

Original Article

An Exposition and Evaluation of Thomas Aquinas' Five Proofs of the Existence of God

Remigius Mmadubugwu Obiora

Department of Philosophy, University of Nigeria, Nsukka, Nigeria

Received Date: 10 November 2023

Revised Date: 26 November 2023

Accepted Date: 06 December 2023

Abstract: *With a critical gaze on the intricacies, orderliness, harmonious functioning of the celestial bodies, interplay of natural laws and purpose in the universe, one would begin to ponder on the fundamental question about the creator of the universe, does God truly exist? This profound contemplation led Thomas Aquinas to propound his Five Proofs of God's existence, which are based on motion, cause, contingency, design and gradation. Aquinas argues that these five proofs portray God as the First Mover, the Uncaused Cause, the Necessary Being, the Supreme Being and the Designer of the universe, respectively. These proofs have continued to generate fundamental arguments in both philosophical and theological debates about the existence of God. This work exposes and evaluates Aquinas' five proofs of the existence of God, highlights their soundness, persuasiveness, strengths and weaknesses and shades new light on their significances in contemporary philosophical and theological thoughts on the existence of God.*

Keywords: *Profound Contemplation, Harmonious Functioning, Universe, Existence, Fundamental Arguments.*

I. INTRODUCTION

A. An Exposition of Thomas Aquinas' proof of God's Existence:

In a universe filled with numerous enigmas and incredible phenomena, it is inevitable and natural for the human mind to question the existence of an almighty power. From the observable mysterious happenings in world, one cannot help pondering on the fundamental question: Does God truly exist? This contemplation is induced by the intricacies and orderliness of the universe, with its harmonious celestial bodies and the interplay of natural laws. How could such complexity arise without a deliberate design? A meticulous contemplation on this, results in the realization of the existence of a supreme being and a transcendent creator. The very existence of the universe and its harmonious functioning, points towards an intelligent source.

As sentient beings, we constantly seek meaning and purpose in our lives. The struggles we encounter and the challenges we face prompt us to reflect upon the purpose behind our existence. Aquinas posits that if life were devoid of meaning, there would be no basis for morality or the pursuit of virtue. The very fact that we strive for goodness and purpose suggests the existence of a transcendent source that imbues our lives with significance. The origin of the universe itself remains a subject of fascination and wonder. The Big Bang theory, supported by scientific evidence, proposes that the universe began with a tremendous explosion. However, the question of what caused this initial event remains unanswered.

The presence of moral values and ethical principles within societies throughout history, have been a source of worry to philosophers and thinkers. Our shared understanding of right and wrong, justice and fairness, points to the existence of a universal moral law. Aquinas asserts that the existence of an objective moral standard points towards a divine law-giver. The struggle to discern and uphold moral principles in a complex world invites us to contemplate the origin of such principles and the existence of a higher power who upholds them. Thomas Aquinas's Five Proofs of God's Existence as contained in his work *Summa Theologica*, which he termed *Quinque Viae* (Five Ways), provide a philosophical framework that resonates with our innate desire to seek answers and find meaning in the world. By contemplating the intricacies of nature, our search for purpose, the origins of the universe, and the existence of moral values, we embark on a journey to understand our place in the grand tapestry of existence. The five arguments are as follows:

a) *The Argument from Motion:*

The Argument from Motion is one of the Five Proofs for the existence of God presented by St. Thomas Aquinas. This argument is rooted in the observation of motion in the universe and asserts the necessity of an unmoved mover or a prime mover to account for the existence of motion. Aquinas argues that everything in the world is in a state of motion, and for



something to be in motion; it must have been set in motion by something else. However, this chain of causation cannot regress infinitely; there must be a first cause, an unmoved mover, that initiates all motion without being moved by anything else.¹ Aquinas begins the Argument from Motion by observing that motion is a fundamental aspect of the world. He contends that objects in the universe are in a constant state of change and motion, and these movements are caused by other objects. According to Aquinas, if everything were merely moved by other objects, there would be an infinite regress of movers and moved objects, leading to an absurdity. Aquinas argues that an infinite regress of movers and moved objects is untenable because it would imply that there is no ultimate cause or source of motion. He asserts that for motion to occur, there must be a first mover that sets everything else in motion without being moved itself. This first mover, which Aquinas identifies as God, is an unmoved mover that initiates all motion.²

