

ادله اثبات خدا

درس گفتارهای مقولات ویژه در فلسفه دین

دکتر سید حسن حسینی

گروه فلسفه علم

دانشگاه صنعتی شریف

پاییز و زمستان ۱۳۹۹



To Justify or to Believe

1. To Justify God

1. Argument, Natural Theology

1. Theoretical Arguments, Evidentialism

1. Ontological Argument
2. Cosmological Argument
3. New Kalam Cosmological Argument
4. Fine Tuned Argument, Teleological Arg

2. Practical Arguments

1. Moral Arguments
2. Pascal's Wager Arguments
3. Practical Rationality Arguments
4. Religious Experience Arguments
5. Argument from Miracle

2. Explanations

2. To Believe in God; Reveled Theology, Fideism, Dogmatic Theology

* تبیین ایده آلیستی مطلق

* تبیین ایده آلیستی شخصی

* تبیین نئوکانتی (بریتانیا)

* تبیین پوزیتویستی

* تبیین رئالیستی نو

* تبیین فنومنولوژیکال

* تبیین پراگماتیسی

* تبیین زبان شناختی فلسفی و پوزیتویستی

* تبیین نئوتومیستی (گرایش به نوعی الهیات طبیعی)

* تبیین مبتنی بر فلسفه تحلیلی

تبیین (برخی گرایش‌های قرن بیستم)

۱. خدا و براهین وجود شناختی

۱-۱- مقدمه

۱۰۷۸: آنسلم، Proslogion، ارائه اصل استدلال

۱۲۶۴: آکویناس، Summa، نقد انسلم

۱۶۳۷: دکارت، Meditations، استدلال

۱۶۸۰: اسپینوزا، Ethics، دفاع از استدلال

۱۷۰۹: لایپنیتز، New Essays Concerning Human Understanding، تکمیل
استدلال دکارتی

۱۷۷۶: هیوم، Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion، ایراد کلی به همه
استدلالات

۱۷۸۷: کانت، Critique of Pure Reason، ایراد جدی بر استدلال (وجود و محمول)

۱۸۳۶: هگل، Lectures، دفاع و ارائه استدلال

۱۸۸۴: فرگه، Foundations of Arithmetic، وجود و محمول مرتبه دوم

۱۹۴۱، ۱۹۶۰، ۱۹۷۴، ۱۹۹۵، استدلال‌های جدید در دفاع از استدلال به ترتیب توسط
هارتشون، مالکوم، پلنتیجا، و گودل.

A:

- 1) God is that than nothing greater can be conceived.
- 2) Than that which nothing greater can be conceived must exist extramentally as well as mentally.
- 3) God exists extramentally.

B:

- 1) God is that than which no greater can be conceived. (p)
- 2) If God is that than which no greater can be conceived then there is nothing greater than God that can be imagined. (l)

Therefore:

- 3) There is nothing greater than God that can be imagined. (1 , 2)
- 4) If God does not exist then there is something greater than God that can be imagined.

Therefore:

- 5) God exists. (3,4)

C: (Plantinga's version of Anslem's argument)

- 1) God exists in the understanding but not in reality (premise)
- 2) Existence in reality is greater than existence in understanding alone.(premise)
- 3) God's existence in reality is conceivable. (Premise)
- 4) If God did exist in reality, then he would be greater than he is. (1,2)
- 5) It is conceivable that there is a being greater than God is (3,4)
- 6) It is conceivable that there be a being greater than the being than which nothing greater can be conceived.(5 by the definition of God)
- 7) It is false that God exists in the understanding

D: Anselm's so-called second version:

- 1) By definition, God is a being than which none greater can be imagined.
- 2) A being that *necessarily* exists in reality is greater than a being that does not *necessarily* exist.
- 3) Thus, by definition, if God exists as an idea in the mind but does not necessarily exist in reality, then we can imagine something that is greater than God.
- 4) But we cannot imagine something that is greater than God.
- 5) Thus, if God exists in the mind as an idea, then God necessarily exists in reality.
- 6) God exists in the mind as an idea.
- 7) Therefore, God necessarily exists in reality.

E: Plantinga's version:

- 1) The concept of a maximally great being is self-consistent.
- 2) If 1, then there is at least one logically possible world in which a maximally great being exists.
- 3) Therefore, there is at least one logically possible world in which a maximally great being exists.
- 4) If a maximally great being exists in one logically possible world, it exists in every logically possible world. (A being has maximal greatness if and only if it has maximal excellence in every possible world.)
- 5) Therefore, a maximally great being exists in all possible world.

This indeed is not at first manifest, since it would seem to present some appearance of being a sophism. For being accustomed in all other things to make a distinction between existence and essence, I easily persuade myself that the existence can be separated from the essence of God, and that we can thus conceive God as not actually existing. But, nevertheless, when I think of it with more attention, I clearly see that existence can no more be separated from the essence of God than can its having its three angles equal to two right angles be separated from the essence of a triangle, or the idea of a mountain from the idea of a valley; and so there is not any less repugnance to our conceiving a God (that is, a Being supremely perfect) to whom existence is lacking (that is to say, to whom a certain perfection is lacking), than to conceive of a mountain which has no valley.

