*Abdullah Hosseini ESKANDIAN**
*Masoumeh Rajab NEZHADIAN***
(Iran)

*University of Tabriz
**Farhangian University

A Comparative Study of the Evil Problem in the Thoughts of St. Augustine and John Hick

Abstract

The problem of evil is one of the most important things that has always occupied the minds of human beings throughout human history and has led to many questions and doubts among the followers of various religions and sects, so many thinkers and philosophers have studied and detailed research has been done on this topic. St.St.Augustine believes that evil does not exist independently, but that the lack of proper use of good by man creates various evil in the world. At the same time, John Hick denies the existence of evil and believes that evil is an integral part of the world, whose existence does not contradict the divine attributes and the good system. Examining and comparing the ideas of St.Augustine and John Hick about evil is a subject that can clarify their views and solutions in this regard for contemporary man and respond to some of his doubts and also clarify the intellectual differences between these two great thinkers.

* Master student of Islamic Theology, University of Tabriz.
e-mail: hosseinieskandianabdullah@gmail.com
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2318-022X

** Theology Student of Farhangian University.
e-mail: mrajabnezhadian@gmail.com
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0417-381X

In this article, with a descriptive-analytical method, first the nature and what is evil from the point of view of St.Augustine and Hick is examined and then the subject continues by expressing the types of evil and finally by expressing the solutions of evil and comparing the thoughts of these two thinkers about evil this paper will end.St.Augustine and John Hick, despite their differences of opinion about evil, believe that the existence of evil does not contradict the divine attributes and the good system, but by gaining the necessary knowledge about this, one can realize the necessity of evil in the system of creation.

Keywords*: Evil, St.Augustine, John Hick, God, The Good System*

Introduction

Man has long been faced with the question of what is the philosophy of the existence of evil in the world? Could not the world of creation have survived without the existence of evil? What are the benefits of existence of evil? In addition to these issues, theists face another question that, if not properly understood and explained, could be a violation of their accepted religious beliefs and principles, and whether evil is issued from God, who is absolute good? The existence of such questions throughout the history of science has always led man to explore the problem of evil, and various thinkers with different religions and schools of thought have discussed evil and offered solutions to solve the problem.

The issue of evil in modern times has become a haven for atheism and polytheism, according to the views of the likes of J.L. Mackey and William Rowe, and it is these biased ideas of evil that have led philosophers such as Swinburne, Plantinga, John Hick, and other thinkers explain the problem of evil and show its compatibility with divine attributes.The issue of evil, if not properly understood and its relationship with God and the world is not explained, can be a serious analogy to denying the existence of God or at least adhering to His attributes (Eskandian & Nejhadian 2020: 108).

John Hick is one of the thinkers who, with the influence of St.Irenaeus, defined evil as an example and tried to make the existence of evil compatible with the existence of a wise, omnipotent and absolutely benevolent God. He believes that evil

has no contradiction in this world. They do not have it with goodness, because the goodness of this world depends on the realization of the minimum evil and the maximum of good.St.Augustine, on the other hand, considers evil to be a non-existent thing that has no essence and means lack of perfection and goodness in something.God didnt create evil, but this is human who creates evil in the world by following his passion and desires.

So far no research has been done that fully compares John Hick and St.Augustine's thoughts on evil.And only in some articles, the thoughts of one of these two Christian thinkers have been specifically examined or compared with other thinkers or the thoughts of these two thinkers have been criticized, in which the focus is on examining the evil nature in the thoughts of these two Christian thinkers or criticizing the point of view. They have been and have neglected to deal with the types of evil and the strategies and explanations given by these two thinkers in order to solve the problem of evil.

In this article, with reference to reliable sources and necessary analyzes, an attempt is made to fully examine and compare the nature and interpretations of evil, types of evil and solutions to the problem of evil from the perspective of Hick and St.Augustine, which in previous research. Such research has not been discussed with such axes and attempts are being made to answer these questions;

What did Hick and St.Augustine say about evil? Is evil non-existent or existential? Can the existence of evil contradict the existence of God or his attributes? From the point of view of Hick and St.Augustine, can the existence of evil violate the goodness of this world? Why we see evil in this world? What are the types of evil? What strategies have been proposed by Hick and St.Augustine to solve the problem of evil? What are the differences and intellectual similarities in explaining and solving the problem of evil?

2. The Nature of Evil

2.1. Agustine: St.Augustine considers evil not essential, but transcendent, which has no essence and matter, and means the absence of perfection in the object. He believes that the existence of a minimal evil is accepted and its non-existence is expressed according to its minimalism.St.Augustine considers evil to be non-exis-

tent, which is why it is not worthy of having a cause, because the first and most important condition for the existence of an object is to have a cause.The essence and reason of the existence of every object must be according to the end so that the object exists for that reason and is not non-existent, but evil because they have no cause and no reason can be considered for them, because they are non-existent and therefore lack. They are the first cause of existence and are a kind of lack of goodness and perfection.any object or phenomenon that has the degree of perfection and is useful is the same as good, and if the object lacks the degree of perfection, it can no longer be called good, but it is evil that has no cause and because it has no cause, it also exists. It does not and as a result it is non-existent.

In his definition of evil, St.Augustine says that evil is the misuse of good things (Agustine 2006: 76) His interpretation revolves around the axis of free will, and its content is turning away from the higher god to the lower being in order for the soul to be satisfied. (ibid. 188). In this interpretation, which is equivalent to the moral meaning of evil, the model of the first definition is used, because although evil has a factor here, that is, human will plays a role in its occurrence, but evil is considered a kind of absence or non-existent thing without essence (Moradi & Sefidkhosh 2015: 77-88).

