Jurnalul de Studii Juridice

Year XII, No. 1-2, June 2017, pp. 67-75

THE SELF BETWEEN METAPHISICAL EXTREMES

Iulian GRIGORIU

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18662/jls/6>

Covered in:

CEEOL, CrossRef, CrossCheck, Index
Copernicus, Ideas RePeC, EconPapers,
Socionet

THE SELF BETWEEN METAPHISICAL EXTREMES

Iulian GRIGORIU¹

Abstract:

The terms used here: The Self, God, divinity, immortality, truth, life, reason etc. come from day to day language, but have a philosophical potential. (Through immortality, for example, I understand the continuation of the self's own duration in a reality of a different nature, immanent or transcendent). Their stake is seen by placing the issue into context, such that the options that are studies better explain these concepts' place in a world which fits them. The concepts used are coextensive with all possible inherent worlds – at first – from a logical standpoint, and are circular, dependent and tributary to a metaphorical traditional language. This analysis aims to reduce the current questions regarding the self to a narrower spectre, depending on the existence or not of divinity and the immortality or not of the human self.

Keywords:

Metaphysics, Self, Divinity, Truth, Immortality.

1. Introduction

Talking with Petre Țuțea (Grigoriu, I., (1992):271-276; 277-283) about Pilate meeting Jesus, I asked:

“What is truth, Mr. Țuțea?” He replied:

Truth is God, from whose will Christian man is immortal. Because without God and immortality, there is no truth!”

Pilate, hearing that Jesus comes from the world of truth and that he bears witness to the truth, asks him, somewhat rhetorically: “What is truth?” and leaves, without waiting for an answer, to tell the Jews that he down not consider Jesus guilty of any crime. It is implied that Jesus would have said: “Truth is the faith of those who believe that I come from Truth. Truth is faith.”

Greek philosophers would say that truth is when you say that there is that which is and falsity is when you say that there isn't that which is or say that there is that which isn't. Over time, a philosophical theory or practice of truth which could spare us debate could not be constructed. Even from the start, the philosophers' truths have contradicted one another: Being comes from being. (Parmenides)

¹ Lecturer PhD, Faculty of History, Philosophy and Theology, „Dunărea de Jos” University, Galați, Romania, iulian_grigoriu@yahoo.com

Being and not being are the same. (Heraclitus)

Whatever you might utter, it must be true, for there is no lie. (Protagoras)

There is a plethora of questions, many naïve or misconstrued, about the self, because they evoke, rather than refer to the conjecture of the concepts at hand: *the self*, *the soul*, do they stem from the individual, or persist after it disappears physically? Or, put another way, is the self-created (by a god), or is it the result of pure chance, of material evolution and combination? What connection is there between selves and their parents? If the self is dependent on nature's whims, when and where is it free from the *ex nihilo* determinism? In what moment can there be such a psycho-physical structure?

For now, I shall boil down there questions to a narrower range, depending on two priority alternatives: the existence, or not, of God and the immortality, or not, of man. There will be subdivision stemming from the interpretation of the main questions. Thus, there are four possible worlds with as many ontological options:

W1. There is a god The self is immortal	W2. There is a god The self is mortal
W3. There is no god The self is immortal	W4. There is no god The self is mortal

This tributary classification of a belief and value system is made up of data from the world and there is no irrefutable proof for either of these options. Factual indetermination is essential to having the freedom of questioning the absolute differences between faiths. Thus, we join or distance each other in faith and the fact that there are no certainties makes us the beneficiaries of a world that is far from perfect, filled with contradictions and shortcomings. As far as options go, one cannot prove anything as long as one cannot reason a stance or argue against the contrary.

Several ontological, logical and rational concepts have been proposed by philosophers, theologists and scientists, without one having stood the test of time. Thus, there is pantheism (God is nature, action, infinity, proposed by Thales, Anaximenes, Anaximander, but also by Giordano Bruno, Nicolaus Cusanus, Baruch Spinoza), deism (God is an impersonal creator principle, a principle postulated based on the rational order of the world, which has created the laws, harmony and end of the material universe and then immediately retreated from it, with proponents such as Newton,

Leibniz, Kant, Locke, Rousseau), theism, as a reordering of the previous ones, after which, unlike pantheism, God is transcendent to the world, but has not left it yet, as proposed by deism, but rather acts as a continuous Providence; Judaism, Christianity, Islam are all theist ideologies, with all their inherent consequences that leave room for interpretation regarding the place of god against its negative counterpart, the devil, and their relationship with the universe in general; there are also other such concepts (such as animism, for example), which are subsumed by the ones presented here.

