



ISSN: 0976-3031

Available Online at <http://www.recentscientific.com>

CODEN: IJRSFP (USA)

International Journal of Recent Scientific Research
Vol. 8, Issue, 11, pp. 21824-21831, November, 2017

**International Journal of
Recent Scientific
Research**

DOI: 10.24327/IJRSR

Research Article

THE ONTOLOGY OF THE FLOW

Augustinas Dainys*

Department of Education and Philosophy in Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.24327/ijrsr.2017.0811.1149>

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received 05th August, 2017
Received in revised form 21st
September, 2017
Accepted 06th October, 2017
Published online 28th November, 2017

Key Words:

Tyrannical and democratic sights, world
without a stable ground, causaless universe,
play of accidents without substance.

ABSTRACT

The article develops the ontology of the flow, which is contrasted to the substance ontology. Ontology of substance is deconstructed, leaving the playfulness of accidents, unsubordinated to the substance centre. The tyrannical and democratic sights to the world are compared. The first is associated with the Western metaphysical tradition, which imposed its concepts to reality, the second imposes nothing to reality and recognizes the democracy of things. The ontology of the flow sees the world without the stable ground, and claims causaless universe which thinking model is rooted in the playfulness of the D. Hume's billiard balls. The Great flow as the origin of the universe is revealed. It is recognised that after deconstruction of substance is revealed free playfulness of accidents, this brings you closer to the love as the nerve of God, which gives and loves, without anything retaining or holding back. In this respect, the non-substantial and non-traditional concept of God is stated.

Copyright © Augustinas Dainys, 2017, this is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this article is to present ontology of the flow, by opposing it to the stability ontology based on the substance as its main construct. Substance is the stable ground of the world, which was claimed by the traditional Western metaphysics. The world without substance is a world without a stable ground. The substance seeks to expropriate and retain the world, meanwhile, flow is unexpropriated and unretained way of being in the world, which creates wonder of the human being participating in it with unpredictable events and perspectives of seeing the things of the world. It is argued that ontology of the flow better reveals the peculiarity of the being of a human in the world than the ontology of the stability of the substance, which seeks to retain and expropriate the flow. But such a strategy of brings fear into human life, when the expropriated and retained world slips out from human hands, and the initiator of total control faces an uncontrollable flow. Therefore, rather than expropriating and retaining flow, it must to be recognized that an inevitably control of the world for human being creates fear when human being discovers and feels that the world is out of control. In this case, a human is required to trust life and go on with the flow which is a condition of freedom of the will, and allows a human to play the game of his life different from life other human beings. The argument of the article can be divided into the following theses:

1. Ontology of the flow means an ontology that does not seek to retain and expropriate the flow of becoming, but frees the flow from a tyrannical sight that imposes its images on the world, thus retaining and expropriating this flow.
2. Ontology of the flow is not a substance ontology. Where the substance ends, there the flow begins.
3. A human can participate in the flow when he does not seek to expropriate, to retain it and to subjugate the world to himself. Stepping into the flow takes place when the confidence of life is acknowledged, giving everyone self to the flow and being carried on a ridge of its wave of the flow.
4. By refuting the thinking of substance, we uncover world and reach spontaneous reality, which is the Great flow, the source of each local flow.
5. Ontology of the flow abandon the idea of traditional God which is the substance, and its attributes are the singularities of the world.
6. Ontology of the flow as the plays of accidents without substance allow to approach God as a self-sacrificing love, who gives oneself away and does not retain or expropriate anything.

Three seeing modes

The human way of seeing the world is not unified, because it constantly shifts to different seeing regimes. From concrete

*Corresponding author: **Augustinas Dainys**

Department of Education and Philosophy in Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences

regime of seeing depends way how we discover the world and see it. We refer to one mode of seeing as tyrannical seeing, the other as boring seeing, and the third one as democratic seeing. The tyrannical mode imposes its schemes of reason on things and forces the world to obey them. Meanwhile, the democratic mode of seeing allows things to be themselves, and does not impose anything. One could say, the tyrannical mode is a traditional metaphysical mode, which projects its own concepts onto reality. In our times, metaphysics has turned into technological domination of the world. The tyrannical seeing mode is the causal mode when the schemes of the subject's reason is transformed into the changed state of things in the world. The subject of tyrannical seeing, when asked why the state of world things has changed, replies that this as happened because I figured out such a scheme of reason and voluntarily imposed it on the world. Meanwhile, a democratic seer of things does not project its schemes and logical shapes to the world. For the democratic viewing, the world is a universe of flows and plays. Human being with this way of seeing participate in these plays of the flow of the universe.

