A2 Religious Studies

PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION

G581
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Done</th>
<th>Revised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Religious Language** | *Candidates should be able to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of:*  
Religious language - uses and purpose  
The via negative (Apophatic way)  
The verification and falsification principles  
Different views on the meaningfulness of religious language  
The uses of symbol, analogy and myth to express human understanding of God  
The views of the Vienna Circle, A.J. Ayer, Anthony Flew, Ludwig Wittgenstein and Paul Tillich on religious language  
Candidates should be able to discuss these areas critically and their strengths and weaknesses. |      |         |
| **Experience and Religion** | *Candidates should be able to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of:*  
Arguments from religious experience from William James  
The aims and main conclusions drawn by William James in *The Varieties of Religious Experience*  
The following different forms of religious experience: visions, voices, 'numinous' experience, conversion experience, corporate religious experience  
The concept of revelation through sacred writings  
Candidates should be able to discuss these areas critically and their strengths and weaknesses. |      |         |
| **Miracles**           | *Candidates should be able to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of:*  
Different definitions of miracle, including an understanding of Hume  
The biblical concept of miracle and the issues this raises about God's activity in the world  
The concept of miracle, and criticisms made by Hume and Wiles  
The implications of the concept of miracle for the problem of evil  
Candidates should be able to discuss whether modern people can be expected to believe in miracles, and whether miracles suggest an arbitrary or partisan God. Candidates should be able to discuss these areas critically and their strengths and weaknesses. |      |         |
<p>| <strong>Nature of God</strong>      | <em>Candidates should be able to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of:</em> |      |         |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Done</th>
<th>Revised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G581: Philosophy of Religion</td>
<td>God as eternal, omniscient, omnipotent and omni-benevolent - and the philosophical problems arising from these concepts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The views of Boethius in his discussion of eternity and God's foreknowledge in Book 5 of <em>The Consolations of Philosophy</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The question as to whether or not a good God should reward and punish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Candidates should be able to discuss these areas critically and their strengths and weaknesses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life after Death</td>
<td>Candidates should be able to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distinctions between body and soul, as expressed in the thinking of Plato, Aristotle, John Hick and Richard Dawkins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other concepts of the body/soul distinction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Different views of life after death: resurrection and reincarnation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Questions surrounding the nature of disembodied existence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The relationship between the afterlife and the problem of evil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Candidates should be able to discuss these areas critically and their strengths and weaknesses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUESTIONS TO AID IN REVISION:

1. Have a go at the questions – do it on another sheet!!
2. If you are REALLY stuck look at the notes on the following pages
3. Once you have done a section, go through the notes and check it is correct.
4. Now you are ready to try and examination question

**Religious Language**

1. What is the apophatic way sometimes known as?
2. What is the Verification Principle?
3. Who developed it?
4. Who developed weak and strong verification?
5. Give one example of weak verification?
6. Give one example of strong verification?
7. Who developed eschatological verification?
8. Who originally came up with the Parable of the Gardener?
9. Who later developed it in order to prove the falsification principle?
10. Who spoke of toys in the cupboard?
11. Who wrote the parable of the dons?
12. Who said symbols help to bring understanding about God?
13. Who said we use analogical language when speaking about God?
14. What is univocal language?
15. What is equivocal language?
16. What is the analogy of attribution?
17. What is the analogy of proportion?
18. What is the difference between non cognitive and cognitive language?
19. Who speaks of models and qualifiers?
20. Give an example of a model and a qualifier.
21. Who spoke of demythologising the Bible?

**Life after Death**
1. What is Dualism?

2. Name two philosophers who followed dualism?

3. What is Materialism?

4. Name one scientist/philosopher who follows Materialism?

5. Who put forward the replica theory? What is it and how does it challenge concept of materialism?

6. Give one criticism of the replica theory.

7. Give one criticism of the Christian belief in hell.

8. What is purgatory?

9. Within Roman Catholic and Orthodox Christian traditions no one is predestined to go to hell. True or False

10. Define reincarnation.

11. What is karma?

12. How does regression and déjà vu support reincarnation?

13. Why does Swinburne reject reincarnation?


---

**Religious Experience**

1. What does Otto mean by the “numinous”?

2. What are the 2 groups that Swinburne puts religious experiences into?

3. What happened to St Teresa of Avila?

4. What happened to St Bernadette?

5. How would schizophrenia be used to criticise “hearing voices”?

6. What is the title of William James most famous book?

7. What are the 4 characteristics that James identifies as prominent in religious experiences?

8. What is the principle of credulity?

9. What is the principle of testimony?

10. Who put forward these 2 principles as a way of assessing claims about religious experiences?
11. What did Flew say about Swinburne's comments on religious experience?

12. What type of experience is the Toronto Blessing?

13. What did Freud say about religious experiences?

14. What did Marx say about religious experiences?

**Miracles**

1. What is Hume's definition of a miracle?

2. What are Hume's four practical arguments against miracles?

3. Give one argument that could be used back at Hume.

4. What does Wiles say about God's action in the world?

5. How does Holland define a miracle?

6. How does Tillich define a miracle?

7. What is a contingency definition of a miracle?

8. Give one reason as to why miracles matter for religious believers.

9. What is the placebo effect?

10. What is petitionary prayer?

**Revelation and Holy Scripture**

1. What is the difference between propositional and non-propositional revelation?

2. What type of revelation is the Qur'an?

3. Give one example of a biblical passage which may make it difficult to believe in propositional revelation.
Attributes of God

1. What is the inconsistent triad?

2. Define Omniscient / Omnipotent / Omnibenevolent

3. Why is God described as transcendent and immanent?

4. What is the difference between eternal and timeless?

5. Explain how a belief in God as everlasting may be more beneficial to believers than the idea that God is timeless

6. What is process theology?

7. How does Peter Geach define God?

8. What is the Paradox of the Stone?

9. Define Middle Knowledge

10. How is God omniscient and able to allow human’s free will

11. What is the difference between the God of philosophy and the God of theology?

12. Who is Lady Philosophy?

13. What is Boethius’ solution to the problem of God’s foreknowledge?

14. What is the relationship between God and goodness?

15. What is the Euthyphro dilemma?

16. Can God do evil?

17. Can hell exist if God is omnibenevolent?

18. Define Calvin’s theory of pre-destination

A2 essay questions

1. ‘The concept of resurrection of the body is incoherent’ Discuss

2. ‘By definition, a miracle can never happen.’ Discuss

3. ‘Philosophers have proved conclusively that religious language is meaningful’ Discuss

4. ‘God is most clearly revealed to humanity through scripture’ Discuss

5. ‘Assertions such as “God is love” cannot be falsified, so are completely meaningless.’ Discuss

6. ‘Theories of life after death do not provide a solution to the problem of evil.’ Discuss

7. Assess Hume’s reasons for rejecting miracles.

8. ‘The verification principle offers no real challenge to religious belief.’ Discuss

9. Discuss the view that religious experiences must be true because there is a common core to all of them.

10. How far does Swinburne’s argument for the existence of God based on religious experience succeed in overcoming the challenges to it? [35]

11. Critically assess the philosophical problems raised by the belief that God is omnipotent. [35]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analogy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bliks</td>
<td>An unverifiable and un-falsifiable interpretation of one’s experience. For example religious beliefs are bliks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coherent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disembodiment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dualist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empirical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equivocal language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eschatological verification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamental</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language games</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materialist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miracle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mysticism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural theology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noetic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-cognitive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-propositional revelation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numinous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propositional revelation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realism</td>
<td>The world exists objectively &amp; independently of the ways we think or describe it. To interpret religious statements in a realist way involves asserting these statements are made either true or false by something that exists objectively and independent of the way we think about it or describe it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revealed theology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soul</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special revelation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthetic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcendent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univocal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via Negativa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Religious Language

Cognitive Statements
Vienna Circle
- Based on empiricism of Locke & Hume
- Group of philosophers in ’20s w/ common approach to philosophy that emphasised importance of sense experience & of using logical analysis to solve philo problems inc. Schlick & Carnap
- Only propositions that can be verified empirically have meaning
- Only accepted 2 types of language: a prior & a posteriori

Verification Principle
In order to distinguish what is meaningful, came up with verification principle - we know the meaning of a statement if we know the conditions un which the statement is true or false, otherwise meaningless
- God, ethics, art & metaphysics meaningless as can’t be verified empirically
- Existence of God is a meaningless issue as it cannot be discussed (death of 1000 qualifications)
- This opened a debate on the function of RL - some claimed it served diff function from other speech & in this context of infinite, language is meaningful vs. logical positivists
- RL used to consider things beyond experience û discussion of God not based on common ground, equivocal leads to diff interpretations & understandings of words used

Evaluation
1. Kuhn - what is considered truth now in science will later be proved wrong. Same as EL, can’t anchor theory to science
2. Hick - eschatological verification + ontological argument is tautological
3. Similar to ethical naturalism
4. Emphasis on empiricism - Plato + idealism
5. Bultmann’s demythologising the Bible is a propositional approach

Weak Verification
1. Later realised that we accept some scientific & historical propositions which haven’t been verified w/ certainty + influenced by meeting Vienna circle û strong & weak verification
2. Different from VC by arguing we don’t have to conclusively prove something by direct observation, just suggest how it could be verified
3. Allows statements of emotion & scientific predictions to be meaningful while religion is still not
4. Ayer eventually accepted it was too broad allowing for anything to count as meaningful

Evaluation
- Some religious principles e.g. Jesus’ life is provable + couldn’t you argue for design argument?
- Using scientific principles to explain religion = science vs. religion debate
- Intuitive idea that statements that lack verification lack substance (Wittgenstein ‘if we can never go wrong then can we ever go right?’)

