

## A Metaphysics of Freedom for the Post-Modern Times

Santino Cavaciuti\*

**Abstract:** The essay upholds the theory of the ontological and metaphysical supremacy of freedom, starting from the thesis of Maine de Biran, concerning the anthropological supremacy of freedom as it is the “power” of initiative and creativity. In the essay, it is showed that the anthropological being-freedom has an essential “vocation” for becoming “love” in the passage from the power of creativity to the act. This passage happens on the basis of the transcendency of the original Being, which, by its for free giving rise to the “multiplicity” of the beings, manifests itself as Absolute Freedom and Creativity, which *ab aeterno* becomes “love”. Such a passage from freedom to love can be phenomenologically observed also in the life of the Saints, in the life of families and in the life of some religious and ascetic communities. According to some extracts from the religious tradition, this passage could also have a cosmic realization. In that way, the draft of a metaphysics of freedom can be delineated, this could also answer the modern crisis of metaphysics founded on pure reason, and its relative nihilism.

**Keywords:** creativity, freedom, love, Maine de Biran, metaphysics, original Being, vocation

### PREMISES

One of the fundamental acquisitions of the modern world is the emergency of *freedom*, not only in relation to politics, but also, at least virtually, on a philosophical level, in going beyond the traditional anthropological and ontological supremacy of the thought<sup>1</sup>.

The thesis I am going to present is exactly the one of the supremacy of freedom, a supremacy that, before and more radically than its realizations in the “practical”, social and political field – through the statement of the democratic idea – finds its fundamental expression in

---

\* Santino Cavaciuti (✉)  
University of Genoa, Italy  
e-mail: santino.cavaciuti@gmail.com

<sup>1</sup> Of this it is possible to see an example, among many, in the Phenomenology of Life by A.-T. Tymieniecka. See Daniela Verducci. 2012. *La Fenomenologia della vita di Anna-Teresa Tymieniecka*.

the anthropological, ontological and “metaphysical” field. In order to present my thesis in the most synthetic and clearest possible way, I will divide it into different points, converging from the historical level – of the *history of philosophy*, of course – to that of *metaphysics*.

## HISTORICAL ORIGIN OF THE THESIS

The theory about the anthropological, ontological and metaphysical supremacy of *freedom*, answers the spirit of modernity and, even more, the so called post-modernity. From the concrete point of view of the genesis of this theory, I must admit that it comes from long years of study on a thinker who is often considered by the French their own Kant, and about whom Henri Bergson used to say that modern metaphysics should follow exactly the thought of this philosopher (see Bergson 1950, 424). I am speaking about François-Pierre-Gontier Maine de Biran<sup>2</sup>.

Certainly the theory of the anthropological and ontological supremacy of *freedom*, both explicit and virtual, has also other origins and other exponents. I am thinking, in particular, of the Italian philosopher Luigi Pareyson (1955). And, besides Pareyson, for whom the same formula “Ontology of freedom” is explicit, it is necessary to remember Schelling, and also Fichte, as Maine de Biran himself did (see Biran 2001, 117). On the other hand I think we should consider Kant, because of his theory related to the supremacy of the *moral* that can evidently find its reason only in the supremacy of freedom on an anthropological level. And, as a logical consequence, the anthropological supremacy of freedom will be exactly the subject of my paper.

---

<sup>2</sup> The studies on Biran of the undersigned author are distributed in 8 volumes, with a general title: *La coscienza morale nel pensiero di Maine de Biran*. The titles and subjects of the single volumes are the following:

- 1) Vol. I: *Maine de Biran: L'uomo e il filosofo*. Milan: Marzorati, 1981, pp. 180;
- 2) Vol. II: *Principi di antropologia*. Milan: Marzorati, 1981, pp. 184;
- 3) Vol. III: *Il concetto di scienza morale*. Massarosa-Lucca: Del Testimone, 1987, pp. 188;
- 4) Vol. IV: *La coscienza morale*. Massarosa-Lucca: Del Testimone, pp. 176;
- 5) Vol. V: *Coscienza morale e corporeità*. Massarosa-Lucca: Del Testimone, 1989, pp. 269;
- 6) Vol. VI: *L'alterità*. Firenze: Cesati, 2004, pp. 235;
- 7) Vol. VII: *Coscienza morale e Trascendenza*. Firenze: Cesati, 2006, pp. 403;
- 8) Vol. VIII: *Il pensiero teologico e religioso di Maine de Biran*. Firenze: Cesati, 2011, pp. 322.

## THE ANTHROPOLOGICAL SUPREMACY OF FREEDOM IN THE PHILOSOPHY OF MAINE DE BIRAN

The theory on the anthropological, ontological and metaphysical supremacy of freedom finds its main, if not exclusive, origin, in the thought of the French philosopher Maine de Biran, and precisely in his doctrine of the *effort* which is not a physical effort, but radically, an interior one, as act of freedom. It is the “effort” through which the *ego*, which, according to Descartes, was made by the *thought* - (we should keep in mind that the French philosophy, more than the common modern philosophy, goes back to the philosophy of Descartes) - , I say the “effort” through which the *ego* becomes aware of himself and in some way even “creates” itself, puts itself into being. Indeed, the “ego” exists as *ego*, as “awareness of itself”, in the act of “telling itself” (inside). And that exactly through an “act”, which is an act peculiar to the “subject”: it is not caused by something external to it: it is therefore a *free* act, put into being by itself. So Biran says that the *ego* is radically *freedom* that is freedom which puts itself into being. And by putting itself into being, the *ego* “feels” itself, it is “awareness of itself”, it is “self-consciousness”.

