The Problem of Evil: Evaluating its Theological and Philosophical Implications for the Attributes of the "Good God"

Austin OMOMIA and **Alaba Bukola IFABIYI**

Abstract

The problem of evil remains a profound challenge in theology and philosophy, particularly concerning the coherence of the attributes of a "Good God" in a world marred by suffering, injustice and moral evil. The purpose of this study is to critically evaluate the theological and philosophical implications of evil on the traditional attributes of God: goodness, omniscience and omnipotence. Employing a multidisciplinary approach, the study engages classical theodicies such as the Augustinian and Irenaean models, alongside philosophical arguments including the free will defense and process theology. Textual analysis and comparative evaluation of historical and contemporary sources guide the methodology. The findings reveal that while atheistic perspectives often present evil as incompatible with divine goodness, many theistic responses offer reasoned frameworks that preserve belief in a benevolent God. The study also uncovers existential dilemmas faced by individuals, particularly in reconciling faith with persistent natural and moral evils. The analysis shows that evil does not conclusively negate God's goodness but rather invites deeper theological reflection and ethical responsibility. Conclusively, the research affirms that a nuanced understanding of divine attributes, in light of suffering, can sustain faith and inspire moral resilience. The contribution to knowledge lies in bridging classical theodicies with contemporary existential concerns, offering insights that support both academic discourse and lived religious experience.

Keywords: Attributes of the "Good God", Theological and Philosophical Implications, Theodicy, Problem of Evil, Faith and Suffering.

1. Department of Religion and Peace Studies, McPherson University, Seriki Sotayo, Ogun State, Nigeria; austin.omomia@yahoo.com
2. Department of Religion and Peace Studies, McPherson University, Seriki Sotayo, Ogun State, Nigeria; anbukky@yahoo.com

INTRODUCTION

 The problem of evil has been a longstanding and complex issue in the fields of philosophy and theology. It explores the apparent contradiction between the existence of an all-powerful, all-knowing, and all-good God and the existence of evil and suffering in the world. This paradox raises critical questions about the nature of God and His relationship to the world, particularly in terms of divine omnipotence, omnibenevolence, and omniscience. The problem can be categorised into two broad forms: moral evil, which arises from human actions (e.g., murder, theft), and natural evil, which involves suffering resulting from natural events (e.g., earthquakes, diseases) (Van Inwagen, 2020). Throughout history, philosophers and theologians have struggled with this dilemma. Classical responses include Augustine's argument that evil is the result of free will granted by God, and Leibniz's suggestion that evil is necessary for the existence of the best possible world (Leibniz, 1710). These traditional theodicies include the free will defense, which asserts that human freedom is the necessary condition for moral responsibility, and the soul-making theodicy, which argues that suffering contributes to the development of virtue and character (Hick, 2007). However, contemporary philosophical discourse has complicated these responses, particularly with the rise of atheistic and agnostic perspectives, which assert that the existence of evil is incompatible with the existence of an all-good, all-powerful God (Dawkins, 2006; Hitchens, 2007).

The issue of evil has gained increasing prominence in modern discourse, as contemporary global events, wars, pandemics, environmental disasters, and systemic inequalities, have escalated the question of why a benevolent God allows such widespread suffering. Philosophers like Richard Dawkins and Christopher Hitchens have criticised the traditional theistic responses, asserting that belief in a good God is logically incompatible with the existence of evil (Dawkins, 2006; Hitchens, 2007). In response, theologians have reworked classical theodicies, introducing newer concepts such as process theology, theodicy through divine hiddenness, and the compatibility of free will with divine omniscience (Cohen, 2013; Mavrodes, 2018). Contemporary philosophers like Jean-Luc Marion and Emmanuel Levinas have also criticised the idea of resolving the problem of evil with strictly rational arguments, arguing that suffering is ultimately a mystery to be engaged with (Marion, 2018; Levinas, 2021). This shift towards a more existential and phenomenological approach challenges the notion that evil can be fully comprehended in logical terms, emphasising instead the need to engage with suffering on a deeper, experiential level. The problem of evil is not only an intellectual dilemma but also a deeply existential concern. For many religious adherents, the struggle to reconcile the existence of evil with the belief in a good God is central to their faith. The issue also affects pastoral care, as communities and religious leaders seek to provide meaningful responses to the suffering that their congregants experience.

Conceptual Clarification
Evil: It refers to the presence of suffering, destruction, or moral wrongdoing. It can be divided into **moral evil** (actions that result from human decisions, such as violence or cruelty) and **natural evil** (suffering caused by natural events, such as floods or diseases).

Theodicy: This means justifications for God's allowance of evil, actually the defense of God's justice and His righteousness.

Omnibenevolence: The term is the attribute of God as being all-good. It posits that God is wholly good and desires the best for His creation.

Omnipotence: It refers to God's all-powerful nature. It implies that God has the power to do anything, including the power to prevent or eliminate evil.

Omniscience: It means God's all-knowing nature. It asserts that God knows all things, including past, present and future events.

Statement of the Problem
The core issue of the problem of evil lies in reconciling the existence of a good, omnipotent, and omniscient God with the widespread reality of evil and suffering in the world. This paradox challenges traditional theological beliefs and calls for a thorough reexamination of both the nature of God and the nature of evil. The study will investigate how different theodicies and philosophical frameworks address this issue and assess their ability to offer meaningful resolutions to the problem.

Objectives of the Study
This study seeks to:
1. Investigate the nature of evil and its theological implications for the attributes of a good God.
2. Examine classical and contemporary theodicies that attempt to reconcile the existence of evil with God's nature.
3. Analyse the philosophical and theological challenges posed by the problem of evil.
4. Assess the impact of the problem of evil on contemporary religious communities and their understanding of divine providence.

