

*Piotr Cycjiura*  
Toruń

### *Amare est bonum velle alicui*

What does it mean to act in upright way? The answer seems to be incomparably easier to a scientist who confines himself to the algorithm proposed in the science. Nevertheless, it was not until Galileo obvious what algorithm underlies what we now call modern physics. The consciousness in question underpins the difference, too, between, say, alchemy and scientific chemistry. Since Galileo accepted that the book of nature is written in the language of mathematics, the way had seemed to be paved. The discovery, excellent as it was, had, though, to be proved. Unless we make the others see (Husserl would speak about ἀποφάνσις), we are merely *enlightened*, but not provided with the real knowledge. The realm of science spans *between* (Plato would say μεταξύ) us, not *above* us, as Avicenna believed, and Scotus encapsulated in the idea of *general enlightenment*.<sup>1</sup> It might be true that mathematics gives us insight into the nature (Schlick),<sup>2</sup> but, unless we knew *why*, we could not be precise about *what* we meant by the nature. The accordance of the physical and mathematical might seem miraculous (Husserl),<sup>3</sup> but science cannot put up with the mere admiration. The experiments have been proving the truth of the statement, but they are constricted to the boundaries of space (the planets closest to us, perhaps), and of time obviously, too.

The idea of mathematical physics was known to Aristotle,<sup>4</sup> and it was precisely him who gave the reason *why* mathematics can apply to physics. The reason is the *abstraction*, whence the mathematical objects stem. The abstraction

---

<sup>1</sup> John Duns Scotus, *Ordinatio*, I ds. 3, p. 1, q. 4, [22-23] 388-389.

<sup>2</sup> M. Schlick, *General Theory of Knowledge*, trans. from Germ. by A. E. Blumberg, New York 1974, 70. cf. 104, n. 282.

<sup>3</sup> E. Husserl, *Ideen zur reinen Phänomenologie und phänomenologischen Philosophie*, § 58.

<sup>4</sup> Aristotle, *Physica*, I c. 4, 187b 11-12; II c. 7, 198a 26-31.

in question is called by Thomas *abstractio formalis* – one, but not unique kind of perception. We can ask *why* we can put together certain objects so as to obtain certain outcome of the experiment, and the answer sounds that we know the *outlines (formae)* of the objects beforehand.

Analogically, we can ask how to *order* (put together) the object of our common day life that the order be good, and, consequently our life have the moral value. The genetics, e.g. envisages the same objects as ethics, but, nevertheless, in one dimension only (*in abstract*), which is by no means peremptory. In fact, it might seem even superficial, as far as another kind of abstraction, the more fundamental one, is possible. The human nature is not the same as the nature of *quantum*, neither is it the same as the nature, as commonly understood; although it is perceived in the dimensions of space and time. The problem remains how to deepen that *perception* so as to obtain an adequate, not one-dimensional object. In fact, we *separate* rather than *perceive*. The problem of *separation* (χωρισμός) arose when Plato discovered the ultimate destiny of man – the ideal; and has been, since then, strictly connected with the notion of the first philosophy. This, however, underpins the notion of the human freedom. It is metaphysics that makes us free<sup>5</sup> because it gives the deepest cognition. The cause of the freedom is the intellect.<sup>6</sup> The proper notion of ethics, thus, implies the notion of metaphysics, at least dimly perceived, and not, as might falsely appear, to the contrary.<sup>7</sup>

What that ultimate kind of *abstraction* consist in, so that we might call it the *separation*? What abstraction as such consists in? We may call it *liberation* (σωτηρία)<sup>8</sup> (*salus et perfectio*) as far as the actuality is concerned. The actuality in question is a spiritual perfection.<sup>9</sup> The object in question is common. The particular is only relevant for ethics as far as *my* particular is concerned; i.e., in case I apply ethics in *my* life. The taste for particulars as such marks rather the vice of curiosity, whereas the proper cognitive attitude to the world is instilled with *studiosity*.<sup>10</sup> The particular as such is only an object of *my* activity, and it is preposterous to seek to improve the world with the hands of the others. We can, to be sure, give the orders, but they are understood only as far as perceivable order of the objects is included. *To order* is proper to the wisdom.<sup>11</sup>

The distinction between *theory* and *praxis* must not be blurred. The latter, however, can be considered as preparatory for the former. Paradoxically, we understand the common, but we understand it *here and now*. The opposition seemed to Hegel insurmountable and marks all his Odyssey of Spirit. In fact,

<sup>5</sup> Aristotle, *Metaphysica*, I c. 2, 982b 24-32.

