RUCH FILOZOFICZNY
LXXV 2019 2

Stanisław Judycki
University of Gdańsk, Gdańsk, Poland
ORCID: 0000-0003-3586-846X
e-mail: s.judycki@ug.edu.pl

Science and the Last Things

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.12775/RF.2019.018

The times we live in are certainly not conducive to reflections on what is sometimes called the 'last things'. The theoretical success of science and, above all, technological application of discoveries in various fields have led to a significant increase in prosperity among some of the Earth's inhabitants, and consequently, to a belief that the development of scientific cognition will increase life pleasures and perhaps even lead to what is called 'technical immortality', and thus enable individuals to exist indefinitely in time.

At the same time, on the other hand, a kind of scientific propaganda is being developed, often in the form that is more implicit than explicit, one could even say that some 'new scientism' is being proclaimed in the sense that sooner or later our scientific efforts will solve all important theoretical and practical problems, discover the nature of the cosmos that surrounds us and show irrefutably that we are a product derived from it. For example, cognitive science, still fashionable in certain circles, will soon solve the puzzle of the human mind by showing that it is derived from the neural structure of the brain. Although many might not admit it directly, they do join this 'new scientism' indirectly through their practical participation in such projects. Contrary to this, I will argue that the world, as we are able to comprehend it, is a mystery, and that as such it will never be possible to reduce it to a problem, that is to say, to a scientific problem that can be empirically resolved in one future or another.

The expression 'last things' in the title of this text can be understood in two ways: The 'last things' are the issues: (1) of the beginning of the

world, (2) its structure, (3) relating to the 'how' of generation and corruption, and (4) relating to the purpose or destiny of what we call the world. In the second sense, 'last things' refer only to man, but also in the light of the aspects just mentioned, that is, the beginning, the structure, the 'how' of generation and corruption, and the purpose or destiny of human beings. I will seek to demonstrate that none of the known kinds of scientific knowledge, and therefore neither the natural sciences, nor human sciences (*Geisteswissenschaften*), called the humanities, or, for some reason, social sciences, nor, of course, formal sciences, will ever be able to touch the mystery of the world, let alone solve it. There is also another aspect of the expression 'last things', (5) the aspect relating to the idea of the Last Judgement, and it must be stressed immediately that this idea is not only present in Christianity but also in pre-Christian religious systems (ancient Egypt). However, this component of the problem of the 'last things' will not be discussed here.

(1) The beginning. All things seem to have started and ended, but this is not an exceptional situation. It is impossible to imagine, for example, mathematical states of affairs, such as the fact that the sum of internal angles in a triangle equals one hundred and eighty degrees, ever started to exist and ever ceased to exist. I will return to the question of mathematical states of affairs when discussing the metaphysical status of universals as the 'backbone' of the world's structure.

However, on account of the variability of the physical and biological world that surrounds us, we assume that it may have originated in time and may cease to exist at some point in time. In the case of the world as we know it, that beginning and end of time must be understood as taking place in a certain space. Any scientific discourse must therefore accept the dimensions of time and space as 'hubs' where generation and corruption take place. Time and space determine the range of scientific reason, as it is impossible to think of a natural science that would not use these two dimensions, but neither time nor space can be generated in the same way as all other things are generated. Material peculiarity, which is placed at the beginning of the world and called the Big Bang, has already had to happen at some time and in some space, so neither time nor space could be its effect.

If Immanuel Kant had been right, that is, if time and space had to be considered as solely subjective, belonging to the human cognitive apparatus of pure intuitions, then the origin of the world should be understood as the beginning of the conscious mind's perception of the spatial and temporal continuum with its diverse material filling. If Kant had been right, then our bodies, like all material things, would purely be phenomenal. If 'things in themselves', as the philosopher from Königsberg claimed, are non-spatial and non-temporal, they cannot be material things, and therefore we must assume that 'things in themselves'

that stimulate our minds – whatever they may otherwise be – are either finite spiritual beings or an infinite spirit of God. Non-spatiality and non-temporality are not characteristics that can be attributed to any form of matter.