After converting to Manichaeism and accepting Christianity and believing in one God, St.Augustine tried to solve the problem of evil in the world in a way that did not lead to dualism. It is purely intentional and is raised through the issue of non-existence (Mojtahedi 1997: 85).

St.Augustine considers God to be an obligatory being full of goodness and absolute goodness from which nothing but good is issued and evil cannot be attributed to him because God is good and evil is harmful and can not be attributed from God. On the other hand, God is the absolute benefactor and wants nothing but the good of His servants, and it cannot be believed that He created evil to put His servants in trouble, but that the human will should be considered the source of evil. Which is used in a way other than its correctness.

St.Augustine's divine justice sees God in relation to His creatures in the form of impersonal relationships. God's goodness abundant abundance in the gift of existence depends on a realm. Accordingly, man is created as part of a hierarchy of

forms of existence without which he is imperfect (Rezaie & Rostaiepatapeh 2018: 182).

God, who has absolute knowledge, power, and authority, only creates things that he has an argument for creating, and he does not have an important argument for not creating them, so first, good deeds are desirable. Second, evil are necessary for the attainment of many good things.For example, it has not created pain and suffering whose intensity and duration are endless.Fourth, the occurrence of some situations and states of affairs instead of others while they are equal in terms of goodness;It is more perceptible if it is seen as the result of the choice of the observer, not as the result of a random mechanism, because the choice of the observer from among the alternatives is equal in goodness, a mechanism that we intuitively understand to be simple and natural. In fact, it is the only mechanism we have from internal experience, and therefore such a function is understandable(Swinburne 2002: 223-224).

From St.Augustine's point of view, the most beautiful, glorious and precious world is a world in which all kinds of possibilities can be found, from the weakest to the most sublime, from the ugliest to the most beautiful, and from the most imperfect to the most perfect.St.Augustine believes that the evil of the universe is due to the imperfect functioning of existence;while all levels are good in the first place and in essence, and their misdeeds cause the evil of the world to occur, and in this sense, evil is not realized in the external world, and evil is non-existent.

St.Augustine believes that evil does not exist as an existential and ontological thing, but that evil exists morally in relation to human actions, behavior, and responsibilities, because such evil does not originate from the origin of existence and absolute goodness. Rather, it arises from the human will.St.Augustine says that in searching for the nature of evil, I realized that evil is not an existential essence; it is realized only when the will deviates and turns away from God Almighty (St.Augustine 2006: 239).

St.Augustine accepts the Neoplatonic theory that evil is the deprivation and absence of existence, and says that the lower the order of existence, the lower its existence. Therefore, evil has no objectivity as a cosmological thing, and the same thing It is non-existent(Ilkhani 2011: 108).

According to St.Augustine, the elimination of evil has always been one of the ways to solve the problem of evil by various thinkers and St.Augustine was one of the first to express the absence of evil in Christian theology and later became a source of inspiration by other religious thinkers in the study of evil.From St.Augustine's point of view, the evil of the creation world never prevail over its goodness, but there is much more goodness than evil in this world, and there is minimal evil in this world, which he attributes to the nature of the good system of this world as an integral part. He considers it necessary to be charitable.

2.2. John Hick: Hick says that instead of trying to define evil based on the type of theological theory, for example, as something that is contrary to God's will, it is better to define it without veiling, that is, by showing what these words mean. Evil means suffering, physical pain, mental pain and moral evil (Hick 2005: 89).He also says that the word evil, if used in a comprehensive sense, can be distinguished in two ways.1: Moral evil caused by human evil 2: Immoral or natural evil such as disease and natural disaster.Moral evil is created by human beings, cruel, unjust, vicious and misguided thoughts and actions, or in other words, moral evil refers to those evil in which the human factor has a direct role in its emergence. Natural evil arises independently of human actions: disease, flood, earthquake, storm, drought, tornado, and so on(Hick 2007: 265)

Unlike St.Augustine, Hick believes that evil are non-existent and their existence in the world of creation cannot be denied.He considers the non-existence of evil and on the other hand to offer solutions to solve that problem to be contradictory and believes that providing solutions to solve that problem is to be contradictory and he believes that providing a solution to solve the problem of evil is one of the reasons for proving the existence of evil in the universe, because no rational human being for a non-existent assumption states the solution to solve the problem, and if the solution is expressed, it means that the problem already existed that the solution to the problem has now been stated.

From Hick's point of view, the existence of evil in the universe has no contradiction with the attributes of God's benevolence, wisdom and absolute justice; Because God is absolute good and nothing good is issued except good, and evil can not

be attributed to God because it is contrary to divine attributes and God can not be considered the creator of evil.On the other hand, he believes that the existence of evil is necessary to achieve charity, and their minimal existence in the world to identify and gain knowledge about charity is obvious.From Hick's point of view, the existence of evil in the world has no contradiction with the goodness of this world, because the existence of evil in this world is an integral part of it, without which one can not imagine this good system of the world and it is called good system.In his view, if the world is only pure good, it can no longer be considered good for it, and the world full of good was created before this world, and there was no need to create this world. It is the element of human will and authority and the existence of evil. He knows that one of the important pillars of the good system is that in dealing with the evil will of the human will, this goodness is manifested, and this good system is a combination of good and evil, of which good is the maximum and evil is the minimum.

