

## Does God Exist? A Simple Apologetic 3

Heb 11:6

6 And without faith it is impossible to please him, for whoever would draw near to God **must believe that he exists** and that he rewards those who seek him.

ESV

- As Hebrews 11:6 states – for a person to come to God it is a prerequisite that they believe He exists
- It is the task of the apologetic evangelist to provide the proof for God’s existence in a rational and compelling way – efficiently defeating any objections or questions that someone might have
- It is the task of the Holy Spirit to move in that person’s life – according to God’s will – removing doubt and instilling faith – persuading them – that through God’s grace, they might believe

**How is it that we might logically and intelligently provide proofs to the questioning person, that when in concert with the moving of the Holy Spirit, they might come to faith in Christ?**

- First, in Part One, we will speak of the absurdity of life without God
- Secondly, in Part Two, we’ll take note of four primary proofs and lines of thought, that have been applied down through the centuries – as evidence for God’s existence

### Part One

#### I. The Absurdity of Life Without God

- a. The definition of absurd is: “Utterly, or obviously senseless – illogical or untrue – contrary to all reason or common sense”
  - i. Some antonyms for Absurd are: logical or sensible<sup>i</sup>
  - ii. It would be right to say that something that is absurd, violates the established principles of logic and is therefore irrational
- b. In theology, William Lane Craig points out, under the study of the doctrine of man, there is a phrase that is used, “The human predicament” – “That is to say the significance of human life in a post-theistic universe”<sup>ii</sup>  
Craig goes on to say: “The apologetic for Christianity based on the human predicament is an extremely recent phenomenon, associated primarily with Francis Schaeffer. Often it is referred to as ‘cultural apologetics’ because of its analysis of post-Christian culture.”<sup>iii</sup>
- c. Schaeffer explains in his book, *The God Who is There*, that a shift has taken place in society
- d. Before this shift most, even those that did not know Christ – had primarily the same world view – the same way of looking at, and understanding the world around them
- e. Previous to this transition, if someone was to preach the gospel – the preacher and the hearers would have somewhat of the same mindset – therefore the preacher, applying classic proofs for the existence of God – could effectively communicate to their hearers.
  - i. People thought that good was opposite of bad
  - ii. Right was opposite of wrong
  - iii. This was because antithetical relationships made sense to them – Antithesis meaning: “A person or thing that is the direct opposite of someone or something else” – “A contrast or opposition between two things”
  - iv. Before the shift, people thought of the world in those terms – good and bad were easily distinguishable


Francis Schaeffer points out that in classical apologetics, people’s presuppositions were rarely taken into account. The one offering the proofs for the validity of our faith rarely took into account people’s worldview.

Schaeffer says of this, "So, if a man got up to preach the gospel and said, 'Believe this, it is true,' those who heard would have said, 'Well, if that is so, then its opposite is false.' The presupposition of antithesis pervaded men's entire mental outlook." <sup>iv</sup>

### Pay attention to Schaeffer's next comment

"We must not forget that historic Christianity stands on the basis of antithesis. Without it, historic Christianity is meaningless. The basic antithesis is that God objectively exists in contrast (in antithesis) to His not existing. Which of these two are the reality, changes everything in the area of knowledge and morals and in the whole of life."

- v. Francis Schaeffer calls this shift the line of despair
1. Before this line was drawn in the way people in the west thought in terms of absolutes – opposites – good and bad – right and wrong
  2. Yet on the other side of this line of despair people began to think differently about truth
  3. Truth became opinion, or experience, or culture; truth was no longer truth
  4. After the line was drawn, Schaeffer posits, a new way of thinking spread from PHILOSOPHY to ART – from ART to MUSIC – from MUSIC to GENERAL CULTURE – and finally even to THEOLOGY <sup>v</sup>



### What does this mean for us as believers?

- f. We have to assume that when we speak to people about Christ – in most cases we are speaking a foreign language – a language that reflects a world where right and wrong are opposites – and living a life apart from God is absurd
- i. We have to take into account the hearer's worldview – how they see the world – or we will not make any sense to them
  - ii. If we don't do this we cannot communicate effectively

**In some ways this shift in cultural thought reflects that of the first century, as the Apostle Paul noted In First Corinthians, chapter one, verse eighteen....**

1 Cor 1:18

18 For the preaching of the cross is to them that perish foolishness; but unto us which are saved it is the power of God.  
KJV