If, however, Kant had been wrong, so if time and space were to be granted some kind of independent existence in relation to human minds, then it would have to be assumed that the origin of the world must have been the origin of time and space, and the mystery of the emergence of these dimensions goes beyond the competence not only of natural sciences we know, but also of those we can imagine.

Although the structure of 'our' world could be the result of trials and errors that take place in some (speculative) multiverse, every such mulitverse must be understood as something placed in space and time, even if this time and this space should be called meta-space and meta-time in relation to time and space of 'our world' understanding, however, the source, basis, or cause of dimensions of time and space or dimensions of meta-time and meta-space is completely unattainable for us. The same applies to the issue of the genesis of the causal order we are dealing with in our world. The genesis of the causal order itself is also naturally inexplicable since every science of the real world assumes the existence of such an order and it is possible only because of this order.

All of us, scientists and ordinary people alike, are struck by the immeasurable wealth of the world. The world, however, would not have to be like that. As it evolved, it might have been composed of only few genera and species of things, and, nevertheless, we can see a plethora of forms, figures, colours, which may seem unnecessary. Not only that, as we also come to realise that we are all able to see it, while our reaction to the world, as is the case of animals, could be reduced to instinct. Our conscious mind is unrestrictedly plastic in the sense that it can create new names and new concepts. In this way, to a certain extent, it is capable of 'dealing with' the wealth of the world. This 'fertile garden' does not seem to be an accidental creation, but it seems to be something that comes from a being capable of feeling with our senses, capable of understanding with our thoughts.

Today, through various publications, an evolutionary scheme of an almost creative force has been entrenched in our thinking. If something cannot be explained, the word 'evolution' is immediately brought up and everything becomes clear. Every thing, every phenomenon, natural or cultural, can be accompanied by an 'evolutionary comment' and everything becomes clear: "Why is there a reason?" – "Of course, because it was an evolutionary benefit", etc. The universality of such comments, however, calls into question their explanatory value. This has been joined by a second scheme: 'Creationism versus evolution'. The concept of evolution is about two things at once: about the evolution of the cos-

mos and about the biological evolution on our planet. However, if we take a closer look at the concept of evolution, it turns out that it does not provide an answer to any fundamental question. However, the creationist image of the world is also flawed as it suggests that the world was created at a certain point in time, before which there was some 'void' of non-spatial and non-temporal nothingness.

Evolution is nothing more than change and motion, but the assumption is that long-lasting changes and motion are able to lead to the appearance of entirely new things. This assumption may be correct but under one condition, namely that at the starting point of changes and motion which is to be generated is potentially present. The truth every scientist acknowledges, as well as the truth accepted at the level of ordinary human experience, is that not everything can arise from anything. Certain determined potentials must already be present at the starting point. The same applies to changes and motion called evolution. If we put white and black balls into a spinning drum, even if we mix them for any length of time, there will be nothing more of them than black and white balls or particles which they are composed of.

The evolution – cosmic and biological evolution was supposed to be completely different, because here the so-called emergence was to take place, which means that cosmos was to emerge from a limited number of primary components, and in the case of Earth, biological life, vegetation, animals, and ourselves. This could really be the case, but only when all this would potentially exist in the 'primeval elements' of the primordial phase. If truly new properties were to be generated anew in relation to the starting point, i.e. by means of emergence, then we would deal with the creation from nothingness. This idea was already considered in the ancient times (Stoicism) and in the Middle Ages (St. Augustine) when it was claimed that as early as at the beginning of the cosmos, in its primeval elements, the so-called 'seminal reasons' (*rationes seminales*) had to be present. However, it is not possible to reasonably state that the 'seminal reasons' understood in this way could arise as a result of some kind of motion or change, today called evolution.