1. Evil Types

3.1. St.Augustine: St.Augustine considers evil to be limited to two types; moral and natural. Moral evil is evil that is the result of man's voluntary action, whether it is conscious, such as lying, slander, adultery, or unknowingly, as an accident that inadvertently causes the death of a person.Natural evil is also called the evil that we always see in nature and causes damage to humans and animals and even the environment itself, such as floods, earthquakes, storms, volcanoes, etc. St.Augustine considers moral evil as a human sin and natural evil as a punishment for which a person must taste natural evil in order to commit moral evil. Otherwise, natural evil will not occur. In fact, from St.Augustine's point of view, if human will is not abused in affairs and moral evil does not occur, then natural evil will not exist. In a way, according to this view, both types of evil can be attributed to man.

St.Augustine attributes some of the evil to man's lust and evil inclinations, which ultimately cause the human will to expel the villain, and in fact evil in that sense is sin.He also denounces some other evil. Because of the punishment of man for his descent and expulsion from heaven.He says that evil is rooted in the rebel-

lious use of free will, and that the other evil that man experiences are due to the punishment of man for his downfall. (St.Augustine 2006: 203).

While St.Augustine acknowledges moral evil and considers it to be the result of the original sin of mankind through the abuse of his will, the belief in the grace and salvation of Christ makes him ultimately good in the same moral aspect. To know the dominant aspect in the process of creation and human survival (Soltanalgharaie et al, 2012: 94).

According to St.Augustine, evil exists only morally, which is also caused by sin. The cause of moral evil is not the Creator; it is the will of the creature, and the cause of other things is divine good. Returns evil means turning the creature's will away from unchangeable and infinite good (Copleston 2008: 107).

According to St.Augustine, this same moral evil caused evil in the world, and that was not following the divine command and eating the forbidden fruit, and the starting point of moral evil should be considered important that natural evil appeared in its sequence. St.Augustine is trying to theories it is based on the teachings of Christianity and that is why it links moral evil with the subject of original sin and the salvation of Christ.

St.Augustine considers moral evil as a human sin and natural evil as a punishment for which a person must taste natural evil in order to commit moral evil. Otherwise, natural evil will not occur

Although St.Augustine acknowledges the predominance of moral evil and acknowledges that the majority of evil in the world is created by human will, exemplified by wars and killings, he believes that the grace of God and the salvation of Christ is so great that fear and there is no charity in the existence of this evil, and every time a person stops being honorable and prevents the creation of evil, he has turned to charity at the same time.This can be considered as the beginning of a suitable beginning for benevolence and going towards goodness.And benevolence is the same as seeking God, because God is absolute goodness, and when we seek charity, we actually adhere to God's commands and seek Him.

Although St.Augustine considers man as the only cause of evil in the world, but on the other hand, he considers the existence of evil as a necessity for gaining charity and believes that sometimes man's perversion causes charity in the world that

can not be achieved by any good. For example, original sin led to salvation by Christ, so that if original sin had not occurred, there would have been no salvation. From St.Augustine's point of view, the necessity of evil in the moral sense stipulates that one should no longer use one's will to acquire and create evil, and to walk in the direction of good, just as the salvation of Christ does not apply if one does not repent and confess.

2.3. Hick: Hick considers evil to be unique in both moral and natural forms. Moral evil is the result of man's evil and his evil will to create evil, and natural evil includes the natural things in the universe such as floods and earthquakes.After explaining these two parts of evil, he says that moral evil is created by human beings. Oppressive, unjust and misguided thoughts and actions, or in other words, moral evil are those evil in which the human factor has a direct role in its emergence. But natural evil is independent of human will, and human will has no role in creating it (Hick 2010: 265).

Hick considers moral evil to be the result of human will and will caused by the human factor. Hick considers one of the factors that causes moral evil to be human selfishness.In other words, it has been the selfishness and superiority of human beings throughout history that has led to wars and killings, because as long as there is no greed for the land and capital of another land, no war has taken place and blood has not been shed for no reason.Hick considers another factor that causes moral evil to be the ignorance of a person who suffers from evil in knowing good and evil and chooses evil and is unable to distinguish between good and evil. Accepting and surrendering to fleeting desires and committing moral vices all stems from human ignorance in committing and creating evil.

Hick says that there is a deep connection between moral evil and human free will, and human free will play a major role in creating moral evil (263 lbid). He points to the free will of man and states that if God prevented man from creating moral evil, then the free will of man would not be valid and man would be like the creatures that God had already created and one of the differences between man and the angels is the free will of man in doing good deeds and sins.

Hick believes that if a person realizes that God, the Holy Father, is always watching over him and wants him to give up evil and walk towards him; According to this understanding, man will never commit moral evil. But since man's tint is occupied with the lust, and he does not consider God as he deserves;he suffers from evil and evil creation.

In the case of natural evil, Hick also considers suffering as one of its symbols. John Hick considers natural evil to be one of the tools of human progress in science and technology, and believes that if it were not for natural evil, many of today's inventions, tools, and instruments that play an important role in human life would not have been created.Hick, however, believes that natural evil can sometimes cause great harm to humans and animals. But he considers the charity resulting from this evil to be much greater than its losses, and he considers the losses resulting from natural evil to be insignificant in comparison to its charity.

