

The Metaphysics of Man as an Area of "Purified" Humanity

Guzel Kabirovna Saykina¹

¹ Kazan Federal University, Kazan, Tatarstan

Correspondence: Guzel Kabirovna Saykina, Kazan Federal University, 420008, Kazan, Kremlevskaya Street, 18, Tatarstan. E-mail: gusels@rambler.ru

Received: July 16, 2014 Accepted: September 5, 2014 Online Published: October 30, 2014

doi:10.5539/ass.v10n21p122

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ass.v10n21p122>

Abstract

The purpose of the study is to validate man's capability of metaphysical acts to confirm "humanity in man". It discloses the sense of metaphysics: to transcend man to the area of universal generic generality "purifying" him from narrow frames of applied functions and roles. Metaphysical events serve as a way of compensation of ontological deficiency and social truncation of man. The study shows that metaphysics is a value inalienable from man.

Keywords: metaphysics of man, humanity, universal generic generality, conformity, eventfulness

1. Introduction

The article investigates issues of realization of the metaphysical (supernatural) beginning of man. Despite man's shallowing and the desire to overdo and "bury" him, the fate of man is still decided, and we (modern people) all participate in it in one way or another. It is good that we still measure man's manifestations using a measure of genuine humanity, still arguing about what real love, "good" goodness, true thinking, real beauty, "right" faith are... Human concepts live in our "inhuman" world.

The problem space of the article is formed by the following circumstances: realization of the metaphysical beginning of man means confirmation of his own (individual) self-foundation, on the one hand; disposition of man in the metaphysical dimension can be defined as a breakthrough to the area of "purified humanity" - a universal generic human generality, on the other. This brings up the question of the mechanism of such convergence. The purpose of the article is to justify the definition of metaphysical acts of *thinking, faith, love, moral behavior, creativity* as a "natural reserve" of genuine humanity, an "island" of human generality.

The analysis of man's outcome beyond intimately valued individual meanings in acts of metaphysics provokes reconsideration of the question about the subject matter of metaphysics and philosophical anthropology, as well as about the way of their correlation.

We acknowledge that today concerning oneself with questions of metaphysics is akin to a theoretical suicide: metaphysics is forbidden in any of its form. As it is well known, Heidegger already marked reduction of metaphysics to "metaphysics of the subject" that disposed man in the grounds (substratum) of existing things and, thus, betrayed "the truth of being" and became a source of "waste of existing things." At the same time, the philosopher marked a negative way of communication between metaphysics and anthropology: "metaphysics of the subject" turned the science of the World into anthropology (Heidegger, 1993, pp. 41-62). We know his sentence: "Having become anthropology, philosophy itself perishes of metaphysics" (Heidegger, 2003, p. 124).

According to M. Foucault (Foucault, 1994), anthropological configuration of the modern philosophy, which is "*analytics of the finite human being*" (life, labor, and language), becomes "the end of metaphysics". His argumentation can be summarized as follows: Anthropology is oriented to the finiteness, whereas metaphysics - to the eternity and infiniteness.

We admit that metaphysics and anthropology do not contradict each other (Saykina, 2012; Reznik, 2014). M. Scheler wrote: "The essences of all things intersect in man and find solidarity in man" (Scheler, 1994, p. 21). We believe that the approach to man as a quintessence, cynosure of being allows us to remain on the metaphysical level. Moreover, it is impossible (this is our strong belief) to build the philosophical doctrine of man without an analysis of metaphysical birth of man, since existence of man in the metaphysical dimension is constitutive for

man. We believe that the metaphysics of man as a modern form of metaphysics can be considered as the resuscitator of metaphysics as such.

In the Era of Globalization the problem of search for grounds of human generality is especially acute (Bauman, 1998, 2001, 2006; Lasch, 1991; Kutyrev, 2006). Ultimately, it implicates a real problem of each of us: how to reach other people, how to find a sphere of conformity? We believe that metaphysics of man can act as a kind of "topos" for humans to meet.

