
Permanent Metaphysical Structures

Kalıcı Metafizik Yapılar

OLEH SHEPETIAK 

Borys Grinchenko Kyiv University

OKSANA SHEPETIAK 

Kyiv National University of Trade and Economics

Received: 27.08.2019 | Accepted: 21.03.2020

Abstract: Determining the essence of any substance requires the construction of its definition. It is necessary to find a generic concept to construct a definition, and it includes the scope of the definition concept. However, there are such concepts to be the most general of their kind, and therefore generic concepts cannot be found for them. These concepts are meant to be three most general philosophical categories: God, man, and the world. We call these three categories as permanent metaphysical structures. Consequently, human always seeks to outline the objects of his interest in his mind. If a definition is not possible, then they are replaced by explications or quasi-definitions.

Keywords: Metaphysics, definition, religion, worldview, human.

✉ Oleh Shepetiak

Borys Grinchenko Kyiv University, Faculty of History and Philosophy, Department of Philosophy

04053, Kyiv, Ukraine | o.shepetyak@gmail.com

✉ Oksana Shepetiak

Kyiv National University of Trade and Economics, Faculty of International Trade and Law, Department of Philosophy, Social and Political Sciences

02156, Kyiv, Ukraine | oksankaroman@gmail.com



Introduction

Positivism and neo-positivism have developed the belief that philosophy is gradually losing the problematic field of its own research, transferring it to the positive sciences. When science completely transcends the sphere of its study from philosophy, there will be only one task for philosophy i.e. to study the essence and methodology of science itself. In other words, in positivism, philosophy is reduced to the theory of science. It was these conclusions that determined the nature of the Vienna Circle neo-positivism, whose main subject of study was science. It was on this basis that Rudolf Haller Rudolf Haller wrote: "This group of philosophers, mathematicians, physicists and sociologists formed a movement that organized its own congresses, published two journals and, finally, they continued the great tradition of the French Enlightenment with the powerful project of the International Encyclopedia of Unified Science, that sought to create opposition to the irrationalists and other opposite directions of our century" (Haller, 1993: 2). The era of positivism rapid development is long gone in all its modifications. But the question of the subject of philosophy remained constant. What should philosophy do? Will there come a time when all life will be the subject of the empirical sciences study, and that philosophy will no longer remain a problematic field? Can philosophy ever die? These questions are of concern not only to professional philosophers who such a disappointing prospect threatens unemployment to, but also to human civilization in general. After neo-positivism had lost its leading position in philosophical discourse, these questions came with renewed vigor. The considerations outlined above give us reason to think about these horrifying questions and try to answer them. Philosophers of ancient times are convinced that philosophy is eternal, and no matter what the heights of science, it can never do without philosophy. Based on these considerations, we set out in this article the task of analyzing the relevance of a statement about the philosophy eternity and its prospects.

Question and Cognition

Today, following the histories of philosophy and science juxtaposition, it is hard to disagree that all modern sciences have separated them-



selves from philosophy. If philosophy is an attempt to ask questions of existence, and science is an attempt to answer them, then every scientific answer to a philosophical question really narrows its subject area. So, the question of the philosophy perspectives comes down to the question whether something goes unanswered in the epistemological dialectic of questions and answers. If answers are the prerogative of science, then the sphere of philosophy will remain something that cannot be answered. It follows that if there are such objects that are fundamentally impossible to define, then philosophy is eternal. In other words, philosophy will always have something to do if there are items that can be asked but that no one will ever be able to answer. If some questions cannot be answered, then science will not be able to take them away from philosophy, and philosophy will always retain its own segment in cognition.

The answer to the questions posed not only by philosophy as a branch of knowledge but also by philosophy as a characteristic of the human essence is the definition. Not everything can be defined. There are such objects not to be determined by science. This science limitation occurs in two cases. The first is the lack of knowledge about the subject. When a scientist encounters something that neither he nor his colleagues have ever observed, then there may be a situation where the scientific community simply lacks the data to describe a new discovery.