Flew – Falsification Principle
1. Originates in Popper’s philosophy of science – statements are scientific if our empirical experiences could potentially falsify them. This is what distinguishes science from non-science, as that which is impossible to disprove is not a valid theory
2. Improved by stating RL can’t ever be proven false using Wisdom’s parable of gardeners
3. Nothing can count against their beliefs, shift goalposts so much claims so watered down barely statements. God dies a ‘death of a thousand qualifications’
4. Differs from logical positivism as relied on falsification not ver + based on knowledge not believing

Evaluation
- Do religious die ‘death thousands qualifications?’ difference between qualification & clarification
- Some statements can’t be falsified but still have meaning (Swinburne toys + Schrödinger’s cat)
Is it right to compare RL w/ scientific statements? Maybe both verification & falsification wrong, religion is not to do w/ assertions but should be understood as symbolic etc.

R.M. Hare - Flew didn't understand nature of belief. They're one of many of our 'bliks', which are non-cognitive & therefore neither falsifiable nor verifiable + parable of lunatic yet still have meaning.

EVALUATION

- Idea of 'blik' unhelpful for religious believers. His analogy of lunatic reduces religion to interpretation of the world that could be sane or insane (Nietzsche). It's truth & falsity that religious concerned about, not just interpretation of world.
- Believers see themselves making factual claims not just engaging in a way of seeing the world.

Mitchell - believers are not blind to the problems of faith, just don't let it count decisively against (same thing?) e.g. partisan + use qualifiers. His analogy suggests there could be empirical observations, which could count against particular blik: provisional hypotheses, vacuous formulae, sig articles of faith (Flew argues as they fall into 3rd category can't be falsified). RL are assertions, not just blik as Hare says.

EVALUATION

- Flew's parable could be used in response - if religion makes assertions then we come up against problem of qualification, when pushed very assertion has to be qualified.
- Nietzsche on faith.
- Via Negativia / Apophatic way the way of the negative + 'apophasis' = negation.
- Mystics e.g. St John on the cross accept statements about God not accurate due to being greater than comprehension & ineffable. Rather than having no knowledge of God, negative statements can be made.
- Language when applied to God is equivocal. By saying what God is not we can arrive in a limited way to an understanding. Influential in Judaism.

Origins

- Plotinus used this method to describe form of the good where he argued could be known through secret knowledge. Good is separate from the world & is unknowable (good/God link).
- Christian writer Pseudo-Dionysius speaks about God as being beyond assertion or description. Making positive statements results in anthropomorphic ideas.
- Jewish emphasise VN where pos statements improper & disrespectful by bringing him down to human level, only pos statement is that he exists everything else should come from VN.

EVALUATION

- Doesn't reduce or disrespect God in human level, only way to convey his transcendence.
- Supports idea God is beyond description and experience of him is ineffable.
- Results in limited understanding + still making pos statements just inversed.
- Goes against religious teachings where you can accurately talk about God.

Wittgenstein

Based on The Tractatus where he argued anti-realist non-cognitive purpose of language is enable representation of the world. Highly influential 'Whereof one cannot speak, thereof one should remain silent' taken by logical positivists to mean we cannot speak meaningfully about God, although unlikely.

- Supported logical positivists but rejected verification principle. Meaning of words is in their use as agreed upon group 'language game'.
- Wittgenstein saw earlier work as exemplifying language as method of science.
- Became interested in analysing how words are used - role is to let the fly out of the fly bottle. Meaning of words not mystically fixed, more important is how they're used e.g. relativity, which helps to create our perspective of the world (blik).
- Words are tools, they're moves on a chess board that we making playing various language games.
• Can’t create private language (Descartes) as language is a social product. He’d denied the 1st person certainty that had underlined both rationalist & empirical approaches to philo
• Similar to category of mistake where non-religious apply their language game to religion

Language games
In Philosophical Investigations argued the meaning of a word is just how it used in our language in particular contexts
1. Language analogous w/ playing a game w/ rules. Each word only make sense against backdrop of other words within the game
2. Although not religious, realised it couldn’t be analysed via narrow criteria of verification as it can’t be spoken of and analysed in scientific way, as it’s not the same sort of thing. It gives an important interpretation of human life to those who are in that language game (can those outside of it talk about it?) this is synonymous with Fideism (Flew qualifications)
3. RL only understood by those who take part in that game implying no one outside can criticise
4. Religious believe they are making objective statements e.g. ‘Jesus is the son of God’
5. D.Z. Phillips
6. Wittgenstein prevents philosophy of religion as no one who is outside the game can criticise it
7. He deviates from Wittgenstein’s approach by arguing some propositions caused by religious language exist because we take them literally

EVALUATION
• RL not isolated & therefore non-believers can understand
• Non-believers may be better at understanding than religious due to objectivity
• Religion & science best demonstration of language games (also it’s downfall of overlap)
• Who makes the rules? Can they be challenged? If so, by whom?

Non-cognitive language
All culturally relative, equivocal, non-cognitive & anthropocentric e.g. Hume

Analogy
Due to anthropocentric, God is secondary analogate, no. of ways around inc. remotion & excellence + Aquinas
1. Rejected idea RL can be univocal
2. Only have normal language to use in application to God who is far greater, therefore need analogies
3. Analogies are only option available given the difficulties of making univocal or equivocal statements about ineffable & transcend God where via Negativia doesn’t allow for anything to be said, univocal can’t be applied to transcendent & infinite being (God is good) and equivocal leaves us unable to understand what words mean when applied to God and consequently RL becomes meaningless
4. We can talk about God by way of analogy - understanding something complex by understanding how related to something more similar & simple

Language can’t be literal & writers of scripture do use analogies but this should be extended to all terms about God. Two different ways:

Analogy of Attribution
• As God created world, his nature is reflected in the qualities of the world + imago dei (pantheism)
  e.g. medicine healthy from fact urine is healthy. Similarly we can deduce God is good from the fact that Ghandi is good (POE)
• Analogies we ascribe to each other are a reflection of God’s qualities
• When we see this qualities in others, we are able to make analogies with God’s attributes

Analogy of Proportion
• When we say God is good, must realise that the property is relative to his infinite nature
• While can’t convey him completely, gives us some knowledge & understanding
Evaluation

- Says nothing about God’s existence
- Analogy has to have some shared understanding for basis for comparison, not possible when speaking about God + still reduces him down to human level.
- Proportion - we can’t know what properties like goodness mean when applied to God
- Assumes similarities between humans & God (imago dei link)
- Could be argued that the Bible is analogy – Wiles, liberalism & threat to C
- Avoids twin pitfalls of agnosticism and anthropomorphism
- Hick – make some statements about God but still preserve degree of mystery in JC theology
- Scotus – too vague and leaves us unable to understand God and his actions

Ian Ramsay
1. Our language is like a model which gives us some understanding of what is
2. To understand a model we need qualifiers so as not take literal & thus limit e.g. add infinite to good
3. We use many different models to understand what God is like
4. Evaluation
5. Avoids difficulties of understanding RL univocally or equivocally + via Negativia as we can say something pos about God’s nature
6. Knowing what qualifier needed requires we can know & speak about God’s nature directly

Tillich - Symbol
1. RL is symbolic & communicates most sig beliefs as it opens up new levels of reality e.g. flag
2. Symbol expresses that beyond rational recognition. Avoids being bogged down like Nicodemus
3. Only non-symbolic statement that can be made about God is that ‘God is the ground of being’ – which can only be known through symbols
4. Symbols also cog statements ‘a symbol participates in that to which it points’ we can learn something about God but our words are symbolic rather than literal
5. Views symbols as having both positive & negative aspects - can’t adequately describe God their meaning is always partially negated by that to which they point + by pointing to God it’s a credible alt to analogy and can transcend knowledge of him
6. The Bible makes use of symbol e.g. God as rock, shepherd etc.

EVALUATION
✓ Not cognitive, symbols function similar way to art & tell us nothing about external reality just about our own human experience
✓ If not literally true, difficult to see what they do say (views of logical positivists)
✓ Can be trivialised & lose meaning e.g. modern use of the cross
✓ A symbol is meant to point to something for understanding, how can you point to God?
✓ Reflects ideas of ineffability + mod theology suggests this is how much of bible was written – Jesus’ resurrection & LAD? + suggests C’s have little contact
✓ No way of knowing if appropriate as can’t represent beyond human experience
✓ They can become the focus of worship in themselves

Myth

Myths often ask ultimate questions & to communicate objective truths. Vital function is that of a narrative which embodies and expresses claims that can’t be expressed in any other way. They can give cognitive knowledge of God e.g. ex nihilo & is omnibenevolent, but is non-cognitive approach

- Enlightenment period suggested crude miraculous bible owed their form to the narrators whom didn’t understand scientific causality (religion as adaptation)
- Bultmann - suggested we may understand parts of bible as myths ‘demythologise the Bible’ in apologetic way to find kerygma that 20th C logic would understand + impossible to hold both science and NT as equally true (Wiles support)
Rather than understanding all of the bible as literally true, must recognise certain stories are myths that communicate values of C

Myths not literal but deep objective truth that requires existential response + inspires action & response. Similar to symbol in that it points to objective truth and often to another reality

Demythologise the Bible - work out what objective/moral truth is being expressed. Suggested gospels show little more than Jesus existed, preached & was crucified. Miracles added later should be regarded as statements of faith

The literal truth of such accounts unimportant to the teaching of Jesus

EVALUATION

° However, may be so intrinsic anti-realist it's indispensible part of RL language game
° Challenge to Christianity, especially evangelicalism
° Some would argue that it is a disagreement over literal truths that separate the diff religions
° The attempt to demythologise misunderstands the power of myths. Possible that part of msg being expressed cannot do so as powerfully/at all directly (ineffability of language & symbol link)
° While liberating for those who struggle to accept stories as literal, difficult to interpret myths + make the distinction with literal truths & fictional stories + who's qualified to make judgement?
° How can we be sure that we understand the right truth? e.g. stewardship vs. dominion
° If there is a truth to be expressed, it should be able to do so directly & only then can they be subjected to rational assessment e.g. falsification
° Where do you draw the line? God?

