

Exploring Simplified Variants of Gödel's Ontological Argument in Isabelle/HOL

Christoph Benz Müller

May 26, 2024

Abstract

Simplified variants of Gödel's ontological argument are explored. Among those is a particularly interesting simplified argument which is (i) valid already in basic modal logics K or KT, (ii) which does not suffer from modal collapse, and (iii) which avoids the rather complex predicates of essence (Ess.) and necessary existence (NE) as used by Gödel.

Whether the presented variants increase or decrease the attractiveness and persuasiveness of the ontological argument is a question I would like to pass on to philosophy and theology.

Contents

1	Background Reading	2
2	Higher-Order Modal Logic in HOL (cf. [2] and Fig. 1 in [4]).	2
3	Selected Simplified Ontological Argument	3
3.1	Verifying the Selected Simplified Ontological Argument (version 1)	4
3.2	Verifying the Selected Simplified Ontological Argument (version 2)	4
4	Presentation of All Variants as Studied in [4]	5
4.1	Preliminaries: Modal Ultrafilter (Fig. 2 in [4])	5
4.2	Preliminaries: Further Basic Notions (Fig. 3 in [4])	5
4.3	Ultrafilter Analysis of Scott's Variant (Fig. 3 in [4])	6
4.4	Ultrafilter Variant (Fig. 5 in [4])	7
4.5	Simplified Variant (Fig. 6 in [4])	8
4.6	Simplified Variant with Axiom T2 (Fig. 7 in [4])	8
4.7	Simplified Variant with Simple Entailment in Logic K (Fig. 8 in [4])	9

4.8	Simplified Variant with Simple Entailment in Logic T (Fig. 9 in [4])	9
4.9	Hauptfiltervariant (Fig. 10 in [4])	10
4.10	Formal Study of Version No.2 of Gödel's Argument as Reported by Kanckos and Lethen, 2019 [6] (Fig. 11 in [4])	11

1 Background Reading

The selected simplified variants of Gödel's ontological argument [5, 7] as presented in §3 have first been extracted from the insights gained in §6 of [4]. These variants are also influenced by the work presented in [1] and they significantly extend the findings from [3]. In §4 we additionally include the sources from [4].

2 Higher-Order Modal Logic in HOL (cf. [2] and Fig. 1 in [4]).

```
theory HOML imports Main
begin
nitpick-params[user-axioms,expect=genuine]
```

Type *i* is associated with possible worlds and type *e* with entities:

```
typedecl i — Possible worlds
typedecl e — Individuals
type-synonym  $\sigma = i \Rightarrow bool$  — World-lifted propositions
type-synonym  $\gamma = e \Rightarrow \sigma$  — Lifted predicates
type-synonym  $\mu = \sigma \Rightarrow \sigma$  — Unary modal connectives
type-synonym  $\nu = \sigma \Rightarrow \sigma \Rightarrow \sigma$  — Binary modal connectives
```

Logical connectives (operating on truth-sets):

```
abbreviation c1:: $\sigma$  ( $\perp$ ) where  $\perp \equiv \lambda w. False$ 
abbreviation c2:: $\sigma$  ( $\top$ ) where  $\top \equiv \lambda w. True$ 
abbreviation c3:: $\mu$  ( $\neg$ [52]53) where  $\neg\varphi \equiv \lambda w. \neg(\varphi w)$ 
abbreviation c4:: $\nu$  (infix $\wedge$ 50) where  $\varphi \wedge \psi \equiv \lambda w. (\varphi w) \wedge (\psi w)$ 
abbreviation c5:: $\nu$  (infix $\vee$ 49) where  $\varphi \vee \psi \equiv \lambda w. (\varphi w) \vee (\psi w)$ 
abbreviation c6:: $\nu$  (infix $\rightarrow$ 48) where  $\varphi \rightarrow \psi \equiv \lambda w. (\varphi w) \rightarrow (\psi w)$ 
abbreviation c7:: $\nu$  (infix $\leftrightarrow$ 47) where  $\varphi \leftrightarrow \psi \equiv \lambda w. (\varphi w) \leftrightarrow (\psi w)$ 
consts R:: $i \Rightarrow i \Rightarrow bool$  (-r-) — Accessibility relation
abbreviation c8:: $\mu$  ( $\Box$ [54]55) where  $\Box\varphi \equiv \lambda w. \forall v. (wrv) \rightarrow (\varphi v)$ 
abbreviation c9:: $\mu$  ( $\Diamond$ [54]55) where  $\Diamond\varphi \equiv \lambda w. \exists v. (wrv) \wedge (\varphi v)$ 
abbreviation c10:: $\gamma \Rightarrow \gamma$  ( $\neg$ [52]53) where  $\neg\Phi \equiv \lambda x. \lambda w. \neg(\Phi x w)$ 
abbreviation c11:: $\gamma \Rightarrow \gamma$  ( $\rightarrow$ -) where  $\rightarrow\Phi \equiv \lambda x. \lambda w. \neg(\Phi x w)$ 
abbreviation c12:: $e \Rightarrow e \Rightarrow \sigma$  ( $=$ -) where  $x=y \equiv \lambda w. (x=y)$ 
abbreviation c13:: $e \Rightarrow e \Rightarrow \sigma$  ( $\neq$ -) where  $x \neq y \equiv \lambda w. (x \neq y)$ 
```

