

WHICH GOD?

Beyond Epistemological Conceptions

A Journey to Ontological Reality



Emrah BOZKURT

May 2025

Abstract

This article examines the question “*Which God?*” on a rational and conceptual basis, aiming to resolve the contemporary philosophical confusion surrounding the concept of “God.” It argues that the God-conceptions produced by the human mind in accordance with its epistemological capacities are often mistaken for an ontological being, which leads to misinterpretations of the diverse understandings of God that appear across individual and cultural contexts. In this study, a rational definition of God is offered, whereby all intermediary conceptions of divinity are set aside in favor of understanding God as “a single, creative, and transcendent substance.” Multiple philosophical scenarios are then explored to test the coherence of this concept, including issues such as countability, conflicts of will, causal chains, and the relationship between time and space. The analysis demonstrates why God must necessarily be a single and transcendent being. Ultimately, the study concludes that epistemological models concerning God are inherently limited, and thus a clear conceptual understanding requires a definition grounded in ontological reality.

Keywords: God, Metaphysics, Islam, Religion, Philosophy, Ontology, Epistemology, Rationality, Causality, Determinism, Monotheism, Polytheism, Zeitgeist

Introduction

The concept of God is one of the oldest and most debated metaphysical problems in human history. The aim of this article is not to directly prove or disprove the existence of God. Rather, it is to clarify and define the concept of God by discussing the question “*Which God?*” on a philosophical and rational foundation. Today, many different understandings are expressed under the name “God,” and these often refer to entirely different notions, resulting in a profound conceptual confusion.

This study centers on an important distinction that is frequently overlooked when speaking about God: the difference between an ontological being and an epistemological conception. God Himself—as an ontological reality—may be singular and absolute; however, when humans attempt to grasp Him, they generate conceptions shaped by their own cognitive limitations, cultural backgrounds, historical contexts, and personal perspectives. Thus, the diversity of God-conceptions does not pertain to God Himself but rather to human cognition.

In this article, we first examine the relationship between the human mind and reality, along with the epistemological modeling process through which humans develop their understanding of existence. We then explore how God-conceptions throughout history have been shaped by cultural and temporal contexts—what might be called the “spirit of the age.” Following this, we develop a rational definition of God that is independent of proper names or mythological figures, focusing instead on a purely conceptual framework. This definition views God as “a single, indivisible, formless, transcendent substance that is the creator of everything.”

In the later sections of the article, this conceptual definition serves as the basis for demonstrating the logical and metaphysical contradictions inherent in the idea of multiple gods. We also examine whether God can be subject to causation—that is, whether God Himself can have a cause. The ultimate aim is to show that God can be approached not only through belief but also through robust philosophical principles, and to establish a rational foundation capable of resolving the widespread confusion surrounding God-conceptions.

The Ontological–Epistemological Distinction: Fundamental Concepts and Differences

Ontology and epistemology—two conceptual frameworks that lie at the heart of philosophical thought—represent the distinction between being and knowledge. Ontology concerns itself with what exists, how it exists, and under what conditions it comes to exist. Epistemology, by contrast, investigates how we obtain knowledge of that existence, how we justify our beliefs, and to what extent such knowledge is possible. Although these two domains often intersect, they represent fundamentally different perspectives that must be distinguished from one another. Ontology refers to external reality, the order of being that exists independently of our minds; epistemology, on the other hand, deals with how this reality is represented within the human mind.

The ontological realm concerns things as they are *in themselves*, whereas the epistemological realm concerns their representations in consciousness. Humans do not apprehend external reality directly; they reach it through perceptual and cognitive processes. Thus, what we call “knowledge” is formed within the structure of the human mind and is,

strictly speaking, an epistemological construct rather than an ontological reality. The mind receives information through the senses, intuition, reason, and experience, but every piece of incoming data is filtered, interpreted, and given meaning by cognitive processes. This interpretive process is precisely where the distance between being and knowledge begins to widen.

This leads to a crucial distinction: humans do not encounter reality directly but only through mental representations. These representations are shaped by an individual's knowledge, experiences, beliefs, and cultural codes. Therefore, humans understand ontological reality within the limits of their own epistemological frameworks. This also explains why individuals construct different conceptions of the world, of being, and even of God. The epistemological realm belongs to what is subjective and variable; it is shaped by personal and contextual factors.