2. Evil Problem Solutions

4.1. St.Agustine: St.Augustine, in order to solve the problem of evil and show its compatibility with the attributes of justice, benevolence and divine wisdom, expressed strategies to adapt the evil to belief in God and the good system of this world. From St.Augustine's point of view, it is in spite of these strategies that one can put aside the harmful aspect of evil and realize the usefulness and role they play in strengthening belief in God.For from St.Augustine's point of view, evil are not only not in contradiction with the divine attributes, and in spite of them, one cannot deny God and turn to atheism, but by understanding it correctly and gaining the necessary insight and knowledge about it, God cna be understand better for him. St.Augustine has stated these solutions to solve the evil problem;

4.1. Evil is Non-Existent: The root of this solution to solve the problem of evil by St.Augustine should be considered in his turning away from Manichaeism and his acceptance of Christianity. Based on Manichaean beliefs, we see the presence of the God of Good and the God of Evil, who in turn creation, and for this reason there is both good and evil in the world of creation, and each has its own creator. This is the same dualism, and St.Augustine, based on his single belief in God, tried

to show his separation from Manichaeism and acceptance of the one God by cove-ring up the evil intentions.According to the non-existence of evil, there is only one creator who rules the universe, who is ruled by all creatures, and the idea that he creates a good God and another God is evil is imaginary and impossible, and there is no evil at all that no other god can create, but evils are non-existent.

All of God's creations and all that may be created are good, and if something is considered evil, it has good in it (Bahrsmi 2008: 7-8).According to the divine holy essence, good is eager and evil is subject to it; that is, good is equal to existence and evil is on the other non-existence, which is manifested in the form of lack of essence or lack of perfection of the perfections of existence. Its two meanings are basically non-existent and do not require a forger and a creator, and thus the doubt of duality is removed with this solution (Khedri 2015: 36).

St.Augustine believes that evil is non-existent and that there is no external existence for which we consider existence.He says in this regard that everything that exists is good, and the evil that I was trying to find the cause of has no substance, because every substance is good. Therefore, it became clear to me that all creation is good and evil has no substance to be a creature (St.Augustine 2006: 217).

Hick says that St.Augustine's main philosophical position is to promise the non-existent nature of evil. St.Augustine separately believes in the Christian -Jewish belief that the world is good, that is, that the created world is a virtuous God who created it for a good purpose.According to St.Augustine, the great and omniscient goods, bigger and smaller, exist in abundance and in various forms. In any case, everything that has existence benefits from goodness, unless it is destroyed or cor-rupted.The will of evil was not created by God in the universe, but evil is to deviate from what is inherently good.St.Augustine, for example, refers to blindness; blind-ness is not an existential thing, and the only thing here is the eye, which is good in itself, and the evil of blindness is the lack of proper eye function (Hick 2003: 93-94).

St.Augustine considers the lack of goodness in any matter as a criterion for considering it evil, and believes that if there are no signs of goodness in a matter or phenomenon, then it is evil and it should be harmful. He knew in human happiness and spiritual and physical peace.

4.2. Evil is Necessary for Charity: St.Augustine sees evil as a means of displaying charity and believes that the existence of evil is necessary for man to realize charity.He also believes that the things we consider evil are solely due to man's downfall and sin, and that this belief is derived from the Christian tradition in which he is a rabbi and links the subject of evil to his preconceived beliefs.Based on this solution, we sometimes realize the goodness of some phenomena through evil, and with this realization, we try to protect and fortify them as much as possible. For example, disease is a kind of evil by which the importance and we realize the value of health or hunger that makes us realize the blessings of satiety.Motahhari says in this regard that ugliness has the greatest right over beauties. If it were not ugly, beauty would not have manifested and flourished, and beauty has taken its meaning from ugliness (Motahhari 1983: 154).

In fact, many charities are obtained for us by evil. In other words, some evil are the prelude to the acquisition of charity, and it is with the occurrence of that evil that we achieve or realize charity, and more seriously in order to preserve it. For example, unless there is a disease, we do not realize the importance of health.So, although the villains may seem harmful in appearance, they will either turn us to charity to try to pay more attention to their preservation, or it will lead us to newer charities. A bomb blast in the mountains for mining may kill a number of nearby animals and insects, such as ants, but ultimately give humans access to a mine of reserves that can meet the needs of many humans in some dimensions.

Ross says: "If there was no possibility of sin in the moral realm in order to overcome it, 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.Similarly, in the field of aesthetics, one should not judge the whole by looking at a small part of it. Looking at a painting, it may seem that a pile of colors are ugly and meaninglessly put together, as well as in music. A particular instrument may be an earplug alone, but its existence is necessary for overall harmony" (Ross 1984: 104).

St.Augustine considers the existence of evil to be essential to the ultimate good, and believes that ultimate good can be achieved through evil, and that if there was no original sin, Christ's salvation would have no meaning. On the other hand,

St.Augustine with this solution, the evil seeks to explain the moral evil and considers them necessary in order to achieve the highest good and understand the divine path.

4.3. Evil is Few and Good is Great: 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 charity.

2 .These good deeds are superior and greater than the evil ones.

3 .It is not possible to create another alternative good in the absence of evil or with the occurrence of smaller evil (Wainwright 1999: 75).

Evil will thus serve the interests of human beings. John Hick has stated that this world, with all its evil and misfortunes, ultimately contains a remarkable good, and that is the fact that the world is a valley of soul-building and self-training. (Hick 2010: 323).

St.Augustine believes that although evil in the world of creation is caused by the evil will of man in various areas of dealing with things, but it should be noted that the evil of this world is always much less than its charity and is not comparable to charity at all.In this world, charity is maximum and evil is minimal, and small evil should not be preferred over large good, and this is due to the disbelief and ingratitude of people who do not see the existence of maximum charity until faced with hardship and suffering

4.4. Evil is Necessary for a Good System: In dealing with the problem of evil, thinkers fall into two categories; some, such as Plato, St.Augustine, Leibniz and all Islamic philosophers, have tried to make the problem of evil a violation of the attributes of God by recognizing the existing system and providing logical solutions and arguments.On the other hand, people like J.L. Mackey and William Rowe, and others, see the issue of evil in conflict with the good system of the world and the divine attributes, and believe that despite this evil, it seems unlikely that God is benevolent, There should be a just and wise person who is the creator of a good system.

