
UNIT 2 AGAPEIC NOTION OF BEING (BEING AND AGAPE)

Contents

- 2.0 Objectives
- 2.1 Introduction
- 2.2 Notion of Being
- 2.3 Being as Agape (love)
- 2.4 Let Us Sum Up
- 2.5 Further Readings and References

2.0 OBJECTIVES

Being is love, *agape*. Being is love, because Being gives itself to beings in total freedom. Being gives itself to beings so that there can be beings. This Unit:

- Investigates into the notion of Being
- Investigates into the notion of love and freedom
- Affirms that Being is love

2.1 INTRODUCTION

A lover who tries to love the beloved must face towards the beloved and concentrate full attention on the latter. This full attention draws upon all four levels of the lover’s being: biological, psychological, moral, and ontological. This full attention of the lover to the beloved calls for total devotion or dedication of the lover to the beloved. Hence, this total dedication is total self-giving or self-donation of the lover to the beloved. It is the self-giving of the being of the lover to the beloved. The best gift is self-gift, i.e., giving of one’s being to another. That is *agape*. *Agape* is not merely giving what we have but what we are. In this way, it is distinct from *eros* and *philia*. In *eros* we give only what we desire (like) to give; in *philia* we give in proportion to what we receive. Hence, in *eros* and *philia* we give what we have, but in *agape* we give what we are. When we give what we are, we also give what we have. Consequently, *agape* does not exclude *eros* and *philia*, but includes and transforms them. It is because originally and fundamentally Being gives itself to beings, so that beings are made possible. Without Being there cannot be beings. Beings are possible because Being gives itself out of itself. In this way, Being by nature is self-giving or love. Being is love. Since Being is love, it calls for loving response on the part of beings.

2.2 NOTION OF BEING

Being as Distinct from Beings: Being as such is distinct from particularized being. *Particularized being* is being which is studied by the diverse sciences of nature. It is the sensible and mobile beings which are either the object of the philosophy of nature or of the other empirical sciences. Particularized being marks and envelops the metaphysical notion of Being. The metaphysical notion

of Being is not disengaged from the particularized being, but is present in it in a disguised and invisible manner. All our notions and concepts are resolved in the metaphysical notion of Being. It is the first of all our notions, of which all the rest are determinations. Being is determined by the difference which arises within and not outside itself. It is Being which the intellect perceives first and before anything else. Hence, the metaphysical intellect must disengage Being and know it in its distinctive mystery. Being as such is real being in all the purity and fullness of its distinctive intelligibility or mystery. All objects express this being. They utter it to the intellect not to all intellects but only to those capable of hearing it. Being, seen in its distinctive properties, is trans-objectively subsistent, autonomous, and essentially diversified. When the intellect makes its first judgement in regard to Being (*esse*), it forms its first idea, the idea of being (*ens*) by which the intellect, through simple apprehension, 'crosses over' to judgement and lays hold of what properly belongs to judgement, the act of Being.

Being as Act: Being (*Esse*) is the very act which turns a possible into a being. Essence is not the highest perfection in the order of being but *esse* (act of Being). However, essence is an element of finite being of absolute necessity and very high nobility, as each essence is the possibility of an actual being endowed with its own finite degree of perfection. Finite being is also act and perfection. The world of finite beings is made possible by the very essences of the things which their own *esse* makes to be true beings. In this way, everything is called a being because of its *esse*; while everything is also called a thing on account of essence or quiddity. As long as one keeps within the notion of the Pure Act of Being, essence cannot be distinguished from it. But as soon as one begins to think of a being, it becomes necessary to conceive it as a participation in the Pure Act of Being, which is the source of its dynamism.