As it is “awareness of itself”, the freedom which is the *ego*, is, at the same time, a radical “knowledge” of itself, so that the radical “knowledge” – as precisely awareness of itself, results to be internal to *freedom*, not “depending” on *freedom*, but its essential quality. This last theory, of the “knowledge” as internal to *freedom*, is not to be found, as a matter of fact, in the Biranian texts: it is a personal interpretation of mine, or, if we want, the development of an idea, which finds anyway its reasons in the same thought of Biran.

The *being* of man as man is therefore made, according to the Biranian thought, by *freedom*. The theory of the *anthropological supremacy of freedom* comes there from and, on its turn, it is the starting point of the further theory of the *ontological supremacy of freedom*, from which that of *freedom metaphysical and theological supremacy* will follow.

## ONTOLOGICAL SUPREMACY OF FREEDOM

From the theory which establishes the anthropological supremacy of freedom, my reflection brought me to a further and more radical development of my thought: that of the *ontological supremacy of*

*freedom*, according to which the *being*, in its original version, should be considered as *freedom*.

Of course we must specify the sense in which such freedom should be considered, already on the anthropological level. It is not exactly the freedom as it is generally considered, that is the *freedom* as “absence of constraint” on the *individual*, *social* and *political* level, but – according to what emerges from the idea itself of the Biranian *effort* – it is that of *freedom* as “power” of “initiative”, that is to say, of “creation”, of “putting into being”, of something “new”, not caused in a deterministic way, as it happens with the common “natural” phenomena.

We have to highlight that the being as it is generally considered, that of the common experience, is not the original being. The chain of causality, which characterizes the being of experience and is at the origin of the single material beings, does not have in itself its last reason, and therefore must be referred to the original being. Aristotle and the Aristotelism – which dominated the history of thought for a long time – had theorized, at the top of the causing chain, the Thought of Thought, as the “final Cause” of the world; but the “thought” as such is not “causing”, it is not an “efficient cause”. If in the beginning there were the pure thought, we could not come to justify the “multiplicity” of the beings, not even their existence. Aristotle himself did not justify it, since the Thought's Thought has the beings before itself: it passively attracts them to itself, but it has not efficiently caused them. To come into being, the multiplicity of the beings needs that there is something like a power of “initiative”, a power of “creativity”, that is exactly the freedom in the sense above mentioned.

The freedom, experimented in man on the level of “action” as a free action, that is a not externally determined action, is the “key” – I repeat – to understand the *origin* of the *being* as it is generally considered. Only if we admit the *being* as *freedom* in the beginning, we understand the existence of the *being* as it is *generally experimented* and, in particular, the “plurality” of the beings, which can be justified only if we admit that the *original being* is a “power of creativity”, that is a power of putting into being new entities: we should have, otherwise, only one being as pantheism would like).

Now, of the free, original causality, there are traces in the world itself, although it is dominated by mechanical, deterministic causality. Such traces – if we can call them so – are made, first of all, by the

being of man, where, in relation to the common “physical nature”, a form of free causality emerges, which is exactly the human freedom.

But, according to some scholars of the physical world, some traces of freedom would exist also in the world of nature itself<sup>3</sup>, where subatomic particles would not be subject to deterministic laws.

As we have so specified the sense of the theory which states the *ontological supremacy of freedom*, considered, such *freedom*, as the *original being*, without which it is not possible to acknowledge the existence of the common being of experience, the being of nature, the being of the world (unless we satisfy ourselves in considering the physical world as self-sufficient, according to the materialistic option, which is not an “explanation” but a simple uncritical “acceptance” of the reality of the world), we still have to determine the nature of this *original freedom*, of this *original being*, considered as *freedom*. Such “specification” is what makes the subject of “metaphysics” as I want to mean in this study.

#### THE CREATIVE “TRANSCENDENCY” OF THE ORIGINAL BEING AS A METAPHYSICAL IDEA

My theory on the transcendency of the original Being refers, again, to the anthropological level of the being, highlighting precisely to the fact that, in man, it emerges a freedom “transcending” the pure physicalism, since human life cannot be reduced to the common laws of the physical/biological world, which are deterministic laws, except for those “traces” of freedom, which some scholars recognize in the same physical world, as above mentioned.

In conclusion, we can speak about some form of “transcendency” of *freedom* in relation to the same “body” of man. Even acting in the body, freedom reveals a different nature from the body, above all due to the fact – I repeat – that it is not subject to the laws of determinism; in this sense *freedom* “transcends” the body.

Now it is clear that, what we acknowledge in the human being, should be acknowledged also for the Freedom which is at the origin of

---

<sup>3</sup> About the “creative” character – and in this sense the free character – of some aspects or particles of the physical world, we can see, among others, A. Gesché. 1994. *Le cosmos*; J. Guitton, G. Bogdanov, I. Bogdanov. 1991. *Dieu et la science : vers le metarealisme*; I. