

Understanding The Cosmological and Teleological Arguments For God's Existence

Moses Adeleke Adeoye¹

¹ Bowen University, Iwo, Osun State, Nigeria; princeadelekm@gmail.com

<i>Abstract</i>	
Keywords: Cosmological Argument; Teleological Argument; God's Existence; Complexity Argument; Substantial Argument	The teleological and cosmological reasons for God's existence are thoroughly explained in this research. The fact of God, a necessary and causeless being, is implied by the cosmological argument, which holds that the cosmos must have a purpose. The teleological argument contends that the order and complexity of the natural world prove the presence of an intelligent designer, usually called God. This work examines the historical development of these arguments and the contributions of prominent intellectuals like Thomas Aquinas, William Paley, and Immanuel Kant. A fair assessment of its philosophical implications and empirical usefulness is conducted by weighing the strengths and weaknesses of every argument. Moreover, among the objections made against these assertions are the scientific bases for the Big Bang theory and evolution. The paper concludes that while these arguments do not offer irrefutable proof of God's existence, they significantly enhance the plausibility of theism, especially within the framework of natural theology. It calls for continued reflection rooted in critical thought and openness in exploring metaphysical questions.

Kata kunci:
Argumen Kosmologis; Argumen Teleologis; Keberadaan Tuhan; Argumen Kompleksitas; Argumen Substansial

Article history:
Received: 01-03-2025
Revised: 19-05-2025
Accepted: 29-05-2025

Abstrak
Alasan teleologis dan kosmologis atas keberadaan Tuhan dijelaskan secara menyeluruh dalam penelitian ini. Fakta tentang Tuhan, makhluk yang perlu dan tanpa sebab, tersirat dalam argumen kosmologis, yang menyatakan bahwa kosmos pasti memiliki tujuan. Argumen teleologis menyatakan bahwa tatanan dan kompleksitas dunia alami membuktikan keberadaan perancang yang cerdas, yang biasanya disebut Tuhan. Karya ini meneliti perkembangan historis argumen-argumen ini dan kontribusi para intelektual terkemuka seperti Thomas Aquinas, William Paley, dan Immanuel Kant. Penilaian yang adil atas implikasi filosofis dan kegunaan empirisnya dilakukan dengan mempertimbangkan kekuatan dan kelemahan setiap argumen. Selain itu, di antara keberatan yang diajukan terhadap pernyataan-pernyataan ini adalah dasar ilmiah untuk teori Big Bang dan evolusi. Makalah ini menyimpulkan bahwa meskipun argumen-argumen ini tidak menawarkan bukti yang tak terbantahkan tentang keberadaan Tuhan, argumen-argumen ini secara signifikan meningkatkan kemungkinan teisme, terutama dalam kerangka teologi alamiah. Makalah ini memberikan refleksi berkelanjutan yang berakar pada pemikiran kritis dan keterbukaan dalam mengeksplorasi pertanyaan-pertanyaan metafisik.

Corresponding Author
Moses Adeleke Adeoye
Bowen University, Iwo, Osun State, Nigeria; princeadelekm@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

For millennia, philosophers and theologians have wrestled with the issue of how to make a logical and reasonable case for the existence of God. Thomas Aquinas provides proof of God's existence, focusing on cosmological and teleological arguments from design (Aquinas, 2017). The Cosmological argument serves as more substantial proof for God's existence than the teleological argument, which would gravitate towards the belief that the cosmological argument is stronger (Evans, 2010). The foundation of the cosmological argument is Aristotle's idea of the so-called cosmological ways (Hawley &

Holcomb, 2005; Oderberg, 2013). Thomas Aquinas is well-known for the "Five Ways", which compiled the ideas of the philosophers who came before him. The argument can be categorised into five approaches: concept-based, efficient cause-based, possibility-based, necessity-based, gradation-based, and global governance-based, each with its own argument (Almeida, 2018). Teleological arguments attempt to prove the existence of a god by highlighting designed aspects of nature (Evans, 2010). The assertion that something in nature must be created is an assumption, despite observable evidence supporting it. A cursory glance across history reveals an almost infinite number of presumed designs that originated in pure natural phenomena: lightning, earthquakes, floods, volcanoes, comets, weather, motion of celestial objects, geographical features, sickness, etc.

The Big Bang theory and the theory of evolution provide scientific explanations for the universe's existence and the diversity of life on Earth (Dastagiri, 2018). The Big Bang hypothesis posits that the universe emerged from a solitary point of immense density and temperature around 13.8 billion years ago (van den Heuvel, 2016). This initial explosion resulted in the expansion of space and the creation of matter and energy. The theory of evolution explains the complexity and diversity of life on Earth. According to this theory, all living organisms share a common ancestor, and natural selection drives the gradual changes and adaptations over generations (Futuyma, 2015). Through this mechanism, species evolve to suit their environments better and survive.

The Cosmological Argument for God's Existence holds that the existence of the cosmos requires the existence of a necessary being, namely God (Cantens, 2012). This argument is supported by the Big Bang theory, which postulates that the cosmos must have had a cause for its existence (Kragh, 2023). Supporters of the Cosmological Argument frequently make the case that the cosmos had to have an uncaused cause since nothing can exist in a vacuum. They assert that this is the result of God. Alternatively, the Teleological Argument argues that the complexity and order of the cosmos, present in both living organisms and inanimate objects, point to the existence of an intelligent designer, which is the divine word for God (Manson, 2002). The theory of evolution offers an alternate explanation for the apparent design in nature, which strongly focuses on natural selection and adaptability (Bouchard, 2013). It suggests that living things' complex characteristics and abilities result from slow, long-term modifications motivated by the advantages to survival bestowed by particular attributes.

The question of God's existence remains one of the most enduring and profound inquiries in the history of human thought. For centuries, philosophers, theologians, and scientists have debated the foundations of reality and the implications of an ordered cosmos. The cosmological and teleological arguments are among the most influential classical approaches to this debate. These arguments—rooted in logic, metaphysics, and observation—seek to demonstrate the necessity or probability of a divine being as the cause or designer of the universe. Their enduring relevance lies not only in their philosophical depth but also in their ability to engage contemporary scientific discoveries and existential questions. The cosmological argument—in its Thomist,

kalām, and Leibnizian variants – asserts that the universe must have a cause or sufficient reason for its existence, ultimately leading to the postulation of an uncaused, necessary being (Aquinas, 2015; Craig & Sinclair, 2009). In its kalām form, revived by William Lane Craig, the argument employs philosophical reasoning and contemporary cosmological data, particularly the Big Bang theory, to affirm that the universe had a finite beginning and must have a transcendent cause (Craig, 2004). In this light, scientific advancements do not nullify religious reasoning but rather provide an empirical framework for meaningfully exploring metaphysical questions.