Being as Dynamic: The human intellect is not a mirror that passively reflects the objects which come within its field; rather, it is active, fundamentally oriented towards its final goal, the absolute Being. The intellect is dynamic and active. It is a faculty in quest of its intuition, i.e., of assimilation with Being which is pure and simple, supremely one, without limitation, without distinction of essence and existence, and of possibility and reality. Tending towards the infinite, it is not fully satisfied by any finite object. However, to the extent that a finite object participates in the infinite, the intellect finds a partial goal for its appetite in the object, affirms it categorically, and makes a judgement of reality. Hence, truth is found in judgement. The judgement is a *synthesis* through concretion. It unites a subject of inherence and a form. The substantial unity of the knowing subject renders possible the *conversio ad phantasma* without which the intellect could not think of the material singular, nor bring about the concrete synthesis of the judgement. Judgement is not only a synthesis, but an *act of affirmation* too. The affirmation is the essential element of the judgement; for it makes the synthesis which has been effected into an 'object.' It endows it with truth by relating it to the absolute Being. Affirmation is an absolute objectification of the subjective form. It transforms subjective form into an 'ontological object', an affirmation of Being which is a necessity. *The necessity of affirming Being* is identical with the very necessity of thought. Since only Being can become a content of thought, it follows that the necessity of thought is identical with the affirmation of Being. *The affirmation of Being is the a priori condition of the possibility of every object in consciousness*; and in every affirmation of the finite, the mind goes beyond the finite to the infinite. In other words, human necessarily judges.

Judgement implies affirmation of Being. In the affirmation of Being, human experiences a movement, a dynamism. This dynamism has its ultimate source in Being which is necessarily affirmed in every judgement. Human intellect is dynamic because Being, which is absolute, is dynamic. In fact, there takes place a twofold movement: human intellect moving towards Being and Being moving the human intellect towards itself. However, the ultimate source of this twofold movement is the Absolute Being, without which no movement is possible. It is the objective of the pure desire to know. Pure desire to know means the dynamic orientation manifested in question for intelligence and reflection. It is the a priori and enveloping drive that carries the cognitional process from sense and imagination to understanding, from understanding to judgement, from judgement to the complete context of correct judgements that is named knowledge. It moves human to seek understanding, and then it prevents one from being merely content with one's own imperfect, subjective personal experience. It moves human to reflect, to seek the unconditioned, and to grant unqualified assent only to the unconditioned and the unrestricted.

Being as Unrestricted Notion: At the root of all that can be affirmed or conceived is the pure desire to know. It is the pure desire which underlies all judgement and formulation, all questions and all desire to question, that defines its all-inclusive objective (pure desire defines Being). The objective of the pure desire to know is Being. It is the source not only of answers, but also of their criteria; not only of questions but also of grounds on which they are questioned. In other words, there is a cool, detached, disinterested desire to know at the root of cognitional process, and its range is unrestricted and spontaneous.

Being as Spontaneous Notion: There is a distinction between the spontaneously operative notion and theoretical accounts of its genesis and content. The spontaneously operative notion is invariant. It is common to all human beings. It functions in the same manner irrespective of what theoretical account of it a human may come to accept. The theoretical account of the content and genesis of the notion are numerous. They vary with philosophical contexts. Spontaneously operative notion is present, invariant in all. The notion of Being is such a notion present in all, and thus extends to everything that is known and unknown. It is true that Being is known in judgement. It is in judgement that we affirm or deny. Until we are able to affirm or deny we do not yet know. Although Being is known only in judgement, the notion of Being is prior to judgement. For judgement presupposes reflection. Reflection presupposes question. Question presupposes the desire to know. The desire to know is the desire to know Being which is immanent to self or spontaneously operative. It is all-pervasive and underpins all cognitional contents and penetrates them all, constituting them as cognitional. All cognitional contents such as ideas and concepts are responses to the desire to know, and all judgements are responses to the demand for the unconditioned. It is the notion of the to-be-known through that content which is prior to every content. The 'to-be-known through the content' passes without residue into the known through that content as each content emerges. The Notion of Being also constitutes all contents as cognitional (can be known) levels of knowing: experience, understanding, and judgement. *Experience* is the first level of knowing. It presents the matter to be known. *Understanding* is the second level of knowing. It defines the matter to be known. *Judgement* is the third level of knowing by which the experienced is thought and the thought is affirmed or denied. Hence Being is really known in judgement by which it is known as

Being. Hence, knowing is knowing Being spontaneously as it is the core of meaning.