Research Questions
This study addresses the following questions:
1. What is the nature of evil and its theological implications for the attributes of a good God?
2. What are the classical and contemporary theodicies that attempt to reconcile the existence of evil with God's nature?
3. How do we analyse the philosophical and theological challenges posed by the problem of evil?

4. How do we assess the impact of the problem of evil on contemporary religious communities and their understanding of divine providence?

Significance of the Study

This study is significant because it provides a contemporary analysis of the problem of evil and its implications for both theology and philosophy. By engaging with modern philosophical and theological responses, the research aims to contribute to ongoing efforts to reconcile the existence of evil with belief in a benevolent God, particularly in light of modern-day suffering. This will have practical implications for faith communities, as it will provide insights into how individuals and churches can grapple with evil in the world while maintaining their belief in a good God.

Scope and Limitations

This study focuses primarily on the problem of evil as it relates to monotheistic religions, particularly Christianity. It will engage with contemporary philosophical and theological responses but will not extensively explore non-theistic or alternative religious perspectives. Additionally, while the study will touch on psychological and existential themes, it will not delve deeply into empirical studies or psychological theories of suffering.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The problem of evil has been one of the most profound challenges in both philosophy and theology. At its core, evil represents the existence of suffering, moral wrongdoing, and destruction, which seems at odds with the notion of a benevolent, omnipotent, and omniscient God. To understand the problem of evil, it is essential to distinguish between different categories of evil that arise in human experience: moral evil and natural evil. Moral evil refers to the suffering caused by the free will and actions of human beings. It includes actions such as murder, theft, lying, and other forms of violence or immorality that result in harm to others. These actions are often seen as violations of moral laws or ethical principles, and they reflect the choices made by individuals who exercise their free will in ways that lead to harm or injustice. The existence of moral evil raises significant theological and philosophical questions about the nature of human freedom, responsibility, and the moral order of the world (Van Inwagen, 2020). A key aspect of moral evil is that it directly implicates human agency, and as such, it is often framed within debates around free will and the responsibility of individuals for their actions. In many religious traditions, human beings are granted free will as part of God's design, and with that freedom comes the potential for moral evil. The challenge, then, is to understand how a good and omnipotent God would allow free will, knowing the potential for moral evil (Dawkins, 2006). Natural evil refers to suffering and destruction caused by natural events or phenomena, such as earthquakes, hurricanes, diseases, and other calamities that occur independently of human actions. These events lead to loss, pain, and suffering for

countless individuals, often without regard to their moral character or actions. Natural evil presents a unique challenge to theodicy, as it raises the question of why an all-powerful, benevolent God would permit such widespread, seemingly senseless suffering. Unlike moral evil, which can often be linked to human choices, natural evil seems to be a result of the inherent properties of the natural world. It is often described as suffering caused by the "forces of nature," such as earthquakes, floods, and disease, which do not appear to have a direct moral cause. Philosophical and theological discussions around natural evil often include questions of divine providence and the possibility that these natural phenomena are part of a larger divine plan or natural order that human beings do not fully comprehend (Hick, 2007).

Theodicy refers to the attempt to reconcile the existence of evil with the belief in a benevolent, omnipotent God. Over the centuries, several classical theodicies have been proposed to address the problem of evil. These responses seek to provide a rational justification for why a good God might allow evil to exist in the world. The free will defense is one of the most common and well-known responses to the problem of evil. It posits that evil exists because human beings have free will, and this freedom is essential for moral responsibility. According to this view, a good and omnipotent God grants humans the freedom to choose between good and evil. However, the existence of free will means that humans have the capacity to choose evil, which inevitably results in moral evil. Philosophers such as Alvin Plantinga (1974) argue that the possibility of moral evil is a necessary consequence of the gift of free will. Without the ability to choose evil, human beings would not be morally responsible for their actions, and therefore, their goodness would be meaningless. In this sense, the existence of evil is a direct result of the greater good of free will, and the potential for evil is an unavoidable part of human freedom.

The soul-making theodicy, proposed by philosopher John Hick (2007), suggests that evil and suffering are necessary for the development of virtues such as courage, compassion, and perseverance. Hick's view is rooted in the idea that God created human beings with the potential to grow spiritually and morally, but this growth requires the experience of challenges, suffering, and adversity. According to Hick, the existence of evil provides the conditions for individuals to freely choose to develop virtues and strengthen their character. Hick argues that without suffering, there would be no opportunity for the development of moral and spiritual qualities, which are essential for human flourishing. This theodicy aligns with the idea that God permits evil not as an end in itself but as a means to achieve a greater good: the soul-making process that allows individuals to develop into morally responsible beings capable of knowing God and choosing to live virtuously. The Augustinian theodicy, based on the writings of St. Augustine (354–430 CE), argues that evil is not a substance or a force in itself but rather a privation of good. According to Augustine, evil arises when created beings, including human beings, turn away from the good that God intended for them. In this view, God created the world and everything in it as good, but the abuse of free will by moral agents leads to the corruption of that good. Augustine's theodicy asserts that evil exists not as an independent

entity but as a distortion or corruption of the goodness that God originally created. This understanding allows for the compatibility of a good God with the existence of evil, as it is the misuse of human free will, not the will of God, that leads to evil (Hick, 2007). According to Augustine, evil is a consequence of human disobedience and separation from God's goodness, rather than something God willed to create.

