

RELIGION IN FEUERBACH: A CRITICAL EXAMINATION OF THE EPISTEMOLOGICAL FOUNDATIONS OF HIS ANTHROPOLOGICAL CRITIQUE OF THEOLOGY

Carlos Erwin I. Fajardo, A.B. Philo, LPT, JD
University of Perpetual Help System DALTA-Calamba
PHILIPPINES

ABSTRACT

This study critically analyzes the epistemological basis of Ludwig Feuerbach's anthropological criticism of religion, especially his interpretation of theology as anthropology and his explanations of projection, objectification, and religious alienation. The study uses a philosophical approach to textual analysis and critical argument, reconstructing Feuerbach's assertion that the predicates ascribed to God are derived from human consciousness and are idealized forms of human essence. The study gives special consideration to his genetical-critical method, which justifies religious concepts by examining them in terms of human nature, psychological requirements, dependence, desires, and aspirations. The analysis recognizes the explanatory power of Feuerbach's criticism in uncovering the anthropomorphic and projective aspects of religious consciousness. It does not, however, follow from any explanation of the human origin or psychological role of a religious belief that the object of the belief has any ontological status. There is a difference between the epistemological and the human origin of the concept of God, and between the existence of an independent reality and the concept of God. The study thus suggests that although Feuerbach's criticism offers an important anthropological and psychological account of religious consciousness, it is not, by itself, proof of God's non-existence without a supplementary philosophical argument. Feuerbach's central legacy is his careful differentiation of the origin, meaning, justification, and ontological referent of religious belief, which compelled philosophy and theology to do the same.

Keywords: Ludwig Feuerbach, philosophy of religion, projection, alienation, religious epistemology

INTRODUCTION

In the early 1840s, Ludwig Feuerbach published a series of books that rejected traditional theology and speculative philosophy and advocated a “new philosophy,” or “philosophy of the future.” Feuerbach's emphasis on the supremacy of the concrete, the sensuous, the human, was central to this philosophical work. His criticism gained considerable popularity amongst the young Hegelians and other contemporary thinkers. Later Friedrich Engels would comment that the effect of *The Essence of Christianity* was “the enthusiasm was general: we all became at once Feuerbachians (Engels, 1888, p. 18). Feuerbach's philosophy of religion is built on the idea that the study of theology ultimately rests on an anthropological premise. Religion attributes to God what it is given to worship. However, Feuerbach claims that the divine attributes people know and venerate are objectifications of human nature. That is, when predicates are absolutely applied to God, such as reason, will, love, goodness, then they are understood to denote human nature in an idealized and externalized form (Feuerbach, 1841/1989). This process is closely related to Feuerbach's criticism of religious alienation. The highest attributes that human beings give to a divine being, which they imagined as existing outside of them, tend to separate them from their own species-being. Religion is, in Feuerbach's interpretation, the indirect mode of man's self-consciousness: Man meets himself,

but first he meets “the other.” Feuerbach thus attempts to rethink theology anthropologically. It is not only a criticism of religious teaching, but also a critical challenge to the epistemological question of how the idea of God forms in human interiority, and what grounds it. Is it logically required that God is nothing but the objectification of human essence if the predicates given to him come from human consciousness and experience? But if religious ideas can be traced back to people, does that prove that there is no reality separate from a human being that corresponds to them? This study addresses the philosophical problem these questions pose.

Finally, Feuerbach suggests that religion should return to humankind the attributes it has denied. The anthropological metamorphosis is formulated as *Homo homini Deus est* – “Man is a god to man” (Feuerbach, 1841/1989) and means that the relation between human beings is now the same as the relation between humanity and God. For this reason, critical examinations of Feuerbach's philosophy of religion focus on his concept of human essence, his idea of God as an objectification of human essence, and his epistemological bases for a critique of theology. This paper examines whether Feuerbach successfully explains the human origin of religious concepts to support his overarching thesis about the nature and reality of the religious object he calls divine.

Research Problem

The criticism of religion by Feuerbach is an important contribution to the philosophy of the 19th century because it is meant to resolve the “alienation” of man from his own powers. As Feuerbach says, humanity invests divinity with its highest attributes and later comes to see these attributes in God as belonging to a separate and superior God. His philosophical project is then an attempt to bring these lost predicates back to humanity.

This study examines Feuerbach's description of the criticism of religion and focuses on the epistemological grounds on which this thesis rests; in particular, it asks whether his claims about God and religion sufficiently substantiate Feuerbach's thesis on the origin of religious concepts.

More precisely, this study will seek answers to the following questions:

1. What is the philosophical basis of Feuerbach's claim that religion constitutes a form of human alienation?
2. How does Feuerbach understand the nature of humanity and the concept of God?
3. On what philosophical grounds does Feuerbach identify the divine essence with the human essence?
4. How does Feuerbach explain the origin of human knowledge and the concept of God, and what are the epistemological implications of this justification?

The research examines the underlying arguments of Feuerbach's philosophy of religion, including his denotation of God as an independent reality and his explanation of the source of religious ideas in man, through these questions.

Significance and Scope

Feuerbach's philosophy of religion is a significant development in nineteenth-century thought and had a lasting impact on later developments in the philosophy of religion, anthropology, alienation, and humanism. His reinterpretation of theology as anthropology was particularly

important to later thinkers critical of the relationship between religion and human self-understanding.

This study matters because it explores not only Feuerbach's conclusions about religion, but also the epistemological reasoning that underlies them. This analysis can help distinguish between a description of how man creates his understanding of God and the deeper philosophical question of whether that understanding is adequate in itself or corresponds to an objective reality beyond human thought.

The study can provide a critical understanding of Feuerbach's philosophy of religion and the broader philosophical issue of the relationship between religious consciousness, human experience, knowledge, and assertions about transcendent reality.

Scope and Limitations

This study concentrates on Ludwig Feuerbach's philosophy of religion, namely on his definition of human essence, his conception of God, his notion of religious alienation, and his epistemological justification for religious belief. The main source of Feuerbach's most influential anthropological interpretation of religion is the primary text, *The Essence of Christianity*.

Other writings of Feuerbach are quoted as needed to clarify the development and philosophical foundations of his standpoint. Secondary sources include articles by scholars and philosophical commentaries that offer historical context and background on Feuerbach's ideas and arguments.

It is not intended that it should be exhaustive of Feuerbach's entire philosophy, and it is not designed to examine all subsequent commentaries on Feuerbach's philosophy systematically. It philosophically examines the reliability of his description of religion, specifically the human source of religious consciousness, and draws inferences about the nature and existence of God.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature for this study comprises primary and secondary discussions of Feuerbach's philosophy of religion. This review focuses on writings that shed light on his anthropological approach to theology, his ideas of projection and alienation, his conception of human nature, and the epistemological implications of his attack on religion.

Gaskin's Varieties of Unbelief

For a discussion of Feuerbach's interpretation of God as an objectification of the human essence, see Gaskin's *Varieties of Unbelief*. Gaskin places Feuerbach in the context of philosophical unbelief and explores the hypothesis that religious consciousness is human self-consciousness. Of special interest for the present study is Gaskin's analysis of the anthropomorphic nature of religious concepts. This discusses Feuerbach's position and the older philosophical remark that human beings often make divine beings in the likeness of what they know in human experience. The comparison gives Feuerbach's more systematic claim that the predicates given to God have their history in human consciousness. Gaskin's treatment is relevant both because it helps define the projection thesis discussed in this study

and because it provides a concrete example of projection. However, this research aims to go beyond merely describing projection and to question the human origin of religious concepts enough to support Feuerbach's conclusion about the ontological nature of the object to which they are directed.

The Phenomenology of Religion by Bettis

Bettis's edited collection, *Phenomenology of Religion: Eight Modern Descriptions of the Essence of Religion*, offers several contemporary perspectives on understanding religious phenomena. Its treatment of Feuerbach is especially relevant to understanding the projective interpretation of the religious object. In this sense, Feuerbach does not locate religion's final aim in a natural or supernatural reality outside religion. Rather, religious consciousness is explored in terms of the human subject who creates and lives it. God is then explained as the objectification of man's consciousness.

In the present study, this source helps situate Feuerbach's account within other philosophies of religious phenomena. It also helps separate phenomenological questions about the reality of religious consciousness from epistemological questions about whether the phenomenological description of religious consciousness determines the reality or nonreality of the religious object it is directed toward.

The Philosophy of Ludwig Feuerbach, by Kamenka

Kamenka's *The Philosophy of Ludwig Feuerbach* is a thorough and scholarly work on Feuerbach's philosophical evolution. The paper not only analyzes Feuerbach's critique of religion but also his critique of speculative philosophy, his theory of philosophy, philosophy of knowledge, materialism, anthropology, and ethics. This is because Kamenka is particularly relevant to the present study, in that the philosophy of religion cannot be understood apart from his philosophical transformation. In both cases, Feuerbach's condemnation of theology is a condemnation of speculative idealism, which aims to reverse a development in which the ideal or abstract gains priority over the real and concrete, human and natural, life.

Kamenka's analysis therefore allows us to explore the epistemological aspects of Feuerbach's thought. It shows that, in Feuerbach's criticism of religion, he is part of a larger project to "ground" philosophy in sensuous human life rather than abstract thought.

Feuerbach's Critique of Religion, written by Sass.

In the *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Sass's article about Feuerbach highlights the importance of projection, sensuousness, interpersonalism, and humanism in Feuerbach's mature philosophy. The objections to religion are framed as a quest to reclaim for humanity the attributes it gives to a transcendent divine being. This interpretation matters because it makes alienation the central theme of Feuerbach's criticism. When man separates his own qualities from himself and then encounters them as a separate divine object, he misrecognizes them. The human basis of the predicates assigned to God is, therefore, recognized in overcoming alienation.

Sass also situates Feuerbach's philosophy in history by accounting for its impact on later humanistic and materialistic thought. This matters for the present study because it lets us avoid treating Feuerbach as simply an opponent of Christianity; his anthropological shift was key to nineteenth-century European philosophy. The divine will be simple, in your manner.

The divine will be simple; you will be simple. Stewart adds the “Doctrine of the Humanity of the Divine in The Essence of Christianity, which explains Feuerbach's central principle in a modern way. Stewart explains Feuerbach's assertion that the traditional idea of God as a transcendent entity separate from humanity should be rethought because God's attributes reflect the human person.

Stewart's Analysis of the Humanity of the Divine

In the chapter “The Humanity of the Divine in Feuerbach's Doctrine of the Humanity of Christianity”, Stewart offers a contemporary rendition of Feuerbach's main conclusion. Stewart outlines Feuerbach's message that the long-held image of a transcendent, separate God should be questioned because its characteristics are human in nature.

The book study is particularly helpful in demonstrating the continuing connection between Feuerbach and Hegelian categories. Important concepts of alienation, recognition, and self-consciousness persist in Feuerbach even as he counters Hegel's idealistic, speculative system. Religious alienation occurs when man comes face to face with the good in him and mistakes it for another person. Stewart's analysis of human essence, divine predicates, objectification, and alienation is directly relevant to the present study. It also offers a modern set of scholarly resources for interpreting Feuerbach's project as an attempt to re-enfranchise humankind in qualities given to the divine.

