

UDC: 1 (091).

LBC: 87.3

**The Logical Problem of Evil in Western Philosophy and Islamic
Theology (Comparison and Analysis of the Views of Leibniz and Fakhr Razi)**
Abdullah Hosseini Eskandian*

Samad Behrouz**

Abstract. One of the most important philosophical and theological topics is the problem of evil, which has always been the subject of discussion of philosophers and religious theologians due to its complexity and various and sometimes contradictory explanations. In the meantime, Leibniz and Fakhr Razi have each tried to explain the problem of evil on the basis of their own ideology. Leibniz considers evil to be an existential thing in the minimal sense necessary to attain great good and Fakhr Razi in one sense has considered it non-existent meaning the lack of goodness and in another sense, has explained it as a existential thing to achieve good. Examining and comparing the views of Leibniz as a Western philosopher with the ideas of Fakhr Razi, who is one of the great scholar of Islamic hikma and theology, on the problem of evil can acquaint us with their commonalities and intellectual differences in explaining this philosophical and theological challenge. In this article, an attempt is made to study and compare the ideas of Leibniz and Fakhr Razi about the nature and what is evil, the types of evil and the solutions to the problem of evil through a descriptive-analytical method. Leibniz and Fakhr-e Razi, despite their intellectual deviations in explaining the problem of evil, which is also obvious considering their intellectual and religious affiliations, but in the end, both thinkers have stopped trying not to explain the problem of evil in contradiction with theism, and to defend the existence of a God who knows everything, all-powerful and just.

Keywords: The Problem of Evil, Leibniz, Western Philosophy, Fakhr Razi, Islamic Theology, The Existence of God

* M.A. of Tabriz University; Tabriz, Iran
E-mail: hosseinieskandianabdullah@gmail.com
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2318-022X>

** Assoc.professor, Faculty Member of Tabriz University; Tabriz, Iran
E-mail: sa_behrouz@yahoo.com

To cite this article: Hosseini Eskandian, A., & Behrouz, S. [2022]. The Logical Problem of Evil in Western Philosophy and Islamic Theology (Comparison and Analysis of the Views of Leibniz and Fakhr Razi). *"Metafizika" journal*, 5(2), pp.108-131.

Article history:
Received: 02.03.2022
Accepted: 03.06.2022

1.Introduction

Man has always faced hardships and sufferings since he saw the universe open, and his life has included a combination of joy and unhappiness. Existence of diseases, wars, mental anguish, natural disasters, death of loved ones and thousands of other cases have caused the problem of evil to always be questionable and preoccupying in the mind, and this has led to widespread discussions about evil. On the other hand, since the problem of evil is in conflict with the evidence of the existence of an omniscient, omnipotent and just God, it has become an excuse for atheists to deny the existence of God and to show the infinity of the created world ,and consequently, such a thing has provoked the reaction of the religious people, and they have defended theism despite this rational issue.

Leibniz and Fakhr Razi, who are the greats of Western philosophy and Islamic hikma, have each in turn tried to explain the problem of evil in accordance with the goodness of the world of creation and that the existence of a minimal evil can not violate the ultimate and good order of the universe and on the other hand challenge the existence of God and His transcendent attributes. In this research, an attempt is made to compare the intellectual explanations made by Leibniz and Fakhr Razi in solving the problem of evil.

1-1 Research Background

The problem of evil has always been a question and ambiguity for man, and since it is related to various topics in theology, cosmology and anthropology, it has always been the subject of discussion and analysis from the time of Greek philosophy to the contemporary era. The oldest book in which the problem of evil is mentioned is "*Rig Veda*" in Hinduism, and the book "*Avesta*" in Zoroastrianism is the second book in which the problem of evil is mentioned in terms of antiquity. Evil is frequently mentioned in the Torah and the Four Gospels as well as in the Holy Quran. But scientifically speaking, for the first time in Greek philosophy, people like Xenon, Plato, and Aristotle pioneered the discussion of evil.

Regarding the background of the present study, it should be noted that so far no research has been written to examine and compare the views of Leibniz and Fakhr Razi on the problem of evil, and in works such as " the problem of evil and its relationship with determinism and free will from the perspective of Fakhr Razi, written by Ali Akbar Seraj and et al"; "the role of the devil in the realization of moral evil from the perspective of Fakhr Razi, written by Akram Salehi and Reza Akbari" or "investigating the problem of evil in Leibniz's thought, written by Maryam Sadeghi", either they have dealt specifically with the problem of evil in the thought of Leibniz and Fakhr

Razi, or they have compared their views on the specific axis of the problem of evil with the thoughts of other thinkers. The initiative of this research is, firstly, to compare and analyze the views of Leibniz and Fakhr Razi for the first time, and secondly, to address the issues of the nature of evil, types of evil and solutions to the problem of evil in the opinions of these two thinkers that in previous research, either these issues have not been addressed or little attention has been paid to it.

1-2 Problematicization

The problem of evil is one of the important philosophical and theological cases that has always occupied the human mind and has confronted him with such questions; What is the philosophy of the existence of evil? Is it necessary to have evil in the world? If the universe has a Creator with supreme attributes, then why did He create evil? Therefore, many thinkers and sages have constantly sought to answer these questions and provide solutions to solve the evil problem. God-believing thinkers have also faced another task, and that is to defend theism against the doubts of the deniers of God and the resurrection, especially in the present age, the problem of evil has been the pretext of atheists such as J.L. Mackey, William Rowe and David Hume to deny the existence of God.

Leibniz and Fakhr Razi have been thinkers who have each tried to explain the problem of evil, and although they have different intellectual views on this issue, they have the same goal and that is to defend theism. The present study tries to answer these questions by referring to the works of Leibniz and Fakhr Razi and performing the necessary analyzes;

What explanation do Leibniz and Fakhr Razi have for evil? Is evil non-existent or existential from the point of view of these two thinkers? What are the types of evil? Can evil challenge the existence of a God with absolute attributes? How is the existence of pain and suffering, and on the other hand ,natural disasters compatible with the prosperity of the created world?What solutions have Leibniz and Fakhr Razi stated in solving the problem of evil? What are the similarities and differences between the ideas of Leibniz and Fakhr Razi in solving the problem of evil?

2.The Nature of Evil

2-1 Leibniz: Leibniz acknowledges the existence of evil, but argues that the evil that exists is the minimum necessary for the existence of good and far less than the existing good. Evil is therefore a cost that is paid for the many benefits of good. In this theory, it is assumed that good can exist only in opposition to evil, but what is true about phenomena that require opposite aspects, is not true about good and evil [5, p.47].