Similarly, the teleological argument has evolved from analogies like William Paley's watchmaker to more nuanced forms such as the fine-tuning argument. This argument contends that the universe's fundamental constants and initial conditions are so precisely calibrated for the emergence of life that they point toward intentional design (Swinburne, 2010; Tipler, 2003). While Darwinian evolution and natural selection offer robust explanations for biological complexity (Futuyma, 2015), proponents of the teleological view argue that such mechanisms themselves presuppose a structured and intelligible universe – one that suggests a rational order beyond mere chance (Davies, 2011). In an age where scientific narratives often dominate public discourse, the relevance of these classical arguments lies in their ability to bridge faith and reason. Rather than representing outdated paradigms, the cosmological and teleological arguments offer critical frameworks for engaging with contemporary scientific thought. They invite interdisciplinary dialogue between philosophy, theology, and science, encouraging a more holistic understanding of existence. Richard Swinburne (2007) observes that theism remains a simpler and more unified explanatory hypothesis for a range of phenomena, including consciousness, morality, and cosmic order, than many secular alternatives. Therefore, this paper re-examines these two foundational arguments for God's existence, tracing their historical development, evaluating their philosophical rigour, and exploring their modern-day significance. By engaging both classical formulations and contemporary critiques, this paper aims to offer a balanced analysis that underscores their ongoing importance in the rational discourse about the divine.

The cosmological argument explores the observable world and the "Cosmos" to determine the First Cause, referring to the world's contingency, using terms "a priori" and "a posteriori" to establish the foundations for a proposition (Tahko, 2011). A proposition is knowable a posteriori if it can be known independently of any experience other than learning the language in which it is expressed. For instance, the claim that it is pouring outside right now is after the claim that all bachelors are single. Craig William characterises the cosmological argument as an a posteriori rationale seeking a cause or explanation for the "Cosmos" (Craig, 2004). The cosmological arguments are fundamentally grounded in existentialist premises. There must be an underlying reason and cause for any entity to exist. The argument primarily addresses causality. Cosmological arguments rank among the earliest of the six philosophical arguments,

including ontological, cosmological (including kālām cosmological), teleological, moral, miracles, and the argument from religious experience (Loke, 2022).

Initially, contributions have been made by the pagans of Ancient Greece, Muslims, Christians (both Catholic and Protestant), Jews, and pantheists (Van Nuffelen, 2012). The second method relies on the causal chains observed in nature, specifically the transition from potency to actuality and the progression from an efficient cause to its effect (Craig & Sinclair, 2009). Chains of causation cannot extend infinitely; they must ultimately lead to a first cause or mover. The third approach involves observing contingency and limitation in natural entities (Ellis, 2014). The argument posits that their cause must be an unconditioned and necessary being. The fourth approach focuses on the various levels of participating perfection in objects and concludes that there is only one infinite source from which all of these finite perfections originate (Pruss, 2009). As a result of the laws of nature remaining stable, the world has order and finality. This is observed in the fifth way, which concludes that intelligence is the ultimate cause of all things (Tipler, 2003). Their demise was premeditated and not unanticipated. Without the guidance of a knowledgeable human, something lacking understanding cannot go toward its goal, just as an archer guides an arrow. Consequently, an intelligent being must guide all-natural phenomena toward their ultimate goal. This being is what we refer to as God. The cosmological argument remains robust due to the numerous compelling endorsements from prominent philosophers throughout history. Plato is regarded as the originator of this argument. Subsequently, Aristotle supported this argument.

It is appropriate to refer to Plato as the founder of philosophical theism because he introduced natural theology into Western philosophy (Kenny, 2010). Plato effectively invented the subject of philosophy and provided artistic language and expression. In Book X of the Laws, Plato formulated the foundations of the cosmological and teleological arguments (Naddaf, 2004). Plato identifies eight distinct types of motion. Motion about an axis; Displacement; Motion involving both displacement and axial rotation (e.g., planetary motion); Deceleration; Acceleration; Development; Decline and Destruction (Marinescu, 2021). Re-interpreting Plato's statement, some things can activate themselves, and others can only be activated by different things (Eatough, 2016). Plato never says anything about where the universe came from, whether the universe has a beginning or even remotely. At least two principles of activity drawn out by Plato are things that can activate themselves and other things, and things that other things must activate (Korsgaard, 2009). Plato will ask which of these two principles of logic (not necessarily temporally) is before the other.

Motion or change in one entity is induced by motion or change in another entity that influences it. The causes suggest that motion or change must arise from an initial self-moved mover. Plato posited that this mover serves as the origin of change in motion for all that has existed (Zeyl, 2021). One could see Plato's observation that the succession of causes must end as an early form of Leibniz's theory, which holds that a series must have a reasonable justification for its beginning. Plato's perspective initiated the discussion regarding the acceptance or rejection of infinite regression. In many

philosophical writings, discussions of the causal concept are prevalent. From Plato, Copleston contended that the argument from contingency stems from the argument that existence can be argued from a stated cause (Copleston, 2003). The assertion of a necessary being prompts critics to examine religious arguments closely. Plato posited the existence of a standard of 'goodness' independent of divine influence. This formed the foundation for Plato's central concept, aligning with his understanding of the soul.

Aristotle of Stagira, a student of Plato, studied various disciplines including physics, metaphysics, poetry, drama, music, logic, rhetoric, politics, government, ethics, biology, and zoology (Anderson & Stephenson, 2014). Initially, Aristotle attributes intelligence to cosmic objects, positing that they generate their movement voluntarily (Bodnar & Pellegrin, 2016). Later, he comes to the same conclusion as Plato—namely, that everything in motion must have a cause. Anything that is not moved by itself is moved by another entity. Furthermore, nothing is capable of moving by itself. Ross explains Aristotle's cosmology: The cosmos comprises concentric spheres (Hetherington, 2023). The Earth is spherical and rests at the centre of the cosmos. The universe's outer shell, or first heaven, is a limited sphere containing what we now call fixed stars. These stars do not move, but are transported around by the first heaven's uniform revolution once every 24 hours. In terms of the more intricate motions of the sun, moon, and planets, Aristotle accepts, with some modifications, the Eudoxus hypothesis created by his companion Callippus (Hetherington, 2023). Aristotle believed that the initial movement of the heavens was caused by God, who acted as the object of love and desire. However, the movement of the sun, moon, and planets is explained by the activity of different moving agents in each sphere, rather than God (Oliver, 2006).

Thomas Aquinas presupposes the existence of God, the last purpose of all matters, in his philosophical and theological works (Davies, 2011). This God is characterised as the unmoved mover, the uncaused purpose, and the essential being from which all contingent beings derive their existence. Aquinas' perception of God is founded in classical theism, a philosophical framework that accentuates divine simplicity, omnipotence, omniscience, and perfection (O'Gorman, 2017). In step with Aquinas, God is not always the creator of the universe but also the sustainer of all things, the source of all goodness and truth, and the ultimate goal toward which all things strive (Aquinas, 2015; Dodds, 2020). This information about God as the foundation of fact and the supply of all order and motive is central to Aquinas' philosophical and theological ideas. Aquinas was a theist and used his philosophical arguments only to prove the existence of God, rather than going into the more controversial 'Trinity' debate (Paasch, 2016).

Aquinas argued that the existence of God can be demonstrated through philosophical reasoning (Burrell, 2016). He initiated his endeavour from an Aristotelian perspective, as he later acknowledged in his writings. Aquinas proposed five arguments for the existence of God in his *Summa Theologiae*, commonly referred to as The Five Ways of Thomas Aquinas (Göcke & Göcke, 2014). Thomas Aquinas identifies five arguments: the argument from motion, the argument from the nature of efficient cause, the argument from possibility and necessity, the argument from gradation, and the

argument from global governance. Philosophical consensus holds that the first three ways constitute genuine cosmological arguments, while Craig characterises the fourth way as 'the most Platonic of Aquinas's arguments.' The fifth approach is a teleological argument.