Cumming on Feuerbach's Critique of Religion and Karl Barth

Cumming examines the ongoing theological relevance of Feuerbach's critique in the context of Karl Barth's reply to projection theory. Feuerbach challenges religion as a human projection, arguing that the Christian notion of God is a synthesis of human ideals and perfections. Cumming's study matters because it shows that Feuerbach's argument elicited a reaction not only from atheistic or secular philosophy, but also from theology itself. Barth could accept the gravity of Feuerbach's attack on religion while challenging his claim that it is irrelevant to God's revelation. The disagreement then extends beyond projection in religion; it also involves whether all alleged knowledge of God can be explained in terms of projection. This debate is very relevant to the current study. It highlights the difference between the view that some religious depictions have anthropomorphic or projective features and the stronger claim that all statements about God are purely the product of human projection because the distinction is directly relevant to the epistemological evaluation conducted in this study.

Synthesis of the Reviewed Literature

The Reviewed Literature was synthesized and annotated. The reviewed literature shows several consistent interpretations of Feuerbach.

Firstly, theologians have always noted the shift of theology to anthropology as a characteristic of his philosophy of religion. Second, projection, objectification, and alienation are interconnected concepts that help Feuerbach explain religious consciousness. Third, his critique is inseparable from his broader rejection of speculative idealism and his focus on sensuous, embodied human life. Lastly, as philosophical and theological theories develop later, it becomes clear that Feuerbach's explanation of the origin of religious ideas does not answer all epistemological questions about their truth or reference. This paper extends the discussion of the epistemological shift in Feuerbach's argument, namely, from the notion that religious ideas are first the expression of human consciousness to the stronger claim that the

religious notion of the divine object does not exist outside human consciousness. The study examines this transition by critically analyzing Feuerbach's anthropological interpretation of religion and how he uses it to support his ontological conclusions.

METHODOLOGY

This study uses two methods: philosophical textual analysis and critical argumentation. The study explores Feuerbach's core texts to uncover and clarify his main ideas on humanity, God, religion, projection, alienation, and religious consciousness. It places special emphasis on *The Essence of Christianity*, using other pertinent writings where necessary for clarification. Secondary philosophical and scholarly literature contextualizes Feuerbach, clarifies problematic concepts, and highlights important evaluations of his work.

The study consists of the exposition and criticism of Feuerbach's arguments, both regarding the accuracy of his reconstruction and the correctness of the premises, logical connections, and epistemological implications.

The analysis therefore focuses mainly on the conceptual and argumentative aspects. It does not involve human subjects, surveys, experiments, or statistical analysis. Its evidence comes mainly from philosophical texts and scholarly interpretations relevant to the questions explored.

Analytical Focus

The paper clearly distinguishes between descriptive reconstruction and critical evaluation. First, the paper introduces Feuerbach's claims concerning human essence, the divine predicates, projection and objectification, alienation, and the genetico-critical method. It then tests these claims by distinguishing the origin of religious ideas from questions of their psychological function and their justification, truth, and ontological basis.

RESULTS

Two main sets of results emerged from the textual and conceptual analysis. One is the reconstruction of Feuerbach's anthropological account of religion and the other is an epistemological evaluation of the genetico-critical method he employs to account for religious belief. Ludwig Feuerbach became one of the nineteenth century's most important critics in religion and speculative philosophy. He criticized philosophy for being abstract and theoretical, and wanted to bring it back to the real world. For Feuerbach, the Absolute spirit, God, or pure conceptual being was not philosophy's starting point. Instead, it begins with the human being: a sensuous, embodied, and relational being.

Feuerbach's philosophy of religion is based on this anthropological approach. In fact, he attempts to re-explain theological beliefs and content by tracing their roots to human origins. In this sense, theology becomes anthropology. In short, what human beings say about God reflects, in an alienated and objectified way, their own anthropology.

The Primacy of Being

Feuerbach's departure from speculative idealism begins with his grasp of being. Feuerbach opposes a philosophy that values conceptual thought over material and sensuous reality. For

him, the reality of the human being, rather than abstraction, is the right starting point for any philosophical reflection. This work counters Hegelian idealism. Feuerbach does not give ontological priority to thought but to the sensuous actuality of existence. Thought is not the production of being but the presupposition of an already existing one that thinks. This sensuousness also influences Feuerbach's theory of knowledge. Reality is approached from the point of view of embodied reality and sensory experience and not from the point of thought alone. What exists only in the mind is not as established as an independent reality. From this, he criticized abstract being. De-essentializing things is an empty abstraction. Concrete beings are concrete entities with their own particular features. Thus, if philosophy must start with real human existence rather than abstract speculation, religious consciousness should also be studied in relation to the real human beings who experience, formulate, and express it.

The Human Essence

The human being is central to Feuerbach's philosophy of religion. Human beings are a part of nature and rely on nature for their bodily lives. Feuerbach also sees consciousness as a unique human trait. His consciousness is greater than his awareness of himself as an individual.

Human beings can think about their own species or essential nature. They can consider what it means to be human and identify common attributes that are not necessarily unique to them. Feuerbach sees reason, will, and love or affection as expressions of this human essence.

They are fundamental aspects of what it means to be human. Through these powers, human beings think, will, love, and relate to others. These powers shape Feuerbach's concept of subject and object: in the subject, meaning is an object of consciousness, made intelligible to the subject by its capacity. The things of reason will be rational capacities, the things of love will be love capacities, and the things of will will be volitional capacities.

In this relation, Feuerbach formulates one of the main tenets of his philosophy of religion: that the human consciousness of an object reveals something about the human subject. Feuerbach says that consciousness of God is indirectly consciousness of man. In the same sense, knowledge of God is indirectly knowledge of man.