Leibniz states:

"The problem of evil is in fact the most important, the most difficult and the most stubborn problem that has always offended human thought and ultimately has not found a decisive and convincing answer" [16, p.202].

According to Leibniz, the world system has an orderly and efficient mechanism, and the evils can not disrupt this complex and good system. He states:

"Since evil is necessary for the existence of greater goodness, God has given consent to their existence. God has never willed evil but has consented to its existence" [15, p.160].

Leibniz believes that evil arises from a kind of limitation, because monads are all created and limited to the central monad, and that is why metaphysics is the limitation of evil, and other forms of evil that are moral and natural evil are somehow rooted in metaphysical evil. According to Leibniz, the existence of this limitation is necessary for the harmony and order of the world of creation.

According to Leibniz, anything created by God is good, and although we may consider them evil, given our weak perceptions, but their existence is necessary for the world, and this world has a true system and this world has a real system that cannot be considered crooked or wrong, because this real system is the best system.

According to Leibniz, God is able to create evil, but evil is never issued from Him. On the other hand, the Good Spirit of God must be considered obligatory. Thus the special possibility of existential propositions will ultimately be based on the premise that God's Goodness is not necessary. According to Leibniz, the Goodness of God focused His will on creating good, His Knowledge revealed the best possible thing to Him, and His Power enabled Him to create it [22, p.82].

Leibniz believes that God is Good and nothing but good comes from good, in the sense that there are many possible worlds for God, and since God encompasses all of them scientifically, the good and evil of each are same and so clear to God. And since God is the absolute good, He can not choose except the best. The absolute good, nothing but good is issued, and therefore God's choice has been the best. So this world is also the best possible world [5, p.33].

According to Leibniz, God has done what is best for the world, and this universe is the best system that God has created in the most perfect and beautiful way, and there should be no small evil that is in fact the

introduction of charity in the world ,and evil should not be considered in conflict with some divine attributes such as Justice and Benevolence.

Leibniz states:

"God has three attributes of Goodness, Knowledge and Absolute Power, and considering these three attributes, we conclude that God has done the best possible in the world, because, if otherwise He does not want to do His best and lacks good will, His Goodness and Benevolence will be limited and if He does not have the necessary Knowledge to know and distinguish the best or has Knowledge but does not have enough Power to do it, His Wisdom and Power will be questioned; then the existing system is the best system" [15, p.190].

Murray states:

"According to Leibniz, the fact that God created the best possible world does not mean that the world is absolutely perfect and there are no defects in it. Although he speaks of the various perfections of this world, he is convinced that this world is only a part of absolute perfection benefits. In order to be a creature, this world must have a perfection less than the perfection of God, because otherwise it will not be different from God. That is why he considers metaphysical evil as the essence of every creature. However, according to Leibniz, although there are some evils in the world, but it is the best possible world. Different views have been expressed about Leibniz's criterion for the supremacy of this world; some consider the best world to be a world that has the maximum virtue for rational beings. Some have considered the existence of maximum nature as a criterion of superiority" [18, p.28].

According to Leibniz, according to the attributes of Goodness, Knowledge and Divine Power, the existence of evil can not be considered a defect for God, and this view does not contradict the Divine Attributes. In this regard, he states:

"From the attributes of Goodness, Knowledge and Divine Power ,we conclude that God has done the best possible thing, because otherwise if He does not want to do the best and lacks the will of goodness, His Goodness and Benevolence will be limited, and if He does not have the necessary Knowledge to know and recognize the best, His Wisdom and Power will be questioned" [15, p.190].

Leibniz considers evil as an opportunity for a person to take advantage of goodness and recognize charity. In his view, the existence of some evil is the beginning of the descent of charity and the existence of evil in this regard is

obvious and necessary. Leibniz, on the other hand, considers evil to be inherent in the world, and it is obvious that his statement is more focused on physical evil or natural evil.

2-2 Fakhr Razi: In his works, Fakhr Razi has sometimes expressed evil as non-existent and sometimes as existential. Evil, which he considers to be existential, refers to perceptual evil such as the existence of fear, physical pain, or amputation, which he, like many thinkers, believes that this type of suffering is generally perceived and felt by man and as a result is an existential thing.

Fakhr Razi states:

"Evil goes back to two types; existential evil and non-existent evil. Non-existent evil goes back to three types, which are four in total; a) Existential things that are sometimes referred to as evil, such as heat, which causes the organs of the body to separate from each other. b) Lack of necessary things for an object such as life for the body. c) Lack of beneficial things, which, although not necessary, are close to necessity, such as lack of sight or hearing. d) Absence of things that are not necessary but are considered virtues, such as lack of knowledge of philosophy or mathematics" [7, Vol.2, p.152].

He also states:

"Whenever we examine each of the actions and things that are called evil, we see that this action is good and perfect in relation to its perpetrator, and its evilness is in comparison with another object, like the oppression that emanates from the power of anger and is the perfection of the power of anger. Therefore, oppression is good compared to the power of anger, and weakness is evil for the power of anger, and if one cannot defend himself, he will be condemned, and therefore oppression is evil in comparison with the oppressed. Another thing is that burning fire is perfection and benefits a person, but if it causes a person to lose his life, it is considered evil" [7, Vol.2, p.152].

Therefore, in explaining the nature of evil, Fakhr Razi believes that evil is relative and not real, and it looks different in comparison with different people.

In the definition of evil, Fakhr Razi says:

"Evil is the imperfection of perfection, and anything that is not perfect is considered evil " [7, Vol.1, p.104].

Existential matters are not evil in essence, but evil in nature, because they imply the absence of necessary or beneficial matters [7, Vol.2, p.520].

Evil in common and popular custom means pain and everything that leads to pain, and it is obvious that pain is an existential thing and has been acknowledged by the wise. Yes, some people think that pleasure is the decline of pain and consider it non-existent, but there is no difference between them that pain is an existential matter [9, Vol.2, p.551].

Fakhr Razi, based on the principle of good and evil, states that God is Pure Good and nothing but good is issued from Him. About this topic He states:

"If the goodness and ugliness of deeds are lawful, all the deeds issued by God are good, because the deeds of God are good according to Him, therefore the good deed of God is necessary and there will be no evil deeds". [6, Vol.3, p.550].

Fakhr Razi, as an Ash'arite theologian who believes in the good and the bad of sharia (religion), believes that whatever God does is good and that He is the One who misunderstands things, otherwise any action that is issued by God, in it is the ultimate good and no evil is issued from God.