Religious Experience

William James was an psychologist, physiologist & philosopher. Bought up w/ strong Christian teachings, interested in phenomenology & pragmatism

1. Most important book on RE influencing Russell & Wittgenstein. In it, James aims to survey various types of RE as a psych & to present findings as implications for philo
2. Phenomenological focus - RE if they apprehend them to be what they consider divine
3. Gives psych analysis of religious tendencies e.g. sick soul one who focuses on hell etc.

EVALUATION

° Can you dismiss teachings as 2nd hand? + RE only happen to the religious
° Wiles - RE damage faith, far from heart of religion

Characteristics of experience

1. Recognises importance RE serves, but this don't necessarily make it true
2. Nonetheless, hold view (but doesn't attempt to prove it) that as a result of RE 'further limits of out being plunge into an altogether other dimension of existence'
3. Focuses on phenomenon as sees it fundamental to faith, keeping it in place & change lives e.g. Paul's conversion + Wittgenstein - faith more than just propositional
4. Teachings 2nd hand. These dev later as indivs reflect on the experience - only actual experience that can be regarded as true religion
5. RE are psych phenomena but this isn't argument against validity just means they come naturally + counter sceptics idea of psych disorder
6. Doesn't provide arguments for existence of God & leaves issue open to question

Criteria for experience

Difficulty of providing definition of ME so proposed following 4 criteria which are sufficient to mark out states of consciousness peculiar enough to deserve special name & study = mysticism:
° Passive - not initiated by mystic rather sense something is acting upon them (FWD)
° Ineffable - experience beyond proper or adequate description e.g. love & St. Teresa of Avila
- Noetic - despite ineffability not just feelings, deep & direct knowledge of God, possib revelation + authority
- Transient - temp & hard recall but affects profound & LT e.g. alt perception & can dev/deepen w/ more

RE not unequivocally supporting God's existence, but what is unequivocal is existence & ability to unite w/ something larger than ourselves. In that union we find our greatest peace

**EVALUATION**
- Similarities w/ schizophrenia & drugs - only applies to certain types of RE e.g. Swinburne's categorisation

**Conclusions**
Draws on knowledge of psych in accepting RE as psych phenomena but this doesn't limit them to brain, argues RE may also have supernatural element. Conclusions rest on 3 principles:
1. **Empiricism** - they're based on empiricism of continuity of consciousness w/ a wider spiritual envi from which the ordinary man is shut off + empirical effects = have to conclude must be truth in it
2. **Pluralism** - various religions are similar. RE experience same ultimate reality, differences lie in secondary belief structure
3. **Pragmatism** - truth not fixed & what is true is whatever has value for us. Therefore, observing effects of ME have to conclude that there is truth to be found in religion

**EVALUATION**
- Psych nature creates some objectivity but doesn't tell us anything useful at philo level e.g. reveals nothing about metaphysics. However, James would accept this - believes in pragmatism
- Doesn't prove existence of God but supports adaptation + strength of his modesty
- Strengths of starting from phenomenological perspective
- Self-defeating - if RE appear to have psych explanation they can't be thought of as religious

**Numinous experience**
RE of wonder in presence of almighty transcendent God. Invokes awareness of relative insignificance. Biblical examples including Isaiah 'I live among a people of unclean lips & my eyes have seen thing King'

**Rudolf Otto**
1. Religion must derive from a being that is totally separate from this world. It's in the presence of such a being that numinous experience occurs
2. Influenced by Kant phenomenon/noumenon - God can't be known via senses or logical argument
3. It's an experience of being acted upon by 'wholly other' making us aware creatures of almighty vs. MEX seeks unity of all things (similar to James)

**Mysterium tremendum**
1. RE mysterious & ineffable. Invokes awe-inspiring terror at being aquatinted w/ 'wholly other'
2. Yet also fascinans - convinced & drawn by them, they determine how we interp the world after RE
3. Not able to know God unless he chooses to reveal himself through numinous experience. It's felt on emotional level as deepest cog apprehension + imply no further RE (contradicts James)
4. RE key to understanding religions. Claimed 'no religion in which it doesn't live as the innermost core & w/o it no religion would be worthy of the name'

**EVALUATION**
- Notion of God as entirely separate is problematic - deism? + JC
- Makes sense to say if experience is true it is 'wholly other' compared to James' psych explanation
- Some see RE as 'union experiences' i.e. Hindu ideas of making us aware of our essential unity. Our relationship w/ God seems too submissive in Otto's analysis

**Other understandings**
1. **Schleiermacher** - agreed w/ Otto that RE primarily emotions, which are deeper than reason. These RE not numinous but at feeling of absolute dependence upon divine (James' noetic) & central to religion. Theology arises afterwards as people reflect on the RE (James & Otto)

2. **Buber** - RE analogues to intimate personal relationships 'I-thou relationships' mutual interaction & felt by experiencing God vs. 'I-it relationship' have w/ objects or treating people as objects (Kant). Otto’s analysis of RE makes our experience more I-it than I-thou

3. **Kierkegaard** - faith is a miracle & only way God can be known is leap of faith. Faith arose through human experience, which could inc. RE

4. **Wittgenstein** - distinction between 'seeing-as' and 'experiencing-as'

### Visions and voices

**Visions:**
1. Corporeal visions - physical object & knowledge gained e.g. Joseph Smith & Muhammad
2. Imaginative visions - happen in dreams, may communicate knowledge
3. Intellectual visions - experience rather than observation but far too profound to be confused w/ imagination e.g. St. Teresa 'I was conscious of Him, for neither w/ eyes of body or soul did I see anything'

**Evaluation**
- In what sense can it be a vision of it's not corporeal?
- If it is a physical object then why can't it always be seen publically? Gods' mysterious way

**Voices:**
1. Revelatory - reveals something about God
2. Authoritative - message communicated has God's authority
3. Disembodied - voice appears to come from no particular body
   - a. Key is the communication of knowledge & as w/ visions, carry authority & have profound effect
   - b. Usually voice of God, or as in Muhammad revelation, voice of angel mediating words of God
   - c. Need not be audible like Paul's conversion, some C refer to 'still small voice'
   - d. RE not always supernatural e.g. Augustine. May be natural events that we interp as religiously sig

**Evaluation**
- How can we est. either are from God? e.g. Augustine. Gave problem of schiz e.g. Sutcliffe (conscience link)
- Also, some observed that experiences such as visions & voices often linked to phys factors such as fasting - often associated w/ religion
- St. Teresa of Avila - has to fit w/ C teaching & leave person feeling at peace (v. convenient + assumes prior knowledge of the will of God - doesn't convince RE sceptics)

**Conversion and Corporate experience**

**Conversion**
1. Although inner experience not empirically detectable, resulting change in behaviour is
2. Conversions are considered evidence as they are such rapid change believers see it as evidence - unconscious & involuntary most believable

**James**
1. As w/ all RE, truth found in results = dramatic changes does count as empirical evidence
2. Some will never be converted because of narrow-mindedness/cynicism (God's omnipotence?)
3. St Paul's conversion was 'subconscious incubation'.
4. Sudden change v. real for those experiencing it, for Methodists salvation not truly received unless they've been through crisis of sort, sense of miracle rather than natural process, even when natural was inspired by divine
Evaluation

- Psychologically, dramatic changes can occur, especially in face of crisis
- Starbuck - drew parallels between RE & teen identity crisis when most conversions take place
- Freud - often happen to vulnerable who lacked attachment (psych adaptation link)
- Beyond verification? E.g. Wittgenstein
- No way of distinguishing objectivity (science & religion link)

Corporate experiences
1. Public/shared RE which often result in change of behaviour, lifestyle or attitude (conversion link)
2. Subsequent phenomena in these meetings e.g. Toronto blessing & evangelical Christians including uncontrollable weeping, laughing & speaking in tongues as holy spirit descended upon them
3. Supporters of these blessings took these events as sign of 'new move' of God
4. Sceptics suggests mass hysteria & copious psych evidence supports this + examine scripture & question whether experiences fit w/ what is revealed of God's nature

Evaluation

1. Could be class as conspiracy to prove particular religious doctrine (happen to large groups of religious believers not atheists)
2. Easily explained mass hysteria + shared desire which is multiplied by crowd & manipulated (Marx)

Do shared experiences carry more authority?
- RE only authority for the indiv who experiences them
- Particularly interested in effects of RE on people's lives w/ validity of RE resting upon pos effects it produces. Sig that the RE have dramatic impact
- Offers argument for God in v. general terms w/ RE pointing to higher order of reality not necessarily proving God's existence (pluralism) & provide knowledge of God not otherwise available
- Recognises psych explanation, but sees as verifying need for higher spirituality not falsifying

Argument from experience

If there is a God we would experience him, we do = there is a God
1. Through prayer, conversion etc. & can't be explained by empiricism (Hume & Swinburne)
2. Believers suggest his involvement understandable, accepted & expected 'personal being' v. others suggest POE & FW issues (Wiles + Swinburne) = argument from experience based on interaction
3. However, some would argue reveals himself too much, limiting FW + partisan God
4. Profound effects, range of experiences, quantity & similarities. Others take general approach of revelation in creation etc. (teleological argument) demanding spiritual recognition
5. Some argue conversion is an easily verifiable proof - but psych challenges

Evaluation

- Linked to environmental context, upbringing & openness (James + Freud conscience)
- Requires consciousness (Descartes & Dawkins)
- Makes logical fallacy of affirming the consequent Modus Ponens - big leap (Ockham + leap of faith?)
- Only way to know is through testimony which require spirituality recognition (cog bias)
- Problems of objectivity - Kierkegaard no objective way of reaching God
- Problems of verification - subjective (Hare - blik), small testimony, different types of revelation (James) & drugs+ Hume vs. faith (Nietzsche)
- Often don't involve God, rather mystical union or messengers (could be indirect proof)
- Lack of correspondence & coherence theory vs. pragmatic theory e.g. James (psych explanations)
- Ayer - if claims ineffable then everything beyond is nonsense. Only gives insight into state of mind

It only carries weight if religious!!!!

