CHAPTER: III

PHILOSOPHICAL UNDERSTANDING OF GOD

The concept of God or Absolute is the most important, most universal and central concept of religion but also has great philosophical significance. God is the highest reality, the highest value and the highest end. It is a metaphysical concept. The philosophical analysis of the religious concept of God has interpreted the existential mode of thinking. The western religious thinking, specially, is predominantly metaphysical. Religion or religious belief is chiefly concerned with the object as the matter of workshop.

The "philosophical understanding of God" has persisted in our language as the scientific study of God. It is an intellectual and logical interpretation of the idea of God. The "Philosophical Understanding of God" merges in philosophy so far as its philosophical thinking about god is concerned. In "Philosophical Understanding of God" all the philosophical aspects of God as the organ of religion is understood. Philosophical thought is always rational and very deeply intellectual. It is a rational analysis. All the metaphysical significance, proofs for God's existence, attributes, relations of God with the world etc. are the determining factors of philosophical understanding.

The relation between God and the world and the problem of existence have given birth the theories which have philosophical understanding. The theories like deism, pantheism and panenteism or theism are known as metaphysical theories which shows the relation between God and the world. On the other hand, the theories atheism,
agnosticism and naturalism have shown the problem of the existence of God.

**Deism:**

*Deism* was the predominant religious philosophy of British thinkers. It was introduced by Herbert Cherbury (1583-1648) and was greatly popularized by Sir Isaac Newton (1642-1727) and was accepted by Charles Darwin (1809-1882).

*Deism* is generally associated with British religious thought. The term "*deism*" was originally equivalent to *theism*. *Theism* based on the Greek word for God (theos), and *deism* on the Latin (deus).

*Deism* was used in numbers of ways rather than the principal one. These are, *viz.*, (i) *Deism* is a belief in a supreme being lacking all attributes of personality, (ii) belief in a God but denial of any divine providential care of the world, (iii) belief in a God but denial of any future life and (iv) belief in a God, but rejecting of all other articles of religious faith.

*Deism* is the belief in the existence of a God without revelation. It is essentially hidden God. God is an object beyond worship and knowledge of man. "In its principal meaning, deism signifies the belief in a single God and in a religious practice founded solely on natural reason rather than on supernatural revelation". *Deism* holds that God is perfect, infinite, eternal, omnipotent, omniscient, personal and the absolute reality.

Deists believed that God is the causa sui, the first cause of universe. The world is created by His will at a particular time but from
out of nothing. After creation, the world runs independently and God performs his duty as a sustainer and caretaker.

Deistic conception is that the world is an independent reality but world depends on him on certain occasions. Deism signifies that God exists apart from the world. God is completely transcendent or eternal from the world. He has no logical relations with the ongoings of the world. Deism had made concept of God as a definite, independent being as an object of worship. A religious man who cannot accept god as dependent upon the world rightly maintains God as a transcendent being.

In deism God is regarded as a creator of the world assuming that the world has been created by God like a perfect machine. As a machine being perfect requires no supervision. So the world also does not need any further supervision. God is retired from the world like the absentee landlord. "God has created man with freewill and has endowed him with his natural light of reason by virtue of which he can determine his moral duties."

Relation between God and the world is indicated in this theory on the analogy of the watchmaker and the watch he makes. The relation of the watchmaker with the watch ends when it has been finally made. So is the God’s relation with the world.

Deism can be interpreted as having scientific manner ---

(a) Nature can be explained in terms of natural causes only and there is no room for supernatural agency or miracles.

(b) Each natural event is determined by its own causes.
(c) There is hardly any inner law in the heart of nature which can be styled as moral.

From a critical analysis and justification it is found that the theory ‘deism’ is unsatisfactory and for the following reasons.

(a) It is asserted that *deism* has some scientific explanation but it is a truce which is not permanent.

(b) The theory that the world is created by God is an insoluble problem for *deism*. Why did a perfect God create the world? How did He create? Did He create out of Himself or of some pre-existing matter? Again, did He create the world in a timeless void or did He create the world along with the time? Further, if God is perfect then the world will have no value for Him. Again, if God is infinitely good and omnipotent then why is there evil at all.

All these problems raised here almost are insoluble for any rational form of religious philosophy. *Deism* though claims to be wholly rationalistic is failed to solve such problems. A God fully understood is no God at all. A fully understood God becomes a mere concept of human intellect.

(c) *Deism* involves *dualism* between god and the world. God and the world becomes two realities as the world is created by God. In this regards *deism* appears as a *dualism*, which has similarities with the *dualism* of Descartes.

(d) It is mentioned that the world is created by God but it finds difficult to determine the purpose of the creation.
(e) **Deism** holds that God has created the world out of nothing but from His will, it is logically inconsistent.

(f) If God is conceived as a mechanic or an architect, it makes God like human architect.

Hence **deism** provides no sufficient explanation of the relation between God and the world and of the revelation of God. Its tendency was purely rational interpretation. It is, that is to say, a critical rather than a spiritual movement.

This interpretation of the theory provides some points of characteristics which indicates the depth of philosophical understanding

(a) The world is supposed to be created by the will of God. He can be called a moral agent or moral being. So, His creation is adopted to have moral purpose.

(b) **Deism** has recognized God as the sustaining power of the universe.

(c) **Deism** emphasizes the duties of men towards God and who in turn comes to be regarded as the final judge.

This theory of **deism** was supported by the western philosophers i.e. John Toland, Mathew Tingal etc. during the 16th and 17th centuries. Though Karl Barth and Paul Tillich accept the transcendence of God, but have laid stress on revelation. So, **deism** has raised an important philosophical issue.

**Pantheism:**

Pantheism comes from the Greek term 'Pan' means 'all' 'theos' means 'God'. So, literally means 'all is god'. More commonly it means
that the world is God and the God is the world. This is opposed to 
deism and it is a reaction against it. It conceived God as absolutely immanent in the world. “In emphasising the immanence of God, pantheism fulfils the desire of religious spirit which wants God to be present everywhere in the world”³.

Pantheism is much older system. It is found in both east and west. It is closely associated with the mystic experiences.

Immense is the key concept in explaining pantheism. Pantheism holds that God is immanent in the universe in the sense that God pervades the whole universe as an indwelling spirit.

Immense God may be the vitalizing, moulding, sustaining and indwelling power of the world.

The immense of God also means that God is the primordial stuff of which everything is the modifications.

Pantheism regards God and the world are necessarily co-existing and immanently present in all. God without world is like a substance without quality and world without God is absolute nullity. God and world are identical. Everything, every event, every mental function are nothing without God. God is not only present in all. He is the sole reality. If God is the only reality, there is nothing other than God, the whole multiplicity is reduced to an unreal appearance.