With this statement, Fakhr Razi tries to show that the control of the affairs of the world is in the hands of God, and it is not important that a person considers God to be an evil agent, but it is important that nothing but good is issued from God and everything that is issued from Him, is good. Fakhr Razi believes that evil can not deny the existence of God, because God's existence is instinctively and rationally fixed, and evil, which is in an aura of ambiguity and doubt, can not deny the existence of God, which is the most obvious thing. On the other hand, he believes that evil can not limit the divine attributes such as benevolence, wisdom and absolute justice, and based on the principle of good and evil, he believes that God's command is ultimately Justice, Wisdom and usefulness for man, although one is unaware of and unable to understand it.

From Fakhr Razi's point of view, evil cannot deny the beauty and well-being of the world of creation, and the world of creation, which is extremely complex, has a good mechanism. However, in some of his works, he has made statements that the good world is challenged by perceptual evil.

3. Types of Evil

3-1 Leibniz: Each type of evil in Leibniz's thought has its own nature and characteristics that make it different from other types of evil. Based on his specific philosophical ideas as well as being inspired by the ideas of St. Augustine, he has divided and presented his views on the types of evil and divides the evil into three categories: metaphysical, physical and moral evil. Although Leibniz divides evil into three categories, he considers them to be completely related to each other. Leibniz acknowledges that evil cannot be a

real thing against God's goodness, but even if evil is nothing but a lack of goodness, it still seems to contradict God's perfection and needs to be explained [5, p.31]. Leibniz's answers generally consist of the Augustinian method, which consists of three parts;

A. Evil as the absence of good;

B. Human beings have the will and authority (justification of moral evil)

C. God can remove good from the will of evil [2, p.20].

One of the types of evil categorized by Leibniz is metaphysical evil. Metaphysical evil is actually the evil that lies at the root of people and objects and has a potential in them.

Metaphysical evil is the absence of absolute perfection, which is inherently devoid of it. Broad argues that it is metaphysically necessary that every created world must contain some kind of metaphysical evil, because in the created world there is a monad, and every monad has a degree of ambiguity and therefore a degree of metaphysical evil [3, p.160]. Metaphysical evil is a mere defect; that is, evil is a defect that requires a finite existence in itself. The existence of the creature is necessarily finite, and the finite being is necessarily imperfect, and this defect is the root of the possibility of error. Where should we look for the source of evil when we derive our whole being from God? the answer is that the source of evil must be found in the nature of the creature's soul, since this nature is contained in the eternal truths which are in the knowledge of God independent of His Will, because we must note that there is an initial defect in the creature before committing sin and what creature is limited to its essence and as a result can not know everything and may be misled and make other mistakes [19, pp.103-104].

Metaphysical evil means the absence of absolute perfection that is woven into the mite of the whole possible world. Metaphysical evil is necessary for the creation of the universe of possibility. The evil that pervades the universe is the limitation and imperfection of the universe relative to the infinity of God. In other words, metaphysical evil is the evil with which all possible beings and creatures of God are affected and cannot be separated from them, and it means limitation and in Mulla Sadra's words "*existential poverty*" of all possible beings in front of God's infinite perfection. Because every limitation is considered a defect and weakness and every defect is considered as a kind of evil; therefore, limitations are poverty and the possibility of the existence of evil [1, p.98]. The metaphysical evil of the universe has occupied both possibility and matter, and the reason for this is the limitation of the universe to the infinite God. In Islamic philosophy, this evil is called absolute imperfection, which is like non-existent evil.

Physical evil is the same as the events of the world of nature, such as floods, earthquakes, storms, tsunamis, etc, which may always occur in different parts of the world and their existential roots go back to nature, although human manipulation should not be ignored in their creation.

Physical evil is one of the characteristics of the natural world that is always happening and happens many times in different places. It seems that this group of evils have an inseparable existence with the system that rules nature. Some believe that physical evil is the same. It is a manifestation of metaphysical evil in the natural world [12, p.1710].

Leibniz states:

"Concerning physical evil, it can be said that God sometimes intends it to punish sin and sometimes as a means to an end, that is, the source of greater evil or the attainment of greater good. Punishment is also a source of correction and lesson. Evil often makes us better understand good, and sometimes it contributes to the development of the person who endures it. It is a beautiful parable used by Christ himself" [15, p.140].

Regarding natural evil, Leibniz believes that pain is a part of the natural system, and that in the whole natural system, natural good is much greater than natural evil; in addition, many natural evils are the result of human moral evil, and at the same time for achieving good ends is useful [25, p.81]. Leibniz says that natural good in the world is more than natural evil. In addition, natural pain is the result of moral evil and is a useful way to reach many ends, because they serve as a punishment for sins as well as a means to complete good [4, p.417].

According to Leibniz, the last type of evil is moral evil, which is the source of the creation of a person who commits sin by following his passion and avoiding divine commands. In fact, moral evil is the same as man's obedience to it is the devil inside and out that causes evil among human beings.

According to Leibniz, moral evil depends on the will of human beings, and its emergence requires that a person will do evil, for example, lie, commit murder, or commit any other evil. In fact, as long as one does not want to, no moral evil does not occur, and the appearance or non-appearance of such evil depends on man and his action.

Leibniz, however, divides evils into three categories; in practice, he considers them to be quite related to each other. In his view, moral evil often causes physical evil, and many of the sufferings that are caused to man are due to selfishness and improper human actions. Like St. Augustine, he considers many natural disasters to be the result of man's sin and his disobedience to

God Almighty. Leibniz also believes that metaphysical evil is an unlikely cause of moral evil and therefore physical evil [10, p.111].

On the other hand, sometimes some evil is a combination of physical and moral. For example, if we cut down trees, as a result, when it rains, the probability of flooding increases, or if an earthquake occurs due to rockets and the pressure to hit the ground, it can not be considered as a perfect example of physical evil, but also the human factor has been involved in it and in fact it has been a combination of moral and physical evil.

Leibniz believes that the types of evil, despite their differences, are quite related to each other, because on the one hand metaphysical evil for moral evil is an unlikely cause that is related to man's relationship with God and potential affairs, and on the other hand the result evil is physical and natural.

3-2 Fakhr Razi: Fakhr Razi, in his works, has not dealt with the division of evil and has not expressed a comprehensive division of it, but what is evident from his writings is that, he believes in two types of evil, moral evil and natural evil. Moral evil is created by the will of man and natural evil is created by the world of nature and is the essence of the world of creation.

Moral evil is created by man; by following his passion and desires and avoiding divine commands, he commits sin and causes evil. In fact, moral evil is the obedience of man to the devil inside and outside, which causes evil between human beings and the world. In fact, the moral evil in Fakhr Razi's thought is the estimation of his thought in the role of man in sinning and creating evil in the world.