James
1. Points towards higher being/state experience which man normally shut off, not necessarily JC
2. RE has authority only for those experiences
3. Though it sig that RE seem to have life changing impact
4. Gives knowledge of 'God' not otherwise available
5. Saw that it could be part of psych, but doesn't see as criticism but support (evo of religion)

**Swinburne**
1. RE possib public, perhaps breaking laws of nature, or private in dreams etc.
2. Unfair to treat RE any diff to ordinary perceptual claims
3. Certain principles which should be applied when analysing reports of RE or any perceptual claim:
   - Principle of credulity - ought to believe what we're told/see unless clear evidence of contrary
   - Principle of testimony - unless evidence they are misremembering or untrustworthy, should believe them
     a. Linked to credulity, offers 3 reasons to reject RE: hallucinating, proof God doesn't exist or clear evidence events not caused by God
     b. Doesn't accept that it's a problem of testimony that only religious get RE - they're only people w/ prior beliefs that make them able to recognise experiences as religious (James/Otto disagree)

**EVALUATION**
✓ Are RE really the same as ordinary perceptions?
✓ Have such pos & dramatic effects does suggest God
✓ Considerable similarities between descriptions that might not be present if not real
✓ Various other explanations that discount God given RE
✓ Russell - due to private experience, rejects argument as impossible to confirm or deny that is happening inside someone else
✓ Unless take James' argument, not all believers can be right

**Challenges**

**Secular explanations**
1. Feuerbach - idea of God human projection + adaptation - naïve physics, animism, attachment etc.
2. Voltaire - 'if God didn't exist it would be necessary to invent him'
3. Freud + Marx
4. Evaluation
5. Jung - dev of spiritual aspect of us was essential to psych wholeness. Each of us have archetype within a shared collective unconscious (supports adaptation not God)
6. James - accepted RE psych dimension but didn't agree this meant RE were pure psych (speculative)

**Physiological explanations**
1. Causal operator & holistic operator within brain in fMRI of Buddhist meditation
2. Phys proof of psych adaption
3. God helmet - doesn't disprove God but suggests psych basis of RE
4. Can reject RE w/ some confidence but not God or God directed phys/psych experience
5. Logically impossible to experience God
6. Kant - senses can only experience empirical phenomena. May be reality beyond our experience 'noumena' but impossible for us to experience it as matter of logic
7. C teachings that God is beyond knowing & out of time (eternal interp)
8. Evaluation
9. Speculative to claim God only can exist outside of empirical phenomena
10. Advanced monkey / blind people analogy (also for schiz so doesn't support God)

**Revelation**
There is a debate over nature of revelation because it is seen as most important within philosophy of religion. The stance which one takes would seem to determine how we understand all of religion inc. faith, relationship, language etc.

Types of revelation
- General - available to all people at all times & places e.g. conscience & design argument
- Special - God revealing himself to particular people at definite times & places inc. sacred writings
  1. Not necessarily competing schools - both reveal something about nature of God
  2. If we assume Bible is special revelation, question remains as to way in which scripture was revealed. Was he revealing propositional or non-propositional?
  3. Fideism - faith is independent of reason due to religion being an attitude + faith can't occur as result of rational argument. Some suggest Wittgenstein defend for of fideism 'Wisdom is passionless but faith is passion'

Propositional - when God revealed himself to writers of scripture he revealed truths about himself. In order to accept God's revelation, required to believe certain propositions are true (RL). Contradictions are human failure to understand Aquinas as supporter, faith can be described as 'belief that', distinguished between natural theology & revealed theology. Revealed becomes natural - infeuntial for CC

EVALUATION
- Reflects trad thought of accepting/rejecting certain propositions. These accept/reject propositions separates diff religions (James)
- God is supposed to be beyond expression & understanding? e.g. Jews
- Hick - right reason can assert God's existence but only through proposition can we know more
- Wittgenstein - faith can't turn upon the truth or falsity of a proposition (Kierkegaard objectivity)
- Kohlberg - lower level of conscience

Non-propositional - more modern approach (relativity) to see God as revealed via ineffable RE to writers which they later reflect on & attempt to put into words (James) not facts & truths communicated but attitude & relationship, more 'belief in' (RL non-cog link). Not divine command, but divinely inspired

EVALUATION
- Supports mod relativity & understanding of God beyond expression
- Accounts for contradictions through interpretation
- Many would argue that if religion doesn't have basis on factual propositions then it becomes entirely empty - doesn't mean it can't communicate truth however + can for ineffability
- Means religious pluralism only separated on attitude - far more than that

Fundamentalism and liberalism
1. Our understanding of nature of revelation will affect our take on liberalism/fundamentalism
2. Fundamentalism - propositional understanding vs. Liberalism - non-propositional where contradictions arise from ineffability & human writing them + attitudes imparted on Bible
3. Many argue divinely inspired, some suggest every word intended by God whereas liberal argue just general meaning is God's intention affected by cultural historical context (VE - C morals relative?)
4. Tensions arise in miracles & morality interpretation + literals criticise cherry picking

Can we trust the Bible?

No
1. Religious persecuted scientists such as Galileo & rejected Darwin due to Biblical teaching (still is)
2. Writing of Bible v. human process (depends on type of C
3. Bible interp in so many & some ideas not applicable today
4. Belief in Bible causes a lot of difficulties & conflict between those who believe in other faith
5. Historical accounts
6. New vs. Old
7. Different ways of interpreting - led to fragmentation of church e.g. virgin Mary
8. It’s written by humans, often based on RE & then chosen by those in authority (conservative agree w/ human error but argue still reliable)
9. Davies - not until middle ages all collected. This influenced choice of what was inc. + due to variations no true ‘bible’
10. Liberals would suggest possib trust in symbolic etc. meaning, but alts to Bible e.g. oral tradition (Dawkins on Bible as moral authority)
11. John even admitted his views on homosexuality were not Jesus’

Yes
1. Difficulties between religion & science due to literal interp (who’s to say it’s not? RL link)
2. Fact that humans involved in writing doesn’t mean there are mistakes – God guided (bias)
3. The Bible influences & is followed by many, can change lives (doesn’t mean we can trust!)
4. Many theologians believe OT historically correct (ha) + literalism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Miracles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Many believe whole essence of C is based upon miracles: One might argue to reject view that God performs miracles is to reject the whole of C itself</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Definitions of miracle**

Miracles are violations
1. Hume - although sceptical about their occurrence, defined them as ‘transgression of a natural law by a particular violation of the deity’
2. Violation definition key claim is a violence or breaking of natural law e.g. Moses in Exodus

**Evaluation**
1. Assumes we know what the laws of nature are (Kuhn) + exist, quantum physics (dangerous to root belief in science inc. RL & EN) + theological ideas of God creating natural laws & Hick’s idea of post hoc creation
2. His definition actually supports a God
3. McKinnon - if laws of nature merely describe the actual course of events, then to define miracles in this way is to call it an event that disrupts actual course of events which is self-contradictory

**Religious significance**
1. One problem w/ miracles is that events that may appear to be coincidences are excluded
2. Swinburne - science shows laws of nature in-deterministic. God’s intervention will simply be matter of working within ‘laws’ of nature
3. R.F. Holland - famous example of boy on railway shows that miracles not necessarily violations of nature but any event that person experiences as having religious sig. Accepts problems of assessing whether or not something is miracle but doesn’t see this as a problem as it misses the point
4. Tillich - signs religious sig & reveal God w/ ecstatic experience not emphasising supernatural characterises (RL). Fits w/ Biblical ideas of Jesus as worker of sings no miracles mentioned

**Evaluation**
✓ Only in-deterministic on quantum not macro level
✓ Dawkins - not surprising interp coincidences as sig but can’t claim miracles. Only reflect placebo
✓ Are we still taking about miracles? + drugs can fit all criteria
✓ Hume’s definition given for a reason - everything can be counted as miracle w/ religious sig + where do we draw the line? i.e. only dependent on interpretation? Wittgenstein - private language: if there’s no means of public verification then it becomes meaningless
✓ Does faith cause miracles or do miracles cause faith?