Ontology seeks what is universal and unchanging; epistemology concerns what is personal, historical, and mutable. While ontology asks, "*What exists?*", epistemology asks, "*What can we know?*" These questions are not independent from one another, yet the connection between them is framed by the nature of human cognition.

The human mind constructs representations of ontological reality, but people often fall into the error of mistaking these representations for reality itself. This leads to philosophical confusion and, in many cases, ontological misplacement. A person may begin to treat an epistemological construct as though it were an ontological being. This confusion will become even more evident in later discussions of God-conceptions.

In summary, there is a fundamental difference between what exists ontologically and what is known epistemologically. This distinction plays a key role in evaluating metaphysical issues. Because the human mind has limited capacities, it cannot fully grasp an ontological reality—especially one that is transcendent and absolute. Instead, it forms conceptual models based on its own epistemological boundaries. Therefore, when speaking of God, ignoring this distinction leads to the mistake of elevating human cognitive limitations to the level of universal truth.

The World of the Mind and Ontological Beings: An Epistemological Perspective

Human perception of the universe and of existence is not based on direct access to ontological reality, but on its representation as constructed within the mind. In other words, human beings do not grasp external objects, events, and beings exactly as they are; rather, they understand and make sense of them through mental models. This indicates that the human experience of reality is not ontological but epistemological. Humans do not perceive the outside world directly—they relate to a mentally constructed model of it.¹

In this context, the mind produces representational structures about external reality through tools such as sensory perception, experience, reasoning, belief, and language. These structures are not the reality itself but its interpreted form. Thus, "reality," from the human standpoint, is always an interpreted, filtered, and meaning-laden reality. At this point, it is

¹ For more information, see: Emrah Bozkurt, "Truth, Reality, and Actuality", *academia.edu*, May 2025.

important to emphasize that there is no one-to-one correspondence between the models created by the mind and the structures that exist in the external world. The mind does not merely receive data; it organizes, categorizes, and interprets it—constructing meaning. This meaning-making process yields a particular version of reality.

To clarify this further, consider the example of a tree. When a person sees a tree, the tree is not transferred into the mind exactly as it exists externally. The eyes capture an image, and then this image is interpreted based on mental categories. The concept of a “tree” is not a direct replica of the external world; it is an abstraction created by the human mind. Different cultures, belief systems, and personal experiences may assign different meanings to a tree. This shows that there is always an intermediary layer—a transforming filter—between the world of the mind and the world of being.

Here the essential distinction becomes clear: ontologically, the tree exists independently of the mind. Epistemologically, however, the “tree” we perceive is a mental representation constructed by the mind—interpreted, categorized, and conceptualized. Therefore, knowledge of a thing is never knowledge of the thing *in itself* but knowledge of its mental representation. Humans perceive the universe not as it is, but to the extent their minds can model it.

This issue becomes especially significant when discussing a transcendent being such as God. If God is defined as absolute, infinite, and transcendent, then the human mind—being finite and limited—cannot grasp His ontological nature directly. Instead, the mind constructs models of God within its own boundaries. These models correspond not to God’s true ontological essence but to epistemological constructs formed within the mind. In other words, a person’s “perception of God” is not God Himself but a mental model of God.

Humans tend to mistake the God-model formed in their minds for God Himself. This explains why both individuals and societies develop different conceptions of God. These conceptions are not simply individual products but are also shaped by religions, cultures, and traditions, which provide ready-made interpretative frameworks. Even revelation-based religious traditions express divine knowledge in the conceptual language of their era. God addresses human beings in the terms they can understand. Thus, even a revelation initiated by God becomes shaped within the cognitive and conceptual world of its historical recipients.²

Ultimately, every person constructs a God-conception—whether more complete or less complete—within the limits of their own mind.

When a person says, “God exists,” what they actually mean is: *“There exists a model of God in my mind.”*

Likewise, when someone says, “There is no God,” they are not rejecting the ontological God but the specific God-model that exists in their mind (or the one inherited from others). To deny something, one must presuppose a conceptual model of it. Even atheistic rejection presupposes an epistemological model—a mental construct of “the kind of God that is being denied.”

² For more information on this subject, see: Emrah Bozkurt, “God’s Necessities and the Illusion of Nature”, *academia.edu*, May 2025.

Thus, whether in affirmation or denial, the subject of debate is not God Himself but the mental representation constructed within the epistemological realm.

This distinction applies not only to God but to all beings. Humans understand everything through mental modeling. Every piece of knowledge about the external world consists of models constructed by the mind. These models make reality intelligible—but the meaning they provide is epistemological, not ontological.

Human thought begins with sensory data, which is stored in memory and eventually forms conceptual structures. For instance, the concept of “justice” is a synthesis of all the experiences a person has encountered related to justice. Conceptual structures evolve as reasoning and intuition refine them. The mind connects concepts, forming new ideas. This process is influenced by personal experience, education, belief, and culture. Thus, the mental world is both an individual and social product.

Because the mind constructs meaning, no knowledge is neutral. Every piece of knowledge is shaped by a subject’s interpretive filters. Achieving universal knowledge is possible only by becoming aware of these cognitive models and analyzing their limitations.

In conclusion, the relationship between the world of the mind and ontological beings is the most fundamental relationship humans have with reality. Humans relate not to reality directly, but to mental representations constructed within the epistemological realm. This fact is essential in both epistemology and metaphysics. The sections that follow will examine God-conceptions and transcendence within this conceptual framework.

The Epistemological Origins of God-Conceptions and the Spirit of the Age

The human mind naturally thinks by forming connections between concepts. This contextual mode of thinking underlies the mind’s capacity for abstraction and meaning-making. When attempting to comprehend a transcendent and infinite being such as God, humans must operate using the conceptual and epistemological tools available to them. Consequently, every individual constructs a God-conception shaped by their own cognitive background, level of knowledge, and cultural–linguistic environment.

In this sense, God-conceptions are not reflections of God’s ontological essence but products of the human mind’s attempts to understand Him. Each person develops a mental model of God according to their own epistemological framework, and such models may differ even within the same individual at different stages of life. Yet this does not imply that God Himself changes or multiplies. Epistemological diversity does not entail ontological plurality. Ontologically, God is one; epistemologically, He may be conceived in many different ways.

This phenomenon is not limited to individuals. Religions, too, present conceptions of God shaped within specific historical and cultural contexts. Even revelation-based scriptures convey their messages using the conceptual language and symbolic world familiar to their initial audience. For example, in the context of early Arab society, power and sovereignty were embodied in the figure of the king. Therefore, the Qur’anic conception of God often employed the language of kingship—depicting God as the absolute authority surpassing all worldly rulers.

This was not because God *is* a king-like being ontologically, but because that society's cognitive and symbolic framework made such descriptions the most effective means of communication. A more abstract, philosophical, or system-based depiction of God would not have been meaningful to that audience.

Here, the concept of the "*spirit of the age*" (Zeitgeist) plays a crucial role. Each historical period generates its own God-conceptions based on its knowledge base, metaphorical language, and prevailing figures of authority. Thus, the portrayals of God found in sacred texts also reflect the spirit of their age—not because God changes, but because human cognitive capacity and cultural conditions shape the way divine communication is received and understood. Today, with enough historical distance, we can more easily see how these conceptions were influenced by their contexts. Similarly, future generations will reinterpret our current understandings based on their own epistemic standards. This variability points not to a change in God's nature but to the inherent limitations of human perception.

The primary reason individuals have different God-conceptions is precisely these human limitations. Each person's cognitive resources, knowledge level, metaphysical sensitivity, and worldview differ, leading to distinct conceptions of God. A mind that is open, inquisitive, and holistic will form a deeper and more comprehensive God-conception. Conversely, a narrow or rigid mental framework leads to shallow, reductionist, and often anthropomorphic conceptions. These differences arise not only from personal factors but also from educational, social, and cultural conditions.

This diversity has produced numerous God-conceptions in the modern world. Yet this does not imply that many different gods exist ontologically, nor does it mean that God is a purely subjective phenomenon. The differences reflect only the variations in human cognitive frameworks. Unfortunately, some perspectives mistakenly treat these differences as if they point to distinct ontological deities. This is a philosophical error because epistemological multiplicity does not imply ontological multiplicity. If every individual's God-conception were taken as an ontological reality, this would lead to the absurd conclusion that each person or religion has their own separate God. This not only weakens the concept of God but also undermines metaphysical rationality.

It is essential to maintain the following principle: *God is one; conceptions are many.*

Every conception of God is a reflection of the epistemological capacity of the individual or society producing it. Thus, no particular God-conception—including those found in religions—can claim absolute completeness, because all conceptions are limited by human cognitive capacities.

From this epistemological framework, we can now proceed to the next critical question: *How can we conceptualize the ontologically singular and absolute God in a way that is universal, timeless, and rational?* To what extent can human reason advance in this direction, and where do its limitations begin?

