

UNUS MUNDUS is the IMMANENT + TRANSCENDENT ?

Elemér E Rosinger

*Department of Mathematics
and Applied Mathematics
University of Pretoria
Pretoria
0002 South Africa
eerosinger@hotmail.com*

Dedicated to Marie-Louise Nykamp

Abstract

Recently, in [3], a non-ontological definition of ontology was suggested with the help of four questions. Here several immediate developments are presented.

UNUS MUNDUS = IMMANENT + TRANSCENDENT ?

The way ontology is defined in [3], namely, without any ontological type assumption, and rather through four questions, appears to be of a less familiar nature. Let us therefore look at some of the more immediate developments which may follow from such a non-ontological definition of ontology, given by the respective Four Questions.

Clearly, one of its features is that the mentioned definition sets up the duality "IMMANENT versus TRANSCENDENT".

Namely, "IMMANENT" are the realms which may at a given time be within the awareness of a given human, or of humanity as such. On

the other hand, "TRANSCENDENT" are those realms about which a certain human, or in fact that whole of humanity, can only have the awareness of not being aware of.

This duality, therefore, is in its essence relative, since it depends on the presently given content of our awareness, be that of an individual human, or of the whole of humankind as such. Thus it is a duality that happens in the realms of gnoseology, epistemology and pragmatics, and not so much of ontology. Indeed, this duality is not a consequence of any ontological assumption. Rather, it is of a direct and unmediated, permanent, moment by moment experience of every human whose awareness is functioning within what may be considered as normal ranges.

Otherwise, for instance, in absolute terms, this duality need not at all exist. Indeed, it is perfectly compatible with "unus mundus".

In this way, the duality "IMMANENT versus TRANSCENDENT" exists as a reflection of the fact that none of us humans, nor the whole of our species, is supposed to be omniscient

Furthermore, our modern times, and above all, modern science and technology, have clearly shown that whatever boundaries may be between the "IMMANENT" and the "TRANSCENDENT", those boundaries can - and do - move rather fast, even during the lifetime of one single human generation.

Now the way those boundaries move is actually not so simple. Indeed, it is certainly not merely about a glorious ever ongoing march in which the "IMMANENT" is, so to say, encroaching upon more and more of the earlier realms of the "TRANSCENDENT". No, it is not merely so, since not a few realms earlier in the "IMMANENT", may end up for a while, or for much longer, back in the realms of the "TRANSCENDENT" ...

However, what is worth pointing out, and in fact, it is of outmost importance, is as follows :

As far as we can best understand, there is not absolutely any danger,

let alone an imminent one, that, one nice day, the "TRANSCENDENT" may suddenly be completely gobbled up by the "IMMANENT"

So that, being relative or not, this duality of the "IMMANENT versus TRANSCENDENT" is here to stay for longer, for much much longer, in fact ...

And the only way out of it, at least as known so far, is to fall into a dreamless sleep, or who knows, to pass away ...

Now, the amusing thing is that, as it appears, inert objects, plants and animals do not much seem to function according to this duality.

As for us humans, at least in modern times, we do appear to manifest a most strong tendency which, in some ways, recalls that of inert objects, plants and animals ...

Indeed, we tend to consider that duality as simply nonexistent. And here we mean by that the following. The ever ongoing massive enlargements of the "IMMANENT" realms, by their encroachments upon the "TRANSCENDENT" ones make us see no relevance at all in the latter ...

And so it comes to pass that, not such a long time ago in our modern times, we entered the peculiar world in which, as we best see it, and actually are quite proud of it, the formula rules :

UNUS MUNDUS = IMMANENT

Well, and then, what is the problem ?

The problem, of course, is quite obvious, and as such, it is in fact courting the catastrophic :

Even today, we still have in fact nothing short of :

UNUS MUNDUS = IMMANENT + TRANSCENDENT

and this is not a mere ... ontological assumption ..., but an empirically most obvious fact ...

And then, all that means that we are simply LYING to ourselves !!!

Indeed, please remember the formula for taking the oath in a court of law, according to which one is obliging oneself :

”... to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth ...”

Well, as long as one does not tell the WHOLE truth, one is in fact LYING, according to that formula, even if whatever one says is true. But now, how on Earth could we ever be in the possession of the WHOLE TRUTH ?

How indeed, no matter what spectacular new successes we have managed to achieve in enlarging the ”IMMANENT” ?!?!??

After all, the remaining ”TRANSCENDENT” is - by its very definition - that which is not in our awareness, except by our awareness of not being in our awareness ...

References

- [1] Plato : Republic
- [2] Rosinger E E : In Support of Comte-Sponville (pp. 18-23)
<http://vixra.org/1011.0016v2.pdf>
- [3] Rosinger E E : Four Questions can define the Transcendental ?
<http://vixra.org/1208.0047v1.pdf>
- [4] Unus Mundus : Gerhard Dorn, Carl Jung, see Wikipedia