The First Way: Aquinas's initial proof is based on motion, paralleling the approaches of various early Greek, Muslim, and Jewish philosophers (Davies & Stump, 2011). In the *Summa Theologiae*, he argues that it is evident from our senses that another moves any entity in motion, as nothing can be moved unless it exists in a state of potential relative to that which it is moving towards (Van Nieuwenhove, 2021). A thing moves because it is in action. Motion represents a transition from potentiality to actuality. However, a transition from potentiality to actuality requires the preexistence of actual conditions. For example, the fire burns wood and makes it hot because fire is hot and wood can be hot. In this sense, things cannot exist simultaneously in actuality and potentiality. As a result, objects cannot be moved simultaneously. The first mover, whom no other mover has moved, is reached as we regress along the mover—moved chain. Everyone understands this first mover to be God.

The Second Way: In his 'Summa Contra Gentiles', Aquinas credits Aristotle with providing this evidence. The second method is predicated on how causation works. Aquinas says every cause in the observable cosmos has a purpose (Mitchell, 2013). The statement "it is impossible to have a final cause without an intermediate cause" implies that we do not observe anything causing itself. The First Cause, to whom everyone assigns the term "God," is where this chain of causes must ultimately end (Evans, 2010). Gilson Etienne states that the first way argues for a change in things, whilst the second way argues for things' existence to illustrate the distinction between the two approaches (Capehart, 2021). Aquinas argues that the second approach to understanding the cosmos posits God as the creative cause, contrasting the first approach, which attributes cosmic motion to God, and the second approach posits Him as the creator of things (Dodds, 2020).

The Third Way: The Third Way represents the discourse between possibility and necessity. Aquinas argues that all entities in nature possess the potential for existence or non-existence, as they undergo processes of generation and corruption (Vijgen, 2018). These entities cannot exist perpetually. Given that entities that do not exist arise from those that do, there must be a being that necessarily exists as a foundational premise. Accordingly, we are forced to acknowledge the existence of some being that is necessary in and of itself, not dependent on another being for it, but instead creating it in others (Butler, 2001). The cause that leads to a being whose features and properties we do not know is eliminated in Aquinas's proof. In *The Existence of God*, John Hick identifies a primary weakness of the cosmological argument as a means of proving God's existence to atheists or agnostics: it begs the question (Nah, 2013). Martin Copleston acknowledges that introducing a non-believer to God requires their agreement with the cosmological argument belief that the existence of a world is a puzzle that requires explanation (Evans,

2010). Copleston believes that Aquinas's sole novel contribution was his rejection of the idea that existence is merely incidental (Haldane, 2016).

David Hume is a prominent Scottish philosopher and historian, primarily recognised for his critique of causality (Millican, 2016). He is widely considered an atheist. Hume's critique of the cosmological argument and the argument from design and his method of articulating philosophical views were presented through dialogues. This approach reflects the dual nature of the subject matter, which is both self-evident and significant, yet also obscure and uncertain (Hehenkamp, 2015). Hume's argument critiques a specific iteration of the cosmological argument and the classical theistic conception of God as a necessary being, which he deems incoherent and unintelligible (Bell, 2011; Spoerl, 2017). Spoerl (2017) posits that if a God exists, His existence must be contingent, similar to that of Caesar, the angel Gabriel, or the sun. Hume's evaluation of the cosmological argument posits that, if it is valid, the traditional theistic understanding of God must be rejected as inconsistent (Kraal, 2023).

Hume's assertion that "whatever is, cannot be" is subject to a significant rebuttal. Hume identifies two fundamental categories for classifying all human reason or inquiry objects: relations of ideas and matters of fact (Warr, 2008). The two categories of propositions are discerned through different perceptual processes: relationships between ideas are recognised via intuition or demonstration, while facts or existence are perceived through sensation, recollection of past experiences, or deductions based on our understanding of cause and effect, which depends on our sensory perception of the ongoing convergence of specific events. Demea, one of Hume's characters, presents the cosmological argument from contingency as an "infallible a priori demonstration" (Spoerl, 2017). Nothing can create itself or be the source of something else's existence. Therefore, everything that exists needs to have a cause or a purpose. There must either be an ultimate cause inescapably present or an unending series of causes and consequences without any ultimate cause. If an infinite series of causes and effects exists without a definitive origin, then the existence of the entire chain lacks justification.

However, the chain as a whole cannot exist without a cause if there is not an endless chain of causes and effects leading to no ultimate cause. If a final cause must exist, then who possesses the reason for existing and cannot be assumed to exist without an apparent and present contradiction? Demea states that everything that exists must have a reason or cause for existence, as nothing can produce itself or be the source of its existence (Hume, 2016). Consequently, to move from effects to cause, we must either continue following an endless succession without ever reaching an ultimate cause or, at some point, turn to an ultimate cause that is unavoidably real—this succinct, straightforward explanation of causation (i.e. the cosmological argument). Until the opposite suggests a contradiction, nothing can be proven. Nothing conceivable suggests a contradiction. Anything that we can imagine to be real, we can also imagine to be non-real. There is not a single being whose absence suggests a contradiction. As such, there is no being that can have its existence proven. Hume critiques the cosmological argument, asserting that it is "quite irrational" to question the cause of the entire causal

chain, as each cause and effect within that chain elucidates the subsequent and preceding events (King-Farlow & Christensen, 2012).

Bex (2011) revealed in his statement that Hume examines arguments with irrational "jumps" in premise and assesses the plausibility of his counterarguments about the main one. Hume conflates "sensible or physical existence" with "being in general," suggesting that the human mind cannot abstract being in general from its sensible and material conditions, we might conclude that his fundamental criticism of the cosmological argument is not, as he puts it, "completely decisive" (Spoerl, 2017).

Hume critiques the Teleological argument from design through the character of his fictional Cleanthes. Hume says the world is one big machine comprising numerous complex, interconnected elements that are precisely adjusted to achieve goals (Hume, 2000). Although far more intricate than human-made machines, nature's machines are similar. Similar causes must provide similar consequences. The creator of the natural world shares some similarities with the human mind, albeit with far greater capacities. In the Dialogues, Hume states that "all experimental reasoning is built on the presumption that identical causes prove similar effects and similar effects cause" (Beebee, 2006). This means that all conclusions regarding facts are based on experience. Hume presents both formal and substantial arguments:

Hume challenges experience-based arguments on the universe's cause and order, arguing that it is improper to transfer conclusions from one part to another, stating that it is not the origin of the whole (Stanek, 2017). Hume asserts that reasoning from the operation of one part to the origin of the whole "can never be accepted" (Wilson, 2010). Hume's assertion regarding the analogy between human-designed productions and the universe, which underpins the entire argument, lacks sufficient strength to substantiate the conclusion that the latter arises from a source akin to human intelligence, similar to the former (Buckle, 2004).

Hume presents multiple critiques of this argument: All reasoning regarding causality is grounded in experience; however, we lack experiential knowledge of the world's creation. The universe is finite. Thus, it cannot substantiate the existence of an infinite author, as the cause must correspond to the effect. The universe exhibits imperfections. Thus, it cannot substantiate the concept of God's perfection. The collaborative efforts of individuals in constructing artificial machines, such as ships or houses, suggest that the argument from design does not substantiate the existence of God. The universe resembles an animal and an artificial machine, suggesting that God may be the soul of the universe, as posited by the Stoics, rather than being transcendent. The universe arises from generation rather than from reason or design. The irregular argument asserts that the argument from design is self-evident and indisputable. This is evident and indisputable; however, it lacks a rational basis. It cannot be addressed through reason, the essential instrument in natural religion. Hume contends that attributing a finite yet supreme level of power, wisdom, and goodness to God, which is unwarranted for an infinite degree, contradicts our expectations and experiences of the real world (Tooley & Plantinga, 2011).