Process theodicy, inspired by the philosophy of Alfred North Whitehead and Charles Hartshorne, offers a radically different approach to the problem of evil by suggesting that God's power is not absolute or coercive but limited. In this view, God does not possess omnipotence in the traditional sense. Instead, God is seen as a participant in the process of the world's unfolding and is deeply affected by the experiences of creatures within creation. According to process theology, God does not have the power to prevent all evil but works within the constraints of the natural order and the free will of creatures. This perspective suggests that while God is all-good and all-knowing, His power is not absolute, and He cannot control every aspect of the world. Instead, God's role is to influence and guide creation toward greater harmony and goodness, even as evil and suffering exist as part of the natural process of life (Hartshorne, 1997). This theodicy offers a unique take on the problem of evil by reimagining divine omnipotence and offering a more relational understanding of God's nature.

Beyond philosophical and theological responses, there are also existential and emotional responses to the problem of evil that focus on how individuals experience and engage with suffering on a personal level. These responses are often rooted in the human experience of pain, grief, and loss, rather than abstract reasoning about the existence of evil. Existential responses to evil often deal with the meaning of suffering. Philosophers like Jean-Paul Sartre and Simone de Beauvoir have discussed the nature of human existence and suffering in a world without inherent meaning. For existentialists, suffering is part of the human condition, and individuals must find meaning in their suffering or face a sense of despair. This view often leads to an emphasis on personal responsibility and the freedom to choose one's response to evil, despite its apparent randomness or senselessness (Nagel, 2002). Emotional responses to evil are more personal and often focus on the emotional struggle to reconcile belief in a good God with the experience of suffering. This includes feelings of grief, doubt, and anger. In religious communities, these emotions often lead to deep spiritual questioning or a crisis of faith, where individuals struggle with their belief in a benevolent God while confronting the reality of evil in their lives. Religious responses may include prayer, lament, and community support as ways to address these emotional experiences and find meaning in the midst of suffering (Marion, 2018).

Theological Implications of Evil for the attributes of the "Good God"
The presence of evil in the world has profound theological implications for the concept of a good and omnipotent God. In this section, we explore how the existence of evil challenges the

core attributes of God and examine various theological perspectives, including biblical views and the role of eschatology in resolving the problem of evil. The traditional theological attributes of God, omnipotence, omnibenevolence, and divine justice, come into tension with the existence of evil in the world. The challenge is to reconcile these divine attributes with the suffering and moral wrongdoing that pervade human experience. Theological reflection on the problem of evil often centers on the apparent contradictions between these attributes and the reality of evil. The concept of omnipotence refers to God's all-powerful nature, the belief that God is capable of doing anything that is logically possible. However, the existence of evil raises questions about the scope and nature of God's power. If God is omnipotent, why does He allow evil to exist? This dilemma often leads to the discussion of human free will as an explanation for the presence of evil. If human beings are truly free to make choices, then God may permit evil to exist as a consequence of granting individuals the ability to choose good or evil freely. The free will defense, as discussed earlier, suggests that God allows evil because freedom of choice is a greater good that justifies the possibility of evil. Philosophers such as Alvin Plantinga (1974) argue that an omnipotent God could not create a world with free beings who never choose evil. In this view, free will is an essential component of moral responsibility, and the existence of evil is a result of human misuse of that freedom. The tension between omnipotence and free will, however, remains a challenging problem. If God is omnipotent, why cannot He prevent evil without undermining human freedom? This question continues to provoke debate within both philosophical and theological circles (Basinger & Basinger, 2020).

Omnibenevolence refers to the belief that God is all-good and desires the best for His creation. This divine attribute appears to conflict with the reality of suffering and evil. If God is omnibenevolent, why does He allow such widespread suffering in the world? The presence of moral and natural evils seems to challenge the goodness of God, leading many to question how a benevolent God could permit such pain and destruction. One theological response to this challenge is the soul-making theodicy, which asserts that suffering is necessary for spiritual and moral development. According to this view, God allows evil and suffering as part of the process through which human beings grow into virtuous, morally responsible individuals. John Hick (2007) argues that the existence of evil provides the conditions for the development of qualities such as courage, empathy, and wisdom, which are essential for human flourishing. While suffering is painful, it is framed as a means to a greater good: the maturation of the soul. However, critics of this perspective point out that the intensity and scale of suffering in the world seem disproportionate to the goal of moral development. The existence of natural disasters, diseases, and widespread injustice challenges the idea that suffering can always serve a greater good (Van Inwagen, 2020).

Divine justice is the belief that God is just and will ultimately right every wrong. However, the presence of apparent injustice in the world, such as the suffering of the innocent and the prosperity of the wicked—raises questions about the nature of divine justice. In the face of

such injustice, many struggle with the question of why God allows evil to persist without immediate punishment or correction. In Christian theology, the concept of divine justice is often linked to the problem of theodicy, where theologians seek to justify God's justice despite the apparent unfairness of the world. The book of Psalms, for example, frequently addresses the suffering of the righteous and the apparent success of the wicked (Psalm 73). These texts express the emotional tension between God's justice and the reality of injustice in the world. A theological response to this problem is the trust in God's ultimate justice. The idea is that while injustice may prevail in the short term, God will ultimately bring about justice in the final judgment. This belief is rooted in the hope of eschatological fulfillment, where all wrongs will be righted, and God's justice will be fully revealed.