Polymorphic possibilist quantification:

abbreviation $q1::('a\Rightarrow\sigma)\Rightarrow\sigma$ (\forall) **where** $\forall\Phi \equiv \lambda w.\forall x.(\Phi x w)$
abbreviation $q2$ (**binder** \forall [10]11) **where** $\forall x. \varphi(x) \equiv \forall \varphi$
abbreviation $q3::('a\Rightarrow\sigma)\Rightarrow\sigma$ (\exists) **where** $\exists\Phi \equiv \lambda w.\exists x.(\Phi x w)$
abbreviation $q4$ (**binder** \exists [10]11) **where** $\exists x. \varphi(x) \equiv \exists \varphi$

Actualist quantification for individuals/entities:

consts $existsAt::\gamma$ ($-\textcircled{-}$)
abbreviation $q5::\gamma\Rightarrow\sigma$ (\forall^E) **where** $\forall^E\Phi \equiv \lambda w.\forall x.(x\textcircled{w})\longrightarrow(\Phi x w)$
abbreviation $q6$ (**binder** \forall^E [8]9) **where** $\forall^E x. \varphi(x) \equiv \forall^E \varphi$
abbreviation $q7::\gamma\Rightarrow\sigma$ (\exists^E) **where** $\exists^E\Phi \equiv \lambda w.\exists x.(x\textcircled{w})\wedge(\Phi x w)$
abbreviation $q8$ (**binder** \exists^E [8]9) **where** $\exists^E x. \varphi(x) \equiv \exists^E \varphi$

Meta-logical predicate for global validity:

abbreviation $g1::\sigma\Rightarrow bool$ ($[-]$) **where** $[\psi] \equiv \forall w. \psi w$

Barcan and converse Barcan formula:

lemma *True nitpick*[satisfy] $\langle proof \rangle$
lemma $[(\forall^E x.\Box(\varphi x)) \rightarrow \Box(\forall^E x.(\varphi x))]$ **nitpick** $\langle proof \rangle$
lemma $[\Box(\forall^E x.(\varphi x)) \rightarrow (\forall^E x.\Box(\varphi x))]$ **nitpick** $\langle proof \rangle$
lemma $[(\forall x.\Box(\varphi x)) \rightarrow \Box(\forall x. \varphi x)]$ $\langle proof \rangle$
lemma $[\Box(\forall x.(\varphi x)) \rightarrow (\forall x.\Box(\varphi x))]$ $\langle proof \rangle$
end

3 Selected Simplified Ontological Argument

theory *SimplifiedOntologicalArgument* **imports**
HOML
begin

Positive properties:

consts $posProp::\gamma\Rightarrow\sigma$ (\mathcal{P})

An entity x is God-like if it possesses all positive properties.

definition G (\mathcal{G}) **where** $\mathcal{G}(x) \equiv \forall\Phi.(\mathcal{P}(\Phi) \rightarrow \Phi(x))$

The axiom's of the simplified variant are presented next; these axioms are further motivated in [4, 1]).

Self-difference is not a positive property (possible alternative: the empty property is not a positive property).

axiomatization where *CORO1*: $[\neg(\mathcal{P}(\lambda x.(x\neq x)))]$

A property entailed by a positive property is positive.

axiomatization where *CORO2*: $[\forall\Phi\Psi. \mathcal{P}(\Phi) \wedge (\forall x. \Phi(x) \rightarrow \Psi(x)) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\Psi)]$

Being Godlike is a positive property.

axiomatization where *AXIOM3*: $[\mathcal{P} \mathcal{G}]$

3.1 Verifying the Selected Simplified Ontological Argument (version 1)

The existence of a non-exemplified positive property implies that self-difference (or, alternatively, the empty property) is a positive property.