2. Method

The study is subject to the eventful principle in approaching man.

3. Results and Discussion

The immediacy of the problem of building the metaphysics of man is caused by the crisis of universal human generality. Ancient people searched for universality of man in his nature which unites everyone from birth (even if formally). Today, this approach works no longer. S. Zizek calls the generic generality as "fighting generality", "place of constant struggle" (Zizek, 2006, 2008). Indeed, the universal definition of man is based on a mechanism of norm (Foucault, 1991, 2003; Harrison, 2007) setting which creates an illusion of equivalent parity (since everybody is equal only within the norm but not beyond it) and produces man abstraction: "Mankind has come to universality by *exclusion* (extraction) of certain social groups from its structure" (Saykina, 2009, p. 205). J. Baudrillard (Baudrillard, 1993, p. 272) calls this process "excommunication", "markedness", against which the struggle arises (not the class struggle but the "subhuman's struggle against their status as beast").

The position of E. Rosenstock-Huussy is appealing to us: according to it, two claims are inherent in man: "I exist" and "I am human". According to him, each man has a certain dependence on the need to be called human. And man would survive even if he lost all the names associated with a role or belonging to a certain community, but with the loss of titles "the one who exists" and "human being" he would not be able to survive (Rosenstock-Huussy, 2000, p. 72). In this regard, man primarily requires from other people to treat him as "actually existing" and as "man".

We approach man as a metaphysical being: in the metaphysical sense, man is an *event* of man that is not guaranteed, a co-being in being. Man comes into the world through a special - metaphysical - birth, which is essentially *man's free self-creation* in acts of transcendence (outcome beyond empeiria and oneself as present, factually given).

Kant (Kant, 1998; Loudon, 2008) considered metaphysics as "a natural inclination" of man, Heidegger marked that it belonged to human nature. According to Scheler, there is no man without a metaphysical plan of existence: "Intellectual consciousness of absolute being is a part of man's *nature* and forms a *single* indestructible unit with consciousness of self, consciousness of the world, language and conscience" (Scheler, 1994, p. 4). He states that man always has a metaphysical feeling or idea about the grounds of himself and the world, and he has no choice in this regard. However, due to certain circumstances, man can supplant the sphere of the absolute by physical things, which devastates himself.

We deem, however, that the essential connection between metaphysics and man is not to be treated as automatically activated. The metaphysical area is not disclosed to every man in any moment of his life; it is disclosed only to man disposed to metaphysics in a certain way - man who brought his existence to the metaphysical register. Metaphysical essence of man is primarily composed of his capability to constitute an "area" of being and to live in the existence mode. Being directs man "to the pure forms of life, authenticity, completeness and wholeness" (Saykina, 2014). In fact, metaphysics is accessible only to man who is in the essential - human - mode of existence. Thus, man's metaphysical ability is not just the ability to question "above existing things" but to exist "above existing things" - to be "*a life meta-physician*".

Ultimately, man is not so much a free being as a choice of freedom, a choice of himself as a human being, a choice of the "man's in man". No one except man can arrange a metaphysical encounter with himself; no external necessity can compel man to be meta-physical; no one can be meta-physical if he exploits the labor of others and does not work diligently. Therefore, from the standpoint of metaphysics, the external does not determine thoughts and actions, the way of man's being, and this imposes on him an absolute responsibility for all his endeavors. Thus, man's metaphysics expresses not only presence of the supernatural dimension in man but also his ability to determine himself, to be his own creation. "Metaphysical ability of the man to self-creation allows him to be a kind of "alpha" in respect to himself and hence - to the world as a whole, thereby creating a possibility of his realization as a meta-physical being. Metaphysics of the man is essentially a structure out of himself by acts on initiatives as for his own order" (Saykina, 2014).

It is important to note that the problem of metaphysical realization is not instantaneous but fundamental and perspective for man, of course, if he wants to become man. Humanity, in the strict sense of the word, has no substance, no base, it does not stretch or last by itself. It is causeless and groundless. It is out task to reproduce, stretch and last it by a metaphysical effort.