In this classification, when I say *God* (or *divinity*), this implies at least one god with a set of implicit attributes, and some poorly understood ones: the creator and rightful owner of the world can take the form of life, good, truth etc., but only such positive concepts. Moreover, several gods would constitute a contradiction in terminology. The concept of a god itself is contradicting. Thus, we will consider the God of this world. It is hard to believe that every god lives in its own universe, just as there are several addresses on a street and that, once in an eon, they choose a governor. In any case, we are neither *God*, nor can we influence the human condition, but we can think in order to transcend our condition. Looking at data from the world, I will attempt to place it in one of the boxes. Discussing each of the four cases, I will only analyse beliefs.

The critical perspective at play is placed upon a perpetual problem in ancient philosophy: if a being is One or Several (which I translate to the issue of there being several fields of rationality); the conflict between “the being is” and “the being becomes”; is “One is made up of several parts, or not” or if “the being of things is more or less than One” etc. These same basic issues are disguised today in the so-called revisionist metaphysics, or in knowledge theories etc.

2. First World. There is a god and we are immortal

It is the world of those who believe in God or a god in general and in individual immortality. Here I shall consider that the two options (god and immortality) are either independent (A), or the former implies the latter (B).

In variant A, if we are immortal independent of God’s existence and willing, then the necessary question is: then what is God? The creator of whom is he? Because the attribute of the divine instance is to be creator, or at least initiator. If he created the world and we came into it (eventually created by him too), we can’t say we became immortal independent of him, the so called supreme person. If we are independently immortal, it means

that either he did not create us (which contradicts his essence), either we are opposable to him, which results in conflict. God couldn't create the world (for manifesting his essence), and then create us independent of it. The situation W1A results in irreconcilable contradictions between the independent immortality of the human being and the essence of the creative divine.

We can also rise the problem that he could be an independent creator from the interest in our earthly and post-earthly journey. If he's not interested, he doesn't love us, he's more like a punisher. In this case we wouldn't have much in common with God here on Earth. God would be from human perspective, either a subaltern functionary who takes care that everything goes naturally, or a guy separated from the stake of those created (as in Buddhism), or a dissident God who is no longer part of the plan (physicists and scientologists would see him give up just after the Big-Bang – see the deism). Immortality would seem like a natural recycle along with a psihostazia, for the universe to retain what is important for it, not for us. The ego could dissolve in the big Nothing, in an universe with an impersonal divinity who has made his job and then left (many people invoke a world like that).

There would also be the variant in which our immortality to meet a sublime fullness, a love and harmony sphere, but, in parallel with what God is, not in communion with Him. It would be a different immortality, one for people. Then maybe we wouldn't believe in God? How would appear an immortality without God for those who lived here in faith? Would he cultivate us without our desire to meet him? An atheist eternity contradicts the basics data of W1A. The last variant is not plausible and in general, W1A seems impossible.

W1B

God being the one who made us immortal, then the problem above disappears, W1A, but questions and worries related to world W1 in general rise: why do we live in the condition of a mortal earthly world? Why do we miss the inebranable proof of God's existence? Why do we have to pass through a mortal world full of suffering? All mythologies and religions believe in **W1B** and the majority are telling us that we are here because of a primordial mistake, of an ontological ancient accident and that there is a possibility to go back to the paradisiac condition. The beliefs are so different, that not all of them will be dogmatic verified in the eternity. But everyone believes in his own immortality scenario. If we were souls first and then people, like gnosism believes, the first souls knew where they came from,

but we entirely forgot. In another belief, Adam and Eve, the first people, knew where they were coming from. Making us partakers of his immortality, Him, God, must want to communicate with us, set us free, talk to us. Christianity claims that God came to Earth following an expiator plan, like son of Man, to restore the creation through his own sacrifice which in human history's configuration appeared necessary. He is love, freedom, truth, pole of values, source of the faith that we will resurrect with the body and soul, that the world would be judged by its actions. Here it happens all the evil because the devil (the negative counterpart of the Creator) is let trying to tempt us. We can free ourselves from all evil through a virtuous, humble, wise life. Knowing the hidden parts of the world, of the nature's and human's laws is an open path, but not important for what is to come for human as an immortal ego.