Aquinas
1. God can do which nature can't
2. Nature can do, but not in that order
3. God did which nature can but w/o forces of nature

**Biblical miracles**

Importance for Christian's - support existence, sign of God' continued active, immanence I prayer, resurrection foundation, show Jesus is God + his providence

**Old Testament**

- Generally acts of God that support & help the faithful + demonstrate glory & omnipotence + bring punishment on the wicked or those who oppose God's people
- Central miracle in OR is events surrounding the exodus from Egypt. Tell of Moses standing before Pharaoh asking Israelites to be freed. W/ each refusal, plagues affect only Egyptians & culminate in death of first-born & cross of the Red Sea. Egyptians who cross were killed as waters return

**New Testament**

Centre on Jesus w/ over 30 recorded miracles. Scholars divide them into categories:

- Healing
- Exorcisms
- Nature miracles

These are recorded by writers of the gospels. They show that Jesus is the Messiah & new era being unveiled through him. Show that God will have final victory in the age to come

**EVALUATION**

- Does the differences between OT & NT disprove God?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Understanding miracles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science advances led many educated C to abandon belief that events described actually happened.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can/should we believe in miracles in a literal sense?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Fundamentalist + controversial - world of God, therefore literal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Form critics argued key to understanding miracles was understanding period where the stories were passed by word of mouth i.e. hermeneutic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Bultmann - demythologised NT. By removing supernatural elements, argued it's possible to get closer to real message of God rather than the miraculous interp of early church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Swinburne - if do exist would point to existence of agents other than humans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EVALUATION**

- Hume + verification principle show that often just coincidences & bias both conscious & not
- Do they really occur? e.g. Loudes (Marx)
- They're pointless + point to partisan God
- Ockham's razor

**Jesus' resurrection**

1. Seen as key event in history of C. Confirms son of God & demonstration he is able to give his followers eternal life
2. For most Christians it is essential to believe the resurrection was real event even if doubt other miracles
3. For others, shouldn't be taken literally: 'Evidence of the texts, nature of the trad & general facts about the way people all over the world rapidly believe appropriate stories to support the religious beliefs leave me wholly uncertain about the Empty Tomb as literal' - Bishop of Durham

**Problems with interventionist interpretation**

Miracles showed that God is imminent & omnipotence. However, were also understood as signs - more religious sig than Hume definition. Didn't have concept of 'laws of nature' so miracles were seen through them as evidence of God's will

1. Problem of bias (psych analysis of OT)
2. Problem Of Evil - arbitrary & partisan God

**EVALUATION**

- Explanations for POE exist
- Arrogant to assume God's will falls in line w/ human rationality + greater plan
- Fail to recognise God's activity in the world?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theoretical argument</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Laws of nature been supported innumerably over period of hundred of years to show resurrection impossible. An apparent miracle that seems to break these laws would need to outweigh this amalgamation of evidence - miracles are wrong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Probability of miracle happening so slight it's irrational to believe in them + laws of nature are uniform &amp; constant (quantum). As empiricist no substantive evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. No testimony is sufficient to est. miracle unless testimony such a kind that its falsehood would be more miraculous than the fact which it endeavours to est.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EVALUATION**

- Problems w/ definition in reliance on laws of nature - Hick, Kuhn, religious etc. |
- Problems of induction inc. probability & stats. Would accept & claim past evidence something we rely on in everyday life |
- Part of human nature to sometimes accept improbable, nature of faith. However, doesn't justify it yet haven't justified rationality of probability |
- Would mean we would have to reject many past events e.g. space exploration |
- What is meant by sufficient? |
- Related to RL Ayer's weak verification

**Practical argument**

1. No miracle attested by a sufficient no. of men, of such unquestioned good sense or education as to secure us against all delusion |
2. Natural psych tendency towards wonder, emotion etc. exploited by religious w/ some knowing the truth but continuing to spread (Marx) + natural tendency for gossip, exaggeration & sensationalism |
3. Only amongst ignorant & barbarous nations that miracles are reported & believed |
4. All religions claim miracles. Probability weakens w/ each further contradictory claim = cancel out

**EVALUATION**

- Appeal to laws of nature contradictory to his belief they are psych habit based on what we repeatedly see e.g. no good reason to expect sun to rise |
- Miracles are claimed today - not ignorant or barbarous nations (but uneducated) |
- James - miracles show human interpretation & point towards one higher existence |
- Swinburne - testimonies are not the only evidence

**Swinburne's response**

1. Important to be clear what the laws of nature are - not necessarily fixed truths but statistical |
2. Miracles by definition are rare. If they weren't it would be confusing + encourage idleness

**Definition** - goes against our current generalisation but not enough for us to modify them

**Practical argument** - range doesn't cancel 1 another out as most don't purport to est. truth of particular religion, synonymous w/ James + divide & conquer methodology

**Theoretical argument** - need to treat reports of miracles like reports of any past events i.e. weigh up evidence & conclude rather than being sceptical immediately + get as much as possible
4 types of historical evidence w/ varying degrees of reliability: own memory, other testimony, physical consequences & scientific info about what is possible - if such evidence is not sufficient to est. miracles, neither is it sufficient to est. certainty of natural law

EVALUATION

✓ None of 4 criteria have any reliability
✓ Hume points out own problems of induction himself + hasn't undermined 'no testimony sufficient'

Flew
1. Agree that can't be proved & w/ speculation reject them
2. Uses historical approach to strengthen the argument - to fully accept needs to be there (strong ver) & therefore instead have to turn to indirect evidence which is weak verification & through our direct experience of no miracles, reject them

Polkinghorne
1. All that science can tell us is that a given event is against normal expectations not disprove (Kuhn)
2. Key theological question is whether it makes sense to say God has acted in a new way
3. Consequences of laws of nature may change if God deals w/ humans in new way. Jesus’ resurrection brings new age in God's dealing w/ people. He acts through nature not against

Wiles (moral response)

Wanted to explain how God could be seen as showing concern & involved by reinterpretation this in way that avoided issues of biblical times (propositional vs. non & liberal debates). Doesn't reject on basis of scientific of rational as a C, but on moral grounds

Arbitrary and Partisan God
1. Interventionist view raises issue of consistency & fairness. Such a God would be arbitrary & partisan
2. Goodness of God & existence of miracles incompatible e.g. water to wine but not holocaust
3. Better to believe in God doesn’t do any miracle than one who’s not moral - not worthy of worship
4. God can’t suspend the laws of nature often, otherwise no laws

Solution
1. God is creator & sustainer of the world - deism & pantheism
2. Only 1 miracle & that was God’s creation which was good & didn’t require specific intervention
3. In creating the world God puts in place certain natural laws - miracles by definition would be rare
4. If they weren’t, wouldn’t have faith in laws of nature & we would never know when he might intervene (similar to Swinburne)
5. If must be infrequent, would God do such things? Water to wine for embarrassment > holocaust
6. Biblical miracles inc. resurrection symbolic & teach about God + obedience (non-propositional)

EVALUATION

✓ Form of deism & pantheism not theism but Wiles rejects on basis of God's immanence
✓ Is the whole world a miracle? - Swinburne + Hume disagree
✓ Solves POE - doesn't intervene as either can't or is bound by laws of nature (omnipotence)
✓ Doesn't follow Christian trad teachings or consistent w/ Bible (Dawkins). However, doesn't mean wrong + suggest non-literal (does this mean no LAD?)
✓ Not appropriate to make God conform to human rationality. Acts in ways we don't understand. However, cop out + inconsistent w/ C making substantive claims about God
✓ Misses point of miracles: revelation (bloody stupid, demonstrates Wisdom, Flew & Nietzsche)

Problem of evil
Omnipotent - ability to perform miracles
Omnibenevolent - treat everyone equally. Miracles are selective & unfair
Incompatibility = reject on theological grounds, scientific grounds, defend as symbolic, defend as literal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reject miracles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theologically</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Wiles - shouldn’t understand God in literal sense - demythologise the bible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Irenaeus - suffering is necessary for ‘soul-making’. If God intervened would prevent us from growth + come to expect God to constantly perform miracles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Augustine - the fall: we suffer because we’re being punished (omnibenevolence?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Wiles threat to trad C + does he fail to intervene because he can’t or because he chooses not to?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Not inconceivable to suggest God may act seemingly randomly in order to have impact on humans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Miracles act as signs &amp; encourage faith + Bible refers to miracles in some instances as signs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ If God is omnipotent then couldn’t he have found another way for us to achieve likeness?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Scientifically** |
| 1. Nature is closed system w/ fixed laws |
| 2. Nature was created by God & therefore natural evil direct responsibility of God. If he intervened would indicate world wasn’t perfect. If he didn’t his omnibenevolence questioned |
| **Evaluation** |
| ✓ Ignores effect of free will & sin e.g. Augustine both natural & moral evil ours not God’s responsibility. Indicate God may choose to intervene occasionally but not morally obliged to |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Defending miracles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Symbolic stories</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Bultmann - regarded stories in NT as later additions to inspire us to follow God &amp; be moral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Symbolically, teach us about God’s power &amp; J’s compassion. Should inspire us to do similar (VE link)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Eases some difficulties of POE as he’s not arbitrary or partisan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Question still remains if lack of divine intervention is choice or inability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Wouldn’t inspire more faith if they were true?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Even symbolically seems as partisan of out group not human</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Literal belief** |
| 1. Way that God reveals power + beyond our understanding |
| 2. Solve POE by pointing to greater plan where God will defeat evil. He’s omniscient, where we’re not & ought not to question his workings on faith & reason |
| **Evaluation** |
| ✓ Impossible to discuss it as it’s neither falsifiable or verifiable + religious change goal posts + cop out |
| ✓ If God made world but intervenes - threat to all attributes |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Life after Death</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dualism</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plato: key idea is soul being ‘simple’ which can’t be split (Moore: ME if taken metaphorically / soul I &amp; II / RL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Body &amp; soul - body worldly inferior, reliant on senses &amp; prison of the soul which wants to be in the world of forms &amp; longs for truth - it’s LAD and pre-life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Soul has 3 parts: reason, spirit and appetite (Charioteer) which should be balanced [Freud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. He is dualism, materialism, idealism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Argument from knowledge</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recognise something to be true due to a priori process of recollection due to soul previously being in forms. Uses e.g. of Pythagoras' theorem w/ Socrates & slave

**Argument from opposites**

- Whole of philo relies on drawing contrasts between opposites - forms/particulars & so can M&B
- Everything in physical world consists of opposites. For there to be living, there has to be death.
  - For there to be something rather than nothing, soul must exist
- Life thus comes from death, death from life & endless chain of birth, death & rebirth (Hindu)

**Descartes - heir of Platonic thought on the soul**

Mind is in infallible *I think therefore I am* relies on soul (conscience always right link - Newman).