Everitt's version of Descartes

- 1) God is by definition a being with all perfections.
- 2) Existence is a perfection.
- 3) God has the perfection of existence (1,2)
- 4) God exists (3)

2. Cosmological Arg. A Short History

- Aristotle's Physics (VIII, 4–6) and Metaphysics (XII, 1–6)
- **Thomas Aquinas** (1225–74) Summa Theologica
- Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz (1646–1716) Monadology
- Samuel Clarke (1675-1729), The Works
- David Hume, (1711-1776) Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion
- Immanuel Kant, (1724 –1804) Critique of Pure Reason
- William Lane Craig 1979, The Kalām Cosmological Argument
- Richard Swinburne, 1996, Is There a God
- Copleston and Russell in 1964, “Debate on the Existence of God”

۲. خدا و استدلال‌های کیهان‌شناختی

۲-۱- آکویناس (۱۲۲۵-۱۲۷۴، ایتالیا)

First way:

1. Some things are in a process of change.
2. Whatever is in a process of change is being changed by something else.
3. An infinite regress of changers, each changed by another is impossible.
4. There is a first cause of change, itself not in a process of change.

The proof for (2):

- i. If something is in a process of change toward a state A, then it is potentially in state A.
- ii. If something is in a process of change toward state A, there must be something which is actually in state A which is causing the thing in question to be changing toward state A.
- iii. Nothing can be both actually in state A and potentially in state A at the same time.

2. whatever is in a process of change is being changed by something else.

Second Way:

1. Some things exist and their existence is caused.
2. Whatever is caused to exist is caused to exist by something else.
3. An infinite regress of causes resulting in the existence of a particular thing is impossible.

Therefore:

4. There is a first cause of existence.

Third Way:

1. There are contingent beings.
2. Not every being is a contingent being

Therefore:

3. There exists a necessary being
4. An infinite regress of necessary being each having its necessity caused by another is impossible

Therefore:

5. There exists a necessary being which has its necessity of itself and not from another.

Proof for (2)

- i. Whatever is a contingent being at one time did not exist
- ii. If every thing is contingent then at one time nothing existed.
- iii. If at one time nothing existed then nothing would exist now.
- iv. Something does exist now.

Therefore:

2. not every being is a contingent being.

۲-۲- کلارک (۱۶۷۵-۱۷۲۹، بریتانیا)

1. Every being is either a dependent being or an independent being; therefore,
2. Either there exists an independent being or every being is dependent;
3. It is false that every being is dependent; therefore,
4. There exists an independent being; therefore,
5. There exists a necessary being.

۲-۳- لایپنیتز (۱۶۴۶-۱۷۱۶، آلمان) و اصل دلیل کافی

(Principle of Sufficient Reason)

1. Anything that exists has an explanation of its existence, either in the necessity of its own nature or in an external cause.
2. If the universe has an explanation of its existence, that explanation is God.
3. The universe exists.

Therefore:

4. The explanation of the existence of the universe is God.

تمام این استدلال‌ها و حتی استدلال‌های دیگر به
Principle of Sufficient Reason باز می‌گردد.

PSR

"our reasoning are founded on two great principles, that of contradiction... and that of sufficient reason, in virtue of which we consider that no fact can be real or actual, and no proposition true, without there being a sufficient reason for its being so and not otherwise, although most often these reasons cannot at all be known by us." (لایپنیتز)

Different Versions

1. For every existent there is an explanation (**strong**).
2. For every existent that comes into the existence there is an explanation (**weak**).
3. For every fact, there is an explanation (**Strong**).
4. For every true contingent proposition, there is an explanation why it is true (**weak**).
5. For every true proposition there is an explanation why it is true (**strong**).

Causal Principle

6. For every contingent event, there is a cause.
7. For every contingent event there is a cause which is itself an event.
8. For every contingent being (that once did not exist) there is a cause.
9. For every contingent being (that comes into existence), there is a cause.
10. For every contingent being, there is a cause.

Is the **PSR** True?

The PSR is either

Analytic a priori, or

Synthetic a priori, or

The presupposition of all human knowledge
and science

The Parity of Reasons

The principle of sufficient reason can be illustrated in various ways as we have done, and if one thinks about it, he is apt to find that he presupposes it in his thinking about reality, but it cannot be proved. It does not appear to be itself a necessary truth, and at the same time it would be most odd to say it is contingent. If one were to try proving it, he would sooner or later have to appeal to consideration that are less plausible than the principle itself. Indeed, it is hard to see how one could even make an argument for it, without already assuming it. For this reason it might properly be called a presupposition of reason itself. One can deny that it is true without embarrassment or fear or refutation, but one is then apt to find that what he is denying is not really what the principle asserts. We shall, then, treat it here as a datum—not something that is provably true, but as something which all men, whether they ever reflect it or not, seem more or less to presuppose. (Richard Taylor)