Finally, Feuerbach clarified that the individual is finite and the human species is infinite. The universal associations of human qualities are conceived in contrast to the limitedness of individual human beings. Feuerbach finds the seeming infinitude of the divine predicates in the powers of the human species, not in the isolated individual. Hence, the divine being is the human essence, not bound by the limits of human existence.

The Divine Essence as Objectified Human Essence

The attributes that human beings give to God, such as reason, goodness, love, wisdom, and perfection, are qualities intelligible to the human mind. Feuerbach emphasizes the subject-predicate relationship in his argument. Feuerbach says a predicate-less being would have no content for human consciousness. Ordinary religion does not deal with an entirely indeterminate being. The believer speaks of God as good, wise, loving, just, powerful, personal, or providential. These predicates are considered objects of religious consciousness. Feuerbach argues that we can recognize such predicates because their content is already available in human life. So human beings know love because they love; they know goodness

because they experience and conceive goodness; they know wisdom because they have rational consciousness, and through it they know wisdom. Feuerbach derives this from the fact that theology expresses human attributes in absolute, idealized terms. Although religion gives them to a transcendental subject, they are still human in origin. This argument alone does not make clear whether a reality exists outside human consciousness as those predicates, or not. This epistemological question will be tackled later in the critical analysis of the discussion.

God is the Being of Understanding

Feuerbach first conceives God as the objectification of understanding or reason. The rational God has the attributes highest for rational beings. Thus, his independence, necessity, universality, infinity, and freedom proceed from contradiction. Theological propositions become intelligible through understanding as a criterion. If reason denies God's finitude, spatiality, or temporality, then it establishes what can be usefully said about God. In this sense, theological predicates are commensurate with the norms and powers of the human intellect.

God as infinite intelligence then is reason in its greatest and most free form. Feuerbach gives theological formulations such as "necessary," "infinite," "self-subsistent," and "independent" a naturalistic meaning; these are objectified expressions of the characteristics reason projects onto God when no particular limitations bind it. The importance of this argument is based on Feuerbach's inversion of the classic position of divine versus human reason. In the usual presentation of theology, reason is secondary, and God is the primary source of that reason. Feuerbach then turns this upside down, asserting that the intelligibility of divine reason rests on the conceptual content given by human reason.

God is a moral and loving being.

The God of religion is not merely the thing you understand. Religious consciousness seeks a God who is present to know, love, forgive, console, and respond meaningfully to human beings. Feuerbach differentiates between the God of abstract thought and the one found in religious practices. The only comfort to the religious person in a pure, abstract infinite would be if the infinite had attributes through which a human relation could be established.

In Feuerbach's interpretation, love takes on a special significance. Whereas moral law judges, love reconciles and forgives. Thus, the religious believer imagines God not only as Lawgiver and Judge but as compassionate, merciful, and loving. Feuerbach gives Christianity the most significant example of this tendency in the teaching of the Incarnation. God is made flesh, known, seen, and felt, and suffers. Feuerbach took this not primarily as God's transformation into humanity, but as the presence of what is most human within God.

God is religious because his qualities of love, compassion, mercy, and sacrifice are recognized in human relational existence. In this way, Feuerbach reduces the God of religion to an objectified expression of humanity's moral nature.

The Essence of Religion

Feuerbach's understanding of religion stems from his anthropology. Religion is not known as the human connection to an independently defined supernatural reality. Instead, it is read as self-relation in human beings, in which each of them meets the self as if it were a different

form of life. Feuerbach also relates the development of religion in history to human beings' awareness of their dependence on nature. Human beings are aware of themselves as fragile in relation to forces beyond their control. People ascribe religious meaning to natural phenomena, and objects or forces they rely on can become objects of worship. In polytheistic religions, these attributes can be manifested in multiple anthropomorphic deities, such as the god of beauty, the god of war, and the god of love. In monotheism, the universal attributes of humanity are manifested in a single transcendent divine being. Therefore, objectification and alienation are part of religion.

Objectification is when human characteristics and features are presented as a thing from outside of the human. When human beings see themselves as lacking compared with the object's perfection, they become alienated. God is infinite, yet man is finite; God is perfect, and man is imperfect; God is eternal, and man is temporal; God is powerful, and man is weak; God is holy, and man is sinful. Feuerbach claims that the more human substance is invested in God, the less there is in man. The opposition is the alienating aspect of religion. Human beings are unaware of their own inherent abilities since they have been transferred, abstracted, and venerated as a part of another.

Similarly, a religious awareness finds its objectified content, but does not recognize its human source right away. Feuerbach stated that his critical project consists of raising religious consciousness to the anthropological source of its representation. Feuerbach does not deny that the individual believer constructs an image of God. His argument deals with another level of religious consciousness where man's species being is objectified, and man meets this objectification as divine.

Prayer as an Expression of Religious Consciousness

Prayer is a good example of Feuerbach's anthropological conception of religion. In prayer, a religious person speaks to God directly and admits needs, fears, hopes, thankfulness, sufferings, and desires. Here, God is presented as someone who can hear, understand, sympathize, love, and act. A person who seeks consolation suffers; a person who seeks protection feels vulnerable; and a person who seeks forgiveness feels guilty. The God of the prayer must then be conceived in a way that makes a meaningful relationship with humans possible.

According to Feuerbach, faith is the assurance of human subjectivity regarding the possible achievement of its most important desires. It is the objectification of human desire, freed from its natural constraints through free and imaginative imagination.

In Feuerbach's analysis, prayer, faith, and miracle unveil the human behind the religious. These religious elements reveal the seeker, the sufferer, the lover, the hope bearer, the fearer. This analysis leads to Feuerbach's pivotal conclusion about religion. That the alienated human self-consciousness of religion occurs when man projects his own subjective essence onto God, and then sees these attributes as his own in God.

