# Contents

**Preface**  
page xvii

## DIVINITY

I. ‘God’, ‘god’, and God  
1. Existence and essence questions  
2. Names in questions of existence and belief  
3. Etymology and semantics  
4. The core attitudinal conception of God  
5. The philosophers’ conception of God – God as a perfect being  
6. The common conception of traditional theology  
7. Might there be a god, even if there is not a perfect being?  
8. Might there not be a god, even if there is a perfect being?  

## ARGUMENTS FOR THE EXISTENCE OF GOD

II. Classical Ontological Arguments  
1. Introduction  
2. Part One: René Descartes’s ontological proof  
3. Part Two: “Mr. Spinoza, meet Mr. Russell”  
4. Part Three: St. Anselm’s argument of Proslogion II  
5. Part Four: Immanuel Kant’s critique of Descartes’s ontological argument  

Appendix A. Symbols and symbolizations  
Appendix B. Derivations and models  
Appendix C. Rules of inference and forms of derivations
III. Modern Modal Ontological Arguments

1. Norman Malcolm’s argument

2. Charles Hartshorne’s argument

3. A fly in the ointment?

4. Other Anselmian arguments

5. ‘It’s the possibility!’

6. Foes of ontological arguments say that their possibility-premises beg questions

7. Friends of ontological arguments respond

8. But that – that conceivability entails possibility – is simply not true!

9. A demotion of the argument from a proof, to a license to believe

Appendix A. ‘Possible worlds’

A1. Worlds enough

A2. Truth and actuality at possible worlds

A3. Modal realism without tears

A4. This is not a story

A5. A logic for possible worlds

Appendix B. Modal logic

B1. Sentential modal logic

B2. Hartshorne’s modal ontological argument

B3. Quantified modal logic

IV. Kurt Gödel’s Ontologischer Beweis

1. Introduction

2. Language and logic

3. Axioms, definitions, and two theorems

4. That it is necessary that there is a God-like being

5. Would that be God, could it be God?

6. Modal collapse

7. Concluding recommendations

Appendix A. Notes in Kurt Gödel’s hand

Appendix B. Notes in Dana Scott’s hand

Appendix C. Mainly derivations

C1. A logic for Gödel’s system

C2. Two promised derivations

C3. Derivations of theorems in Gödel’s system

C4. Derivations for Anderson’s emendation of Gödel’s system

V. First Causes: “The Second Way”

1. Part 1, Question 2, of Summa Theologica – “The Existence of God”
## Contents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. An articulation of the Second Way</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ‘Efficient causes’ in the argument – sustaining, or generating?</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The infinite and infinite regresses</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The preliminary conclusion</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. There is a gap in the argument</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. On the ultimate conclusion, that God exists: Whether this would</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>follow even if all was well in the argument to it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix A. Notes on Aquinas’s other ways</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix B. Bangs and infinite regresses of causes</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- B1. Big bang!!</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- B2. A blast from the recent past – William Lane Craig’s kalām</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>causal argument</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. Ultimate Reasons: Proofs a contingentia mundi</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1. Classical sources</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 2. A Leibnizian cosmological argument</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 3. On the premises, and terminology</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 4. Comparisons with ontological, and again with first cause,</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arguments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 5. Cleanthes’ objection</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 6. A ‘small problem’ with our Leibnizian argument</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 7. That ‘small problem’ with the argument goes into bigger problems</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for its ‘ambition’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 8. Proofs a contingentia mundi – what a nice bad idea</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix A. Leibniz’s problem with necessity</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A1. What, according to Leibniz, is the reason for the existence of</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the World?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A2. Has he given a sufficient reason?</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A3. Leibniz’s ‘trilemma’</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix B. Contingency in John Leslie’s Axiarchism</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix C. Robert C. Koons’s ‘New Look’ cosmological argument</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- C1. A start-up problem</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- C2. A terminal problem</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. Look ’Round! – Arguments from Design</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1. The argument of the Dialogues – first statement</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 2. On assessing arguments for causal explanations</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 3. Probabilities, plain and conditional</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 4. Bayes’s theorems</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 5. A ‘particular discussion of the evidence’ – the Dialogues, Parts</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5–8, 10, and 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 6. Part 12 of the Dialogues: Hume’s ‘philosophical theism’</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 7. New facts and new theories</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

© in this web service Cambridge University Press
Contents

8. The argument from design – millennial editions 277
9. It is best to leave God-like beings out of otherwise natural explanations 287

Appendix. Swinburne’s teleological argument, and his cumulative argument, for the existence of God 288
A1. Swinburne’s teleological argument 288
A2. The ‘logic’ of this argument 289
A3. The argument compared with Cleanthes’ 290
A4. ‘Cumulative confirmation’ – ‘Don’t try this at home!’ 291
A5. On Swinburne’s cumulative argument for the existence of God 294

