Thomas Aquinas’ Third Way is easily divided into two parts. The first part concludes with the thesis that there must be a necessary being. The second part begins with this thesis and concludes that there must be a necessary being that does not have a cause of its necessity but that is the cause of necessity of all other beings. From this conclusion we are to take it as proven that there is a god, for such a being “quod omnes dicunt Deum.” In classical and contemporary discussions of the third way, a number of objections are directed at it. In this paper I consider two of those objections. The first objection is directed to the first part of the argument, and asserts that Aquinas is fundamentally confused in his use of the modal terms ‘possibility’ and ‘necessity’ when he argues for the thesis that there must be a necessary being. Likewise, the second objection is directed to the first part of the argument, and asserts that Aquinas commits the quantifier shift fallacy in the following conditional, “If therefore everything has the possibility of not being, at one time there was nothing.” I respond to these two objections. The second objection employs Leibnizian notions of possibility and necessity when analyzing the argument. And while Aquinas elsewhere recognizes these Leibnizian senses of possibility and necessity, the senses employed in the argument are not Leibnizian, but are tied to Aristotle’s work On Generation and Corruption, and must be evaluated according to that work. In which case, the first objection represents a misreading of the argument. Second, I respond that Aquinas does not commit the Quantifier Shift Fallacy. Common responses to this objection on behalf of Aquinas attempt to supply one or another otherwise tacit and additional premise to the argument to avoid the fallacy charge. I argue that no such premise is required, because the objection misreads the use of the term ‘all’ or ‘omne’ in the argument as the universal quantifier of the Predicate Calculus. The Quantifier Shift Fallacy requires the use of the universal quantifier. But since ‘all’ does not function as the universal quantifier in the argument, it cannot commit the fallacy. I conclude provisionally that the first part of the argument is valid.