

Critical comments (by Kant)

1. God is called necessary being, but this is self -contradictory phrase because there is transgression of linguistic usage.

Necessary can be legitimately used with regard to stipulated definitions of symbols only or is used with reference to propositions, not with reference to things or beings. Hence, it is a-priori. Again, any existing thing can be contingent only and of anything existing, we can always imagine it to be otherwise; than what it is and even a possibility of it not existing at all.

Thus, if God exists then he can also be imagined not to be existing at any time. If he is necessary, then he is not being and if he is being, he is not necessary. To say that God is a necessary being is as self-contradictory as a square circle is.

2. A proposition is necessary if its predicate cannot be denied without involving us in self-contradiction .For example, a triangle is bounded by three straight lines.

On the other hand, a synthetic proposition is that whose predicate can be denied" without contradiction. This is true of any empirical proposition

So, if existence is a predicate of God in an empirical proposition, we can always imagine it to be different from what it is.

3. Existence is not a real predicate. The word "God is" adds no new thing. So, the words "God is" and "God exists" do not add anything.
4. By mere thought on concept, we cannot bring anything into existence. If it is so, all would be kings. Thus, the concept God remains a concept no matter how hard we think about it.

Cosmological arguments

If God' is a real proper name with his own appropriate attributes then God would be an actual entity. But if it so, then as Hume pointed out, it is absurd to demonstrate a matter of fact by any a priori argument. For this reason we can say that the Ontological argument has failed, because it is purely a priori and analytic. Hence, one has to take recourse to actual states of affairs, which are based on some verifiable experience. And this is what is proposed to be achieved by the Cosmological argument.