<sup>6</sup> S. Thomas, *Summa theologiae*, I-IIae, q. 17, a. 1 ad 2.

<sup>7</sup> S. Thomas, *In Ethicam*, I lect. 2, nr 9.

<sup>8</sup> Aristotle, *De Anima*, II c.5, 417b 3-5.

<sup>9</sup> S. Thomas, *In De An.*, II lect. 11, nr 9; III lect.9, nr 3.

<sup>10</sup> S. Thomas, *Summa theologiae*, II-IIae, q. 160, a. 2, c.

<sup>11</sup> Aristotle, *Metaphysica*, I c. 2, 982a 17-19.

each of us has to get to the homeland himself. The theory seems to be the goal, the praxis, the way. The preparatory gains the moral value analogous to the binary value of arithmetic (0-1) (and, generally, of the common object of science which considers immediately *two* opposites<sup>12</sup>), when we take into consideration the ultimate *aut-aut* of the human existence. The decimal system seems to be rather awkward (we could as well have, say, eight fingers), whereas *left* and *right* seem to be fundamentally opposed. Ethics considers precisely the *right* way of behavior. The opposite *naught* has nothing positive in it: it is a nonbeing, which stamps all the being perceived. That is why we have to search the *goal beyond*, by the proxy of what we perceive *between us*. The scholastics expressed this in the words: *prius vita quam doctrina*. We cannot achieve the wisdom save we abnegate all the particular. Otherwise: the project of the wisdom attracts our spiritual activity. *To abnegate* and *to sacrifice* is here the same. *My good* is mine as far as private; it can, nevertheless, become *good as such*, as far as I sacrifice it for the others. The *reason* for the sacrifice must be plain. We tend to the good in general (*universalis ratio boni*). If our *intentions* are pure, we seek after Being that fulfills the ultimate destination of the human nature. The human nature, if understood thoroughly, appears to be inwardly not self-sufficient. The perfection, the happiness is to be sought in the Source of its existence.

The way to the theory is stamped with moral quality. We could, e.g., put up with one's being affected by leprosy so as if it had been necessary for his Karma. But we can as well reject the allegedly necessary for the sake of the true good. *You need not be miserable; it is not necessary to suffer; however, if you exist, you must appreciate the fullness of existence – the happiness*. We separate all the unnecessary from the concept of human nature. For many this seems to be extremely “inhuman.” The wealth, pleasure, etc., seem to support our existence. What if we take it away? They are, in the mouth of Mozart's Don Giovanni, “sostegno e gloria d'umanità.” For Kierkegaard, *Don Giovanni* was both the most excellent and most alluring masterpiece. Stripped of all the unnecessary a man feels his weakness. But, in fact, the real Buttress of our existence appears then. We need not assume, as Aristotle did, that the species are perpetual. The necessity in question is rather conditional one. It is not necessary for the human kind to exist for ever, but it is necessary for a man's real existence to turn back to the Source of his existence.

Human existence was, according to ancient Greeks, doomed to the inevitable – εἰμαρμῆνη. The necessary was not to be found in the core of it, but rather “in the stars.” Aristotle discovered another kind of necessity – the necessity of goal. *For there to be life, there must be water. For the human existence not being absurd, there must be a Source of it, because the absurd is unintelligible*. All but

---

<sup>12</sup> Aristotle, *Physica*, I c. 6, 189b 25-26.

his nature and his destiny are contingent to man. *You need not be-such-and-such, but you must be, i.e., exist in the way proper to you, i.e., as free and intelligent.*

Modern predestinationism dooms the man to the destiny instilled in his genes (which sounds more sophisticated than “in the stars;” still, New Age, nowadays, abides by “the stars”). There is no responsibility, because the genes are “responsible.” The psychoanalysts, before, thought that a man cannot change his personality. Nowadays, it appears that we cannot change but the notions of those who believe in the absolute truth and good. Were it the case, what would come after the destruction? The destruction lives on the existence of a victim. The absolute *naught* of our existence is not possible; it is not possible to live in the world of the total relativity (the lack of order); but it can happen that, when totally bereft of his truth, man will cease to exist.

