

Question 1: Match the following terms to their appropriate descriptions/definitions. Note that some terms show up twice.

theism:	A. the view that God exists
atheism:	B. the view that God doesn't exist (also can apply to anyone who doesn't accept theism)
agnosticism:	C. the view that it's impossible to know whether God exists (also can apply to anyone who occupies a middle ground between theism and atheism)
deism:	D. the view that God exists in a minimal non-religious sense: e.g., creating the universe to begin with, but not caring about us humans
pantheism:	E. the view that the natural universe is God
classical theism:	F. the view that God exists and is omnipotent, omniscient, morally perfect, eternal, etc.
metaphysics:	G. a subfield of philosophy that focuses on the fundamental nature of reality, especially cause/effect, space/time, objects/properties, as well as topics like God's existence, free will and determinism, and the mind-body problem
empirical science:	H. the study of nature guided primarily or entirely by observation and experience

Question 2: Match the philosophers to their arguments/positions

Blaise Pascal	E. The Wager
W. K. Clifford	K. Evidentialism
William James	C. Pragmatism
St. Anselm of Canterbury	A. Ontological argument
Gaunilo of Marmoutiers	G. Critique of ontological argument
St. Thomas Aquinas	B. The Five Ways
Samuel Clarke	J. Modal cosmological argument
William Paley	I. Watchmaker teleological argument
David Hume	F. Critique of modal cosmological argument and teleological arg.
Bruce Russell	D. Evidential argument from evil
Richard Swinburne	H. Theodicies

Question 3: What kind of reason does Pascal's Wager give for believing in God?

- **A self-interested reason for believing.**
- Strong empirical evidence for God's existence.
- An *a priori* proof of God's existence.
- Believing in order to satisfy emotional needs.

Question 4: How does Pascal respond to the objection that it's impossible to make yourself believe in God?

- **It is possible, but only gradually, through associating with and imitating believers.**
- Whether it is possible or not, it is still in your interest to try.
- It is impossible, but if you try, God will give you the grace necessary to believe.
- It is possible, because we have absolute free will over our own beliefs.

Question 5: What is the 'Many Gods' objection to Pascal's Wager?

- **There are many possible versions of God with different rules regarding the afterlife, so that there is no reason to bet on one possibility rather than another.**
- Pascal inadvertently proves the existence of many gods, thereby undermining the monotheistic view that he was attempting to establish.
- Pascal fails to consider the possibility that there are many gods, and that by following some gods, you only upset the other gods.
- Pascal assumes that some form of pagan polytheism is true, instead of allowing for the possibility that the so-called "God of the philosophers" exists.

Question 6: What is the point of W. K. Clifford's shipwreck example?

- To show that believing in religion runs just as contrary to the evidence as believing that a defective ship won't sink.
- To give an example of how beliefs are influenced not just by intellectual considerations, but by emotional factors as well.
- **To illustrate his view that it is wrong to believe something without sufficient evidence.**
- To illustrate his view that it is wrong to put self-interest ahead of morality.

Question 7: What does Clifford think about the modified example where the ship doesn't end up sinking?

- The shipowner was right to believe that it wouldn't sink, because true beliefs do not require evidence.
- The shipowner was right to believe that it wouldn't sink, because it makes no sense to criticize someone for a belief that is true.
- **The shipowner was still wrong to believe that it wouldn't sink, because he didn't have sufficient evidence.**
- The shipowner was still wrong to believe that it wouldn't sink, because he didn't know with absolute certainty.

Question 8: What does Clifford say about the distinction between beliefs and actions?

- It's a legitimate distinction, but beliefs can be evaluated as right or wrong, regardless of anything to do with action.
- **It's a legitimate distinction, but beliefs always have some sort of influence on action.**
- It's not a legitimate distinction: belief is measured in terms of action.
- It's a legitimate distinction, and he admits that beliefs cannot be criticized unless they happen to lead to action.

Question 9: Why does Clifford think that beliefs not based on sufficient evidence are wrong?

- Because it goes against human nature, in particular the proper use of rational activity.
- **Because they lead, directly or indirectly, to negative consequences in society.**
- Because there is something intrinsically inappropriate about holding such beliefs.
- Because they invariably end up with death and injustice, as in the shipwreck and rumor-mongering examples.

