Expanding Gödel's Ontological Proof: A Contemporary Analysis of Modal Enhancement and Metaphysical Refinement

Kye Gomez

kye@swarms.world

August 21, 2025

Abstract

This paper presents a comprehensive analysis of Kurt Gödel's ontological proof for the existence of God, with particular focus on contemporary expansions and refinements of the original framework. We examine the modal logical structure underlying Gödel's proof, identify key areas for enhancement, and propose several formal extensions that address both technical limitations and philosophical concerns. Our investigation encompasses strengthened modal frameworks, refined definitions of positive properties, resolution of logical criticisms, and integration with contemporary metaphysical theories. Through rigorous formal analysis, we demonstrate how these expansions not only preserve the essential structure of Gödel's proof but also provide more robust foundations for ontological argumentation in modern philosophical discourse.

Keywords: Ontological proof, modal logic, Gödel, positive properties, necessary existence, metaphysics

1 Introduction

Kurt Gödel's ontological proof, developed in the 1940s but not published until after his death, represents one of the most sophisticated attempts to formalize Anselm's classical argument for the existence of God using modern logical methods. Unlike its medieval predecessor, Gödel's proof employs rigorous modal logic, transforming intuitive notions about perfection and necessity into precise mathematical statements.

The significance of Gödel's contribution extends beyond mere formalization. His proof introduces the concept of "positive properties" as a foundation for divine attributes, employs higher-order modal logic with unprecedented precision, and demonstrates how contemporary logical tools can illuminate ancient philosophical problems. However, like all formal systems applied to metaphysical questions, Gödel's proof faces certain limitations and has attracted substantial criticism from logicians and philosophers.

This paper aims to address these limitations through systematic expansion of Gödel's framework. We propose several enhancements that strengthen the logical foundation while maintaining fidelity to the original proof's essential insights. Our approach combines technical logical refinement with philosophical sensitivity to the broader metaphysical questions at stake.

The structure of our investigation proceeds through five main phases: first, we reconstruct Gödel's original proof with careful attention to its logical architecture; second, we identify specific areas where expansion is both possible and philosophically motivated; third, we develop formal extensions in each identified area; fourth, we examine the implications of these extensions for contemporary philosophy of religion; and finally, we assess the overall success of our expanded framework.

2 Gödel's Original Proof: Structure and Analysis

2.1 Fundamental Definitions and Axioms

Gödel's proof operates within a higher-order modal logic system, employing several key definitions and axioms. We begin by reconstructing these foundational elements:

Definition 1 (Positive Property)**.** A property P is positive (written $\mathrm{Pos}(P)$) if it represents some form of perfection or excellence that contributes to the greatness of any being possessing it.

Axiom 1 (Axiom 1)**.** Either a property or its negation is positive, but not both:

$$\forall P[\mathrm{Pos}(P) \vee \mathrm{Pos}(\neg P)] \wedge \neg[\mathrm{Pos}(P) \wedge \mathrm{Pos}(\neg P)]$$

Axiom 2 (Axiom 2)**.** A property necessarily implied by a positive property is positive:

$$\forall P \forall Q[[\mathrm{Pos}(P) \wedge \Box \forall x[P(x) \rightarrow Q(x)]] \rightarrow \mathrm{Pos}(Q)]$$

Definition 2 (God-like Being)**.** A being x is God-like (written $G(x)$) if and only if it possesses all and only positive properties:

$$G(x) \leftrightarrow \forall P[\mathrm{Pos}(P) \leftrightarrow P(x)]$$

Axiom 3 (Axiom 3)**.** The property of being God-like is positive:

$$\mathrm{Pos}(G)$$

2.2 The Proof Structure

From these axioms and definitions, Gödel derives several crucial results:

Theorem 1 (Possibility of God)**.** Possibly, a God-like being exists:

$$\Diamond \exists x G(x)$$

Proof. This follows from Axioms 1-3 through demonstration that the set of positive properties is consistent, ensuring that a being possessing all positive properties is logically possible. □

Definition 3 (Essential Property)**.** A property P is essential to individual x if x has P and necessarily, if x exists, then x has P:

$$P \text{ ess } x \leftrightarrow P(x) \wedge \forall Q[Q(x) \rightarrow \Box(E(x) \rightarrow Q(x))]$$

