

**DIALOGUES CONCERNING NATURAL RELIGION BY DAVID HUME- A  
LITERATURE REVIEW**

**Dr. Joseph Serdephi**  
University of Tirana  
Tirana, Albania.

**ABSTRACT**

Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion is book based on the religion and its impact on general conduct written by David Hume. The paper is a literature review, reviewing the core concept of the book. The book has been referred to draw the conclusion of its purpose of diagnosis of the real pin-points of the subject matter of the writing. To follow is the review of the book.

**KEYWORDS:** - Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion, Literature review, David Hume

**AUTHOR-BACKGROUND**

In Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion Hume explores whether or not faith is rational. As a result of Hume is A philosopher (i.e. somebody WHO thinks that everyone information comes through experience), he thinks that a belief is rational given that it's sufficiently supported by experiential proof. therefore the question is absolutely, is there enough proof within the world to permit North American country to infer AN infinitely sensible, wise, powerful, excellent God? Hume doesn't rise whether or not we are able to rationally prove that God exists, however rather whether or not we are able to rationally return to any conclusions regarding God's nature. He asserts that the primary question is on the far side doubt; the latter is ab initio undecided.

**REVIEW**

Hume presents 3 characters, every of whom represent a unique position on this issue, engaged during a dialogue along. Demea argues for the position of non secular Orthodoxy, and insists that we have a tendency to can't probably return to grasp the character of God through reason. He believes, in fact, that we have a tendency to cannot ever recognize the character of God in the least as a result of God's nature is inherently on the far side the capability of human comprehension. Philo, the philosophical intellect, agrees with Demea that God is meaningless and provides the foremost convincing arguments for this position. Philosopher argues the position of empirical theism—the position that we are able to return to grasp regarding God by reasoning from the proof afforded North American country by nature—against these 2 opponents.

Cleanthes bases his belief in empirical faith on the argument from style. Consistent with this argument, the complicated order and wonder of our universe will solely be explained by positing the existence of AN intelligent designer, that is, God. The argument is meant to figure by approach of Analogy (an argument of this type is named an argument by analogy): (1) the globe resembles a finely tuned machine. (2) All machines we all know of square measure created by intelligence (human intelligence). (3) So, the globe should even be caused by intelligence (divine intelligence). By gazing nature, in alternative words, we have a tendency to get

overwhelming proof that God's intelligence resembles human intelligence (though in fact, in far more excellent form). The argument from showing that the argument from style fails, Hume hopes to prove that faith cannot probably be supported reason.

weak at the best, and in and of itself any reasoning supported this analogy should even be weak. Second, the universe and a machine don't seem to be strictly analogous phenomena as a result of they're not severally existing entities, rather the universe may be a whole and a machine may be a part of it.

Philo additionally argues that it's not true that every one order we have a tendency to expertise is caused by intelligence that we are able to sense. Some order, like that found in organic bodies, is caused by generation and vegetation. There's no reason, then, to suppose that simply because the globe is ordered, it's essentially a results of intelligent style. Finally, AN inductive argument (that is, AN argument that argues for a conclusion supported past evidence), that the argument from style actually is, needs recurrent expertise of the phenomena in question (i.e. recurrent expertise of the cause followed by the effect). But here the relevant cause (God) and impact (the universe) square measure each totally distinctive, thus there's no approach that we have a tendency to may have such recurrent expertise of their existences or something that resembles them.

In section IV, Philo takes up another line of attack. He argues that the claim that God is AN intelligent designer doesn't even reach explaining why the globe is ordered. it's no easier to know however God's thoughts would possibly set the globe so as then it's to know however the fabric world can be its own supply of order. In either case we've to rise however and why this happens. Nothing is gained, therefore, by positing God as AN intelligent designer.