Being as the Core of Meaning: The notion of Being is the core of meaning as it underpins all contents, penetrates them, and constitutes them as cognitional. Meaning can be distinguished from the viewpoint of its sources, acts, terms, and the core. *A source of meaning* is any element of knowledge such as data, images, ideas and concepts, the grasp of the unconditioned and judgement, and the detached and unrestricted desire to know. *Acts of Meaning* are of three kinds: formal, full, and instrumental. *The formal act* of meaning is an act of conceiving, thinking, considering, defining, supposing, and formulating. *The full act* (of meaning) is an act of judging. *The instrumental act* (of meaning) is the implementation of a formal or of a full act by way of words or symbols in a spoken, written, or merely imagined utterance. The *all-inclusive* terms of meaning is Being, since apart from Being there is nothing. In this way, the *core* of all acts of meaning is the intention of Being. A given judgement pertains to a context of judgements. It is from the context that the *meaning* of the given judgement is determined. For, the meaning of the judgement is an element in the determination of the universal intention of Being, which is the act of existence.

Being as the Act of Existence: Being is grasped only as the act of existence of entity. Being is at once separate and united to a receptive subject that is distinct from it. In other words, in the pre-apprehension we grasp Being only through the concept of a specific, sensibly presented, and particular entity. In the same way, every entity is apprehended in the pre-apprehension of the unlimited scope of all the possible objects of thought. This means that entity is apprehended at the moment when it finds itself with the totality of its possible objects. This totality is the one original ground of all determinations of the possible objects or 'beings,' which are the manifestations of Being.

Being Manifests Beings: When Being is conceived, it is conceived in the manner of an 'object' in the world, in the manner of an appearance. Being in general, and all that is immaterial, is conceived in the manner of material beings. That is to say, it is considered as a being which 'has' Being. One cannot conceive a thing existing in itself, in any other way. Hence the origin of all human concepts is through the senses. Even non-material beings cannot be comprehended by human, apart from reference to an appearance through which this non-material being becomes a datum. Hence, Being ? both in direct knowledge and in metaphysical reflection ? can be grasped only through beings manifested by Being. Even transcendental reflection on Being is effected necessarily through beings. In appearance or manifestation, human finds Being in general opened to it. In the pre-apprehension that goes beyond the appearance, Being in general is disclosed to the human spirit as an objective grasping of appearance. In the pre-apprehension, the most general structures of Being are simultaneously known. Being is being-present-to-itself; Being is knowing or luminosity; Being is self-affirmation, the will, and the good. Therefore, Being in general is disclosed to human in the appearance or manifestation of beings insofar as these most general definitions of Being in general are known through beings, through question.

Being as the Absolute Fact of Question: Human Question is something final and irreducible. Every attempt to place the question in question (i.e., to question the question) is itself again raising a question. So human is bound to question.

Hence it is the absolute fact which refuses to be replaced by another fact. This question is a metaphysical question. The metaphysical question is the reflexive articulation of the question about Being which pervades the ground of human existence itself. It turns upon itself as such and thereby turns upon the presuppositions of the question. The transcendental question does not merely place something asked about in question, but also the one questioning and the question itself; thus Being is the end of question itself.

Being as the End of Human Question: When we ask questions, we not only know how things are in relation to us but also how they are absolutely, in themselves - what it is in itself. In this way, the unconditioned, absolute Being puts an end to human question. The very act of questioning reveals that even if we only explicitly inquire about a relative validity for us personally, this relative validity itself is posited as Absolute. Behind the relative horizon there is always an absolute horizon. 'Validity for me' can be spoken of only because we contrast it with 'validity in itself'. The horizon of our questioning is the Unconditioned. The unconditioned is expressed in the word *IS* (Being). Here Being is the unconditioned condition of all questioning. It is the absolutely necessary. It is always and necessarily presupposed as the condition of every question. It is co-affirmed in the very act of questioning without any limit.