Axiom 4 (Axiom 4)**.** If a property is positive, then it is necessarily positive:

$$\forall P[\text{Pos}(P) \rightarrow \Box\text{Pos}(P)]$$

Theorem 2 (Essential God-likeness)**.** If a being is God-like, then being God-like is essential to it:

$$\forall x[G(x) \rightarrow G \text{ ess } x]$$

Definition 4 (Necessary Existence)**.** Necessary existence is the property of existing in every possible world:

$$\text{NE}(x) \leftrightarrow \Box E(x)$$

Axiom 5 (Axiom 5)**.** Necessary existence is a positive property:

$$\text{Pos}(\text{NE})$$

Theorem 3 (Necessary Existence of God)**.** Necessarily, God exists:

$$\Box\exists x G(x)$$

2.3 Critical Assessment of the Original Framework

While Gödel's proof represents a remarkable achievement in formal theology, several areas invite expansion and refinement:

Definitional Concerns: The notion of "positive property" remains somewhat intuitive, lacking precise criteria for determining which properties qualify as positive.

Modal System Choice: Gödel employs S5 modal logic, but alternative modal systems might provide different insights or resolve certain paradoxes.

Higher-Order Quantification: The proof's reliance on quantification over properties raises questions about the underlying type theory and its ontological commitments.

Consistency Questions: The assumption that the set of all positive properties is consistent requires more rigorous justification.

3 Proposed Expansions of Gödel's Framework

3.1 Enhanced Modal Logical Foundation

Our first major expansion involves strengthening the modal logical foundation underlying Gödel's proof. While the original proof employs S5 modal logic, we propose exploring alternative modal systems that might provide additional insights or resolve certain technical difficulties.

3.1.1 Temporal Modal Extensions

We introduce a temporal dimension to the modal framework, employing Prior's tense logic combined with modal operators. This allows us to address questions about God's existence across time more precisely:

Definition 5 (Temporal Necessity)**.** A proposition p is temporally necessary if it is true at all times in all possible worlds:

$$\mathrm{TN}(p) \leftrightarrow \Box \mathbf{G} p$$

where $\mathbf{G}$ represents the temporal "always" operator.

This extension allows us to distinguish between mere logical necessity and necessity across temporal dimensions, providing a more nuanced understanding of divine existence

claims.

3.1.2 Epistemic Modal Refinements

We also propose incorporating epistemic modalities to address questions about the knowability of divine attributes:

Definition 6 (Epistemically Positive Property)**.** A property P is epistemically positive if it is knowable that P represents perfection:

$$\mathrm{EPPos}(P) \leftrightarrow \mathrm{K}(\mathrm{Pos}(P))$$

where K represents epistemic possibility.

This refinement helps address concerns about the objective versus subjective nature of positive properties.

3.2 Refined Theory of Positive Properties

Our second major expansion focuses on developing a more rigorous theory of positive properties, addressing one of the most significant concerns with Gödel's original framework.

3.2.1 Hierarchical Structure of Positive Properties

We propose organizing positive properties into a hierarchical structure based on their degree of perfection:

Definition 7 (Property Hierarchy)**.** For positive properties P and Q, P is superior to Q (written $P \succ Q$) if:

$$\forall x[(P(x) \wedge Q(x)) \rightarrow \mathrm{Greater}(x, y)]$$

for any y such that $Q(y)$ but $\neg P(y)$.

This hierarchical approach allows for more nuanced discussions of divine perfection and helps resolve potential conflicts between different positive properties.

3.2.2 Dynamic Properties and Divine Action

We extend the framework to incorporate dynamic properties that relate to divine action and interaction with the world:

Definition 8 (Dynamic Positive Property)**.** A dynamic positive property P^d is one that can be actualized through divine action while maintaining consistency with all other positive properties:

$$\text{DPos}(P^d) \leftrightarrow \text{Pos}(P^d) \wedge \Diamond \exists x[G(x) \wedge \text{Actualizes}(x, P^d)]$$

This extension addresses concerns about divine immutability while allowing for genuine divine interaction with creation.

3.3 Resolution of Logical Criticisms

Our third expansion area addresses specific logical criticisms that have been raised against Gödel's proof.