The neuralgic point of **W1B** consists of what we feel when events occur over our head, over our efforts and virtues – as many as they are – , the ones which are almost crushing the man, or are bringing him to a series of natural ties (so called objectives), bad luck, unfavourable situation, cheated hopes and others like that. In the majority of cases, what we call *bad* and *good* are so mixed that we cannot distinguish the action of some pure principles.

Even in **W1B**, the divinity is not material involved directly. There are very rare, exceptionally conjunctures in which it seems to act, that always leaves a question: is he so absorbed in his creation? In a few cases we can say that God intervenes (directly or through his messengers) in the world; especially when our free will loses sight of many facts that are taking place without our will. Another explication of the fact that we cannot trace the presence and action of the divinity is the type of factuality of a proof like that integrated in the world, which is not allowing us to reach, in one way or another, a certainty about it. Any factual context becomes evanescent, ambiguous. Factually there would be probable for God to exist, as long as I exist. The world of divinity and immortality in which we would want to live, is not *here*. Here I can believe that W1B is realizable.

World 2, in which there is divinity and the ego is mortal puts us in a net inferior posture ontological speaking. The two notions are connected, in the sense that we would be like that by his will and because of Him, the one who made us but he doesn't want us in his proximity. If we are to believe that we are immortal without God's will, we would make him helpless, a defeated divinity, some random demiurge. On one side we can be content that the punishment is happening right here, that we can decide on our own how long the earthly exile will last, but we have nothing to be sure

of (like everything in the world actually). If this is what He wants, his goodness would be relative, limited, and in many cases the same as the opposite negative principle. The history cannot prove but the fact that the human being is in a continuous error, and it may as well not existed or disappear like it never was; human being is a nothingness, a divine caprice, a 4D show where the characters are actually living ones, they suffer and die truly just in their own projection, an exchequer or a n-variable game played by divinities just out of whim. In fact, everything is relative and projected only by ourselves. It's a world of immanence of language. Everything signifies in the interior of a sphere. We just imagine that God is related to us, that he exists, that it is possible for him to have been creating us immortal, but we don't understand his attributes at all. We realise that we are limited, that we cannot have a vague idea about ego and world, habitual, like a bunch of ants cannot calculate the movement of the planet, and in their blindness they react at elementary stimuli (pressure, humidity, temperature), or like rats in a basement, trembling at any step from above.

It is hard to believe that there can be a connection between two types of existence, one encompassing, and the other one limited. What would it be the purpose of the human creation and the nature's? Just décor for a cheap show, an artefact, an illusion, a caprice? A modality to obtain food and energy? Existence is immanent. The divinity would be just an extra-terrestrial form, providing any *technology* and being able to do anything with us, just like in the first worlds, but without understanding and really helping the humanity. The current data of our world don't contradict but in a small measure World 2. Even if God created us, he is so far away, that we cannot see in him but the Nature. Involved in his creation, a mortal world's God can master the arguments of an ulterior evolution, a hedonist or even moralist one, but never or too late, a complete human being. The mankind wouldn't be so far of a goose plantation, or a boar's one, a hunting terrain for the celestial burning chariots, because we would miss a dimension: immortality. It is a world of those who lost the pascalian bet. The most advantageous one.

World 3 with its immortal ego and no God is related to the present by the missing crushing proofs that God exists. Obviously, we also miss the others, those of immortality, but if **W3** was real, the ego would be its own God, no matter if someone created it or not. (If someone would have created us, it couldn't have had an inferior ontological condition, so it would be immortal and creator, therefore God, which contradicts the **W3**).

So the man from the **W3** would have to govern himself alone in the eternity. And as we can observe that people don't get along here on earth, it

would be very probable that they would continue their conflicts there, in the immortality – it would be the proper environment for SF sceneries or utopias extrapolated to absolute. Being immortal, by his nature, the man would have to take a few very important decisions in order to enshroud his eternity for which he doesn't have any forerunner and isn't prepared enough. We could also ask ourselves: are we simultaneous immortal or sequentially immortal? We wake up suddenly there, in what manner? Finding an already formed society, or some alveoli that are sufficient for immortality, or having to work in order to raise a durable house? By the way, would the immortality be material, or in what nature? Or maybe we are talking about a natural community of souls, a Sphere of well-being and fullness, one pure energy, a state of spontaneous aggregation(already traced). An immortality without God would have to presume the existence of firm morale principles, ontological and spiritual non-transgressor, because the man has only proved in history that he can ruin everything, that he evolves in syncope, that he doesn't learn from his past. And this moral principle would hold as objective God. Otherwise, immortality would be a transformation, a total metamorphosis, an eradication of history, and then what about the ego's conservation? Not so probable that such a structure of the world (**W3**), would be plausible in an eternal negativity; the nature would not create something self-destructive to absolute, infernal hierarchies and perpetual wars. Everything would be absurd. Here it is possible either the loving communion of reunited egos, either the stratified and endless inferno. So, the lines too large, but equally possible (such as the promise of Paradise or the imminence of the inferno from **W1**) discredits **W3** as being plausible.