The Concept of God: A Rational Definition and Its Limitations

The primary aim of this article is to examine the concept of God within a philosophical and rational framework, independent of speculative claims or dogmatic belief systems. Thus, the God-definition developed here is not a defense of any particular religion's portrayal of God or any culturally inherited depiction. On the contrary, it aims to transcend such subjective conceptions and establish a universal concept of God grounded in principles of logical necessity. It should be noted that the God-model presented in this section does not attempt to exhaust the full depth of the subject; it is confined to the scope of this article. Nevertheless, even this limited definition provides an essential foundation for understanding the ontological nature of God.

a. Addressing the Concept of God Rationally Within This Article's Framework

Throughout human history, conceptions of God have been shaped by the cultural, political, and epistemic structures of societies. In other words, what each era has regarded as the embodiment of "absolute power" has influenced how God was conceptualized within that period. In agricultural societies, God was often associated with the heavens and nature; in imperial eras, He was imagined as a sovereign ruler; in the modern age, He is commonly described as a transcendent cause, a ground of being, or an ultimate consciousness. This diversity arises not from God Himself but from the limitations and cognitive tendencies of the human mind. Human beings cannot directly access God's "nature"; they can only model Him within the boundaries of their mental capacities. In this sense, speaking of God having a "nature" is itself problematic, as attributing any determinate nature to God imposes limitations on Him.

To ground the concept of God rationally, we must strip away dogmas, historical-cultural projections, and metaphorical narratives. Instead, we must adopt a method based on logical necessity—one that identifies which qualities God must possess in order to be God. This approach eliminates not only culturally specific conceptions ("tribal gods," "mythological gods," etc.) but also psychological constructs shaped by human needs. The God-concept used in this article is therefore one that does not rely on names, stories, imagery, or symbolic representations, but only on ontologically necessary attributes.

Using this method, we can meaningfully answer the question: "*Which God?*"

Our answer is: *God as the single, unique, absolute substance that is the creator of all things.*

This definition excludes all intermediary deities, symbolic figures, and culturally conditioned representations. Here, God is understood as the source of all existence—singular, incomparable, indivisible, formless, and unlimited. Why God must necessarily be "one" will be discussed in detail in later sections; however, even at this stage, it is clear that the concept of multiple gods is incompatible with this definition.

b. A General Definition of God Independent of Proper Names

Definitions of God are often tied to proper names and religious narratives. However, these names are deeply rooted in specific historical, cultural, and linguistic worlds. In this article, we detach God from particular names and instead present a universal, rationally

grounded concept. The most essential features of this definition are God’s absolute formlessness and infinite potential.

Formlessness means that God cannot be confined to any physical or mental form. If God had a form, He would be finite. If He were finite, He would not be absolute. Thus, God must be beyond all forms, categories, and limitations the human mind uses to describe existence. God is the metaphysical “ground” of all being—the source from which all forms arise and upon which all dependent entities rely, yet who is Himself dependent on nothing.

Because of this formless and transcendent nature, all human conceptions of God are necessarily mental models. These models are shaped by cognitive capacities, cultural inheritance, language, psychological tendencies, and personal experience. Humans differ in these aspects, so they inevitably differ in their conceptions of God. Thus, though God is ontologically one, epistemologically He appears as many.

At this point another distinction must be made: *ontological universality vs sociological universality*.

Religions often seek sociological universality by spreading shared beliefs and practices to large populations. They may succeed in creating social unity, but this does not guarantee that their God-conceptions are ontologically universal. Ontological universality refers to ultimate, mind-independent reality—truth as it exists beyond human interpretation. Because the human mind is limited, no religious or personal conception can perfectly capture this ontological reality. It can only approximate it.

This limitation makes rational discourse about God not merely useful but necessary. Without rational grounding, personal projections or cultural metaphors can easily be mistaken for objective truth, leading to confusion and conflict. Thus, the God-model presented here is based on the following principles:

- God is an absolute and singular substance.
- God cannot be reduced to any form (formlessness).
- God is the creator, source, and ground of all existence.
- The human mind can understand God only through conceptual modeling.
- God is independent of all proper names and cultural narratives.
- Epistemological diversity does not negate ontological unity.

In summary, the concept of God presented here transcends all historical and cultural theisms, offering a rationally grounded metaphysical understanding. This model stands above belief systems, providing a conceptual platform upon which deeper discussions regarding causality, unity, and transcendence—addressed in later sections—can be built.