(2) Structure. Our human epistemic situation in the world is that the universal can only be understood through the opposition of the 'universal – the dimension of its exemplification'.[1] For us, that is for cognitive beings who use semantic categorization, this dimension, which makes

[1] "A thing is not an individual thing if it is a 'universal', a universal being a thing that can have 'instances'" (P. van Inwagen, *Metaphysics* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1993), 24); "a universal is an absolutely determinate feature (a quality or relation) that may exist at many different places at the same time; it is a 'repeatable entity' (B. Aune, *Universals and Predication*, in: *The Blackwell Guide to Metaphysics* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2002), 131).

it possible to grasp universality, is the spatio-temporal dimension, but, just as unexemplified universals may exist, so it must be assumed that dimensions of the exemplification of universals, which are neither temporal nor spatial, may also exist. Hence, even these same dimensions can be subject to a kind of exemplification, or be something that is not exemplified and exists only as an ideal possibility. The possibilities, however, must somehow exist, even if these are only pure or ideal possibilities, that is to say, possibilities independent of any previous conditions. The existence of dimensions of the exemplification of universals other than time and space is a mystery to which our science has no access and, as we can certainly say, will never have such an access. If this is the case, however, then the genesis of not only the spatio-temporal world but also its structure will remain a mystery to our minds forever.

The existence of universals does not give rise to the existence of their exemplification, any exemplification, be it in the spatial and temporal dimension or in any other 'centre of implementation'. Both for Plato's extreme conceptual realism and for the moderate conceptual realism in the spirit of Aristotle, exemplification can only be a fact. In the case of the Aristotle-type position, it is less visible as it is obscured by the negation of the independent existence of universals, but even here should be considered a fact, that the same numerical quality, e.g. the quality of red, is realized in many red things. If the supporters of moderate conceptual realism wanted to negate it, they would have to end up in nominalistic or conceptualistic positions, i.e. claim that things are only similar to one another and that the human mind itself produces an illusion of numerically the same quality, which is exemplified in many red objects, and then calling it universal. But then, however, any statement of truth or falsehood in any field becomes a complete illusion. Similarity presupposes numerical uniqueness of the quality that is 'repeated' in individual things, without which similarity is but a product dependent on one or another structure of the mind relating to various objects.

If from the existence of universals does not follow their exemplification, and if at the same time exemplification is a fact, then there must be a force that makes the world a structure formed according to universals. Again, this force cannot be something that may be described by means of universals or ideas and their possible exemplifications. It must be something unique, completely 'elevated' above all concepts, even as definitive as universals and their possible exemplifications. Only this kind of 'factor' can 'bridge' the gap between Platonic (and Aristotelian) 'separation' (*chōrismós*), whether it is 'separation' between ideas and their exemplifications or the 'chasm' of 'separation' between form and matter.

This can be described as follows: Not only does God not play dice, but God does not make sandcastles using different forms, templates or patterns. The 'carrying' of universals into the form of existence in a cer-

tain determined dimension that causes the numerically identical and metaphysically unique pure quality of red to transform, in a way 'disintegrate' into the structure of a multiplicity of red things, is the essence of creation, or rather, this fragment of the essence of creation which we can somehow understand and describe, but of course creation cannot be exhausted solely in it. The power of a being capable of creation must be something completely different from the human ability to produce, discover, construct, different than the ideas that we have. The mystery of numerically identical and metaphysically unique quality of red transforming into the form of many red things, becomes unbearable when one considers the universal red is not red in the sense of human sensuality. Likewise, the idea of a triangle is not triangular, and so on.

Even if we assume that universals somehow 'by themselves' transform into a form of existence in spatial and temporal dimensions, their exemplification still does not result from their very nature. This exemplification could only be stigmatic, that is to say, only one triangular thing or one red thing could be realized, and that is what the world would consist of – and nothing more! A chaotic exemplification would also be possible: the individual qualities would be realized in a certain dimension, but to a large extent they would not be connected with each other, and even if they could be captured by some conscious subject, this subject would be completely confused both as to their existence and as to the consequences of that fact. In such a situation, there would be no creation that we would call the cosmos. As one can see against the background of these possibilities, the exemplification we are dealing with is not just any exemplification but an ontically rich and coordinated exemplification.