lemma *LEMMA1*: $[(\exists \Phi. (\mathcal{P}(\Phi) \wedge \neg(\exists x. \Phi(x)))) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\lambda x. (x \neq x))]$
<proof>

A non-exemplified positive property does not exist.

lemma *LEMMA2*: $[\neg(\exists \Phi. (\mathcal{P}(\Phi) \wedge \neg(\exists x. \Phi(x))))]$
<proof>

Positive properties are exemplified.

lemma *LEMMA3*: $[\forall \Phi. (\mathcal{P}(\Phi) \rightarrow (\exists x. \Phi(x)))]$
<proof>

There exists a God-like entity.

theorem *THEOREM3'*: $[\exists x. \mathcal{G}(x)]$
<proof>

Necessarily, there exists a God-like entity.

theorem *THEOREM3*: $[\Box(\exists x. \mathcal{G}(x))]$
<proof>

However, the possible existence of Godlike entity is not implied.

theorem *CORO*: $[\Diamond(\exists x. \mathcal{G}(x))]$
nitpick *<proof>*

3.2 Verifying the Selected Simplified Ontological Argument (version 2)

We switch to logic T.

axiomatization where *T*: $[\forall \varphi. \Box \varphi \rightarrow \varphi]$

lemma *T'*: $[\forall \varphi. \varphi \rightarrow \Diamond \varphi]$ *<proof>*

Positive properties are possibly exemplified.

theorem *THEOREM1*: $[\forall \Phi. \mathcal{P}(\Phi) \rightarrow \Diamond(\exists x. \Phi(x))]$
<proof>

Possibly there exists a God-like entity.

theorem *CORO*: $[\Diamond(\exists x. \mathcal{G}(x))]$
<proof>

The possible existence of a God-like entity implies the necessary existence of a God-like entity.

theorem *THEOREM2*: $[\Diamond(\exists x. \mathcal{G}(x)) \rightarrow \Box(\exists x. \mathcal{G}(x))]$
<proof>

Necessarily, there exists a God-like entity.

theorem *THEO3*: $[\Box(\exists x. \mathcal{G}(x))]$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

There exists a God-like entity.

theorem *THEO3'*: $[\exists x. \mathcal{G}(x)]$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

Modal collapse is not implied; nitpick reports a countermodel.

lemma *MC*: $[\forall \Phi. \Phi \rightarrow \Box \Phi]$ **nitpick** $\langle proof \rangle$

Consistency of the theory; nitpick reports a model.

lemma *True nitpick[satisfy]* $\langle proof \rangle$
end

4 Presentation of All Variants as Studied in [4]

4.1 Preliminaries: Modal Ultrafilter (Fig. 2 in [4])

theory *MFilter* **imports** *HOML*
begin

Some abbreviations for auxiliary operations.

abbreviation $a::\gamma \Rightarrow (\gamma \Rightarrow \sigma) \Rightarrow \sigma$ ($-\in-$) **where** $x \in S \equiv S x$

abbreviation $b::\gamma$ (\emptyset) **where** $\emptyset \equiv \lambda x. \perp$

abbreviation $c::\gamma$ (\mathbf{U}) **where** $\mathbf{U} \equiv \lambda x. \top$

abbreviation $d::\gamma \Rightarrow \gamma \Rightarrow \sigma$ ($-\subseteq-$) **where** $\varphi \subseteq \psi \equiv \forall x. ((\varphi x) \rightarrow (\psi x))$

abbreviation $e::\gamma \Rightarrow \gamma \Rightarrow \gamma$ ($-\Gamma-$) **where** $\varphi \Gamma \psi \equiv \lambda x. ((\varphi x) \wedge (\psi x))$

abbreviation $f::\gamma \Rightarrow \gamma$ ($^{-1}-$) **where** $^{-1}\psi \equiv \lambda x. \neg(\psi x)$

Definition of modal filter.

abbreviation $g::(\gamma \Rightarrow \sigma) \Rightarrow \sigma$ (*Filter*)

where *Filter* $\Phi \equiv (((\mathbf{U} \in \Phi) \wedge \neg(\emptyset \in \Phi))$

$\wedge (\forall \varphi \psi. (((\varphi \in \Phi) \wedge (\varphi \subseteq \psi)) \rightarrow (\psi \in \Phi))))$

$\wedge (\forall \varphi \psi. (((\varphi \in \Phi) \wedge (\psi \in \Phi)) \rightarrow ((\varphi \Gamma \psi) \in \Phi)))$

Definition of modal ultrafilter .