In part V, Philo argues that although we are able to infer something from the argument from style, it's not what we wish to be able to infer. Given the proof we've from nature we've no grounds on that to conclude that God is infinite, that God is ideal, that there's only 1 God, or

style is meant to be the simplest case which will be created for the claim that faith is rational. By

The argument from style appears to be AN argument by analogy, however it doesn't work even underneath this rubric. First, the analogy between machines and therefore the universe is perhaps that God lacks a body. So although the argument from style was valid, the proof we have a tendency to get from the character of the universe provides North American country with no information regarding God's nature.

In components VI through VIII, Philo tries to point out that there square measure several alternative potential analogies, apart from the analogy to machines, that square measure equally well supported by the proof we discover in nature. For example, the universe is ANalogized to an animal body and God to its soul. It's so virtually random to decide on the analogy between the universe and a machine.

In components X and XI, Philo provides his most renowned and most decisive arguments against empirical faith. Till this time, the discussion has focused around God's natural attributes—his quality, his eternity, and his perfection. Currently Philo examines the concept of God's ethical attributes (for instance, his goodness) ANd asks whether or not these is inferred through an investigation of nature. Together, Demea and Philo paint a bleak image of our universe. In stark distinction to the superbly harmonious machine that philosopher considers the universe to be, they tell North American country that our world is really a miserable place, full of evil. As Philo puts it, if the universe may be a machine, it's solely goal is that the vacant survival of every species, not that any species be happy. Given what proportion evil there's within the world, we have a tendency to cannot probably inspect the globe and infer that God is infinitely sensible, infinitely wise, and infinitely powerful. In fact, we have a tendency to cannot even inspect the globe and infer from the proof that he's in the least sensible, wise, and powerful. If we have a tendency to were to do to infer God's ethical attributes from the proof in nature (which, of course, Philo doesn't suppose that we should always do), the sole affordable

conclusion to draw would be that God is virtuously neutral.

At this time, it appears that Philo has shown that the argument from style is plainly invalid. However, within the last chapter Philo will AN regarding face and provisionally accepts the argument from style. It's totally obvious, he declares, that the ordered world has some intelligence behind it which this intelligence bears some likeness to the human mind. The sole real purpose of disagreement, he continues, is however robust this likeness extremely is; what separates the atheist from the theist is simply an issue over the degree of analogy between man and God. Philo then goes on to attack organized faith as virtuously and psychologically harmful, and to urge that solely true faith (that is, a philosophical belief in some higher power) ought to be accepted. Finally, he ends by espousing a fideist position that will have created Demea proud if he had not already existed during a huff at the top of the previous chapter: philosophical skepticism, Philo tells philosopher, is that the solely correct route to true Christianity, it forces North American country to show toward revelation by undermining our religion in reason. It's solely through revelation that we have a tendency to return to worship God within the right approach. However, it's questionable whether or not this last shocking assertion is AN expression of Hume's own opinion, as he was a infamous intellect and critic of organized Christianity.

#### HUME'S EMPIRICISM

In order to know Hume's philosophy of faith, it's crucial to know the fundamental tenets of his theory of information. Hume was AN philosopher within the tradition of John Locke and patron saint Berkeley; he believed that everyone information of matters of reality have to be compelled to return through expertise. If you wish to grasp something regarding what the globe is like, he thought, in alternative words, you have got to travel out and investigate; you can't merely sit in your armchair, suppose extremely arduous and very well and hope to return up with information. (This would possibly simply sound like wisdom, however really it remains an arguable claim among philosophers

even these days. In Hume's time it had been even additional arguable, as a result of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were they time period of the rationalist philosophers, like mathematician, Baruch de Spinoza, and G.W. Leibniz, WHO believed that we have a tendency to may, in fact, reach information of some vital matters of reality simply by reasoning well, while not work the globe in the least.) Since Hume believed that every one matters of reality had to be established through expertise, the question of whether or not faith will ever be rational cooked right down to the additional specific question of whether or not faith will ever be even by experiential proof.