To illustrate his argument, Aquinas uses the example of a stick moving a stone. In this analogy, the stick is moved by the hand, and the hand is moved by the arm, and so on. Aquinas asserts that if this chain of movers and moved objects were infinite, there would be no initial force or agency, and thus no motion would be possible. Critics of the Cosmological Proof have raised objections, including the challenge of an infinite regress of causes or the possibility of an eternal universe.³ They argue that the existence of an unmoved mover or a first cause is not necessary to explain the motion observed in the universe. These objections question the need for positing a necessary, transcendent being as the source of all motion. Aquinas acknowledges that his Argument from Motion does not provide a comprehensive understanding of the nature of God, but rather establishes the necessity of an unmoved mover as the source of all motion. The Cosmological Proof, particularly the Argument from Motion, has sparked philosophical discussions and adaptations throughout history. It has influenced subsequent thinkers and contributed to the development of cosmological arguments for the existence of God. Contemporary philosophers have engaged in debates surrounding the nature of causality, the implications of an infinite regress, and the relationship between the cosmological proof and scientific explanations of the universe's origins.

b) Cosmological Proof: The Efficient Cause:

The Cosmological Argument, also known as the argument of the Efficient Cause, according to Aquinas, relies on the observation of motion and causation in the universe to establish the existence of a prime mover or an uncaused cause. Aquinas maintains that everything in the universe is in a constant state of motion, and for something to be in motion; it must have been set in motion by something else. However, this chain of causation cannot go on ad-infinitum; there must be a first cause, an uncaused causer, which initiates all motion without itself being moved by anything else.⁴ Aquinas' argument for the Uncaused Cause draws heavily from Aristotle's concept of actuality and potentiality. Aquinas maintains that objects in motion possess potentiality, meaning they have the ability to change from one state to another. However, for this potentiality to be actualized and for motion to occur, an external force or cause is necessary. Aquinas contends that this chain of causation cannot be infinite because, if it were, there would be no ultimate causer and therefore no motion at all.⁵

To illustrate his point, Aquinas presents the analogy of a series of movers and moved objects, such as a stick moving a stone. In this illustration, the stick is moved by the hand, and the hand is moved by the arm, and so on. Aquinas maintains that if this chain of movers and moved objects were infinite, there would be no initial force, and thus no motion would be possible.³ Therefore, Aquinas concludes that there must be a first causer, an uncaused causer, which initiates the entire chain of motion. Aquinas' Cosmological Argument, particularly the Uncaused Causer, continues to be a subject of scholarly discussion and debate. Philosophers and theologians have offered various interpretations and refinements of the argument over the centuries. Some have explored the relationship between Aquinas' concept of the Uncaused Cause and modern scientific understandings of causality and cosmology.⁶ Others have examined the implications of the argument for the nature of God and the existence of contingency in the universe.⁷

c) Contingency Proof: The Argument from Contingency

In Argument from Contingency or Contingency Proof, Thomas Aquinas asserts that the existence of contingent beings in the world presupposes the necessity of a non-contingent, self-existent being called God. He argues that contingent beings, those whose existence is dependent on external factors, cannot account for their own existence and thus require a necessary being as their ultimate cause.⁸ Aquinas begins the Contingency Argument by differentiating between necessary and contingent beings. Necessary beings, according to Aquinas possess existence in them and do not depend on anything external for their existence. On the other hand, contingent beings rely on external factors or causes for their existence and could have potentially not existed. Aquinas maintains that if all beings were contingent and dependent on other beings for their existence, there would be no ultimate explanation for the existence of anything. He argues that a chain of contingent beings cannot go on infinitely because

such a series would still lack a foundation and fail to account for why anything exists at all. To support his claim, Aquinas uses the concept of infinite regress. He argues that if the chain of contingent beings were infinite, it would be akin to saying that there is no ultimate cause, which would contradict the principle that everything has a cause or explanation for its existence. Aquinas concludes that there must be a necessary being, a being that exists by its own nature and does not rely on anything else for its existence. This necessary being, which Aquinas identifies as God, is the ultimate cause that explains the existence of contingent beings.