abbreviation $h::(\gamma \Rightarrow \sigma) \Rightarrow \sigma$ (*UFilter*) **where**

UFilter $\Phi \equiv (\text{Filter } \Phi) \wedge (\forall \varphi. ((\varphi \in \Phi) \vee ((^{-1}\varphi) \in \Phi)))$

Modal filter and modal ultrafilter are consistent.

lemma $[\forall \Phi \varphi. ((\text{UFilter } \Phi) \rightarrow \neg((\varphi \in \Phi) \wedge ((^{-1}\varphi) \in \Phi)))]$ $\langle proof \rangle$
end

4.2 Preliminaries: Further Basic Notions (Fig. 3 in [4])

theory *BaseDefs* **imports** *HOML*
begin

Positive properties.

consts $posProp::\gamma\Rightarrow\sigma$ (\mathcal{P})

Basic definitions for modal ontological argument.

abbreviation a ($-\sqsubseteq-$) **where** $X\sqsubseteq Y \equiv \forall^E z.((X z) \rightarrow (Y z))$

abbreviation b ($-\Rightarrow-$) **where** $X\Rightarrow Y \equiv \Box(X\sqsubseteq Y)$

abbreviation c ($\mathcal{P}os$) **where** $\mathcal{P}os Z \equiv \forall X.((Z X) \rightarrow (\mathcal{P} X))$

abbreviation d ($-\sqcap-$) **where** $X\sqcap Z \equiv \Box(\forall^E u.((X u) \leftrightarrow (\forall Y.((Z Y) \rightarrow (Y u))))))$

Definition of Godlike.

definition G (\mathcal{G}) **where** $\mathcal{G} x \equiv \forall Y.((\mathcal{P} Y) \rightarrow (Y x))$

Definitions of Essence and Necessary Existence.

definition E (\mathcal{E}) **where** $\mathcal{E} Y x \equiv (Y x) \wedge (\forall Z.((Z x) \rightarrow (Y\Rightarrow Z)))$

definition NE ($\mathcal{N}\mathcal{E}$) **where** $\mathcal{N}\mathcal{E} x \equiv \forall Y.((\mathcal{E} Y x) \rightarrow \Box(\exists^E Y))$

end

4.3 Ultrafilter Analysis of Scott's Variant (Fig. 3 in [4])

theory *ScottVariant* **imports**

HOML

MFilter

BaseDefs

begin

Axioms of Scott's variant.

axiomatization **where**

$A1$: $[\forall X.((\neg(\mathcal{P} X)) \leftrightarrow (\mathcal{P}(\neg X)))]$ **and**

$A2$: $[\forall X Y.(((\mathcal{P} X) \wedge (X\Rightarrow Y)) \rightarrow (\mathcal{P} Y))]$ **and**

$A3$: $[\forall Z.((\mathcal{P}os Z) \rightarrow (\forall X.((X\sqcap Z) \rightarrow (\mathcal{P} X))))]$ **and**

$A4$: $[\forall X.((\mathcal{P} X) \rightarrow \Box(\mathcal{P} X))]$ **and**

$A5$: $[\mathcal{P} \mathcal{N}\mathcal{E}]$ **and**

B : $[\forall \varphi.(\varphi \rightarrow \Box\Diamond\varphi)]$ — Logic KB

lemma B' : $\forall x y. \neg(xry) \vee (yrx)$ *<proof>*

Necessary existence of a Godlike entity.

theorem $T6$: $[\Box(\exists^E \mathcal{G})]$

<proof>

Existence of a Godlike entity.

lemma $[\exists^E \mathcal{G}]$ *<proof>*

Consistency

lemma *True nitpick*[*satisfy*] *<proof>*

Modal collapse: holds.

lemma MC : $[\forall \Phi.(\Phi \rightarrow \Box\Phi)]$

<proof>

Analysis of positive properties using ultrafilters.

theorem *U1*: [*UFilter* \mathcal{P}] — Proof found by sledgehammer
<proof>

lemma *L1*: [$\forall X Y.((X \Rightarrow Y) \rightarrow (X \sqsubseteq Y))$] *<proof>*

lemma *L2*: [$\forall X Y.((\mathcal{P} X) \wedge (X \sqsubseteq Y) \rightarrow (\mathcal{P} Y))$] *<proof>*

Set of supersets of X , we call this $HF X$.

abbreviation *HF* where $HF X \equiv \lambda Y.(X \sqsubseteq Y)$

HF \mathcal{G} is a filter; hence, *HF* \mathcal{G} is Hauptfilter of \mathcal{G} .