- Futility leads to hopelessness – Hopelessness leads to despair
  - This is the downward spiral, upon which those born of the flesh find themselves
- g. Life without God is logically absurd, owing to the fact that in due course there is no meaning – no ultimate purpose
- i. Those that either do not believe in His existence – or have some vague concept of God and heaven – with very little concept of sin and holiness (which are antithetical) – endeavor to find their purpose in things that are far lower than their Creator
  - ii. It may be in the job they have – it may be in their family – for a few, it may be in their celebrity
  - iii. Yet in the end, all that does not answer the longing they have inside for a fulfillment beyond their understanding
  - iv. They keep climbing – grasping – obtaining – and all ends in futility

Rom 1:21

21 For although they knew God, they did not honor him as God or give thanks to him, but they became futile in their thinking, and their foolish hearts were darkened

ESV

**The Grace New Testament Commentary says of this...**

God's wrath allows sin to sink the sinner deeper, causing a spiritual stupor. Thus, what causes this futility and darkness—that only God can remove—is sin that takes over and degrades humanity.<sup>vi</sup>

- v. In the Greek the phrase "*became futile*" is one word – it is passive and means, to be delivered up to vanity
  - 1. In the *Kittle's Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, this delivering up, is said to be, "Not to nothing, but to the nothingness of man"<sup>vii</sup>
  - 2. This is the situation – Man is nothing without God

## Part Two

### II. Four Primary Proofs for the Existence of God

- a. There are four classical proofs for God's existence that have been used over the centuries
- b. Some of these proofs are still employed today in a variety of ways
  - i. The Ontological Argument
  - ii. The Cosmological Argument
  - iii. The Teleological Argument
  - iv. The Moral Argument
- c. It is important to note that in classical logic, arguments must have premises and a conclusion – we are not simply talking about debate here – we're talking about logical arguments, who's conclusions must not violate any of the laws of classical logic
- d. The **Ontological Argument**

**Among the four this position is the one that you will least likely use, but I thought it was important to show you for the sake of apologetical history concerning the classical arguments for the existence of God**

- i. Ontology is the area of metaphysics concerned with the nature of being<sup>viii</sup>

**The Baker Encyclopedia of Christian Apologetics states that...**

Ontology is the study (logos) of being (ontos). It is the study of reality. **It answers the question "What is real?"** as ethics answers the question "What is right?" as aesthetics answers the question, "What is beautiful?" and epistemology answers the question, "What is true?"<sup>ix</sup>

- ii. In **Ontology**, God is seen as a Necessary Being, where humankind are seen as Contingent Beings
  - 1. A necessary being is a living, self-aware thing that must necessarily exist for all other things to exist, because that necessary being is the author of the universe and the initial cause of all things material<sup>x</sup>
  - 2. A contingent being is one that is dependent

Contingency: In philosophy, any event or object that is dependent on another event or object for it to happen or exist. This is in contrast to a necessary event or object, which happens or exists independently of other events and objects.<sup>xi</sup>

- iii. The Ontological argument attempts to prove from the very concept of God that God exists: if God is conceivable, then He must actually exist<sup>xii</sup>

- iv. This argument was formulated by Anselm and defended by Scotus, Descartes, Spinoza, Leibniz, and, in modern times, Norman Malcolm, Charles Hartshorne, and Alvin Plantinga, among others<sup>xiii</sup>

The Ontological Argument is “...an argument for the existence of God that argues from the idea of God itself to the reality of God”<sup>xiv</sup>

- v. Anselm (1033 – 1109) wanted to find a single argument that would prove not only that God exists, but also that He has all the superlative (matchless) attributes Christian doctrine ascribes to Him<sup>xv</sup>

William Lane Craig says that... “Having almost given up the project, Anselm landed upon the following reasoning. God is the greatest conceivable being. This is true by definition, for if we could conceive of something greater than God then *that* would be God. So nothing greater than God can be conceived. It is greater to exist in reality than merely in the mind.”