The tyrannical seeing is the defensive position of the subject. Usually, people are afraid of a flowing and playing world. They want to retain it, to make the world stable. And this creation of stability is an attempt to retain the world. But, as practice shows, those attempts to retain the world are ineffective and not lasting. Because, the world slips from the schemes of reason, which tyrannical viewing imposes on the world. And this tyrannical subject, who dreamed of being safe, having secured with the stability of the world, again becomes a subject of becoming and this is a source of fear for him. He is afraid to be. But he wants to retain the world, impose on it his mental schemes and remake a world according to them. The subject has three strategies of creating the world of stability: 1) creating schemes of reason about the world; 2) turning these schemes into reality; 3) retaining the realization of these mental schemes in time. The tyrannical seeing is like a tyrant, who walks in his own palace in his own country, and wants to see a conspiracy against him everywhere. When he sees any danger that a conspiracy may arise, he will destroy the source of conspiracy. The mental instrument that allows the expropriation, stabilization and retention of the world, are logical constructions. The mind imposes a logical form on the world and forces the world's singularities to obey it. We do not discover the logical form of the world. The world in itself does not have a logical form, it is a place of plays and contingencies. Meanwhile, the mind imposes a logical form and then forces the world to obey it, and the world develops under it.

Boredom comes from the very structure of the temporality, which takes away the subject's attention to the past or to the future, and prevents the subject from participating in here and now. This situation creates indifference to the world. The description of our boring sight is related to Jean-Luca Marion's idea of boredom, expressed in his work *Dieu sans être* (Marion, 1982), but by describing the tyrannical and democratic seeing of the world we are moving away from Marion. His scheme seeing is such: idol-boredom-icon. (Our scheme: tyrannical look-boring look-democratic look.) The idol directs the human gazing in immanence, returns to what the gazing has put in it. Boredom expresses a certain "sunset of idols" when nothing higher opens up for the glance. It is important that idols fail to a

enchanted glance. The icon embodies the transcendental divine glance, when, praying behind the icon, one can experience a divine look toward the praying one.

The boring sight is indifferent to everything, not finding anything worthwhile and seducing in the field of its seeing; therefore, it wanders around the world without stopping, nobody fascinates it and it does not want to direct a sight to the thing of the world and stop at it. It does not impose its order on anyone, but does not engage in the world order either. Therefore, it's attitude is between the tyrannical and democratic sights. This seeing is not superstitious in order to indulge to any kind of worldly given, but it is also not cheerful to enthusiastically devote to the world and be carried by its flow. For this sight, all the idols of the world are dead, therefore it does not project its order to the world, but at the same time does not notice the beauty of the world, which would force it to get involved in the world and enthusiastically engage in it. For the boring sight, the world causes nausea, its objects are annoying and tiresome, therefore, the main pole of this sight is the inwardness to which it returns after the empty voyage from an unloved world. The subject of a boring sight is ironic, rejecting the world, because it does not have any value to it. Therefore, the subject of boredom is forced to kill the time, because the flow of time is too hard and tiring.

Moving to a democratic seeing of the world, one can say that a democratic sight does not impose the logical forms on the world, but looks at the world as openly as possible. This openness to the things of the world can be called the democracy of the worldly things. It does not impose any logical form on the world, but opens up and participates in the plays of the world. As it concerns a tyrannical sight, it has been said that this strategy of seeing helps to retain the world. And when the subject of democratic sight participates in the world without retaining it, is it not this attitude a suicide of a subject? Democratic subject needs the courage to be and to give itself in to the flows and plays of the world. Then the world carries a human and gives the possibility of freedom of the will-a human can play his own game of life by participating in these plays. If the human trusts the life, this commitment to the plays of the world can be as an interesting adventure. The task of the democratic seeing subject is not to stop these plays, not to retain and repress them, but, on the contrary, release them and give up itself to them. A human trusting his life in this case is bravely involved in plays of the world, and this is a much better strategy than retaining and expropriating of the world, which is typical of a tyrannical sight. When a human retains the world, he is not free from what he projected out to the world by retaining it. Such a retaining tyrannical subject is continually threatened by dangers and fears that the flows of the world plays will slip from his hands and cause chaos in life, and therefore he is haunted by the shadows of neglected things. Tyrannical subject cannot escape from this shadow, because he constantly suspects that perhaps the world will again escape from his schemes projected to the world, and he will again be the person who is afraid of the world and for whom the changes and flows of the world are a source of fear.

The advantage of a democratic sight is that in this case there are no fears in relation to the world, instead there are more joyous attitudes. The tyrannical seer always has to check whether his scheme of reason will agree with or not agree with

the world. In the case of a democratic sight, you just dive the river of plays and flows, and the current carries you.

The main instrument of the expropriating subject is the concept of oneness. In fact, oneness is only a projection of reason of tyrannical subject to the multiple of the world, when, in fact, there is no oneness in the world. Oneness is only a construct of language, which is imposed on the world and the world is unified. There are only multiple of singularities in the world. Those singularities related in play with each other. Neoplatonics imagined that the oneness is the highest structure in the world. They thought that the multiple of the world was evil and the oneness was good. Their goal was to link themselves with the oneness. But, wherever we look, there is no oneness, there is only the multiple of singularities. All singularities can be called atoms of the world. There are many atoms playing with each other. And there is no passive substrate, as Aristotle says, a matter that remains stationary while the world moves. The whole world is made up of divisions and there is no oneness. Oneness is just a figure of speech, which the tyrannical subject imposes on the world in order to subjugate it to himself. Thus, a democratic sight does not imply any single constructions to the world. Plays that open up to the mode of the democratic glance do not have a logical structure and are ruled by chance, and the world has no logical structure as well. The world is just there, and the human imposes on it a logical structure and thus expropriates it. Meanwhile, the world is a set of plays and flows.