The Genetico-Critical Method

Feuerbach seeks to uncover the anthropological conditions from which the concept of God emerges. This procedure is called the genetico-critical method because it investigates the genesis of religious ideas and criticizes traditional interpretations of their origin. It is also

genetic because it explores the derivation and evolution of beliefs and concepts. It matters because it challenges the belief that the true cause of religious phenomena is supernatural. In theology, Feuerbach's method attempts to show that what religious consciousness calls God is actually a human attribute: consciousness, feeling, desire, dependence, and human nature. This chapter explores how this method operates and its epistemological implications. Here, a key epistemological question is explored: if an idea is explained as coming from people, is the reality it purports to describe true or false? Understanding this distinction matters when considering Feuerbach's critique of religion.

Feuerbach's Application of the Genetico-Critical Method to Religion

Feuerbach argues that an object reveals the nature of its subject. Applied to religion, what is said of God gives us insight into the qualities, ideals, and capacities of the human beings who believe it. Thus, Feuerbach's famous idea is that consciousness of God is indirectly human self-consciousness and knowledge of God is indirectly human self-knowledge (1841/1989). Feuerbach summarizes the alienating movement of religion as humankind externalizing its own being into objectivity, then relating to that objectivity as though it were an autonomous subject. Religious consciousness thus inverts the subject's real relation to the object.

In applying the genetico-critical method in religion, theology becomes anthropology. As he claimed, humans have not only conscious awareness of themselves as individuals, but also of their species and the key abilities which are essential to it. The finite individual is aware of their lack of knowledge, goodness, power, and love in particular, and other capacities in general. However, these attributes can be imagined transcending individual characters. Their unlimited forms are then thought to be given to God as a religious expression of their religious awareness. God is thus perceived as perfectly wise, perfectly good, perfectly loving, and unlimited in power.

For Feuerbach, these predicates remain anthropological. Human beings understand wisdom, goodness, love, and will because these characteristics are part of human experience and consciousness. But the crucial epistemological issue is whether the anthropomorphic source of predicates is enough to decide the ontological status of their subject.

Genesis and Truth: The Central Epistemological Problem

Feuerbach's genetico-critical method has strong explanatory power. It asks why human beings conceive god in particular ways and why these conceptions would be psychological, anthropological, and historical conditions for representing god. However, explaining the origins of a belief and assessing its truth are two different logical questions.

If, for instance, one particular religious symbol can be interpreted in terms of human fear, dependency, desire, imagination, aspiration, that is ok. This may involve "filling in" factors that can help to generate the belief. This explanation does not, by itself, show that the object of the belief does not exist.

The same applies to projection. Since the qualities, desires, or ideals humans attribute to God do not, by themselves, prove that no reality exists apart from them that matches those attributes in some way, it is not valid to conclude from this that they do not exist. This does not prove that God exists. Rather, it establishes a more limited epistemological conclusion:

the psychological or anthropological origin of a belief cannot by itself determine the ontological status of its purported object.

Thus, Feuerbach's method needs evaluation at two levels. At the explanatory level, one may ask whether his anthropology plausibly accounts for the development and content of religious ideas. At the ontological level, one must separately ask whether his explanation establishes that God has no existence independent of those ideas.

The Infinity of Human Consciousness

Feuerbach's concept of human consciousness and infinity involved a serious inquiry. In his book, *The Essence of Christianity*, he tied the infinite with the seemingly infinite nature of the human species (Feuerbach 1841/1989). Here, two philosophical questions need clarification. First, is it not the human understanding of infinity proof that the nature of man is infinite? Second, does the intentionality of consciousness create an infinite reality, or is consciousness a reflection of an infinite reality? Clearly, based on these questions, neither the existence nor the nonexistence of a transcendent infinite being can be deduced simply from man's power to conceive infinity.

Another challenge is Feuerbach's separation of the finite individual and humanity as species-being. Feuerbach claimed universality and infinity for the species of humanity, rather than the individual. But if humanity is literally unlimited, or infinite in an eternal or ontological sense, further arguments are needed.

Synthesis

Feuerbach's genetico-critical method focuses on the human conditions underlying the formation of religious ideas. This has been the foundational anchor of his philosophy of religion. In this way, theology is rethought anthropologically, and religious consciousness is made a platform for studying human nature.

The genetico-critical method has explanatory power. It offers a starting point for examining the nature of religious imagery and its potential to represent the nature and aspirations of those who create it. However, its epistemological shortcomings also warrant acknowledgment. The genesis of an idea is separate from the veracity of the proposition it expresses. It is not enough to say that a concept is anthropomorphic to infer that the concept's referent does not exist. If man can conceive the infinite, this alone does not prove that it exists.

DISCUSSION

Feuerbach's philosophy of religion has been reconstructed, and the genetico-critical method examined, through which he traces religious concepts to human sources. His critique has a fair measure of philosophical substance. It highlights the anthropological dimension of religious language, the potential for projection in religious awareness, the otherness that a specific religious language can engender, and the human conditions within which religious concepts of God are constructed. Yet, Feuerbach's theory's explanatory power does not automatically or unambiguously imply all of its ontological implications. Explaining how man thinks about God is not the same as deciding whether God exists outside of man's thinking.

The Question of Being

Feuerbach's philosophical work starts with a radical shift towards sensual and concrete reality. Against speculative philosophy, he argues that philosophy must start with the living human being in the midst of nature, not with abstract reflection outside sensuous life. This focus is one of the few lasting legacies of his philosophy. In his critique, he reveals a significant threat inherent in philosophical abstraction. Phenomenological concepts are not things in their own right because they can be conceived in thought. Thus, Feuerbach emphasizes the primacy of the concrete over speculative abstraction. Yet this raises a further ontological question. Affirming the primacy of sensuous being does not yet account for being itself.

