil without rendering the problem wholly

Nevertheless, more modern theodicies are arguably the most sophisticated attemption Whether or not you agree with theodicies such as Hick's soul-making idea, they do and philosophically convincing attempt to reconcile our everyday perceptions of evil may exist. All still have flaws, but, for the religious individual, they may be end rationally coherent way of outlining how a benevolent, omre btent God can coexi

Quick Quiz

- What is the difference by er poral evil and natural evil? 1.
- What is the inca the strad? 2.
- 3.
- How do the define evil?
 How do the define believe evil came into being? 4.
- 5. What is responsible for natural evil in the Augustinian theodicy?
- 6. What is the term Hick gives for the separation maintained between God and
- 7. What does Hick mean by the term 'soul-making'?
- What is the term for a God who has no personal investment in the lives and f 8.



Answers

ACTIVITIES

1A Activity:

Example answers

1. A loaf of bread

Material: Flour, wheat, etc. (Any of the in, relie to moread!)

Formal: The shape of a loaf

Efficient: The baker Final: Sustenance t

2. A moto

Materia dandlebars, seat, motor, etc.

Formal: Streamlined, narrow, two-wheel shape Efficient: The mechanic/craftsman/factory

Final: Mobility

3. Mobile phones

Material: Buttons, battery, screen, etc. Formal: Handheld, rectangular device

Efficient: The inventor, factory, skilled workers

Final: Communication

1B Activity:

Basic examples given below

- a) Psychological terms Perception, comprehension, memory (intentional terms)
- b) Neuroscientific terms Neurons firing, synapses, physical nnections in brain
- c) Biological terms Colour receptors in the eye
- d) Physical terms Light waves hitting the c 's at 'm rearranging to pass charged

2A Activity:

Basic examples lo

- 1. No info To Jesign to designer Designer might be best explanation, even creation experience of things there is no experience of the control of things there is no experience of the control of things there is no experience of the control of things there is no experience of the control of
- 2. Fallacy of composition Fallacy can't be invoked in isolation. There's plenty of even universal level (e.g. natural laws). Critic needs to show that the world is unordered invoke fallacy.
- Spatial order The universe exhibits order on a grander scale. This suggests mor not limited to observable parts of the universe, especially when things such as na constants exist.
- 4. Designer not necessarily God The proponent of the teleological argument might simpler explanation than invoking multiple designers or beings (e.g. Ockham's rational contents).
- 5. Anthropomorphism The creator might not be given any si mificant human attri might not be qualified as a fully descriptive word (1) in logical language rather than 10 might not be qualified as a fully descriptive word (1) in logical language rather than 10 might not be qualified as a fully descriptive word (1) in logical language rather than 10 might not be given any si mificant human attri

2B Activity:

Predicates in bold:

- 1. The beautiful viviand and bulbous.
- 2. Everyth with uch is soft and brittle.
- 3. The kin to thall broke my window.
- 4. **Are** you **now satisfied**?
- 5. Have you almost finished this exercise?

INSPECTION COPY



3A Activity:

Answers to the first two are likely to match James' criteria. All are transient, offer info had distinct effects upon the experiants. The enlightenment of the Buddha is the most prolonged period of meditation, the information was about the material world to som power that took hold of the Buddha. The Buddha was, however, changed by the exper Students might also question whether the Buddha's enlightenment counts as a religion does not fit the criteria.

3B Activity:

Potential responses:

- 1. Greater emphasis on impace ce / gaincance of free will rather than human imp
- 2. The Fall not a literal an allegorical or metaphorical one human beings need the point of the second actions, not just good ones.
- 3. Leave c rences to angels and other divine beings. Natural evil may have of by free very moral evil (e.g. soul-making).

QUICK QUIZZES

Ancient Philosophical Influences

- 1. An immaterial, unchanging reality that contains all the perfect versions of things
- 2. Republic
- 3. Because Plato believes reason is the primary source of knowledge about the wor
- 4. The Form of the Good
- 5. Cause/explanation
- 6. Material, formal, efficient, final cause
- 7. In order to explain what is the final cause of the universe.
- 8. Through a constant pull or attraction towards themselves.

Soul, Mind and Body

- 1. Appetite, emotion, reason
- 2. Vegetative, appetitive, intellectual
- 3. The view that there is only a kind adbstance.
- 4. P1. One can conceive that a thinking being, existing without one's body. P2. Any that a conceived is logically possible.
 - P3. If it for ally possible that one can be a thinking thing without a body, then body.
 - C1. Therefore, the mind is not identical to the body.
- 5. The difficulty of explaining how the immaterial mind and material body meaning
- 6. Because he argues that talk of the soul as a separate substance commits a categoral talk of the mind means there is a separate mind.
- 7. The view that talk of mental states is just talk of behaviours.
- 8. In a metaphorical sense.

Arguments from Observation

- 1. Where one draws a comparison between two or more things in order to explain things.
- 2. The analogy of a watch and watchmaker.
- 3. Evolution
- 4. Regularities of co-presence and regularities of successi
- 5. The principle of sufficient reason.
- 6. Infinite regress
- 7. By stating that a 'necessary' by ing salaringless proposition, since a necessary to not exist.

Arguments 1 Education Reason

- 1. A priori
- 2. A being than which nothing greater can be conceived.
- 3. That of the greatest conceivable island.
- 4. His ontological argument only applies to God as he possesses necessary existence possess contingent existence.

NSPECTION COPY



- 5. Because existence is not a predicate.
- 6. Modal logic
- 7. Maximal greatness

Religious Experience

- 1. Ineffability, noetic, transient, passive
- 2. Numinous
- A religious experience which causes someone to significantly change their views. Religious experiences that occur for multiply proprocessing a particular time or processing the control of the control o 3.
- 4.
- Due to the principles of credulity and leading that religious experiences 5.
- Because he believes the large and the result of wish-fulfilment, originating in the hum 6. in a cha
- 7. nges, drugs, mental illness, etc. Hormo

The Problem of Evil

- 1. Moral evil comes from free human actions, natural evil comes from the natural w
- 2. The view that a benevolent, omnipotent God cannot logically coexist with the exist
- 3. As a privation of God
- Through the Fall 4.
- Fallen angels or other divine beings 5.
- Epistemic distance 6.
- The moral or spiritual growth human beings undergo in the face of suffering and 7.
- 8. Deism





NSPECTION COL