lemma *F1*: [*Filter* (*HF* \mathcal{G})] *<proof>*

lemma *F2*: [*UFilter* (*HF* \mathcal{G})] *<proof>*

T6 follows directly from F1.

theorem *T6again*: [$\Box(\exists^E \mathcal{G})$] *<proof>*
end

4.4 Ultrafilter Variant (Fig. 5 in [4])

theory *UFilterVariant* **imports**

HOML

MFilter

BaseDefs

begin

Axiom's of ultrafilter variant.

axiomatization **where**

U1: [*UFilter* \mathcal{P}] **and**

A2: [$\forall X Y.((\mathcal{P} X) \wedge (X \Rightarrow Y) \rightarrow (\mathcal{P} Y))$] **and**

A3: [$\forall \mathcal{Z}.((\mathcal{P}_{\text{os}} \mathcal{Z}) \rightarrow (\forall X.((X \sqcap \mathcal{Z}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{P} X))))$]

Necessary existence of a Godlike entity.

theorem *T6*: [$\Box(\exists^E \mathcal{G})$] — Proof also found by sledgehammer
<proof>

Checking for consistency.

lemma *True* **nitpick**[*satisfy*] *<proof>*

Checking for modal collapse.

lemma *MC*: [$\forall \Phi.(\Phi \rightarrow \Box \Phi)$] **nitpick** *<proof>*
end

4.5 Simplified Variant (Fig. 6 in [4])

theory *SimpleVariant* **imports**

HOML

MFilter

BaseDefs

begin

Axiom's of new, simplified variant.

axiomatization where

A1': $\lceil \neg(\mathcal{P}(\lambda x.(x \neq x))) \rceil$ **and**

A2': $\lceil \forall X Y.(((\mathcal{P} X) \wedge ((X \sqsubseteq Y) \vee (X \Rightarrow Y))) \rightarrow (\mathcal{P} Y)) \rceil$ **and**

A3: $\lceil \forall \mathcal{Z}.((\mathcal{P}os \mathcal{Z}) \rightarrow (\forall X.((X \sqcap \mathcal{Z}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{P} X)))) \rceil$

lemma *T2*: $\lceil \mathcal{P} \mathcal{G} \rceil$ *<proof>*

lemma *L1*: $\lceil \mathcal{P}(\lambda x.(x = x)) \rceil$ *<proof>*

Necessary existence of a Godlike entity.

theorem *T6*: $\lceil \Box(\exists^E \mathcal{G}) \rceil$ — Proof found by sledgehammer
<proof>

lemma *True nitpick*[*satisfy*] *<proof>*

Modal collapse and monotheism: not implied.

lemma *MC*: $\lceil \forall \Phi.(\Phi \rightarrow \Box \Phi) \rceil$ **nitpick** *<proof>*

lemma *MT*: $\lceil \forall x y.(((\mathcal{G} x) \wedge (\mathcal{G} y)) \rightarrow (x = y)) \rceil$
nitpick *<proof>*

Gödel's A1, A4, A5: not implied anymore.

lemma *A1*: $\lceil \forall X.((\neg(\mathcal{P} X)) \leftrightarrow (\mathcal{P}(\neg X))) \rceil$ **nitpick** *<proof>*

lemma *A4*: $\lceil \forall X.((\mathcal{P} X) \rightarrow \Box(\mathcal{P} X)) \rceil$ **nitpick** *<proof>*

lemma *A5*: $\lceil \mathcal{P} \mathcal{NE} \rceil$ **nitpick** *<proof>*

Checking filter and ultrafilter properties.

theorem *F1*: $\lceil \text{Filter } \mathcal{P} \rceil$ *<proof>*

theorem *U1*: $\lceil \text{UFilter } \mathcal{P} \rceil$ **nitpick** *<proof>*

end

4.6 Simplified Variant with Axiom T2 (Fig. 7 in [4])

theory *SimpleVariantPG* **imports**

HOML

MFilter

BaseDefs

begin

Axiom's of simplified variant with A3 replaced.

axiomatization where

A1': $\lceil \neg(\mathcal{P}(\lambda x.(x \neq x))) \rceil$ **and**

A2': $\lceil \forall X Y.(((\mathcal{P} X) \wedge ((X \sqsubseteq Y) \vee (X \Rightarrow Y))) \rightarrow (\mathcal{P} Y)) \rceil$ **and**

T2: $[\mathcal{P} \mathcal{G}]$

Necessary existence of a Godlike entity.

theorem *T6*: $[\Box(\exists^E \mathcal{G})]$ — Proof found by sledgehammer
<proof>

lemma *True nitpick*[*satisfy*] *<proof>*

Modal collapse and Monotheism: not implied.