Is More Than One God Possible? Contradictions in Divine Multiplicity Assumptions

a. Countability and Transcendence: The Question “How Many Gods?” Is Itself Invalid

At first glance, the question “*Can there be more than one God?*” seems reasonable. Yet, the question itself places God into the wrong conceptual category. Concepts such as number, plurality, or quantity —“one,” “two,” “three”— apply only to entities within time and space. Countability requires spatial distinction and temporal sequencing.

However, if God is properly understood as a timeless, spaceless, transcendent substance, then asking “*How many?*” already commits a category error. It is akin to asking “*How many kilograms does a blue idea weigh?*”

Such a question appears meaningful but is ontologically nonsensical.

Transcendent reality cannot be counted.

What is countable cannot be transcendent.

Thus, polytheism collapses conceptually at the very first step: the notion of multiple gods contradicts the very definition of God as an unbounded, non-spatial, non-temporal, absolute being.

b. Multiple Gods With the Same Essence and Will: Apparent Plurality, Actual Unity

Let us temporarily ignore the issue of countability. Suppose there exist several gods who share the same attributes, the same power, and the same will.

If they act identically, follow the same laws, and possess a single unified will, then what we have is not plurality but unity.

Plurality requires difference —distinction by essence, will, or boundary.

If there is **no** difference, there is **no** plurality.

Two beings that are absolutely identical in essence, power, and will cannot be considered two separate gods. They are, at best, indistinguishable copies of one reality. Thus even the assumption of “many identical gods” reduces logically to a *single God*.

c. Multiple Gods With Different Wills: The Gate to Chaos

Now consider another scenario: suppose these hypothetical gods have equal power but different wills.

Two possibilities arise:

1. Their wills conflict

Then the universe would contain contradictions, disorder, and instability. The laws of nature would clash. Yet the universe exhibits extreme coherence, unity, and lawful structure. This consistency indicates a single governing will.

2. Their wills differ but never clash

This could occur only if:

- a. one god is subordinate to another (which negates divinity), or
- b. none of them possess true independence (again negating divinity).

A being whose will can be overridden is not God.

Therefore, the idea of multiple gods with different wills is logically inconsistent. Absolute wills cannot coexist without chaos or hierarchy —both of which contradict the concept of God.

d. A Creator God and Created Gods: The Problem of Ontological Superiority

Consider a scenario where one supreme God creates other gods.

First problem: Anything created is dependent. Dependency negates divinity. A created being cannot be equal to its creator, regardless of power.

Second problem: Suppose the creator God makes perfect copies of Himself. Even then, the created copies would remain ontologically subordinate, because their existence is contingent upon the creator. If they act identically, they collapse back into unity; if they act differently, conflict emerges. Either way, multiplicity is impossible.

e. All Gods Existing Uncreated and Simultaneously: The “Independent Substances” Issue

Last scenario: suppose multiple gods existed eternally and independently, without any creator.

This leads to several contradictions:

- Multiple independent substances would require boundaries, relations, and coexistence—all of which imply space or division.
- But a truly infinite, absolute, unlimited being cannot share existence with another unlimited being.
- If multiple absolute beings existed, each would have to *limit* the other to maintain its own absoluteness.

But anything limited is not God.

Hence:

- Either they are limited → not God
- Or one is superior → one God
- Or they merge → still one God

Thus, the concept of “many absolute beings” is logically impossible.

The Spirit of the Age and Packaged God-Conceptions

Throughout history, polytheistic beliefs were culturally shaped packages—arising from political structures, mythic imagination, natural fears, and symbolic personifications. They reflected human psychology, not metaphysical reality.

Here, however, we are discussing God as a **concept**, not as a cultural artifact. God, as absolute transcendent substance, cannot be multiplied. Multiplicity is a phenomenon of the finite, not the infinite.

Conclusion of This Section & Transition

All scenarios for multiple gods—identical, conflicting, hierarchical, co-eternal—lead either to logical contradiction or collapse into a single God.

Thus, multiplicity is metaphysically impossible.

This brings us to the inevitable question:

“Then what is the cause of the one God? Why does God exist?”

The next section directly addresses this fundamental question.

The Cause of God: Creativity, Causality, and the Connection Between Time and Space

a. The Difference Between Determinism and Causality

“*Causality*” refers, in its simplest form, to the idea that one event brings about another. Event A causes event B; without A, B would not occur. This way of thinking emerges from the mind’s observation of regular patterns in time. Causality is a cognitive tool that connects events in a sequential manner and always presupposes a *before-after* structure.