Insufficient knowledge does not allow us to formulate such a subject definition. However, this situation is not hopeless. The discovery is sure to attract scientists; they focus their attention and skills on it, invest their time and effort in its explanation. Eventually, this will accumulate enough information to define a still unknown study subject. The second case is much more problematic. It is well known that in order to construct a definition, i.e. to determine the meaning of the definition concept, it is necessary to form a definition, that is, a set of concepts whose product of contents is equal to the meaning of the definition concept. The definition, in its turn, should include a generic concept and the latter combines all the meaning of the definition concept and a list of all the specific features that distinguish the definition from the scope of the definition generic concept. A generic concept is the essence of the problem. There are such cases when it is not present. We can easily explain what a square,



a table, a star is... All these concepts are elements of other larger in scope concepts that are generic to the mentioned items above. However, the hierarchy of concepts does not go to infinity. The logical operation of generalization is not infinite, because of which the meaning of the concept is impoverished, but its scope is enriched, i.e. the concept goes to a more general. Its series ends with the most general concepts. Such concepts cannot be generalized. There are simply no generic concepts for them. That is why they cannot be defined. And what is next?

The human mind is constructed in such a way that it always raises questions. Everything a person sees, hears, feels, gives rise to questions, which in turn require answers. Even the fundamental inability to give a comprehensive answer does not stop the person from constantly searching for the answer. Therefore, human will seek answers despite the apparent utopia of that intention. Logic provides for definition substitutes when it cannot be formed. Such a substitute is explication, which, like the definition, consists of two parts. They are explicandum, that is, a concept that is explained, and explicans, that is, a set of concepts that explain the content of explicandum. The purpose of explication is to explain what is impossible to define. Explication is also used when the definition is impossible owing to the temporary lack of knowledge about the under-study subject and when it is impossible conceptually.

Kant's Big Questions

Now we have the task to determine the concepts that are not definable. We have outlined above that these concepts are the most general, and therefore there is no more general concept that in their definition could take the place of a generic one. The list of these concepts is fundamentally important for understanding epistemological issues. In search of these ideas, let us turn to Immanuel Kant, the meter of philosophical thought. The Konigsberg thinker believed that the process of cognition occurs in three stages. They are sensibility, understanding and reason. In the first stage, the sensibility, the person perceives the world through the prism of space and time. In the second case, understanding, the obtained data are classified into twelve categories. The third one, reason, is the most important thing: the data processed the way they are collated to



form a picture of knowledge on the basis of three absolute ideas, i.e. God, the world, and the human soul (Kant, 1794: 248).

These three ideas are crucial to cognition, because their interpretation underlies the formation of outlook. They are the most general, non-definable concepts. There is nothing more than God, the world, and the human soul. Although they are not definable, they are necessary in the cognitive process because they are the three whales which the worldview is based on. There is no person who isn't looking for answers to these questions. There is no culture based on these points of genesis. Throughout the history of human civilization, God, soul, and the world have been interpreted differently, but have always been present at the heart of worldview systems. The way we interpret and understand these concepts depends on all perceptions of reality. They are not within the sphere of science, but science is based on a worldview, and therefore on the interpretation of God, the world and man. They claim a special name, being outside of science, but influencing it, changing their interpretation, but always at the heart of the worldview. It seems to us the most appropriate is to call them as permanent metaphysical structures. In this term, the word "constant" should emphasize the fact that there is no culture and personality that these issues do not matter. The term "metaphysical" is intended to indicate that they are beyond experience and science, but define them.

Let us try to consider each of the metaphysical structures and their role in human life. The first and foremost among them is God. We will not consider the problem of God genesis, since it does not relate to issues of epistemology. In this context, we are also forced to bypass the issues of philosophy, sociology, and psychology of religion. However, for epistemology, the key issue is the question of God.