While Feuerbach may offer an explanation for how the human person encounters reality and a focus on the natural and sensuous conditions of human life, the larger metaphysical question as to why there is being instead of nothing is not answered. Feuerbach's lack of an ultimate explanation of being in his metaphysics is not proof of God. Nor does his leaning toward sensual life prove that the sensual is all that is real to human beings. It's a difference that matters. It is a principle which is epistemological, about how people experience reality, and not ontological, about what might be possible.

Another issue around this is Feuerbach's attack on abstraction. Feuerbach takes up an anti-speculative Hegelian approach and aims to bring philosophy back to concrete humanity. However, his call to humanity as a species-being might lose the very humanity it calls for by separating it from concrete individual persons, as already presented. Therefore, Feuerbach's criticism questions one type of abstraction, while also questioning how the universal human essence connects to concrete individual existence.

Projection and the Question of God's Existence

One of Feuerbach's more significant works in the philosophy of religion is his projection theory. The predicates of God as wise, loving, good, conscious, willing, and personal are attributes of human consciousness and experience.

Feuerbach is right to ask the believer to question the degree to which human desires, cultural presuppositions, and ideals might distort ideas of God. But it's worth noting that a concept differs from the actual existence of what it conceives. Assume that human beings form a concept of God based on human experience. It follows that human understanding and language are the means through which God is known in human terms. This does not imply that there is nothing in the world outside the capacities this concept refers to.

The epistemological question remains unresolved from projection; the ontological question cannot be settled by projection alone. In doing so, Feuerbach can claim that human categories create religious concepts, human qualities idealize divine attributes, psychological needs shape religious images, and believers give human constructions a divine origin. But these assertions do not logically compel the conclusion that no independent divine reality exists. This ontological conclusion needs further premises and argumentation. This is not a proof of God's existence,

On the other hand, showing that an argument against God's existence is unsuccessful does not prove that the argument succeeds in establishing God's existence.

Religious Experience and the Limits of Reduction

Feuerbach is a naturalist of religious experience. The human organism is dependent, vulnerable, in love, fearful, hopeful, guilty, desiring, aspiring. Religion gives these experiences objective and symbolic expression. However, describing the human conditions in which religious experience occurs does not necessarily capture the full range of meaning or possible references for religious experience.

Rudolf Otto's description of the numinous highlights this. For Otto, religious experiences are expressed in terms of the captivating and the fearsome properties of the experience of the holy—what is captivating is attractive and what is fearsome is overwhelming—*mysterium tremendum et fascinans* (Otto, 1917/1958). Otto's analysis is not a formal proof for God. Instead, it is a unique form of religious awareness. This distinction matters when assessing Feuerbach. Religious experience cannot prove God's existence because its interpretation remains debated in philosophy.

Is Religion Necessarily Alienating?

Alienation is one of the most significant components of Feuerbach's criticism, as he asserted that religion results in alienation. He says that people give their best to God and take their best from themselves. God is wise, and man is foolish; God is powerful, and man is helpless; God is holy, and man is sinful. This is an analysis of a real potential of religious consciousness. Religious expressions and practices that systematically devalue human action, undermine human value, or affirm that human capacities are intrinsically worthless can reasonably be called alienating. The issue, however, is whether religion per se inevitably leads to this effect. Further argument is needed on the universality of Feuerbach's conclusion. The separation of God from man may be a religious doctrine, but it does not have to result in the belief that man has no dignity or worth. In fact, some religions understand human dignity in relation to the divine. Similarly, humility is not necessarily a negation of self or a dependence that alienates the self. Human beings are reliant on other people, communities, natural conditions, and relationships, but not all this reliance is alienating.

The question, then, is what sort of dependence and what sort of relationship is meant? Feuerbach is right when he attacks religious devotion for the loss of any human agency and the rejection of any human value. However, when a religious relationship is part of moral development, interpersonal responsibility, meaning, hope, or human flourishing, alienation cannot be inferred simply from dependence. So Feuerbach offers a strong criticism of forms of religion that alienate him, but a more convincing argument is needed to show that every religion is necessarily alienating.

Religion as Communion and Relationship

Feuerbach sees the alleged connection between humanity and God as the connection between humanity and their own objectified essence. In this context, prayer, worship, love of God, and religious devotion are indirect forms of human self-relation. But, as is typical of religious practices, these practices can be understood in other ways. Prayer is not just the expression of human wishes but communication with a reality believed to exist apart from the worshipper. Worship is not only self-objectification, but it is a response to what believers regard as transcendent reality. The existence of competing interpretations does not decide the matter. It shows that the anthropological interpretation is not self-evident and must be fought for; it is

not Feuerbach's. The example of prayer is instructive. Feuerbach rightly mentions that prayer often reflects human needs and wishes. Prayer by petition can include requests for health, protection, consolation, forgiveness, and deliverance. These practices certainly give a clue as to the type of person who prays. However, not all prayer is petition; other kinds exist. Thanksgiving, contemplation, praise, confession, lamentation, surrender, and other prayers in which the worshipper does not seek the satisfaction of a specific material desire are also religious traditions.

This variety makes a completely wish-fulfillment reading challenging. A proper philosophy of prayer must then consider prayer's subjective aspects and the believer's claim that prayer aims at something other than the self.

The Epistemological Limit of Feuerbach's Critique

Feuerbach's theory explained the anthropomorphic nature of the divine predicates. However, it would be just as absurd to go the other way around and say, "Since Feuerbach does not prove God to be false, then it is true. It would just be as wrong to draw the opposite conclusion, "Feuerbach does not prove God to be false, therefore God exists. The failure of an argument does not prove that the proposition is true.