Pantheism may be personal and super personal. According to the personal pantheism, the absolute reality is personal in nature. This type of pantheism is found among the sufists and also among the Christian mystics. According to super personal pantheism, the absolute reality is all inclusive, cannot be less than its appearance. The reality is
not personal as it is much richer and higher than personal. This type of pantheism is found in F.H. Bradley's philosophy.

Spinoza in the west was the typical exponent of pantheism. As it has been mentioned in the previous chapter, according to Spinoza, God is substance and substance is God. God and world are identical. It might be remarked that when Spinoza tried to explain the relation between God and the world through the pantheistic explanation by the end of the eighteenth century, he has in his mind a series of doubts about the creation of the world by the God. "Tolard coined the word pantheist and held that the universe is God".

The western thinker Josiah Royce is also a pantheist. His deity is all-inclusive and all-knowing.

Like Spinoza and Royce, Hegelian form of idealism is pantheistic in character. Hegel considers reality as the absolute mind or will. Nothing falls outside the absolute and everything is the absolute. God is infinite and omnipotent.

Ācārya Śaṅkara, the exponent of Advaita Vedānta is the typical exponent of pantheism. Śaṅkara holds that Brahman or the Absolute is the only reality, and the world is an illusion. It has no real existence. The Absolute or Brahman is one without any second. Brahman is indeterminate and indescribable. This theory is said to have relation with the Upaniṣadic saying 'aham Brahmasmi' and 'sarvam khalvidam Brahma'.

Rāmānuja in Vishishtādvaita view holds God as co-extensive with the universe. The world like God is without beginning and is limited neither by time nor by space.
Śaṅkara, Spinoza, Upaniṣadic seers and Buddhistic thinkers are pantheists and are highly intellectual philosophers. The nature of Indian thought is highly pantheistic in character and does not accord personality to all pervasive reality. The \textit{pantheism} of Śaṅkara, Spinoza and Wordsworth are impersonal.

The theory of \textit{pantheism}, however, has some problems which are mentioned below.

(a) In this theory God and the world are mentioned as identical and also God is regarded as real. The finite temporary world cannot be identical with God. If the world is real and identical with God, the impersonal world itself becomes the object of worship and devotion.

(b) If we believe that all is God and God is all, then there would not be the problem of evil in the world. If He is here, He must have evils and defects. So how can He be regarded as perfect?

(c) Here God is regarded as immanent in the world. If God is regarded as immanent and is within this world, how can God be real, eternal and infinite? For the world is non-eternal, all these concepts will be impossible for this theory.

(d) \textit{Pantheism} mentions that God is real and independent. Hence, finite self has no independence and freedom.

(e) \textit{Pantheism} creates religious difficulties in society. According to \textit{pantheism}, God is not a personal Being and man is not having distinct personality of his own for religious activities.
So, from all these reasons and points it can be regarded that pantheism is not a satisfactory and sound theory.

In spite of all these problems pantheism has high historical importance. The pantheistic tendency emerges in very different systems of culture. Pantheism appeals to real instincts of the religious consciousness.

Pantheism is an elusive word whose spiritual significance is not well defined. Some pantheist have Christian mode of thought and expression, while some are not so.

Thus, pantheism is abstract monism which believes in the reality of one at the expense of the many things and objects of the world.

Panentheism or Theism:

The term ‘theism’ can be used as equivalent to the term ‘panentheism’ or concrete monotheism. Panentheism or theism is the reconciliatory theory of both deism and pantheism. This theory considers both as transcendent and immanent. ‘Pan’ means ‘all’, ‘en’ means ‘in’ and ‘theos’ means ‘God’. So literally, pan-en-theism means all is in God. “Panentheism avoids both extreme monism and extreme pluralism, and it does this, it claims, without obvious paradox”. This view is outcome of a purely religious notice. A theist believes that the world cannot exist independently. God appears to be present everywhere. God is immanent in the world and is not subject to ordinary limitations which is in the phenomenal world. God transcends the world and He is not identical with them. He acts on the world but does not depend on the world. He is infinite as complete and self-sufficient. He is absolute and unconditional ground of all existences. He is attributed with omniscience, omnipotence and omnipresence. He is
everywhere. God is all powerful for He is the independent and self-sufficient ground of the being of the world.

According to this theory, God is ever-present in every movement of the world and ultimately is connected with the world. Therefore, God is immanent in the world. Again, the world follows from God. He, therefore, transcends the world. Hence, God though immanent in the world, yet is transcendent and immanent. One can remember here the famous Upaniṣadic saying about God 'atytiṣṭad daśāṅgulam'. Panentheism holds that God is infinite and protector of the world. God is above time and space though He includes time and space in the immanent relation to the world.

Panentheism is based upon a concrete metaphysics of Hegelian idealism which is a view that establishes relation between the finite and the infinite, world and the God. Panentheism believes that God is the highest personality, supporter and defender of the world.

Theism which is known as Panentheism conceives God as a self-conscious being whose nature is expressed within the structure and process of the universe. In theism (or Panentheism) "God has been conceived neither as a more plurality nor as a bare unity, but as unity in-plurality".

The theist is not willing to go the whole way with the deist or with the pantheist. With the deist, theist denies that God cannot be identified with the space-time order. With the pantheist, the theist denies that God can be wholly external to the space-time order. Theism agrees with the deism in the point that God is in some sense more than the world. On the other hand, theism agrees with the pantheism is that God is found within the world order.
Among the western philosophers who have advocated this **theism** are Descartes, Locke, Berkeley, James Ward, Hegel etc. The Hegelian doctrine of **Panentheism** is generally known as **theism**. The **theism** advocated by Martineau differs from Hegel. Hegel holds that God is both immanent and transcendent to the finite souls. Martineau, on the other hand, holds that God transcended the finite selves. Finite selves have freedom of will, are free to work for their destiny.

**Theism** or **Panentheism** is also not free from defects. Some of them are as follows –

(a) **Panentheism** holds that ‘all things’ are in God. If all things are in God then God cannot be more than all things. God will have the same status with the things.

(b) It creates a religious difficulties by producing a sense of **dualism**. In **pantheism** ‘all things are in God’ indicates a **dualism** of ‘all things’ and ‘God’.

(c) God is both immanent and transcendent. The question arises, if God is immanent then how can God be transcendent? It is logically inconsistent.

**Theism** as a doctrine have a high religious attitudes. It occurs as the all-knowing, all-powerful and the creator of all. **Theism** as a concrete **monotheism**, believes one divine reality instead of negating the contents of the world, things of the world and will of men. Among the different theories regarding the conception of God, **Panentheism** or **theism** appears to be the best. The theistic connection is the outcome of a more purely religious motive. The theist speaks of communion and co-operation with God in religious worship and religious life.
Monotheism:

The term *monotheism* derived from the Greek 'mono' (single) and 'theos' (God). The term *monotheism* refers religious experiences and philosophical perceptions and emphasizes that God is One, Perfect, immediately Creator of the world from nothing. He is all powerful. He is worshipped by all creatures as a personal and worthy being. "*Monotheism* (one-God-ism) is the belief that there is but one Supreme Being who is personal and moral and who seeks a total and unqualified response from human creatures". The *monotheism* was considered by the theological apologists and nineteenth century cultural evolutionists as a higher form of belief.