Aristotle’s *soteria* may be called “a way out.” We can be liberated from, say, being addict; and there is but one boundary of the human freedom – we can obtain it solely from the Source of our existence, which means that this boundary stretches out into Infinite. That was, probably, what Scotus meant when speaking about the freedom. We can change *everything*, but we cannot change the very fact that we can do it. We cannot change the fact that our nature is rational and free; we can, true, try to destruct it, but is merely a sign of the freedom; the proof of the freedom is to hinder the destruction, which means *to build*.

The simplest way to see the problem is to imagine how we put together some objects. Children play this way, but their object are not “real.” The adults, to the contrary, understand the nature of the real objects, because they can abstract the common nature from the particular. This *putting together* is a primitive feature of our activity. The affect that underlies this was called by Thomas the love. The love is the first of our emotions, or, more precisely, affections. The latter term includes volition, which makes it possible to be stirred by the intellect indirectly. According to Augustine, the love as such is neither good nor bad. In other words, it can be both of them, or we could speak about true love, and the apparent one if we take into account the fullness of human existence. We, at least, try to order objects; if I take a draught of water that is because I deem *it* good for *me*. The definition of love makes it clear. According to Aristotle “We may describe friendly feeling towards any one as wishing for him what you believe to be good things, not for your own sake but for his, and being inclined, so far as you can, to bring these things about.”<sup>13</sup> The definition seems to be prolix. Thomas expresses this briefly: *amare est bonum velle alicui. To love is to will a good for someone.*<sup>14</sup>

“Every art and every inquiry, and similarly every action and pursuit, is thought to aim at some good; and for this reason the good has rightly been declared to be that at which all things aim.”<sup>15</sup> However, not everybody knows what the real

<sup>13</sup> Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, II c. 4 (in princ.); trans. by W. Rhys Roberts.

<sup>14</sup> S. Thomas, *Summa theologiae*, I-IIae q. 26, a. 4, c; trans. by A. J. Freddoso.

<sup>15</sup> Aristotle, *Ethica nicomachea*, I c. 1 (in princ.); trans. by W. D. Ross.

good consists in. A toxic mother might deem it good for her child to be not self-reliant. The real love, to the contrary gives the strength to the person loved. To give it, we have to, first of all, *know and want to know* what the real good is. We have to understand the nature of the real good. Similarly, we have to understand the nature of a person to be given. It might be good for the animals to crave after sheer sensual pleasure, whereas, e.g., listening to the good music seems to be befitting to man. “Now the mass of mankind are evidently quite slavish in their tastes, preferring a life suitable to beasts, but they get some ground for their view from the fact that many of those in high places share the tastes of Sardanapallus.”<sup>16</sup> The reason is, as pointed out, the lack of reasoning. For to understand, in turn, we have to *separate* all that aggravates the purity of human existence. Consequently, the real love requires proper cognition. To order, we must separate; to build, we must prepare the bricks. Those primitive *elements* of our deeds are precisely the notions of human nature, and of what is befitting to it.

The question whether our deeds enrich the person supposed to be loved is of a pivotal importance. We can *liberate* a man from a disease, poverty, ignorance; but can we presume our being necessary for them? We can easily make them feel their dependence, which amounts, thus, to feel them deprived of the liberty. Is love contrary to freedom? It is a paradox that the truer our love is, the more we have to put ourselves into the shade. What, however, is then to be enhanced? The good that is neither mine or yours, the good that operates in all my deeds, as long as they are upright; it is rather Good itself that dignifies me with the honour of being a mere instrument of His; that Good that permeates into your heart by dint of my hands. It is neither my good nor my truth; it is acceptable to anybody. *Perhaps you will even accept it and understand it better than I do. I wish you did.*

The genuinely moral characteristics of the actions depends on to which extent the objects concerned are genuine. A clear idea of which is to be done must precede. Not sufficient as it is, the moral idea is indispensable. To be genuine means, first of all, to be serious; *σπουδαῖος* in Plotinus means “Sage.” (*Enneads*. I, 1, c. 4, 24). According to Plotinus, the real happiness consists in being wise, serious. The terminus harks back to Plato. In *Ps.-Platonic Definitions* (415 D): to be serious is to be *perfectly good*. The vice opposed is maliciousness (*De legibus*., VII, 814 E). First of all, however, etymologically, it is opposed to being *childish* (*Cratylus*., 406 C). The choice seems to be clear: either the actions are good, or ludicrous only, and, possibly, wicked.

Many pursue, according to Aristotle, the way of life proposed already in ancient times by Sardanapallus in the inscription on his tomb: “stranger, eat, drink and make love, as other human things are not worth this” (signifying the clap of the hands). “To *make* love” – means generally to *play* with it (*παιδίζεῖν*); to *live* would be to *play*. A game has its own rules, and does not have to take

<sup>16</sup> Aristotle, *Ethica Nicomachea*, I c. 5; trans. by W.D. Ross.

into account the “outsiders.” That is why the persons unable to speak out their rights are not regarded. The battle is to the strong. Some are not strong enough to “participate” in the game. Our social activity was described already by Cicero as *ducere partes*. In modern times, however, contrary to Greek notion of the tragedy of human existence, an optimistic eschatology predominates. Thus, the problem arises how to understand the *humanity*; how to be really human.

The formula of the humanity seems to be articulated by Kant. *The ‘Humanity’ in human beings requires that we must treat as an end in itself.* The rule of the game too, in a notorious formula “as though.” Kantianism is, precisely, the philosophy of “as though” (Hans von Waihinger) (Similarly in Camus). Contemporarily, the idea of the *language-game* emerged (Wittgenstein).

It can be, to be sure, asked whether game is not totally inoffensive. It seems to be incredible that sheer jest become a crime. People, usually, fear natural disasters; and, indeed, the only possible disaster, seems to be expected from the not dominated nature. As far as an egoism of the natural beings is done away with, no evil seems to be possible.

Generally speaking, the very idea of nature has had no more such an importance and meaning as in Greeks. Contrary to Aristotle, it is commonly accepted that the physical objects do not impose the necessity of their own on our understanding. They procure merely an occasion for the intellection.<sup>17</sup> The so-called “ancient necessitarianism” has been strongly opposed since Scotus.<sup>18</sup> Two poles of our existence are deemed the *material* and the *intentional* being. For not to succumb the rude determinism of the “nature,” the philosophy of the subject ascends to the *intentional*. The latter, however, is of no importance, as long as it remains undiscovered. The *essences* and the *implicit definitions* do not, to be sure, depend on any particular person; they are, however, as it were, “coextensive” to the human imagination. The boundaries of the game are, thus, marked by the so-called *collective consciousness* (Durkheim). Since Kant it has been only too notorious that the human will is lawmaking. We *can* create a *better* world for ourselves, provided we respect the rules of the game which set down the meaning of “us-subject.”

*There are not the wicked save those who believe that the wickedness exists in the genuinely human. There is no hell except for those who want the crime to be punished according to justice. The belief in the immanent rules of the game must not be staggered. The belief in the transcendent must be banned.*

There is, however, another side of the problem yet. The material for the game is to be provided. As humans “transcend” the natural, the question whence it stems is easy to answer: the very nature is that material. Something must be

<sup>17</sup> John Duns Scotus, *Ordinatio*, I ds 3, p. 1, q. 4 [12] 341.

<sup>18</sup> P. Scapin, *Contingenza e libertà Divina in Giovanni Duns Scoto*, O. Min., Roma 1964, pp. 6-7; *Ordinatio*, I ds. 8, p. 1, q. unica, 251.

sacrificed. The game is on, it unfolds because the voice of the victims is not heard. As they do not participate in the game, they are simply naught. The unborn, the terminally ill have no “right” to exist.

Contrary to Greek naturalism, it is believed that the reality can be “enchanted;” we can create a more human world. The natural is to be despised; whereas a proper realm of the human existence is the *intentional*.

Contemporarily, no one assumes as naively, as Scotus did, that the intentional being is the secondary object of Divine intellect.<sup>19</sup> It is rather the divine that is purely thought of; “close to us” than the transcendent ideal to be conformed to by man.