Hence the present critique does not try to convert the deficiencies of Feuerbach's atheistic, anthropological thesis into a philosophical demonstration of theism. Instead, it asserts the more limited statement that the genesis and human content of religious belief in Feuerbach does not, on its own, decide the ontological status of God. This separation enables Feuerbach's real findings to be preserved without the acceptance of statements that go beyond those that the method of Feuerbach warrants.

Synthesis

Feuerbach's philosophy of religion remains interesting because it argues that religious consciousness must address challenging questions about itself. How do believers make God in their own image? What proportion of religious belief is psychological need? Does religious piety limit freedom of the human will? Are theological predicates revelatory of God, human beings, or both? Even if one does not accept Feuerbach's anthropology as the basis of theology, these questions are still of philosophical value.

This critical analysis has identified the gap between what his criticism plausibly asserts and what it needs to prove with further argument. He stresses sensuous human life, which clashes with exaggerated abstraction. His projection theory reveals the anthropological aspects of religious discourse. His sense of alienation recognizes how religion can reduce human self-understanding. But his approach does not alone prove that sensuous reality is all there is to being, that projection renders the question of an independently existing referent moot, that all religion is alienating. His analysis confronts religious belief by considering its anthropomorphic assertions. But, as with theology, this must be justified by arguments adequate to give them reality.

CONCLUSIONS

The present study examines Ludwig Feuerbach's criticism of religion, focusing on its anthropological and epistemological bases. Feuerbach's philosophy is significant as a bridge

between German speculative idealism and a philosophy that takes as its object the concrete, sensuous, and embodied human being. This shift is reflected in his criticism of religion. For Feuerbach, religion can never be known in terms of a divine reality, only in terms of humanity. The predicates of God that are traditionally attributed, namely reason, will, love, goodness, wisdom, power, and perfection, are understood as attributes of human consciousness and human essence. Theology is then changed to anthropology. This position draws on Feuerbach's ideas on being, human essence, divine essence, projection, objectification, alienation, and religion.

It also examined his genetic-critical method, which traces the origins of religious beliefs in a purportedly human and anthropological sense. The study's primary epistemological question was whether explaining the human origin of religious ideas was enough to determine the ontological nature of religion's claimed object. Feuerbach's critique has been analyzed with respect to anthropomorphic aspects of religious consciousness, and it has been concluded that it provides valuable insights into them.

However, the research also found a difference between describing the origin of the idea and searching for the independence of the reality in which this idea is manifested. Based on this distinction, the study examined the scope of Feuerbach's criticism of religion. Based on the philosophical analysis conducted in this study, the following conclusions may be drawn:

1. Feuerbach builds his philosophy of religion on real, human existence. He does not start with ideas or speculative thought as idealism often does. Instead, he begins with the sensory world and with human beings as they actually live and experience life. Nature and the human body are the foundation of his philosophy. This shift matters because it pushes us to see religious and philosophical ideas not as isolated truths, but as human creations. Because of this, Feuerbach turns attention away from metaphysical debates and toward what humans really are, as thinking, feeling, connected material beings.

2. Feuerbach sees God as a reflection of what humans are. He points to reason, will, and love as core traits of being human. These traits form the basis for how humans describe God. When people describe God as wise, loving, good, and powerful, Feuerbach says they draw on qualities they already know from their lives. When they imagine these traits without limits and assign them to a being, they are creating a divine image. He is not saying any single person is God. Instead, he sees God as the species, that is what it means to be human projected outward and made divine. In this way, theology becomes anthropology. What seems like a discussion of God ends up mirroring nature.

3. Feuerbach's theory of projection shows how deeply human religious thought is shaped by experience. He argues that human beings think and speak based on their mental and linguistic makeup. So when we create concepts of God, those concepts carry marks of our culture, our language, our longings, and our imagination. Feuerbach is right to ask if religious ideas might be projections of desires or needs. This critique remains important whenever people assign traits to God that clearly come from their lives without stopping to ask where those traits really come from. Just because a religious idea has human roots does not mean it has no real object. The origin of an idea and the truth of what the idea refers to are not the same thing. We can explain how a concept came to be without proving that it refers to nothing

4. Feuerbach's idea of alienation gives us a way to understand how religion can separate people from themselves. He says religion takes qualities and gives them to God. The more perfect God becomes, the more human beings seem to fall short. As a result, people fail to see their power and value. They treat their abilities as belonging to some other being. This criticism works well when religion treats beings as weak, helpless, or unimportant. Not all religion works this way. Dependence on God does not always mean alienation. Religious humility can be a form of respect, not a denial of worth. Many religious traditions describe a relationship with the divine as a source of meaning, moral duty, connection with others, or personal growth. Feuerbach's analysis reveals a danger in religion, but it does not prove that all religion is alienating.

5. The genetic-critical method helps explain how religious belief might begin. It does not answer whether those beliefs are true. This is the study's epistemological lesson. Feuerbach's method looks for the sources of religious beliefs, such as fear, need, desire, imagination, and the wish to escape death. These explanations help us understand religion as a phenomenon. Explaining why a person believes something is not the same as proving that the belief is true or false. Even if Feuerbach shows that beliefs about God come from needs, that does not mean God does not exist. On the other hand, showing that one argument against God's existence is weak does not prove God exists. The method is limited. It can explain how beliefs form. It cannot settle whether God exists. Its value lies in what it reveals about belief, not in what it proves about reality.

6. Feuerbach's critique remains important even if we disagree with his conclusion about God. We should not judge the worth of his philosophy by whether we accept or reject his claim about God's existence. His work forces religion to ask questions. It challenges us to look at how anthropomorphism, projection, authority, human dignity, and psychological need shape religious belief. These questions cannot be ignored. Feuerbach asks believers: Are our religious ideas about God, or are they really about us? Feuerbach must be held to the same standard. An explanation about how religion comes from life cannot be used to conclude that God does not exist without good reasons. Feuerbach's real importance lies in both the strength of his critique and the questions his own limits raise.