lemma *MC*: $[\forall \Phi.(\Phi \rightarrow \Box \Phi)]$ **nitpick** *<proof>*

lemma *MT*: $[\forall x y.(((\mathcal{G} x) \wedge (\mathcal{G} y)) \rightarrow (x=y))]$ **nitpick** *<proof>*
end

4.7 Simplified Variant with Simple Entailment in Logic K (Fig. 8 in [4])

theory *SimpleVariantSE* **imports**

HOML

MFilter

BaseDefs

begin

Axiom's of new variant based on ultrafilters.

axiomatization where

A1': $[\neg(\mathcal{P}(\lambda x.(x \neq x)))]$ **and**

A2'': $[\forall X Y.(((\mathcal{P} X) \wedge (X \sqsubseteq Y)) \rightarrow (\mathcal{P} Y))]$ **and**

T2: $[\mathcal{P} \mathcal{G}]$

Necessary existence of a Godlike entity.

theorem *T6*: $[\Box(\exists^E \mathcal{G})]$ *<proof>*

theorem *T7*: $[\exists^E \mathcal{G}]$ *<proof>*

Possible existence of a Godlike: has counterodel.

lemma *T3*: $[\Diamond(\exists^E \mathcal{G})]$ **nitpick** *<proof>*

lemma *T3'*: **assumes** *T*: $[\forall \varphi.((\Box \varphi) \rightarrow \varphi)]$

shows $[\Diamond(\exists^E \mathcal{G})]$

<proof>

end

4.8 Simplified Variant with Simple Entailment in Logic T (Fig. 9 in [4])

theory *SimpleVariantSEinT* **imports**

HOML

MFilter

BaseDefs

begin

Axiom's of new variant based on ultrafilters.

axiomatization where

$A1'$: $\lceil \neg(\mathcal{P}(\lambda x.(x \neq x))) \rceil$ **and**

$A2''$: $\lceil \forall X Y.((\mathcal{P} X) \wedge (X \sqsubseteq Y)) \rightarrow (\mathcal{P} Y) \rceil$ **and**

$T2$: $\lceil \mathcal{P} \mathcal{G} \rceil$

Modal Logic T.

axiomatization where T : $\lceil \forall \varphi.((\Box \varphi) \rightarrow \varphi) \rceil$

lemma T' : $\lceil \forall \varphi.(\varphi \rightarrow (\Diamond \varphi)) \rceil$ $\langle proof \rangle$

Necessary existence of a Godlike entity.

theorem $T6$: $\lceil \Box(\exists^E \mathcal{G}) \rceil$ — Proof found by sledgehammer
 $\langle proof \rangle$

T6 again, with an alternative, simpler proof.

theorem $T6again$: $\lceil \Box(\exists^E \mathcal{G}) \rceil$

$\langle proof \rangle$

end

4.9 Hauptfiltervariant (Fig. 10 in [4])

theory *SimpleVariantHF* **imports**

HOML

MFilter

BaseDefs

begin

Definition: Set of supersets of X , we call this $\mathcal{HF} X$.

abbreviation $HF::\gamma \Rightarrow (\gamma \Rightarrow \sigma)$ **where** $HF X \equiv \lambda Y.(X \sqsubseteq Y)$

Postulate: $\mathcal{HF} \mathcal{G}$ is a filter; i.e., Hauptfilter of \mathcal{G} .

axiomatization where $F1$: $\lceil Filter (HF \mathcal{G}) \rceil$

Necessary existence of a Godlike entity.

theorem $T6$: $\lceil \Box(\exists^E \mathcal{G}) \rceil$ $\langle proof \rangle$

theorem $T6again$: $\lceil \Box(\exists^E \mathcal{G}) \rceil$

$\langle proof \rangle$

Possible existence of Godlike entity not implied.

lemma $T3$: $\lceil \Diamond(\exists^E \mathcal{G}) \rceil$ **nitpick** $\langle proof \rangle$

Axiom T enforces possible existence of Godlike entity.

axiomatization

lemma $T3$: **assumes** T : $\lceil \forall \varphi.((\Box \varphi) \rightarrow \varphi) \rceil$

shows $\lceil \Diamond(\exists^E \mathcal{G}) \rceil$ $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *True* **nitpick**[*satisfy*] $\langle proof \rangle$

Modal collapse: not implied anymore.