There may be two strategies: either I form the ground of the world with my tyrannical sight and make world match this ground, or I participate in the plays of the world and I am carried by their flow of the world. It seems to me that all problems, both ecological and of national minorities, and conflicts of religions arise from the fact that there is a tyrannical sight. It wants to impose a universal logical structure on reality of the world, and then the tyrannical subject will feel safe, because in the world it will recognize the its imposed structure and will be able to move along its segments. However, this procedure is just a way of acquiring fear, because the fear comes from the fact that we in some way want to retain the world and fear that it will slip out from our hands. And when we do not attempt to stop the flow the world, then human is open to the flowing and he is involved in the flows of the world.

The world without a stable ground

As we have just said, the world opens up for the democratic sight as plays of the flow, because this sight does not retain or expropriate the world. Such a world can be called a world without a stable ground. Stable ground of the world is not discovered but created as the scheme of reason and imposed on the world. Human with its rational activity makes the world obey the laws of logic, causal relations, and thus makes the world rational and stable. Kant has pointed out that from the sense data material, by imposing the schemes of our reason, we make a logical world, which obeys to the principle of the cause and effect. The most important task of the human is to retain this world stable. It is only because of that the society continues to exist, trained by the education system simultaneously to impose mental schemes on the world, thus creating a stable intersubjective co-existence. Individuals of our society

collectively carry out certain logical operations simultaneously, impose logic and causality on the world and, therefore, the world become logical and transparent. It is easy for a human to orientate in such a logical and transparent world. If we go out into the street, we see a lot of signs indicating where to go, where it is possible, where it is not possible to stop, etc. The world is covered with certain logical threads. Of course, such world gives us a lot of advantages, first of all, certainty and security. But, on the other hand, we can feel that the real sense of life is slipping away from us, we sink in habits of the ordinary, in actions that are constantly repeated. It goes without saying that this retained, stable world is created by the reason and this world is reasonable.

But, this retained, stable world is disturbing us because of many things: we fear that the elevator may get stuck, that something can happen to the car during the journey, etc. We are afraid of many things living in a retained and expropriated world. Retaining things of the nature and the world is not unspotted, because nature and the world resist to projected to it schemes of reason and want to get out of them. It is a very uncomfortable situation for a human of everyday life. The more we control the world, the more the nature deceives us by slipping out of our hands. It slips from our tools that we impose on the world. A world without stable ground is the world as a constant flow. It unfolds like the flow when we reject the schemes of expropriation and retention of our reason and let the world happen by itself. When we do not interfere with the world and do not distort it, then we are involved in this flow of the world. We feel like a surfer, carried on a ridge of wave. It's a paradox: The more the world is controlled, expropriated and retained, the more insecure we feel, because the world wants to get away from our conceptual tools projected on the world. And when we allow the world to go on its own without interrupting, expropriating, or retaining it, this attitude seems dangerous at first glance, because we cannot control the world and we cannot say what is waiting for us tomorrow, but at the same time such an attitude requires courage to be, and because of that opens up the full being in the world.

With regard to the cases relevant to each human, two situations of love relations can be distinguished: first, the relationship of love when we expropriate another human being and, secondly, the relationship of love without expropriating another human being, therefore the latter is without defined, fixed guarantees. In the relationship of love, after the expropriation of another human being, this human being will want to break out from us like from a prison. And the relationship of love without guarantees, by giving oneself to a pure flow of love, this can become an authentic love experience. The happening world is not a threat, but a kind of way to live in it without usurping anything, conquering anything and subjugating nothing for oneself. Such a world does not turn into chaos, it is between stability and chaos. Therefore it is necessary to rely on and participate in the world and its flow. This will bring some risk to our lives, but it will be a more gratifying way of life than staying by retaining, by expropriating and subjugating the world. When a human does not retain the world, then he lives in harmony with it. And when he gives himself to the flow of the world, it does not mean that the world will become chaotic, but rather the opposite-it will unfold. Heidegger used the term "*Gelassenheit*", "the permission to be" when a human allows

the world to be, and the world allows a human to be. Then the human and the world are in a common flow.

The first philosopher of flow in the West was Heraclius, who proclaimed that there is only the becoming. World expropriation and stabilization became widely established in the new ages, although the first trends be found already in the thinking of Plato and Aristotle. Plato wanted to resist the Heraclitus's philosophy of becoming, recognizing the stable ideas over the curtain of the sky, which grounds the things of becoming. The basic concept of Aristotle's metaphysics *ousia*, or its Latin translation "*substantia*", points to a stable, non-flow-oriented nucleus of reality, and variable, flowing accidents. The philosophy of the new centuries turned to the subject and the subject became the expropriating, retaining instance of the world. The theory of the subject, set up by Descartes, was most developed by Kant who can be considered the founder of a retaining relationship with the world, since Kant speaks of the a priori forms of experience, incorporating all content of experience to them, thus creating the stable world. To Kant, the world is in the human reason and is construction of it.

The Lithuanian philosophers community has a joke about two Lithuanian philosophers who came to Rome: one stood in the row to get to the Sistine chapel, while the other said he will watch the same paintings and frescoes on the Vatican's television, because after Kant everything is just a movie and a play of our reason. After Kant, it seems, it does not matter if you really look at the frescoes of Sistine chapel, or see them on the TV. Kant's subject is making coherent films about reality in our heads. Then what is in the head is imposed on the world, and thus the Kant's subject feels safe, because the world is his creation, without unexpected events.

The flow model does not provide security at the beginning, because it requires trusting the world and its flow that carries the subject, and therefore, allows to be unfolded and disclosed the subject to the world. When the subject expropriates and retains the world, it does not allow the world and itself to unfold. Heraclitus was one of the first Western philosophers to state that the world is happening. According to him "*War is the father and king of all: some he shows as gods, others as men; some he makes slaves, others free*" (Kirk, Raven, 1957, 195). We would say in our terms that the Heraclitian war is a play, because the play is the mother or father of all things that are born. Play happens in the flow, and if a human does not repress these plays, does not retain them, expropriate them, they allow the human to play his own game of life. The source of the wordly plays is a cosmic *hyperplay* network. Each small play comes from the great plays that one can call God. Flow is a flow of plays. Not to expropriate them is the true, authentic way of staying in the world. The rationality of the West sought to expropriate the world by creating the natural science, which today has become the domination of technology on the Earth's planet. As a result, an ecological catastrophe has occurred. This is because the West wants to control everything what happens on Earth. Usually if a human loses control over other people, things of the world or himself, he considers himself looser and failed man, and oppositely really to indulge to the flow is the ability to be in the authentic manner.

We could say that each thing in the world is the event, even buildings are events: they were built, they stand, some time they will be repaired or destroyed. The house also is an event, only extended in time-for two hundred or thousand years. But small events-wind, rain, and therefore on -are short-term events, therefore the most common. Refusal to expropriate the world means the rejection of the order of reason, because it interferes and prevent the living of human being by giving oneself to the flow of the plays. The mind wants to do everything logical, impose the principle of cause and effect on the things and make the world a highway where everything is moving purposefully and regularly. But in fact the world is a network of branching paths that requires trust and surrender to life.

Causaless universe

Causeless universe is the universe, where events are not subjugated to the necessity of the cause and effect. There is no causation among events. Their emergence can be perceived as a miracle.

In the new ages, especially since Descartes, in the framework of the human conception, the concept of causal events was developing: according to Descartes, there are two substances-thought and extension, and thinking in the form of a causal link commands the extending substance to act. A human moves his hand and says that this event was caused by the idea of reason that ordered a human to move his hand. The human consists of soul and body, i.e. the thinking and extending substance. The thinking substance commands the hand to move and it moves. Hidden mental event is a cause of a physical event: the movements of the hand are a consequence of mental events. Metaphorically speaking, the Cartesian man can be imagined as a driver of a car. The car is the human body and the human soul is the driver. It clicks various buttons, turns the steering wheel, changes gears and the car rides. According to Descartes, our bodies are machines and the soul controls the machine. There is always a mental event that causes the physical event.

The natural science of new ages has established the causal conception of the universe. It was assumed that every event has a cause and, once identifying it and starting manipulate, you can artificially induce this event. If the human manipulates the cause of the event, this may cause the event as an effect of the cause. Natural science conquered the nature, increasing field productivity by manipulating the fertility reasons of the land. The new age science has emerged as the advent of the concept of the causal event. The new age natural science seeks to establish that, the same causes, have the same effects. The scientific experiment is considered to be successful if it can be repeated twice or more times, and from the same causes, to get the same effects. There is a necessary link between cause and effect. Therefore the core of natural science is a causal relationship. For new ages universe was causal universe.

If we introduce the conception of the causeless universe, we strike the most sensitive place in the natural sciences structure-the relationship between the cause and effect because in the natural science mentality, as we have said before, this connection is necessary. Natural science would collapse, if the connection could not be repeated. It can be argued that the natural science concept of event which is based on the causal link, is rough. Not only because it destroys the nature-polar ice

melts, to climate is warming, the ozone hole increases-and causes similar side effects as a consequence of domination of natural science over nature, but it is rough event in the sense that it is believed that the event as effect of cause can be manipulated.