Biblical Perspectives on the Problem of Evil

The Bible presents a complex and multifaceted view of the problem of evil. Both the Old and New Testaments grapple with the presence of evil and suffering, providing theological and existential responses to these challenges. The Book of Job is one of the most famous biblical texts addressing the problem of evil. In this story, Job, a righteous man, suffers immense loss and pain without any apparent reason. Throughout the book, Job questions God's justice and struggles to understand why he, an innocent man, is afflicted. His friends offer various theological explanations, but Job's suffering remains a mystery. In the end, God responds not by explaining why evil exists, but by revealing His infinite wisdom and power. The book suggests that human beings may never fully understand the reasons behind their suffering, but they must trust in God's greater wisdom (Clines, 2017). The Psalms also express profound emotional responses to suffering and evil. Many psalms lament the suffering of the righteous and call out to God for justice. For example, Psalm 22, which begins with the words, "My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?" captures the deep sense of abandonment that can accompany suffering. However, the Psalms also affirm the ultimate trust in God's ability to bring justice and redemption. The Book of Ecclesiastes explores the seeming futility of life and the mysterious nature of suffering. The Preacher of Ecclesiastes reflects on the injustices of the world, where good things often happen to bad people and bad things to good people. The conclusion of the book encourages humans to fear God and keep His commandments, even in the face of life's apparent absurdities (Barton, 2020).

In the New Testament, the life and suffering of Jesus Christ are central to the Christian understanding of evil. Jesus' suffering and crucifixion are seen as the ultimate act of sacrificial love, where God takes on human suffering in order to redeem humanity. This act of divine self-sacrifice presents a profound response to the problem of evil: rather than explaining suffering, God enters into it and transforms it through love and redemption (N.T. Wright, 2014). The Apostle Paul's teachings further contribute to the New Testament's perspective on evil. In Romans 8:18–23, Paul acknowledges the reality of suffering in the world but offers hope in the ultimate redemption of creation. He suggests that suffering is part of the groaning of creation,

awaiting the final redemption when God will restore all things. For Paul, suffering has a redemptive purpose, and the believer's hope is found in the resurrection and the future glory that will be revealed (Hays, 2017). Eschatology, or the study of the end times, plays a crucial role in Christian theology's response to the problem of evil. Many theologians argue that the apparent injustices of the world will be addressed in the final judgment and the establishment of God's kingdom. The second coming of Christ, the resurrection of the dead, and the new heaven and new earth are seen as the ultimate resolution to the problem of evil. In the eschatological vision, God's justice will be fully realised, and all wrongs will be righted. This hope provides comfort to believers who experience suffering and injustice in the present world, as they look forward to a time when God will eliminate evil and restore peace and righteousness (Moltmann, 1993).

Philosophical Perspectives on the Problem of Evil
Philosophical discussions of the problem of evil address the apparent contradiction between the existence of evil and the traditional attributes of God, including omnipotence, omnibenevolence, and omniscience. In this section, we examine classical philosophical arguments, contemporary responses, and atheistic and agnostic perspectives on the problem of evil. Classical philosophers have long debated the nature of evil and its compatibility with the existence of an all-powerful, all-good God. These discussions have focused on the logical and empirical challenges posed by evil to theistic belief systems. Epicurus, the ancient Greek philosopher, famously articulated a version of the problem of evil that has since been known as the "logical problem of evil." Epicurus' argument, as presented in his paradox of evil, states that if God is omnipotent, omnibenevolent, and omniscient, evil should not exist. If God is willing to prevent evil but is unable, then God is not omnipotent. If God is able to prevent evil but unwilling, then God is not omnibenevolent. And if God is both willing and able to prevent evil, then why does evil exist at all? Epicurus' formulation of the problem creates a contradiction in the classical conception of God (McGrath, 2021). This formulation has influenced many later philosophers, particularly those who seek to reconcile the existence of God with the reality of evil. While Epicurus himself did not resolve the paradox, his challenge remains central to philosophical discussions on the problem of evil.

David Hume, in his work Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion (1779), advanced a skeptical perspective on the problem of evil. Hume's empirical challenge focuses on the observation that the world contains evil and suffering, which seems to contradict the existence of an all-powerful and all-good deity. According to Hume, the presence of evil is empirical evidence that challenges the rational justification for the existence of a benevolent God. Hume argued that the existence of evil should lead one to question the traditional attributes of God, especially the claim that God is omnibenevolent. In Hume's view, the argument from evil provides strong evidence for rejecting the classical conception of God as both omnipotent and omnibenevolent (Hume, 2000). His challenge has influenced many modern atheistic

arguments against theism. J.L. Mackie, in his influential essay *Evil and Omnipotence* (1955), developed a version of the logical problem of evil known as the **inconsistent triad.** Mackie argued that it is logically impossible for God to be both omnipotent and omnibenevolent while allowing evil to exist. The three propositions in the triad are: God is omnipotent (all-powerful), God is omnibenevolent (all-good) and Evil exists in the world. Mackie suggested that if all three of these propositions are true, then there is a logical contradiction. If God is all-powerful, He should be able to eliminate evil. If God is all-good, He should desire to eliminate evil. Since evil exists, one of these propositions must be false. Mackie concluded that the classical conception of God cannot be true in light of the existence of evil, challenging the coherence of traditional theism.

Contemporary Philosophical Responses
In response to classical philosophical arguments, contemporary philosophers have developed a variety of theodicies and defenses to reconcile the existence of evil with the attributes of God. Alvin Plantinga's Free Will Defense, presented in his seminal work God, Freedom, and Evil (1974), is one of the most influential responses to the logical problem of evil. Plantinga's argument centers on the idea that evil is a necessary consequence of human free will. According to Plantinga, God could not create a world in which free agents always choose the good, because such a world would not truly involve free will. Free will, by its very nature, allows for the possibility of evil, but it also enables genuine moral goodness. Plantinga argues that the existence of evil does not disprove the existence of an omnipotent and omnibenevolent God because God has granted humans the freedom to choose between good and evil. The presence of evil, therefore, is the result of human choices, not divine deficiency. This defense provides a philosophical justification for why God might allow evil to exist while remaining both omnipotent and omnibenevolent (Plantinga, 1974).