d) Ontological Proof: The Argument from Gradation (Perfection)

The Ontological Proof, equally known as Argument from Gradation, according to Thomas Aquinas focuses on the idea of perfection and necessary existence to demonstrate the existence of a perfect being called God. Aquinas is of the opinion that perfection entails necessary existence and that there must be a being that encompasses all perfections.⁹ Aquinas begins the Ontological Proof by examining the nature of perfection. He contends that when we speak of something as perfect, we are attributing to it the quality of possessing all the perfections that can be found in reality. For instance, a perfect being would possess qualities such as infinite knowledge, infinite power, and infinite goodness.¹⁰

Aquinas maintains that necessary existence is an essential aspect of perfection. A perfect being must necessarily exist because existence is a fundamental attribute of perfection. He argues that if a perfect being were to lack existence, it would be lacking a necessary perfection, which would contradict its status as perfect. Therefore, a perfect being must possess necessary existence.¹¹ To illustrate this, Aquinas maintains that there are varying degrees of things. For example, goodness, truth, nobility, e.t.c but there is a perfect standard or highest degree of all which we understand as God.¹²

The Ontological Proof has continued to raise philosophical debates and adaptations throughout history. Descartes, for instance, expanded upon Aquinas' argument and presented his own version of the Ontological Proof, highlighting the concept of existence as a predicate.¹³ Other philosophers such as Kant, have criticized the Ontological Proof, arguing that existence is not a predicate and cannot be treated as such.¹⁴

e) Teleological Proof: The Design Argument

The Teleological Proof, or the Design Argument, according to Aquinas is based on the observation of design and purpose in the natural world, believing that the intricate order and complexity found in the universe indicate the presence of an intelligent designer. Aquinas argues that the natural world exudes some qualities of designs that cannot be explained by chance or mere natural processes.¹⁵ Aquinas begins the Teleological Proof by acknowledging that inanimate objects, such as rocks and trees, lack intelligence and intentionality. However, he posits that these objects still possess a degree of order and functionality, which points to a guiding intelligence behind their existence. Aquinas maintains that this intelligence must be separate from the objects themselves, as inanimate matter lacks the capacity for self-direction.¹⁶

Aquinas draws upon the concept of final causality, which refers to the notion that objects in the natural world possess inherent purposes and goals. He argues that these purposes and goals can only be adequately explained by the existence of a being that possesses intelligence and intentionality, namely, God. The intricate workings and interdependencies found in nature, such as the complex ecosystems and the precise laws of physics according to Aquinas, suggest a deliberate plan and design.¹⁷ He employs analogical reasoning to support his argument by comparing the natural world to a work of art or a machine, asserting that just as a painting or a watch requires an artist or a watchmaker, the complexity and order of the natural world require an intelligent designer. Aquinas contends that the design evident in nature cannot be attributed to chance or natural processes alone, as the probability of such complexity arising spontaneously is highly unlikely.¹⁸

B. Objections and Responses to Aquinas' Arguments on the Existence of God:

Aquinas' Five Proofs for the existence of God have been subject to various critiques and objections over the centuries. These objections challenge the validity, soundness, and logical coherence of the arguments. In response, Aquinas and his followers have provided counterarguments and clarifications to address these objections. The objections and responses are as follows:

a) Objection and response to the cosmological proof or the uncaused causer argument:

The cosmological argument is rooted in the observation of motion in the universe and the necessity of an unmoved mover or a prime mover to account for the existence of motion. Aquinas argues that everything in the world is in a state of motion, and for something to be in motion, it must have been set in motion by something else.¹⁹ However, this chain of causation cannot

regress infinitely; there must be a first cause, an unmoved mover that initiates all motion without being moved by anything else. Objection by the critics of this argument is based on the infinite regress of causes. Critics argue that if everything has a cause, then why cannot the series of causes and effects regress infinitely? Aquinas counters this objection by asserting that an infinite regress of causes would fail to provide an ultimate explanation for the existence of anything. He argues that an infinite regress of causes does not allow for a first cause, leading to an absurdity. Aquinas maintains that the chain of causation must have a first cause, an uncaused causer, which initiates all motion.