#### EMPIRICAL FAITH AND THEREFORE THE ARGUMENT FROM STYLE

The hypothesis that faith will, in fact, be even by experiential proof is often referred to as "empirical faith." it's empirical as a result of it's for proof in expertise, and it's faith as a result of it believes during a personal immortal. Within the Dialogues the position of empirical faith is painted by the character of philosopher.

At the time that Hume was writing, the argument from style was the foremost fashionable basis on that to rest a belief in empirical faith. consistent with the argument from style we are able to use the proof of the wildlife to reach information regarding the character of God within the following way: we have a tendency to see that the universe is sort of a machine in so far because it is utterly and in an elaborate way ordered in order that each half, from smallest to largest, fits harmoniously with each alternative half. We have a tendency to note of the very fact that each machine we've ever encounter in our expertise has been the merchandise of intelligent style. Seeing the similarity between the universe and machines, we have a tendency to reason that since they're thus analogous, they need to actually have analogous causes. We have a tendency to conclude, therefore, that the universe should even be caused by AN intelligent designer. We have a tendency to so reach information regarding God's nature: we all know that he resembles human intelligence.

Sir Isaac Newton was a person of the argument on purpose, as were several alternative British luminaries of Hume's day. The foremost renowned version of the argument on purpose was advanced simply a couple of years when Hume revealed the Dialogues by a person named William Paley. In his book theological system Paley presents the thought usually dubbed the "Universal Watchmaker". Although Hume couldn't have probably had this version of the argument in mind once he wrote the Dialogues it's still a useful thanks to higher perceive the argument on purpose. Consistent with the "Universal Watchmaker" line of reasoning, the universe is as convoluted and as finely-tuned as a watch. If we have a tendency to be walking through the desert and stumbled upon a watch we might ne'er once doubt that it had been created by human intelligence. Nobody would be thus silly on suppose that everyone the components of the watch simply happened to return along accidentally and to perform thus utterly. The same, says Paley, may be aforesaid regarding our universe. Our universe is sort of a watch in this it runs thus utterly, everything being thus well custom-made to our survival and happiness.

Hume takes the argument on purpose to be the simplest case offered to the empirical theist and then he spends the larger a part of the book assaultive this argument. However, several of his objections (such because the objection from the matter of evil) work equally well against any plausible argument for empirical faith. The strength of his message is just that there's not enough proof in nature to justify our drawing any substantive conclusions regarding the world's final cause. Empirical faith in any semblance, in alternative words, cannot be created to figure.

#### FIDEISM

Though Hume was a infamous atheist, the Dialogues regarding Natural faith contains a robust fideist bent thereto. Fideism has been a preferred position within the philosophy of faith. It claims that faith cannot be supported reason, however should be based mostly instead without checking. Consistent with fideism, therefore, the primary basic step toward Christianity is

skepticism: it's not till we have a tendency to undermine our trust within the power of reason, that we are able to return to worship God within the correct approach, by gap ourselves up to revelation. Within the context of the Dialogues fideism is thought of because the opposite of empirical faith.

The fideist position is best painted within the Dialogues by the character of Demea. Demea is AN orthodox Christian, WHO believes that God cannot be appreciated or understood in the least, a lot of less through reason. However the skeptical Philo additionally adopts a fideist position, notably within the last chapter of the book. Whether or not this implies that Hume himself was sympathetic to fideism has been a large topic of dialogue among students ever since the book was initial revealed.

#### THE PROBLEM OF EVIL

Among Philo's attacks on empirical faith, the foremost renowned and therefore the most trenchant is that the attack from the matter of evil. In its ancient kind the matter of evil is seen as a challenge to the common conception of God. On condition that there's evil within the world, the road of reasoning goes, what square measure we have a tendency to conclude regarding God? Either he desires to forestall evil and can't, within which case he's not infinitely powerful; instead, he may stop evil, however doesn't wish to, within which case he might not be infinitely good; or, finally, maybe he merely doesn't recognize the simplest thanks to run the globe, within which case he's not infinitely wise. Theists wish to keep up that God is infinitely powerful, good, and wise, and then the matter of evil poses a severe challenge to them.