The “participation” and exclusion are inevitably opposed. Nowadays, to demand self-abnegation (*contempus sui*) seems to be quite odd. Do we all not experience the love and freedom in ourselves? What a reason to search the “real” freedom, as man is free absolutely speaking (Sartre). Shall we expect to be given a “real” freedom? Somebody who craves after the “real” freedom and “real” love seems to be desperately mistaken, because we have them at hand. To demand from the humans the effort of self-dependent understanding and strong willing seems to be “inhuman;” the burden of the game seems to be incomparably lighter than the burden of the responsibility.

The game requires not to violate the rules, not to search “the other side” of the *given*. It is, precisely, the rules that are *given*. The nature would spring the frames of the given, of the thought of, so the nature must be banned from the society. Especially, the intellectual nature. There must not be anything unpredictable; we cannot afford to listen to the least perceptible voice: the voice of the intellect. The intellect and its natural object is, since Luther and Rousseau, stamped with the mark of evil.

For the morals to be genuine and the love true, it is, still, not enough the objects of acting to be real. The core of the morals consists in the objects being ordered properly. We cannot “project” our existence (Heidegger). We can, however, realize the projects for the sake of the others. It is not up to us to choose the point of the departure. It is, in a sense, of no importance for the deeds to be good. The only important thing is the genuine desire for the utmost good. No matter how deep is a decay; the depth of the desire for the beatitude appears even more salient when fostered *de profundis*.

The problem of the authenticity of our existence, fiercely enhanced by Existentialism, seems thus to be solved. True, the objective norms seem to set down each person.<sup>20</sup> It may seem, consequently, that for not to be “replaceable” we have to choose our “own” “set of values.” But, in fact, we have only to find

<sup>19</sup> John Duns Scotus, *Ordinatio*, I ds. 3, p. 1, q. 4 [20] 375.

<sup>20</sup> J.-P. Sartre, *L'être et le néant. Essai d'ontologie phénoménologique*, Éditions Gallimard, Paris 1943, P. I Ch. 2-III.

ourselves the value of the present, facing the ultimate future. The value is the “right” of the binary system of axiology – the most natural one. The way to search the foundations of ethics in the set theory is mistaken. To act we have to form an *sylogismus operativus* by dint of the principle as simple as *aut-aut*. Otherwise, we have only the *σωρός* (a piling up of the terms).<sup>21</sup> The elements must be neatly distinguished, and we cannot be replaced while evaluating the authenticity of the good proposed to us. We have full right not to be satisfied with all the proposed provided we set it down after the full consideration. Consequently, the fullness of existence is neither “projected” nor merely thought of. It is more real than reality itself; we realize its authenticity.

What does it, then, mean “to be yourself”? Your real Self is to be found in the future as the outcome of the primitive tension towards the ultimate goal of the existence. We cannot experience it; we can, to be sure, find a repose in the foretaste of the ultimate. Contrary to the animals, however, we do not “feel” it; we, as Aristotle puts it, “contemplate” it. The rest in question is instilled with both the imprint of the cognition of the future existence, and the desire for the totality itself.

The gist of the problem consists in the true essence of humanity being abstracted from each individual, and not being simply multiplied in the individuals invited to participate in the ideal proposed to those who are supposed to be civilized enough. Accordingly, the authenticity of the token called *humanity* can be understood in two ways. Firstly, it can be proved to be true if applicable to the individuals with the force proportionate to the purity of the abstraction. Thus, *abstrahere* and *operari* seem to be two kinds of “energy,” whose sum is constant. Secondly, however, the individuals might be pretended to be real by the ability to fit the pattern given *a priori*. Thus we remain in the enchanted circle of the signs. The token is not the proof. We have not proved the existence of freedom.

One act of the perfectly accomplished abstraction opens us the gates to understand all the others specimens of the species in question. If we *liberate* but one person (we show him or her the way to not being tethered to the earth whatsoever), the way to understand the others is paved.

A special realm of the constructive attitude towards the others, which has been called love, is the love of wisdom. Not just one’s wisdom, but the wisdom stamped with the imprint of community; the wisdom accessible to anybody.