Man's ontological birthplace is metaphysical acts of faith, love, conscience, thought, creativity that fall out of a succession of natural phenomena arising outside the everyday course of things. In fact, there is no special place and time for goodness, love, thoughts, faith: you must clear space and time for them by yourself. In metaphysical acts man puts himself in the beginning and, thus, confirms the beginning of himself.

In a sense, man exists as man only *at the moment* of metaphysical acts performance (born in the act, he dies in it if there is no further *metaphysical work*); beyond the act he is a non-being. It is hard for man to stay in the metaphysical state; to keep his *human* identity (to find and not to waste himself, his human self) he must actually do metaphysical work and constantly feed his metaphysical feelings.

Performing a metaphysical event man escapes from anonymous existence and meets himself. The metaphysical act is realized "from the first person" and can not be experienced "from the outside"; it can be conceived only from the inside through its self performance. The metaphysical is not given to us at the level of internal self-evidence, at the level of "I", thus, it is difficult to prove to others the presence of metaphysical feelings and states in own life. The metaphysical event can not be prepared artificially, placed on production, on a conveyor line; it is not a mass phenomenon related to imitation. It can not be taught. Everyone learns metaphysics by himself. That is why it is remarkable how man gets into the area of human generality through metaphysical events. Any metaphysical act is born at the limit of efforts, and every time man is a newcomer.

The metaphysical act is characterized by entirety of Dasein, it affects man in totality, which, as we believe, means that it is realized in the *very essence of man*, in his *foundation*. It appears that man is realized in it through total indivisibility of his essence (i.e., in indivisible unity of body and soul, reason and sense, will and heart, etc.), as if man does not have any separate functions. Indeed, the metaphysical - the truly human - manifestations are not a function of an organ but "function" of all human being. We think with all ourself, not just with brain; we love with all ourself, not just with heart; we believe with all ourself not just with soul...

In the context of our discourse, some Aristotle's ideas can be productive; he warns against functional analysis of human manifestations: "Thinking, loving, and hating are affections not of mind, but of that which has mind, so far as it has it. That is why, when this vehicle decays, memory and love cease; they were activities not of mind, but of the composite [of soul and body] which has perished" (Aristotle, 1976, p. 386). In fact, the "man's in man" appears only when there is a *totality* - an integral *connection* of man's constituents, which allows to perceive oneself as a united personality.

The metaphysical as such is indivisible in its nature: we love entirely not partly; the thought is given as total, not as its part. In this sense, the metaphysical act always represents entirety, inner finality, a product of self-creation. On the other hand, man always feels that he constantly needs work that lasts this act. Therefore, whole life can be evaluated as one metaphysical act, one lasting performance.

It is important that totality is not given to man in advance. That is why rallying oneself in unity is already a metaphysical event. Rallying is an outcome from spontaneity and randomness of existence (from the natural regime) and transition to life that you are able to rally by yourself. The demand to rally implicitly says that without his own efforts man (spontaneously, in uncultivated form) exists in a chaotic state (thus, existing in inhuman form, not as man); he falls into lots of pieces, each of which lives an independent life and dictates its own laws and rules to man.

Man has no limits but man's constituents (body, soul, gender, social role) are always limited in abilities. Decomposed, man finds himself thrown into the "*nature*" of his constituents, betraying his own - human - nature. In other words, when man is divided into parts and only one part of him is alive, he is always constrained and he falls into *specific* existence (moves off from universal nature). Moreover, when man has no world inside and outside himself he actually cannot display his true human properties, and his behavior becomes inhuman, uncivilized.

Thus, man's birth, in fact, consists in maintaining of split-base and split-level constituents with an effort, and in leading with his will the parts of his essence to a common denominator. Undoubtedly, in this regard, the essence of man is not in his parts or their summation, but in *totality*.