Being as the Unlimited: If the horizon of our knowing is limited, then our knowledge cannot be absolute. In a limited horizon, we cannot ask about the ultimate, absolute, unconditioned point of view. Hence, the horizon must be unlimited. To penetrate into the *intensively* deepest core of Being, we must reach the *extensively* widest range of Being. That which constitutes the ultimate, unconditioned reality of things is *Being*, and that which affects absolutely everything, without any limitation, is also Being. Therefore, Being is the ultimate reality both intensively and extensively. The horizon of Being within which we ask the question as question is unlimited, as it is knowing and not-knowing at the same time.

Being as Knowing and Not-Knowing: Every question implies that we know about Being. For, we cannot question about something of which we do not know anything at all. However, the question also presupposes that we do not know about Being. In this way question manifests both the identity of Being and knowing, and the distinction between them. In other words, our knowledge about Being consists in the identity of Being and knowing, and our not-knowing about Being consists in the non-identity of Being and knowing. Thus, Being is the principle of all beings.

Being as the Principle of Beings: One may ask two basic questions about everything: *whether* it is and *what* it is. The first question is about the thing's *act of Being*; the second is about its *essence*. Should something possess only an essence without the act of Being, then that would not be a real being, but a mere possible. The real differs from the possible as the act of Being is added to its essence. Hence, the act of Being is that in the entity which makes it real. It distinguishes the entity from a merely possible thing. It is the inner principle or ground of that which really is. It is the inner ground through which beings are in themselves. It is that through which every entity is real. The whatness of each entity receives its reality from the act of Being of the same reality. The Act of Being makes real whatever is real, including all determinations of the entities,

including its whatness. Being is the universal ground or principle of all entities and of their determinations.

2.3 BEING AS AGAPE (LOVE)

Beings come from Being. If beings come from Being, how do they come from Being? Why should they come from Being? Why should there be beings rather than nothing? It is a clear fact of experience that we are beings and what we encounter are all beings. One reasonable explanation for the presence of beings is that they all come from Being. Are they there on their own? They cannot be there on their own power because they are finite or limited. Hence, these must be there because of Being which is by its own power. If Being is there totally on its own power, it must be all-powerful. If it is all-powerful, it must be unlimited. If it is unlimited, it must be infinite. If it is infinite, it must be eternal. If it is eternal, it must be the ultimate. If it is ultimate, it must be the unconditioned condition of all other conditions. Hence, Being – which is the all-powerful, infinite, eternal, ultimate, and the unconditioned – is the principle of all finite beings. Since all finite beings come from Being the finitude of the finite beings must also come from Being that is infinite. The finite beings must be limited by Being, only since there is nothing outside the domain of Being. If it is so, then, is Being finite? The question is contradictory because the infinite cannot be finite. Although the infinite cannot be finite, the infinite can allow itself to be limited so that finite beings are possible. In this way, there takes place always, an ‘ontological incarnation’ by which the infinite on its own freely allows itself to be limited in the finite for the sake of the finite. The infinite Being is infinitely free to give itself to the finite so that finite can respond itself in freedom. In other words, Being gives itself so that finite can be. The finite beings are the instances of the self-giving of the infinite Being. This self-giving of the infinite, completely for the sake of the finite, is *agapeic* in nature. That is, Being by its very nature is self-giving or *agapeic*, love. Thus, Being is *agapeic* or love; ontology, by its very nature, is **agapeic ontology**. One could be justified in saying, *I love therefore I am*. If Being is self-giving or *agapeic*, then every being is expected to give itself back to Being in freedom. There can be no genuine love without freedom.

Freedom as Condition of Love: A determinist is one who denies human freedom. The determinists reason that every human action is a definite, determined act. Since the act of choice is determined, it is caused, and hence not free. According to them, an act is an unavoidable response to a stimulus. The true cause of our actions may not always be clear to us; it may be hidden from our consciousness. What we normally call choices is firmly controlled by factors that lie beyond the individual’s control. If the controlling factor is physiological, then the determinism is hereditary, or genetic, which means that through certain inherited characteristics, one is led to choose and to choose unalterably the way one does. If the controlling factor is one’s past patterns of behaviour and one’s fundamental mind-set, then the determinism is psychological. If the controlling factor is one’s cultural and educational background, then the determinism is environmental. Finally, the determinism is theological, if the controlling factor is attributed to the divine will or heavenly bodies.

