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Abstract: This paper is a study about the Transcendental Reality of matter. I want to investigate what is the extent of the word matter\(^1\), dealing with it as a lexeme not merely reflecting reality but highlighting it, as Paul Klee\(^2\) proposes. Properly speaking the title of the paper should say “The Horizon of the Utopic-Transcendental Reality of ‘Matter’”.
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1. Dedication\(^3\)

In order to honour such an enthusiast of matter as Prof. Escavy, who lives matter and dwells in matter beyond any belief, I cannot do anything but deepen in the long reach and implications of its pure and simple meaning, matter, something there, our only and always reliable grip in life, which “exists before us”, “helps us stand up alive” and will “survive”, always there, ready for us to grip at it.

2. Confronting Matter

Everybody can understand the reverential sense upon the inert corpse of a beloved relative. It is unimportant for you as a relative and friend how to bury him even in its pure ashes as the prosaic and pessimistic argument states, but then you will do with a relish in the non-poetic, rather pessimistic and eschatological Christian motto "memento, homo, quia pulvis es et in pulverem reverteris".

3. Matter, Something Always There

Matter, reliquary of our loftier gestures, beauties and heroism, mere matter, always sustaining us, always at hand, always generous, the generous crucible that missed the more pleasant energy of our young lover matter in the captivated tremors of our living bodies. Our own matter plunged in the matter of our most beloved matter, in the form of the help that our most beloved person provides us spontaneously, for example, to clarify our computer screen, when a greater energy flows in our respective bodies. Our living matter, our bodies intertwined with our fragile and penetrating eyes, through soft hair, electrical antennas of our unmissable, advised and attentive sense of touch, such an accurate watchtower and living thermometer of our bodies in contact.

4. The Paradoxical Lexeme

The criticism of Professor J. C. Chevalier to my tribute to Professor Garcia Berrio aroused in me the feeling of conceiving of matter and defending it as “The Paradoxical Lexeme”, matter, something always there, permanent and eternal. In effect, nothing exists but matter: it “pre-exists”, “assists” and "post-exists" us, at a time. Paradoxically, matter hides all we can see, touch, hear, smell or taste. In addition, what we can take with our hands will go out of our hands and transport us to the unattainable and undefiled talismanic power of our energy.

4.1. Matter and Energy

Who amongst us can even pronounce the word matter with the exact certitude of what it is? Who can firmly state that the

---

\(^1\) Cf. Ramón Trives 2000, pp. 221-235.
\(^2\) Cf. Klee 1985
\(^3\) This paper belongs to my contribution to Tribute to Professor Ricardo Escavy, University of Murcia, (Spain), 2015, [forthcoming]. From these lines I want to thank Prof. Martinez del Castillo for his help in the translation of this paper.
things you say of energy cannot be applied of matter, that it "is neither created nor destroyed, but only transformed", as Lavoisier would say? Is A. Einstein² not right when he puts together energy with mass invigorated by velocity square? Who can deny today that the whole is in everything, as our quantum physicists³ and our poets in the style of Juan Ramón Jiménez⁴ want to and others who are for Edward O. Wilson’s "consilience"⁵, such as J. Wagensber⁶ or Fernando Diez⁷? Who can deny with founded reasons that beauty emanating from the whole is irreducible to each of its parts, they all being material?

4.2. Matter and the Theory of Everything

To a certain extent, energy, the “spirit”, pure or intellective impulse, which thickens and condenses, and materializes or individualizes in each of the existing points in the universe, one and many at a time, in a full convergence with Theory of the Everything or the Whole imposing on any theory. Only circular motion allows the return movement to the same point. As we know, that was already proposed intelligently by the subtle Plotinus, who wittily intuited it through a process of eternal expansion and unperturbed circular return, thus anticipating Nietzsche and, needless to say, the shrewd and unfading Stephen Hawking.

4.3. Matter and Beauty

Who can deny the athlete the beauty of his jump, despite being so real, so material or even more material than the reality of matter of several spectators who barely made any effort?

4.4. Matter Versus non-Matter

_De rerum natura_, by Lucretius, does not consider matter versus non-matter, but some types of matter in front of others, being matter the main analogous of all material or real things.

5. Matter and Real Things

Matter is the stimulus for the development of the material up to the limit of our abilities in a sort of ideology of life in "conatus" or permanent stimulus for an essential survival, or law of life, which is incompatible with the absence of life or death. In effect, philosophy, as explains Emilio Lledó⁸, teaches us not only to die, as Plato intended to, but to live in the best possible way, given for granted that matter, our own matter, that of every one, is always perfectible, and for all those who encourage it with our intimate energetic force or personality, reversible to its originating inanimate state.

6. The Problem of Matter

As you can see, everything is still very confusing, blurred or brownish, not to say "green", still very green, as "the golden tree of life", according to Goethe, and sure, I will have to afford many criticisms, but there is no choice.