If we are talking about cognition as a man natural necessity, if we agree that the first step of cognition is a question to which a person will always seek answers, then the fact that everyone asks himself a question about God is the indisputable. Since man has existed, since then he cannot distance himself from the question of God. He is present in man not only as the image he was created according to biblical descriptions, or his transcendental existential, according to Rahner's apt utterance. It is also



present in human as a cognitive idea that cannot be eliminated.

There are atheists among the people, but there are no non-religious people because atheism is also a religion. The phenomenon of religion received many different definitions in the history of human thought. It was understood as a social phenomenon in Marxism and in its dependent philosophical concepts, as Marx did not regard man differently as just an integral element of society and productive forces. Sigmund Freud believed that religion was a psychological phenomenon to be matured on the basis of the Oedipus complex. Nietzsche claimed that religion emerges at a certain stage of evolution (at the human stage) as a reactive force that gives rise to a culture of resentment. All these definitions of religion are controversial. Religion is not a consequence of any trait that characterizes a person; it is itself a fundamental feature of man, embedded in its essence. Both an ancient hunter and a modern businessman, both an Indian yogi and a Greek philosopher, both a Persian warrior and a European scientist, each forced to find their own answer about God. And this statement is a religion.

Answering a religious question is one of the three whales in the outlook formation. For self-determination, it doesn't matter whether the Sun goes around the Earth or the Earth revolves around the Sun. If we ask anyone to tell about oneself to express its views orally or in writing, we will not know about vis-à-vis astronomical opinions according to this self-characteristic, but we will definitely hear about his religious beliefs. The self-revelation of God to Adam had been faded by time and cultural stratification. Man, gradually had been losing his living connection with God, been sought Him in magical attempts to conquer the world with his own idols and false ideals. Wherever the religion search has returned, the fact of this search has always remained constant and unchanged. Ivan Ortynsky noted: "Faith embraces the whole person and all his existence dimensions giving them their own meaning, purpose and inherent direction" (Ortynskyi, 2014: 34).

The phenomenon of atheism seems to be particularly striking for our consideration. Since the answer to a religious question belongs to the permanent metaphysical structures, that is, a question that cannot be answered in principle, it can only be imagined. Only God himself can



reveal the fullness of the truth about himself. But such self-disclosure in a revelation can be perceived or rejected by a person. The human mind, when seeking answers to a religious question on its own, produces a variety of explanations for God. These beliefs about God can neither be verified nor falsified. They do not make a clear definition. The atheists were able to abandon their belief in God, but they could not refuse the religion. Pope Benedict XVI wrote in this context: “Faith does not refer to the sphere of the constructed, though it touches it, but to the sphere of fundamental human decisions that cannot be evaded” (Ratsinhier, 1998: 39). Every time a person gives up on true God, he or she must fill this gap with something else, even with an artificially created illusion of a deity. For example, the writer George Orwell proclaimed the words “God is power” through the mouth of his character O'Brien in the novel “1984”. (Orwell, 2008: 567). God is “man's view of his own essential nature” (Feuerbach, 1841: 221) for Ludwig Feuerbach. Man is not capable to give a definition of God. He is unknowable to him because there is no more general concept that could become generic for him.

A vivid example of reduced explanations is human explication. Throughout the history of civilization, various outlines of human nature have been formed. All of them carry not only cognitive consequences, but also form an attitude towards the person in his environment. The emergence of the evolution theory and the intensive development of biology formed the idea that man is a living organism. If the concept of “living organism” is set as generic concept of “man”, then the analogy between man and animal becomes obvious, as the animal is also a living organism. As a result of this quasi-definition, a human is reduced to an animal. In such a paradigm the attitude to man is formed and is not different from the one towards the animal. In the animal world where the law of natural selection prevails, a stronger one survives and a feeble, an infirm one dies because it is not adapted to surviving the harsh wildlife and becomes a burden for the flock. If a human being is a living organism first and foremost, then the human community is a flock where the laws of survival also prevail. It is common to destroy those individuals in such a human herd who are unable to adapt to the survival conditions and who become useless to the herd. As a consequence only in the human flock can abor-



tion and euthanasia be the norm, not in a community of people united by mutual love. Unborn children, who are not yet able to protect themselves from the cruel decision of their parents and people in white coats sworn to save lives and health, are dying at their hands because they are unnecessary. And the unnecessary thing is usually thrown away. Similarly, people from the world who through age, illness, and physical disabilities are no longer able to bring material benefits to the herd are expelled by euthanasia. Paradoxically, the word “euthanasia” means a happy death. The feeble people murder is considered to be a fortune for them. Officially, such a death is called the happy one because it frees people from suffering, but, in fact, it is happy only because living and experiencing our own futility in the consumer values world is no more bearable than a death. The world of living organisms is brutal. At the moment a person called himself a living organism, that is, he equated himself with an animal, he really became like him, and the world he lives in became a jungle.

Another common interpretation of the human essence is the “element of society”. In most totalitarian states a person is defined as an element of society, state, nations, etc. If a person is an element of society, then he must fully adapt to society. Any totalitarian system is functioning as a mechanism, requiring all its members to meet its general standards. The mechanism is not able to reconcile with the identity of its members. If the part of the mechanism does not meet its requirements it is corrected then, or, if no correction is possible, thrown away. It occurs similarly in totalitarian societies that were abundant on the planet Earth in the twentieth century. Neither of them tolerated either the views of individual citizens or individual traits. Everyone should be the same, think the same, believe the same, and obey the same authorities. Any “norm” deviation is perceived negatively. The reaction scenario of the ruling system is always the same: first, freethinkers are re-educated by means of propaganda; if the re-education does not produce the expected results, they are isolated from other elements of society in specially created concentration camps, so that their presence in society does not infect them with the dangerous beliefs of others; the concentration camps use the cruelest means of influence, the purpose of which is not only to intimidate, but to break the personality, to eradicate everything individual-



ly, to make them repent of their own otherness; if such isolation does not produce the expected results, then the freethinker is physically destroyed as a part no longer suitable for use in the mechanism. If a person is an element of something, then he must be such as something, part of what he or she is. Years of blood spilled all over the world and millions of people killed in political prisons and concentration camps in the twentieth century have become the payback for a failed human identification.

Some mystical doctrines, especially prevalent among the peoples of the Far East, emphasized the human soul, completely ignoring the body. For example, in Hinduism and Buddhism there is a belief that any affection is a sin. Even affection to life is condemned. The goal of spiritual maturity is to be free from any addiction, including individual existence. Everyone must realize that its own atman (individual spirit) is nothing but Brahma, and as long as one considers the atman as a reality, separated from the general stream of being, until he attains salvation in nirvana. Such a radical emphasis on the man spiritual component and the complete material side alienation caused the specific cultural type of India and the peoples who were culturally dependent on it. The Hindus and Buddhists have developed a deep and extraordinarily interesting spiritual culture where everything is subordinated to the sole purpose of promoting spiritual growth and liberation from the material one. Instead, material culture, science and technology did not produce the same results as in Europe. This is because the Indian genius was not interested in the material world ignoring it openly.

There are many similar examples in the history of civilization because “man became the main point of relations, as if it were the” measure of “everything” (Rusecki, 1994: 20). The axiology and human civilization existence depend on the way we define a person. False definitions of a person cost its dearly. Karl Rahner believed that “man is essentially ambiguous. He is always placed in the world and always above him” (Rahner, 1957: 405). It is in the Rahner’s teachings fundamentally important statements about man appear. He believed that man was completely beyond the world. “Runner emphasizes the proof of the absolute man transcendence, of his absolute openness to existence” (Kymieliev, 1985: 118). The wealth of a person's characteristics makes him a citizen of many worlds



but does not exhaust him. It is both a living organism, and an element of society, and a spiritual entity... but none of these characteristics depletes the entire multifaceted nature of the human essence.