Craig continues, “Anselm gives the example of a painting. Which is greater: the artist’s idea of the painting or the painting itself as it really exists? Obviously the latter; for the painting itself exists not only in the artist’s mind, but in reality as well. Similarly, if God existed only in the mind, then something greater than Him could be conceived, namely, His existing not only in the mind, but in reality as well. Therefore, God exists.”<sup>xvi</sup>

“Another way of putting this, says Anselm, is the following: a being whose non-existence is inconceivable is greater than a being whose non-existence is conceivable. But God is the greatest conceivable being. Therefore, God’s non-existence must be inconceivable (using classical laws of logic) There is no contradiction (according to the law of non-contradiction) involved in the notion. Therefore, God must exist.”<sup>xvii</sup>

- vi. Douglas Groothuis, in his *Christian Apologetics, A Comprehensive Case for Biblical Faith*, states that, “For this argument, God’s existence is not merely possible or probable or very likely, but is logically guaranteed.”<sup>xviii</sup>
1. The Ontological Argument is *A Priori*
  2. This means that this is not dependent upon experience,<sup>xix</sup> where something that is *A Posteriori*, something that comes after, is dependent upon experience

Groothuis says of this, “It is a priori (depending on no debatable empirical conditions); it is deductive in form, thus making its conclusion certain and not merely probably; and its conclusion is metaphysically superlative: there must be a Perfect Being”<sup>xx</sup>

e. The **Cosmological Argument**

**It has been said that, “Unless there were an infinite being, there could be no finite beings”<sup>xxi</sup>**

- i. Thomas Aquinas (1225 – 1274) an Italian Catholic Priest, philosopher, and theologian, in his **Five Ways** argument, in the Second Way, which dealt with causation stated this, **“everything that begins to exist, must have a cause”**
- ii. This is also known as the *Kalam Cosmological Argument* –having been developed primarily by Muslim theologians in the Middle Ages

**The logical syllogism goes thus:**

- Whatever begins to exist must have a cause
- The universe began to exist
- Therefore, the universe has a cause

- iii. If this is the case it put us in a position of choice

1. We can either believe in an **infinite number of causes** – a cause brings something forth, which brings something forth, which brings something forth, ad infinitum
  2. Or, we must come to a point where we reach a **First Cause** – that cause which brought forth all other things
  3. This is known as the **Law of Causality**
- iv. This is where we reach that concept mentioned before of a Necessary Being – one upon which all other existence and contingent beings, depends
1. This being depends on nothing, or no one else for its existence, and therefore is necessary
  2. This brings forth another question and decision – which is more logical?
    - a. Do we have a self-existent universe – meaning that matter is infinite
    - b. Or, we have a self-existent, personal being, that we know as God
- v. Self-Created vs. Self-Existent
1. Self-created means exactly what it states – that something or someone brought itself forth from nothing
  2. R. C. Sproul says of this that, “Self-creation is a concept that is, in philosophical language, *analytically false*.”<sup>xxii</sup>

Sproul had mentioned earlier in his book, *Defending Your Faith, An Introduction to Apologetics*, that, “The premise that ‘every effect must have a cause’, is a ‘formal’ or ‘analytical’ truth, which means simply that it is true *by definition*.”

Sproul continues, “The idea of self-creation, when examined in this fashion, shows itself to be false *by definition*.”<sup>xxiii</sup>

3. The Law of Non-Contradiction states that, contradictory statements cannot both be true in the same sense at the same time, e.g. the two propositions “A is B” and “A is not B” are mutually exclusive.

Of this Sproul, speaking of the law of non-contradiction, states, “As such, it is a tool of logic that we can apply to the idea of a self-created universe. In order to affirm a self-created universe, one must reject the law of non-contradiction. Plainly, the second possibility of explaining the universe—that it is self-created—is self-referentially absurd. For something to create itself, or to be its own effect as well as its own cause, it would have to exist before it existed. The universe, to be self-created, would have to be before it was.”<sup>xxiv</sup>

- vi. The Big Bang Theory
1. We can use the Big Bang Theory for a proof of the existence of God
  2. This is because this would mean that the universe, at some time, began to exist
  3. If we accept the premise, as stated by Aquinas, that “everything that begins to exist must have a cause” – we can say that the universe had a cause as well
  4. The big question about the Big Bang, then, would be what was the cause? – And, “If the universe was moving toward disorganization (as the theory states), how did it become organized in the first place?”<sup>xxv</sup>
  5. What caused the Big Bang?

