Секция «Философия. Культурология. Религиоведение»

God's Omnipotence in the context of Richard Swinburne's philosophy

Козик Юрий Александрович
Студент
Киевский Национальный Университет имени Тараса Шевченко, Философский факультет, Киев, Украина
E-mail: martin-iden@ukr.net

A famous English philosopher of religion Richard Swinburne considers the issue of God's omnipotence in the book entitled '*The Coherence of Theism'* - one of his trilogy devoted to philosophical problems of religion. He says: "a person P is omnipotent at a time t if and only if he is able to bring about the existence of any logically contingent state of affairs x after t, the description of the occurrence of which does not entail that P did not bring it about at t, given that he does not believe that he has overriding reason for refraining from bringing about x" [1, p.156]. It is clear to understand that Swinburne's answer calls to apologize God from famous omnipotence paradox which is usually known as so-called paradox of the stone: "Could an omnipotent being create a stone so heavy that even that being could not lift it?"In general, thesis of Swinburne follow Saint Thomas Aquinas theology, who handled this problem in *'Summa Contra Gentiles'* where he wrote about possibility of existing triangle with the sum of the angles different from 180. God can not create square circle or triangle which does not have three angles equal to two right angles. Swinburne explains this in two keys. He says "that a person is omnipotent if and only if he is able to do any logically possible action, any action, that is, of which the description is coherent. Thus 'getting divorced' is an action that can be performed only by a married person 'committing adultery with an unmarried man' is an action that can be performed only by a married woman 'entering into a monogamous marriage' is an action that can be performed only by an unmarried person. Sitting down can only be done by an embodied being; becoming incarnate can only be done by a non-embodied being ;and haunting (in the literal sense) can only be done by a ghost. Yet we should hardly regard the fact that an unmarried spirit could not get divorced as showing that he was not omnipotent" [ibid, p. 155]. It is hard to argue. But we can stumble at rigour of his position. It is obvious that the idea is that Swinburne believes in only one correct name of thing, i.e. some person can be married or unmarried at the same time. Copenhagen interpretation thought experiment of Erwin Schrödinger 'Schrödinger's Cat' claims that a cat can be a cat simultaneously alive and dead. So one object can be in two conditions in the same time, and woman can be married and unmarried at the same time to. She can hide her marriage and do like unmarried person (dating with somebody for example) and in another context she can position herself as married. It is an open question whether for example square circle can be a state of affairs. Geometrical figures are not in empirical reality. And by the way square circle already exists. It exists in our language notwithstanding that it is logically contradictory. Our language and our fantasy are not considered with the rules of logic. But God is. I think that Swinburne's position is anthropomorphizing of God's abilities according to human cognitive abilities. I don't think that it is really satisfactory. Let me say that my essay is not devoted to criticism of Swinburne's position. Really I don't think that I am competent for serious criticism. Swinburne's point of view has provoked me to try to consider position which runs against Swinburne's intentions. We wish to try

to propound understanding of God's omnipotence literally and peremptorily and show the consequence of this position. Let us think about 'Thomas triangle'. God created World where a triangle's sum of the angles is equally to 180. We don't have any other triangles in our world. If we consistently and selflessly defend the idea of super omnipotence of God than we ought to make a suggestion that omnipotence God can create another triangle. But, the world, created by Him, the world in which we live, is not assumes existing other triangles, triangles with the sum of the angles different from 180 and creation of such thing would lead Him to changing laws of our geometry and possibly many others. So, if God wants to create another triangle he must change laws of geometry and our minds which don't have any idea about triangle the sum of the angles of which differs from 180 of round squares. However we cannot say that He cannot do this action. But such changes run against our free will. And again if God is really omnipotent He can do this otherwise without changing our minds. Lets try to find this triangle or square. Lets think about non-contradictory round square or 250 angles triangle. We cannot, so we can belief that he didn't do this. And if God is really omnipotent can He integrate in our world another triangle without changing laws of logic? It is possible for Him, but at this moment we don't have any knowledge about it, we don't know any triangles with the sum of the angles different from 180. I guess we should wait another Lobachevsky, because before him it was believed that parallel lines did not cross. Crossed parallel lines before Lobachevsky were quite logically impossible and non-contradictory, as a round square for us. Moreover, we can make a suggestion that Creator realizes His omnipotence creating another world with another logic, other triangles and other people. But our world He left as it is, where comprehension of triangles with the sum of the angles different from 180 and a square circle run against logic. And what if comprehension of God's omnipotence is upper than our possibilities and goes beyond our capabilities? What if paradox of omnipotence shows us our inability to capture by the mind God's opportunities? What is result of this position? It leads us straight to William of Ockham's theology and to famous Wittgenstein's aphorism 7 "Whereof one cannot speak, thereof one must be silent" [2, p. 90]. God's omnipotence cannot be spoken non-contradictory but it is not seemed that God is not completely omnipotent.

Литература

1. Richard Swinburne The Coherence of Theism Clarendon Press, Oxford 1993
2. Ludwig Wittgenstein Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus transl. by C.K. Ogden, London 1922