Proponents of this theory believe that evil is necessary for the realization of charity and the acquisition of them, because although evil is many and great in relation to itself, but when we compare them with the total charity of the material world,

its ratio will be very low; It is true that evil is always expressed in a minimal way, and this minimal aspect of it is also necessary for achieving good.

St.Augustine considers the universe to be a benevolent system that is full of goodness and is so full of goodness that there is no room for evil left by God. He says that there is no evil for you and even in general. The created world, in its totality, is no evil (St.Augustine 2006: 13).From St.Augustine's point of view, a world that has autonomous beings and also contains evil is better than a world that has no evil and no authority in it.Explaining St.Augustine's view, Plantinga says that the benevolent God did not refrain from creating even creatures that he already knew would sin, and did not deprive them of the power to commit sin. A rebellious horse is better than a boulder that does not rebel because of lack of mobility and perception. By the same token, creatures who commit sin voluntarily are far superior to creatures who are unable to commit sin due to lack of freedom and authority (Plantinga 1995: 199).

John Hick says that St.Augustine's world is a work of art and a beautiful and orderly collection, and all its parts share in creating its beauty, and we can not separate the elements that make up the world because it damages its order, beauty and perfection. Everything in the world has a role in its beauty; therefore, the evil in the world also affect its beauty.St.Augustine goes even further and sees hell as the place of punishment for sinners as part of this beauty (Nooshabadi 2017: 145).

St.Augustine believes that the existing world has taken on the best possible state and is a system in which there is no disturbance and has taken on the best state and situation, and that evil is an integral part of this world, without which this world would no longer be a system. It will not be 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.

4.5. 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.We must note that relativity is opposite to the truth. Also, the conditions and situation of time indicate the relativity of evil, 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.

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 cause, Will repel it and this is contrary to the assumption; therefore, the evil of an object for non-self is its cause and effect (Amoli 1995: 157).

In the theory of the relativity of evil, St.Augustine has emphasized on the order, beauty and harmony of the universe. If something is considered evil, it is relative and in relation to the totality of things and in the whole world, if it is considered, it is not evil (Ilkhani 2011: 108). According to St.Augustine, every evil is good in comparison with the whole system of existence, and when we look at things from our limited point of view, we consider them evil and do not realize their value in the universe and unknowingly consider them evil while that this can be comparable, that is, it is good for one person and evil for another, and while evil is really something that is "the imaginary extinct of existence", that is, "nothingness is present".

The relativity of evil has two meanings in St.Augustine's thought; the first meaning is that the object may be evil for one person and the same object may be good for another.He says that if we look at the components of the universe separately, we will consider their incompatibilities with others as evil. This is while they are in harmony with others and are therefore good, but in fact they are in themselves, they are good to themselves and to themselves (St.Augustine 2006: 216). Another meaning is that objects are considered good in comparison with the whole universe. St.Augustine says that when I looked at objects well, I found two different kinds of beauty; 1.The beauty of an object when it is considered alone and in its entirety 2. The beauty of the proper fit between independent objects is like the proper balance between the whole body and each of its components (ibid. 130).St.Augustine does not accept the absoluteness of evil, and believes that an object can be both good and evil in various ways, and if considered in relation to the whole universe, will be nothing but good.

4.2. Hick: Hick believes that although in appearance it is possible that the existence of evil is incompatible with the existence of God Almighty and His attributes, or that it challenges the goodness of the system of existence, but when we rea-

lize the truth of evil, not only does it contradict existence. We do not see God and the good system, but rather we realize the existence of God and understand the goodness of this world. He has stated these solutions in order to solve the evil problem;

4.2.1. Evil is Necessary for Charity: One of the solutions to the problem of evil that many religious thinkers have stated is that it is necessary to understand charity. Based on this solution, we sometimes realize the goodness of some phenomena through evil, and by realizing them, we try to protect and fortify them as much as possible. For example, disease is a kind of evil by which we realize the importance and value of health or hunger that makes us realize the blessings of satiety.

Many charities are obtained for us by evil. In other words, some evil are the prelude to the acquisition of charities, and it is with the occurrence of that evil that we attain or notice the charities, and we strive more seriously to preserve those charities. For example, we do not realize the importance of health until there is no disease, or we do not realize the importance of security and tranquility unless it threatens our danger and insecurity. So, although evil may seem harmful in appearance, they will either turn us to charity to try to pay more attention to it or lead us to newer charities. Mining a mine blast may kill a number of nearby animals and insects, such as ants, but it will eventually lead to a mine of reserves that can meet the needs of many people.

Taliafro says:"By experiencing evil, we realize the nature of good and fully appreciate it. Good without evil is neither known nor its value will be known. This approach can also be called the theory of divine justice of the great good. By believing in this theory, theists believe in the all-encompassing dimensions of the universe, which they believe are truly good; They cling to it, in addition to arguing that these good deeds are either a condition for the existence of some evil people or the realization of these good deeds requires some evil people". (Taliafro 2003: 500)

Hick 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 all good for us, and we may be unaware of its nature.The same trend continues in the universe, and natural phenomena, although seemingly harmful to nature and to ourselves, but

the benefits of that natural evil far outweigh the harms to us humans and nature itself.