Light from distant stars is subject to coordinated exemplification before it reaches us, it is subject to multiple relations between universals, and this is what we call the mathematical structure of nature. Therefore, it existed before we, the beings that practise mathematics and are thus able to read the structure of the material world, began to exist, and hence it can be seen that universals are independent of our mental activities.[2] Nature, however, could be much more 'modest': although it would be coordinated in such a way that certain relationships between universals would have to exist in it, they would, however, be reduced only to the fact that, for example, one quantum of light would rush into the infinite dimension of space, or one hydrogen atom would last in the unlimited

[2] For N. Hartmann, one of the main arguments against the subjective interpretation of an ideal being (universals) was the fact that the processes taking place in inorganic nature are carried out according to mathematical regularities; in other words: that which is mathematical permeates the inorganic; cf. N. Hartmann, *Zur Grundlegung der Ontologie* (Berlin–Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter, 1935), 247.

dimension of time, in completely empty space. However, this is not the case. The exemplifications we can observe and read in a certain manner are rich in indescribable ways and are coordinated with each other in the same way.

It can be seen here that philosophizing cosmologists are causing a lot of confusion here, suggesting that there is some mysterious opposition between science and the belief in the existence of God, the Creator of the world. They keep pulling their listeners and readers into the abyss of supposition that it may be the visible universe works in a way by itself. Most often, however, the impression they create is that they do not know what this is all about.

If nominalists or conceptualists were right, we should reconcile with the fact that all rational beings live in fundamental error. In the worlds they explore, there would be no coordinated exemplification, but only minds that see similarities between things completely devoid of rational organization. The hypothesis of this kind of universal illusion about universals and their coordinated exemplification is exotic in itself, but that is not the most important thing. More importantly, in such a world or worlds, there would be no other explanation for what the subjects that live in them actually observe, and thus, no explanation for the rationality of the world would exist. Referring to the evolution, to various, even infinitely lasting attempts 'made' in the so-called 'multiverse', which would eventually lead to the creation of our cosmos together with ourselves, will not help here, because all these cosmic 'transmutations' can only come into effect on the basis of some universals and regular connections between them.

Evolution does not produce universals but acts in accordance with the laws arising from the relationship between them. It should be stressed once again that the hypothesis concerning the evolving 'multiverse' refers only to the world as something realized in the dimension of time and space, while the idea of exemplification refers to a huge number of possible dimensions of the realization of universals.

(3) The 'how' of generation and corruption. In recent times, one can clearly feel the presence of almost frenetic agitation in favour of the belief that man is a 'purely' material thing, and that everything he does is the sole responsibility of his body, especially the brain: it is the brain which thinks, feels, wants something, experiences states of joy, depression, etc. It seems that the point is to 'banish' the soul from the everyday dictionary even at the level of common consciousness. This word is connected mainly with the Christian religious tradition in which the soul is not only something that comes directly from God, but it is also an essential element of eschatology: human soul is not only an immaterial and immortal 'thing' but also something that will be subject to the Last Judgment. However, the idea of absolutely true and impartial judgment

is not favored today, since many people prefer their lives and deeds never to be subject to any evaluation.

The immateriality of the soul does not mean any indeterminacy or pure negativity; quite the contrary, the 'soul' epitomizes fullness of positivity, and I believe that the fullness of these positive things is best understood from the point of view of human reason. A non-Christian, philosopher and biologist, Aristotle wrote a long time ago:

> We can only assume, therefore, that reason itself (the intellectual soul) enters [the embryo] from the outside, and that it is divine, because the physical action has nothing to do with the action of reason.[3]

The human soul must be understood as a force that configures the actions of the human body and brain in such a way that they are capable of living, but above all as a force that enables the production of multiple cultural contents, including the creation of the scientific content and the content of everyday cognition, etc. Nowadays, computer scanning is carried out in various areas of the brain, and on the basis of very general correlations between a specific state of human consciousness and a specific area of the brain, the conclusion is made that it is the brain that thinks. However, generation does not follow from the correlation, because, likewise, by observing from a plane a city illuminated at night we could conclude that the lights in the windows of human houses are the same as the thoughts of the people who live in them, and if they go out, we would have to conclude that nobody thinks about anything anymore.