Obviously, we communicate with each other by dint of the signs. Now, a sign ought to be as perspicuous as to make appear impartially the universal truth behind it. There is not so much *my* truth that is meant to have preponderance; it is rather *your* truth that I try to find with my own words. In a way, *your* truth is preeminent there: it is a real challenge to abnegate the *mine* for the sake of the *common*. Otherwise, what is presumed to be new might be envisaged as a threat against one’s own ideas. Truth imposes itself on the minds by its own force; it must not be connected with *my* way

---

<sup>21</sup> Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, VII, ch. 17.



of thinking, *my* own expressions unless they just give a broader foundation to express them in the way accessible to anybody. Vital ideas have it that fiercely espoused cease to be private ideas, and, as it were, conquest the minds by their own transparency. They do this, however, only to the extent they are precisely the common good, not exclusively connected with anybody. Now it seems to be of pivotal importance to trace down in the history the ideas what fits best the vocation of human mind.

The love of truth is love *par excellence*; we can only be loved when seen in the whole truth of our existence. True, our own identity is concerned there; but, on the other side, we have become what we are when only rooted in the past, as we are not spirits, and the spatio-temporal connected with the body is a part of our existence. It has, therefore to be diligently checked whose bequest is to be accepted as to find ourselves to be enriched with the wealth of the history (Cicero). Consequently, we have to rethink the sense of the historicity in the light of the authenticity of our existence. Two requirements are to be matched: the absolute liberty of man, and his being connected with time and space.

To put it in the other way: what is necessary for man to be as free as possible? A special kind of necessity underlies our freedom – the conditional necessity discovered by Aristotle: for there to live the source of the life is indispensable.<sup>22</sup> For the freedom seems to be nothing else than a totality of existence. Man has it, as a social being, that the source in question is by no means connected with one's own existence only. We are free to the extent we are wise, and the wisdom is born in the community. The truth is borne in upon the mind, because of its bearing on the mind in general.

Some claimed that it is beauty that is loved by everybody. Given that Hegel was right in maintaining that beauty is to be found but in art, we can ask, however, what makes an art or more generally speaking, a craft, being attractive. According to Aristotle, two things are relevant for being beautiful. Obviously, a perfect proportion of, say, one's face makes it nice to look at. But a clarity of the elements must come first. Aristotle called that "the magnitude" (μέγεθος). The elements must be easily (due to their size) distinguishable.<sup>23</sup>

The border between art and kitsch is hard to be precisely set down. E.g., the brightness and vivacity of the musical structure of Poulenc stems, no doubt, from the simplicity of the elements being used. One step further, however, would render this oversimplified. We do not, usually, like to be guided, as it were, by hand, to the outcome. We would rather "compose" our vision of the final object ourselves. Some artists, to the contrary, pretend to be profound visionaries by making simply the outlines of elements blurred. It seems to be extremely difficult to match the simplicity with profoundness. Rembrandt's "Landscape with the

<sup>22</sup> Aristoteles, *De partibus animalium*, I c. 1, 639b 19-640a 8, 642a 1-13, *De generatione et corruptione*, II c. 11, Berolini 1931; *Physica* II c. 9, 199a 34-200b 8; O. Hamelin, *Le Système d'Aristote*, Paris: 1976, s. 275; D. Ross, *Aristotle*, Methuen – London: 1964 s. 79.

<sup>23</sup> Aristotle, *Poetica*, 1450b 38.

Good Samaritan” had been painted with, true, rough brush-strokes, but the clarity appears nevertheless.

Consequently, we must ask: What it is to be simple? Being simple is tantamount to being abstracted in the way perspicuous to anybody. Being integer, in turn, adds up to the elements being put up so as to edify the viewer. Thus, the moral aspect appears. It is not so much putting together the elements, as rather enriching others with the complex and sophisticated edifice of the artistic experience.

Obviously, it is not lascivious Don Giovanni that attracts our attention. There are, in the ordinary life, or in quite unordinary stories, some hardly visible elements that, if diligently seized and ordered, can become constituents of a masterpiece. Children can put up with cartoons; the emotionally ripe, however, require that the elements of the picture be both neat and refined. Thus, we become, as it were, composers ourselves when the totality imposes itself in the way invented by a “real” composer. The obviousness is deadly to art. Unless we find ourselves the double bottom, we could not enjoy being wise enough to find the emotional fulfillment. Our emotions become free as soon as our Self makes us true participants in the art’s being performed. The way we do this is, no doubt, foreseen by an artist, and that is why we can call him a genius. The power of his art stretches out into future so as to conquer the hearts by giving them freedom. The conquest, however, is rather a gift.