RESEARCH METHODS

The research methodology outlined facilitates a thorough exploration of the cosmological and teleological arguments for God's existence. This research contributes meaningfully to the ongoing philosophical discourse surrounding these foundational arguments by employing a qualitative approach grounded in historical and contemporary analysis. A comprehensive literature review was conducted to gather various scholarly articles, books and philosophical treatises related to the cosmological and teleological arguments. This research uses academic databases, library catalogues, and internet resources to analyse relevant materials, focusing on the cosmological and teleological arguments for God's existence. The authors, William Lane Craig and John Hick, have been chosen due to their depth of arguments, impact on current philosophical concepts, and unique insights they offer to the broader communication. Craig and Hick's perspectives have also had a significant impact on current philosophical concepts, shaping the discourse on the lifestyles of God, particularly concerning the cosmological and teleological frameworks. Their works have sparked scholarly debate and resonated with a broader target audience, contributing to the ongoing dialogue between theism and atheism. Exploring their perspectives allows for successful engagement with the triumphing currents of concept and understanding the evolving dynamics within the philosophical panorama. By exploring their perspectives, it is easy to uncover novel dimensions of the concept, confront tough questions, and expand the scope of inquiry surrounding the lifestyles of God. Prioritising the examination of Craig's and Hick's perspectives allows for a comprehensive understanding of the difficulty count. The presuppositions of God within the cosmological and teleological arguments vary significantly between them, with Craig aligning with the traditional Christian concept of a non-public, omniscient, and omnipotent God, and Hick emphasising a transcendent, ineffable truth that transcends specific spiritual formulations. While the research is primarily theoretical, it is essential to approach the discussion of belief and scepticism with sensitivity.

RESEARCH RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The article discusses the cosmological and teleological arguments for God's existence, emphasising their historical development and philosophical foundations. The cosmological argument that the universe requires a first cause is supported by philosophers like Aristotle and Aquinas, who posit that there must be an uncaused cause, typically identified as God. This argument is bolstered by modern scientific theories, such as the Big Bang theory, which suggests the universe had a definite beginning. In contrast, the teleological argument asserts that the complexity and order of the universe imply the existence of an intelligent designer, commonly understood to be God. Historical figures like William Paley used the analogy of a watch to illustrate this idea. At the same time, modern proponents point to the fine-tuning of the universe as evidence of a purposeful creator. Despite their historical and contemporary appeal, both arguments face significant critiques, particularly from philosophers like David

Hume and Immanuel Kant. Hume questioned the assumption that everything must have a cause, challenging the cosmological argument, and critiqued the analogy between human-made objects and the natural world in the teleological argument. Modern science, especially evolutionary biology and the theory of natural selection, offers alternative explanations for the complexity of life, reducing the need for a divine designer. These criticisms highlight the limitations of inductive reasoning and the empirical basis of the arguments, suggesting that while they are compelling to many, they are not definitive proof of God's existence.

Teleological Argument

The argument from order, also known as the argument from design, is among the most prominent theistic arguments regarding the universe. It has historical ties to the contributions of William Paley. The teleological argument, derived from the Greek term 'Telos,' signifies 'aim or purpose.' The term 'teleological' pertains to end-purpose. This argument is the oldest in natural theology, tracing its origins to Plato and Aristotle in Ancient Greece. Plato posits two reasons for the necessity of belief in God: the existence of the soul and the order and motion observed in the universe, which serve as indicators of an intelligent designer at the origin of all things (Rheins, 2010).

In his writings, William Paley utilised the analogy of discovering a watch in a field to develop a more modern version of the teleological argument (Firestone, 2019). The fact that it was designed that way would lead the person who finds it to believe it was a watchmaker rather than just a coincidence. One can assume that the cosmos has an intentional and strong creator due to its sophisticated design and order. Evolutionists argue that chance or natural selection may explain the order of things. Modern versions of this argument argue that the cosmos must be "fine-tuned" to accommodate life. If the universe was formed by the "Big Bang," the circumstances are too complicated to be random, arguing for an intelligent creator.

Paley William

Paley created a famous design argument analogy, advancing Aquinas' fifth method by stating "qua purpose" instead of "qua regularity" (Davies, 2011; Smith, 2014). The analogy demonstrated that the universe seems to fit with a 'Telos' in mind, as seen in the example of a watch made by someone, rather than merely occurring in the desert. This results from the watch's complexity and numerous components, all of which appear to work together with the teleological purpose of showing the time. The speaker argues that the world's seemingly cohesive structure implies a creator, claiming it must be God. He supports this claim by using natural examples, such as the well-crafted joints of an earwig's antennae and hinges in its wings. The first premise holds that intelligent design produces human artefacts; the universe is like artefacts made by humans. Consequently, the cosmos results from intelligent design; nevertheless, unlike human artefacts, the universe is enormous and complicated.

Swinburne Richard

In his critical analysis of the cosmological argument, Richard Swinburne presents a specific conceptualisation of the divine being that deviates from conventional theological viewpoints. Swinburne, an excellent philosopher of religion, needs the foundational assumptions of the cosmological argument to provide amazing information about the nature of God (Gudyma, 2023). Swinburne's grievance with the cosmological argument is rooted in his notion that the traditional notion of God as an uncaused, crucial being is flawed (Weston, 2018). Swinburne posits a unique form of deity, one that is confined in strength and knowledge. According to Swinburne, God presupposed by using the manner of the cosmological argument is constrained by the principles of logic and cannot behave freely (Swinburne, 2010). This God is issued to crucial truths and cannot choose among distinct motion guides.

Swinburne's concept of God is in step with a deistic view, wherein God is an impersonal force instead of a personal author (Swinburne, 2010). Swinburne's critique of the cosmological argument highlights several key weaknesses in the conventional knowledge of God. One of the principal criticisms is that the cosmological argument is based totally on the concept that God is an uncaused, critical being without supplying sufficient justification for this claim (Evans, 2010; Weingartner, 2010). Swinburne argues that this thought of God is incoherent and lacks empirical resources (Beckman, 2008). Another vulnerable factor identified by Swinburne's way is the problem of evil. Swinburne contends that evil lifestyles worldwide are incompatible with the traditional perception of an all-powerful and all-loving God (Adeoye, 2024). Swinburne suggests that a more attainable cause of the presence of evil is that God is constrained in power and information, in preference to being all-powerful and omniscient. Despite his criticisms of the cosmological argument, Swinburne is renowned for the strength of the argument in pointing towards the life of an essential being. Swinburne proposes a modified version of the cosmological argument consistent with his idea of God. In this revised argument, the lifestyles of an important being are used to support the assertion that God is a finite and contingent being, in contrast to a limitless and necessary one. This opportunity technique to the cosmological argument offers a mindset of the person of God and offers a new framework for records on the connection between God and the arena.