Free will is the ability of the will, all conditions for action being present, to decide whether to act or not to act, and whether to act in this manner or in that

manner. Freedom (in the widest sense) is absence of external coercion or force; (in the narrow sense) it is absence of intrinsic necessity or determination in the performance of an act. 'Intrinsically necessary' means that which is determined by its very nature to be what it is and to act as it does. The will is free from intrinsic necessity or determination in at least some of its acts, i.e., will is capable of choice when all the conditions for acting are present. It does not mean that will is free in every respect. For instance, it is governed by intrinsic necessity or determination in seeking happiness. Besides, the will acts impulsively and indeliberately in many circumstances. The advocates of free will also admit that certain states and mental conditions make it impossible for the will to exercise its freedom, such as sleep, absent-mindedness, delirium, hypnosis, insanity, etc.

We shall consider four arguments justifying freedom: (1) the argument from common consent, (2) the psychological argument, (3) the ethical argument, and (4) the philosophical argument. *Argument from Common Consent:* The great majority of humans believe that their will is free. This conviction is of the utmost practical importance for the whole of human life. Therefore, if there is order in the world, the majority of humankind cannot be wrong in this belief. Hence the will is free. *Psychological Argument:* We have said that most people naturally hold that the will is free. Why do they cling to that conviction? This is because they are directly and indirectly aware of the freedom of their own decisions. They are directly aware of their freedom in the very act of making a free decision; they are indirectly aware of it because of the many instances of behaviour which can only be explained by admitting the freedom of the will. *Ethical Argument:* If there is no freedom, there is no real responsibility, no virtue, no merit, no moral obligation, no duty, and no morality. The necessary connection between freedom and these spiritual realities is quite obvious and is demonstrated in Ethics. This is a strong argument, because the sense of duty and the belief in morality and moral obligation come naturally to human, and even those who deny their existence in theory live in practice as if they admitted it. Kant, who claimed that the existence of freedom was not demonstrable by theoretical reason, nevertheless was convinced that human is free, and he derived this conviction from the fact of duty, which he considered to be immediately evident to the practical reason. *Philosophical Argument:* Every kind of knowledge evokes a corresponding kind of striving as my knowledge is always knowledge of (after) 'something'. In knowledge, my mind freely tends or strives towards the object of my knowledge. This follows from the fact that knowledge and striving are the two fundamental immaterial functions or aspects of a rational being. In other words, there is in human an immaterial kind of knowledge. Hence, there must also be in human an immaterial kind of striving. Immaterial striving is intrinsically independent of matter which is one of the principles of limitation or restriction of a material finite being; the other being an infinite principle, namely, the Absolute Being. And since immaterial striving in itself is independent or free of matter, there is in human a free principle which is the principle of free striving, i.e., free-will which is relatively free (but not absolutely free as it is not free of the absolute Being).

Philosophically speaking, freedom is also an analogous concept predicated in different ways of different types. The various forms of attribution indicate a formal relation which remains the same. This relation can be put negatively or positively. Negatively, freedom means 'being free from,' i. e., the relation of not being bound, of being independent from something. This negative concept is also a relative one since every finite being is related to other beings in the world.

It may be free from direct relationships to this or that, but not from all things. Beings, for instance, which are free from insertion into civilization and history, are all the more fully involved in nature and the universe. A being fully free in the negative sense could not be a being in the world. A fully isolated being, without any relationship, would be based on nothing and be nothing. Negation is always based on something positive. If negative freedom was conceived as an absolute, such a fully indeterminate being would be without a world and reduced to nothingness. In contrast to the negative and relative concept, there is a positive and absolute concept of freedom. A being is positively free insofar as it is in possession of itself with the sufficient condition for all its being and relations. Hence, freedom means self-possession, of being completely present to oneself. Self-possession is the essence of 'person' too. A person is in possession of oneself and is not possessed by another.