As for the causeless universe concept, the Meillassoux Hume's interpretation is important to us. Meillassoux says: "So long as we believe that there must be a reason why it is, is the way it is, we will continue to fuel superstition, which is to say, the belief that there is an ineffable reason underlying all things." (Meillassoux, 2006, 111). This philosopher creates the conception of the world without metaphysical causes and effects of things. Things exist without any reason. The only necessity that is allowed by Meillassoux, is that a contingency is necessary. And there is no other necessity. When we excluding metaphysical reasons and grounds of things, only the world of contingencies remains. It is called hyper - chaos, and is characterized by the fact that the laws of nature are not stable and may vary. The sceptical treatment of the cause and effect relationship by Hume has helped Meillassoux to achieve this philosophical position. For the Badiou student it is important that Hume says: if a billiard ball hits another billiard ball, there are a lot of opportunities for that other balls to move-there is no strict causality to determine the more strictly defined direction of the balls movement. We don't have definite conception of effect, when we talk about billiard balls hitting on the next ball or other balls. They can move in totally different directions than we have originally imagined. Meillassoux takes this concept of Hume in order to criticize the conception of causality. From the one effect there is no unambiguous consequence, while there are many of them. In his work *After Finitude* he presents a model which assumes that the classic modern natural science causality does not work. Of course, Hume was a sceptic and interpreted the concept of causality without trust, stemming from the British empiricist assumptions. For him it was important to refute the notion of causality. According to Hume's insight, if the sun rose today, it does not mean that it will rise tomorrow. If today was the sunrise, it does not mean that there is some sort of causal link, and that tomorrow the sunrise will be again, as it may not. Meillassoux imagines the universe as hyper - chaos-chaotic movement of the world elements. However, for this thinker it is difficult to reconcile the fact that the world is hyperchaotic, with the fact that the world given to our senses is more or less stable. How to combine the idea of hyper - chaos with the fact that the world is stable. We do not live in chaos, we live in a world between stability and chaos and our world is filled with the flow of plays as events.

What is our interpretation of Hume's Meillassoux interpretation? Our term of play is intended to describe nonlinear causality as one strictly defined effect does not follow from one cause (such concept of causality dominates in the classical natural science), but there are a lot of unintended effects, and it forms a free, non-linear play. Therefore we have to talk not about the linear, but about non linear playful causality, but the conception of the latter overcomes what we are accustomed to call causality, because, according to conventional thinking of causality, it means linear causality. The best example of play in the history of philosophy is the billiard balls play by Hume given example, when one cause-

one billiard ball collision with other billiard balls-leads to a huge number of possible unforeseen billiard ball trajectories, which cannot be envisaged by a geometric mind, because only linear causality obeys to it when strictly defined one effect flows from one cause. Therefore, play cannot be perceived by geometric, logical mind. The consequences of a play cannot be logically deduced, they can only be experienced and described by participating in the play. Therefore, the universe whose things are linked with plays is causeless universe. Also, it is not linear, not subjugated by the logical mind, which seeks to impose linear mind schemes to the universe. However, by putting these schemes of reason away, we open the playing reality of the flow, which is not subjugated to the logical mind, because it thinks only linear causality, which is opened by a causal universe. It is a logical shell that covers the playing reality of the flow. When the logical shell is rejected, we open the playing reality of the flow, which was subjugated by geometric logic and common sense: is focused only on his own schemes and imposes them on reality by creating a rational and logical world.

The flow of plays is what is between stability and chaos, therefore we assume that the Meillassoux's idea of hyper - chaos is unnecessary extreme. We recognise a certain harmony for the happening world which does not allow itself to turn into chaos. However, unlike G. Leibniz's predetermined harmony, we adhere to the view that the world itself is a self-regulating system that does not allow to self-destruction.

The Great flow

The main concept of traditional ontology is substance: Greek *ousia* or Latin *substantia*. The paradigm of ontological thinking prevailed from ancient Greece to the end of the Middle Ages, and, with some exceptions in later centuries. Philosophers of Miletus started searching for the first principle. In the Ancient Greek philosophy *arche* of first philosophers of Miletus, which was often identified with one of the natural elements, begins the search for the first principals of reality and Aristotle's substance completes it. The substance was already developed first principal, because it had its nucleus as the invariable substance, and changing accidentals. Accidentals were what substance attracts to itself, subordinate them centre of substance. Therefore, Aristotle's substance in the same philosophical construct aligned these opposites, which alignment was a task for Plato thinking-becoming, and constancy-(substance is constant, and its accidentals are changing). The substance thinking revived the seventeenth century in Spinoza's philosophy. Spinoza understood substance as God or Nature, and the number of substance of attributes (spinosian name for accidentals) are infinite. The main attributes, including a human, is thinking and extension. Therefore, God is what attracts to himself all worldly attributes. Subsequent Western thinking went towards the direction of desubstantiation and replaced the ontological paradigm from Descartes with the subject paradigm. In the thinking of Heidegger, the biggest of the twentieth century ontologists, the distinction between the entity and Being is what remained from the substance of Aristotle, the greatest ancient Greek ontologist. The entity is a distant echo of accident, and the Being heard with non-substantial, spiritual, thinking ear or hearing eye is distant echo of substance. (When writing about the late Heidegger's Being, we will use this word with a capital

letter, and writing about being in not Heidegger' meaning we will use that word in lowercase.)