Let us assume that in the future empirical sciences will provide us with very precise correlations between what is physical and what is conscious (psychological), i.e. if a given conscious (psychological) phenomenon takes place, e.g. the thought that now I can see the indigo color, then an appropriate, strictly defined state of the nervous system also occurs. Let us further assume that these are correlations of the nature of scientific laws, i.e. of a nomological nature, i.e. correlations that do not allow exceptions and indeterminacy. We would then have to assume that neural correlates can be established both for the contents and truths discovered through logic and mathematics, as well as for all other human cultural products. This, however, seems to be not only fantastic, but also something that transcends the boundaries of any understanding. In the case of logic and mathematics it should be assumed that there may be laws of neurophysiology of the human brain describing and expressing, for example, the content of Pythagorean theorem. Worse still, we should assume that the neurophysiology of the human brain is our last

[3] Aristotle, *On the Generation of Animals*, transl. P. Siwek (Warsaw: PWN, 1979), 736b.

word about the world because neural mental correlates of a nomological nature for all laws of physics would also have to allow themselves to be discovered. In this way, I think it is clear that the naturalisation of reason, that is, an attempt to explain its essence and the way it functions exclusively in terms of natural sciences, is something that we are completely incapable of fathoming.

It would also be necessary to discover neural correlates of a nomological nature for such mental content as "Oh, Lithuania, my homeland" or the content that appears in our conscious minds when we listen, say, to Chopin's Concerto in E minor, etc. It must be remembered that although all scientific creations, and more broadly, all cultural creations can in some way be 'anchored' in some kind of durable material, taken as such, all these creations are mental contents produced, discovered and carried by the conscious human soul.

Even if we could construct artificial creations in the future, embedded in a material other than biological material, imitating the human mind, it would still not be a knowledge about the 'how' of the connection between what is fundamental and what is built upon this foundation. The 'how' of this connection is a mystery the Creator holds in his hand, and man never creates anything, man can only imitate the structure of what is created and is able to manipulate this structure to some extent.

So what is the best possible explanation for the fact that the human mind is able to come into contact with so many different contents: is it the fact that the 'neural clutter' of human brain starts to be able to think at some point in its development, or that this biological structure is merely a transmitter of the stimuli of the world and that, as such, it is configured by a completely different factor that the tradition of human thought has called the soul since time immemorial? What does the elephant have to do with, say, number seven? Not much, except that both of these 'things' are objects in the broadest sense of the word 'object'. So, what do the extremely complex mental contents that humans are capable of producing and understanding have in common with neurons?

Once again, it must be emphasized that in the case of coexistence of factors which differ from each other so much, such as reason (rational soul) and matter, the hypothesis that correlation equals generation should be considered as pure fantasy. If one day we started to take scientific treatises and works of art which are subtle in content and appearance out of our washing machines instead of wet laundry, would we suddenly believe that it is the mechanics of the washing machine that leads to their creation? I am convinced that those who say that it all must be about generation, either do not believe it themselves or have never thought it over well enough.

The influence of physical and bodily factors on mental states (alcohol, drugs, etc.) and the influence of mental states on the body (strong

feelings causing facial redness, etc.) – these things have been known since time immemorial, so what has computer brain scanning told us about the formation of our thoughts?

The third of the 'knots of the world', besides universals and the rational soul, is the question of free will. And it is also about the 'how' of connections between different spheres or manners of existence. If free will does not exist, then man stays completely beyond good and evil, just as the case is with animals. But if free will does exist, then people do not belong exclusively to the kingdom of the physical cosmos, for good and evil is not a concrete building block in the world we know. If free will exists, then our human freedom is only a trace of a powerful spiritual kingdom which we cannot have any concrete idea of at the moment. It is already these statements that indicate the absolute metaphysical uniqueness of the problem of free will. We attribute free will not only to men but also to other spiritual beings, if, of course, we accept their existence, and thus also to spiritual beings such as angels, but we also recognize that God does not act as a 'passive source', distributing its goodness, but he makes free decisions.

Those who oppose the theory of the existence of free will can be divided into three categories. First, it is the determinism of fate or destiny; second, the determinism of the subconscious or unconscious; and third, materialistic and scientific determinism which has gained nearly regal position in recent times. I am omitting here the problem of theological determinism, that is, the issue of how human free will can be reconciled with God's omniscience, as it belongs to a vertical rather than horizontal perspective.