According to Swinburne, scientific hypotheses must be simple, explain diverse phenomena, and align with prior knowledge, making them unsurprising and more straightforward than competing hypotheses. Swinburne posits that theism is a straightforward hypothesis that accounts for anthropic coincidences, the uniformity of nature, the elegance of natural laws, and various other phenomena, including human consciousness and moral experience (Swinburne, 2007). Swinburne distinguished between two types of explanation: purposeful or personal explanation and inanimate explanation. The explanation provided by the inanimate object pertains to the abilities and limitations of objects. (Liability is the term used to describe susceptibility to outside influences. For example, water can dissolve salt, and salt can be dissolved by water. The inanimate explanation can be understood as an explanation of natural laws plus

beginning conditions, since everything is made up of the same natural types, the benefits and drawbacks of each type can be written down in natural laws.

In contrast, a personal explanation explains agents' beliefs, purposes, and powers. In contrast to inanimate objects, agents make decisions based on their goals and beliefs, acting on these decisions when given the necessary authority and opportunities. Swinburne believes personal explanation is essential to our intellectual and practical lives. He distinguishes between inanimate explanation (laws) and personal explanation (agent aims).

The weaknesses of the cosmological argument

The cosmological argument employs an inductive approach. This represents a flaw in the argument, as the conclusion relies on an inductive leap, essentially an assumption. According to Hume, the cosmological Argument extends beyond the limits of our experiences. Given our lack of direct experience regarding the creation of the Universe, we are not in a position to draw definitive conclusions about its origins. Inductive arguments, however, can provide only a degree of likelihood rather than definitive proof. The cosmological argument posits that infinite regress is untenable, asserting that the universe must have a beginning, which it identifies as God. Hume raised enquiries regarding the potential existence of a beginning for the Universe. He proposed that it may have always been present. Consequently, discussing a cause may not be particularly rational. However, what rationale is behind the regression necessitating a singular initial cause? Independent events may revert to independent origins, suggesting multiple initial causes. Hume argued that even if the Universe were to have a cause, it does not necessarily follow that this cause must be identified as the Christian God.

Counter-argument (strength)

Inductive arguments, being *a posteriori*, rely on universally accessible empirical evidence. The relationship between cause and effect is a fundamental characteristic of the universe, which remains unassailable, contributing to the enduring appeal of such arguments. Contemporary cosmology endorses the Big Bang Theory as the universe's origin, a conclusion derived from inductive reasoning that lacks direct empirical evidence. They dismiss the concept of an infinite past and advocate for a singular point of singularity at the universe's inception, which may hold the key to understanding the question "What caused the Big Bang?" Craig William has revitalised the Kalam form of the argument, similarly to Al-Ghazali, and dismisses the concept of infinity. He articulates that an infinite series cannot exist, as it is logically flawed to suggest such a series. One would have had to traverse an infinite time to reach the present moment.

The weaknesses of the Teleological argument

Since the conclusion is an assumption, the argument is weak. As Hume suggested, why must there be one God when several gods might be accountable for various sections of the world? However, empirical evidence is subjective. Scientists get diverse inferences from sensory data. Darwin's theory of evolution and natural selection shows that order may be random (Michael & Ruse, 2009). The hypothesis states that only the most suited

will pass on their genes, resulting in a completely adapted species. Even though they seem planned, they evolved via variety and survival. This describes the cosmos without a god. Since the cosmos is more complicated, God must create it. Hume opposed such arguments because comparing God to a timepiece anthropomorphises God (Hartl, 2024). It rejects the traditional concept of God as almighty. Hume also argued that we cannot compare the cosmos to a watch. Too big a difference diminishes the connection.

Counter-argument (strength)

The attractiveness of inductive arguments is that they are *a posteriori* and rely on empirical data. According to Swinburne, the cosmos might have been created using scientific theories such as the "Big Bang" and evolution (Swinburne, 2010). After science proved the natural world's inherent orderliness, there are strong arguments for believing in a higher power like God. Even though he was well aware of this argument, Paley did not assert God's essence. Those who agree with Paley's interpretation argue that he only used the watch to symbolise, rather than depict, the cosmos.

CONCLUSION

The cosmological and teleological arguments remain two of the most enduring and philosophically robust approaches to affirming the existence of God. Through their respective emphases on causality and design, both arguments continue to offer compelling frameworks for interpreting the origins and order of the universe—especially in the light of modern scientific advancements. In its *kalām*, Thomist, and Leibnizian formulations, the cosmological argument asserts with reasoned clarity that the universe's existence requires a cause that itself is uncaused, necessary, and transcendent. Despite alternative hypotheses—such as Hawking's appeal to quantum mechanics—the fact remains that scientific models like the Big Bang do not fully account for the origin of existence itself. Rather than diminishing the strength of the cosmological argument, these models often deepen its relevance, pointing to a finite beginning that aligns with metaphysical necessity and invites reflection on the cause beyond space and time. Thus, the cosmological argument retains substantial philosophical credibility as a rational pointer to a necessary being, identified in classical theism as God. Likewise, the teleological argument—whether grounded in classical analogies or contemporary fine-tuning theories—continues to carry explanatory power in light of the universe's astonishing complexity and precision. While evolutionary theory explains biological development, it does not adequately address why the laws of nature are finely tuned to permit life in the first place. The consistent order and intelligibility observed in the cosmos suggest not mere randomness but the work of an intelligent cause. Though the teleological argument does not yield conclusive proof, it renders belief in a designer eminently reasonable and intellectually defensible. Taken together, these arguments do not claim to prove God's existence in the empirical sense exhaustively. However, they provide coherent, cumulative, and rational grounds for theistic belief. They challenge the modern thinker to engage with questions that lie beyond the scope of scientific method alone—questions of ultimate origin, purpose, and meaning. Therefore, this

paper affirms that the cosmological and teleological arguments remain valid and relevant. They enrich the intellectual discourse surrounding theism and serve as powerful signposts that gesture beyond the physical universe to a transcendent, purposeful source. For those grounded in Christian thought, these arguments function not as substitutes for faith but as supports illuminating the plausibility of belief in a Creator whose ultimate self-revelation is found in the person of Jesus Christ. In the final analysis, reason and faith need not be adversaries but can be complementary pathways in the pursuit of truth.

REFERENSI

Adeoye, M. A. (2024). Divine Nature under Scrutiny: Rethinking the Problem of Evil in the Light of Modern Philosophical Discourse. *RUDN Journal of Philosophy*, 28(2), 543-557. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2313-2302-2024-28-2-543-557>

Almeida, M. (2018). Cosmological arguments. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108675604>

Anderson, M. J., & Stephenson, K. F. (2014). Aristotle: Genius Philosopher and Scientist. Enslow Publishing, LLC.

Aquinas, S. T. (2015). Of God and his creatures. Aeterna Press.

Aquinas, T. (2017). The Cosmological Argument. Readings in the Philosophy of Religion, 22.

Beckman, E. (2008). Richard Swinburne's Inductive Argument for the Existence of God – A Critical Analysis. Bachelor Dissertation, Department of Culture and Communication (IKK) Philosophy, Faculty of Art and Sciences, Linköping University

Beebee, H. (2006). Hume on causation. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203966600>

Bell, M. (2011). Hume on the Nature and Existence of God. A Companion to Hume, 338–51. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470696583.ch18>

Bex, F. J. (2011). Arguments, stories and criminal evidence: A formal hybrid theory (Vol. 92). Springer Science & Business Media. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-0140-3>

Blyth, D. (2015). Heavenly soul in Aristotle. *Apeiron*, 48(4), 427-465.