In Aristotle's time it has been taken for granted that the term of *substantia*, in addition to philosophical meaning, was also domestic, and marked the human wealth and property. For example, the inheritance of the father in the allegory of the prodigal son in Luke's Gospel is called *substantia* in Latin and in Greek-*ousia*. This is one of the few philosophical terms in the New Testament. The second, everyday meaning of substance is fundamental in our study, because it allows to better understand the nature of the substance. In order to better clarify philosophical meaning of *substantia* we can bring close to ancient every day meaning and see the substance as a philosophical term in similarity to that everyday meaning of substance: in this sense, substance refers to what attracts to itself all the goods and which retain them in the household. Meanwhile, in the philosophical sense the substance is the nucleus of reality, connecting the singularities in the world, i.e. accidents, to its order. Therefore, we have the nucleus of substance as a place for retaining the good things of the household or singularities of the world, and accidents of substance as the good things of the household itself. The thinking of substance ruled the Western way of thinking since Aristotle until the end of the Middle Ages, but it is fundamental also in the philosophy of Spinoza, with revalued and overthrown medieval values. In Spinoza's thinking God is a substance, but to think of God as the substance is to reify God.

God, when thought as substance is a superbeing underlying simple beings. However, the superentity, the essence of which, according to Thomas Aquinas, is its existence, still remains an entity. The next step, made by the reification of God, is turning God into givingness. Defined givingness of God is defined God's face, creating the anthropomorphic illusion of God. Each religion worships its face of God, i.e. their anthropomorphic givingness of God. Religious wars and conflicts are disagreements on different givingnesses of God. But God, thought outside of its givingness, is not an anthropomorphic object. Therefore, our task is to think of an non-objective, non-substantial, non-anthropomorphic God. We say that such God is the Great flow. After discussing the poverty of God's thinking resulting from the reification of God, one should try to think of God beyond the relation of substance and accidents. Then we get the divine flow. God without God's givingness is the divine flow.

Remembering the folkloric meaning of *ousia* and *substantia*, that the substance is property protected by the person in a household, we can assume that if we go beyond the thinking of substance, we then get into a situation where we need to be as Jesus said of the birds: "Look at the birds of the air; they do not sow or reap or store away in barns, and yet your heavenly Father feeds them. (Matthew 6, 26). Thinking the being in the world without retention, is to recognise the world's flows and participate in them without seeking expropriate these flows. It means freeing the reality of the substance from the tyranny that subordinates each singularity to substance. Such thinking is seeking to participate in the reality with least interfering with it and without its deformation, without distortion. What then image of God we get, when we think of God beyond the substance? When we reject the relationship of the substance

and accidents we liberate the world from the subjugation to the substance, which retains and stops its flow. One can introduce the concept Great flow here, which combines God as a network of hyperplays with the world of plays.

The great flow corresponds to God, but not of substantial, but rather flowing, streaming. Our task is to participate in the flow with least retaining of reality, with least expropriating it, and least transforming the reality into substance. Life according to the Great flow is life without substance. The human egoism wants substance, wants property, but to live without the substance is to live as birds in the Gospel. God as the Great flow moves up the plays of the world. We have the major plays, hyperplays, which are God, and the smaller plays, which are the world's playfulnesses. We understand the world in a dynamic way that it is in a constant flow: the wind blows, the clouds sail, the lake waves, a raven flies and this is flow, we have to participate in it. We reject to convert this flow into substance, it means we refuse to be wealthy. The Great flow from God's hyperplays, goes into the plays of entities in the world, and the plays of entities go back to God, to hyperplays. Thus, we get the playing variety of the world and we seek not to retain it, but to participate in it.

Play does not have givingness and is not connected to the centre or the core. When we think of God as a whole of plays, it is God without givingness and such God is the Great flow. When we talk about the Great flow, we talk about openness and sensitivity to the reality and do not seek to expropriate it, making it our own, we simply are involved in it, and least interfere with reality. When we begin to think of God as the Great hyperplays connecting the Great flow, we are aware that such a God does not have givingness, because the givingness of the flow is stabilization and retention, and in this case we have opened ourselves out into the fresh flow. One can remember the famous Heraclite's phrase that you cannot enter twice in the same river of flow. The reason is that there is no world givingness, there is nothing to hold on, every moment is different and they cannot be retained or gripped. What was the moment ago, has passed, now there is a next moment, the next flow and there is nothing to hold on, nothing to stop. The traditional Western thinking wanted to expropriate, suspend the reality by converting it into property. When the prodigal son takes his part of property of his father, he gets the givingness, i.e. a stable thing, and then wasted money and goes back to ask his father for help. The thinking of the Great flow is thinking beyond the Western economy principle. Here we have giving without givingness, when giving does not turn into a full value object, or think, or givingness, it is only the giving without givingness, i.e. God in this new sense, is world's Great flow.