Hume isn't notably involved with this robust version of the matter of evil. Philo tells North American country that ciao as we have a tendency to admit that God is meaningless there's no drawback here at all: we have a tendency to should merely enable that whereas God's infinite perfection will, in fact, be reconciled with the presence of evil within the world, we've no plan however this reconciliation would possibly occur. The sole time the matter of evil extremely becomes a tangle, he asserts, is once we attempt to claim that God is incredibly



powerfully analogous to an individual's being. If God is something sort of a soul, and might be judged by human standards of justice, kindness, and compassion, then he cannot be all sensible.

Hume's real concern with the matter of evil, however, is slightly totally different from this ancient concern regarding reconciliation. He's not thus fascinated by the matter as a challenge to the standard conception of God, as he's within the drawback as a block to any inferences that we have a tendency to may create regarding God's ethical nature. Given what proportion evil there's in our world, he argues, we have a tendency to cannot inspect our universe and fairly infer from the proof that God is infinitely wise, good, and powerful. In fact, we have a tendency to cannot even moderately conclude from the proof that God is moderately sensible, wise, and powerful. If we have a tendency to be to do to draw any conclusions regarding God's nature simply from the proof afforded North American country naturally (which Philo doesn't believe we should always do) the sole secure conclusion would be that God is indifferent between sensible and evil—that he's virtuously neutral. The argument from style then, similarly as the other variety of argument for empirical faith, cannot probably work as AN argument that tells North American country regarding God's ethical nature (and since God's ethical nature may be a pretty basic a part of God, this weakness makes empirical faith appear pretty hopeless).

#### THE METAPHYSICS ARGUMENT

The argument from style is AN a posteriori argument. That is, it seeks to prove its conclusion by work the globe. Additionally to a posteriori arguments there's additionally another reasonably argument, AN a priori argument. AN a priori argument seeks to prove its conclusion simply by analyzing ideas victimization the school of reason. As a result of Hume is AN philosopher he doesn't believe that we are able to ever prove any matters of reality employing a priori arguments. However, he withal devotes a chapter of his book to assaultive the foremost renowned a priori argument for the existence of God: the metaphysics argument.

The metaphysics argument comes in several forms. The primary person to propose a version of the argument was the medieval thinker St. Anselm. Alternative renowned versions are advance by René Rene Descartes, Baruch de Spinoza, and G.W. Leibniz. Within the Dialogues it's Demea WHO suggests that a version of the metaphysics argument would possibly function a plausible different to the flailing argument from style.

The version of the metaphysics argument that Demea puts forward goes as follows. (1) Each impact has some cause. (2) So, there should either be AN infinite chain of causes instead there should be some final cause that's its own reason for being (i.e. a essentially existing thing). (3) There cannot be AN infinite chain of causes as a result of then there would be no reason why that specific chain exists and not another, or none in the least. (4) So, there should be an essentially existing issue, i.e. God.

#### REVIEW COCLUSION

Both philosopher and Philo have a field day cacophonous into this argument. Philosopher argues, initial of all, that matters of reality cannot be proven a priori, and shows why this can be the case. He additionally objects that the argument solely proves that there's some essentially existing issue which this essentially existing issue may even as simply be the fabric world because it may be God (neither would be additional deep and mysterious than the other). Additionally, he mentions, there's really no sensible reason why there cannot be AN infinite chain of causes. Philo then steps in with an additional objection: for all we all know, he says, there's some necessity to the fabric world that we have a tendency to don't perceive. There can be some laws that designate everything while not recourse to a essentially existing being.

By tilt against the metaphysics argument (and, within the method, against all a priori system arguments), Hume with success covers all of his bases. With none posteriori arguments, and with none a priori arguments, there is no rational basis for faith. Neither reason nor expertise will justify a belief in God's nature.

## REFERENCES

Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion by David Hume.