But let us go a step further. Poetry seems to be similar to painting, as Horace put it. Is, however, philosophy, in turn, similar to poetry? Many maintained so. However, the esthetical in philosophy, present as it may, has a specific character. It is rather the intellectually apprehended in it that makes a theory splendid, whereas beauty as such appears in apprehension whatsoever. The intellectual outlines in question are far more strict than the artistic ones, which adds up to that we take the esthetical in a broader sense. The experience in question is, thus, rather existential than merely sensual. That existential dimension is precisely the freedom. It is a paradox that freedom accrues to the nature to the extent that intellect dominates over the sensual. Intellectual rules unfold in a necessary manner from the given aspect of the apprehended world. It is the *necessitas conditionata* – the being apprehended on the condition of the object’s existing. That is why, for Aristotle, material logic is more important than formal one. True, the subject-matter, whatever it be, must be considered according to the strict rules. Still, without the subject logic is blind. We have to, as it were, “overpower” the obvious in search for the necessary that underlies it. It is not, however, as Hegel assumed, an obstacle; it is rather a “thread” which guides us upwards. We subjugate but our own lust, and this is which the freedom consists in. The quest for understanding is stamped with the mark of freedom; it is, though, only my reason that makes my Self ordered, the reason whose dictates are strong and alluring all the same. The verity itself has an overwhelming power of enticing, as far as understood as mine. It is my reason that makes me free, or makes me susceptible to freedom whatsoever. But the act

of ordering, of obedience is rational too, which, apparently, was overlooked by Kant. For “to obey” is the same as “to accept the order” appropriate to anybody living in the factual world. That is why for the reason it is natural to conform to the transcendent;<sup>24</sup> to find the principle of order behind itself.

The elements of our intellectual creativity are stamped with the imprint of perspicuity that makes them acceptable to anybody absolutely speaking. The novelty consists in putting up the intellectual edifice according to strict rules given by reason. Those elements are abstracted from the sensual, and this is why Aristotelian logic is so akin to metaphysics.<sup>25</sup> The rules are necessary according to their community – without being participated and acceptable to everybody they are nothing. Thus, the very natural tendency of humans towards the ultimate is “inclusive.” As far as the common good is concerned, the creativity in question has a moral character. This is connected with Aristotelian notion of *soteria*, mentioned above. There are no borders to human freedom, as long as its intellectual source is concerned. The reason edifies and liberates. The outlooks proposed, or merely faced, are dazzling. No wonder, the intellectual principle of man it often looked at with envy. *You are allowed everything provided you become a mediocrity.* We face an enslavement and disfranchisement every time we admit the so-called *misologia*.<sup>26</sup> The modern kinds of enslavement are closely connected with the contempt of reason – the intellectual principle of our nature.

By following our natural inclination towards the spiritual plenitude, we, nonetheless, remain in the boundaries of science. For the very natural is the very rational at the same time. Otherwise our freedom would be bereft of the foundation, and become a sheer postulate, as in Kant. Living according to nature, or, more precisely: to the intellectual nature, is but following the general principle of nature – the tendency towards the good.

The rhythm of our intellectual life is, as it were, an inclination and sublimation, of the natural desire towards the perfect. It is natural, because those two elements: the analysis and synthesis, are to be found in every living thing, and, more generally, in every substance probably, too. It was Heraclitus who noticed first that binary rhythm of nature. It was, however, not until Aristotle that a self-consistent theory of substance and accident had been given. The love that “moves the heavens” is the general tendency of nature,<sup>27</sup> intellectually seized by the principle which is most perfect in the nature – human intellect.<sup>28</sup> The work to be done is, though, of purely active and ethical character. The perfection to be achieved is, paradoxically, our own, and common, too. It accrues to human

---

<sup>24</sup> S. Thomas, *De Veritate*, q. 1, a. 9, c.

<sup>25</sup> S. Thomas, *In Boethium de Trinitate*, q. 6, a. 1. 1, c.

<sup>26</sup> Plato, *Phedo*, 89D 1.

<sup>27</sup> Aristoteles, *De Anima*, II c. 4, 415a 29-415b 21.