The fate the gods prepared for Oedipus was that whatever he did, he had to do what he thought was wrong. The answer to the determinism of fate or the determinism of destiny, however, seems quite simple: fate or destiny relate to facts which are external to the being equipped with free will. When Oedipus became aware of his fate, he freely determined his attitude to the deeds he had done and lamented over them. Therefore, he retained free will in his judgement and decisions even though he was deprived of the knowledge on the basis of which he had made his earlier decisions.

Determinism of the unconscious or subconscious, proclaimed by various forms of psychoanalysis in the twentieth century, stated explicitly or only implicitly, claims that at least a large part of the decision of free will is determined by subconscious or unconscious processes, but these are not material processes in the brain, and they are to be specific psychological unconscious or subconscious processes. And here, as before, it must be said that when something appears on the surface of our consciousness, then by using free will we can evaluate it and make appropriate decisions. Perhaps the genesis of some of our desires may be

sexual, but once we realize this, it is our free will that determines how we evaluate them and how we act.

The strongest opponent of free will is deterministic and scientific materialism which claims that we are only bodies and brains, and that as such, we are completely subject to the extremely complex causal networks existing in our bodies and brains. Actually, according to materialism, we do not exist, there are only our brains, which, for some reason, generate the illusion of conscious and free subjects for themselves. The 'pro-cerebral' propaganda is ubiquitous today, but what is not mentioned is that if it is all the case with us and our brains, then everything else is but an illusion. Thus, it is an illusion to attribute merit or to blame someone. An education aimed at instilling positive norms is also an illusion and so are social institutions, e.g. the judiciary, which assume the concept of free will and the reality of free will.

In order to weaken the horrendous nature of such an image, a position called compatibilism has been introduced to modern philosophy. These compatibilists claim that free will can be reconciled with the total determination of completely material human beings in such a way that it is sufficient for them to do what they want. So, for me to be free, it is enough to opt for lemonade rather than ice cream, and in line with this desire, to be able to choose it when I go to a confectionery, even though in reality I am determined by my brain to want and choose lemonade. One can see right away that this is just a trick on the part of the so-called compatibilists, because I am really totally determined in my wishes and in my choices, and this is only my imagination that it is not so.

So does free will exist? Surely there is an internal experience of being free, even in those cases in which something determines us to an extreme, we still realize the possibility of a different decision, a different choice. Can this experience be an illusion, as traditional deterministic materialists or their compatibilist friends want it to be? I believe there is no proof of the existence of free will, but there is deep experience or experiences of it. Perhaps, however, drawing attention to the following state of affairs may be a kind of proof.

Cases of radical sacrifice, like sacrificing one's own life on the one hand, and of terrible evil on the other, can be 'proof' of the existence of free will. If human beings were derived solely from the physical world, if biological 'machinery' were to decide about their action, there would never be acts of sacrifice for one's own children, sacrifice of life for one's homeland, or simply for other people. Animals sacrificing themselves for their own children do not do so consciously and voluntarily for the obvious reason of not having a 'sophisticated' (semantic) consciousness of the world. The cases of terrible evil, cold-blooded murder, human and animal abuse, etc. are, I presume, more convincing in this respect. Terrible evil causes horror and, as some say, 'calls heaven for vengeance'.

The indignation at horrendous evil indicates that it cannot be created by the action of a passive machinery of our brain and nervous system. If human beings were merely biological machines that adapted to the world, there would never have been cases of radical evil, nor would we have ever felt fear, indignation or disgust towards them. If this is the case, however, the experiences of freedom and free will are traces of human beings belonging to a world that is different from the visible cosmos. The human heart senses that radical sacrifice and horrendous evil would not have been possible had it not been for the struggle for the destiny of individual human beings in the history of the world.