Moral evil is all the evil that is the deliberate product of those people who do bad deeds or the evil that is made possible by human beings who fail to do good deeds due to negligence.

Although according to the points made by Fakhr Razi and his Ash'arite school, he does not believe much in human free will and even in some cases attributes evil to God, but nevertheless, moral evil in his mind is done in the light of human will.

Fakhr Razi on natural evil believes that pain is a part of the system of nature and in the whole system of nature, natural good is much more than natural evil, in addition to the fact that many natural evils are the result of human moral evil and at the same time for achieving good ends is useful.

Fakhr Razi believes that natural good in the world is more than natural evil. In addition, natural suffering is the result of moral evil, and the way to attain many good deeds is useful, because they are used as a punishment for sins, as well as a means to complete good.

Natural evil is one of the characteristics of the natural world that is always happening and happens frequently in different regions. It seems that there is an inseparable existence between this group of evil and the system that governs nature. Some believe that natural evil is the manifestation of metaphysical evil in the natural world.

4.Solutions to the Problem of Evil

4-1 Leibniz: In dealing with the problem of evil, thinkers fall into two categories; some, such as Plato, Plotinus, St.Augustine, Leibniz and all Islamic philosophers, have tried to make the problem of evil a violation of attributes by recognizing the existing system and offering various solutions and arguments and tried to solve the evil problem. On the other hand, thinkers like J.L. Mackey and William Rowe, considering the evil as irrational, have stated it as a reason for denying the existence of God and have made the problem of evil a refuge for their atheism [11, p.117].

According to Leibniz, in his *"Theodicy of Divine Justice"*, he has proposed four solutions to solve problem of evil;

4-1-1 Evil is Non-Existent: Leibniz's first solution to the problem of evil, which is based on the pre-Christian foundations and is rooted in Augustine's thoughts, is that evil is non-existent. According to this solution, there is no evil at all for which titles such as *"disrupting the good system"* or *"violating the divine attributes"* can be considered, and evil is a non-existent thing to which there is no existence.

Leibniz believes that evil is non-existent and without causes, because in his view, cause belongs to things that exist, and evil, since it is non-existent, does not exist so that it can have a cause. The essence of the object returns that evil lacks the essence and existence to which the cause is based.

Leibniz, recognizing the necessity of metaphysical evil and basing it on physical and moral evil, concludes that evil and sin are purely negative and non-existent, because they arise from metaphysical evil, and this kind of evil is also non-existent [3, p.159]. Evil is not a productive reality but a loss, just like the hole inside a cake which is only the absence of a cake. Therefore, evil has no active cause and is a kind of loss [15, p.222].

Knowing that evil is non-existent, rather than trying to solve the problem of evil, seeks to disprove the duality. According to this view, because evils are non-existent, they do not need a creator. Therefore, because there is one type in the world that is charity, then we have only one creator and the idea of polytheism and dualism is false [17, p.154].

Copleston states:

"According to Leibniz, God previously willed only good, but since imperfection is not related to divine will but to the nature of the creature's soul, it was not possible for God to create at all without creating imperfect beings. Nevertheless, God has created the best possible world, and if the problem of evil itself is taken into account, the Divine Will, wills only the good; but later, when the Divine Will for the creation of the universe became certain, it wills the best possible; but it was not possible for God to will the best without the will of imperfect creatures; even in the best possible universe, there must be defects in beings" [4, p.416].

4-1-2 The Necessity of Evil to Achieve Good: This view has an ancient history among the philosophers of the West and the East like the Stoics. Adherents of this theory, by accepting and acknowledging the existence and establishment of evil in this world, consider it necessary and inseparable from the world, which includes many superior and many good things, to the extent that the small evil of the world was to be ignored. The creation of the principle of the existing universe must also be abandoned. Proponents of this solution cite examples to prove their claim; for example, the existence of fire, which no one doubts is good, sometimes causes a lot of harm and evil, yet no one objects to its existence. Therefore, God's main purpose in creating fire is its innumerable benefits, but the harms and evils that result from it are intended by God. This view is composed of the following three pillars and introductions;

A. The multiplicity of good and the smallness of evil

B. Do not separate evil from charity

C. Equality of leaving many good with many evils [23, p.101].

Leibniz's other solution to the problem of evil is that it is necessary to achieve good. In other words, the existence of some charity requires the existence of evil, and that charity cannot be achieved unless it is evil. From Leibniz's point of view, there is a lot of charity in evil, and when that evil occurs, we realize that charity.

Ross states:

"If it were not possible for sin to be overcome in the moral realm, our character would be weakened. In the realm of nature, too, the absence of calamities, sufferings, and hardships required such irregularities in causal laws that prevented the possibility of science and engineering; just as in the realm of aesthetics, the whole should not be judged by looking at a small part of it. Looking at a painting, it may seem that a bunch of colors are ugly and meaningless put together, and also in

music, a particular instrument may be a scratch on its own, but its existence is necessary for the overall harmony" [20, p.104].

Leibniz believes that the good of the world is much greater than its evil, but there are two reasons why human beings consider evil more than good;

1. Evil attracts our attention more, while we do not pay so much attention to the existence of charity, and when we lose that charity, we realize their value. He states that evil attracts our attention more than good, and that is why that proves evil is rarer.

2. Man is a holistic being, and if he sees evil, he includes it in the whole universe, arguing that the whole universe is full of evil and misery, while carrying only its own difficulty and hardship over the whole universe [15, p.43].

Leibniz believes that with a superficial view, we should not consider every seemingly evil thing to be harmful to us, because in its essence it may be full of goodness for us and we may be unaware of its nature. The same trend continues in the universe, and natural phenomena, although they may cause harm to us and to nature itself, but the benefits of that natural evil far outweigh the harms to us humans and nature.

4-1-3 Eliminate Evil: Leibniz's third solution to the problem of evil is to eliminate evil in the universe and replace it with good. Leibniz's view has been criticized by some thinkers as very optimistic.