Bodnar, I., & Pellegrin, P. (2006). Aristotle's Physics and Cosmology. A Companion to Ancient Philosophy, 270-291. <https://doi.org/10.1111/b.9780631210610.2006.00020.x>

Botteri, G., & Casazza, R. (2023). The Astronomical System of Aristotle: An Interpretation (Vol. 58). Brill. <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004525535>

Bouchard, F. (2013). How ecosystem evolution strengthens the case for functional pluralism. Functions: Selection and mechanisms, 83–95. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-5304-4_5

Buckle, S. (2004). Hume's enlightenment tract: the unity and purpose of An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding. Oxford University Press, USA. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199271146.001.0001>

Burrell, D. B. (2016). Aquinas: God and action. Wipf and Stock Publishers.

Butler, J. (2001). Giving an account of oneself. *Diacritics*, 31(4), 22-40. <https://doi.org/10.1353/dia.2004.0002>

Cantens, B. (2012). Suárez's cosmological argument for the existence of God. *Interpreting Suárez. Critical Essays*, 89–114. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139018753.005>

Capehart, J. D. (2021, June). Étienne Gilson: Three Stages and Two Modes of His Christian Philosophy. In *Forum Philosophicum* 26(1), 51–84. <https://doi.org/10.35765/forphil.2021.2601.05>

Cho, H. J. (2009). A Study on the Proofs of God's Existence in Thomas Aquinas. *한국기독교신학논총*, 66(1), 97–116.

Copleston, F. C. (2003). *Logical positivism and existentialism* (Vol. 11). A&C Black.

Craig, W. L. (2004). The cosmological argument. In *The rationality of theism* (pp. 124–143). Routledge.

Craig, W. L., & Sinclair, J. D. (2009). The Kalam cosmological argument. *The Blackwell Companion to Natural Theology*, 101–201. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444308334.ch3>

Dastagiri, M. B. (2018). The Origin of Universe: Big Bang to God Theory. *European Scientific Journal*, 14(33), 143-155. <https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2018.v14n33p143>

Davies, B. (2011). *Thinking About God*. Wipf and Stock Publishers.

Davies, B. (2011). Thomas Aquinas on god and evil. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199790890.001.0001>

Davies, B., & Stump, E. (Eds.). (2011). *The Oxford Handbook of Aquinas*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780195326093.001.0001>

Dodds, M. J. (2020). *The One Creator God in Thomas Aquinas and Contemporary Theology*. Catholic University of America Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv131bt1q>

Eatough, G. (2016). *From Plato's Cave to Tragic Truth: A theoric journey between theatre and the visual arts*. Lancaster University (United Kingdom).

Ellis, G. F. R. (2014). On the philosophy of cosmology. *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science Part B: Studies in History and Philosophy of Modern Physics*, 46, 5-23. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.shpsb.2013.07.006>

Evans, C. S. (2010). *Natural signs and knowledge of God: A new look at theistic arguments*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.5040/9780755621422>

Firestone, R. S. (2019). Dismantling Paley's Watch: Equivocation Regarding the Word "Order" in the Teleological Argument. *Open Journal of Philosophy*, 10(1), 155–186. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ojpp.2020.101012>

Futuyma, D. J. (2015). Can modern evolutionary theory explain macroevolution? *Macroevolution: Explanation, interpretation and evidence*, 29-85. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-15045-1_2

Göcke, B. P., & Göcke, B. P. (2014). *Concepts of God in Philosophy and Theology. A Theory of the Absolute*, 154-168. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137412829_9

Gudyma, I. (2023). Theistic Cosmology of Richard Swinburne as a Phenomenon of the Theological Renaissance. *European Journal of Science and Theology*, 19(3), 73–89.

Haldane, J. (2016). Heythrop, Copleston, and the Jesuit Contribution to Philosophy1. *Philosophy*, 91(4), 559–589. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0031819116000383>

Hartl, P. (2024). Anthropomorphism and Priestly Power: Hume's Criticism of Popular Religion. In *Hume's Minimal Theism and the Supervised Christian Church: A Philosophical and Historical Analysis of the Idea of True Religion* (pp. 57–79). Cham: Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-54945-8_4

Hawley, J. F., & Holcomb, K. A. (2005). Foundations of modern cosmology. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198530961.001.0001>

Hehenkamp, J. B. M. (2015). David Hume's work on the cosmological argument and the argument from design in Dialogues: A systematic exposition (Master's thesis, University of Utrecht).

Hetherington, N. S. (2023). Aristotle's cosmology. In Cosmology (pp. 95–104). CRC Press. <https://doi.org/10.1201/9781003418047>

Hetherington, N. S. (2023). Plato's cosmology. In Cosmology (pp. 79–94). CRC Press. <https://doi.org/10.1201/9781003418047>

Hume, D. (2000). A treatise of human nature. Oxford University Press.

Hume, D. (2016). Why Is There Something Rather Than Nothing? Journey into Philosophy: An Introduction with Classic and Contemporary Readings, 206.

Kenny, A. (2010). A new history of Western philosophy. Oxford University Press.

King-Farlow, Y., & Christensen, W. N. (2012). Faith and the Life of Reason. Springer Science & Business Media.

Koons, R. C. (2014). God's Existence. In Neo-Aristotelian perspectives in metaphysics (pp. 247–268). Routledge.

Korsgaard, C. M. (2009, November). The activity of reason. In Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association (Vol. 83, No. 2, pp. 23-43). American Philosophical Association.

Kraal, A. (2023). The Problem of God in David Hume. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009270243>

Kragh, H. (2023). Big bang cosmology. In Cosmology (pp. 371–390). CRC Press. <https://doi.org/10.1201/9781003418047-32>

Loke, A. (2022). The teleological and Kalam cosmological arguments revisited (p. 387). Springer Nature. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-94403-2>

Manson, N. A. (Ed.). (2002). God and design. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203398265>

Marinescu, R. I. (2021). Plato on Self-Motion in Laws X. *Rhizomata*, 9(1), 96-122. <https://doi.org/10.1515/rhiz-2021-0005>

Michael, R. U. S. E., & Ruse, M. (2009). Darwin and design: Does evolution have a purpose? Harvard University Press.

Millican, P. (2016). Hume's Chief Argument. *The Oxford Handbook of Hume*, 82–108.

Mitchell, J. A. (2013). From Aristotle's Four Causes to Aquinas' Ultimate Causes of Being: Modern Interpretations. *Alpha Omega*, 16(3), 399–414.

Naddaf, G. (2004). Plato: the creator of natural theology. *International Studies in Philosophy*, 36(1), 129–150. <https://doi.org/10.5840/intstudphil20043616>

Nah, D. S. (2013). Christian theology and religious pluralism: A critical evaluation of John Hick. The Lutterworth Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt1cfgf1qd>

Oderberg, D. S. (2013). The cosmological argument. In *Routledge Companion to Philosophy of Religion* (pp. 401-410). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203813010.ch37>

O'Gorman, M. (2017). An investigation of the concept of Divine Freedom within the philosophical Theology of St Thomas Aquinas (Master's thesis, Mary Immaculate College, University of Limerick).