World 4, with no divinity and a mortal ego, appears as a possibility fully independent but strictly limited. Looking from ego to world, we see that here we are dependent to the condition in which we appeared, it all happens here, and the world depends on the way things frozen in the universe, at a temperature of 2K. The world is a succession of improbable events. This seems to be the scariest thing. Proper to this world would be that it doesn't know where it came from, how did it all appear, that there are large hiatuses and areas of unknown landlord: how come there is something that exists, that the chaos has simply self-organized, without any material or spiritual explication... everything is without beginning and without any mean... a world that would give us impossible mental experiments, like the one of thinking of the primordial nothing. The capacity of dreaming (of immortality or anything without connection with the world, as it often happens) or of creating something new, would have no meaningful explication.

In this pure nominalist world we would call *God* an abnormal form of time, which tolerates us and is of quantitative nature, no qualitative (such as a being or essence). We'd be some universe's microbes with self-consciousness (for which God is the Supreme Microb) and he either annihilates himself, either forgets about their condition, finding all kind of tools, entertainments, illusions, subterfuges. Ego's evolution to another aggregation ontological state would be the one way of transcending, the only real necessity, in fact evolution necessity would be the only reality. The recovery of natural tendency of earthly life of persisting would be done based on immanent resources (mater, energy, information), tending to a virtual immortality. Axiological speaking, neither of us would agree to be actors in a life-death game, with macabre realism accents, madness, unconsciousness, agony, delirium.

The picture exposed so far is part of a world with one single rational domain, the human's one, through whose prism we judged everything. A second domain of the rational, the divinity's one cannot be understood but guessed. Anyway, the structuration of the four worlds above takes part in a more complex picture which can be obtained like this:

1.simple: without rational domains or with just one domain like that, involving human ration.

2.composed: with many rational domains, supra-rationality, meta-rationality, non-equivalent with our rational domain, with many ontological zones – here there could be more causes or existential justifications, necessary and sufficient rationalities, ontic zones and ontological propositions either contrary, either excluding one another: material life – spiritual life, mortal world – immortal world, paradisiac world – infernal world, etc.)

A. opened: with opening, root, exist, metaphysical valve, having the possibility of transcending, evolving, ontic changing, of accumulating and ontological transforming the nature etc. The world can be opened through its nature, so a substantial given, or becoming like this, so in a metaphysical processualist type.

B. closed: Subjected to immanence, with an apparent, material, superficial evolution, between traced limits.No openness, stake or metaphysical chance.Here divinity is not necessary, decisive, without the possibility of being transforme dont ologically. A unit that appears and perpetuates or not without other consequences.

It should be noted that until now the discussion has taken place in the area of a simple, closed world (we cannot know if it opened even with

the possibility of projection of such an opening) without even suspect the way things complicate in the composite, open worlds (or even closed) in which we can make the hypothesis of the existence of divinity.

Conclusions

Regardless of the characteristics of the four worlds, the reality of immortality or God, from all the discussion so far, I extract that *man is a self-conscious earthly being capable of an abstract language in which he can think of the real possibility of an accident, of immortality and of God*. It is wondering the fact that, even in a world where I don't admit them, I can question the divinity and immortality, as possibilities or even as unrealized facts, negative ones. In all four worlds, *God*, the rigorous philosophical concept, like the *immortality* one, are missing.

In any world we'd live in a real way, we have the justification to believe or not in the immortality of the human being and in the existence or non-existence of God; that is, it is real that belonging to one of the beliefs does not constrain our beliefs in any way, our orientations and our metaphysical relations. That is why I argue that the philosophically-conceived Ego is an integral part of all possible contradictions.

References

Grigoriu, Iulian (1992). „Despre Misterul creației” and „Templul”, in the volume *Între Dumnezeu și neamul meu*, dialogues with Petre Țuțea, pp. 271-276 and 277-283, Anastasia Publishing House, Bucharest.