The most important critique of Leibniz's optimistic view is that the existing world could not be the best possible world, because figures such as Hitler and other prominent human beings have made the face of this world ugly. It is natural that God could have created a better world by eliminating evil. Why didn't God create kinder figures like Mother Teresa instead of creating Hitler? here it is thought that figures like Hitler can be removed from the world without major change in the world. This means that this world can be the same without Hitler, but according to the above principles, it is impossible to remove Hitler from this world and replace him with a better person like Mother Teresa, because a part of Mother Teresa's concept is that she dies 52 years after Hitler's death. Anyone who does not carry this burden will not be Mother Teresa. Therefore, if Hitler is somehow removed from this world, Mother Teresa will not be Mother Teresa, and from here a clear contradiction is needed, because Mother Teresa dies 52 years after Hitler's death. As a result, Hitler could not be removed from the world without being changed by Mother Teresa or anyone else. With the removal of Hitler, this world is neither the previous world nor Mother Teresa the same as Mother Teresa, and this is also true of any other person or event in this world [10,

pp.122-123]. Leibniz believes that with the elimination of evil, no major change will take place in the world, but it should be noted that the universe, despite this evil and its solidarity, is next to charity, which means and without them can not be many Charity was achieved.

4-1-4 Evil is Necessary for a Good System: Many thinkers believe that the evils in the world are not only a violation of the good system, but on the contrary are an integral feature of the current system. The world is in spite of evil, which forms the same good system, otherwise the world without evil was created by God before the creation of this world, and if this world was created without evil, there would be no better place for this world and the existence of evil. In this world, it is a kind of groundwork for the exaltation of man in the correlation between good and evil, so that he can be charitable despite this natural need and avoid creating evil [13, p.1700].

The vast majority of Islamic thinkers and some Western scholars believe in the researcher of the "*best system*" and the best possible world, which means that all the worlds that God has created and the existing material world are the best possible worlds. In other words, the world we see, which consists of charity and evil, is one of the best products of the factory of divine creation, which is better than it can be imagined in terms of quantity and quality. The reason for the proponents of this view is summed up in the statement that since God is Wise, Omnipotent and Absolutely Benevolent, He has no claim or motive to create evil, and everything that is imparted from an infinite source is all good. But what we see from the evils and misfortunes in the mirror of the world are all the consequences of the movements and contradictions of the material world, which, whether we like it or not, endanger the interests of some and cause the loss of others. But in order to study the innumerable benefits of this world, there is no escape from this evil [23, p.112].

Leibniz states this in explaining the theory of the good system:

"In fact, "A" alone can be possible, as can "B", but not all possible things can happen, because not all of them are possible together. The set of possible ones together form a possible world, and infinite possible worlds can be assumed but among them, God chooses only the world in which the greatest good is for most people, and this will be enough to make that world a reality. By definition, the world may be a world that does not contain contradictions. That is, there should be a possible relationship between its components, not a refusal relationship, and that world will be the best world in which the largest group of "possible" have gathered, because God has created

as much as possible and created a world that to the fullest extent possible. Thus the present world is made up of the largest group of "both possibilities" " [21, p.184].

4-2 Fakhr Razi: Although Fakhr Razi considers perceptual evil as an existential thing, but by ignoring other types of evil, he seeks to solve the problem of duality. In other words, in Fakhr Razi's thought, the problem of duality is not solved except by ignoring a group of evil people, and the problem of physical fear and suffering, which is called perceptual evil, is considered by him as an existential thing. However, by passing this solution in order to solve the problem of duality, Fakhr Razi has stated the following three solutions to solve the evil problem;

4-2-1 Evil Is Relative: Another solution to the problem of evil is to know it as relative. According to this theory, evil is relative and may be an evil phenomenon for some people and the same phenomenon may seem good to others, and we must pay attention that relativity is the opposite of truth. Also, the conditions and situation of time indicate that the evil is relative, because in a certain period, a phenomenon may be evil for a person, and in another period and time, the same phenomenon may appear as good.

The reason why evil is relative is that if we consider a creature to be evil, it is either evil for itself, or for its cause or effect, or for others. If evil is evil for itself, it must destroy itself, and such a thing will never exist. If it is evil for its cause, then it will not be the same, and this is contrary to the nature of cause and effect. If it is evil for its effect, it will repel it and this is contrary to the assumption; therefore, the evilness of an object for its non-self is its cause and effect [14, Vol.2, p.157].

Fakhr Razi believes that evil is a relative thing and for different people and also in changing circumstances, it is possible for a phenomenon to appear as good or as evil. He states:

"All objects are common in the body. The attribution of each of them to specific and definite features is due to the autonomous agent. Therefore, the autonomous agent is able to create these properties and benefits and is able to remove corruption. In other words, things are equal in terms of good or evil, but God, by His Power and Authority, creates benefits and goodness in them and eliminates evil. For example, fire for one person may cause burns to his body and be considered evil, and for another person it may save him from the cold and be considered good" [6, Vol.3, p.282].

4-2-2 Evil Is Necessary for a Good System: Fakhr Razi believes that the evils of the world of creation are necessary for its good system, and

despite this evil, the goodness of the world of creation makes sense. According to him, the world of creation is not pure good, but has many good and few evils, and it is this minimal aspect of evil that makes the good system of the world of creation meaningful, because the world of pure good belongs to the world of angels.

Fakhr Razi states:

"Existence is either good in all respects or evil in all respects, and this kind of itself is divided into three directions: whether good prevails over evil, or evil prevails over good, or whether good and evil are equal. But the kind in which good prevails over evil, if it is not created, many good deeds will inevitably disappear, and the disappearance of many good deeds is evil itself, and the second direction, the matters in which good and evil go together, belong to the world of elements and there is no doubt that the world of elements is the result of higher causes. If the elements are not created, from the absence of this kind, the absence of causes them to be pure charity, and the absence of pure charity is pure evil, so the existence of this type becomes obligatory" [7, Vol.2, pp.551-552].

Fakhr Razi believes that the existing world has taken on the best possible state and it is a system in which there is no disturbance and it has taken the best state and situation, and evil is an inseparable part of this world, without which this world will no longer be a good system.

4-2-3 Evil Is Minimal and Good Is Maximum: One of the most important arguments put forward by some thinkers as an answer to the problem of evil is the dominance of the aspect of charity over the evil of the universe. According to this idea, although evils are realized in the world and some of them, like earthquakes and floods, are the product of nature and some are the result of murder and slavery as a result of human malice, but it should be noted that the good of the world is much more than its evil, and we should not ignore the many good and simply consider the evil as the absence of charity. This view was first put forward by St.Irenaeus and later developed by other thinkers.

The thinkers who have given this answer to the evil question believe that this argument can be complete and acceptable if it meets these conditions;

1. The evil that happens is logically necessary for some good.
2. These good deeds are superior and greater than the evil ones.
3. It is not possible to create other alternative good deeds in the absence of evil or with the occurrence of smaller evil deeds [24, p.75].

Fakhr Razi believes that evil is very small and insignificant in comparison with good, and in the world of creation, God has given so much blessing and goodness to man that evil in comparison with it is not considered at all.