Metaphysics is done by man only in the form of his total Dasein, and due to this fact it can be defined as an area of pure humanity. Rallying of man into totality means not only self-concentration and internal regulation,

harmonization of all the parts and structures, but also their reassignment to the human principle of realization. We believe that man coincides with the *personal* (true) form of man in the metaphysical event.

Thus, metaphysics is done at the limit of human abilities through solidity, totality of our being and, therefore, metaphysics exposes our genuineness. It gives man a feeling that he really *lives* (with live life), not just exists. The experience of *fullness* of being is given to man also due to self-verification obtained at the time of the metaphysical act: "I exist". Essentially, metaphysics reveals being to us and us to being, and it is done as an act in being.

It should be stated that the metaphysical event is an occurrence of a certain moment of truth: man shows his true colors (Dasein), and no one can be fooled. The event, as the truth, enlightens truth about man. The metaphysical act works with "nothingness" but, surprisingly, man truly exists precisely in it: as an "eidos" of man and himself. Man is taken in his "purity" - as he is at the present moment. At this moment he has no past, no future, no age or social status. It is the real action (and its meaning) that is evaluated, not past achievements. And, furthermore, in the metaphysical event man becomes real, worthwhile, worthy - what man should be. Through the state of "man as he must be" he forces his way into the sphere of transcendence, the sphere of *generality*.

The metaphysical choice made by man in each act is ultimate to the extent of "the choice of choice" (as noted S. Kierkegaard) rather than the choice of himself. "But what I actually choose? I choose the absolute. What is the absolute? It is myself, in my *eternal validity of man* [emphasis added- G.S.]: Anything other than myself I cannot choose as the absolute" (Kierkegaard, 1998, p. 266). In fact, a true choice of oneself is a conscious choice of humanity in the *unconditional* form (as a counter to everything inhuman) and an effort to keep this choice. According to Kierkegaard, a true choice of oneself does not separate man from other people, from his history, but links "with the root on which all mankind rests together with him" (Kierkegaard, 1998, p. 268). Thus, choosing himself man joins the generic content and obtains universality (which means: humanity). The deep metaphysical paradox is that using metaphysics we can constitute, build a generic unity of mankind (generic conformity, sociality) from the inside of human personality.

Man's acquisition of himself (humanity) is possible by means of participation in transcendent values, rising into the atemporal dimension, into the sphere of Absolutes (and, consequently, into the universal dimension). The transcendent world makes man complete. For acquisition of humanity it is necessary to move not horizontally, not across the surface (this is how "empeiria" leads man), but upwards, vertically. Man can *become* a human only if he rises above himself - transcends (overdoes himself constantly).

Transcendence into the world of absolutes saves from egocentrism of the self, from "self-center" (G. Marcel). It should be noted that transcendence not only unites man with himself, but also *disunites* himself in a good sense directing human impulses for the benefit of other people, for the benefit of being. In this respect, the word "absolute" has an important connotation, videlicet "loose".

You must consider that man can think, believe, love, sympathize, communicate, be happy only by means of "assembled" - generic - organs, only when he is able to put himself in other person's place, and to supplement himself with other position. But for conception and evaluation of metaphysical events man should have human - universal - organs as well. The problem is that the metaphysical event is invisible to regular physical sight - it is visible only to the human (historically cultivated) one. I can see another man's goodness, estimate the value of another man's thought, understand actions of an affectionate person, another man's religious pursuits in case if I not only went through similar states myself but also if I participated in the generic mind, in the history of metaphysical abilities development.

Through metaphysics man learns to treat another person as an *absolute value*. Usually we wrongly associate this lesson *only* with the field of morals, but the genuine metaphysical intention of man in any appearance, in any field is imbued with acceptance of absolute value of any man, respect of his merits. Otherwise, we would never defer to other man's thought content, think about meanings of other man's poem, about complexity of love or religious emotion...