According to Rahner, the most characteristic feature of man is the transcendental existential, i.e. the orientation of man existence outside the experienced categories, to God, which is an absolute mystery, because “the inconceivability and incomprehension of God is marked as a secret” in Rahner’s (Muck, 1983: 151). According to Hrents and Olson, “he seeks to show that everyday universal human experience cannot be conceived without a holy transcendental mystery called “God”, and man knows the Holy Mystery of God every day through his historical environment.” (Hrents S, Olson R., 2011: 181). If the absolute mystery of God is decisive for man, and it is impossible to determine the mystery through obscurity, then man becomes a mystery by his involvement with God and this mystery is not definable fundamentally. Rahner's associate Emerich Coreth held similar beliefs that “man is transcendental in his spiritual and personal essence, but as a spirit in the body, in the world, in history, he is equally bound by immanence, while transcending the latter”. (Coreth, 1998: 195). Such considerations about man not only isolate him from the entire experimental world, but also uphold his dignity which Blair Pascal wrote to Blair Pascal long before Rahner and Coreth: “Man is only a cane, the weakest in nature, but it is a thinking cane. ... If the Universe had destroyed it, the man would still have been more dignified than the thing that killed her, for she knew that she was dying, whereas she knew nothing of the Universe superiority over her.” (Pascal, 2011: 298).

The consequences of interpreting the world are equally interesting. All material things are in the world. Therefore, they can be defined only on the basis of a certain worldview. However, we cannot answer the definition what the world is. Various ideas about the world have been formed throughout history. In Claudius Ptolemy's system the Universe consists of the Earth in the center, planets orbiting the Earth, the stars that fill the sky. All this is enveloped in a fiery flame. Such a Universe is limited in space. Copernicus flipped the world by placing the Sun in the center and moving the Earth to the periphery. Now that the Earth is not the center of the Universe and, subsequently the very concept of the center of the



Universe disappears, the question arises about its limits. Descartes already holds the following argument: “It is inadmissible to think of the infinite, but to be considered simply boundless things with no boundaries we can see; they are the length of the world, the particles of matter separation, the stars number, etc.” (Descartes, 1989: 324). This distinction of Descartes expresses his belief that only God can be the infinite and the world is boundless since it has no boundaries. In Kant, an even more drastic conclusion emerges: “The cosmological question about the magnitude of the world is first and foremost a negative answer: the world neither exists from the beginning in time nor has the extreme limit in space” (Kant, 1964: 470). Kant was convinced that the world is eternal in time and space in the subcritical period of his scientific activities. He named the seventh section “Creation in the total extant of its infinity both in space and in time “in his work “Universal Natural History and Theory of the Heavens” (Kant, 1755: 100-128). At the same time, the Königsberg thinker was convinced that the world was created by God but the act of creation was not instantaneous: “The creation of the world is not a matter of one moment” (Kant, 1755: 113). It is fair to say that theories in favor of infinity are being developed today. An example of modern theories of the world infinity is Andrew Linde’s assumption according to which the world is infinite and filled with dense energy and the visible part of the world was formed by the dense energy dilution in the space ball (Linde, 1990: 280).

The hypothesis of the infinite Earth satisfied the inquisitive human mind not for long. Too much controversy has it caused. As a result, the problem of the world prompted scientists to search for new theories that could explain it more accurately. Today the dominant theory of the universe is to be the Big Bang theory, whose creators claim that the world arose from the explosion and the embryos of the universe were in a singular state exactly at that time. The Big Bang theory is based on the Edwin Hubble law (Hubble, 2013), according to the velocity of galaxies is proportional to the distance between them. On this basis it was concluded that the explosion of the “cosmic atom” was the beginning of such a planets flight. Hubble published the results of his research in 1929. He was preceded by two theories that largely predicted and stimulated Hubble's



research. They were Georges Lemaître's the expanding universe theory (Lemaître, 1946) and the theory of the nonstatic universe of Alexander Friedman. The theoretical basis for these considerations was the general theory of relativity by Albert Einstein (Einstein, 1916: 769-822).