(4) Purpose. How would it be if the lioness could suddenly see its children, but not by the instinctive reflexes that make it take care of them, but in the way we see ourselves and each other? The warmth given by the mother is, for the little cubs, an unnamed feeling: they do not understand its source, nor the principle on which it is based. A comparable leap for us would be the transition to higher forms of self-perception and higher forms of communication with others. In accordance with theological tradition, these higher forms of communication will be collectively referred to as perichoretic communication. In Christian theology, relations between Persons in the Holy Trinity are referred to as perichoresis of persons. It should be emphasized that this is a collective term, because between our human semantic communication and perichoretic communication in its proper sense, there may be a large number of degrees of communication. Communication between pure spirits is an example of a level of communication higher than our human level (angelic communication).[4]

The positiveness of a person exceeds all properties, all universals, because it is able to relate to all properties, to all objects and to all other persons. Therefore, the person (soul) is none of the possible or current properties, it is not their synthesis, and yet, it is something positive. According to Christian theological tradition, unlike any other relationship between persons, human and non-human, the reality of Persons in the Holy Trinity lies in the full participation of each of them in the ontic positiveness of each of the others, in the full participation in all the possible

[4] Gregory of Nazianzus was the first to use the term 'perichoresis' in the 4th century, meaning the mutual transfer of attributes between the natures of God and Christ. It is done through the intermingling of the both natures, but without them mixing with each other, which was later referred to as '*communicatio idiomatum*'. In mid-seventh century John of Damascus in *De fide orthodoxa* applied the concept of perychorese to the relationship between persons in the Holy Trinity; cf. Oliver D. Crisp, *Divinity and Humanity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 1–32, where Crisp claims that perichoresis of natures ought to be distinguished from '*communicatio idiomatum*', and these both things from perichoresis of persons.

and current properties, including the full participation in the so-called 'omniproperties', i.e. properties such as omnipotence or omniscience.

Relationships between human persons and non-human persons can be similarly interpreted when they approach the infinitive creative power of God. Relationships between them become completely different from those we know. Every person entering a higher level of cognition receives a greater share in the creative power of God and thus is able to express this power in relationships with other persons. It is neither a Leibnizian or Husserlian 'reflecting' (Spiegelung) of individual monads in all the others because this reflection is but a passive 'looking' at oneself. Instead, it is a creative participation in the unique ontological positiveness of others.[5] This creative participation of some people in the lives of others is, of course, already happening now, because everything we call human culture is created through the participation of some people in the lives of others.

Traces or substitutes for perichoretic communication appear where great love takes place between parents and children, in situations of deep friendship, in Penelope's fidelity, in love such as the relationship between Tristan and Isolde, Dante's love for Beatrice, or Romeo and Juliet's love. Each of these situations is about the participation in someone's life, although this may or may not be an exclusive participation. However, the aim of this aspiration is always 'living someone else's life', i.e. some kind intermingling of persons. Higher kinds of communication must have different means than our current semantic means at their disposal, but at the moment not only do we not have access to them, but we cannot even speculatively imagine them, and all analogies break against the hard gateway to eternity.

The desire of people who have a connection with each other to almost own the other person's 'self' and their subjectivity, and the resulting confusion of the both sides of this kind of relationship that do not understand what all this can mean is but a trace of this kind of communication. However, this kind of striving for each other is wrong, and perichoretic communication is certainly not a kind of possession. One can only suppose that when it appears, then closeness between persons, exceeding all possession, will be realized. No-one is going to feel lonely, while the goal of this intersubjectivity, other than our current one, will be the infinitive coexistence and the inexhaustible communication of all subjects participating in the infinite, creative power of God. All those who love the uniqueness of their loved ones, like Tristan and Isolde, will

[5] Cf. Stanisław Judycki, *Monadologiczna metafizyka Edmunda Husserla* [*Monadological metaphysics of Edmund Husserl*], in: *Metafizyka, cz. I: Koncepcje metafizyki*, [*Metaphysics p.1. The Conceptions of Metaphysics*], ed. S. Janeczek, A. Starościc (Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL, 2017), 145–161.

not have to strive for death as the kingdom of forgetfulness, as the 'holy night', the place where individuality is finally erased, in the joyful but ultimate end of existence.[6]

The purpose of creating the world was not to have stars, mountains, oceans, trees, animals and various particles they are made up of, but the purpose was to communicate all this greatness to others. If but one person could not be made aware of a world, it would be a worthless mass of existence, an infinite network of relationships that would exist for no man. It is for the sake of communication that God sustains the universals in existence and their exemplification in the created minds in the form of semantic consciousness. It is also for the sake of communication that he makes the subjects that possess semantic information to be able to communicate with each other and thus enable semantic harmony. Even if there were only one entity, a metaphysically lonely entity, but able to realize even a small fragment of creation, then the creation would be something purposeful. The goal of creation was not the world of non-personal things, and the things that have been and are still being created are and are becoming so that communication between persons can never end. And each one of these persons, through their own uniqueness, is able to express the infinite creative power of God in a unique way.