Sproul states that, “A thing at rest tends to stay at rest unless some outside force is applied to it. And once it begins moving, it is going to stay moving unless its motion is retarded by some other outside force.” Again, what caused the Big Bang? Biblical Christianity, Sproul states, has the answer to that question. “Christianity’s answer is the doctrine of Creation: we have a self-existent, eternal being who has the power of motion, who has the ability to move that which is not moving. That is what Aristotle understood when he talked about the ‘unmoved mover’. He understood that there has to be an origin to motion, and that that which has the origin of motion must have the power of motion within itself, just as it must have the power of being within itself.” Sproul concludes, “And that is why we assign these attributes to God.”<sup>xxvi</sup>

### Let’s sum up the Cosmological Argument

- Aquinas stated in his *Five Ways* that, “Everything that begins to exist must have a cause”

- Therefore, we can either have an infinite number of causes or a **First Cause** that brought forth all other things – This is known as the Law of Causality
- The Cosmological Argument would hold to an infinite being that is logically necessary - one upon which all other existence and contingent beings, depends
- Christianity states that we serve a self-existent, eternal God – and that a self-existent universe violates the law of non-contradiction, and is illogical and absurd
- Further, is it more logical to hold to an infinite number of causes progressing back – or the premise of an infinite being, the necessary being – the unmovable mover – that caused all things?
- Finally, we can use the Big Bang Theory to provide a starting point – in our defense of the existence God

f. The **Teleological Argument**

The Teleological Argument is, “An argument for the existence of God based on the seemingly purposeful order of the universe that suggests the world is the work of a ‘Master Architect’ rather than a result of chance” <sup>xxvii</sup>

**The logical syllogism would go thus...**

- All designs imply a designer
  - There is great design in the universe
  - Therefore, there must be a Great Designer of the universe <sup>xxviii</sup>
- i. Crag says, “The implication of the design hypothesis is that there exist a Cosmic Designer who fine-tuned the initial conditions of the universe for intelligent life” <sup>xxix</sup>
- ii. “The Creator brought everything into existence ex nihilo and engineered the structure and function of the universe” <sup>xxx</sup>

Jer 10:12  
12 It is he who made the earth by his power,  
who established the world by his wisdom,  
and by his understanding stretched out the heavens.  
ESV

- iii. The term teleological comes from the word, teleology – which means, “The doctrine of design and purpose in the material world
1. The word is from the Greek word *Telos*, which can be defined as *end, or goal*
  2. This speaks to the premise that the things that we observe of the material universe, or for that matter humanity suggest design – and design suggests a goal or purposeful end
  3. If we accept this premise, the observable universe and humanity could not be logically the result of random events, not survival of the fittest
  4. As an aside, the phrase, Natural Selection, ironically suggests a selector
- iv. Enlightenment apologist William Paley (1743-1805) suggested a **Watchmaker Analogy** which is a very well-known argument using natural theology
1. The Apostle Paul used natural theology as a base for his statement, “So they are without excuse (Rom 1:20)” – Where he stated that all should have recognized the invisible attributes of God through those things that had been made (Rom 1:18-23) – This was a Teleological argument from natural theology

**Paley’s supposition**

The classic statement of the teleological argument is that of William Paley in his Natural Theology. Paley likened the universe to a watch. Like a watch, he said, the universe consists of many complex parts functioning in harmony towards some useful end. In a watch the various parts are ordered such that they measure time; in the universe, such that they support life.

The two are, in this respect, similar. This comparison forms the basis of Paley's argument for intelligent design.

In the case of a watch we take these properties to constitute evidence of design. If we were to stumble across a watch in a natural environment, lying on a heath (moorland), to cite Paley's example, then we would instantly know, because of its order and complexity, that it was designed. Order and complexity are the marks of design.<sup>xxxii</sup>

Wayne Grudem, in his *Systematic Theology, An Introduction to Biblical Doctrine* states, "The Teleological Argument is really a subcategory of the Cosmological Argument. It focuses on the evidence of harmony, order, and design in the universe, and argues that its design gives evidence of an intelligent purpose (the Greek word *telos* means 'end' or 'goal' or 'purpose'). Grudem continues, "Since the universe appears to be designed with a purpose, there must be an intelligent and purposeful God who created it to function this way."<sup>xxxiii</sup>

2. It is not only William Paley's and Wayne Grudem's premise, but the testimony of King David, the Apostle Paul, Thomas Aquinas, and people like you and I as believers, that the material universe and all humankind testify of the handiwork of God