Oliver, S. (2006). *Philosophy, God and motion*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203008195>

Paasch, J. T. (2016). Aquinas on the Trinity. *Aquinas's Summa Theologiae: A Critical Guide*, 68-87.

Pruss, A. R. (2009). The Leibnizian cosmological argument. *The Blackwell companion to natural theology*, 24–100. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444308334.ch2>

Rheins, J. G. (2010). The intelligible creator-god and the intelligent soul of the cosmos in Plato's theology and metaphysics (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania).

Smith, S. H. (2014). *The Problem of God*. Xlibris Corporation.

Spoerl, J. S. (2017). Hume's Critique of Natural Religion: A Thomistic Response. *Saint Anselm Journal*, 13(1).

Stanek, T. B. (2017). On David Hume. *Journal of Critical Issues in Educational Practice*, 7(1), 3.

Swinburne, R. (2007). The Revival of Natural Theology. *Archivio di filosofia: LXXV*, 1/2, 2007, 1000-1020.

Swinburne, R. (2010). God as the Simplest Explanation of the Universe. *European Journal of Philosophy of Religion*, 2(1). <https://doi.org/10.24204/ejpr.v2i1.348>

Swinburne, R. (2010). The argument to God from the laws of nature. *Science and Religion in Dialogue*, 213–222. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444317350.ch14>

Swinburne, R. (2010). *Is there a God?* Oxford University Press.

Tahko, T. E. (2011). *A priori and a posteriori: A bootstrapping relationship*. *Metaphysica*, 12(2), 151–164. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12133-011-0083-5>

Tipler, F. J. (2003). Intelligent life in cosmology. *International Journal of Astrobiology*, 2(2), 141–148. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1473550403001526>

Tooley, M., & Plantinga, A. (2011). Hume and the Problem of Evil. *Philosophy of Religion: The Key Thinkers*, 159–86.

van den Heuvel, E. (2016). The Big Bang as Origin of the Universe. In *The Amazing Unity of the Universe* (pp. 137-160). Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-23543-1_10

Van Nieuwenhove, R. (2021). *Thomas Aquinas and Contemplation*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780192895295.001.0001>

Van Nuffelen, P. (2012). Beyond Categorisation: “Pagan Monotheism” And the Study of Ancient Religion. *Common Knowledge*, 18(3), 451-463. <https://doi.org/10.1215/0961754X-1630332>

Vijgen, J. (2018). The Corruption of the Good of Nature and Moral Action: The Realism of St. Thomas Aquinas. *Espíritu: cuadernos del Instituto Filosófico de Balmesiana*, 67(155), 127-152.

Warr, A. (2008). *Nietzsche on truth* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Saskatchewan).

Weingartner, P. (2010). God's Existence. Can it be proven? De Gruyter Brill. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110324624>

Weston, P. R. (2018). A Reformed Assessment of Richard Swinburne's Christian Theology (Doctoral dissertation, London School of Theology).

Wilson, J. (2010). What is Hume's dictum, and why believe it? *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, 80(3), 595–637. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1933-1592.2010.00342.x>

Zeyl, D. J. (2021). Divine Causal Agency in Classical Greek Philosophy. In Philosophical Essays on Divine Causation (pp. 14–31). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429320767-2>

Adeoye, M. A. (2024). Divine Nature under Scrutiny: Rethinking the Problem of Evil in the Light of Modern Philosophical Discourse. RUDN Journal of Philosophy, 28(2), 543-557. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2313-2302-2024-28-2-543-557>

Almeida, M. (2018). Cosmological arguments. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108675604>

Anderson, M. J., & Stephenson, K. F. (2014). Aristotle: Genius Philosopher and Scientist. Enslow Publishing, LLC.

Aquinas, S. T. (2015). Of God and his creatures. Aeterna Press.

Aquinas, T. (2017). The Cosmological Argument. Readings in the Philosophy of Religion, 22.

Beckman, E. (2008). Richard Swinburne's Inductive Argument for the Existence of God – A Critical Analysis. Bachelor Dissertation, Department of Culture and Communication (IKK) Philosophy, Faculty of Art and Sciences, Linköping University

Beebee, H. (2006). Hume on causation. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203966600>

Bell, M. (2011). Hume on the Nature and Existence of God. A Companion to Hume, 338–51. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470696583.ch18>

Bex, F. J. (2011). Arguments, stories and criminal evidence: A formal hybrid theory (Vol. 92). Springer Science & Business Media. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-0140-3>

Blyth, D. (2015). Heavenly soul in Aristotle. Apeiron, 48(4), 427-465.

Bodnar, I., & Pellegrin, P. (2006). Aristotle's Physics and Cosmology. A Companion to Ancient Philosophy, 270-291. <https://doi.org/10.1111/b.9780631210610.2006.00020.x>

Botteri, G., & Casazza, R. (2023). The Astronomical System of Aristotle: An Interpretation (Vol. 58). Brill. <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004525535>

Bouchard, F. (2013). How ecosystem evolution strengthens the case for functional pluralism. Functions: Selection and mechanisms, 83–95. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-5304-4_5

Buckle, S. (2004). Hume's enlightenment tract: the unity and purpose of An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding. Oxford University Press, USA. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199271146.001.0001>

Burrell, D. B. (2016). Aquinas: God and action. Wipf and Stock Publishers.

Butler, J. (2001). Giving an account of oneself. Diacritics, 31(4), 22-40. <https://doi.org/10.1353/dia.2004.0002>

Cantens, B. (2012). Suárez's cosmological argument for the existence of God. Interpreting Suárez. Critical Essays, 89–114. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139018753.005>

Capehart, J. D. (2021, June). Étienne Gilson: Three Stages and Two Modes of His Christian Philosophy. In Forum Philosophicum 26(1), 51–84. <https://doi.org/10.35765/forphil.2021.2601.05>

Cho, H. J. (2009). A Study on the Proofs of God's Existence in Thomas Aquinas. 한국기독교신학논총, 66(1), 97–116.

Copleston, F. C. (2003). Logical positivism and existentialism (Vol. 11). A&C Black.

Craig, W. L. (2004). The cosmological argument. In The rationality of theism (pp. 124–143). Routledge.

Craig, W. L., & Sinclair, J. D. (2009). The Kalam cosmological argument. The Blackwell Companion to Natural Theology, 101–201. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444308334.ch3>

Dastagiri, M. B. (2018). The Origin of Universe: Big Bang to God Theory. European Scientific Journal, 14(33), 143-155. <https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2018.v14n33p143>

Davies, B. (2011). Thinking About God. Wipf and Stock Publishers.

Davies, B. (2011). Thomas Aquinas on god and evil. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199790890.001.0001>

Davies, B., & Stump, E. (Eds.). (2011). The Oxford Handbook of Aquinas. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780195326093.001.0001>

Dodds, M. J. (2020). The One Creator God in Thomas Aquinas and Contemporary Theology. Catholic University of America Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv131bt1q>

Eatough, G. (2016). From Plato's Cave to Tragic Truth: A theoric journey between theatre and the visual arts. Lancaster University (United Kingdom).