Richard Swinburne offers a greater good argument in response to the problem of evil, particularly focusing on the relationship between human freedom, responsibility, and the greater purposes of God. In his work The Existence of God (2004), Swinburne argues that some evils are necessary for the greater good of the world. He contends that human beings can only develop morally and spiritually in a world that contains the possibility of evil and suffering. Without the opportunity to choose between good and evil, human beings would lack moral responsibility and the ability to grow in virtues such as courage, compassion, and empathy. Swinburne also suggests that certain evils may be necessary for the realisation of greater goods, such as the development of strong character or the possibility of deep relationships. While he acknowledges that the existence of evil presents a challenge, he maintains that it is consistent with the existence of an all-good, all-powerful God, as these goods outweigh the suffering caused by evil (Swinburne, 2004).

Marilyn McCord Adams presents a horrendous evils theodicy in response to what she sees as a deeper challenge posed by particularly intense and seemingly gratuitous evils, such

as the suffering of innocent children or victims of extreme torture. In her work *Horrendous Evils and the Goodness of God* (1999), Adams argues that some evils are so severe and so overwhelming that they cannot be justified by ordinary theodicies. She suggests that such horrendous evils pose a unique challenge to faith, as they appear to be beyond any conceivable greater good. Adams' response to this challenge is to argue that while these evils may be incomprehensible from a human perspective, they do not undermine the existence of a benevolent God. Rather, she suggests that God can redeem such evils in ways that are beyond human understanding, and that those who endure horrendous evils may experience ultimate redemption and restoration in the afterlife. This perspective provides a way to reconcile the existence of extreme suffering with belief in an all-good God (Adams, 1999).

Atheists and agnostics have long used the problem of evil as a central argument against the existence of God. For many atheists, the sheer amount and intensity of evil in the world is incompatible with the traditional attributes of a benevolent and omnipotent God. According to thinkers like Hume and Mackie, the existence of evil provides empirical and logical evidence that either God does not exist or that God's nature is fundamentally different from the traditional conception. Some atheists, like Richard Dawkins, have argued that the existence of evil is evidence for a naturalistic understanding of the world, where suffering is simply a consequence of blind evolutionary forces, not the result of divine will or purpose (Dawkins, 2006). For them, the problem of evil is not merely a challenge for theism but a key reason to reject theistic belief altogether. Agnostics, on the other hand, may take a more neutral stance, acknowledging that the existence of evil raises significant doubts about the existence of God but also recognising the limitations of human understanding in addressing these issues. Agnostics may argue that the problem of evil is an intractable mystery that cannot be definitively resolved, leaving the question of God's existence open-ended (Smith, 2012).

Theodicy and Human Experience
The problem of evil has not only philosophical and theological implications but also profound ethical, social, and personal consequences. In the face of human suffering, people from various religious traditions seek ways to understand and respond to the existence of evil. This section explores religious responses to suffering, the ethical and social implications of theodicy, and comparative religious perspectives on evil. Religious responses to human suffering are central to theodicy because they address the emotional and existential aspects of experiencing evil. Many religious traditions offer frameworks for coping with suffering that emphasises spiritual resilience, moral reflection, and the hope of eventual restoration. Prayer is a central element in many religious traditions as a means of coping with suffering. It allows individuals to seek solace, express their pain, and connect with the divine in moments of distress. Religious faith-based coping mechanisms include not only prayer but also meditation, rituals, and communal worship, all of which help individuals navigate the emotional turmoil that arises from experiencing or witnessing evil and suffering. Research has shown that prayer and other religious practices

often provide a sense of comfort, meaning, and hope in the face of adversity (Pargament, 2013). For example, studies in psychology of religion demonstrate that individuals who engage in prayer during times of suffering tend to experience a greater sense of spiritual well-being, which mitigates feelings of helplessness and despair. In this way, prayer functions as a coping mechanism, offering both emotional relief and the hope that suffering has a purpose or an eventual resolution (Pargament, 2013; Koenig, 2015).

Religious leaders play an essential role in guiding their communities through the experience of suffering and evil. In many traditions, religious leaders provide theological and pastoral responses to the problem of evil, offering interpretations of suffering that align with their faith's teachings. These leaders offer counsel, prayer, and moral support to individuals and communities confronting suffering, often emphasising themes of hope, redemption, and the possibility of divine justice. For example, in Christian traditions, clergy often emphasise the power of prayer and the hope of eternal life to counterbalance earthly suffering, drawing from the teachings of Jesus in the Gospels (Matthew 5:4; John 16:33). Similarly, in Islam, religious leaders remind believers of Allah's greater plan and the virtue of patience *(sabr)* in times of hardship (Nasr, 2015). Religious leaders help their followers find meaning in suffering, guiding them through a framework that affirms the belief in a benevolent and omnipotent God, despite the presence of evil. Theodicy also raises significant ethical and social questions about how people should respond to suffering, injustice, and evil in society. These ethical reflections often intersect with the problem of evil and influence how religious communities engage in social action and advocate for justice. The problem of evil has profound implications for ethical decision-making. The question of how to respond to evil, whether it is the suffering of others or the moral choices that lead to harm, confronts individuals, religious communities, and institutions alike. Many ethical frameworks, particularly those rooted in religious traditions, view the experience of evil as a call to action, urging individuals to alleviate suffering and prevent harm. Christian ethics, for example, draws heavily from the example of Jesus, who, in the face of suffering and evil, demonstrated compassion and sacrifice. The ethical imperative to love one's neighbor, alleviate suffering, and seek justice becomes a core part of Christian moral teachings in response to the problem of evil (Matthew 25:31-46). Similarly, in Buddhist ethics, the cultivation of compassion (karuna) and the reduction of suffering *(dukkha)* are central to ethical behavior, as followers are taught to engage in actions that relieve the suffering of others (Dalai Lama, 2011).