b) Objection and Response to the Teleological Proof

The Teleological Proof, or the Argument from Design according to Aquinas, posits that the complexity and order in the natural world presupposes an intelligent designer. Critics of the Teleological Proof have raised objections, including the challenge of the presence of apparent imperfections or "design flaws" in nature. They argue that if the natural world is the result of an intelligent design, why would it contain elements that seem inefficient or even harmful? In response, Aquinas responds by acknowledging that apparent imperfections do not necessarily negate the overall evidence for design. He argues that human understanding may be limited or that greater purposes beyond immediate comprehension might exist. Aquinas posits that the presence of imperfections does not undermine the existence of an intelligent designer.²⁰

c) Objection and Response to the Contingency Proof or Argument from Contingency:

The Contingency Proof, also known as the Argument from Contingency, posits that the existence of contingent beings necessitates a non-contingent, necessary being. Critics of the Contingency Proof raised objections, including the challenge of an infinite series of contingent beings that does not require a necessary being. They argue that an infinite regress of contingent beings is a possibility and could provide an alternative explanation for the existence of the universe. These objections challenge the necessity of positing a necessary being to explain contingency and openness to metaphysical reasoning.

Aquinas responds by arguing that an infinite regress of contingent beings would still lack a foundation and fail to account for the existence of anything at all. He asserts that there must be a necessary being that serves as the ultimate explanation for the existence of contingent beings.²¹

d) Objection and Response to the Argument from Motion:

Critics of the argument from motion have raised objections, including the challenge of an infinite regress of causes or the possibility of an eternal universe.³³ They argue that the existence of an unmoved mover or a first cause is not necessary to explain the motion observed in the universe.²² These objections question the need for positing a necessary, transcendent being as the source of all motion. Aquinas acknowledges that his Argument from Motion does not provide a comprehensive understanding of the nature of God, but rather establishes the necessity of an unmoved mover as the source of all motion. The Cosmological Proof, particularly the Argument from Motion, has sparked philosophical discussions and adaptations throughout history. It has influenced subsequent thinkers and contributed to the development of cosmological arguments for the existence of God. Contemporary philosophers have engaged in debates surrounding the nature of causality, the implications of an infinite regress, and the relationship between the cosmological proof and scientific explanations of the universe's origins.

e) Objection and Response to the Ontological Proof

The Ontological Proof, though not specifically attributed to Aquinas, has garnered criticism. Critics of the Ontological Proof raised objections particularly challenging the validity of the argument's logical structure. They argue that existence cannot be deduced solely from the concept of perfection. They contend that just because one can conceive of a perfect being does not mean that such a being necessarily exists.²³ This objection questions the leap from conceptual necessity to actual existence.

Aquinas himself acknowledged the limitations of the Ontological Proof and recognized that it may not be convincing to everyone. He considered it to be a contemplative proof that appeals to those who already believe in God, rather than a persuasive argument for sceptics. The Ontological Proof has continued to spark philosophical debates and adaptations throughout history. Critics argue that existence cannot be treated as a predicate or attribute that adds to the essence of an object. Aquinas himself acknowledged the limitations of the Ontological Proof and recognized that it may not be convincing to everyone. He considered it to be a contemplative rather than a persuasive argument for skeptics.²⁴

In responding to these objections, Aquinas and his followers have offered clarifications and additional arguments to support their positions. They emphasized the limitations of human understanding, the need for philosophical reflection, and the compatibility between faith and reason. Additionally, various philosophers and theologians, both within and outside the

Thomistic tradition, have engaged in ongoing discussions, refining the arguments, addressing objections, and exploring alternative formulations.

C. Relevance and Application of Aquinas' Arguments for the Existence of God in the Contemporary World:

Aquinas' proofs for the existence of God continue to hold significance in contemporary philosophy and theology. While they originated in a medieval context, they have been subject to reinterpretation and adaptation to address the challenges and advancements of modern thought. In contemporary philosophy, Aquinas' arguments have sparked ongoing debates and discussions. They have influenced subsequent thinkers who have built upon his foundations or presented alternative formulations. The arguments have been engaged with by both proponents and critics shaping contemporary discourse on the existence of God and the nature of reality.²⁵ The Cosmological Proof, with its emphasis on causality and the need for an uncaused cause, have influenced contemporary discussions on cosmology, cosmological arguments, and the origins of the universe. Philosophers and scientists continue to explore the implications of the Big Bang theory, the nature of causation, and the possibility of an eternal or multiversity model. Aquinas' arguments have contributed to the dialogue surrounding these topics, provoking reflections on the nature of causality and the implications for the existence of God.