From Fakhr Razi's point of view, this is a person who, in exchange for the blessings that God has bestowed upon him, takes the path of disbelief and ingratitude, and turns away from those charities and does not pay attention to them at all, and when he realizes their true value, he will lose them, just like a sick person who has lost his health.

He states:

"The circle of evil is not wide, but narrow and limited, because evil occurs only in the material world, and in the immaterial world as there are actual objects, there is no evil, and in the material world, which are potential objects, evil occurs, which is also it is small and insignificant" [7, Vol.2, p.52].

He also states:

"Only a part of the world of possibilities has evil and the world of its possessions is of two types: the world of matter and the world of creation. The world of matter is all good and there is no evil in it, but the world of creation has evil and again evils in creation world are less than good" [8, Vol.3, p.317].

5.Comparison

The problem of evil is one of the important philosophical and theological cases that different thinkers have discussed this topic despite the differences in religion. The problem of evil was first discussed in ancient Greek philosophy, although its theological origins go back to the scriptures of religions. The existence of numerous verses in the Holy Quran and the hadiths of the Prophet (PBUH) and Imams (AS) about evil and on the other hand the familiarity of Muslims with different sects and the transfer of Greek philosophy to the Islamic world caused the problem of evil to attract much attention in the Islamic world, and existence of doubts about the fact that denied the existence of God or at least restricted the Divine Attributes, made this attention more widespread.

Leibniz, considering the existence of the problem of evil in Western philosophy, discussed this issue as a philosophical issue and tried to show the problem of evil compatible with God and the good world with the principles of Western philosophy, and in fact, he followed the path taken by the great philosophers of Western philosophy, Plato, Aristotle, Augustine, and Aquinas, in explaining this issue. Leibniz believes in the non-existence of evil, with the difference that he also states the minimum constraint for evil, in

that the existence of the minimum evil that man creates is necessary to achieve good, and he considers only a small part of evil to be an existence whose existence is the minimum aspect of evil necessary for achieving good. Fakhr Razi, who is one of the great theologians of Asharties, has discussed the problem of evil in his works and in some of his works, he has considered evil as an existential thing and in others as non-existent. It seems that he means the existential evil, the evil that is made and paid for by human action and will, and in a precise sense, moral evil, although elsewhere he has considered perceptual evil as existential. In a way, it can be said that both Leibniz and Fakhr Razi have expressed evil as both existential and non-existent, and have attributed the existential aspect of evil to various instances and types of evil.

Leibniz considers God to be an Absolute Good and believes that God did not create evil and Fakhr Razi also expressed such a view, and the difference between this is that Fakhr Razi tried to create evil in the world by man, explain by his will and authority, but Leibniz emphasizes the role of this evil of man in achieving charity, which ultimately leads to man achieving charity, and considers the divine will to achieve good in human beings involved in this matter. Both thinkers consider the world of creation as a good system and among Aristotle's five divisions under the title of world of absolute good, world of absolute evil, world of equal good and evil, world of abundant good and little evil and world of abundant evil and little good, to the world of abundant good and little evil, that the evil of this world is so small compared to its goodness that Leibniz considers it necessary to achieve good and Fakhr Razi considers it as a divine tradition on earth and one of the essences of this world that without this minimal evil, this world was no longer a good world.

In the division of evil, both philosophers refer to moral and natural evil, but Leibniz mentions another type of evil called metaphysical evil, which means the evil that underlies people and things, But Fakhr Razi suffices to express only moral and natural evil and considers man as the absolute cause of moral evil and nature as the absolute cause of evil in the world of creation. Leibniz believes that the types of evil, despite their differences, are quite related to each other, because on the one hand metaphysical evil is a rare cause for moral evil, which is related to man's relationship with God and potential affairs, and on the other hand, it is the result of physical and natural evil. But Fakhr Razi does not believe in the existence of a connection between the types of evil and considers the two types of moral and natural evil to be

completely different from each other, the perpetrators of which have nothing to do with each other.

In explaining the solution to the problem of evil, Leibniz first considers the non-existence of evil and can be considered the source of his inspiration in this regard Plato, because it was Plato who first expressed the non-existence of evil. However, although Fakhr Razi has mentioned the non-existence of evil in some of his works, but in the end, contrary to the prevailing practice of Islamic theology and philosophy, he has not stated the non-existence of evil as a complete solution to solve the problem of evil, and he has expressed the relativity of the evil in terms of time and individually, that a phenomenon may be evil for a person at a certain time, but at another time the same phenomenon may seem good to him. Or a phenomenon is evil for one person but the same phenomenon is good for another, such as rain for the potter and the farmer, which is evil for the potter because it destroys his jars, but for the farmer because it makes his crops fertile, it is good for him. Both thinkers believe that the evil in the world is a small evil that is in no way comparable to its many good deeds. Also, both Leibniz and Fakhr Razi believe that evil is necessary to achieve good, and the difference here is that Leibniz considers good to be a general thing, but Fakhr Razi has used it to better understand the system of creation. Elimination of evil is also one of the solutions expressed by Leibniz and is contrary to Fakhr Razi's views; because from Fakhr Razi's point of view, one cannot ignore the minimal role of evil in appearance, which is the same as esoteric charity in order to obtain good, and their minimal role should be satisfied and they should not be excluded. Finally, both philosophers have emphasized that the existence of evil can not contradict the existence of God or restrict His attributes, but by properly understanding the problem of evil, we can better understand God, and He believed more in His existence and His Wisdom in creating the best possible world.

6. Conclusion

The problem of evil is one of the important philosophical and theological issues that has occupied various thinkers despite differences in beliefs and thoughts and has been the subject of discussion and analysis for many centuries. In Western and Islamic philosophy, in order to explain the problem of evil and defend the existence of God and the absolute Divine attributes against doubts, Leibniz and Fakhr Razi have been among those scholars who discuss this issue and defend the existence of God and His absolute attributes against suspicions. Despite the differences between the ideas of Leibniz and Fakhr Razi, which is to be expected despite the differences in religion and school of thought, but in the end, the efforts of both thinkers have been that;

1) The evil of his existence is indefinite and non-existent, and it cannot deny the existence of God, whose existence is clearer than anything else, or challenge His attributes.

2) The universe created by God is Wise and has order, and even if evil in its minimal sense is existential, it is still an inseparable element of this good system, and this evil can mean the goodness of the created world.

3) This world cannot be considered without evil, and this world has many good and few evils, and the minimal existence of evil is one of the essences of the creation world.