The only thing I can be sure of is my thinking, when I contemplate my body then surely they are distinct - fallacious but offers alt: I can think of myself as just thought and apprehend of such a world. I can imagine God being able to separate me from my body therefore he must (ontological + only true for his knowledge)

1. Body is corporeal mind non-corporeal. Upon physical death soul is able to continue w/ God
2. Rejected naturalistic idea of soul gave life to body & left at death. Our body is spatial but not conscious & even though 2 are separate, unite within the brain w/ soul joined to all parts of body

**Substance Dualism**

1. M&B 2 fundamentally diff substances but interact within the body + don't drive each other
2. Mind infallible & unobservable 'I think therefore I am' (Newman)
3. It's irreducible & can't be explained or measured like monism as more than phys reductionism

**Evaluation**

- Leaning towards idealism? Some go further claiming parellism rather than interaction
- Hume - due to fragility of mind more than likely to be destroyed at death & not survive
- We're never the same person again w/ new cells - soul or problem of consciousness?
- Could Kant's moral argument be seen as proof of LAD?
- Aquinas - soul so connected to body only embodied existence can occur at 2nd coming after purgatory - dualist/monist interact
- Hegel - 'geist'

**Materialism**

**Aristotle: De Anima**

1. Rejected Plato's idea of 2 different realms or that knowledge doesn't belong in empirical world
2. Body is matter & soul is the form e.g. personal characteristics. Form and matter can't be separated e.g. axe analogy/Plato beauty can exist w/o beautiful objects, but for Aristotle it can't (Ryle)
3. It's not something extra that exists in addition to body nor a prison - we are body and soul
4. The soul animates the body by organising a potential living body into an actual one
5. Links w/ Dawkins - rejects idea of soul as trad understood. A fiction that reflects lack of scientific understanding of the nature of consciousness (Skinner link)
6. His understanding of the soul doesn't fit w/ commonplace use of term i.e. substantive seat of personhood that survives after death

**Types of Soul**

Every living creature has a soul but different kind. Hierarchy of souls:

1. Not all living things have souls w/ same innate faculties
2. What distinguishes human soul is intellect & reason (Plato links). Influence C + philo accounts of personal identity (hierarchy of life in eco)

**Life after death**

1. If M&B are fundamentally the same substance then it would seem that the soul could not survive the death of the body (Hick materialism)
2. However, Aristotle did suggest that intellectual thought could possibly be separated from the soul and become eternal in most abstract non-personal platonic a priori sense. But this means personal identity couldn’t be retained after death.

EVALUATION

- Lacks much proof for 4 causes, some argue faith & God are proof for Plato
- Animals show rationality
- Suggest that intellectual thought could be separated is Platonic
- Man in the head discounted by science e.g. neuro & Skinner + who controls him?
- Doesn’t explicitly mention this and there are a lot of contradictions + contradictory
- Aquinas - modified his thinking. Soul is the form of body & therefore body needs the soul to animate it. The 2 are closely linked. However, the mind doesn't age & at death leaves the body to enter purgatory before re-uniting w/ the body at 2nd judgement (similar to Unger)

Gilbert Ryle – category mistake

1. Soul collective noun for personality, category mistake to state ‘ghost in machine’ e.g. university & cricket
2. Individual is a physical living body & nothing else. When body dies, so does the whole person
3. Instead philosophical behaviourism: all mental events are physical events interpreted in mental way
4. Ockham’s razor + Heidegger, category of mistake to claim being

Dawkins

Soul

Bio materialist as far removed from Plato as possible. ‘Cheap trick, which implies that if science can’t explain something, this must mean that some other discipline can’

1. Mythological anachronistic concept invented to explain what we don’t understand about ourselves & mystery of consciousness, God provided easy explanation for gaps in science
2. If scientists suspect the mind is completely scientifically explainable but can’t say how, it is logical to doubt but not legitimate to substitute a word like soul as if that constituted an explanation
3. One day science will be able to explain (weak verification + Watson & Crick)
4. To invoke soul is ‘not an explanation but an evasion’ + damaging to human endeavour
5. Reductionist account of mind, purely phys & NS. Feel like single organism for NS co-op ‘meme’
6. Life lacks purpose, indifferent to suffering & is no God. NS only rational theory w/ genes living on

Mystery of consciousness

Is it something that we can ever hope to scientifically explain, or is it fundamentally different from other more scientific mysteries?

- Our grasp of phenomena states is supplied only by introspection + incomplete grasp of what objectivity of brain and body, but there is a vast chasm between the 2 which is hard to imagine bridged due to no matter how much objectivity, left w/ something we cannot explain subjective ‘hard problem of consciousness’

EVALUATION

- Isn’t his acknowledgment of consciousness the same as what others call soul?
- Jackson - ‘epiphenomenal Qualia’ shows even most objective description of phys facts of consciousness can’t hope to explain the irreducibly subjective nature of consciousness
- Bishop Berkeley - consciousness is the only existence ‘idealism’ ∴ Kierkegaard no external reality
- Sartre - we define our own existence + Godless society ‘everything is free’ + sees consciousness as ultimate freedom for ‘being in-itself’ (FWD link)

Definitions of soul

Soul 1: trad view of a principle of life, dualistic/platonic notion of separate spiritual substance
Soul 2: might be a place for talking about the soul in a metaphorical/symbolic way i.e. high development of mental faculties (RL link). This room exists as long as it doesn’t refer to separate things (avoids dualism at all costs). However, still subject to criticisms of everything subjective is objective

Life after death
1. We are incredibly lucky accidents and therefore should live life to the full rather than relying on false comfort we could survive the death of our body (Marx)
2. Consolation it provides only true if religion is true & we’re able to survive death
3. Death shouldn’t be feared. It’s extinguishing of consciousness, no different to time before birth

Hick
1. Christian theologian who rejects traditional dualism by adopting soft materialism & arguing this doesn’t stop LAD whilst maintaining humans are psycho-somatic unity not trad dualist nor monist
2. No ‘ghost in the machine’ soul is name for moral, spiritual self, formed by N/N interaction (Dawkins link) & ‘behavioural dispositions’ (VE). Talking about soul is talking about whole body
3. If God exists, soul must too
4. Unger - phys continuity necessary for preservation of personal identity as psych in brain

Evaluation
✓ Doesn’t completely rule out M&B diff entities. May be some non-phys existence through BAD evidence of ESP & telepathy ‘mind-brain dualism’ phys & mental aspects could interact but would be depend on each other, so more like Aristotelian monism than trad dualism
✓ Point of sadness over death? Points to lack of belief throughout

Replica theory
1. Influenced by St. Paul resurrection. LAD doesn’t depend on platonic souls/reincarnation
2. Soul can’t be separated from body, on death, divine action of resurrection occurs where exact ‘psycho-physical’ replica created in different place (NY thought experiment)
3. The key to identity is true memory. If the replica remembers their former existence, grounds for claiming that it is the same problem

Evaluation
✓ Perry - thought experiment wrong. Only way to know same person is divine revelation (if that)
✓ What are necessary conditions of identity? + memory problems
✓ Replica must have same ‘consciousness, memory & emotion’ - linked to the same phys body
✓ Problem of multi replicas – logical possibility is a threat: how can something external to me alter what my personal identity consists in?
✓ Where is this alt space? How could there be a temporal unity w/o spatial unity?

Religious beliefs about Life After Death

Resurrection
1. Belief in continuation of human existence after death always been central to C. Resurrection of body based on belief that Jesus rose from the dead - provide prototype for LAD
2. This is why it’s important to C to believe resurrection was physical not ghost like. As early as 1st C Paul can be seen defending bodily resurrection by using e.g. of Jesus
3. Paul - body diff: powers according to scripture walked through walls, not easily recognised & required no food - taken to indicate resurrected bodies diff ‘sown perishable, raised imperishable’
4. Davies - resurrection absurd notion e.g. cannibal possibilities
5. Hick - 3 scenarios
6. While most emphasise idea of unity, others argue more for dualism in judgement day
Trad Christian belief that the resurrection of body occurs at end of the time. Many C argue dualist approach that soul is immediately united w/ God from Bible e.g. thief on cross
1. CC - souls go to purgatory where they experience punishment or purification in order to prep them for Beatific vision, souls then ready to be united w/ resurrection body
2. Protestant - some interpret resurrection as spiritual event that involves souls w/ God w/o need for resurrected bodies vs. resurrection body distinct from present ones in same way Paul argues. Heaven is a community where people recognise 1 another

EVALUATION
✓ Base their belief in resurrection on Jesus’ – he is v. diff from us + faith & evidence (Nietzsche)

Heaven & Hell
1. In NT heaven place w/ God where good people go when they die after day of judgement & speaks of God’s wrath where unrighteous sent to ‘eternal fire’ – seems to contradict omnibenevolence
2. Catholics see eternal life as a timeless beatific vision of God, stemming from Jesus’ death witnesses & in the book of revelations
3. Requires resurrection if taken literally
4. Most accept idea of being w/ God in perfect fulfilment/happiness (Plato & Aristotle influences)
5. Not all even accept existence of hell (where is it?). Context of writing often ignored, metaphors misunderstood, could be seen as just descriptions of what it’s like to be w/o God (RL link + why not think of heaven non-literally?) + Hick - hell as possible on earth, possib description of non-believer & multi worlds (Sartre went as far as to claim separation from people was hell – FW link)

Morality and afterlife

Reasons to behave morally
1. God as judge at the moment of death (sheep & goats)
2. Catholics - actions and forgiveness (requires repentance)
3. For some it’s actions and faith in J as son God (evangelical strand)
4. Religious as HI & Pascal’s wager (Dawkins), hard to justify POE w/o reference to need for moral
5. Kant - need to be moral to achieve summum bonum

Reasons not or no need to behave morally
1. Divine election, related to HD/TD
2. Irenaeus - universalist argument. Behaving morally is faster but not requirement (Plato)
3. No afterlife - atheism, liberal C, idealism (behave morally as a CI - more moral than religious HI)
4. Implies behaving morally direct commandment - Feuerbach morality not part of God’s plan + adaptation, secular conscience etc.