In secular moral philosophy, the problem of evil often prompts debates about justice, fairness, and the role of the state in addressing social evils such as poverty, inequality, and discrimination. Philosophers like Peter Singer (2015) argue for an ethical response to global suffering, emphasising that individuals and governments have a moral responsibility to address preventable harms in the world, particularly in contexts of extreme poverty or conflict. The question of social justice is deeply intertwined with the problem of evil. Many religious responses to suffering emphasise not only personal redemption but also collective efforts to address

social evils, such as poverty, oppression, and inequality. Theodicy often provides a theological or philosophical justification for engaging in social justice work, offering a vision of a just society where evil and suffering are eradicated or alleviated. In liberation theology, a Christian theological framework, the problem of evil is addressed through a call to action against systemic injustice and oppression. The suffering of the poor and marginalised is seen as a form of evil that demands a response from both the church and society. Figures like Gustavo Gutiérrez (2009) argue that salvation is not only a spiritual matter but also a social one, requiring Christians to actively engage in the struggle for social justice, confronting the social structures that perpetuate suffering. Similarly, Islamic social ethics emphasises justice *(adl)* as a core value. The Qur'an speaks of God's command for believers to act justly and to alleviate the suffering of the oppressed, particularly the poor, widows, orphans, and those marginalised in society (Qur'an 2:177; 4:1). Islamic teachings on social justice provide a framework for addressing the material and social causes of evil, encouraging believers to work towards an equitable and just society.

Social justice movements in other religious and secular contexts often draw on these theodicies to call for greater action in addressing the root causes of evil, such as systemic inequality, environmental destruction, and human rights violations (King, 2018). The presence of evil in the form of social injustice is seen not only as a theological problem but as a moral and political issue that requires collective human action. Religious traditions around the world offer various interpretations of evil, often with unique perspectives on its nature, causes, and possible resolution. Despite differences in theological doctrines, many religious systems share common themes regarding the role of human suffering, divine justice, and the ultimate defeat of evil. In Christianity, the problem of evil is deeply tied to the doctrine of original sin, human free will, and the redemptive work of Christ. Christian theodicy often focuses on the idea of divine providence, God's ability to bring good from evil. The crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus are seen as the ultimate triumph over evil and suffering, offering believers hope that even in the face of profound suffering, God's plan is ultimately one of redemption and restoration (Romans 8:18-39).

In Islam, the existence of evil is seen as part of God's will and plan, with the Qur'an emphasising that God is both just and merciful. The experience of suffering and evil in the world is viewed as a test of faith, with individuals being held accountable for their responses to evil (Nasr, 2015). Suffering is not seen as meaningless but as an opportunity for spiritual growth, with the ultimate reward being eternal paradise for those who endure suffering with patience (sabr) and righteousness.

Buddhism approaches the problem of evil through the concept of dukkha (suffering), which is one of the central tenets of Buddhist teaching. According to the Four Noble Truths, suffering is an inherent part of life, and its root causes are ignorance, attachment, and aversion. Buddhism offers a path to overcome suffering through the practice of the Noble Eightfold Path, which guides individuals towards ethical conduct, mental discipline, and wisdom (Dalai

Lama, 2011). Hinduism, like Buddhism, addresses the problem of evil through the lens of karma. Suffering is seen as the result of actions in this or past lives, and it is ultimately through spiritual practice and the pursuit of moksha (liberation) that one can transcend the cycle of suffering. The *Bhagavad Gita* offers a perspective on suffering as an integral part of the spiritual journey, where righteous action in the face of adversity leads to liberation (Bhagavad Gita 2:47).

Critical Evaluation and Synthesis
The study of the problem of evil and the development of theodicies have played a significant role in both theology and philosophy. Over the centuries, various theodicies have emerged, each attempting to address the complexities and contradictions posed by the existence of evil in a world governed by an all-powerful, all-good God. This section critically evaluates the strengths and weaknesses of the major theodicies, explores the relationship between theology and philosophy in understanding evil, and considers the future of theodicy in a postmodern world. Theodicies are intellectual frameworks that attempt to reconcile the existence of evil with the belief in a good, omnipotent God. While each theodicy presents its own strengths, they are not without criticism. A critical evaluation of the major theodicies reveals both their merits and limitations. One of the most prominent theodicies is the Free Will Defense, championed by philosophers such as Alvin Plantinga (1974). According to this defense, evil is a result of the free will granted to humans by God. In this view, God allows evil to exist because human freedom is necessary for moral good. Without the possibility of choosing evil, genuine goodness and love would be impossible. The Free Will Defense provides a plausible explanation for moral evil, particularly actions like murder, theft, and war. It emphasises human responsibility, preserving the integrity of moral choices while protecting God's omnipotence. This theodicy has been highly influential in reconciling human freedom with the problem of evil. Critics argue that the Free Will Defense fails to address the existence of natural evil—suffering caused by natural events like earthquakes, diseases, and famines, which humans do not have the freedom to control. Moreover, it raises the question of whether God could have created beings with free will who would always freely choose good, thus preventing the existence of evil while preserving moral freedom.

John Hick's Soul-Making Theodicy posits that evil exists as a means of developing virtues such as courage, compassion, and wisdom. Hick argues that the world is designed as a "vale of soul-making," where individuals undergo challenges and suffering that allow them to grow spiritually and morally. According to Hick, God allows evil in order to nurture the soul's development, which ultimately leads to a greater good. The Soul-Making Theodicy provides a robust explanation for natural evil, as it argues that suffering can contribute to personal growth and moral development. It offers a perspective of hope, where the purpose of suffering is seen in the context of spiritual maturation. The major criticism of the Soul-Making Theodicy is that it seems to justify the existence of extreme and gratuitous suffering. Some argue that the

scale of suffering in the world, such as the suffering of innocent children or the victims of natural disasters, is disproportionate to the alleged soul-making benefits it produces. Moreover, the assumption that all evil contributes to soul-making is questioned, as many people may not experience any moral or spiritual growth from their suffering.