When we look at freedom in this way, human freedom is neither merely negative and relative nor fully positive and absolute. Of course, human has some dominion over oneself and so also over parts of the world. But one is at the same time inserted into the world and dependent on the beings among which one finds oneself. Thus human freedom is constituted by isolation and power, and being 'free from' and being 'free to.' This basic mode of human freedom may be called 'transcendental freedom' which is the fundamental property of human by which human alone can say 'is.' Human can contrast all things with oneself as 'beings' and so comprehend them in being. In this way, human has the capacity of distancing all things from oneself and oneself from all things and even from oneself. This universal freedom of distancing is transcendence, 'being over and beyond' every individual being. Thus, freedom is the foundation of human's self-transcendence. This capacity for self-transcendence is the basis of *agapeic* or self-giving love. If a being does not give itself to Being and beings, then it goes against its very nature as being.

Agapeic Love: In classical Greek, especially in Plato's *Symposium*, there are two terms for love. These are *eros* and *philia*. *Eros* is based on strong feelings toward another. It usually occurs in the first stages of a man-woman relationship. It is based more on physical traits. For example, when a man says he has 'fallen in love' with a woman because 'she looks like an angel', or when a woman 'falls in love' with a man because he is intelligent and he has good breeding, etc. It is based more on self-benefit, on what can benefit oneself rather than the other person. When one person doesn't feel happy anymore in loving the other person, she/he is led to believe that she/he has fallen out of love. *Philia*, as we mentioned earlier, is love based on friendship between two persons. Undoubtedly, friendship is the foundation of a successful relationship. This is true whether it is marriage, relationship between family members, relationship with co-workers, one's employer, etc. This is in contrast to a man-woman romantic relationship which starts out by *eros*. With *eros*, one sees only each other's strengths/good side; everything is rosy. *Philia* is based on 'give-and-take', where two people enrich each other in a mutual relationship. One partner is still concerned with what she/he can take, but at the same time is also concerned with her/his partner's benefit and therefore gives back in return. It is a higher type of love than *eros*. *Philia* is a mutual, 'give-and take' relationship, while *eros* is a self-based form of love that is more concerned with self-benefit. There is also a third Greek term '*agape*', which occurs rather infrequently in Greek usage [of course, the verb *agapao* = 'to love' was common in classical Greek], and occurred in the Septuagint (LXX)

borrowed from the popular Egyptian dialect. It is love above *philia* and *eros*. It is a love that is totally selfless, where a person gives out love to another person even if this act does not benefit her/him in any way. Whether the love given is returned or not, the person continues to love even without any self-benefit. Say for instance, one helps another person, even though that person hates her/him. Or one takes insults from one's partner without hitting back, all the while forgiving and praying for the partner to amend her/his ways.

Agapeic Love as Love for Peace: Indian ontology, though the term 'ontology' is symptomatically Western, denotes the ontological speculations of prominent Indian thinkers, ancient or modern, Hindus or non-Hindus, theists or atheists. Even in the ancient writings of the orthodox Hindu philosophers, like the *Sarva-darsana-samgraha* of Madhavacarya which tries to present in one place the views of all (*sarva*) schools of philosophy, we find the views of atheists and materialists like the Carvakas, and unorthodox thinkers like the Bauddhas and the Jainas, along with those of the orthodox Hindu thinkers. Indian ontology is marked, in this respect, by a striking breadth of *agapeic* inclusiveness, other-centered outlook which only testifies its unflinching devotion and love to the other in its search for truth. Though there were many different schools with various views, each school took care to learn the views of all the others and did not come to any conclusion before considering thoroughly what others had to say. This *agapeic* spirit led to the formation of a method of ontological discussion. A thinker had to first state the views of one's opponents before one formulated one's own theory. The statement of the opponent's view came to be known as the prior view (*purvapaksa*); then followed the refutation (*khandana*) of this view; last of all came the statement of the philosopher's own position, which, therefore, was known as the subsequent view (*uttarapaksa*) or the conclusion (*siddhanta*).