“*Determinism*,” however, is a broader ontological claim: it asserts that every event in the universe is determined by preceding events and that nothing occurs by chance. Determinism assumes that if all initial conditions were known, every future outcome could be predicted with certainty.

Thus:

- Causality is a mental model built from experiential patterns.
- Determinism is an ontological assertion about the nature of the universe.

Causality deals with mental structuring of experience, whereas determinism claims that this structuring reflects actual metaphysical necessity.

b. The Question of God’s Cause and the Issue of Causality

Does God have a cause? At first glance, this question seems reasonable. However, it contains an implicit category mistake.

To ask for the cause of something is to place that thing *within time and space*. Causation requires temporal priority (“A happened before B”) and often spatial relationship. But God, by definition, is the creator of time and space and therefore cannot be located within them.

To ask for God’s cause is to reduce Him to a created entity.

In philosophy, this error is avoided through the concept of the **necessary being**. A necessary being does not derive existence from another source. Its nonexistence is impossible. Contingent beings—anything that could be otherwise—require causes. But a necessary being, by definition, does not.

Causality applies only to *possible beings*, not to a being whose existence is absolute and independent.

God, if understood correctly, is not the first link in a causal chain—He is the ground of the chain itself.

c. Causality Cannot Apply to a Being Beyond Time and Space

Causality is inseparable from time. A cause must come “before” its effect. This “before” is meaningful only within the flow of time. Human cognition sequences events temporally, and from this temporal order it constructs causal relations. Without temporal order, causation has no meaning.

But if God is beyond time, the very idea of “before” and “after” becomes inapplicable. A timeless being cannot have a temporal cause.

Thus, asking “What caused God?” is like asking “What is north of the North Pole?” The question dissolves once the underlying category mistake is recognized.

Furthermore, causality is not directly observed in nature—it is a mental interpretation. As Hume noted, we never witness a “necessary connection” between events. We only see constant conjunctions—certain events regularly following others. The mind interprets these patterns as causal relationships.

Since causality is a mental construction shaped by our experience *within* time, applying it to a being *outside* time is logically invalid.

God cannot have a cause because:

1. A cause must precede its effect in time.
2. Time itself is created by God.
3. Therefore, no cause can precede God.

God transcends causality not by arbitrariness, but by definition: He is the source of the entire causal framework.

To apply causality to God would be to place Him inside the very system He created.

God cannot have a cause because causality is a framework internal to time, and God exists beyond time. A timeless, spaceless, independent being is necessarily uncaused. Causality governs created entities, not the creator of the causal order.

God is therefore best understood as the metaphysical ground of all existence—the being whose existence is not contingent but necessary.

Conclusion

This article set out to clarify the conceptual confusion underlying many contemporary debates about the idea of God. The central issue examined was the question “Which God?” because discussions about God often refer not to an ontological being but to epistemological constructs produced by human minds. For this reason, individuals and cultures may have diverse views of God; however, this diversity does not imply multiplicity in God’s essence. Epistemological diversity does not amount to ontological plurality. The definition of God presented here is grounded not in any belief system or religious mythology but solely in rational necessities, conceptual coherence, and metaphysical principles. Accordingly, we argued that God must be defined as:

- a substance that is the creator of all things,
- unique, indivisible, and formless—irreducible to any shape or category,
- a transcendent reality beyond time and space.

Based on this definition, the idea of multiple gods was shown to be logically and metaphysically contradictory. Various scenarios—countability, identity, conflicting wills, creator–created relationships—were systematically examined and found untenable, demonstrating why God must be one.

In the final section, we addressed whether God could have a “cause.” We concluded that causality applies only within time and space and therefore cannot apply to a transcendent being. Causality is a temporal framework, and God, as the creator of time and space, cannot be subjected to it. God is not a link within a causal chain but the ground and source of the entire causal structure. Another key insight is that causality is not an observable law but a mental construction; applying this limited framework to God constitutes a category mistake.

In conclusion, meaningful and coherent philosophical discourse about God requires defining God at the conceptual level based on rational principles. This leads necessarily to the affirmation of a single, transcendent God. Such a God is an absolute being conceived at the highest level accessible to philosophical reason—beyond individual beliefs and cultural frameworks. Therefore, when speaking of God, it is essential to remember that epistemological models are limited, and what ultimately matters is ontological reality.