The explanation of the world origin is interrelated with the explanations of God and man. The boundlessness of the world in time and space denies the necessity of the Creator: if the world is eternal, no one created it. The Big Bang theory proves that the world has a temporal beginning and spatial boundaries. This denies the arguments against creationism. It is worth noting that Georges Lemaître was a Catholic priest and the impetus for his studies in astronomy was a Bible-based belief that God created the world alongside his desire for a deeper study of his subject matter. Scientific proof of the beginning of the world contradicts the materialistic worldview. Another argument for the beginning of the world is the theory of entropy as it was called by Rudolf Clausius in 1865. According to the second law of thermodynamics, heat will be distributed uniformly for some time in a closed space at all points in this space. The universe is a closed system. Therefore, the heat in it must be evenly distributed at all points. We do not see this. This means that the heat distribution process is still ongoing. If it continues, it should have once begun. If the world were eternal, then the process of heat distribution would begin and end indefinitely. Since it is not over yet, the world is not eternal.

These considerations are important not only to explain the world origin but also the man emergence. On the basis of the claim that the world has no boundaries neither in space nor in time; it can be assumed that all possibilities without exception can be realized in it. The well-known model of possible worlds, used to explain the correlation of modal (apodictic, asertoric, and problematic) judgments, can be ontologically realized only under the space-time boundlessness of the world. If all the possibilities in the world can be realized, and life, as it is, is an opportunity, then the probability of a spontaneous origin of life is high enough. If, however, the world is limited in time and space, then it becomes necessary to determine the probability of its spontaneous origin by comparing all the necessary conditions for the origin of life. Taking into account all the prerequisites known in modern science, it turned out that the spon-



taneous origin of life is close to zero. Astrophysicist Hugh Ross has come to believe that the likelihood of a spontaneous origin of life is so low that it cannot be considered (Ross, 1997: 256). If the spontaneous origin of life is so improbable, then the accidental origin of a man is not worth talking about. This, in turn, requires the presence of a Creator who would create living organisms. One of the consequences of such calculations was the formulation of the so-called “anthropic principle” formed by Brandon Carter in 1974 (Löffler, 2006: 72). It is based on the following that if the probability of origin of life in general and, of man in particular is so low that the belief in the spontaneous origin of life and a man cannot be taken seriously, it means that the whole world was formed in a way to be fit for human origin. In other words, a man could not appear by accident as the coincidence of circumstances necessary for its occurrence is almost impossible. It follows that the world was formed with a definite, well-defined goal, and that purpose is human.

Conclusion

The innumerable reflections on God, the world and man, as well as their inseparable relationships, testify to their influence on the formation of all human knowledge. It is inherent for a person to find the answers to the questions. We formulate these answers in the definition. Each definition must include a generic concept. The number of generalizations is not infinite. It ends with the most general concepts - the permanent metaphysical structures that God, man, and the world belong to. As we are not able to define them and there is no more general concept about them, we are looking for some explications or quasi-definitions for them. All further cognition depends on which explanation of the stable metaphysical structures we choose, it is these concepts that become generic for lower-generality concepts. For a man who believes in God, the world cannot be infinite in time and space. For those who are persuaded that man is the most precious creation of God, there can be no conviction that a person who thinks differently needs an ideological correction, and that person who has fulfilled his workforce can be destroyed by euthanasia. Since metaphysical structures can never be defined, and at the same time will always determine the direction of all further knowledge, they will always remain the prerogative of philosophy, which will raise questions about



them, and will form options for answers, which in turn will determine the world outlook, culture, science, and morality, social norms ,etc.