8. Showing how the idea of God comes from beings does not prove that God does not exist. The study finds that Feuerbach clearly shows religion has human roots. He gives us a way to understand how divine ideas often reflect traits, hopes, and needs. His shift from theology to anthropology is powerful. However, the study does not find enough support for saying that because religious ideas are human, they have no real object. Instead, it identifies the epistemological limits of Feuerbach's method and preserves the continuing philosophical importance of his critique.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author is grateful to Dr. Anne Marie S. Fajardo, Francis Dominic Fajardo, RCh, Benedict, and Matthew for their core support and resources. Also, to all SHS faculty of UPHSD-Calamba Campus headed by Dr. Ernesto F. Ramirez and Dr. Analee C. San Diego for the strong academic atmosphere. To Eufemia Fajardo, Peter C. Igalinos +, Antoine and Edna Schiavini, Alma, Jen, Eugene, and Kristine for the inspiration and familial encouragement.

REFERENCES

- Barnhart, J. E. (1967). "Anthropological nature" in Feuerbach and Marx. *Philosophy Today*, 11(4), 265–275. <https://doi.org/10.5840/philtoday19671145>
- Bettis, J. D. (Ed.). (1969). *Phenomenology of religion: Eight modern descriptions of the essence of religion*. Harper & Row.
- Bier, W. C. (Ed.). (1972). *Alienation: Plight of modern man?* Fordham University Press.
- Cumming, R. P. (2015). Revelation as apologetic category: A reconsideration of Karl Barth's engagement with Ludwig Feuerbach's critique of religion. *Scottish Journal of Theology*, 68(1), 43–60. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0036930614000891>
- Della Torre, F., II. (2024). Mediating Feuerbach and Barth: Bonhoeffer's this-worldly theology. *Scottish Journal of Theology*, 77(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0036930623000364>
- Kamenka, E. (1970). *The philosophy of Ludwig Feuerbach*. Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Sass, H.-M. (1998). Feuerbach, Ludwig Andreas (1804–72). In E. Craig (Ed.), *Routledge encyclopedia of philosophy*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780415249126-DC027-1>
- Stewart, J. (2021). Feuerbach's doctrine of the humanity of the divine in *The Essence of Christianity*. In *Hegel's century: Alienation and recognition in a time of revolution* (pp. 89–117). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009019828.006>
- Bogliolo, L. (1987). *Rational theology*. Urbaniana University Press.
- Bowie, A. (2021). Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph von Schelling. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2021 ed.). Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University.
- Collins, J. (1959). *God in modern philosophy*. Henry Regnery Company.
- Engels, F. (1888). *Ludwig Feuerbach and the end of classical German philosophy* (S. Moore, Trans.). Progress Publishers. (Original work published 1886)
- Engels, F. (1975). Letter to Karl Marx, November 19, 1844. In *Marx & Engels collected works* (Vol. 38). Progress Publishers. (Original work written 1844)
- Feuerbach, L. (1983). Towards a critique of Hegelian philosophy (Z. Hanfi, Trans.). In L. S. Stepelevich (Ed.), *The Young Hegelians: An anthology* (pp. 95–128). Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1839)
- Feuerbach, L. (1986). *Principles of the philosophy of the future* (M. Vogel, Trans.). Hackett Publishing Company.
- Feuerbach, L. (1989). *The essence of Christianity* (G. Eliot, Trans.). Prometheus Books. (Original work published 1841)
- Fichte, J. G. (1982). *The science of knowledge: With the first and second introductions* (P. Heath & J. Lachs, Eds. & Trans.). Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1794)
- Gooch, T. (2024). Ludwig Andreas Feuerbach. In E. N. Zalta & U. Nodelman (Eds.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2024 ed.). Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University.
- Hegel, G. W. F. (1975). *Lectures on the philosophy of world history: Introduction: Reason in history* (H. B. Nisbet, Trans.). Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1837)
- Hegel, G. W. F. (2010). *The science of logic* (G. di Giovanni, Trans. & Ed.). Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1812–1816)
- Kant, I. (1998). *Critique of pure reason* (P. Guyer & A. W. Wood, Eds. & Trans.). Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1781)

- Kenny, A. (2007). *Philosophy in the modern world: A new history of Western philosophy* (Vol. 4). Oxford University Press.
- Kınağ, M. (2022). God as the implication of alienation: A criticism of religion in Ludwig Feuerbach's anthropological atheism. *Kilis 7 Aralık Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 9(2), 417–440. <https://doi.org/10.46353/k7auifd.1181030>
- Locke, J. (1975). *An essay concerning human understanding* (P. H. Nidditch, Ed.). Clarendon Press. (Original work published 1690)
- Otto, R. (1958). *The idea of the holy: An inquiry into the non-rational factor in the idea of the divine and its relation to the rational* (J. W. Harvey, Trans.). Oxford University Press. (Original work published 1917)
- Schelling, F. W. J. (2004). *First outline of a system of the philosophy of nature* (K. R. Peterson, Trans.). State University of New York Press. (Original work published 1799)
- Solomon, R. C., & Higgins, K. M. (Eds.). (2003). *The age of German idealism* (Vol. 6). Routledge.
- Steup, M., & Neta, R. (2024). Epistemology. In E. N. Zalta & U. Nodelman (Eds.), *The Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy*. Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University.
- Tylor, E. B. (1871). *Primitive culture: Researches into the development of mythology, philosophy, religion, art, and custom* (Vols. 1–2). John Murray.