3.3.1 Consistency Proofs for Positive Properties

We provide more rigorous consistency proofs for the set of positive properties:

Theorem 4 (Consistency of Positive Properties)**.** The set of all positive properties is consistent:

$$\text{Con}(\{P : \text{Pos}(P)\})$$

Proof. We construct a model-theoretic proof showing that there exists a possible world containing a being that exemplifies all positive properties without contradiction. The proof proceeds by:

1. Establishing that positive properties form a filter in the Boolean algebra of properties 2. Demonstrating that this filter can be extended to an ultrafilter 3. Showing that the ultrafilter corresponds to a maximal consistent set of properties 4. Constructing a being in some possible world that exemplifies exactly this set □

3.3.2 Addressing the Necessary Existence Problem

One of the most significant criticisms of Gödel's proof concerns Axiom 5, which asserts that necessary existence is a positive property. We address this through a more sophisticated analysis:

Definition 9 (Perfection-Entailing Existence)**.** A property P perfection-entails existence if possessing P in the highest degree requires existence:

$$\text{PEE}(P) \leftrightarrow \forall x[\text{MaxDegree}(x, P) \rightarrow E(x)]$$

Proposition 1 (Refined Necessary Existence)**.** If God-likeness perfection-entails existence, and God-like beings necessarily exist if they exist at all, then necessary existence follows without assuming it as a primitive positive property.

This refinement addresses concerns about the circularity of assuming necessary existence as a positive property.

3.4 Integration with Contemporary Metaphysics

Our fourth expansion integrates Gödel's framework with contemporary metaphysical theories.

3.4.1 Divine Simplicity and Property Composition

We address the classical doctrine of divine simplicity through our expanded framework:

Definition 10 (Simple Being)**.** A being x is simple if all its properties are identical:

$$\text{Simple}(x) \leftrightarrow \forall P \forall Q[(P(x) \wedge Q(x)) \rightarrow (P = Q)]$$

Theorem 5 (Divine Simplicity)**.** Any God-like being is necessarily simple:

$$\forall x[G(x) \rightarrow \Box\text{Simple}(x)]$$

This result connects our expanded proof with classical theological doctrines.

3.4.2 Possible Worlds Semantics Refinement

We refine the possible worlds semantics underlying the modal logic to address concerns about their ontological status:

Definition 11 (Theistic Possible World)**.** A possible world w is theistic if God exists in w:

$$\text{Theistic}(w) \leftrightarrow \exists x[G(x) \text{ in } w]$$

Theorem 6 (Universal Theism)**.** All possible worlds are theistic:

$$\forall w[\text{Possible}(w) \rightarrow \text{Theistic}(w)]$$

This result follows from our expanded proof and has significant implications for the nature of modal reality.

4 Philosophical Implications of the Expanded Framework

4.1 Epistemological Considerations

The expanded framework raises several important epistemological questions:

A Priori Knowledge: Our enhancements preserve the a priori character of Gödel's original proof while providing more robust foundations for the requisite intuitions about positive properties and modal concepts.

Rational Faith: The expanded proof suggests a model of rational faith where logical demonstration provides a foundation for religious belief without eliminating the element of trust inherent in faith relationships.

Limits of Logic: Our analysis highlights both the power and limitations of logical methods in addressing ultimate metaphysical questions.

4.2 Theological Implications

The expanded framework has several significant theological implications:

Divine Attributes: Our hierarchical theory of positive properties provides a more nuanced understanding of how different divine attributes relate to one another.

Divine Action: The incorporation of dynamic properties allows for a more satisfactory account of divine interaction with the created order.

Theological Method: Our approach suggests ways in which formal logical methods can inform and be informed by traditional theological inquiry.

4.3 Metaphysical Consequences

The expanded proof has broad metaphysical implications:

Modal Realism: Our results suggest that if modal realism is true, then theism necessarily follows, providing an interesting connection between two major metaphysical theories.

Abstract Objects: The proof's reliance on properties and propositions raises questions about the ontological status of abstract objects and their relationship to divine being.

Contingency and Necessity: Our framework provides new tools for analyzing the relationship between contingent and necessary truths.

5 Critical Assessment and Future Directions

5.1 Remaining Challenges

Despite these expansions, several challenges remain:

Intuitive Foundation: The expanded framework still relies on intuitions about positive properties that may be contested.

Logical System Choice: Questions remain about which modal logical system best captures the relevant metaphysical truths.

Philosophical Assumptions: The proof continues to rely on controversial philosophical assumptions about the nature of properties, possible worlds, and existence.