6.1. Causal Explanations

Causal explanations abound with the data and arguments in formulations of the problem appearing everywhere in books of science from its very beginning. It is surprising the ease causal explanations slide, as can be seen in the splendid book, _Le corps humain, cet inconnu_ by Robert Jainin⁹, Librairie Hachette, Paris, 1975, whose Spanish translation by A. Jornet Cases, Barcelona, Ediciones Toray, 1980, I am using here. Pages 10 and 11 are illustrative of such abundance of causal explanations:

"We come from a mass of gas wandering in space which four or five billion years ago was condensed to form, amongst the millions of systems in the Galaxy, the solar system one part of which planet Earth is".

"Fascinated by the incomprehensible beauty and complexity of the Universe, and unable to imagine that it would have come out from nothing, for a long time Man tried to explain its appearance through wonderful legends involving gods and geniuses, often in large number".

"Therefore, the Bible tells us about the creation of the World in seven days".

"However, we know that life appeared on Earth only lately. Before, hundreds millions years were required for the different species of living organisms, animals and plants to arise […]".

"The first vestiges of life known, in the form of mineral secretions left by different blue algae can be traced back to two thousand and a half million years. Man made his appearance only one million seven hundred thousand years approximatively. Five thousand million years separate, then, the appearance of the Earth from the first man […]"

"What a long distance we ran since some atoms of hydrogen, oxygen and nitrogen were accidentally combined to form, in the water of oceans, the first living cell! What extraordinary adventure, the one of the first fish which, by chance, came up out the water and began the hard lesson of life on earth, so different from its first element! In some thousands years we dominated and learnt how to use the main natural sources […]"

"Man managed to knock all his enemies out. This brilliant victory will not ever be complete until the day comes when Man will no longer be an enemy to Man".

6.2. De Verbis Non Est Disputandum: Whole, God, Cosmic Intelligence

The text by Jainin is fascinating and instructive, and also disturbing and frustrating. As a matter of fact, without sufficient reason, the data are mixed up with suspicion,
causes with chance. In addition, the obvious and verifiable making of a chain of causes and contributory causes pairs, with no reason other than ignorance, the blind, irrational and capricious chance. In fact, almost no one stops to think about the feasibility of a cosmic intelligence, ultimate reason for everything. In the atheist horizon of the Whole in Stephen Hawking’s, “Theory of Everything” 10, the cosmic intelligence can only be atheist, because there is nothing above, and it is precisely the human being, especially the scientist, the only possible believer. Indeed, scientist, as often Einstein says, discovering cosmic intelligence, cannot do anything but recognize the greatness of the universe and its faultless laws, compatible with cosmic religiosity.

There is no blessed water but rain for a thirsty field in seedtime... A child nourished and sleeping ecstatically and happily in the sweet taste and warmth of the breasts of its mother, the most sacred temple abounding in nature, is the living testimony of the subtlety and undeniable grandeur of the nature of which we all participate.…. This makes us redefine or reject as unfounded the statements expressed in the long text mentioned above. I agree with that text, if we depurate expressions relating to chance, such as "incomprehensible", "accidentally", "by chance", which have no place in a causal and inter-causal universe.

This long text could regain its full acceptability. The chain of universal causality is riding on the law of laws of the living existence on Earth, that is, the law of evolution in its entirety. We can assume evolution in its biogenetic aspects as Ch. Darwin proposes, and in its co-evolution or epigenetic-cultural sense as Edward O. Wilson proposes. In fact, evolution in its entirety can be considered the full explanation of every living being, from the amoeba to Man, whose raison d'être it properly may justify. Law, far from precluding the legislator, requires it. It is well known that evolution is anything but something lacking in intelligence or sense.

Scientists all over the world of all times wonder, ask, seek, look for the real reasons or causes of existence. Scientists are working hard with a kind of horror vacui producing chance as the raison d'être of anything respected. Tireless and incorruptible a scientist will seek the real causes of everything. Scientists enthroned chance as raison d'être of anything existing.

In loving and warm embrace every part in the world receives, in a similar way as "birds on the sky", as Jesus said, anything they need for their existence; mine, for example. There are many situations to think about. The experience of living cannot be separated from mystical experience, as a scientist so rigorous and demanding as E. O. Wilson12 defends, who accepts the reasonable, enthusiastic, mystical experience of Santa Teresa. That kind of joyful rapture, the one after an important dose of anesthesia and the insistent calls of a generous nurse, or rather, that state you go out of when you feel transformed after an extremely happy moment, as for example, the Ecstasy of spouses in fathering their own son, and finally that sublime experience lived by Dr. Eben Alexander13 in his seven days coma, in November 2008, constitute proofs of evidence giving us the chance to think about the greatness of reality, in which we participate.

7. Conclusion

The horizon of the utopic-referential reality of the lexeme matter is the whole in which we all participate but only as a part of it. There is no Whole, God, in the different parts, the existing ones, but it is the Whole the one existing. The absolute, God, is neither male nor female, or anything existing: simply It is. The human being, either atheist or theist, is unable to prove or refute the existence of the Whole, God, because nobody is the Whole or can escape the Whole.
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