*Monotheism* has a slide difference with *theism*. In *theism*, God is taken to be a supernatural person and the creator of value evolving world. He may not be absolute. In Indian thought, Îśvara is the Supreme God who has created this value evolving world but He is not the Absolute.

In the west, the *theism* assumes the form of *monotheism* where one God is worshipped and the worship of other Gods are treated as aberrant. The objective truth of this doctrine is that only one god is true and others are false. For *monotheism* god is a person and also an infinite being who necessarily exists. We are more concerned with *monotheism* than *theism*. In this respect, *monotheism* differs from *theism*. It also differs from the views that accept plurality of divine beings.

The term *monotheism* is generally theological rather then philosophical descriptions of religion. Philosophers used the term *theism* as having the same meaning with *monotheism*. Monotheism pre-
supposes the idea of Theos, a divine being with mind and will, fully personal, conceivable and approachable through prayer. Monotheism supposes the idea of Theos, a divine being with mind and will, fully personal, conceivable and approachable through prayer. Monotheism raises excessively one Theos to the absolute supremacy and power. The best example of monotheism about the idea of God is found in Judaism, Christianity and Islam. “Jews, Christians, and Muslims drew on the fundamental monotheistic vision of ancient Israel, each group filling out the picture of God with colourings and shapes drawn from its own particular culture”. The term monotheism is used to indicate the conception of deity as found in the traditions such as Zoroastrianism, Sikhism and some form of Hinduism and Buddhism.

Monotheism can be divided into monarchic monotheism; emanational mystical monotheism and historical ethical monotheism.

Monarchic monotheism is the belief which believes in only one God who rules over many Gods. This one high God is the Supreme Authority and has unlimited power who forces other powers to total submission. Akhenaton’s monotheistic movement in ancient Egypt was of this type.

Dualistic monotheism is a subtype of monarchic monotheism. Here one God opposes against evil forces. In this view there is one ruler God who is all-good and all-just. The distinctive feature of this type of monotheism is that it takes evil away from the being of one God. Zoroastrianism is a classic example of dualistic monotheism: although the one God, Angra Mainyu struggles throughout the history of the world to be overcome only at the end.

Emanational mystical monotheism offers two subtypes to worship God. In one subtype, one god is worshipped through many Gods and in another type, the one God is worshipped as the world soul. The first
subtype is seen in some theistic Hindu cult. Vishnu, for example, can be worshipped in many avatars and with many different names. The other subtype holds that there is one personal theos who is not sharply separated from the world but rather is the creative divine force in everything. Qualified non-dualism of Rāmānuja holds Vishnu to be absolute supreme God and His worshippers are united as soul and body are united.

*Historical ethical monotheism* is the view of one God who is the guide of the historical design of the world and describes God as personal.

**Polytheism:**

The term 'polytheism' is derived from the Greek 'polus' (many) and 'theos' (God) and has recognized the worship of many Gods. *Polytheism* is mainly used as a contrast with *monotheism* and *henotheism*.

In the history of religion, *polytheism* is found as the major and most widespread phenomena. The origin of *polytheism* are closely related with evolutionist view. The evolutionist calls it as post-primitive phenomenon due to the fact of appearance of advance cultures. *Polytheism* claims that there are many Gods because man experiences the world in its verity and manifoldness. "Hence there is also specialization among the gods, of the nature that is either local and tribal-ethnic (gods of specific localities, cities, countries, families) or functional (gods of specific arts, gods of illness, cure, fertility, rains, hunting, fishing etc)"9.
An important corollary of polytheism is that only the major deity can be very powerful. Only the monotheistic god, being monos can be the all-powerful.

In the primitive age polytheism is found. The primitive people believed the individual non-material (spiritual) being. They believed spirits of departed humans as a supernatural entities. Polytheistic belief is found in Vedic and Post-Vedic Period in India. The different Gods and Goddesses, Indo – Aryan asuras (deities) are the most among them.

Hence, it becomes possible to speak of a pseudo – polytheism, a religious system that preserves the traditional polytheistic terminology, the consideration of many gods are the mere manifestations of what is ultimately one divine principle. This tendency is especially noticeable in many modern types of Neo-Hinduism.

Henotheism:

From the Greek ‘henos’ (one) and ‘theos’ (god), the term Henotheism is derived. The view that one god is supreme while not denying the existence of other gods. Henotheism is the intermediary stage between polytheism and monotheism. Henotheism is found in Vedic Period, directed towards the variety of Hindu deities.

Existence of God:

The subject “existence of God” is a problem and debatable topic in philosophy. It has been the centre of debate and controversy since the time of Plato. The philosophers, scientists and theologians have been giving arguments for hundreds of years either to assert or to deny His existence. “The existent may be defined as that which is compatible with more things than is anything incomputable with itself”\(^{10}\) In
Taittrīya Upanisad, it is said. "If one knows Him as Brahman the Non-Being, He becomes merely the non-existent. If one knows that Brahman is then is He known as the real in existence."\(^{11}\) For the Existence of God Sri Aurobindo said "God is love, God is wisdom, God is truth."\(^{12}\) This is the issue and one of the problems of philosophy of religion, because issue of God has occupied a central position in the Philosophy of religion.

"The existence of God" is philosophically, theoretically and practically most extreme by important. By ‘God’ one understands a Supreme Mind regarded either as Omnipotent or at least more Powerful than anything and supremely Good and Wise.

Existence of God or belief in God is a question whether the object of belief is real or not? The philosophy of religion seeks to fulfil the answer by undertaking systematic enquiry into the nature and truth of belief.

"The existence of God" is held to be a necessary existence. Necessity is the property of a being or thing. A thing or being is called necessary which has the character of everlasting. God is said often as a necessary being while everything else is contingent. One of Leibnitz’s proofs of the existence of God concludes that there exists “a necessary Being” in whom essence involves existence. J. N. Findlay says, if God is to be adequate object for religious attitudes, then He must be infinitely Superior to His worshippers. He cannot, therefore, be a being which just happens to exist.

Regarding "This existence of God" the American philosopher Josiah Royce said, "God's existence cannot be assumed but must be
demonstrated," "God cannot be defined and preached until one knows that he exists"\textsuperscript{13}.

The existence of God can also be searched through a critical method. The critical method is nothing other than skeptical method. The skeptical method also ensures the critical character of the spirit. To doubt is a duty for truth seeker. The philosophical truth also comes under the forms of doubt. The philosophical doubt is the essence of thought.

In the history of philosophy, therefore, we have some rational arguments for the theistic belief or faith regarding the existence of God. Such an argument confirms our belief or faith and removes doubt. Some important theistic philosophical proofs or arguments are offered for the existence of God, viz.:

1. Ontological  
2. Cosmological  
3. Teleological or Design,  
4. Moral and some others which are being discussed one by one.

1. Ontological Argument:

The ontological argument was first forwarded by St. Anslem, a medieval philosopher. Later on it was restated by Descartes, accepted by Leibnitz, Hegel and John Caird, opposed powerfully by St. Thomas Aquinas and Kant. In contemporary religious philosophy, the argument was debated by A. J. Ayer, J. J. E. Smart, A. G. N. Flew, J. N. Findly and Norman Malcolm.

Ontological argument tries to prove the existence of God from the ideas or human experience. Anslem said that we have an idea of perfect being who is understood as God.
The root of the argument is found in Plato and later on, more or less, in an explicit form, it is found in the writings of St. Augustine. In Plato, ideas were considered to be more important and more valuable and fundamental then the existing things. Further the idea of God is nothing less than God, was the supreme principle of reality that drew all things unto itself. For Plato, 'existence' was not of much value. However, for him, 'essence' was of greater worth than 'existence' and in this sense he would maintain the spirit of the ontological argument.

The argument proceeds in this way- "God is a being than which no greater can be conceived"14. We have the idea of such a being. The existence is necessary for the concept of such a being. From the definition, it is conceived that He is the greatest being. Therefore, such a being exists.

It is clear from the word 'greater' as used by Anslem which means supreme perfect and the highest. Anslem used to mean the God not as a most perfect being but as so perfect that no more perfect can be conceived. Anslem pointed out in the ontological argument that the most perfect being exists in the reality as well as in the mind. He said that 'God' is a necessary existence, so it is impossible to conceive His non-existence.

Another aspect of his argument is that God is the most perfect being. He must necessarily exist. His idea of non-existence is an imperfection. Therefore, perfection implies His existence. Anslem made his argument from the perfection of God to His existence. He holds that since an existent being is more perfect than a purely imaginary object, it follows that God must exist.
Anslem does not mean his argument as a demonstration. He took the proof with a view to strengthen his faith and justifying one’s belief in God. For him, faith is a necessary pre-condition of understanding God. A being which exists both in the world and in mind is greater than a being which exists in mind only. Therefore, God not only exists in mind but also exists in the world.

Anslem, the Christian church’s most original thinker and the greatest theologian, holds that a Being in thought and also in external world is greater than a being in thought alone. By greater he means more valuable or worthier.

Ontological argument is the nerve of all other arguments. Other arguments are to support and supplement the conclusion of the ontological argument. The main contention of the ontological argument is that existence is the very essence (ontos) of the idea of God. This arguments is apriori; since from the mere analysis of God or the idea of perfect being, we deduce existence.

Descartes made some changes in the argument. He said that God must be the cause of the idea of a perfect Being. According to him, perfection means power, goodness, knowledge and also existence. But only idea beyond God cannot be the cause of such a being, which, according to Descartes, is the innate idea. Descartes refers that perfection and reality are identical. God exists because it is impossible to separate God and existence. Perfection is the essence of existence and naturally essence cannot be separated from being. So, we cannot conceive God without existence, it follows that existence is inseparable from Him, and hence He really exists.
Leibnitz in ontological argument says, the existence is perfection, a simple quality which is positive and absolute. God exists because He is among the number of perfection. Perfection does not express any limitation. Existence is not a property, which is possessed by finite beings. As God is the most perfect, therefore, He necessarily exists. Spinoza like Descartes infers the existence of God from His idea as the source and sum of all perfection.

Ontological argument thus raises the deepest philosophical issues. Its essential contention is that the reality of God is involved in the idea of God. Though the argument is criticized but it is clear that God is a being who is to be and is worshipped. The concept of God is pre-supposed as a Union of a necessary being and perfection. The critiques of the ontological argument have not objected to the perfection or infinitude of God. Most of the criticism is directed towards the concept of ‘God’s existence’ and his ‘necessary Being’.

2. Cosmological Argument:

Cosmological or causal argument proceeds to show cause effect relation. In cosmological argument the idea of the world is assumed as effect and God is assumed as its first Cause. In the widest sense of the theistic proof, when the argument proceeds from the idea of the world to the idea of God, it is known as cosmological.

Cosmological argument was first formulated by Plato in Laws and Phaedrus. Later on it was also stated by Aristotle. Afterwards, St. Thomas Aquinas regarded that it is the central argument for proving God’s existence. The classical statement of the cosmological argument is found in the summa Theologiae (1268-73) of Thomas Aquinas.
Thomas Aquinas rejected Anslem’s proof but under the influence of Aristotle’s metaphysics, elaborated famous ways by which the existence of God can be known. In the first way, he argues from the fact of motion of Universe to a Universal Mover; in the second, from the fact of causation he argues that there must be a substantial Being; the third from the degrees of value like goodness, beauty, truth etc. observed in the finite things to the Absolute value or perfect Being; and lastly, the orderly character of the natural events implies to the existence of an intelligent agent or Divine Designer.

Usually, cosmological argument can be explained in two ways, namely, causal argument and the argument from contingency. The causal argument is not most important than the argument from contingency. But the causal argument cannot be omitted as the philosophers pay attention on it.

**Causal Form of arguments:**

According to Aristotle, the first cause argument is known as cosmological. He holds that whatever happens has a cause and in turn that cause has another and so on, in that series there must be infinite and that infinite cause is known as First Cause or *Causa Sui*. The first Cause is the God which has no other cause than Himself and where is not any possibility of infinite regress.

According to Aristotle, the first cause of creation is the First Mover or Prime Mover. It holds that every thing has a cause. If this is accepted as per the law of causation, then the universe must have a cause. “The law of causality states that every effect must have a cause, and if one sets out to discover the primary cause of creation it would become necessary to stop somewhere and accept some first cause”\(^{15}\). 
That cause is God. So, God exists. Therefore, God must be the first cause of the cosmos. As He is the first cause, He must be regarded as the efficient and the material cause.

Causal argument regards cause as an antecedent of an event. Here the effects reflect its nature of design in the pre-existing matter, known as First cause. The First cause is supposed to be more perfect than the world designed by it.

**Argument From Contingency:**

Plato says that every created thing must be created by some causes. The contingency of the facts is a necessary Being. That necessary Being is the ground of the contingency.

In contingent aspect of the world, things continuously come into being and pass away. A thing is called contingent in which there is not guarantee of its perpetual existence or a thing is called contingent which does not have any ground for its existence. But the point is that, if contingent event cannot exist by itself, there must be a necessary Being as the ground of the contingent events or happenings. The fact of the argument is that the contingent event must come out of something which is nothing other than a necessary Being. Further, Aquinas adds that this necessary Being does not depend on any other being but on itself. Hence this necessary Being is called God.