In fact, morality just strengthens all metaphysical experience of the absolute; as if all the rays of the latter converge in it. It requires that man in different degrees of becoming be considered as absolute, "hundred-per-cent" humanity, as man-personality (even if only a human embryo is involved) and produces respect for any human form. The doer must treat any man, irrespective of his age, status, sex, ethnic group, with extreme goodness - *equally*, recognizing only human dignity rather than any other parameters (in fact, developing an attitude to the *purified* human content).

Generally, according to the principles of metaphysics, each man has an *inherent humanity*. There you cannot be a *little bit of man*, as well as you cannot see insufficient humanity in other men.

There is one more important factor. The fact is that social, age-related, ethnic, civil, sex-related statuses are indifferent for a metaphysical act of being; the act of being takes place even despite these qualities (similar to the principle of love: we love despite we are Montagues or Capulets). By means of metaphysical birth (in conflict of being and non-being, the true and the authentic, the eternal and the finite) I am cleansed of all superficial, unnecessary masks and averaging. I leave my empiric self and show my genuine self. The metaphysical event is death and birth at the same time.

In metaphysical events man, leaving all the secondary, rallies himself and finds himself in the universal dimension, comes across the universal and shows himself as universal being, id est as being that has no definite social status, age, sex, biography. The *man* proper arouses in him. Performing metaphysical acts man confirms only his *humanity*. Therefore, he frees himself from his own partitionality and one-dimensionality.

From such viewpoint metaphysics shows an important *social* property: it seems to return to man subjectivity stolen by sociality. So, in social relations as such man cannot always act as a totality and a subject (as a self-founding beginning completely dependent on his own decisions). Whereas in the metaphysical field man is always a subject, he is not a functionary but free entity. The genuine metaphysics makes man responsible as if he were a full subject of activity; therefore, he cannot be a "bad professional" only for the reason that his activity is directed by someone else. The eminent social meaning of metaphysics lies in its ability to compensate man's deficiency, reduction and alienation in social relations. Raising man to the level of generic generality, metaphysics turns towards the grounds of existing things, to the *grounds* of sociality.

Thus, the essential property of a metaphysical act consists in its performance at the universal, general level by "some purified humanity". In fact, metaphysics constitutes a general subject, and it is implemented only when man is free of his *narrow* characteristics (sex, age, social role, ethnic origin etc.) and shows himself as man as such. Through metaphysics man becomes "total": it completes a man-function that emerged in social division of labor up to "total" man. Total (rather than functional, partial) involvement of man in metaphysical acts, in its turn, requires as well that other people be considered as total, as having humanity.

In our opinion, man's *ontological maximum* is implemented in the metaphysical event. To be precise, man's maximum (when man lives to the maximum, exerts himself to the maximum at anything, at any feeling) is actually man as such. This maximum of man is absolute, independent of any circumstances, of our social roles. "The human in essence" cannot but co-opt "his due" - what man must be, all the more, cannot contradict him. Therefore, man is simultaneously the measure ("the golden mean") and the superior. At the same time, any manifestation of man below the upper limit with regard to the essence will prove to be a subhuman manifestation of man, a nongenuine form of man. Thus, in the Middle Ages man was defined as the "measure excess". There is no man without excess: when man is easily satisfied, when he does not want to overgrow himself (his achieved status), when he does not strive for transcendent heights and metaphysical prospects, underhumanity grows out of him.

Man is performed in the metaphysical event which can be initiated only by him - his freedom. In order to exist, not just occur, it is necessary to extend the metaphysical intention in permanent metaphysical work on improvement of existing things. Generally, metaphysics gives man self-proof and self-assurance: "I cannot but be".

Though the metaphysical act is superempirical, and metaphysical feelings are given only at the level of inner self-evidence, it, notwithstanding, is a *presentation* of man in *social* space, specific manifestation of human image on the stage of being. We actually discover man when he performs an act, shares his thoughts, dazzles with sincerity of his faith, when he loves and creates.

4. Conclusions

1. Man is a unique being: he is not predetermined in his realization as man. He can get into a true human state only performing metaphysical acts that are done contrary to natural principles. Metaphysics is a field of actual realization of man as a human being.