lemma *MC*: $[\forall \Phi.(\Phi \rightarrow \Box \Phi)]$ **nitpick** $\langle proof \rangle$
lemma *MT*: $[\forall x y.(((\mathcal{G} x) \wedge (\mathcal{G} y)) \rightarrow (x=y))]$
nitpick $\langle proof \rangle$
end

4.10 Formal Study of Version No.2 of Gödel's Argument as Reported by Kanckos and Lethen, 2019 [6] (Fig. 11 in [4])

theory *KanckosLethenNo2Possibilist* **imports**
HOML
MFilter
BaseDefs
begin

Axioms of Version No. 2 [6].

abbreviation *delta* (Δ) **where** $\Delta A \equiv \lambda x.(\forall \psi. ((A \psi) \rightarrow (\psi x)))$

abbreviation *N* (\mathcal{N}) **where** $\mathcal{N} \varphi \equiv \lambda x.(\Box(\varphi x))$

axiomatization where

Axiom1: $[\forall \varphi \psi.(((\mathcal{P} \varphi) \wedge (\Box(\forall x. ((\varphi x) \rightarrow (\psi x)))))) \rightarrow (\mathcal{P} \psi)]$ **and** — The \Box can be omitted here; the proofs still work.

Axiom2: $[\forall A.(\Box((\forall \varphi.((A \varphi) \rightarrow (\mathcal{P} \varphi))) \rightarrow (\mathcal{P} (\Delta A))))]$ **and** — The \Box can be omitted here; the proofs still work.

Axiom3: $[\forall \varphi.((\mathcal{P} \varphi) \rightarrow (\mathcal{P} (\mathcal{N} \varphi)))]$ **and**

Axiom4: $[\forall \varphi.((\mathcal{P} \varphi) \rightarrow (\neg(\mathcal{P}(\neg\varphi))))]$ **and**

— Logic S5

axB: $[\forall \varphi.(\varphi \rightarrow \Box \Diamond \varphi)]$ **and** *axM*: $[\forall \varphi.((\Box \varphi) \rightarrow \varphi)]$ **and** *ax4*: $[\forall \varphi.((\Box \varphi) \rightarrow (\Box \Box \varphi))]$

Sahlqvist correspondences: they are better suited for proof automation.

lemma *axB'*: $\forall x y. \neg(xry) \vee (yrx)$ $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *axM'*: $\forall x. (xx)$ $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *ax4'*: $\forall x y z. (((xy) \wedge (yz)) \rightarrow (xz))$ $\langle proof \rangle$

Proofs for all theorems for No.2 from [6].

theorem *Theorem0*: $[\forall \varphi \psi.((\forall Q. ((Q \varphi) \rightarrow (Q \psi))) \rightarrow ((\mathcal{P} \varphi) \rightarrow (\mathcal{P} \psi)))]$ $\langle proof \rangle$

theorem *Theorem1*: $[\mathcal{P} \mathcal{G}]$ $\langle proof \rangle$

theorem *Theorem2*: $[\forall x. ((\mathcal{G} x) \rightarrow (\exists y. \mathcal{G} y))] \langle proof \rangle$

theorem *Theorem3a*: $[\mathcal{P} (\lambda x. (\exists y. \mathcal{G} y))] \langle proof \rangle$

theorem *Theorem3b*: $[\Box(\mathcal{P} (\lambda x. (\Box(\exists y. \mathcal{G} y)))] \langle proof \rangle$

theorem *Theorem4*: $[\forall x. \Box((\mathcal{G} x) \rightarrow ((\mathcal{P} (\lambda x. (\Box(\exists y. \mathcal{G} y)))) \rightarrow (\Box(\exists y. \mathcal{G} y)))]$ $\langle proof \rangle$

theorem *Theorem5*: $[\forall x. \Box((\mathcal{G} x) \rightarrow (\Box(\exists y. \mathcal{G} y)))] \langle proof \rangle$

theorem *Theorem6*: $[\Box((\exists y. \mathcal{G} y) \rightarrow (\Box(\exists y. \mathcal{G} y)))] \langle proof \rangle$

theorem *Theorem7*: $[\Box((\Diamond(\exists y. \mathcal{G} y)) \rightarrow (\Box(\exists y. \mathcal{G} y)))] \langle proof \rangle$

theorem *Theorem8*: $[\Box(\exists y. \mathcal{G} y)] \langle proof \rangle$

theorem *Theorem9*: $[\forall \varphi. ((\mathcal{P} \varphi) \rightarrow \Diamond(\exists x. \varphi x))] \langle proof \rangle$

Short proof of Theorem8; analogous to the one presented in Sec. 7 of Benzmüller 2020.

theorem $[\Box(\exists y. \mathcal{G} y)]$ — Note: this version of the proof uses only axB' and axM' .
 $\langle proof \rangle$

theorem $T5$: $[(\Diamond(\exists y. \mathcal{G} y)) \rightarrow \Box(\exists y. \mathcal{G} y)]$ — Obvious: If we can prove Theorem8, then we also have T5.
 $\langle proof \rangle$

Another short proof of Theorem8.

theorem $[\Box(\exists y. \mathcal{G} y)]$ — Note: fewer assumptions used in some cases than in [6].
 $\langle proof \rangle$

Are the axioms of the simplified versions implied?