Aquinas notes that the ultimate thing cannot merely be contingent. He holds that there must exist something the existence of which is necessary. In Aquinas's assumption the contingent implies necessity. So, the relation between contingent and necessarily is purely logical. The concept 'necessary' and 'contingent' are self-contradictory. The ultimate explanation of the cosmological argument is about a
Being. The Being is always contingent. So, the total explanation in terms of a Necessary Being is both necessary and contingent.

3. Teleological or Design Argument:

In the history of philosophy, the design or teleological argument is found as a very ancient argument for the existence of god. Its roots perhaps has in the thought of Plato who argues that physical world is unintelligible apart from mind. In the English speaking world, the teleological argument was mostly told by Paley (1743-1805) in his *Natural Theology*. He was also preceded by Henry More (1614-87), the platonist. This argument attempts to prove the existence of god by empirical means. It reasons that God is an intelligent designer of evolution. It is observed that there is a purpose or end in this natural order. There is a purpose in governing the world. So, where there is purpose, there must be an agent. So, also since the world is governed has a design there must be a designer. "The Teleological proof bases itself on the presence of order in the world; this order it takes to be the token of design, and concludes that God must be the source of that design".16

The terms 'teleological' has been derived from the Greek word 'telos' which means the 'end' or 'purpose'. On the basis of the meaning teleological argument holds that the order of the nature points to design of a certain infinite intelligence. So, the meaning indicates that the order of the nature points to a certain design. The order of the nature is contingent. There is nothing inside the nature to guarantee it. So, the order of the nature must be grounded self-existing infinite intelligence.

The universe is not a mere aggregate of events. It is an organized whole. There is the order, discipline and harmony in the
universe. This indicates that there must be a supreme, intelligent and wise designer. That designer is nothing other than God.

We have some other instances, which gives example of discipline and order in the universe. The millions of stars, the moon, the sun and the other planets behave orderly. The thousands of nerve cells function in a special order. The mechanism of the human body is wonderful. There are protective mechanism in human body to protect him from the attack of bacteria and other sudden injuries. The colour of animals varies in accordance with their environment so as to afford protection from enemies. This facts imply the existence of an intelligent and wise designer of the world. This designer is God.

The essence of the argument can be compared with the paley's analogy of watch. Suppose when I find a rock lying in the desert, this conveys me that it is produced in the natural process. But if we see a clock, this reminds that the clock has some parts and there must be a composer of these parts. Paley’s argument is that world is a complex mechanism like a clock. There must be a designer of the world like the composer of the clock. He is nothing other than God.

4. Moral Argument:

The moral argument for the existence of God is based on man’s moral nature and religious experience. Moral argument begins with Kant in his *The Critique Of Practical Reason* where he states that the existence of God is a postulate of the practical or moral reason.

Kant states that the existence of God is a postulate or presupposition of moral life. He regards that nothing can be conceived in the world without it or beyond goodwill. So, we should promote highest good or summum bonum for moral life as our duty.
The highest good is virtue, the complete good is in harmony with happiness. Our moral consciousness demands that virtue ought to be rewarded with happiness. But the virtuous are seldom happy. Kant, therefore, argues that there must be a supreme Being or God who will reward the virtuous with happiness.

Kant says that it is the demand of the moral life that the highest good be realised. The highest good has two elements, viz, Virtue and happiness. Virtue belongs to the intelligible world and happiness belongs to the phenomenal world. Kant says, the union of both the worlds is made possible by the postulation of God. Therefore, God guarantees the union of Virtue and happiness.

For Kant, religion is an aspect of morality and is not at all the foundation of morality. As a matter of fact, for Kant, morality is wholly autonomous. However, Kant recognizes that morality as purely rational still requires God for ever signifying the striving for the summum bonum.

Moral argument is the logical inference made possible from objective moral laws to divine Law Giver. “Kant himself in a later work, and many other thinkers, have argued from the existence of the moral law to a law-giver, God”\textsuperscript{17}. It is the process from objective moral values and moral experiences of different individuals imply the existence of God. “When we speak of a moral God, we make God too much a man”\textsuperscript{18}. God is the highest moral value or moral ideal. The ideal is the real. Our spiritual life requires a real moral ideal and God is the source of moral ideal. So, without the existence of God, the moral law and moral order cannot flourish in the world.
Argument from Religious Experience:

Experience is the only court by which the scientific faculty of God can be established. Experience has the case value of statements. Both empiricists and theologians made statements.

The theist unequivocally holds that nobody can have the direct experience by the five sense-organs. He holds the experience of God either through His disclosure to men through intuition, or by mystic trance or by special grace of God where the fact of divination is created for the worshipper.

It is generally claimed that normal human nature either has the capacity to become awake of God or the assumption of God or has special faculty of cognized God. In Indian tradition and also in western theology, belonging to the school of mysticism, the experience and the object of experience remain inseparable. The object becomes one with the subject “Tat tvam asi (That art thou) is the famous maxim of advaitism”. From this concept it is argued that the religious experience is same with its object, namely, the existence of God. This sameness is possible only if God exists. As we cannot deny the different religious experiences, so also we cannot deny the existence of God. Experience of observed some miracles, grace of different deities, the divineness of worship or prayer convince us about the reality of God.

Paul Schmidt does not accept the objectivity of God. He denies that there is reasonable connection between religious experience and the factuality of God. He regards that religious experience is quite valuable. So, one should not deny the value, worth and the enjoyment of religious experience. Pragmatically one can prefer the seeing of God.
to the delusion of experiencing a devil, but on this score one cannot prove the factuality of God.

Here the argument faces some mistakes. Here, if we make equivalent the statement 'God exists' with 'God experiences', the expression may be taken to be indubitable; and if we carefully check the statement, then the statement may be taken to have a very high empirical certainty.

The religious experience, miracles, prayers, worship and grace are purely psychological and man made. They do not guarantee the truth of the factual world. It may be some form of a hypnotism or magic which does not prove the existence of God.

It is, strictly speaking, however not an argument but a claim to intuitive awareness, at best in any form in which it deserves very much attention philosophically. "God seems to be intuited not only as good but as absolutely supreme"²⁰. The mere religious experience constitutes a valid ground for asserting the existence of God. The religious experiences have a religious emotion, which is necessary to have direct apprehension of the existence and nature of God. Though there is the difference between religious belief and religious emotion but there is between a mere feeling of happiness which has happened or is going to happen. As though religious belief is psychological has often intensified the sense of sin, it has inspired the dread of hell.

**Proof for the Existence of God from Indian Standpoint:**

Let us now see the Indian arguments which differ from the western conception of argument. In Vedānta it is found that all animate and inanimate things come into existence, live and play like the wave of a sea and ultimately return at the time of dissolution to whom which is
known as Brahman or the infinite substance or God. It is also stated that the Brahman conditioned by māyā is known as God who is the creator of the empirical world. This aspect is called Saguṇa Brahman or Īśvara in Śankara’s Vedānta Darśana.