The Teleological Proof, or the Argument from Design, has influenced contemporary discussions on the philosophy of science, intelligent design theory, and the relationship between science and religion.²⁶ While critics argue for alternative explanations such as natural selection and evolutionary processes, proponents of the Teleological Proof contend that the intricacies and order in the natural world require an intelligent designer. The ongoing debates surrounding the Teleological Proof reflect its enduring relevance in exploring the nature of complexity, purpose, and the limits of scientific explanations. The Moral Proof, or the Argument from Morality, has informed contemporary discussions on ethics, moral philosophy, and the foundations of moral values. Philosophers continue to debate the nature of moral realism, the objectivity of moral values, and the role of religion in ethical systems. Aquinas' arguments have contributed to the exploration of the relationship between moral values, human nature, and the existence of a moral lawgiver. They have influenced contemporary ethical theories and the ongoing dialogue on the origins and foundations of morality.²⁷

In theology, Aquinas' arguments have been widely studied and developed within the Thomistic tradition. They have provided a framework for theological exploration and have been integrated into systematic theology and apologetics. Aquinas' arguments have been incorporated into contemporary theological discussions on divine attributes, the nature of revelation, and the interaction between faith and reason.²⁸ In addition to their influence within academic circles, Aquinas' arguments also resonate with individuals seeking intellectual and philosophical grounding for their faith. They continue to offer a framework for believers to engage with questions of existence, purpose, and the nature of God. Aquinas' arguments have the potential to inspire reflection and provide a coherent intellectual foundation for religious belief. Aquinas' arguments for the existence of God remain relevant and influential in contemporary philosophy and theology. They have contributed to ongoing discussions on cosmology, teleology, ethics, and the relationship between faith and reason.²⁹ Aquinas' arguments have shaped subsequent thinkers and continue to impact contemporary debates surrounding the nature of reality and the existence of God. They provide a framework for intellectual exploration and offer insights into the complexity and depth of philosophical and theological questions.

D. Comparative Analysis of Aquinas' Proofs for the Existence of God:

Aquinas' Five Proofs for the existence of God offer a distinctive approach to the question of God's existence. While other philosophers, such as Anselm, Descartes, and Leibniz, have also presented arguments for the existence of God, there are notable similarities, differences, and unique aspects between their approaches and Aquinas'. This comparative analysis will explore these aspects, highlighting the similarities and differences in their arguments.

a) Anselm's Ontological Argument:

Anselm's ontological argument, as presented in his *Proslogion*, centres on the concept of a being "than which nothing greater can be conceived." Anselm argues that if such a being exists only in the understanding but not in reality, a greater being that exists in both understanding and reality could be conceived. Therefore, the greatest conceivable being must necessarily exist.³⁰ Unlike Aquinas, Anselm's argument is purely conceptual and does not rely on empirical observations or causal reasoning.

b) Descartes' Ontological Argument:

Descartes' ontological argument, as outlined in his *Meditations on First Philosophy*, builds upon Anselm's argument and employs a different approach. Descartes argues that the idea of a supremely perfect being, including necessary existence, is inherent in the mind. He posits that existence is a necessary attribute of God, as a perfect being would lack perfection if it lacked

existence. Descartes' argument places emphasis on the idea of existence as a predicate, similar to the Ontological Proof that Aquinas discusses. However, Descartes' argument focuses more on the relationship between God and the mind, while Aquinas' approach encompasses a broader range of considerations.³¹

c) Leibniz's Cosmological Argument:

Leibniz's cosmological argument, as articulated in his work *Theodicy*, shares similarities with Aquinas' cosmological proof. Both arguments emphasize the need for a sufficient reason for the existence of contingent beings and the impossibility of an infinite regress of causes. Leibniz argues that the existence of contingent beings requires a necessary being as their ultimate cause, similar to Aquinas' conclusion.³² However, Leibniz's argument incorporates the principle of sufficient reason and the notion of possible worlds, whereas Aquinas' argument is more focused on the observation of motion and causality.