5.2 Future Research Directions

Several promising directions for future research emerge from our analysis:

Computational Verification: Modern automated theorem-proving systems could be employed to verify the logical validity of our expanded proofs.

Alternative Logical Systems: Investigation of non-classical logics (relevant, intuitionistic, paraconsistent) might yield new insights.

Empirical Connections: Exploration of connections between the expanded proof and empirical evidence for theism.

Comparative Analysis: Systematic comparison of our expanded framework with other contemporary ontological arguments.

6 Conclusion

This paper has presented a comprehensive expansion of Gödel's ontological proof, addressing key limitations while preserving the essential insights of the original framework. Our enhancements include strengthened modal logical foundations, refined theories of positive properties, resolution of major logical criticisms, and integration with contemporary metaphysical theories.

The expanded framework demonstrates that Gödel's fundamental insights remain viable and indeed can be strengthened through careful logical and philosophical analysis. While questions remain about the ultimate success of any ontological argument, our expanded version provides a more robust foundation for continued investigation.

The significance of this work extends beyond the specific question of God's existence. Our analysis illustrates how contemporary logical methods can illuminate and refine classical philosophical arguments, providing new tools for metaphysical inquiry. The integration of formal and philosophical methods exemplified in this investigation suggests

promising directions for future work in philosophical logic and metaphysics.

Ultimately, our expanded Gödel's ontological proof represents not a final answer to the question of divine existence, but rather a sophisticated framework for continued rational inquiry into one of philosophy's most enduring questions. The proof's value lies not merely in its conclusion but in its demonstration of how rigorous logical analysis can contribute to our understanding of fundamental metaphysical issues.

The journey from Anselm's medieval insight through Gödel's logical formalization to our contemporary expansions illustrates the ongoing vitality of rational inquiry into ultimate questions. Whether one accepts the proof's conclusion or not, the logical sophistication and philosophical depth of the expanded framework contribute significantly to our understanding of the relationship between reason and faith, logic and metaphysics, proof and truth.

As we look toward future developments in logic, metaphysics, and philosophy of religion, the expanded Gödel ontological proof provides both a benchmark for logical rigor and an invitation to continued exploration of the deepest questions about reality, existence, and the divine.

References

[1] Adams, R. M. (1995). *Introductory note to *1970*. In S. Feferman et al. (Eds.), *Kurt Gödel: Collected Works* (Vol. 3, pp. 388-402). Oxford University Press.

[2] Anderson, C. A. (1990). Some emendations of Gödel's ontological proof. *Faith and Philosophy*, 7(3), 291-303.

[3] Fitting, M. (2002). *Types, Tableaux, and Gödel's God*. Kluwer Academic Publishers.

[4] Gödel, K. (1995). Ontological proof. In S. Feferman et al. (Eds.), *Kurt Gödel: Collected Works* (Vol. 3, pp. 403-404). Oxford University Press.

[5] Hazen, A. P. (1998). On Gödel's ontological proof. *Australasian Journal of Philosophy*, 76(3), 361-377.

[6] Hughes, G. E., & Cresswell, M. J. (1996). *A New Introduction to Modal Logic*. Routledge.

[7] Jordan, H. (2006). Gödel's ontological argument and the problem of modal collapse. *International Journal for Philosophy of Religion*, 60(1-3), 1-18.

[8] Kovač, S. (2003). Some weakened Gödelian ontological systems. *Journal of Philosophical Logic*, 32(6), 565-588.

[9] Malcolm, N. (1960). Anselm's ontological arguments. *The Philosophical Review*, 69(1), 41-62.

[10] Oppenheimer, P. E., & Zalta, E. N. (2011). A computationally-discovered simplification of the ontological argument. *Australasian Journal of Philosophy*, 89(2), 333-350.

[11] Plantinga, A. (1974). *The Nature of Necessity*. Oxford University Press.

[12] Pruss, A. R. (2009). A Gödelian ontological argument improved even more. *Religious Studies*, 45(3), 347-353.

[13] Sobel, J. H. (2004). *Logic and Theism: Arguments for and Against Beliefs in God*. Cambridge University Press.

[14] Wang, H. (1987). *Reflections on Kurt Gödel*. MIT Press.

[15] Williamson, T. (2016). Modal logic within counterfactual logic. In B. Garrett (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Philosophy of Logic* (pp. 467-493). Oxford University Press.