Naiyāyikas are more or less the theist. They believe in God and offer a number of arguments to establish the existence of god. These arguments are as follows.

(a) Causal Argument:

The world is the effect. The world is composed of matters like earth, water, air and light. The atoms of these matters are eternal, and space and time also. So, we require an efficient cause (nimitta kāraṇa) to compose the matter (upādāna). God is the sole agent who has knowledge to compose the atoms of matter to create the world. Hence, the existence of God is the efficient cause to produce the world as the effect.

(b) Moral Argument:

The Naiyāyikas hold that right action produces merit and wrong action produces demerit. The merit and demerit reside in the soul, which are called adrista, are unconscious. So, we must require a conscious agent to govern it. The individual soul cannot be that agency. God, who is the omniscient, must be the moral Governor who rewards the vicious with pain and suffering. Therefore, it implies that God exist.

(c) Argument from the authoritativeness of the Vedas:

The Naiyāyikas infer the existence of God from the authoritativeness of Veda. In Veda, we get both the empirical and transcendental things. By sense-experience we can have the knowledge
of empirical things. The knowledge of Vedas cannot be treated as true without the knowledge of transcendent authority. It, therefore, implies, there must be a transcendent authority like God.

We have clear testimony in the Vedas (Śruti) for the existence of God. In Mandukya Upaniṣad we find that God is the Lord of all, Omniscient, the inner Controller, the Cause of the world, its creator and destroyer. “The Bṛhadāraṇāyaṇa says: God lives in the heart of all and guides them”21.

Theories against the Existence of God:

Some theories we find by which the existence of God has been challenged. They are discussed here.

Atheism (Not Godism):

_Atheism_ is a theory concerned with the existence of God. Atheism means there is no God, or if there is, He cannot in any way affect the human existence. There are evidences of rational understanding and knowledge to support this conception. Scientific development and materialistic ideas are included within this evidence. In _atheism_, questions regarding God are answered from scientific knowledge.

_Atheism_ claims that the religious beliefs in human history have nothing to do about the existence of God. _Atheism_ believes that the existence of God is a false belief.

_Atheism_ which I want to mean, does not mean complete absence of God. The role of God is assumed as an instructive force or power among the people. The authority of God assumed here but not as a supreme Being.
Atheism is also shown in the two types of school of Indian philosophy. Heterodox school does not believe in the authority of Vedas. Cārvākas and Jainas as heterodox school are explicitly atheistic. "The Jains depict the cosmos as uncreated and eternal. They therefore require no doctrine of God in order to explain its existence."\(^{22}\) Atheism is implied in Buddhism also.

Atheism as a theory of the non-existence of God is not found as a satisfactory theory. Some of them are indicated below –

(a) Though the existence of God is completely denied, but cannot be totally ignored. For in order to explain the world we have to assume that there must be a creator, sustainer, controller of the universe.

(b) Though there is scientific development but the scientific development cannot make vanish the shadow of God from the heart of the people. So, there must be something like God.

(c) Man has different needs. A man may have some basic needs like luxury needs, imaginary needs etc. But the material needs is not the only need which can fulfill our all needs. So, man may want to have some other spiritual needs like God.

The different thinkers and philosophers have given their ideas regarding the non-existence of God. But their arguments are partial and for the sake of arguments only. They are ignoring the religious experience of the theist.
Agnosticism:

Agnosticism is derived from the Greek 'a' (not) 'gignoskein' (to know). A term coined by T. H. Huxley to express a position of suspended belief. Huxley used the term to apply to any proposition to indicate insufficient evidences for belief. It is principally applied to the belief with respect to God.

Agnosticism literally means “not-knowism”. Agnosticism is a theory about the existence of God. It does not give us confirmation about the sufficient reason to affirm or deny the existence of God. The propounder of agnostic theory were Huxley, Spencer, David Hume and Voltair. Agnostics do not know any thing about the substances, causes, souls, reality etc..

The term agnosticism was first used by Huxley, but later on it was associated with the name of Herbert spencer. Agnosticism had Greek origin which means without knowledge. According to Spencer, absolute knowledge is not possible. All knowledge is relative. All knowledge cannot go beyond such facts like matter, motion, force, consciousness etc.. These are the symbols or modes of unknowable.

Huxley used the term in religious sense. He said, the existence of God may not be denied, but we cannot know His real nature.

Hume is an agnostic and sceptic philosopher. He doubted about the existence of God. “None of the arguments in fact offered for the existence of God appear to me to be sound: nor, on the other hand, do the arguments of Hume and Kant to show that there cannot be a proof even of a God conceived in the manner of Mill”23. For him, the belief of God is not the result of speculation, curiosity or the pure love of truth, but the belief of God have its origin with happiness, the dread of future
misery, the appetite for food and other necessities. According to Hume, we are not only able to prove as a necessary consequence of His nature. But also we do not know His nature what nature actually is.

This theory, however, is not absolutely free from defects.

Hume, Herbert Spencer show only psychological feeling and emotion. But they do not try to put any rational analysis of God. They should apply reason or rational capacity to Him.

All agnostic philosophers try to consider God in terms of matter or object which are within space and time. But our observation of God is never postulated by the believers as something corporeal, i.e., having spatio-temporal existence.

Hume fails to give a satisfactory opinion to solve the problems of reality. He does not put a consistent level between empirical and metaphysical idea.

Naturalism:

Naturalism is a theory which is concerned with phenomena around us. The theory tries to explain all the phenomena around us on the basis of natural laws. It holds that nature is the ultimate reality. Naturalism seeks to explain nature by means of motion, energy and natural laws. Naturalism allows to use the concepts which are ensured from the study and experience of physical science.

Naturalism is a theory of universal science. It is not limited with the scientific laws of matter and energy rules. It is a theory which is flew from materialism. We have to experience nature and natural laws to study nature. The observation and experience of nature does not exclude God and soul from this theory. We are here more concerned
with the spiritual aspect of nature, because scientific system of nature may not be all exhaustive.

The philosophers like Henri Bergson, Nietzsche, William James, John Dewee and others have attempted to construct general theory about the nature of reality in a purely naturalistic terms.

"William James argues in his famous essay The Will to Believe that the existence or non-existence of God, of which there can be no conclusive evidence either way is a matter of such momentous importance that any one who desires has the right to stake his life upon the God hypothesis"24.

Naturalism is wrongly involved with materialism. Both are different from each other. For materialism, matter is the only reality and for naturalism nature is the only reality.

**Attributes of God:**

It is the logical implication of the worship of God, i.e., God must be the highest being than whom nothing can be conceived. The teleological and moral proof for the existence of God would not establish His being an object of worship. God must have some attributes due to which He becomes object of worship. Let us now discuss this point in same detail.