E. Significance and Legacy of Aquinas' Five Proofs for the Existence of God:

Aquinas' Five Proofs for the existence of God have had a profound and lasting impact on the history of philosophy and theology. Their significance lies in their contributions to philosophical inquiry, their influence on religious thought, and their ongoing relevance in contemporary discourse.

a) Contributions to Philosophical Inquiry:

Aquinas' Five Proofs introduced rigorous philosophical reasoning and methodology into discussions about the existence of God. By engaging with concepts such as causality, contingency, motion, design, and morality, Aquinas provided a framework for systematic exploration and rational inquiry. His arguments integrated metaphysics, cosmology, ethics, and epistemology, contributing to a comprehensive understanding of reality and the nature of God.

b) Integration of Reason and Faith:

Aquinas sought to reconcile reason and faith, demonstrating that philosophical inquiry and theological reflection can complement each other. His Five Proofs provided a philosophical foundation for theological discussions, allowing believers to engage intellectually with questions of God's existence and the nature of God. Aquinas emphasized that reason and faith are not in conflict but rather mutually supportive, encouraging a harmonious relationship between philosophical inquiry and religious belief.³³

c) Influence on Religious Thought:

Aquinas' Five Proofs have had a profound influence on religious thought, particularly within the Catholic tradition. Aquinas' approach to theology, known as Thomism, became a dominant school of thought within Catholicism. His arguments informed and shaped the development of systematic theology, apologetics, and philosophical theology. The Five Proofs provided a robust intellectual foundation for theological teachings, emphasizing the compatibility between reason and revelation.³⁴

d) Continuity and Adaptation:

The enduring legacy of Aquinas' Five Proofs is also evident in their continuity and adaptation over the centuries. They have been studied, developed, and refined by subsequent philosophers and theologians within the Thomistic tradition. Scholars such as John Duns Scotus, Francisco Suárez, and Étienne Gilson built upon Aquinas' arguments, offering further insights and interpretations. Contemporary Thomists continue to engage with the Five Proofs, adapting them to address contemporary challenges and advancements in philosophy and science.

e) Ongoing Relevance in Contemporary Discourse:

Aquinas' Five Proofs remain relevant and influential in contemporary philosophical and theological discussions. They continue to be studied and engaged with in academic circles, serving as a foundation for philosophical inquiry and debate. Scholars from various religious and philosophical backgrounds have engaged with the Five Proofs, exploring their strengths, weaknesses, and implications for contemporary thought. The arguments provide a starting point for discussions on cosmology, teleology, ethics, epistemology, and the relationship between faith and reason.

F. Strengths and Weaknesses of Aquinas' Five Proofs of the Existence of God:

Aquinas' Five Proofs for the existence of God possess several strengths and weaknesses.

a) *Strength:*

- i. **Rational Framework:** Aquinas' Five Proofs provide a systematic and rational framework for discussing the existence of God. They engage with philosophical principles such as causality, contingency, and teleology, offering a structured approach to understanding the nature of God.
- ii. **Integration of Empirical Observation:** The arguments incorporate empirical observations of the natural world, such as motion, design, and moral values. This integration of empirical evidence enhances the credibility and persuasiveness of the arguments.
- iii. **Compatibility with Faith:** Aquinas' Five Proofs seek to reconcile reason and faith, emphasizing their compatibility. They provide a philosophical foundation for theological discussions, allowing individuals to engage intellectually with questions of God's existence while maintaining their religious beliefs.
- iv. **Comprehensive Approach:** The Five Proofs cover various dimensions of existence, including cosmology, teleology, ethics, and epistemology. This comprehensive approach enables a more holistic understanding of reality and the existence of God.
- v. **Enduring Influence:** Aquinas' arguments have had a lasting impact on the history of philosophy and theology. They have shaped subsequent thinkers, influenced religious thought, and continue to be studied and engaged with in contemporary discourse.