VIII. Clouds of Witnesses – “Of Miracles” 298
Introductory and prefatory remarks 298
1. ‘Miracles’ 302
2. ‘Laws of nature’ 305
3. Evidence for miracles, and for God 309
4. On the first part of Hume’s general maxim 312
5. A condition that is not only necessary, but also sufficient, for testimony sufficient to establish a miracle 318
6. On the second part of Hume’s maxim 319
7. Bayes’s theorem for the evidence of testimony 319
8. Thomas Bayes and Bayes’s theorems 321
9. Richard Price 322
10. Lotteries – Price thought they made his case 324
11. Hume, ‘I must weigh this’ 327
12. Two experiments 328
13. Responses to these results 329

Appendix A. A proof of Hume’s theorem 331
Appendix B. Condorcet’s rule, witness reliability, and ‘last degrees of assurance’ 333
B1. Bayesing Condorcet’s rule 333
B2. Witness reliability 335
B3. On last degrees of assurance 336

IX. Romancing the Stone 345
1. On the ‘common names’ of God 345
2. Omnipotence 346
3. ‘Essential properties’? 350
4. On whether omnipotence is possible 353
5. On essential omnipotence 361
## Contents

6. On necessarily everlasting existence conjoined with essential omnipotence 364
7. On omnipotence conjoined with other conditions and attributes 364
8. What is left for God of omnipotence? 365
Appendix. A formal articulation of the argument of Section 5 367

X. ‘God Knows (Go Figure)’ 369
1. Introduction 369
2. The primary argument from the impossibility of a set of the reflective parts of an omniscient’s knowledge 370
3. ‘Totalities’ 374
4. The argument trimmed 374
5. Subtotalities, mappings, more than, and Cantor for totalities 375
6. On kinds of multiplicities 378
7. Taking the measure of these challenges to omniscience 380
8. All truths and possibilities for omniscience 382
9. Divine knowledge, a guarded recommendation 386
10. Taking stock, to move on 388
11. Grim’s radical argument against omniscience 389
12. Conclusions 391
Appendix. Notes on Cantorian set theory 394
   A1. Power sets 394
   A2. Cardinalities 394
   A3. Cantor’s Theorem 395
   A4. Cardinalities of power sets 397

Arguments Against the Existence of God

XI. Atheologies, Demonstrative and Evidential 401
1. ‘That that’s sawce for a goose is sawce for a gander’ 401
2. Ambitious atheistic demonstrations 403
3. Modest atheistic demonstrations 404
4. Hume’s argument in Part 11 of the Dialogues 405
5. The evidential argument from evil of Rowe (1986) 409
6. The evidential arguments from evil of Rowe (1988) and (1996) 413
7. A Bayesian issue for evidence of evil 427
8. Another skeptic 429
9. It can be different strokes for different folks 432
Appendix. Promised derivations 432
XII. The Logical Problem of Evil
1. The argument from evil
2. The argument from the world's not being a best world
3. The argument from the world's not being a best divinely creatable world
4. The argument from the world's not being a best divine bet world
5. The problem of the best
6. The argument from there being a better world than this one
7. A dilemmatic argument to the world's being improvable
8. Might love be the answer?

Appendix A. On alleged incompatibilities of divine omniscience and freedom
A1. An argument from the purported impossibility of foreknowledge of exercises of freedom
A2. Mere everlasting omniscience and freedom: An argument 'after' one of Nelson Pike's
A3. An adaptation of the argument to essential everlasting omniscience without necessary existence
A4. A similar argument for essential everlasting omniscience with necessary existence

Appendix B. A deduction in Section 2.2.3 spelled out

XIII. Pascalian Wagers
1. Theoretical and practical reasons
2. The wager
3. Part Two. Belief-options
4. Part Three. On the variety of possible Pascalian wagers
5. Case 2: Believing would have only other-world rewards
6. Case 3: Belief is not considered to be cost-free
7. Case 4: Alternative reward-policies for salvation are taken seriously
8. Variants of Cases 3 and 4
9. Case 5: Competing God-hypotheses are taken seriously
10. Case 6: Alternative policies not only for rewards, but also for punishments, are taken seriously
11. Case 7: Reason itself is considered another great thing
12. Case 8: All goods and evils are considered commensurable
13. Case 9: God would frown upon willful believing
## Contents

- Appendix. *Hyperreals and decision theory*  
  - A1. Hyperreals  
  - A2. Hyperreals in decision theory

- Notes  
- References  
- Index of Names