Question 10: What does William James say about Pascal's Wager?

- **It is impossible to make yourself truly believe something unless you already have an inclination toward that belief.**
- It violates the principle that beliefs should never be based on something as unseemly and mercenary as mere personal advantage.
- It successfully shows that, contrary to what Clifford says, sometimes it is right to believe something even without sufficient evidence.
- It fails due to the 'Many Gods' objection.

Question 11: According to James, what is the proper goal of belief?

- Personal advantage.
- Emotional comfort.
- **The goal is twofold: gaining truth and avoiding error.**
- Intellectual integrity.

Question 12: What does James say about the fact that some people put priority on gaining truth and other people put priority on avoiding error?

- Gaining truth is clearly the primary goal, and those who prioritize avoiding error are making a serious intellectual error.
- It is the job of philosophy to decide exactly how to properly balance these two goals and how to apply them to particular cases.
- **It's a matter of passion: some people are hopeful and other people are fearful, and both parties should tolerate each other.**
- Avoiding error is clearly the primary goal, and those who prioritize gaining truth are making a serious intellectual error.

Question 13: James's essay mentions several reasons for believing something. Which of the following is *not* one he mentions?

- Sometimes forming the belief instead of waiting for evidence is what enables you to get the evidence (e.g., personal religion).
- Sometimes the belief helps fulfill an emotional need (e.g., moral reality).
- Sometimes holding the belief helps make the belief come true (e.g., optimism, cooperation).
- **Sometimes the belief makes you into a kinder person more likely to help others and forgive people who make mistakes (e.g., Christianity).**

Question 14: Which of the following philosophers present and advocate a cosmological argument for the existence of God? (Note: there can be more than one correct answer)

- David Hume
- **St. Thomas Aquinas**
- **Samuel Clarke**
- William Paley

Question 15: Which of the following philosophers present and advocate a teleological argument for the existence of God? (Note: there can be more than one correct answer)

- **William Paley**
- **St. Thomas Aquinas**
- Gaunilo of Marmoutiers
- St. Anselm of Canterbury

Question 16: Match the character in Hume's *Dialogues concerning Natural Religion* to the correct description.

Demea	C. Traditionalist character who gives a metaphysical argument for God's existence
Cleanthes	B. Modern-science-minded character who gives an empirical argument for God's existence
Philo	A. Skeptic who pokes holes in everyone's arguments

Question 17: What is an *a priori* argument?

- An argument that depends upon observation and experience of the world around us.
- **An argument that does not depend upon observation and experience, but only pure intellectual insight into the nature of things.**
- An argument whose premises strictly logically entail its conclusion.
- An argument whose premises do not strictly logically entail its conclusion, but merely provide strong support for its conclusion.

Question 18: Which of the following is commonly supposed to be a good example of an *a priori* argument?

- **a mathematician's proof of a theorem in geometry**
- a prosecutor's case showing that someone is guilty in a courtroom
- a medical researcher's evidence for a theory in genetic epidemiology
- a physicist's evidence for a theory in cosmology

Question 19: Which of the following arguments for God's existence is considered an *a priori* argument?

- Teleological argument
- Modal cosmological argument
- **Ontological argument**
- 'Unmoved mover' cosmological argument (e.g. Aquinas's First Way)

Question 20: How does Anselm's ontological argument begin?

- observation of the natural world
- observation of God
- a moral judgment
- **a definition of God**

Question 21: Anselm defines God as "that than which nothing greater can be thought".

Question 22: What does Anselm want to show about atheism?

- It is not that different from theism when both are carefully examined.
- It flies in the face of common sense.
- It has dangerous moral consequences.
- **It leads to a contradiction.**

Question 23: What is the philosophical term for a being whose nonexistence is impossible (i.e., that must exist, cannot fail to exist, cannot *not* exist)?

- infinite being
- contingent being
- **necessary being**
- perfect being

Question 24: Sometimes God is said to be an *absolutely* necessary being, or a being whose existence is necessary *per se*. What is another common way of making this claim?

