

## PHI 422 STUDY GUIDE 1

On exam day, I will pick two of the following four short-essay prompts, and then you will answer **one and only one of them**. HINT: study for 3 of them and then you'll be set. All are based on Plantinga's *God, Freedom, and Evil* but only the content we've covered or will cover on 9/9. The exam will be available on Blackboard at Noon on September 11 and you'll have an hour to submit it (so it'll close and be unavailable at 1PM). Shoot for 3-5 paragraphs. Here are the prompts.

**Prompt 1:** Mackie claims that it is irrational to believe in an all good and all powerful God given the existence of evil in the world. (a) He doesn't say exactly why belief in both God and evil is inconsistent, so Plantinga attempts to develop how this contradiction or inconsistency might go. What is the set of sentences that Plantinga thinks would be inconsistent? (b) Part of this set is what Plantinga calls principle (21). Does Plantinga think this principle is true or false? And why? (c) Later, Plantinga introduces the notion of transworld depravity. What is it? And how does it help refute Mackie's charge of inconsistency?

**Prompt 2:** There are two broad pictures of how God and human freedom are related. (a) One picture is the combination of molinism and the libertarian theory of free will. What are those views? Develop one reason or argument in defense of this combination of views. (b) Another picture is the combination of the reformed view and the compatibilist theory of free will. What are those views? Develop one reason or argument in defense of this combination of views. (c) Which view do you think is ultimately right? And why?

**Prompt 3:** In section 5, Plantinga introduces a story about a guy named Paul who refuses to sell his aardvark for \$500. (a) Plantinga then argues that this story shows that there are possible worlds that God cannot actualize. How does his argument go? (b) Do you agree with Plantinga? Why or why not?

**Prompt 4:** Plantinga's Free Will Defense is only successful if he is right that the libertarian theory of free will is true. Let's suppose that he is wrong, and that instead, compatibilism is true about free will. That is, an action is free just in case you desire to perform that action and actually perform it. Moreover, given compatibilism, you can freely choose to perform some action *A* even if *A* is determined to happen by either the laws of physics or God actualizing a world where you choose *A*. How can a compatibilist respond to Mackie's charge that theism is inconsistent with the existence of evil? Any ideas? Develop your thoughts in 3-5 paragraphs.