4) The minimal existence of evil also has a purpose and end, and in the end these goals also lead to good, and since they lead to good, again this minimal evil will be nothing but good.

REFERENCES

1. Alizamani, A., Sadat Hashemi, F. (2014). Augustine's Theory of Evil and Its Critique from Ibn Sina's Perspective. *BiQuarterly Journal of Hekmat Sinavi*, 19 (2)
2. Bahreini, M.S. (2011). *Evil from the Point of View of Swinburne*. Master Thesis. Tehran: Allameh Tabatabai University.
3. Broad, C.D. (1975). *Leibniz*. Great Britain, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
4. Copleston, F. (2009). *History of Philosophy* (1st ed.) (Translated by Ebrahim Dadjoo) Tehran: Scientific and Cultural Publications.
5. Eskandari Damaneh, H., Nasri, A. (2014). A Study of the Problem of Evil from the Perspective of Leibniz and Swinburne. *Comparative Theology*, 5 (12).
6. Fakhr Razi, M. (1987). *Almatalab Alaālyiah men Ilm Allahi* (1st ed.). Beirut: Dar Alosveh Publication.
7. Fakhr Razi, M. (1991). *AlMabahas AlShargheieh fi Ilme AlEilahiyyat va Tabiyyat* (2nd ed.). Qom: Bidar Publications.

8. Fakhr Razi, M. (2002). *Tafsir AlKabir* (3rd ed.), Lebanon: Center for the Revival of Arab Heritage.
9. Fakhr Razi, M. (2005). *Explanation Allsharat va AlTanbihat* (1st ed.), Tehran: Association of Iranian Works and Honors.
10. Fath Taheri, A. (2010). A Study of the Problem of Evil in Leibniz Thought. *Philosophical Research*, 53 (216).
11. Hosseini Eskandian, A., Rajab Nezhadian, M. (2020). Evil Thought and Its Approaches with an Emphasis on Swinburne Theodicy of Divine Justice, *Metafizika Journal*, 3 (4).
12. Hosseini Eskandian, A., Rajab Nezhadian, M. (2021a). Critique of Theodicy of Soul Cultivation of John Hick based on Verses from the Holy Quran. *Turkish Journal of Computer and Mathematics Education*, 12 (14).
13. Hosseini Eskandian, A., Rajab Nezhadian, M. (2021b). A Comparative Approach to Solving the Evil Problem Realized in the Universe by Emphasizing the Thoughts of Ibn Sina and Augustine, *Turkish Journal of Computer and Mathematics Education*, 12 (14).
14. Javadi Amoli, A. (1995). *Rahiq Makhtoum*, Tehran: Esra Publishing Center.
15. Leibniz, G. (1985). *Theodicy* (Trans E.M.Huggard). Biblio Bazaar
16. Leibniz, G. (2005). *Confession Philosophie*, (Editor and Trandlators Daniel Garber and Robert C Sleight), Jr: Yale University Press.
17. Motahhari, M. (1983). *Divine Justice* (1st ed.). Tehran: Sadra Publications.
18. Murray, M. (2005). Leibniz on the Peoblem of Evil. *In Stanford Encyclopedia*.
19. Nowrouzi, A., Berenjkari, R. (2014). A Comparative Study of the Problem of Evil in the Philosophy of Mulla Sadra and Leibniz, *Essays on the Philosophy of Religion*, 3 (2).
20. Ross, G.M. (1984). *Leibniz*, Great Britian, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
21. Russell, B. (1984). *A Critical Explanation of Leibniz Philosophy with Attachments* (1st ed.) (Trans. Iraj Qanuni), Tehran: Mehr Vista Publications.
22. Russell, B. (2012). *History of Western Philosophy* (1st ed.) (Trans. Najaf Daryabandari). Tehran: Parvaz Publications.
23. Swinburne, R. (2009). *The Problem of Evil* (1st ed.) (Trans. Mahmoud Yousef Thani), Tehran; Mah and Din.
24. Wainwright, W.J. (1999). *Philosohy of Religion* (2nd ed.), Belmont, CA: Wadworth Publishing Company.
25. Wall, J. (1991). *Discussion in Metaphysics* (1st ed.) (Trans. Yahya Mahdavi et al.), Tehran: Kharazmi Publications

Qərb fəlsəfəsi və İslam teologiyasında şər probleminin məntiqi izahı (Qotfrid Leybnits və Fəxrəddin ər-Razinin baxışlarının müqayisəli təhlili)

Abdullah Hüseyini Eskandian*

Səməd Behruz**

Abstrakt. Mürəkkəbliyi və müxtəlifliyi, bəzən də ziddiyyətli izahları ilə həmişə din filosoflarının və ilahiyyatçıların müzakirə obyektinə çevrilən mühüm fəlsəfi- teoloji məsələlərdən biri də şər problemidir. Bu problemi Qotfrid Leybnits (1646-1716) və Fəxrəddin ər-Razi (1149-1209) öz ideologiyaları əsasında izah etməyə çalışmışlar. Qotfrid Leybnits şərri böyük xeyirə çatmaq üçün zəruri, minimal məna kəsb edən ekzistensial bir nəsnə hesab etmiş, Fəxrəddin ər-Razi isə onu yoxluq, yəni xeyirin yoxluğu mənasında təqdim edərək müəyyən xeyirləri əldə etmək üçün ekzistensial bir varlıq olaraq izah etmişdir. İslam fəlsəfəsi və teologiyasının görkəmli alimlərindən biri olan Fəxrəddin ər-Razinin şər mövzusunda düşüncələri ilə məşhur avropalı filosof Qotfrid Leybnitsin fikirlərini tədqiq və müqayisə etmək, bu fəlsəfi, teoloji problemin təhlilində onların oxşar cəhətləri ilə rəşional fərqliliklərini göstərmək araşdırılmağa cəlb etdiyimiz mövzunun daha aydın şəkil almasına səbəb ola bilər. Bu məqalədə təsviri-analitik metoda istinadən Qotfrid Leybnits və Fəxrəddin ər-Razinin şər probleminin mahiyyəti, növləri, onun həlli yolları haqqındaki fikirləri tədqiq edərək müqayisə edilmiş, nəticədə bu alimlərin problemin izahı ilə əlaqədar dünyagörüşünün onların rəşional fərqliliyi, intellektual və dini mənsubiyyətindən irəli gələn müxtəlifliklə əlaqədar olduğu vurğulanmışdır. Buna rəğmən hər iki mütəfəkkir və düşüncə sahibi şər problemini teizmlə ziddiyyət təşkil edərək izah etməkdən imtina etmiş, hər şeyə qadir, hər şeyi bilən və ədalətli Allahın varlığını müdafiə etmişlər.