This *agapeic* commitment to the knowledge of reality, of giving oneself to the knowledge of rival positions with humility and concern, was more than rewarded by perfection that each philosophical school attained. If we open a comprehensive work on the Vedanta, we will find in it the statement of the views of all other schools Carvaka, Bauddha, Jaina, Sankhya, Yoga, Mimamsa, Nyaya, and Vaiseshika discussed and weighed with all care. Similarly, any good work on the Bauddha or Jaina philosophy discusses the other views with an *agapeic* openness. If the *agapeic* openness of mind – the willingness to listen to what others say – has been one of the chief causes of the greatness of Indian philosophy in the past, it has also a definite moral for the future, especially for the Indian Christian Philosophizing. If Indian philosophy is once more to revive and continue its onward march, if the Indian Christian philosophizing is to be relevant in today's context, if the Association of Christian Philosophers of India is to be of significance to the thinkers of this country, it can do so only by taking into consideration the new ideas of Being, reality and life which may originate from a vast multitude of peoples – the Blacks, the Whites, the Dravidians, the Aryans, the Semitics, the Mongolians, the Dalits, the Tribals, the scientists and technologists, from all religions of the world and their problems – and only by being *agapeic*. In this way, as we go through the history of Indian ontology, we find India's ontology, despite several diametrically opposed doctrines, to be an outstanding ontology of unity in diversity rooted in an *agapeic* openness. Our fellow-citizens, passing through the inevitable process of struggles and cooperation, have been giving themselves to the promotion of love, harmony, and peace. Moreover, by strengthening harmony ? one of the most practical aspects

of *Ahimsa* ? they have been attracting the attention of the people of the world to the predominant feature of Indian ontology as *agapeic*, and thus, as an ontology of love and peace. Influenced by the Indian concept of peace, not only the Greeks and the Chinese, but many others too reached the Indian soil. They stayed here for months and years, and went back to their respective countries with the eternal message of *agapeic* love and peace.

Check Your Progress

Note: use the space provided for your Answers.

1) What is the relation between Being and *agape*?

2) How do you explain that *agapeic* love is love for peace?

2.4 LET US SUM UP

From our presentation and analysis of the notion of Being we know that Being is self-giving or love (*agape*). If Being is self-giving or *agapeic*, then every being is expected to give itself back to Being and to other fellow-beings in return. When a being gives itself to another in love, harmony and peace follow. Thus, the path from violence to peace is the path of *agapeic* ontology, the ontology of *agapeic* love characterized by kindness, compassion, gentleness, patience, humility, forgiveness, and reconciliation. The *Agapeic* ontology of love permeates the philosophies of India, and is very much implicit in the life and activities of Mahatma Gandhi and Mother Teresa of Kolkata. Thus, we can rightly conclude that *agapeic* ontology, as an ontology of love, is a fitting and challenging philosophical response to the present day evils of our society.

2.5 FURTHER READINGS AND REFERENCES

Aristotle. *Metaphysics*. New Delhi: Cosmo Publications, 2002.

Benedict XVI, Pope. *Deus Caritas Est*, Encyclical. 25 December 2005.

Coreth, Emerich. *Metaphysics*. New York: Seabury Press, 1973.

Notion of Being

Donceel, J.F. *Philosophical Psychology*. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1963.

Hassel, David J. *Searching the Limits of Love*. Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1985.

Lonergan, Bernard. *Insight*. New York: Longmans, 1965.

Maritain, Jacques. *A Preface to Metaphysics*. London: Sheed and Ward, 1943.

Panthanmackel, George. *Coming and Going: An Introduction to Metaphysics from Western Perspectives*. Bangalore: Asian Trading Corporations, 1999.

Panthanmackel, George. 'Ontology, Agapeic' In: *ACPI Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Vol. II. Edited by Johnson Puthenpurackal and George Panthanmackel. Bangalore: Asian Trading Corporations, 2010.

Panthanmackel, George. "From Violence to Peace: Agapeic Ontology as a Philosophical Response." In: *Violence and its Victims: A Challenge to Philosophizing in the Indian Context*. Bangalore: Asian Trading Corporations, 2010.

Rahner, Karl. *Spirit in the World*. London: Sheed and Ward, 1968.