Actualist version of the axioms.

lemma $A1'$: $[\neg(\mathcal{P}(\lambda x.(x \neq x)))]$ $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $A2'$: $[\forall X Y.((\mathcal{P} X) \wedge ((X \sqsubseteq Y) \vee (X \ni Y))) \rightarrow (\mathcal{P} Y)]$ **nitpick** $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $A3$: $[\forall \mathcal{Z}.((\mathcal{P}os \mathcal{Z}) \rightarrow (\forall X.((X \sqcap \mathcal{Z}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{P} X))))]$ **nitpick** $\langle proof \rangle$

Possibilist version of the axioms.

abbreviation a ($-\sqsubseteq^p$ -) **where** $X \sqsubseteq^p Y \equiv \forall z.((X z) \rightarrow (Y z))$

abbreviation b ($-\ni^p$ -) **where** $X \ni^p Y \equiv \Box(X \sqsubseteq^p Y)$

abbreviation d ($-\sqcap^p$ -) **where** $X \sqcap^p \mathcal{Z} \equiv \Box(\forall u.((X u) \leftrightarrow (\forall Y.((\mathcal{Z} Y) \rightarrow (Y u)))))$

lemma $A1'P$: $[\neg(\mathcal{P}(\lambda x.(x \neq x)))]$ $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $A2'P$: $[\forall X Y.((\mathcal{P} X) \wedge ((X \sqsubseteq^p Y) \vee (X \ni^p Y))) \rightarrow (\mathcal{P} Y)]$ $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $A2'aP$: $[\forall X Y.((\mathcal{P} X) \wedge (X \ni^p Y)) \rightarrow (\mathcal{P} Y)]$ $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $A2'bP$: $[\forall X Y.((\mathcal{P} X) \wedge (X \sqsubseteq^p Y)) \rightarrow (\mathcal{P} Y)]$ $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $A3P$: $[\forall \mathcal{Z}.((\mathcal{P}os \mathcal{Z}) \rightarrow (\forall X.((X \sqcap^p \mathcal{Z}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{P} X))))]$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

Are Axiom2 and A3 equivalent? Only when assuming Axiom1 and axiom M.

lemma $[\forall A.(\Box((\forall \varphi.((A \varphi) \rightarrow (\mathcal{P} \varphi))) \rightarrow (\mathcal{P} (\Delta A))))] \equiv [\forall \mathcal{Z}.((\mathcal{P}os \mathcal{Z}) \rightarrow (\forall X.((X \sqcap^p \mathcal{Z}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{P} X))))]$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

end

References

- [1] C. Benzmüller and D. Fuenmayor. Computer-supported analysis of positive properties, ultrafilters and modal collapse in variants of Gödel's ontological argument. *Bulletin of the Section of Logic*, 49(2):127–148, 2020.

- [2] C. Benzmüller and L. Paulson. Quantified multimodal logics in simple type theory. *Logica Universalis*, 7(1):7–20, 2013.
- [3] C. Benzmüller and B. Woltzenlogel Paleo. Gödel’s God in Isabelle/HOL. *Archive of Formal Proofs*, 2013, 2013.
- [4] C. Benzmüller. A (Simplified) Supreme Being Necessarily Exists, says the Computer: Computationally Explored Variants of Gödel’s Ontological Argument. In *Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on Principles of Knowledge Representation and Reasoning, KR 2020*, pages 779–789. IJCAI organization, 9 2020.
- [5] K. Gödel. Appendix A. Notes in Kurt Gödel’s Hand. In Sobel [8], pages 144–145.
- [6] A. Kanckos and T. Lethen. The development of Gödel’s ontological proof. *The Review of Symbolic Logic*, 11 2019.
- [7] D. S. Scott. Appendix B: Notes in Dana Scott’s Hand. In Sobel [8], pages 145–146.
- [8] J. H. Sobel. *Logic and Theism: Arguments for and Against Beliefs in God*. Cambridge University Press, 2004.