**Person:**

The problem of person or personality of God is of cardinal importance for philosophy of Religion. Individuality is the basis of personality or person. A man is an individual where he becomes a person. Personality is the matter of degree. A civilized man is more personal than a semi-civilised.
The human conception of personality has linked with social and ethical elements which develops the doubt whether the conception can be applied to a Being or not. The issue of personality is not the human category which can be legitimately used to God.

God has many attributes. From the point of worship person or personality is most important. A person is a self-conscious unity of thinking, perceiving, willing, cognitive, conative and affective, and possesses of ideas, obligation and purposes.

"God is personality. God is the universal spirit and absolute self-consciousness evolving the worlds of finite spirits and physical objects from within Himself as the object of His consciousness"25. God is the supreme person. The world is the externalization of God. The finite spirits are the reproduction of God. He is the person with self-consciousness having love and will. He is dynamic. He is the infinite moral perfection and realizes infinite perfection gradually in an evolving universe and evolving humanity.

God is worshipped, for spinoza, due to the intellectual love. This love is neither selfish, nor unselfish, but selfless. A God worshipped by the worshipper as because of a person. A worshipper not only prays to God as a person but hopes that He will response to him. As a matter of fact, it is the love of God which awakens a man’s wonder.

Human persons have finite selves and experiences of past memories, present perceptions and future anticipations in our awareness. But we can conceive of an infinite person who realizes all the span of experiences into a self-conscious unity. It is the God as person who is the most comprehensive unity where past, present and future are integrated.
God as a person follows from the logic of worship. If He is a person, He must be an all-comprehensive and perfect person. His thinking, feeling and willing must be infinite. He must be unified all His ideals, obligations and purposes.

God as a person has created the entire universe not because of any need of His own, but because of His sheer generosity and goodness. God is all-powerful (omnipotent), all-knowing (Omniscient) and perfectly morally good.

The thought of God as a perfect person is the thought of a spiritual self which is fully self-determined and Himself is the ground and sufficient reason of his own states of consciousness.

The personal God is that God who reveals His good purpose in the teleological order. The personal character of God is best apprehended by our mind through His manifestation. God could not reveal Himself as person unless He were a person.

This conception of perfect person creates teleological problems. If God is a person, he must have senses like man. But God cannot be said to have sense like man. His thinking cannot be conceptual.

God is said to have free creativity. He is said as omnipotent. But now question arises, can God perform what is logically absurd? Can He make 2+2=5? Does He create out something or out of nothing? There are some of the perplexing problems that arise with regard to God as a creator. Though there may arise such questions regarding God, but such type of questions are irrelevant to God. God as the perfect person, He is the basis of reason or logic. What is logically absurd is beyond the matter of God. God is not the place of logically absurd matter.
God as Immutable, Eternal, Infinite, Self-existence, Absolute and Unconditional:

God is considered as immutable, eternal, infinite and self-existent Being. God is called immutable in the sense that He is beyond the range of destruction. God is called infinite in the sense of being as the ground of the finite world and being. God is called eternal in the sense that God is above the time. God is called self-existent because He exists in Himself and for Himself. He does not depend on any other reality. God has the character of everlastingness not like the ephemeral existence of God.

God is immutable. Change is the mark of mutability. God is the perfect, does not have change or mutability. God is changeless with regard to his essence, but has change as his accidents are concerned.

Eternity or the timelessness has been construed to mean the complete negation of time process. This timeless character indicates to the transcendental self or God. Time always denotes a thing which is within the phenomena and time cannot be applied to what is real. Eternity is the pure negation of time and God is retained as timeless, so God is eternal. "God’s eternity has to be understood as that which endures through the whole series of unending time." Eternity is the essence or attributes of God. The eternal timeless God within which the time process rules and the God, the timeless reality is the truth of the universe. God is eternal because He is raised above the process of time: He is the ultimate condition of the existence of such a process.

The concept of eternity has been used in four senses. In the first, eternity is used as timeless. The God is timeless or independent of time. In the second sense, it is enduring through all times. God has the
eternity who is enduring through all times. The references of eternity are found in Judío-Christian tradition where God is conceived as that who is everlasting or who endures forever. In the third sense, time retained and transcended as total simultaneity. When a work is planned and executed, takes time and then becomes a thing of beauty, it is the joy forever and would never pass into nothingness. In the fourth sense, eternity is used as the way for the fulfillment of best value. A work of art like 'Mona lisa' becomes a thing of value, it becomes independent of its being conceived in terms of time. No doubt any work of art has its beginning or end, but its meaning or value is kept as enduring. So, time is interpreted as the vehicle of meaning or value. The value is an eternal thing. God is looked upon as a creator of value.

Eternity has also the great religious significance when applied to the Divine being. Eternity has negative side as contrast with the mutability and decay, which are the doom of all earthly things.

In contrast to the experience of the world God is commonly known as the Infinite and Absolute. Infinite indicates the opposite of the finite. Finite is limited and boundless. The grounds and conditions of the finite are beyond itself. The theist considers God as the Absolute or identify God with Absolute. In current philosophy the word 'Absolute' is frequently used to signify Ultimate Reality, which is all-embracing, harmonious and complete.

The word 'absolute' has a special meaning which is applied to God. God is the absolute in the sense that He is the ultimate ground of all existences and is limited in so far as through the world created by Him. So, God is appropriately designated as the absolute ground of the world. He is the sole and sufficient reason of the existences. He may
also be called an absolute in the sense that He is a Being harmonious and self-complete, whose consciousness embraces the whole universe.

The Absolute is that which is free from limitations. The Absolute is not merely termed as an all-knower but also an all-determiner, not merely the world-experiences but also the world-possessor.

God is also attributed as unconditioned in the sense of not being conditioned by anything outside Himself. He is also being unconditioned in the sense of being as self-conditioned.

**Omniscience or Fore-knowledge of God:**

Omniscience is an attribute of God. God is an omniscient Being, for He has created all things. Omniscience or Fore-knowledge of God is the thinking or knowing of God. As God is eternal, His thinking or knowing is also eternal. God is said to know the hidden thoughts of every one of us. He is all-knower, before Him everyone is the open book. God is supposed to know everyone individually and completely. Fore-knowledge is the precise and accurate knowledge. "If God knows everything, then he knows that contradictories cannot be true together; he knows that 2+2 = 4 and that the three angles of a Euclidean triangle add up to two right angles. These, after all, are truths which we know. So any omniscient being must know them to be true."27

The theologians like Calvin hold that everyone is pre-determined and pre-destined from the very beginning. So, the pre-determiner like an intuitive seer can know in advance the future course of history and of human decisions. The theist St. Augustine admits that God forknows even the free decision of every individual in advance. According to him, every individual is free and his free decision can be known. His argument means that free knowledge does not affect the nature of act.
The possibility of Divine omniscience must lie in the central relation of God to his universe and all elements of the universe.

The American philosopher, Royce considers omniscience as primary attribute. He argues that from omniscience, omnipotence and other attributes are derived.