- God's essence is prior to his existence.
- God's existence is prior to his essence.
- God's essence belongs to his existence.
- **God's existence belongs to his essence.**

Question 25: Why does Gaunilo criticize Anselm's ontological argument?

- Because he thinks that God doesn't exist.
- **Because he thinks that Anselm's argument is flawed.**
- Because he thinks that Anselm's argument needs assistance to show how it can overcome objections.
- Because he thinks that it's impossible to prove the existence of God.

Question 26: What is Gaunilo's famous parody example of Anselm's ontological argument?

- The Vegetating Library example
- The Watch example
- **The Lost Island example**
- The Shipwreck example

Question 27: According to Gaunilo, how could "The Fool" respond to Anselm?

- Insist that the words "that than which nothing greater can be thought" do not make any sense.
- Insist that "that than which nothing greater can be thought" is completely unintelligible.
- **Insist that "that than which nothing greater can be thought" is something he cannot properly understand.**
- Insist that "that than which nothing greater can be thought" can be clearly shown to be a "false thing".

Question 28: According to Gaunilo, what is one thing that makes God difficult to understand?

- The fact that God doesn't speak to us directly.
- **The fact that God doesn't belong to any genus or species.**
- The fact that God knows all the future decisions of creatures with free will.
- The fact that the world is filled with evil.

Question 29: What does Aquinas think about Anselm's ontological argument?

- **The argument fails, even though God's existence does belong to his essence.**
- The argument fails, because it makes no sense for something's existence to belong to its essence.
- The argument succeeds, but only if it is first shown that a being possessing all the divine attributes is possible.
- The argument succeeds, but only if it is first shown that the concept of an absolutely necessary being makes sense.

Question 30: According to Aquinas, can we have knowledge of God?

- No, God is incomprehensible to us.
- Yes, through direct intellectual insight into God's essence.
- **Yes, through God's effects in the natural world.**
- Yes, but only in the afterlife, as part of the 'beatific vision'.

Question 31: Are Aquinas's "Five Ways" considered *a priori* arguments?

- **No, they always begin with observation of the world around us.**
- Yes, they are as *a priori* as a geometric demonstration.
- Yes, although Aquinas provides examples taken from observation of the world around us.
- No, they are based entirely on observation of the world around us.

Question 32: When Aquinas's First Way speaks of "motion", what is the best way to understand this?

- purpose
- perfection
- essence
- **change**

Question 33: What does Aquinas think about an infinite series of changing things, where each changing thing has its change brought about by another changing thing?

- **This is impossible, because there would be no explanation for where the change in the series came about in the first place.**
- This is impossible, because it's impossible for there to be an infinite amount of past time for the series to exist in.
- This is possible, but there must be some further explanation for why any of these changing things exist in the first place.
- This is possible, but too absurd to be taken seriously, as a matter of basic common sense.

Question 34: Which of the following provides a good example of an 'efficient cause'?

- water and sugar and lemon juice together making up lemonade
- a biological imperative causing an animal to flee a predator
- **a sculptor producing a sculpture out of marble**
- the essence of a right triangle explaining why its angles conform to the Pythagorean theorem

Question 35: In Aquinas's Third Way, why can't all the things in nature be contingent beings ["possible to be and not to be"] that come into existence and go out of existence?

- Because then there would be no necessary being, i.e. no God.
- Because then there would be no explanation for why any of the contingent beings exist in the first place.
- Because then there would be no explanation for why these contingent beings exist rather than some other contingent beings.
- **Because then there would have been a time of absolute nothingness in the past.**

Question 36: Which of Aquinas's Five Ways are considered cosmological arguments? (Note: there can be more than one correct answer)

- **First Way**
- **Second Way**
- **Third Way**
- Fourth Way
- Fifth Way

Question 37: Which of Aquinas's Five Ways are considered teleological arguments? (Note: there can be more than one correct answer)

- First Way
- Second Way
- Third Way
- Fourth Way
- **Fifth Way**

Question 38: The name 'teleological argument' comes from the ancient Greek term 'telos'. What does 'telos' mean?

- change
- perfection
- essence
- **purpose**

Question 39: Which principle lies at the foundation of many modal cosmological arguments?