Ellis, G. F. R. (2014). On the philosophy of cosmology. Studies in History and Philosophy of Science Part B: Studies in History and Philosophy of Modern Physics, 46, 5-23. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.shpsb.2013.07.006>

Evans, C. S. (2010). Natural signs and knowledge of God: A new look at theistic arguments. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.5040/9780755621422>

Firestone, R. S. (2019). Dismantling Paley's Watch: Equivocation Regarding the Word "Order" in the Teleological Argument. Open Journal of Philosophy, 10(1), 155–186. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ojpp.2020.101012>

Futuyma, D. J. (2015). Can modern evolutionary theory explain macroevolution? Macroevolution: Explanation, interpretation and evidence, 29-85. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-15045-1_2

Göcke, B. P., & Göcke, B. P. (2014). Concepts of God in Philosophy and Theology. A Theory of the Absolute, 154-168. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137412829_9

Gudyma, I. (2023). Theistic Cosmology of Richard Swinburne as a Phenomenon of the Theological Renaissance. European Journal of Science and Theology, 19(3), 73–89.

Haldane, J. (2016). Heythrop, Copleston, and the Jesuit Contribution to Philosophy1. Philosophy, 91(4), 559–589. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0031819116000383>

Hartl, P. (2024). Anthropomorphism and Priestly Power: Hume's Criticism of Popular Religion. In Hume's Minimal Theism and the Supervised Christian Church: A Philosophical and Historical Analysis of the Idea of True Religion (pp. 57–79). Cham: Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-54945-8_4

Hawley, J. F., & Holcomb, K. A. (2005). Foundations of modern cosmology. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198530961.001.0001>

Hehenkamp, J. B. M. (2015). David Hume's work on the cosmological argument and the argument from design in Dialogues: A systematic exposition (Master's thesis, University of Utrecht).

Hetherington, N. S. (2023). Aristotle's cosmology. In Cosmology (pp. 95–104). CRC Press. <https://doi.org/10.1201/9781003418047>

Hetherington, N. S. (2023). Plato's cosmology. In Cosmology (pp. 79–94). CRC Press. <https://doi.org/10.1201/9781003418047>

Hume, D. (2000). A treatise of human nature. Oxford University Press.

Hume, D. (2016). Why Is There Something Rather Than Nothing? Journey into Philosophy: An Introduction with Classic and Contemporary Readings, 206.

Kenny, A. (2010). A new history of Western philosophy. Oxford University Press.

King-Farlow, Y., & Christensen, W. N. (2012). Faith and the Life of Reason. Springer Science & Business Media.

Koons, R. C. (2014). God's Existence. In Neo-Aristotelian perspectives in metaphysics (pp. 247–268). Routledge.

Korsgaard, C. M. (2009, November). The activity of reason. In Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association (Vol. 83, No. 2, pp. 23-43). American Philosophical Association.

Kraal, A. (2023). The Problem of God in David Hume. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009270243>

Kragh, H. (2023). Big bang cosmology. In Cosmology (pp. 371–390). CRC Press. <https://doi.org/10.1201/9781003418047-32>

Loke, A. (2022). The teleological and Kalam cosmological arguments revisited (p. 387). Springer Nature. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-94403-2>

Manson, N. A. (Ed.). (2002). God and design. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203398265>

Marinescu, R. I. (2021). Plato on Self-Motion in Laws X. *Rhizomata*, 9(1), 96-122. <https://doi.org/10.1515/rhiz-2021-0005>

Michael, R. U. S. E., & Ruse, M. (2009). Darwin and design: Does evolution have a purpose? Harvard University Press.

Millican, P. (2016). Hume's Chief Argument. *The Oxford Handbook of Hume*, 82–108.

Mitchell, J. A. (2013). From Aristotle's Four Causes to Aquinas' Ultimate Causes of Being: Modern Interpretations. *Alpha Omega*, 16(3), 399–414.

Naddaf, G. (2004). Plato: the creator of natural theology. *International Studies in Philosophy*, 36(1), 129–150. <https://doi.org/10.5840/intstudphil20043616>

Nah, D. S. (2013). Christian theology and religious pluralism: A critical evaluation of John Hick. The Lutterworth Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt1cgf1qd>

Oderberg, D. S. (2013). The cosmological argument. In *Routledge Companion to Philosophy of Religion* (pp. 401-410). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203813010.ch37>

O'Gorman, M. (2017). An investigation of the concept of Divine Freedom within the philosophical Theology of St Thomas Aquinas (Master's thesis, Mary Immaculate College, University of Limerick).

Oliver, S. (2006). Philosophy, God and motion. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203008195>

Paasch, J. T. (2016). Aquinas on the Trinity. *Aquinas's Summa Theologiae: A Critical Guide*, 68-87.

Pruss, A. R. (2009). The Leibnizian cosmological argument. *The Blackwell companion to natural theology*, 24–100. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444308334.ch2>

Rheins, J. G. (2010). The intelligible creator-god and the intelligent soul of the cosmos in Plato's theology and metaphysics (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania).

Smith, S. H. (2014). *The Problem of God*. Xlibris Corporation.

Spoerl, J. S. (2017). Hume's Critique of Natural Religion: A Thomistic Response. *Saint Anselm Journal*, 13(1).

Stanek, T. B. (2017). On David Hume. *Journal of Critical Issues in Educational Practice*, 7(1), 3.

Swinburne, R. (2007). The Revival of Natural Theology. *Archivio di filosofia: LXXV*, 1/2, 2007, 1000-1020.

Swinburne, R. (2010). God as the Simplest Explanation of the Universe. *European Journal of Philosophy of Religion*, 2(1). <https://doi.org/10.24204/ejpr.v2i1.348>

Swinburne, R. (2010). The argument to God from the laws of nature. *Science and Religion in Dialogue*, 213–222. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444317350.ch14>

Swinburne, R. (2010). *Is there a God?* Oxford University Press.

Tahko, T. E. (2011). *A priori and a posteriori: A bootstrapping relationship*. *Metaphysica*, 12(2), 151–164. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12133-011-0083-5>

Tipler, F. J. (2003). Intelligent life in cosmology. *International Journal of Astrobiology*, 2(2), 141–148. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1473550403001526>

Tooley, M., & Plantinga, A. (2011). Hume and the Problem of Evil. *Philosophy of Religion: The Key Thinkers*, 159–86.

van den Heuvel, E. (2016). The Big Bang as Origin of the Universe. In *The Amazing Unity of the Universe* (pp. 137–160). Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-23543-1_10

Van Nieuwenhove, R. (2021). Thomas Aquinas and Contemplation. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780192895295.001.0001>

Van Nuffelen, P. (2012). Beyond Categorisation: “Pagan Monotheism” And the Study of Ancient Religion. *Common Knowledge*, 18(3), 451–463. <https://doi.org/10.1215/0961754X-1630332>

Vijgen, J. (2018). The Corruption of the Good of Nature and Moral Action: The Realism of St. Thomas Aquinas. *Espíritu: cuadernos del Instituto Filosófico de Balmesiana*, 67(155), 127–152.

Warr, A. (2008). *Nietzsche on truth* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Saskatchewan).

Weingartner, P. (2010). God's Existence. Can it be proven? De Gruyter Brill. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110324624>

Weston, P. R. (2018). A Reformed Assessment of Richard Swinburne's Christian Theology (Doctoral dissertation, London School of Theology).

Wilson, J. (2010). What is Hume's dictum, and why believe it? *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, 80(3), 595–637. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1933-1592.2010.00342.x>

Zeyl, D. J. (2021). Divine Causal Agency in Classical Greek Philosophy. In *Philosophical Essays on Divine Causation* (pp. 14–31). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429320767-2>