References

- Einstein, A. (1916). Die Grundlage der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie. *Annalen der Physik*, 7.
- Feuerbach, L. (1841). *Das Wesen des Christentums*. Leipzig: Wigand.
- Haller, R. (1993). *Neopositivismus. Eine historische Einführung in die Philosophie des Wiener Kreises*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Hubble, E. (2013). *The Realm of the Nebulae*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Kant, I. (1755). *Allgemeine Naturgeschichte und Theorie des Himmels oder Versuch von der Verfassung und dem mechanischen Ursprunge des ganzen Weltgebäudes nach Newtonischen Grundsätzen abgehandelt*. Königsberg und Leipzig: Petersen.
- Kant, I. (1794). *Die Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der bloßen Vernunft*. Frankfurt und Leipzig: Philipp Reclam.
- Lemaître, G. (1946). *L'Hypothèse de l'Atome Primitif. Essai de Cosmogonie*. Neuchâtel: Édition du Griffon.
- Löffler, W. (2006). *Einführung in die Religionsphilosophie*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Muck, O. (1983). *Philosophische Gotteslehre*. Düsseldorf: Patmos Verlag.
- Orwell, G. (2008). *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
- Rahner, K. (1957). *Geist in der Welt: Zur Metaphysik der endlichen Erkenntnis bei Thomas von Aquin*. München: Kösel-Verlag.
- Rusecki, M. (1994). *Wiarygodność Chrześcijaństwa*. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL.
- Hrents, S & Olson, R. (2011). *Bobosloviie i Boboslovy XX Vieka*. Cherkassy: Kolkvium.
- Dekart, R. (1989). *Piervonachala Filosofii. Sochinieniia v Dvukh Tomakh*. V.1. Moskva.
- Kant, I. (1964). *Kritika Chystoho Razuma. Sochinieniia v Shesti Tomakh*. V.3. Moskva.
- Kymieliev, Yu. (1985). *Sovriemennaia Burzbuaznaia Filsofsko-Relibioznaia An-*



tropolohiia. Moskva: Nauka.

Coret, E. (1998). *Osnovy Metafiziki*. Kyiv: Tandem.

Linde, A. (1990). *Fizika Elementarnykh Chastits i Inflatsionnaia Kosmobiia*. Moskva: Nauka.

Ortynskiy, I. (2014). *Khrystiianstvo v Yoho Vyiavakh i Sobochasnykh Problemakh: Vybrani Tvory*. Kyiv: UAR.

Paskal, B. (2011). *Mysli. Malyye Sochinieniia. Pisma*. Kirovohrad: AST.

Ratsinhier, Y. (1998). *Vviedeniie v Khristiianstvo: Lektsii ob Apostolskom Simvolie Very*. Briussel: Foyer Oriental Chrétien.

Ross, Kh. (1997). *Tvoriets i Kosmos*. Sankt-Peterburh: Tsentr Khristianskoi Literatury.

Öz: Herhangi bir maddenin özünü belirlemek, tanımının oluşturulmasını gerektirir. Bir tanım oluşturmak için genel bir kavram bulmak gerekir ve tanım kavramının kapsamını içerir. Bununla birlikte, türlerinin en genelleri gibi kavramlar vardır ve bu nedenle onlar için genel kavram bulunamaz. Bu kavramlar en genel üç felsefi kategoridir: Tanrı, insan ve dünya. Bu üç kategoriye kalıcı metafizik yapılar olarak adlandırıyoruz. Sonuç olarak, insan her zaman zihnindeki ilgisinin nesnelerini ana hatlarıyla çizmeye çalışır. Tanım mümkün değilse, bunların yerine açıklamalar veya yarı tanımlamalar gelir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Metafizik, tanım, din, dünya görüşü, insan.