The Augustinian Theodicy, rooted in the writings of St. Augustine, suggests that evil is not a substance or force in itself but rather a privation of good. In this view, evil is the absence of the good that God created, and it results from the free choices of rational beings. Augustine asserts that God created the world as good, but evil entered it as a corruption caused by the misuse of free will by both humans and fallen angels. The Augustinian Theodicy offers a coherent explanation of the origin of evil, particularly moral evil, and ties it to human free will. It maintains that God's creation is fundamentally good, which preserves God's perfect nature while addressing the existence of evil. This theodicy also aligns with the biblical narrative of the Fall of Man in Genesis. One of the criticisms of the Augustinian Theodicy is that it struggles to explain the existence of natural evil. If evil is only a privation of good, then how do we account for suffering caused by natural events that seem independent of human choice? Additionally, the idea that all evil results from free will has been challenged, especially in the case of natural disasters or suffering inflicted on innocent beings.

Process Theodicy, influenced by the philosophy of Alfred North Whitehead, argues that God's power is not omnipotent in the classical sense but is instead persuasive rather than coercive. According to this view, God does not have absolute control over the universe but works within the constraints of the natural order to bring about good. Evil exists because God cannot always prevent it due to the free will of creatures and the inherent limitations of the natural world. Process Theodicy offers a compelling explanation for the existence of evil that is grounded in the limitations of divine power. It acknowledges the reality of evil without attempting to explain it away, thus providing a more realistic understanding of God's relationship to the world. The most significant criticism of Process Theodicy is that it diminishes God's omnipotence, which is a key attribute in many theistic traditions. Critics argue that if God is not all-powerful, then this undermines the traditional conception of God as sovereign and ultimately in control of the universe. Additionally, this view may raise questions about the efficacy of divine action in the world, especially regarding ultimate redemption.

Bridging Theology and Philosophy in Understanding the Problem of Evil
The problem of evil is a unique intersection between theology and philosophy, requiring collaboration between both disciplines to understand its implications. Theological perspectives emphasise the religious narrative of divine justice, providence, and salvation, while philosophical perspectives focus on logical coherence, moral reasoning, and the nature of human suffering. Theodicy serves as a bridge between these two realms, providing a framework for both theological reflection and philosophical critique. Philosophy, particularly in its examination of logical and evidential problems (e.g., the logical problem of evil, as discussed by Epicurus and

Hume), challenges theological claims and forces theologians to refine their arguments in light of modern critiques. Conversely, theology offers philosophical discussions a broader perspective on ultimate meaning, the role of suffering, and the possibility of redemption. As seen in the works of philosophers like Alvin Plantinga and John Hick, the dialogue between theology and philosophy has produced sophisticated responses to the problem of evil. These responses allow for the coexistence of an all-good, all-powerful God with the reality of evil, each discipline enriching the other with its distinct approaches. The future of theodicy in a postmodern world will likely involve a reevaluation of traditional responses to evil in light of contemporary social, political, and cultural changes. Postmodernism, with its skepticism towards grand narratives and emphasis on subjectivity and relativism, challenges the universal claims made by traditional theodicies. This shift is particularly significant in the way we understand the nature of suffering and evil.

In a postmodern world, where the meaning of evil is often viewed through multiple perspectives, there is a growing recognition that the problem of evil cannot be fully explained by any one narrative. Postmodern thinkers may argue that the experience of evil is more personal and contextual, shaped by cultural, social, and historical factors. This calls for more nuanced and pluralistic approaches to theodicy that are sensitive to the diversity of human experiences and the complexity of suffering. The postmodern critique also emphasises the importance of addressing systemic evil, such as social injustice, environmental destruction, and political oppression. The future of theodicy may therefore include a more significant focus on collective action, social justice, and the role of religious communities in confronting evil in all its forms. Rather than offering abstract philosophical or theological answers, contemporary theodicies may increasingly emphasise practical responses to suffering, offering hope and solidarity in the face of human evil.

CONCLUSION

The problem of evil, a central theme in both theology and philosophy, continues to challenge the notion of a good, omnipotent God in a world where suffering and injustice are pervasive. This study has explored various theological and philosophical perspectives on evil, theodicy and the attributes of God, aiming to reconcile the existence of evil with the belief in a good, all-powerful deity. This research highlights both the strengths and limitations of classical and contemporary theodicies, while considering the existential and emotional dimensions of human suffering in relation to divine justice. The study identified two primary categories of evil: moral evil, which is the result of human actions, for example crime, war, and natural evil, which arises from natural events, for example earthquakes, diseases. These distinctions are important in analysing the different responses that theodicies provide to each form of evil. The research reviewed several classical theodicies, including the Free Will Defense, Soul-Making Theodicy, Augustinian Theodicy and Process Theodicy. Each of these offers a different explanation for the existence of evil, balancing the attributes of God (omnipotence, omnibenevolence,

omniscience) with the reality of evil in the world. The study demonstrated that while these theodicies provide valuable insights, none fully resolves the problem of evil, especially in the face of extreme suffering. Philosophers have long engaged with the logical and evidential problems posed by evil. From the logical problem of evil articulated by Epicurus and Hume to the more contemporary responses such as Alvin Plantinga's Free Will Defense and Richard Swinburne's Greater Good Argument, the philosophical responses have sought to demonstrate that the existence of evil does not necessarily negate the existence of an all-good, all-powerful God. The Bible offers multiple perspectives on the problem of evil. Old Testament figures such as Job wrestled with the question of unjust suffering, while New Testament teachings, particularly those surrounding the suffering of Jesus Christ, provide a model for understanding the relationship between evil and divine justice. The study also found that eschatological views, focusing on the ultimate triumph of good over evil, offer a hopeful resolution to the problem of evil. The existential dimension of the problem of evil underscores the human experience of suffering, especially as it pertains to emotional and spiritual struggles. Theodicies must take into account not only the intellectual challenge posed by evil but also the real, lived experience of those who suffer. Religious responses such as prayer, faith-based coping mechanisms, and the support of religious communities are vital in addressing these personal and communal struggles.