- Principle of utility
- Principle of non-contradiction
- Principle of alternative possibilities
- **Principle of sufficient reason**

Question 40: How is the Principle of Sufficient Reason (PSR) typically applied to God?

- God needs no explanation, and is an exception to the PSR.
- God needs an explanation in terms of another being.
- **God is somehow self-explaining.**
- God needs no explanation, but the PSR is compatible with this.

Question 41: In Samuel Clarke's modal cosmological argument, what does Clarke say about an infinite series of contingent beings, with each contingent being explained in terms of a previous contingent being?

- This is possible, but too absurd to be taken seriously.
- This is impossible, because only a necessary being can exist from eternity.
- This is a complete description of the actual world.
- **This is possible, but in need of a further explanation in terms of a necessary being.**

Question 42: In Hume's critique of a Clarke-style argument, what does the character Cleanthes say about *a priori* demonstrations of necessary beings?

- They may be successful pieces of philosophy, but they are unlikely to convince any ordinary person.
- They rely on metaphysical principles that cannot be supported with empirical evidence.
- **They make no sense, because any being can be conceived as existent or non-existent without any contradiction.**
- They are inferior to teleological arguments when it comes to delivering religiously satisfactory conclusions.

Question 43: According to another of Cleanthes's objections to Demea's Clarke-style cosmological argument, what can we say about the argument's conclusion: viz., that there is a necessary being that accounts for all contingent beings as well as itself?

- There might be several of these beings.
- **This being might be the material universe itself.**
- This being may not be that than which nothing greater can be thought.
- This being might be amoral and not care about us.

Question 44: What is Cleanthes's criticism of the idea that even if each and every being in an infinite series has been explained, the entire series of beings still needs a further explanation?

- **Talk of *each and every individual* and *the entire series* are just two different ways of referring to the same thing.**
- It's impossible for such a series to exist in the first place.
- Just because such a series is infinite, that doesn't mean it has the attributes of God.
- All explanations must come to an end somewhere.

Question 45: When Philo adds another objection to Demea's Clarke-style argument, he suggests that the PSR might lead to what (typically unwanted) conclusion?

- Anthropomorphism: the doctrine that God is similar in form to human beings.
- **Fatalism: the doctrine that everything is determined with absolute necessity.**
- Plenism: the doctrine that all space is filled with matter.
- Fideism: the doctrine that God's existence can be known only by faith.

Question 46: The birth of modern science involved a shift from a *teleological* conception of nature (inspired by Aristotle and focused on the natural purposes of things) to a \_\_\_\_\_ conception of nature (seeing natural things as similar to machines).

- dualistic
- **mechanistic**
- materialistic
- idealistic

Question 47: What does Paley use as his go-to example of something we can confidently infer must have been produced by intelligent design?

- an animal
- **a watch**
- a plant
- a stone

Question 48: How does Paley respond to the objection that we infer intelligent design in the case of a watch only because we already know where watches come from?

- **Due to the intricate mechanism of a watch, the inference would be just as strong even if we had never seen a watch before.**
- This objection has force only in the hypothetical example where the watch can reproduce itself.
- This objection loses its force once we consider the hypothetical example where the watch can reproduce itself.
- That may be true, but with things in nature we can infer intelligent design without already knowing where they come from.

Question 49: What is the crucial premise of Paley's argument that mostly goes unstated and unsupported in the excerpt we read?

- **As a general principle, things exhibiting well-ordered arrangements of parts must come from intelligent design.**
- For anything that does not exist, it is possible to think of something greater than it.
- Many things in nature (and arguably nature as a whole) can be observed to exhibit well-ordered arrangements of parts.
- The PSR: for every fact there is, there must be some explanation for that fact.

Question 50: When Cleanthes presents and Philo restates a teleological argument, what is supposed to be the basis of the principle that well-ordered material things must result from intelligent design?

- Pure intellectual insight
- Sheer common-sense plausibility
- **Observation and experience**
- Scripture

Question 51: Philo worries about whether we can safely extrapolate from our limited observations of nature to the rest of nature. Which of the following is he *not* worried about?