#### **Speaking to those at Lystra, the Apostle Paul spoke of the testimony of creation, declaring...**

Acts 14:16-17

16 In past generations he allowed all the nations to walk in their own ways. 17 Yet **he did not leave himself without witness**, for he did good by giving you rains from heaven and fruitful seasons, satisfying your hearts with food and gladness."  
ESV

#### **King David sang, even the heavens declare God's glory...**

Psalms 19:1-2

19 The heavens are telling of the glory of God;  
And their expanse is declaring the work of His hands.  
2 Day to day pours forth speech,  
And night to night reveals knowledge.  
NASU

#### **g. The Moral Argument**

Grudem states that, "The Moral Argument begins from man's sense of right and wrong, and of the need for justice to be done, and argues that there must be a God, who is the source of right and wrong who will someday mete out justice to all people."<sup>xxxiii</sup>

*The Pocket Dictionary of Theological Terms* has for the Moral Argument, "The argument first used by Immanuel Kant, which claims that morality (humans' seeking the 'highest good') presupposes the existence of God, who is both the lawgiver and the judge who will reward humankind's moral striving."<sup>xxxiv</sup>

#### **The logical syllogism would go thus...**

- If God does not exist, objective moral values and duties do not exist.
- Objective moral values and duties do exist.
- Therefore, God exists<sup>xxxv</sup>

#### **The Apostle Paul alluded to this moral order that God has placed in all his human creatures in Romans, chapter two, verses fourteen through sixteen...**

Romans 2:14-16

14 For when Gentiles, who do not have the law, by nature do what the law requires, they are a law to themselves, even though they do not have the law. 15 **They show that the work of the law is written on their hearts, while their conscience also bears witness,**

**and their conflicting thoughts accuse or even excuse them** 16 on that day when, according to my gospel, God judges the secrets of men by Christ Jesus.  
ESV

- i. In these verses the apostle seems to suggest that those who do not have the benefit of the law given to the Hebrew people –are still held accountable – based upon what their Creator God has placed within them

The ESV Study Bible says of this, “Some have suggested that these verses speak of Gentile obedience that leads to salvation (cf. VV. 7, 10). It is clear, however, that Paul explains here why Gentiles **who do not have the law** will face judgment apart from the law (see V. 12). The reason it is fair for God to judge them for their evil is that God’s law is **written on their hearts**, so that their consciences attest to what is right and what is wrong in their behavior.” Continuing, the ESV cautions, “Paul does not imply that the testimony of human conscience is always a perfect moral guide (for people have **conflicting thoughts**) about their moral behavior, sometimes excusing themselves from wrongdoing), but the very existence of this testimony is sufficient to render people accountable to God.”<sup>xxxvi</sup>

- ii. It was C. S. Lewis that gave one of the most compelling defenses concerning the moral argument in his book, *Mere Christianity* – The moral argument of Lewis can be summarized:
  1. There must be a universal moral law, or else: (a) Moral disagreements would make no sense, as we all assume they do. (b) All moral criticisms would be meaningless (e.g., “The Nazis were wrong.”). (c) It is unnecessary to keep promises or treaties, as we all assume that it is. (d) We would not make excuses for breaking the moral law, as we all do.
  2. But a universal moral law requires a universal Moral Law Giver, since the Source of it: (a) Gives moral commands (as lawgivers do). (b) Is interested in our behavior (as moral persons are).
  3. Further, this universal Moral Law Giver must be absolutely good: (a) otherwise all moral effort would be futile in the long run, since we could be sacrificing our lives for what is not ultimately right. (b) The source of all good must be absolutely good, since the standard of all good must be completely good.
  4. Therefore, there must be an absolutely good Moral Law Giver<sup>xxxvii</sup>

**From these proofs we can be confident that not only God exists – But as we equip ourselves with knowledge of them – We can become effective instruments of communication to the glory of God**

**End notes on the next page**



## End Notes

---

<sup>i</sup> <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/absurd> - 2/8/2013

<sup>ii</sup> William Lane Craig; *Reasonable Faith, Christian Truth and Apologetics*, 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition; Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 1984, 1994, 2008; p 65

<sup>iii</sup> *Ibid*; p 65

<sup>iv</sup> Francis Shaeffer; *The Completer Works of Francis A. Schaeffer, A Christian Worldview; Volume One, A Christian View of Philosophy and Culture; Book One, The God Who Is There*; Westchester, IL: Crossway Books, First Printing 1982, P 8

<sup>v</sup> *Ibid*; p 8

<sup>vi</sup> Grace New Testament Commentary; Copyright © 2010 by Grace Evangelical Society. All rights reserved, PC Study Bible version

<sup>vii</sup> *The Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, 10 Volumes*; Copyright © 1972-1989 By Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.