Hick believes that the existence of evil is necessary for the acquisition of charity, and one of the areas in which evil causes the acquisition of good is that evil cultivates the spirit and spirituality in people and as a result elevates them to a much higher human level. And it is difficult to find the ground for excellence for anything.

From John Hick's point of view, evil does not exist without reason because all evil people pursue a goal. He believes that God allows evil to create greater good. (Peterson 2014: 98)

Hick also says about the charities caused by natural evil, if we remove suffering from the world, human activities and efforts to alleviate suffering and natural disasters, and on the other hand, learning techniques and skills and creating and spreading civilization and culture to the principles and will lose the rules of trend and cooperation and mutual support.In this case, the human race will have harmless and innocent people and airs, but ineffective and unmotivated, human beings without identity and personality, devoid of dignity and greatness, and having human responsibility and policy, in a dreamy, pleasant world. (Hick 2007: 307)

Therefore, from Hick's point of view, the existence of evil is a necessary thing in order to know and acquire charity.

4.2.2. Epistemological Distance: In order to explain and solve the problem of moral evil, Hick uses a solution called epistemological distance, which links the creation of moral evil by man to his distance from God, who will be less able because he is far from God, who is absolute good. If he gains good, he will inevitably suffer evil. In defining the epistemological distance, Hick says that the epistemic distance refers to the distance that exists between God and provides man with the possibility of freedom and independence from God. (Hick 2007: 281).

Hick believes that the starting point of man's epistemological distance from God is when God blew his spirit into man and turned away from God, widening the gap by immersing himself in the concerns of material and worldly life. And this epistemological distance causes man to commit sin because man is far from God; that it is far from good and all that is good, and as a result, it suffers from evil.

Hick puts man at an epistemological distance from God. The result of this effective tool in maintaining man's epistemological distance from God is the emergence of the intelligent man as the axis of creation. Therefore, man's spiritual position in the distance of knowledge from God makes him inevitably to organize his life apart from God and put himself at the center of competition with his peers.This central self naturally appears in the developmental nature of individuals and is considered a moral evil that one finds in oneself (Parsa et al. 2019: 52).

Hick believes that this world has less color and smell than God than the world of the hereafter, and that is why God has given man will and authority, and because man does not follow the divine commands as much as he should, and his will used in inappropriate matters; It causes him to turn away from God and as a result create evil. Hick has used this strategy to justify moral evil.

4.2.3. Evil is Relative: Another evil solution is to consider it relative. According to this theory, evil is a relative thing and may be a phenomenon of evil for some people and the same phenomenon may seem good to others, and we should note that relativity is opposite to 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.

Evil are of two kinds: evil that are non-existent affairs and evil that are existential affairs and are bad because they are the source of a series of non-existent affairs. Evil that are non-existent, such as ignorance, helplessness, poverty, etc., are real but non-existent attributes, but existential evil are bad because they are the source of non-existent things, such as floods, earthquakes,ect, which are undoubtedly relative badness. (Sultanalgharaie et al 2012: 97)

John Hick emphasizes that evil are relative and in contrast to each other accepting a description of being worse. He explains that even if God eliminates all the evil that we think are the worst, it is because the relatives are evil. Any evil that remains will accept the same prominent title. (Hosseini et al. 2017: 57)

4.2.4. Evil is Compensated in the Other World: This world, with its limitations, cannot be fully accountable for the creation of justice among human beings, and on the other hand, to please the pious and punish the transgressors.Some human beings from the beginning of life to the end of life are always in sufferings and hard-

ships that are incomprehensible to many others, and if their hardships are not answe-red with a proper reward in this world; This does not mean that they will be deprived of the administration of true justice, but that the limitations of the present world pre-vent the full administration of justice.And God will bring true justice in the here-after, and although aspects of it will take place in this world. If a person in this world always struggles with problems and hardships such as poverty, slavery, suffering and similar bitterness and has not yet achieved his right, or according to religious propositions, God will answer and reward in the hereafter. He will give her hard-ships because many evil are the punishment of deeds. On the other hand, God will punish other people who oppress others.

In response to the question of endless suffering, Hick points to their mysteri-ous nature and states that behind this evil is so great that this world does not have the capacity to bestow it on man, and that there must be a world separate from material features. This is the world so that it can be accountable to man for receiving great good. And this great good is in exchange for the sufferings and hardships of man in this worldly life, in which the conditions for receiving this goodness are not possible for man in this world, and God will benefit man in this world in the hereafter.

Hick believes that every hardship that man has endured in this worldly life; In the hereafter, it will be answered with a great reward, and no hardship will befall man in this world. Unless he shares in the final plan of God, and all this will happen if we believe in the pure and absolute goodness of God and His omnipotent will (Hick, 1989, 388).

3. *Evaluation and Conclusion*

The problem of evil is one of the problems that has caused a lot of confusion among human beings from the distant past. In this regard and in order to remove the confusion of human beings in different religions and sects in different parts of the world, thinkers and philosophers have thought and explored and provided solutions in this regard and have tried to explain this issue logically and comprehensibly.

