

Assignment Schedule #3

A12: Read the selections by Craig and al-Ghazâlî on pages 78-86. Respond to each of the following:

- 1) What is the difference between *actual* and *potential* infinity? On a common-sense view, if I say, “the past is infinite,” what sort of infinity do I have in mind? If I say, “the future is infinite,” what sort of infinity do I have in mind? To which sort of infinity is Craig opposed? Explain.
- 2) See if you can reconstruct al-Ghazâlî’s reasoning along the lines of the argument developed in class. That is, in class we reasoned as follows,
 1. Nothing is greater than infinitely big
 2. A whole is greater than its proper parts
 3. The totality of time elapsed up to now is a proper part of that which will have been elapsed after now.

 4. The totality of time elapsed up to now is not infinite

Based on his first paragraphs from reading, Ghazâlî’s opponent takes an “Aristotelian” view of the universe on which the sun and planets have *always* been revolving around the earth, and the sun makes twelve revolutions for every revolution of Jupiter. Recast the above reasoning for the conclusion that the revolutions of Jupiter are not infinite. Then use our validity format to show that your argument is valid. Hint: there is a *part* of the total revolutions of the sun which correspond to the revolutions of Jupiter (the “Jupiter revolutions”).

- EX: Suppose the past cannot be infinite. From the reading, how might this be a *problem* for the existence of god? How does al-Ghazâlî respond toward the end of his article? Do you think his response is adequate? Explain.

A13: Read Maor, pp. 87-95. Respond to each of the following:

- 1) Assuming Cantor’s correspondence principle, find a correspondence to show that the set of all positive integers has the same size as the set of positive multiples of 3. That is, show that the set $\{1, 2, 3, \dots\}$ has the same number of members as the set: $\{3, 6, 9, \dots\}$. Explain.
- 2) Consider the argument against an infinite past stated above for A12.2 Use our logical notions of validity and soundness to say *how* Cantor’s conclusion from above is relevant to the argument. Given what you’ve seen so far, do you think the argument is sound? Explain.

EX: Consider the following attempt to line up the integers with the decimal fractions:

1	-	0.111111111111...	7	-	0.777777777777...
2	-	0.222222222222...	8	-	0.888888888888...
3	-	0.333333333333...	9	-	0.999999999999...
4	-	0.444444444444...	10	-	0.101010101010...
5	-	0.555555555555...	11	-	0.011111111111...
6	-	0.666666666666...	12	-	0.121212121212...

That is, repeat the integer over and over except that for “duplicate” cases—1 and 11, 2 and 22, 12 and 1212, etc.—prefix enough 0s so that no later fraction duplicates an earlier one. Use Cantor’s method to find the first 15 digits of a fraction that is sure to be left off of the list. Explain how Cantor moves to the conclusion that there are *more* decimal fractions than integers. How is *this* result relevant to soundness of the argument against the infinite past?

A14) Read the selections by Craig and Sorabji on pp. 96-106. Respond to each of the following:

- 1) Consider Craig’s library case. Using Cantor’s methods, how could you add infinitely many books to the library? Having done this, how could you add infinitely many *more* books to the library? After this is done, on Cantor’s account, are there any more books in the library than there were in the first place? Explain.
- 2) How would Sorabji respond to the case you’ve just described? Do you think he is right? That is, who do you think makes the stronger case, Craig or Sorabji? Explain.

EX: In this section of the course, we have considered a number of arguments: (i) Craig’s original argument for the conclusion that the universe has a cause of its existence, (ii) al-Ghazâlî’s argument against actual infinite collections, (iii) the Cantorian arguments about infinity, and (iv) Craig and Sorabji’s considerations about the application of Cantor’s ideas to actuality. Briefly describe these arguments and especially their interrelations. Give particular attention to *which premises* are being supported or attacked by what. You may find a sort of diagram or flowchart to be helpful.

A15: Read the selections by Plato and Hudson on pages 107-117. Respond to each of the following:

- 1) Socrates makes the key point in his second statement. From lecture and reading, what are the problems about saying the gods love piety because it is pious? what are the problems about saying it is pious because the gods love it?
- 2) What is the (unmodified) divine command theory, and how is it supposed to be subject to objections from arbitrariness? From Hudson, what is the “modified” divine command theory proposed by thinkers like Adams? How is the modified theory supposed to ward off these objections?

EX: Hudson develops objections to the Divine Command theory under the headings, (i) The Question of Arbitrariness, (ii) The Teleological Suspension of the Ethical, (iii) Uncertainty about What God Commands, and (iv) Inconsistency with God’s Goodness.

For at least one of these objections, what is the problem and do you agree or disagree? Why?

A16: Read the selections by Adams and Chandler on pages 118-137. Respond to each of the following:

- 1) According to Adams, how does the modified DCT escape the charge that cruelty for its own sake might turn out to be not morally wrong? How does he escape the charge that, in his appeal to love, he appeals to an external moral value? Explain.
- 2) On p. 136, Chandler says, “If the co-extensiveness thesis is true, God’s will becomes redundant, and the D.C.T. is abandoned...; if it is false, we are left with the traditional form of the D.C.T. with all its problems.” Carefully explain this claim. That is, say what the co-extensiveness thesis is, what is supposed to go wrong when it is true, and what is supposed to go wrong when it is false.

EX: Chandler charges that the theist cannot substantively claim that god is ethically good. Toward the end of his article, Adams replies. What is supposed to be the problem? What is supposed to be the solution? Which to you think is right? Explain.

A17: Read the selection by Roy on pages 138-154. Respond to each of the following:

- 1) What is supposed to be “queer” about objective moral values? That is, (i) say we know that some act is a bloody killing; does it follow, from this alone, that it is morally wrong? How so? (ii) Say some powerful being commands that we never wear sneakers, does it follow, from this alone, that it is morally wrong? How so? (iii) How is this relevant to the divine command theory?
- 2) What is Roy’s view? How is it supposed to count as a response to the problem about queerness? That is, (i) how is it supposed to satisfy pressures from moral criticism, method and authority? (ii) How does this matter for a Divine Command theory?

EX: Contrast Adams’ modified divine command theory with the one that results from Roy. (i) How does Adams’s theory block the consequence that moral values are arbitrary? How does Roy’s? (ii) What problem, left unsolved by Adams’s theory, is supposed to be solved by Roy’s? Do you think Roy succeeds? Why or why not?

Preview of essay #1 for final exam: In a paper of about 3 double-spaced typed pages, critically discuss Criag’s defense of the Kalām Cosmological Argument. For this, you should explain the argument, including reasoning we derived from Ghāzālī that the past cannot actually be infinite. Then you can explain objections based on Cantor’s approach to infinity, and evaluate whether Craig’s examples are sufficient to remove Cantor’s objections, and so revive the original cosmological argument.