Judaism - early Jewish scripture not much evidence belief in afterlife. LAD God promises Abraham is via deeds of his offspring (RL link). Belief in some form of immortality seems to be present in some of Psalms but only in later Jewish writing e.g. book of Daniels fully dev belief in resurrection present

Islam - like C, always had belief in idea of LAD. Akhira involves separation of righteous from wicked. Believe life is a test & that deeds done in body will be either rewarded for & punished or forgiven for wrongs they've done. Qur'an describes paradise as luxurious garden where believer will see God. Hell place of fire & often seen as eternal, however, seen as inconsistent w/ Muslim belief Allah is all merciful (C link)

Reincarnation

Hindu
Reincarnation is transmigration of the soul from body to body. Involves karma & multiple lives w/ belief soul is eternal (dualism)
1. Status of new body depends upon causal actions in previous incarnation through karma
2. Brahman is pure thought. Created universe is temporal & in part unreal = Maya
3. All living things have atman which is united to physical matter surrounding them
4. Aim of consciousness is for atman to be liberated from repeated cycle of death & rebirth
5. Notion of 'same person' based on memories buried deep in consciousness from trauma of birth
6. Apparent evidence from past life memories e.g. déjà vu, last life regression therapy. Issues arise in scientific explanations, unconscious & hallucinations

EVALUATION
1. More people alive now than ever before
2. Notion of soul seems quite insubstantial + lack of continuity (Swinburne + Hick criticism)
3. What is carried forward when the atman is reincarnated? i.e. what is it to be human?
4. POE - I am responsible for actions I have no seeming connection to + first evil?

Buddhist
1. Everything in the world is transient or impermanent so don't believe in perm soul that's reincarnated into other bodies
2. Annata - 'no self' because of changing nature of everything around us, no unchanging self that journeys through time (Heraclitus river)
3. Rebirth not continuation of identity, rather consciousness becomes contributory causes in new group of materials from which new persons formed - not identical nor completely different, simply aspects of continuing stream of consciousness
4. Awareness of these truths + right living & mediation enables escape cycle & reach Nirvana

EVALUATION
✓ POE - We are suffering as direct result of past actions. However, doesn't solve rather postpones as no adequate explanation exists in 1st place
✓ Identity - on attaining Moksha mediator able to see connection between all lives vs. doesn't solve personal identity adequately as it's difficult to see how memories transferred

Disembodied Existence
LAD theories make appeal to some kind of disembodied existence even if just intermediate stage e.g. purgatory. Question is, is the notion of disembodiment coherent? And can it be proved?

Coherence
1. To accept possibility of DE in dualism must believe that core of our identity is non-physical. Yet this contradicts much of science in Dawkins DNA & neuroscience. If we are to claim coherence must assert that our mental characteristics are key to our identity - psychology
2. Locke - thought experiment of prince & cobbler suggesting coherence, consciousness is the core of personal identity (psych of consciousness shows phys + Singer & hierarchy)
3. Issues w/ consciousness where apparently no science can explain it all (Dawkins weak ver)
4. H.H. Price - mind may survive death of body & exist in mental world w/ similarity of dream where perception formed by mental images but this will be shared in post-death world
5. Hick - inconsistency stating LAD created by our desires & this will be shared as our desires would be diff to others, leading to diff world for each
6. Aquinas - soul so tied to body only embodied existence can occur
7. Dualism make claims to sense of separation (LOS)

EVALUATION
✓ Logical positivists would argue talking about it at all isn't meaningful + contradiction in terms

Evidence
Assuming coherence, proving something that can't be seen is problematic. Intriguing attempts:
Near Death Experiences
1. First document by Dr. Moody - patients claiming out of body experiences during traumatic ops
2. No. of similarities between cases inc. detail of room that couldn’t be known by unconscious
3. Criteria: feeling of disembodiment, ability to observe, absence of phys pain, movement
unrestricted even b nature, sense of bliss, rapid movement down a tunnel, flash of their lives,
told greatest thing is love & not their time to do
4. Further issues arise in cryogenics - are they really dead? Is that LAD then? Is the soul retained?

Evaluation
1. Blackmore - chemical reactions gen by dying brain
2. Faith and proof far apart + bad empiricism beyond any verification e.g. titanic newspaper
3. Personal identity is essential tied to the physical - Ryle category of mistake + Dawkins
4. What connects material being w/ immaterial disembodied soul? Swinburne problem of continuity

ESP and Mediums
H.H Price examines claims of mediums & concludes these are either evidence that disembodies
persons continue to survive in another world. Can communicate w/ this world or unconscious part of
our mind can transmit & receive info telepathically. However, concludes should be cautious about
claiming continued existence. Marx views of profit + easily explained vs. gives meaning (Holland) &
change (James)

Regression
1. Especially children who claim to have memories of past life. Descriptions given sometimes true
2. Others regress under hypnosis

Evaluation
✓ Many other reasons inc. leading questions

Sightings
1. Deepak Chopra - bodies made of energy, which leaves the body & energy may retain the
bodily image 'ghost'. This is the indiv's consciousness manifesting in remaining energy
2. Others argue ghosts are manifestations of dead people - doubted hallucinations as are
corporate (RE issues)

Life after death and problem of evil
❖ Do atheists go to hell? CC contradictory (conscience)

Resurrection
Idea our actions rewarded/punished & those who suffer unjustly are compensated in new life integral
to resurrection. Kant's summum bonum express in logical terms common sense idea that if goodness is
commanded, it ought to be achievable & rewarded in next life. Both Augustine & Irenaeus theodicy
require belief in afterlife & FW, which in turn requires idea of reward/punishment

Augustine Theodicy
1. Evil enters the world by a malfunctioning of the divine scheme. This corruption can't be caused
by God because he can't lack in any way, but FW
2. Death is a consequence of original sin, but God redeems the believer through Christ
3. The city of God - theology of the resurrection inc. the idea of damned being embodied &
burning forever in flames
4. Is it moral justified for God to give infinite punishment for finite sins? + original sin (Hindu
link)
5. Seems to imply some are predestined to be saved - goes against free will & therefore his
argument
6. After life present in his argument as he argues salvation through Christ which is what enables
afterlife, compensate for the evil in the world
7. Links w/ predestination
EVALUATION

✓ Hell is immoral – questionable whether God is morally justified in allowing an infinite punishment for a finite amount of sins
✓ View on heaven & hell further damaged by his belief in predestination. Seems to be unjust & contradicts his belief in free will

Irenaeus Theodicy

1. Humans weren’t created perfect - developing towards perfection. Presence of evil helps us grown and develop. If not completed in this life the process is completed in the after-life (Kant & Aristotle)
2. Hick - developed idea of ‘soul making’ & argued for idea of universalism. Idea of hell not to be understood literally & that a benevolent God could not eternally punish people (Sartre)
3. Swinburne - death is essential part of reasonable theodicy. It’s only if our choices are limited by time that they acquire sig. If there will always be another chance, what we do does not matter. This unlimited freedom has to inc. the possib of damning ourselves to hell by our own actions

EVALUATION

✓ D.Z Philips - rejected soul making theodicies as they involve instrumental use of evil by God. Not morally right for good God to permit evil in order to bring about future good (can’t justify holocaust). Eternal life in haven may be compensation but doesn’t correct immortality (Philips lacked this compensation as didn’t believe in LAD)
✓ Question of whether punish/reward can be justified synonymous w/ assumption of omniscience & related problems
✓ Doesn’t explain why suffering is arbitrary + animals suffer yet they don’t go to heaven
✓ Christian scientists - evil is an illusion
✓ Couldn’t omnipotent God enable us to achieve likeness in another way?
✓ Does the end justify the means? (deontological vs. teleological)

Reincarnation

Much of what determines quality of life is outside of our control (FWD), which can lead to inequalities & possibly injustice. Reincarnation solves this difficulty by suggesting our situation not random but direct result of karma & at first glance no POE

EVALUATION

✓ How can we explain the status of the first incarnation of our atman? Postponement POE
✓ Fair that something which doesn’t look or behave like us or have our personal character traits should be held MR for our actions? (Hick)
✓ If the idea of the self is an illusion – Buddhism, then is the idea of reward and punishment coherent? (HD & MR link e.g. Skinner)
✓ Not solution but postponement when following causal chain
✓ Does there have to be LAD to compensate for evil? Does evil exist? Should we/God be held MR?
### Attributes of God