St.Augustine and John Hick are among the thinkers who have studied and ar-gued about this. The theories of these two great thinkers, although similar to each ot-her, also have differences. St.Augustine was one of the first to consider evil in Chris-

tian theology as a non-existent thing that has no primary cause, but is a kind of lack of goodness and perfection in the existence of an object. He believes that God is the absolute good and always wants the good of His servants; Therefore, evil is not issued from Him in any way, and also evil is not created in the world by Himself, but human beings cause evil in the world of creation by abusing their free will. John Hick, on the other hand, believes that the existence of evil in the universe cannot be denied. He considers the reason for this theory as providing a solution to solve the problem of evil and states that in the absence of evil, providing a solution to solve the problem of evil does not seem logical and the existence of evil solutions indicates the existence of evil in the world. Believing that there are evil in the world, like St.Augustine, states that the existence of these evil in the universe does not interfere with the goodness of the system of creation.Because nothing but good is issued from God, and the existence of this evil in the system of creation is very small compared to the existing good deeds, which, in addition to being few evil, provide the ground for achieving more good deeds.St.Augustine considers the free will of man as the main cause of the existence of evil in the world and believes that man creates evil in the world of creation due to misuse and abuse of his will and free will. St.Augustine believes that this moral evil caused evil in the world. And that was disobedience to the divine command and eating the forbidden fruit, and the starting point of moral evil should be considered important, which also appeared in the sequence of that natural evil. John Hick, while accepting the involvement of human will in the emergence of evil, states that evil is one of the main components of this system and the existence of minimal evil in the world is necessary to help man gain knowledge about charity and the existence of God and believes that despite this evil is called the good creation of the world, because in dealing with the evil of the human will in the world, this goodness is manifested and man can realize it.

Both philosophers and great thinkers divide evil into two categories, natural and moral, but they differ in their explanation of these two types. St.Augustine believes that there is no natural evil in the world and that what causes natural evil is the will of the creature and his commission to sin. In fact, he considers moral evil as a human sin and natural evil as a punishment for which a person should taste natural evil and be punished for committing moral evil. At the same time, John Hick

believes that moral evil are those evil in which the human will plays a role, but in the case of natural evil, the human will has no role and natural evil cannot be punished for human beings. He also states that the harms of natural evil are negligible compared to its benefits. Both thinkers have come up with solutions to the evil problem; According to these solutions, both thinkers have expressed the relativity of evil as one of the solutions to this problem. They also consider both evil as necessary for gaining more charity as well as the existence of a good system and believe that the evil in the world are very small compared to its charity.

Among the solutions offered by St.Augustine, he considers the non-existence of evil as one of the solutions to this problem, while John Hick considers the existence of a solution to something non-existent far from the mind, and he also considers the distance of epistemological and compensation for evil. Considers the solutions to the problem of evil, which are not mentioned in the works of St. St.Augustine.

Finally, both thinkers believe that although the existence of evil may seem contradictory to the divine attributes and goodness of the system of creation, but with a little care and reflection on this, it can be easily understood that the existence of evil not only does not contradict the divine attributes and there is no goodness in the system of creation.And even with the correct understanding of evil and gaining the necessary knowledge in this regard, as well as according to the solutions provided by these two thinkers and other thinkers in different religions and sects, we can better understand the existence of God and His absolute goodness and understood this system and took advantage of the existence of a minimal evil to achieve many good deeds.

References

1. Bahrami, M. (2008). *Good and Evil in the Perspective of Allameh Tabatabai*, Quranic Studies Special Issue of Quran and Family, No. 48

2. Copleston, F. (2008). *History of Philosophy,* (Translated by Ebrahim Dadjoo), Tehran, Scientific and Cultural Publications

3. Hick, J. (2005). *Pink on Faceless*, (translated by Jalal Tavaklian), Madrese Journal, No. 2

4. Hick, J. (1989). *An Interpretation of Religion,* London, Macmillan

5. Hick, J (2003). *Philosophy of Religion*, (Translated by Bahram Rad), Tehran, Al-Huda Publications

6. Hick,J. (2007). *Philips on God and Evil,Religious Studies*, Cambridge University

7. Hick, J. (2010). *Evil and the God of Love*, New York. Plagrave Macmillan

8. Hosseini, Z., Atashgar., K, Nazarnejad. (2017). *The Problem of Evil from the Viewpoint of John Hick, Islamic Studies of Philosophy and Theology*, Forty-Eighth Year, No. 96

9. Hosseini Eskandian, A., & RajabNezhadian, M. (2020). *Evil Thought and Its Approaches with an Emphasis on Swinburne Theodicy of Divine Justice*, Metafizika Journal, 2020, 3(No4)

10. Ilkhani, M. (2011). *History of Philosophy in the Middle Ages and Renaissance, Tehran,* Organization for the Study and Compilation of University Humanities Books

11. Javadi Amoli, A. (1995). *Rahiq Makhtoum*, Tehran, Esra Publishing Center

12. Khalili Nooshabadi, A. (2017). *God of Love and the Problem of Evil*, Qom, Taha Cultural Institute

13. Khedri, GH. (2015). A*nalysis of the Perceptual Evil Problem from Mulla Sadra's Perspective*, Hekmat Sadraei Scientific Quarterly, Second Year, Second Issue

14. Mohammad Rezaei, M. RostaeiPatpeh, L. (2018). *A Study and Critique of Evil and Its Relationship with God from the Perspective of John Hick*, St.Augustine and Theodice Irenaeus (with emphasis on the book Evil and the God of Love by John Hick), Ghabsat,Year 23

15. Mojtahedi, K. (1997). *Philosophy in the Middle Ages,* Tehran, Amirkabir Publications

16. Moradi, A, Sefidkhosh, M. (2015). *The problematic position of free will and divine grace in St.Augustine's account of the problem of evil*, Quarterly Journal of Islamic Philosophy and Theology, Ayene Marefat, Shahid Beheshti University, Year 11