The problem of evil remains one of the most profound and perplexing challenges to the concept of a good, omnipotent God. The study, articulates the fact that while classical and contemporary theodicies offer valuable insights, none of them fully resolve the tension between divine goodness and the existence of evil. The complexity of the issue lies not only in intellectual reasoning but in the emotional and existential experience of suffering. The question of why a good God would allow evil to persist continues to be a source of theological reflection, philosophical debate, and personal struggle. Nevertheless, the search for a satisfactory theodicy is not merely an academic exercise; it has real-world implications for how people experience suffering, how they relate to God, and how they engage with issues of justice and morality. Theodicies offer more than just explanations, they provide comfort, hope, and a framework for understanding suffering in a world that often seems unjust. As we continue to grapple with the problem of evil, it is essential to remember that, while the problem may never be fully resolved, the search for understanding helps to shape our beliefs, our responses to suffering, and our efforts to alleviate the evil that we can. The problem of evil presents an enduring challenge to both faith and reason. While there is no easy solution, ongoing dialogue between theology, philosophy, and human experience is essential in addressing this profound issue. It is imperative that our discussions of theodicy remain compassionate, open-minded and sensitive to the diverse ways in which people experience and respond to evil in the world. The study highlighted the ethical and social implications of the problem of evil, particularly in the context of social justice. Theodicies must consider the structural and systemic evils that affect marginalised communities and the world's most vulnerable populations. The role of religious

leaders and communities in addressing these challenges is significant, and theodicy must evolve to address not only individual suffering but collective injustices as well.

RECOMMENDATIONS
Further research should explore the role of religious coping mechanisms in helping individuals reconcile the problem of evil.

Future research should more deeply explore how religious communities address social evils like poverty, oppression and inequality.

Comparative studies of theodicy across different religious traditions could offer valuable insights into how various faiths approach the problem of evil.

REFERENCES

Adams, M. M. (1999). *Horrendous Evils and the Goodness of God*. Cornell University Press, Ithaca, NY.

Basinger, D. R., & Basinger, K. (2020). *The problem of evil and the free will defense*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Barton, J. (2020). *The Bible: The basics*. Routledge, London.

Clines, D. J. A. (2017). *Job 1-20: A commentary*. T&T Clark, London.

Cohen, R. (2013). *The problem of evil and the foundations of theology*. Oxford University Press

Dalai Lama. (2011). *The art of happiness: A handbook for living*. Riverhead Books, New York

Dawkins, R. (2006). *The God delusion*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, Boston, MA.xford.

Gutiérrez, G. (2009). *A theology of liberation: History, politics, and salvation* (30th ed.). Orbis Books, Maryknoll, NY.

Hartshorne, C. (1997). *Omnipotence and other theological essays*. State University of New York Press, Albany.

Hays, R. B. (2017). *The letter to the Romans*. Eerdmans Publishing, Grand Rapids, MI.

Hick, J. (2007). *Evil and the God of Love* (2nd ed.). Palgrave Macmillan, New York.

Hitchens, C. (2007). *God is not great: How religion poisons everything*. Twelve, New York.

Hume, D. (2000). *Dialogues concerning natural religion*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

King, M. L. (2018). *The strength to love*. HarperOne, New York.

Koenig, H. G. (2015). *Religion and mental health: Research and clinical applications*. Springer Science & Business Media, New York.

Levinas, E. (2021). *Totality and infinity: An essay on exteriority* (A. Lingis, Trans.). Duquesne University Press, Pittsburgh.

Mackie, J. L. (1982). *The Miracle of Theism: Arguments for and Against the Existence of God*. Clarendon Press, Oxford.

Marion, J. L. (2018). *The erotic horizon of the gospel: The gaze of God and the desire for the other*. Northwestern University Press, Evanston.

Mavrodes, G. (2018). *The problem of evil and the complexity of divine omniscience*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

McGrath, A. E. (2021). *Christian theology: An introduction* (6th ed.). Wiley-Blackwell, Hoboken, NJ.

Moltmann, J. (1993). *The coming of God: Christian eschatology*. Fortress Press, Minneapolis.

Nagel, T. (2002). *Concealment and revelation: Esoteric writings of Jean-Paul Sartre*. Princeton University Press, Princeton.

Nasr, S. H. (2015). *Islamic Spirituality: A Brief Introduction*. HarperOne, New York.

Pargament, K. I. (2013). *Spiritually integrated psychotherapy: Understanding and addressing the sacred*. The Guilford Press, New York.

Plantinga, A. (1974). *God, Freedom, and Evil*. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI.

Singer, P. (2015). *The life you can save: Acting now to end world poverty*. Random House, New York.

Smith, H. (2012). *The world's religions* (2nd ed.). HarperOne, New York.

Swinburne, R. (2004). *The existence of God* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Van Inwagen, P. (2020). *The problem of evil: A critical overview*. Yale University Press, New Haven.

Whitehead, A. N. (1929). *Process and Reality: An Essay in Cosmology*. Macmillan, New York.

Wright, N.T. (2014). *Jesus and the victory of God*. Fortress Press, Minneapolis.