- The origin of the universe
- The origin of life
- The unobservable microstructure of the universe
- **Other planets in the solar system**

Question 52: Cleanthes is not impressed by Philo's initial skeptical objection. Which of the following is *not* one of Cleanthes's responses?

- **An appeal to the authority of Newton**
- The 'vegetating library' example
- An appeal to common sense
- The 'voice from the heavens' example

Question 53: According to Philo's Part IV objection, if amazing well-orderedness in nature needs an explanation in terms of a cosmic intelligence, then what else needs an explanation?

- **The amazing well-orderedness in the cosmic intelligence's mind**
- The possibility of a mind that has thoughts while being perfectly simple
- The ability of the cosmic intelligence to arrange and order things in nature
- The existence of the cosmic intelligence

Question 54: According to Philo's Part V objection, what is the problem with the conclusion of Cleanthes's argument?

- It is drawn from an analogy with mere human intelligence
- It doesn't appear to connect with existing religious tradition
- **It is too indeterminate to count as a form of (religiously satisfactory) theism**
- It is spelled out in terms of incomprehensible metaphysical notions

Question 55: In Philo's critical discussion in Parts VI through VIII, which of the following is not considered as a possible rival explanation to intelligent design?

- Animal reproduction
- Plant reproduction
- **Chance**
- Necessity

Question 56: According to Philo in Part VII, if someone explains well-orderedness in nature in terms of mindless natural processes, and someone else demands a further explanation for those processes in terms of an intelligent designer, then how can the first person respond?

- **They can demand a further explanation for the intelligent designer.**
- They can offer to explain the aforementioned processes in terms of additional mindless processes (rather than intelligence).
- They can maintain that intelligence is not a satisfactory explanation of those processes.
- They can insist that mindless natural processes are self-explaining.

Question 57: In Part X, how does Cleanthes respond to the problem of evil?

- He admits that he can't explain why God allows so much evil, but insist that this does not undermine theism.
- He posits an afterlife to compensate for the evil of this life.
- He offers theodicies to explain why God is justified in allowing so much evil.
- **He maintains that the world contains overall far more good than evil.**

Question 58: What is Philo's overall view on the problem of evil?

- **If we could prove God's existence *a priori*, it wouldn't be much of a problem. But it is a very serious problem if we're trying to prove God's existence from observation and experience.**
- If Cleanthes's teleological argument worked, it wouldn't be much of a problem. But due to all the compelling objections to Cleanthes's argument, it turns out to be a very serious problem.
- Even if we could prove God's existence one way or another, it is such a serious problem that it would completely overturn any such proof.
- We have so little knowledge of the nature of God and the nature of good and evil that the so-called problem of evil is not even a problem in the first place.

Question 59: What does "the Manichaean system" say about the first cause(s) of the universe?

- They are perfectly evil.
- They are neither good nor evil, but indifferent.
- **They are locked in an conflict of good versus evil.**
- They are perfectly good.

Question 60: In Bruce Russell's discussion of the so-called "argument from evil", he argues from "We can see no justifying explanation for this evil" to "Therefore, this evil (probably) has no justifying explanation". What objection would a skeptical theist raise?

- Good and evil are a matter of mere opinion, and cannot be used to argue about what does or does not exist.
- **We limited humans have no reason to expect that we could see a justifying explanation if there were one.**
- Even if there no justifying explanation for an evil, that is no reason to doubt that God exists.
- There are plenty of plausible justifying explanations for the evils we see in the world.

Question 61: What example does Russell use in responding to the skeptical theist?

- Parking fines
- **The Matrix**
- Churchill's parents
- Rescue ship

Question 62: What approach does Richard Swinburne use in responding to the problem of evil?

- Skeptical theism
- Moral skepticism
- Pascal's Wager
- **Theodicies**

Question 63: How does Swinburne ultimately respond to the sheer quantity of evil in the world?

- The vast majority of evil in the universe is due to human free will.
- We should not expect to understand the complicated reasons that an infinite mind might have for allowing all this evil.
- **It makes sense to have creatures struggle with real evil, not a mere parlor game.**
- The vast majority of evil in the universe is actually an illusion.