Bibliography

Aristotle. 1979. *On the Generation of Animals*, transl. P. Siwek. Warsaw: PWN.

Aune Bruce. 2002. *Universals and Predication*. In: *The Blackwell Guide to Metaphysics*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Crisp Oliver D. 2007. *Divinity and Humanity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hartmann Nikolai. 1935. *Zur Grundlegung der Ontologie*. Berlin–Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter.

Van Inwagen Peter. 1993. *Metaphysics*. Boulder: Westview Press.

Judycki Stanisław. 2017. *Monadologiczna metafizyka Edmunda Husserla* [Monadological metaphysics of Edmund Husserl]. In: *Metafizyka, cz. I*: *Koncepcje metafizyki* [*Metaphysics,* p*. 1. The Conceptions of Metaphysics*], ed. Stanisław Janeczek, Alina Starościc. 145–161. Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL.

[6] Richard Wagner constructed his work on the basis of Artur Schopenhauer's worldview as the background, hence the death of the loving couple is for them the only way out of the world that is the absolute end of individual existence. „Tristan and Isolde embrace death as 'holy night', the kingdom of forgetting, the place where individuality is at last extinguished in a blissful but final surcesase" (Roger Scruton, *Death-Devoted Heart. Sex and the Sacred in Wagners' Tristan und Isolde* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 13–14).

Scruton Roger. 2004. *Death-Devoted Heart. Sex and the Sacred in Wagners' Tristan und Isolde*. 13–14. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Summary

The author of the article aims at justifying the following theses: (1) never will scientific knowledge be able to solve the mystery of the world, including the mystery of such dimensions of exemplification of universals as time and space; (2) cosmic and biological evolution do not generate universals but follow in accordance with them; (3) the rationality we observe in the world can only be explained if we assume the existence of universals independent from human minds; (3) human immaterial soul is a power of configuring the physical and the organic activities of human body; (4) the existence of human free will points at the fact that human persons belong both, to the material world and to the 'spiritual realm' which is now inaccessible for us; (5) the aim of the creation of the world and creation of various kinds of persons (human and non-human) was to enable the emergence of intersubjectivity; (6) semantic communication between human persons is the first step towards the participation in the infinite creative power of God.

Keywords: science, the last things, universals, the nature of human mind, free will, the destiny of man

Streszczenie

Nauka i rzeczy ostateczne

Autor artykułu zmierza do uzasadnienia następujących tez: (1) poznanie naukowe nigdy nie będzie w stanie rozwiązać tajemnicy świata, a w tym tajemnicy istnienia takich dymensji egzemplifikacji uniwersaliów, jakimi są czas i przestrzeń; (2) ewolucja kosmiczna i biologiczna nie wytwarzają uniwersaliów, lecz postępują zgodnie z relacjami pomiędzy nimi; (3) obserwowana przez nas racjonalność świata nie miałaby żadnego wyjaśnienia, gdybyśmy nie przyjęli istnienia uniwersaliów niezależnych od ludzkich umysłów; (3) niematerialna dusza ludzka jest siłą konfigurującą czynności fizyczne i organiczne ciała; (4) istnienie wolnej woli wskazuje, że osoby ludzkie należą nie tylko do świata materii, lecz także do teraz zupełnie nam niedostępnego 'królestwa duchowego', (5) celem stworzenia świata i różnego rodzaju osób (ludzkich i pozaludzkich) było umożliwienie zaistnienia intersubiektywności; (6) komunikacja semantyczna pomiędzy osobami ludzkimi jest pierwszym stopniem udziału w nieskończonej stwórczej mocy Boga.

Słowa kluczowe: nauka, rzeczy ostateczne, uniwersalia, natura umysłu, wolna wola, przeznaczenie człowieka