17. Motahari, M. (1983). *Divine Justice*, Tehran, Sadra Publications, first edition

18. Parsa, A. (2019). *Solving the Logical Problem of Evil from the Perspective of Shahid Motahhari and John Hick*, Hekmat Sadraei Quarterly, Year 7, Issue 2

19. Peterson, M. (2014). *God and Evil*, (translated by Rostam Shah Mohammadi), Semnan, Semnan University

20. Plantinga, A. (1995). *Philosophical Theology*, (translated by Ebrahim Soltani and Ahmad Naraghi), Tehran, Sarat Publications, first edition

21. Ross.GM. (1984). *Leibniz*, Great Britian, Oxford, Oxford University Press

22. St.Augustine, A. (2006). *Confessions*, (translated by Afsaneh Nejati), (second edition). Tehran, Payame Noor

23. Sultanalgharaie, Kl, Atashi, H,.Elmi, Z. (2011). *A Study and Comparison of Evil from the Perspective of St.Augustine and Ibn Sina*, Journal of Philosophical Research, University of Tabriz, Year 5, Issue 9

24. Swinburne, R. (2002). *Is There a God? (*Translated by Mohammad Javadan), Qom, Mofid Publishing Institute

25. Taliafro, Ch. (2003). *Philosophy of Religion in the Twentieth Century*, (translated by Insha'Allah Rahmati), Tehran, Suhrawardi Research and Publication Office

26. Wainwright, WG. (1999). *Philosophy of Religion*, (Second edition)Belmont. C.A:Wadsworth Publishing Company

Др. Абдуллах Хусейни Эскандиан
Др. Масуме Реджеп Нежадиан
Сравнительное исследование проблемы зла в философии
Августина Аврелия и Джона Хика
(резюме)

Проблема зла всегда была одной из самых важных тем в сознании людей на протяжении всей истории человечества и вызывала множество вопросов и сомнений у последователей различных религий и сект. По этой причине многие мыслители и философы подробно исследовали этот вопрос.

Августин Аврелий утверждает, что зло не существует самостоятельно, но что человек не использует добро должным образом, в мире происходят различные бедствия и зло.

В то же время Джон Хик отрицает существование зла и полагает, что зло - неотъемлемая часть мира. Таким образом, существование зла - это не парадокс с божественными атрибутами и существованием самой совершенной системы. Исследование и сравнение взглядов Августина Аврелия и Джона Хика на зло - тема, которая прояснит их идеи и стратегии для современного человека. Это ответит на некоторые сомнения сегодняшнего человека, а также прояснит различия в мышлении этих двух великих мыслителей.

В данной статье описательно-аналитическим методом сначала исследуется зло, существующее в природе, и его сущность с точки зрения Августина и Хика, затем определяя типы зла и, наконец, формулируя решения зла сравнивались взгляды этих двух мыслителей.

Несмотря на разногласия Августина и Хика по поводу зла, они верят, что существование зла не противоречит божественным атрибутам и самой совершенной структуре. По их словам, приобретая необходимые знания по данному вопросу, мы можем понять необходимость существования зла в системе творения.

Ключевые слова: *Зло, Августин Аврелий, Джон Хик, Бог, Самая совершенная система.*

Dr. Abdullah Hüseyni Eskandian
Dr. Məsumə Rəcəb Nejadian
Avqustin Avreli və Con Hick fəlsəfəsindəki şər probleminin müqayisəli tədqiqi
(xülasə)

Şər məsələsi, bəşər tarixi boyu həmişə insanların düşüncəsini məşğul edən və fərqli din və məzhəblərin davamçıları arasında bir çox sual və şübhələrə səbəb olan ən vacib mövzulardan biridir. Bu səbəbdən bir çox mütəfəkkir və filosof bu məsələni ətraflı araşdırmışdır.

Avqustin Avreli, şərin müstəqil olaraq mövcud olmadığını, lakin insanın yaxşılıqlardan lazımlı şəkildə istifadə etməməsi, dünyada müxtəlif şər və pislikləri formalaşdırır.

Eyni zamanda, Con Hick isə, şərin varlığının olmamasını inkar edir və şərin olmasını dünyanın ayrılmaz bir hissəsi olduğuna inanır. Ona görə, şərin olması ilahi atributlar və ən mükəmməl sistemin olması ilə heç bir paradox təşkil etmir. Avqustin Avreli və Con Hikin şər haqqında fikirlərini araşdırmaq və müqayisə etmək, müasir insan üçün fikirlərini və strategiyalarını aydınlaşdıracaq bir mövzudur. Hazırkı insanın bəzi şübhələrinə cavab verəcək və həm də bu iki böyük mütəfəkkirin düşüncə fərqləri aydınlaşmış olacaq.

Bu məqalədə təsviri-analitik metodla ilk öncə Avqustin və Hik nöqteyi-nəzərindən təbiətdə mövcud olan şər və onların mahiyyətləri araşdırılır, sonra mövzu şərin növlərini ifadə etməklə və nəhayət şərin həll yollarını ifadə etməklə və bu iki mütəfəkkirin bu barədə fikirləri müqayisə edilmişdir. Avqustin və Hikin şər haqqında fikir ayrılıqlarına baxmayaraq, şərin varlığının ilahi atributlara və ən mükəmməl quruluşa zidd olmadığına inanırlar. Onlara görə, bu mövzuda lazımı bilikləri əldə edərək yaradılış sistemində şərin varlığının zəruriliyini başa düşə bilərik.

Açar sözlər: Şər, Avqustin Avreli, Con Hik, Tanrı, Ən mükəmməl sistem