Açar sözlər: Şər problemi, Qotfrid Leybnits, Qərb fəlsəfəsi, Fəxrəddin ər-Razi, İslam teologiyası, Allahın varlığı

* Təbriz Universitetinin magistrantı; Təbriz, İran
E-mail: hosseinieskandianabdullah@gmail.com
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2318-022X>

** Təbriz Universitetinin dosenti; Təbriz, İran
E-mail: sa_behrouz@yahoo.com

Məqaləyə istinad: Hüseyini Eskandian, A., & Behruz, S. [2022]. Qərb fəlsəfəsi və İslam teologiyasında şər probleminin məntiqi izahı (Qotfrid Leybnits və Fəxrəddin ər-Razinin baxışlarının müqayisəli təhlili). *"Metafizika" jurnalı*, 5(2), səh.108-131.

Məqalənin tarixçəsi:

Məqalə redaksiyaya daxil olmuşdur: 02.03.2022

Təkrar işlənməyə göndərilmişdir: 05.04.2022

Çapa qəbul edilmişdir: 03.06.2022

Логическое разъяснение проблемы зла в западной философии и исламской теологии (сравнительный анализ взглядов Готфрида Лейбница и Фахраддина ар-Рази)

Абдуллах Хусейни Эскандиан*

Самед Бехруз**

Абстракт. Проблема зла, отличающаяся сложностью и разнообразием, а иногда и противоречием, является одной из основных философских и теологических задач, дискусируемой философами-религиоведами и теологами. Данную проблему основываясь на личную идеологию старались разъяснять Готфрид Лейбниц (1646-1716) и Фахраддин ар-Рази (1149-1209). Готфрид Лейбниц считал зло экзистенциальным средством, являющимся важным и минимальным смыслом в постижении большого добра, а Фахраддин Рази предоставлял данное понятие как отсутствие добра, а также экзистенциальное существо, направленное на получение определенных выгод. Исследование и выяснение различий в связи с темой зла между взглядами одного их выдающихся исламских философов и теологов Фахраддина ар-Рази и известного европейского философа Готфрида Лейбница, способствует раскрытию полной картины общих свойств, а также рациональных отличий данной философской и теологической проблемы. В данной статье основываясь на описательно-аналитический метод рассмотрены и выяснены отличительные черты размышлений Готфрида Лейбница и Фахраддина ар-Рази о сущности, типах и путях решения проблемы зла. Воззрения Готфрида Лейбница и Фахраддина ар-Рази, связанные с раскрытием проблемы зла отличаются явным разнообразием, исходящим с их рациональным различием, а также интеллектуальной и религиозной принадлежностью. Оба мыслителя и просветителя при разъяснении проблемы зла не согласовывались с объяснениями, противоречащими теизму и подтверждали существование милостивого, всезнающего и всемогущего Творца.

* Студент-магистр Тебризского Университета; Тебриз, Иран

E-mail: hosseini.eskandianabdullah@gmail.com

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2318-022X>

** Доцент Тебризского Университета; Тебриз, Иран

E-mail: sa_behrouz@yahoo.com

Цитировать статью: Хусейни Эскандиан, А., & Бехруз, С. [2022]. Логическое разъяснение проблемы зла в западной философии и исламской теологии (сравнительный анализ взглядов Готфрида Лейбница и Фахраддина ар-Рази). *Журнал «Metafizika»*, 5(2), с.108-131.

История статьи:

Статья поступила в редакцию: 02.03.2022

Отправлена на доработку: 04.02.2022

Принята для печати: 03.06.2022

Ключевые слова: проблема зла, Готфрид Лейбниц, западная философия, Фахраддин ар-Рази, исламская теология, существование Творца.

**مسئله منطقی شر در فلسفه غربی و الهیات اسلامی
(مقایسه و تحلیل آراء لایب نیتس و فخر رازی)**

عبدالله حسینی اسکاندیان*

صمد بهروز**

چکیده. یکی از مسائل مهم فلسفی و کلامی، مسئله شر است که همواره به دلیل پیچیدگی و تبیینات مختلف و گاه متضادی که از آن شده، محل بحث فیلسوفان و متکلمان دینی بوده است. در این بین لایب نیتس و فخر رازی هر یک تلاش نموده‌اند تا مسئله شر را بر اساس مشرب فکری و اعتقادی خود تبیین کنند. لایب نیتس، شر را امری وجودی به معنای حداقلی می‌داند که برای رسیدن به خیر کثیر ضروری است و فخر رازی نیز در یک معنا آن را عدمی به معنای فقدان خیر دانسته و به یک معنا، وجودی در جهت رسیدن به خیرات تبیین نموده است. بررسی و مقایسه آراء لایب نیتس به عنوان فیلسوفی غربی با اندیشه‌های فخر رازی که از بزرگان حکمت و کلام اسلامی است، در مسئله شر می‌تواند ما را با وجوه اشتراک و افتراق فکری آنها در تبیین این چالش فلسفی و کلامی آشنا کند. در این مقاله سعی بر این است تا با روش توصیفی-تحلیلی به بررسی و مقایسه اندیشه‌های لایب نیتس و فخر رازی درباره ماهیت و چیستی شر، اقسام شر و راهکارهای حل مسئله شر پرداخته شود. لایب نیتس و فخر رازی با وجود افتراعات فکری که در تبیین مسئله شر دارند که آن هم با توجه به تعلقات فکری و مذهبی امری بدیهی است، اما در نهایت تلاش هر دو اندیشمند موقوف به این بوده است که مسئله شر را در تضاد با خداآوری تبیین نکنند و از وجود خدایی همه‌چیزدان، همه‌چیزتوان و عادل دفاع کنند.

واژگان کلیدی: مسئله شر، لایب نیتس، فلسفه غرب، فخر رازی، الهیات اسلامی، وجود خدا

* کارشناسی ارشد دانشگاه تبریز؛ ایران - نویسنده مسئول

E-mail: hosseiniieskandianabdullah@gmail.com

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2318-022X>

** دانشیار دانشگاه تبریز؛ ایران

E-mail: sa_behrouz@yahoo.com

ارجاع به مقاله: حسینی اسکاندیان، عبدالله؛ بهروز، صمد. [2022]. مسئله منطقی شر در فلسفه غربی و الهیات اسلامی (مقایسه و تحلیل آراء لایب نیتس و فخر رازی).

مجله «متافیزیکا»، 5(2)، صفحه. 108-131

Article history:

Received: 02.03.2022

Accepted: 03.06.2022