All rights reserved, PC Study Bible version

<sup>viii</sup> *Pocket Dictionary of Theological Terms*, by Stanley J. Grenz, David Guretzki, and Cherith Fee Nordling; Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1999; P 85

<sup>ix</sup> *Encyclopedia of Christian Apologetics*, © 1999 by Norman L. Geisler; Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, p 564

<sup>x</sup> <http://carm.org/dictionary-necessary-being> - 2/9/2013

<sup>xi</sup> *Pocket Dictionary of Theological Terms*, by Stanley J. Grenz, David Guretzki, and Cherith Fee Nordling; Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1999; P 30

<sup>xii</sup> William Lane Craig; *Reasonable Faith, Christian Truth and Apologetics*, 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition; Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 1984, 1994, 2008; p 95

<sup>xiii</sup> *Ibid*; p 95

<sup>xiv</sup> *Pocket Dictionary of Theological Terms*, by Stanley J. Grenz, David Guretzki, and Cherith Fee Nordling; Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1999; P 86

<sup>xv</sup> William Lane Craig; *Reasonable Faith, Christian Truth and Apologetics*, 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition; Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 1984, 1994, 2008; p 95

<sup>xvi</sup> *Ibid*; p 95

<sup>xvii</sup> *Ibid*; pp. 95-96

<sup>xviii</sup> Douglas Groothuis; *Christian Apologetics, A Comprehensive Case for Biblical Faith*; Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2011, p 185

<sup>xix</sup> *Pocket Dictionary of Theological Terms*, by Stanley J. Grenz, David Guretzki, and Cherith Fee Nordling; Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1999; P 7

<sup>xx</sup> Douglas Groothuis; *Christian Apologetics, A Comprehensive Case for Biblical Faith*; Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2011, p 185

<sup>xxi</sup> *Reasons for Faith, Making a Case for the Christian Faith*; Norman L. Geisler and Chad V. Meister, Editors; Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 2007, p 202

<sup>xxii</sup> R. C. Sproul; *Defending Your Faith, An Introduction to Apologetics*; Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 2003, p 109

<sup>xxiii</sup> *Ibid*; p 109

<sup>xxiv</sup> *Ibid*; p 110

<sup>xxv</sup> *Ibid*; p 128

<sup>xxvi</sup> *Ibid*; pp. 129 - 130

<sup>xxvii</sup> *Pocket Dictionary of Theological Terms*, by Stanley J. Grenz, David Guretzki, and Cherith Fee Nordling; Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1999; P 112

<sup>xxviii</sup> Norman L. Geisler and Ronald M. Brooks; *When Skeptics Ask, A Handbook on Christian Evidences*; Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1990, P 20

<sup>xxix</sup> William Lane Craig; *Reasonable Faith, Christian Truth and Apologetics*, 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition; Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 1984, 1994, 2008; p 170

<sup>xxx</sup> Douglas Groothuis; *Christian Apologetics, A Comprehensive Case for Biblical Faith*; Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2011, p 241

<sup>xxxi</sup> <http://www.philosophyofreligion.info/theistic-proofs/the-teleological-argument/the-argument-from-analogy/> - 2/9/2013

<sup>xxxii</sup> Wayne Grudem; *Systematic Theology, An Introduction to Biblical Doctrine*; InterVarsity Press, jointly with Zondervan Publishing, 1994, P 142

<sup>xxxiii</sup> *Ibid*; p 142

<sup>xxxiv</sup> *Pocket Dictionary of Theological Terms*, by Stanley J. Grenz, David Guretzki, and Cherith Fee Nordling; Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1999; P 80

<sup>xxxv</sup> William Lane Craig; *Reasonable Faith, Christian Truth and Apologetics*, 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition; Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 1984, 1994, 2008; p 172

<sup>xxxvi</sup> ESV Study Bible, English Standard Version; Wheaton, IL: Crossway Bibles, 2008; P 2160

<sup>xxxvii</sup> *Encyclopedia of Christian Apologetics*, © 1999 by Norman L. Geisler; Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, p 500