

Cleanthes' argument from design essay examples

[Religion](#), [God](#)



Philosophy

Three philosophers named Demea, Philo and Cleanthes debates the nature of God existence. In their argument, they differ harshly in opinion on God's attributes or nature and whether knowledge of a divinity can come from humankind. This is after all agreeing that god exists. A number of arguments try to make us recognize the nature of God. There a number of topics debated such as the argument from design. This argument only proves that there is an existing power which may be God or other natural powers which control the universe. This essay explains deeply the arguments of each person and set some objections against the arguments. It also shows that God exist even after series of arguments.

In the argument, Demea fake arguments demolish able by the other two players. The other two players get a chance to elaborate their positions by asking questions. His stand in this argument is that we are not permitted to reach any ideas by the infirmities of our nature, which the indescribable sublimity of the godly attributes in the least corresponds to. Philo argues contrary to Cleanthes that there is only a weak similarity between man-made objects and natural

Cleanthes frames the argument that God exists which surprises Demea. Nature of God is questionable to Demea where he understands that the nature of God is unknown and inexplicable and it's a mystery even in the manner of his existence. Philo on the other hand claims that too accepts the existence of a first source but can't accept to say God rather suggests what we call it God. He argues we should not pretend to know God attributes and that we only use words like knowledge, design or wisdom when speaking of

God because we only have these words.

Cleanthes argues addressing Demea that he sees things quite differently in that God is like the human mind where products of human design exactly resembles adaptation of means to end in nature. He justifies this argument by giving an example of communication of female and male with eye.

Demea goes contrary to Cleanthes claim that God is like neither us nor his mode of argument in that he prefers a priori argument.

Philo sees no basis in Cleanthes's arguments as they are weak and based on experience. Philo argues that repetition of similar cases bases arguments from experience. His argue is that the stronger the likeness, the stronger the argument and the weaker the likeness, the weaker the argument. He gives an example of circulation of blood in one man concludes it takes place in another and is certain if argued from man to animals. Philo argues that the analogy between the universe and a house is very weak. According to Cleanthes, if his argument only amounted to speculation, criticisms would be deserved but denies this by reaffirming close likeness between divine design and human where he compares legs to staircases. Demea turns against both players as their arguments fall short of perfect evidence.

Philo justifies himself that he wants to make Cleanthes the dangers of his way of arguing. Philo explains a posteriori for the existence of God in that the experience of arrangement, order does not prove design except now it has been experienced to result from design. Cleanthes accuses Philo of abusing terms of equivocating over the meaning of experience and arguments for the motion of earth, the same objections could be raised. Philo argues that there are analogies we can draw with for example planets in the case of the

motion of the earth that revolves around other planets. Philo also claims no roots in Cleanthes argument in that he has never seen a universe created. Serious objection can be raised against Philo's argument where Philo's argues that we only prefer God with knowledge words since there are no other words. Philo should have respect to God as he says he believes in a powerful being which with his own mouth says could be what we call God. He also suggests that we pretend the attributes of God but also claims that the source could be this God.

Cleanthes would respond to the objection positively. This is because Philo claimed that he did not know about the creation while we cannot say anything about it since the creation of the universe was a unique event from a source which he is also in support of. Second he would respond positively as he argues that God do exist and is responsible for the occurrence of the nature. His response would be adequate as it justifies his argument.

Work Cited

Radcliffe, E. S. (2010). A companion to Hume. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.