b) *Weaknesses:*

- i. **Reliance on Metaphysical Assumptions:** Aquinas' Five Proofs rely on metaphysical assumptions and concepts that may not be universally accepted. Critics argue that these metaphysical presuppositions limit the persuasive power of the arguments for those who do not share the same metaphysical framework.
- ii. **Limited Empirical Evidence:** While Aquinas integrates empirical observations into his arguments, critics contend that the empirical evidence provided may not be sufficient to support the grand claims about the existence and nature of God.
- iii. **Vulnerability to Counterarguments:** Aquinas' arguments have been subject to various counterarguments and objections. Critics raise concerns regarding infinite regresses, the subjectivity of moral values, and alternative explanations for observed phenomena. These objections challenge the soundness and validity of the arguments.

II. CONCLUSION

Despite the objections and criticisms raised against Aquinas' Five arguments on the existence of God, these arguments continue to hold significant importance and relevance. Firstly, Aquinas' Five Proofs provide a rational framework for discussing the existence of God. By integrating empirical observations, metaphysical considerations, and causal reasoning, these arguments offer a structured and systematic approach to understanding the nature of God. This rational framework allows for philosophical inquiry and critical engagement with the concept of God's existence. Secondly, Aquinas' arguments have had a lasting impact on philosophy and theology. They have influenced subsequent thinkers and have become part of the broader philosophical and theological discourse. These proofs have shaped the development of systematic theology, apologetics, and philosophical theology within the Thomistic tradition. Their enduring legacy is evident in the ongoing study and engagement with these arguments in academic circles. Thirdly, Aquinas' Five Proofs bridge the gap between reason and faith. They emphasize the compatibility between philosophical inquiry and religious belief, demonstrating that reason and faith can mutually support one another. By providing a philosophical foundation for theological discussions, these proofs allow individuals to engage intellectually with questions of God's existence while maintaining their religious convictions.

Lastly, Aquinas' arguments offer a comprehensive approach to understanding reality and the existence of God. They encompass various dimensions of existence, including cosmology, teleology, ethics, and epistemology. This comprehensive approach allows for a holistic understanding of the world and provides a broader context for exploring the existence and nature of God. Despite the objections raised against Aquinas' proofs, their vitality lies in their rational framework, influence on philosophy and theology, integration of reason and faith, and comprehensive approach. These arguments continue to be studied, adapted, and developed by scholars within the Thomistic tradition and beyond. They provide a foundation for intellectual exploration, offering individuals a means to critically examine and engage with questions of existence and the divine. In light of these considerations, Aquinas' Five Proofs for the existence of God remain vital and significant in contemporary discourse. They provide a starting point for philosophical inquiry, offer a bridge between reason and faith, and contribute to the ongoing exploration of the existence and nature of God.

III. REFERENCES

- [1] Aquinas, Thomas. *Summa Theologica*. Translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province. (New York: Benziger Bros., 1947). I Question 2, Art. 3.
- [2] Aquinas, Thomas. *Summa Theologica*. I, Q. 2, Art. 3.
- [3] Craig, William Lane. *The Kalām Cosmological Argument*. (Oxford University Press, 2014).109-112
- [4] Kretzmann, Norman, and Eleonore Stump. *The Metaphysics of Creation*. (Oxford University Press, 1999).54-57
- [5] Descartes, René. *Meditations on First Philosophy*. Translated by John Cottingham. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.45-56
- [6] Kant, Immanuel. *Critique of Pure Reason*. Translated by Paul Guyer and Allen Wood. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998. 595-602
- [7] Aquinas, Thomas. *Summa Theologica*. Translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province. (Benziger Bros., 1947). I, Q. 2, Art. 3.
- [8] Anselm of Canterbury. *Proslogion*. Translated by M. J. Charlesworth. (Clarendon Press, 1965). Ch. 2.
- [9] Descartes, René. *Meditations on First Philosophy*. Translated by John Cottingham. (Cambridge University Press, 1986). Meditation 5.
- [10] Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm. *Theodicy: Essays on the Goodness of God, the Freedom of Man, and the Origin of Evil*. Translated by E. M. Huggard. (Open Court, 1985). 144-146.