Thinking of God, the substance is changed into the Great flow and it is necessary to participate in this flow. Of course, we can say that it raises the fear that there is a real desire to expropriate the reality, to transform it into the property in order to become safe, and now what will be doing tomorrow. However, the described way of life is an attempt to live without being linked to the things, like surfing and sailing on the peak of the wave. A person should not be afraid of life, because the way of expropriating thinking, when everything is transformed into substances stems from the fear of life. In antiquity Plato turned away from the becoming world and spoke of stable ideas. In a certain sense, he experienced the fear of life and felt

uncomfortable in the happening world. Plato had to subordinate the things of this world to the idea, which were over him, and he wanted to relate himself with the cosmos of stable things, and wanted to live in it. For this thinker, ideas were providing security. We need to reject such a model and learn to live in a changing world. And it's not easy, and causes fear, but it needs to be overcome and then we will live with a minimum of interfering in the world, and it will reward us, will provide new opportunities to be.

Love as accidents without substance

Our reflection came to a place where it once again raises the question of God, but not the traditional, identifying it with the substance, but unconventional substanceless God, which, as will appear further in this section, is identical to love. We will try to remove from the conception of God the layers foreign to God as love, and to reveal the loving nerve of God. We distinguish between 1) the God of Greek philosophers, 2) the religious God coming from the letters of apostle Paul, and the purpose of our reflection-3) the God of faith proclaimed by Jesus. Our thesis is such that only after deconstructing the substantial God as *ens causa sui*, finally we can get closer to God as the experience of love. The emerging Christian conception of God has taken a lot from the God of Greek theorists and in Greece, the main science of philosophy was ontology, therefore from very beginning in Christianity God was turned into being. On the other hand, since the Christian conception of God has been formed in the Roman Empire, from the very beginning God took over the Roman Caesar attributes, and became an emperor of the universe. The God proclaimed by Jesus as love remained, but was hidden and enclosed in the God as being, was connected with the conceptions of substance, and the emperor of the universe. Only mystics understood this complexity and drank from God as the source of love. God as the emperor of the universe by analogy with the Roman emperors is substantial God by analogy with the conception of Aristotle and other Greek philosophers, not related to love.

In the message of Jesus, it has been postulated that God is love. But there was no kind of logical connection in the structure of God created by the first Fathers of the Church that leads to love. Traditional God, as the emperor of the universe, is substance with the accidents. God is the substance, and the accidents are all living and not alive creatures, which are subordinated to Him as substance. God grounds the living and not alive entities of the world. It is the God that determines everything. It can be seen as tyrannical because from the early ages He has decided which people will be saved and which will be sent to the hell. God as substance determines the entire human life and leaves no freedom of will. Attributes, or accidents, are the expressions of the God's will. G. Deleuze wrote a book about Spinoza *Expressionism in Philosophy: Spinoza*. There he thought the idea that the attributes of the God of Spinoza-thinking, extension and others-express God. By expressing, they are completely obey to God's will and in this way function.

Now we offer a new concept of God-the infinity of playing accidents without substance. The infinity of these accidents without substance allows to think of God as love. Love retains nothing, as the substance does, which is the centre of all things,

attracting everything into itself and affecting everything. Love gives without requiring to return. And here there is no reference to the substance, to the one that is retaining anything. Love is to give ourselves without identity, without instruction to oneself, without self-retaining at own identity. Substance can't characterize love. It is true giving without requiring return, pure becoming, pure devotion –this is the love proclaimed by Jesus (agape). Love is a pure flow exiting outside itself. The world of love is more like the world of Heraclitus, with more becoming, of a human not identical to itself, rather than the world of Parmenides, which is a stable being, all full, etc. To be in real love is not to seek to expropriate the other human, but wishing him good. When one seeks to expropriate another person according to the substance form, to subjugate it to oneself, making your own accident, then love is destroyed. Love is a stepping beyond the self, non-retaining, but on the other hand, in this state a person feels a little insecure. If the person wants to retain the love relationship and subjugate it to oneself, to control another person, then love negates itself and dies.

As a proof that love is non-substantial state, we can remember Plato's described daimon Eros from *Symposium*, of which the Socrates' teacher, Diotima says:

On the birthday of Aphrodite there was a feast of gods, at which the god Poros or Plenty, who is the son of Metis or Discretion, was one of the guests. When the feast was over, Penia or Poverty, as the manner is on such occasions, came about the doors to beg. Now Plenty who was the worse for nectar (there was no wine in those days), went into garden of Zeus and fell into a heavy sleep. And Poverty considering her own straitened circumstances, plotted to have a child by him, and according she lay down at his side and conceived Eros, who partly because he is naturally a lover of the beautiful, and because Aphrodite is herself beautiful, and also because he was born on her birthday, is her follower and attendant. And as his parentage is, so also are his fortunes. In the first place he is always poor, and anything but tender and fair, as the many imagine him; And he is rough and squalid, and has no shoes, nor house to dwell in; on the bare earth exposed he lies under the open heaven, in the streets, or at the doors of houses, taking his rest; and like his mother he is always in distress. Like his father too, whom he also partly resembles, he is always plotting against the fair and good; he is bold, enterprising, strong, a mighty hunter, always weaving some intrigue or other, keen in the pursuit of wisdom, fertile in resources; a philosopher at all the times, terrible as an enchanter, sorcerer, sophist. He is by nature neither mortal nor immortal but alive and flourishing at one moment when he is in plenty, and dead at another moment, and again alive by reason of his father's nature. But that which is always flowing in is always flowing out, and so he is never in want and never in wealth, and, further, he is in a mean between ignorance and knowledge.