<sup>28</sup> Aristoteles, *Protrepticus*, frg. 10, 23.

nature as such. The fact that we meet this or that individual first, or even that we tend towards our own beatitude, is set in the frames of nature, knowable potentially. Were a person not “intellectually” met, we would see their features but not themselves. Without our being endowed with the intellectual susceptibility we remain blind in the face of persons we meet. Many put up with sheer seeing the surface, and dispense themselves of seeing the gist. Some philosophers have been giving the hand there.

The tragedy of human existence is serious enough to be described honestly. Otherwise, we would only see it superficially. Some writers pretended to understand the problem. The ultimate occurrence in the life seems to explain all that precedes. Von Heist in Conrad’s *Victory* understood the sense of love when it had been already too late to love. Almayer’s suicide crowns the bitterness of his disappointment. Lord Jim’s tragic death sheds light on his life.

Heidegger was probably right, assuming that our attitude towards death makes for the authenticity of our existence. But Wittgenstein was perhaps right too, pretending that death is not a fact.<sup>29</sup> The problem is that the facts of our life do not simply rhyme so as to make a poetry of the life. Providence (even the human one) is not an artist in the usual sense.

“To build” seems to seek for integrity (mentioned above). Now, the integrity of our existential project consists in the outlying of the border between life and death by proxy of Aristotelian *soteria*. The artistic tragedy can be touching, but seldom is building. To build the others, i.e., to love them is to propose the light of the *soteria* behind the brink of despair. Strange and new as it is it springs the borders of the given life. It is *beside*, and thus *a life* is to be abandoned for the sake of *life itself*.

Plato considered the philosophizing as dying, but saw the plenitude beyond.<sup>30</sup> The enslavement stems from what was prematurely accepted as human nature, whereas being the animal nature only. Unordered desires tether us to the earth.<sup>31</sup> The intellect liberates.

Accordingly, we must, while speaking about the nature, avoid some vulgar naturalism. The nature ought to be understood as a close system of energy circuiting the borders of a thing.<sup>32</sup> The latter seems to be the same as Aristotelian substance. Confined, however, to the spatio-temporal, the notion in question seems to nip in bud the very hope for the Transcendent when conceived. There is but one means to transcend the narrow boundaries of our existence: the natural shared with another. Had it been possible that a beam of light be reflected between parallel mirrors, it would have multiplied itself into infinity. Impossible in the material

<sup>29</sup> L. Wittgenstein, *Tractatus logico-philosophicus*, 6.4311.

<sup>30</sup> Plato, *Phaedo*, Ch. 29, 80D-81A.

<sup>31</sup> Plato, *Phaedo*, Ch. 33, 82D-83D.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. R. P. Feynman, R. B. Leighton, M. L. Sands, *The Feynman Lectures on Physics*, vol. 1, Massachusetts 1963, Ch. 12-1.

is the case in the spiritual. The truer our desire, i.e., hope is the more it reflects the desire of another person. The problem was, probably, better seen by classical Neoplatonics than by Hegel. The very animal in man follows the principle. The human parenthood, if genuine, follows the personal relation of two persons able to enforce each other in their natural power. A new life comes in the realm of the light shed by the common desire. Not creative as it is, the human love makes all the potentialities of a person appear. E.g., a woman who falls in love with the “rogue” is not thereby “infatuated,” but, to the contrary, due to her feminine genius, peers as the mythical Lynkeus through the veil of the vices to the hidden core of the personality.

The human love discovers the least visible, the Loves itself creates the invisible so that we might be attracted and led towards the Fullness of being.

*Piotr Cyciura*

***Amare est bonum velle alicui***

*Abstract*

To love is to will a good for someone. Yet nobody can be chosen; persons are simply met. It is the good that we give to and choose for the persons we meet. Still, the more genuine our wish is, the more universal the good in question. The will aims at the universal: we desire the good without any restrictions for those we love. Being an intellectual desire, the will must be informed by the intellect. In the maze of life, the intellect distinguishes the outlines of the real good to be given; it liberates. Without it man is abandoned. The true rhythm of our life consists in distinguishing by means of the intellect and putting up by means of the will. The strong and pure will edifies. For the sake of the really human in us, the intellect and will must dominate over the imagination and emotions.

*Keywords:* love, liberty, abstraction, nature, ethics.