#### Eternal

1. **Timeless**
   - Exists outside of time. God can know past, present & future events simultaneously (realists - future is real/knowable). This is the trad view of God as perfect & unchanging
   - Time is bound up in creation & created things don't affect God. Synonymous w/ Plato's idea of necessary & contingent
   - Calvin - retains idea of omniscience & argues that FW is illusion
   - For God to be non-spatial then it would seem that he would also need to be non-temporal
   - Time not applying to God contradicts scripture where Bible talks of promising & remembering. How could God have created the universe if he existed in time? Supporters argue for analogy (RL link)
   - Idea of God being personal & active contradictory (relates to logical omnipotence) yet makes trad concept of immutability easier to affirm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Everlasting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Most widespread definition of God as eternal - moves through passage of time w/ us &amp; always has &amp; always will exist. Can't know about future actions because we are free to choose them (anti-realist + limits omniscience)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Swinburne - rejects idea of eternal God, instead asserts an everlasting one. He exists at all points in time but doesn't exist out of time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ How can God be in time and not affected by creating &amp; hence change?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Can we make sense of God as temporal w/o being spatial?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Despite difficulties, argue only alt that allows us to preserve omnipotence &amp; action + more beneficial for believers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Alternate ideas

1. **Process theology** - God moves through time w/ creation but IS affected by interaction (POE) limiting omnipotence. Allows omniscience & FW. For God, the past is fully determinate but future only partly in the free decision we are yet to make (undermines omniscience dependent on definition)
2. **D.Z. Philips** - v. diff concept of eternity. Not related to notion of time but express qualitative nature. He cannot be comprehended & arguing he is eternal is attempt to convey this

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Omnipotence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARADOX of the Stone: Can God make a stone so heavy that he is unable to lift it? Can God tell a lie? If he can't, then his power is limited, if he can then he defies logic and other attributes - how can we possibly hope to understand him? Goes against approach of natural theology, which tries to discover nature of God by using rational faculties</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### God can do anything

1. No limitation is placed on his capability inc. logically impossible, supported by Descartes
2. Logical & philo problems - C.S. Lewis, something doesn't acquire meaning w/ prefix of 'God can'
3. Theological problems - If God can defy logic, then how can we possibly hope to understand him? Traditional God thought of as rational e.g. God as just + can’t sin or lie

**God can do anything logically possible**

1. Plantinga - omnipotence not necessary quality. May choose to limit powers in circumstances to preserve FW + beliefs in God don’t require logical justification, can be limited & still omnipotence
2. Solves philosophical paradoxes of ultimate power but does limit him
3. RL link - logic is only human bound, when we talk about God he goes beyond logic
4. JC conflict - can God tell a lie? Could God cause suffering for fun? Could God learn something new? - these are logically possible but conflict w/ other qualities of God
5. Response is he can but chooses not to - ability to do so is still conflict

**God has the power to do what is logically possible for a perfect God to do**

1. Slightly tautological
2. Allows for omnibenevolence not to contradict, however, limits him so does remove omnipotence
3. Assumes he is perfect

**God is Almighty**

Geach - literal translation (RL) almighty, has power over everything rather than power to do anything

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Omniscience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Knowledge and our senses**

1. We gain knowledge through senses, how can God have knowledge of tastes etc. w/o a body? (Jackson - ‘epiphenomenal Qualia’ + omnipotence)
2. If you separate knowledge from sensation - he has knowledge but not the accompanying sensation

**Middle knowledge**

1. Consists of knowledge of what would happen if certain choices were made
2. Does ‘exist’ in quantum physics + multiverse

**Future knowledge**

1. Bible makes it clear God has knowledge of the future 'All the as ordained for me were written your book before one them came to be’ - Psalm
2. Can it be knowledge if it hasn’t happened yet? - God's knowledge may be different to ours
3. Flew - given God could have foreseen consequences of creation ought to have been possible to create free creatures who always do the right thing (epistemic distance, omnipotence & POE)

**Free will**

- Premise 1: If God knows the outcome of every future decision I will make, then I am not truly free
- Premise 2: God has knowledge of everything, including future events
- Conclusion: I am not truly free

Lack of FW undermines free will defence, C teachings, omnibenevolence and any sense of telos. 3 options: accept the conclusion, show the argument is not deductively valid or reject one of the premises

**Accept the conclusion**

1. There are other reasons to think we might not be free - FWD debate
2. No such thing as free will – predestination & Calvinism

**EVALUATION**

- We have sense of freedom (LOI & it’s criticisms)
- Morality doesn’t make sense w/o free will which undermines C teachings (FWD & MR + illusion)

**Reject premise 1:**

- Just because God knows what I will decide doesn’t mean that I was not free to make the decision (neuroscience link)
- Wrong definition of freedom (Hume definition link). Rather than defining freedom as ‘I could have done otherwise’ maybe we should say that we are free if we were not under any external constraint and were amongst the causes of our actions (Hume + compatibilism link)
- God knows but you are causer (he is prime causer) he is eternal – knows but doesn’t cause

**Rejecting premise 2:**

- Our definition of God’s omniscience is wrong
- Rather than saying God has knowledge of everything, we should say God has knowledge of everything expect the future
- Does this limit God’s omnipotence and omniscience? - Our notion of God as eternal is wrong as it’s logically impossible to know about the future (synonymous w/ omnipotence)
- Process theologians reject omniscience in trad sense

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Omnibenevolence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>God is good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Medieval philosophers influenced by Greeks held God was simple not complex (Ockham’s razors). To describe God was to describe a perfect being (Anselm) Aquinas - ‘he lacks no excellence’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Only perfect being worthy of worship - consists of goodness along w/ omnipotence &amp; omniscience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Swinburne – draws analogy w/ parent involving both punish/reward</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Euthyrphro Dilemma</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. What is the connection between God and objective moral good? - Omnipotence vs. omnibenevolence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Voluntarism - morality seems arbitrary - can we really reject the idea that there is an objective moral standard independent of God?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Platonism - limits power &amp; trad C sees him as highest reality &amp; foundation of morality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does God have a choice?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. If God only does ‘good’ things then it would seem that when he does something moral he couldn’t have done otherwise = really a moral action? (synonymous w/ FWD &amp; MR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. However, not all accept that the goodness of an action is in the intention - only VE does (which is the foundation of C though)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What do we mean by good?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Meta-Ethics links</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. If we take voluntarist approach, can apply Moore’s open q. argument - ‘is what God wills good?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Basing our lives on so called ‘will of God’ just subjective pref - Emotivism &amp; prescriptivism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Problem of Evil

1. God’s goodness of lesser value if he has to do good & is not freely choosing to do good actions
2. Logically impossible for God to do evil (omnipotence definition)
3. Links w/ miracles - if God is omnibenevolent then why water into wine & allow holocaust?
4. God often see as partisan on OT e.g. Joshua 10 defending Israelites in their violent battles
5. OT actions often see as immoral e.g. Abraham sacrifice of Isaac
6. Counter-arguments - epistemic distance + interpretation/creation of Bible

### Should God reward & punish?

**Judgement day** fundamental concept in C + ultimately rewarded/punished in heaven or hell

**Yes**

1. Kant – summum bonum suggest good God should reward. We are obliged by duty to try and bring about, is a world in which moral behaviour leads to happiness. Moral arguments states there must be an afterlife in which we are rewarded for moral actions (FWD MR link)
2. Reflects trad views about afterlife & God as farther figure
3. If God is just then surely people should be rewarded for their behaviour appropriately - POE Hick everyone goes to heaven link
4. Reward & punish central to our understanding of right & wrong (Skinner – FWD – conscience)

**No**

1. Means religious do good for HI (Kant) - however, omniscient God would see through
2. If he’s omniscient seems contradictory to judge actions he caused (FW + Boethius)
3. Omnibenevolence inc. forgiveness - if he is unable to forgive is he somehow less then humans?
4. Determinism - evil actions explained by determinism (undermines C concept of FW + FW defence)
5. If morality is just about reward & punishment then doesn’t it become entirely empty?

### Can hell exist?

1. Against some C views + POE evil is illusion/separate from God
2. Does the crime fit the punishment? i.e. how can a finite crime warrant infinite punishment? Inc. original sin fruit for thousands of years of evil?
3. Universalists e.g. Hick - ultimately all humans will be saved
4. Swinburne - human freedom must inc. freedom to damn ourselves
5. Others give symbolic interp. Heaven & hell not real but intended to inspire commitment to teachings (RL + HI)

**Boethius**

‘Seems to be hopeless conflict between divine foreknowledge and freedom of human will’   
'Consolation of Philosophy' presents difficulty of eternity & foreknowledge as dialogue w/ Lady philosophy. Observed that what omniscient God saw in future must happen – whether he sees it therefore it must happen or vice versa irrelevant. Fact that he foreknows them = our actions are necessary, and, as such, we could not have done otherwise (LOI)

1. Pointless/unjust to reward & punish + morality
2. If these actions are foreseen but not prevented – is God not benevolent & MR?
3. No point in prayer + relationship w/ humanity

**Solution**

- Appeals to God’s eternity as timeless (influenced by Plato contingent/necessary) - because he’s eternal he doesn’t ‘foreknow’ actions just sees & therefore not threat to free will
- God’s foreknowledge not the cause of future events but free will

**EVALUATION**

- Kenny – idea of simultaneous is a contradiction (reduction ad absurdum) if we can derive a contradiction form a premise we can reject the assumption that if God exists outside of time then he cannot bear any temporal relations to things which exist within time
- How could such a God relate to us? + Bible shows intervening, which also shows omni- benevolence which wouldn’t exist
- Wiles – he is constantly intervening, he actively sustains his creation which is on-going (depends on interpretation of Bible + God beyond our understanding)
- Perhaps simultaneous is a sort of Schrödinger’s cat, where God can be everywhere at once and as quantum physics shows, allows for free will
- How can God outside of time have knowledge of in time? Wouldn’t it compromise his immutability & therefore his omnipotence?
- Providence requires genuine middle knowledge

**Everlasting God and omniscience**

- Swinburne – God is everlasting & progresses through time. Similar definition to omnipotence, not to know everything but knowledge of everything logically possible & future not logically possible to know. Has knowledge of predictability & also leaves room for free choices e.g. answer prayer