(Symposium, 203 d-e).

Thus, Eros is not a substantial individual. Eros is the most Christian god of all Greek gods and demigods. Born of the Plenty and Poverty, midway between lack and abundance, but retaining nothing, it is a pure daimon of becoming and flow. He sleeps at random, does not seek to retain wealth and riches, which he gets. He does not accumulate them, gives himself entirely to the flow. Therefore, Eros is substanceless

individual-he is pure flow of accidents without substance, pure events that are not retained, not connected into the whole. Here we can recall how Plato speaks of philosophers: They are the wisdom lovers, but they do not have it, only aim for it. Philosopher as a lover of wisdom expresses the substanceless status-seeks wisdom, but does not have it. This action of philosophy is also a dedication to the substanceless flow-participating in the personal becoming. One could say that substanceless state is exit outside of being as *ens causa sui*-which is the cause of itself, is the substance with accidents. The world is a flow of accidents. One has to get beyond being when one seek to devote himself to the flow. In this sense, Socrates and Christ are analogous figures and are the fundamentals of Western culture. Neither one nor the other wrote, others were writing for them. We can recognise Socrates in the image of this love daimon Eros. Philosopher also tries to get out beyond the available knowledge. He does not retain it, philosopher seeks wisdom, but also overcoming of the current knowledge. When the Fathers of the Church spoke out in favour of the philosophers God, the substance of Greek philosophers came to Christianity. Aquinas rewrote Aristotle and his thinking of substance, and applied the God of being to Christianity. The philosopher's God of the substance came to Christianity and in this way God has been associated with being, because we can say that being is the main theme of philosophy. It is now, after deconstructing the substance, an opportunity to think of God as love opens up. God is no longer the matter of substance but of the flow. We can add that love cannot be a rational thing. When love is rationalized, then it is transformed into substance. Love is not rational. Sometimes for philosophers it is difficult to learn to love, because they are rational people, but love has neither methods nor logic. It is barefoot as Socrates or Eros. In love, the mind must be turned off, because it is impossible to love rationally.

Jesus is the teacher of stepping outside the self. He did not retain anything, did not accumulate wealth. He said that God will take care of him. He is a nomad, outgoing beyond the self and to the other side of being. Thus, his preaching lasted the shortest period of all religion creators,-only for three years, and ended with the death on the cross. It is the most unsuccessful teacher in the world. Buddha taught up to 80 years and died only after eating poisonous mushrooms from the peasant. Jesus' teaching is highly concentrated. But it also can be characterized with going beyond the self, no retaining, no fixation to oneself as the substantial individual.

CONCLUSIONS

Theontology of the flow is non-classical ontology, which has been forced out from Western tradition by the opponents of Heraclitus: Parmenides, Plato and Aristotle to Spinoza, with emphasis on equating the thinking to being, and the ontology of stable ideas and substance. Ontology of flow refreshes the thinking of Heraclitus, which was pushed out in the name of tradition stable substance thinking.

1. We succeeded to prove that not retaining and not expropriating the world, and brave dedication to the flow allows to overcome the fear that you live in the non-controlled world, because the expropriated and retained world constantly slips from the subject's created stability, causing him distress.
2. We succeeded to prove that the substance thinking ends where we enter the world of not expropriation and not retaining.
3. We succeeded to prove that participation in the flow is a fate of a non - classical subject.
4. We succeeded to prove that in the framework of ontology of the flow, the traditional God as substance and *ens causa sui* becomes the Great flow.
5. We succeeded to prove that in the framework of ontology of the flow substance no longer exists, but only plays of accidents remain.
6. We succeeded to prove that God as unconditional giving love is free the play of accidents, which retains nothing, and constantly abandons oneself.

References

- Hume, D. (1985). *A Treatise of Human Nature*. London: Penguin books.
- Kirk, Geoffrey, and Raven, John. (1957). *The Presocratic Philosophers*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP,
- Malherbe M. (2001). *La philosophie empiriste de David Hume*. Paris: Librairie philosophic J. Vrin.
- Marion J.-L. (1982, 2013). *Dieu sans l'être*. Paris: Quadrige.
- Marion J.-L. (1991, 2012). *God without being*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Meillassoux Q. (2006). *Après la finitude: Essai sur la nécessité de la contingence*. Paris: Seuil.
- Meillassoux Q. (2008) *After Finitude: An Essay on the Necessity of Contingency*. London: Continuum.
- Naujasis Testamentas. (2006). Vilnius: Katalikų pasaulio leidiniai. Iš graikų kalbos vertė kun. Česlovas Kavaliauskas.
- Plato. (2011). *The Complete Works of Plato. Volume II*. P. G. Naiditch. *The Library of Richard Porson*.

How to cite this article:

Augustinas Dainys.2017, The Ontology of The Flow. *Int J Recent Sci Res*. 8(11), pp. 21824-21831.
DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.24327/ijrsr.2017.0811.1149>