Omniscience is the conception of attribute which is also adopted by the theologians in their discussion of the Divine Nature. We cannot deduce the attribute of omniscience in God from any facts of human experience. Omniscience involves the completeness and perfection of deity.

Omniscience or God's fore-knowledge is however, not commonly accepted by all. Some philosophers like Jonathan Edwards, Henri Bergson, Samuel Alexander and P.A. Bertocci deny God's fore-knowledge.

Omniscience, so to speak, cannot be deduced from the analogy made by human experiences as man's experience is always limited and partial.

**Omnipotence:**

The word 'omnipotence' is composed of two Latin words omnis (all) potens (powerful). God is supposed to bear the attribute omnipotence. Omnipotence means being able to do everything. God is supposed to be a power to do all things. "It remains, therefore, that God is called omnipotent because He can do all things that are possible absolutely; which is the second way of saying a thing is possible"²⁸. St. Augustine said that God is omnipotent in the sense that He can do whatever He wants. He is all-powerful. "The Absolute is not merely an
all-knower but also all-determiner; not merely the world experiencer, but also the world-possessor. But it does not deny the other attributes of God like goodness, love, justice etc.

God's power or omnipotence can hardly be understood as a monotheistic concentration of power. Regarding omnipotence, the theist thinks that God has created free will and voluntarily delegated His powers to human beings. Omnipotence does not mean doing all things but means the power to do all that is worth doing. However, the most important aspect of God's power is one of creation and His relation of transcendence-immanence to it. So, we can turn to the point of God as Creator.

According to Judaeo-Christian theologian, this is the most important attribute of God. This concept is closely associated with creation. The concept of creation evolves out of creative love of God.

The notion of 'creation' is possible to distinguish from the notion of 'making'. God is believed as a creator of the universe not as a maker. Simply, a potter makes a pot out of pre-existing materials called clay. Here, He simply fashions out a pre-existing material into a desired thing. Here, the potter is not all-in-all. He imposes His refractory nature on the clay. So, God is the creator, ultimate reason and immanent spirit of the world.

If God is the omnipotent Being, He must be the object of worship and must be distinct from the worshipper, otherwise worship itself will become logically impossible. From these factors, it is clear that God has the attribute 'omnipotence'.

Regarding creation we have two types of interpretation. One is pantheistic and other is theistic. According to pantheist, all is God and
God is all and everything comes out of God. The eminent religious pantheist are Plotinus and Spinoza. Spinoza's pantheism is Geometrical. For him, the world follows from God in the same way in which all the angles of a triangle are together equal to two right angles follows from the very definition of a triangle. On the other hand, the theist holds that God is the absolute creator of all. Nothing can exist apart from Him. A theist says God creates the Universe out of nothing.

If God fashions the world out of pre-existing something, here He will be reduced to the status of architect which is the hamper of His eternity. This will not be a *monotheism*, but will be a *dualism*, besides God, matter also becomes co-existent, coeval with God.

**Omnipresence:**

God is believed to have the attribute omnipresence. A spiritual conception of God carries the belief of divine omnipresence. The spiritual worshipper feels the presence of God in everywhere. "God is everywhere in the sense that he makes his working everywhere felt". A spiritual worshipper feels that no barrier can shut him out from the object of adoration and he feels God as always nearer to him.

The religious consciousness always rests on the satisfaction that God is omnipresent but none can feel to ask about the way in which He is present. The religious philosopher is not beyond from dealing with the problem. Regarding this problem, the theist excluded pantheistic answer: God is not everywhere because, He is everything. The idea of God is a conceptual form which implies the Divine Being. Consequently the Divine Being cannot be limited by space.

The sphere of the operation of God's activity is extended to the every point of space as He is the active Ground of existences. The
omnipresence is the way of expressing the non-difference between the Being and His activity. Omnipresence shows that the Being of God is not separate from His activity. God is everywhere as because that working makes a feeling of being present everywhere. For that God is the ever-present Ground of the world. We can express the idea of omnipresence with the help of an analogy. This analogy will suggest how we should regard this omnipresence. The soul or spiritual entity is operative throughout the body and stands in relation to all bodily elements. Yet, being a spiritual entity it cannot be located in any organ or part of the body although it pervades the whole body. In like manner, we may think of God as pervading everywhere.

God is believed to have the attributes transcendence and immanence. A transcendent God is one who exists outside the material world and His creatures. Deism is that religious system in which God's transcendence is most exclusively emphasized. According to theism, God is both transcendent and immanent in the world. According to Samuel Alexander, immanence means much more than God's entry into the world of His creation.

Of the moral attributes, 'goodness', 'justice' and 'love' are more important.

Goodness is a human attribute, which is also the perfect characteristics of God. There is a distinction between 'good' and 'evil'. The goodness will be meaningless if there is no evil. In fact, good has a meaning in contrast with the evil. In the matter of goodness there must be a gradual overcoming on evil and correspondingly arises a conscious realization of God.
The notion of God as justice is a moral attribute. The concept of justice is related to the concept of goodness is typical which is an ethical approach to God.

The attribute of God is 'love' and this is the typical view of the Christian and Vaishnava faith. God's love follows from His goodness. Love is a matter of emotion, which is pre-supposed in every communion of God with man. 'God is good' is a feeling for man, a feeling which man has for God and love is another name for such a feeling. It is the motive force to the voluntary operations like will or creation. It is the view that love motivates God's creation. The love is that force which actuates the voluntary operations. So, from these facts, it is true that love is nothing other than the attribute of God.

Religious consciousness makes two demands, one is theoretical and the other is practical. Metaphysical attributes satisfy theoretical consciousness and moral attributes fulfill the practical consciousness. A pantheist or deist, for instance, concentrates on metaphysical attributes, while a crude theist emphasizes moral attributes.

If we treat the attributes as descriptive of a Being called God, then we are found to fall into contradictions and errors. The linguistic confusion which is raised with regard to the arguments concerning the existence of God seems to surround every point about the divine attributes as well. The linguistic confusion arises due to the different mode of analysis in regard to the attributes of God by different philosophers in their theories. Such type of linguistic confusion is an outward contradiction which does not effect to the real nature of God. Though God is described as having different attributes in different languages, but the real nature of God is always attributeless. If God is
described as having different attributes, which may create contradictions and errors. This may appear as the linguistic confusion.

The theologians try to explain the reality of God in terms of personality, eternity and a perfect Being. Ethically the God is regarded as having the goodness. The objections may be raised regarding the ethical character of God. If God is all-good, all-inclusive, the creator, then what is the need of creation of evil which stand as opposed to goodness or why is there any evil at all? The religious consciousness or discourse about God's attribute is not absolutely meaningless as having the purpose to create truth in one's self and in all other things through this.

- God is all-inclusive and naturally there can be nothing to count against any assertion concerning the divine attribute.
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