2. Metaphysical act is characterized by the following properties: performance that gives it entirety and internal finality; man's total Dasein, his confirmation as the active beginning and ultimacy of his efforts; eventfulness, and, hence, confirmation of man's indivisibility with being, which is the grounds for man's self-verification; performance in the very essence of man, in his foundation; ability to raise man to the level of generality and transcend to the Other.

3. In metaphysical realization man confirms himself as unity and as united with the world. Therefore, metaphysical birth of man is an ontological event.

4. The metaphysics of man can be defined as a place of meeting of the individual and the universal, as a unity of generic, social, and personal levels of human being. Through metaphysical events man falls into a particular dimension - "purified humanity" (generic universality), wherein only absolute value of human dignity is of importance, and nothing else. The metaphysics of man is a special mode of life contributing to discovery and confirmation of the generic dimension in him and in others. Man's raising to the level of generic universality allows us to escape "self-center"; it dis-connects with one's own parochialism.

References

- Aristotle. (1976). *On the soul* (pp. 369-448). Works: in 4 volumes. V.I. Moscow: Mysl.
- Baudrillard, J. (1993). *Symbolic Exchange and Death*. London: Sage.
- Bauman, Z. (1998). *Modernity and Ambivalence*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bauman, Z. (2001). *The Individualized Society*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bauman, Z. (2006). *Liquid Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Foucault, M. (1991). Experiences of madness. *History of the Human Sciences*, 4(1), 1-25.
- Foucault, M. (1994). *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Foucault, M. (2003). *Abnormal. Lectures at the College de France, 1974-1975*. London, New York: Verso.
- Harrison, W. C. (2007). Madness and historicity: Foucault and Derrida, Artaud and Descartes. *History of the Human Sciences*, 20(4), 79-105. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0952695107082492>.
- Heidegger, M. (1993). *Time picture of the world. Time and Being*. Moscow: Republic.
- Heidegger, M. (2003). *The End of Philosophy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kant, I. (1998). *Critique of Pure Reason*. Introduction. Translated and edited by Paul Guyer and Allen W. Wood. Cambridge University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511804649.003>
- Kierkegaard, S. (1998). *Pleasure and duty*. Rostov-on-Don: Fenix.
- Kutyrev, V. A. (2006). *Philosophy of post-modernism: Scientific-educational handbook for masters and post graduate students in arts*. Publishing House of Volga-Vyatka Academy of Governmental Service.
- Lasch, C. (1991). *The Culture of Narcissism. American Life in an Age of Diminishing Expectations*. New York, London: W-W-Norton & Company.
- Louden, Robert B. (2008). Anthropology from a Kantian point of view: Toward a cosmopolitan conception of human nature. *History and Philosophy of Science Part A*, 39(4), 515-522. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.shpsa.2008.09.007>
- Reznik, Yu. M. (2014). The metaphysics of man: Images of being. *SENTENTIA. European Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 1, 25-33. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7256/1339-3057.2014.1.10847>
- Rosenstock-Huussy, O. (2000). *Selected works: Language of Human Race*. Moscow: University Book.
- Saykina, G. K. (2009). Abstractness of the Person in the Epoch of Individualization. *Philosophy of Education*, 4, 204-211.
- Saykina, G. K. (2012). *Hard to be a man... (Metaphysical routes of the man)*. Kazan University.
- Saykina, G. K. (2014). Situation in the area of human metaphysics: struggle of "School of Origin" and "School of Being". *Journal of Language and Literature*, 5(3), 22-27. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7813/jll.2014/5-3/4>.
- Scheler, M. (1994). *Philosophical outlook*. Selected Works. Moscow: Publisher "Gnosis".
- Zizek, S. (2006). *The Parallax View*. The MIT Press: Cambridge, Massachusetts; London, England.
- Zizek, S. (2008). *The Sublime Object of Ideology*. London, New York: Verso.

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/>).