Clearly the principle is not logically true. Nor, it would seem that the mere notion of the existence of a thing definitionally contains the notion of a thing being caused....If this is true the Principle of Sufficient Reason is certainly not analytically true. But if the Principle is not analytically true how can it be necessary?...it is far from clear that the Principle of Sufficient Reason is a synthetic, necessary proposition known a priori.(William Rowe)

مروری بر اصل استدلال

1. If every being is dependent then the whole of existing things consists of an infinite collection of dependent beings;
2. If the whole of existing things consists of an infinite collection of dependent beings then the infinite collection itself must have an explanation of its existence;
3. If the existence of the infinite collection of dependent beings has an explanation then the explanation must lie either in the causal efficacy of some being outside the collection or it must lie within the infinite collection itself;
4. The explanation of the existence of the infinite collection of dependent beings cannot lie in the causal efficacy of some being outside the collection;

5. The explanation of the existence of the infinite collection of dependent beings cannot lie within the collection itself; therefore,
6. There is no explanation of the infinite collection of dependent beings; (from 3, 4, and 5), therefore,
7. It is false that the whole of existing things consists of an infinite collection of dependent beings; (from 2 and 6), therefore,
8. It is false that every being is dependent. (from 1 and 7).

۳- خدا و استدلال‌های کلامی (جدید)، کریگ

۳-۱- ساختار کلی استدلال

1. Everything that begins to exist has a cause of its existence.
2. The universe began to exist.
3. Therefore, the universe has a cause of its existence.
4. Since no scientific explanation (in terms of physical laws) can provide a causal account of the origin of the universe, the cause must be personal (explanation is given in terms of a personal agent)

چالش مقدمه اول با اصول مکانیک کوانتوم، نظریه انفجار بزرگ، و خلق از عدم.

۳-۲- اثبات مقدمه دوم استدلال

1. The universe began to exist.

First deductive argument

1. An actual infinite cannot exist.
2. An infinite temporal regress of events is an actual infinite
3. Therefore an infinite temporal regress of events cannot exist

The universe began to exist

Second deductive argument

1. The series of events in time is a collection formed by successive addition.
2. A collection formed by successive addition cannot be actually infinite.
3. Therefore, the series of events in time cannot be actually infinite.

اثبات مقدمه دوم استدلال

The universe began to exist

First and Second Inductive argument

A third argument for (2) is an inductive argument based on evidence for the expansion of the universe.

A fourth argument for (2) is also an inductive argument, appealing to thermodynamic properties of the universe.

Craig

The Leibnizian and *kalam* cosmological arguments are powerful, complementary arguments which make it plausible to believe that the answer to the mystery of the existence of the universe is to be found in an uncaused, metaphysically necessary, personal, Creator of the universe, who sans the universe, is beginningless, changeless, immaterial, timeless, spaceless, and enormously powerful, and who brought the universe into being a finite time ago.

Conclusion

We can summarize our argument as follows:

- 1. Whatever exists has a reason for its existence, either in the necessity of its own nature or in an external ground
- 2. Whatever begins to exist is not necessary in its existence.
- 3. If the universe has an external ground of its existence, then there exists a Personal Creator of the universe, who, sans the universe, is timeless, spaceless, beginningless, changeless, necessary, uncaused, and enormously powerful
- 4. The universe began to exist.
- From (2) and (4) it follows that
- 5. Therefore, the universe is not necessary in its existence.
- From (1) and (5) it follows further that
- 6. Therefore, the universe has an external ground of its existence.
- From (3) and (6) we can conclude that
- 7. Therefore, there exists a Personal Creator of the universe, who, sans the universe, is timeless, spaceless, beginningless, changeless, necessary, uncaused, and enormously powerful.
- And this, as Thomas Aquinas, is what everybody means by God.

۴- براهین استقرایی، سوئین برن

۴-۱- اصل استدلال

- (۱) رویدادهای ذهنی و مغزی از یکدیگر جدا است.
- (۲) رویدادهای ذهنی و مغزی بر یکدیگر تأثیرگذار است. (ارتباط دوسویه)
- (۳) ارتباط دوسویه تبیین پذیر است.
- (۴) ارتباط دوسویه تبیین علمی ندارد.
- (۵) ارتباط دوسویه تبیین شخصی دارد.
- (۶) وجود خدا (خدا وجود دارد)، تبیین شخصی ارتباط دوسویه است.
- (۷) خدا وجود دارد.

۴-۲- ماهیت برهان استقرایی سوئین برن

* e: ارتباط دوسویه (و یا وجود جهان)

* K: معلومات و اطلاعات درباره قوانین فیزیکی انسان

* h: فرضیه وجود خدا

$$1) \quad P(e/h \& k) > P(e/\sim h \& k)$$

بنابراین

$$2) \quad P(h/e \& k) > P(h/k) \text{ (قاعده استقراء نوع c)}$$

* قاعده استقراء

$$1) \quad P(h/e \& k) > P(h/k) \text{ iff } P(e/h \& K) > P(e \& k)$$

بنابراین

$$2) \quad P(h/e \& k) > P(h/k) \text{ iff } P(e/h \& K) > P(e/\sim h \& k)$$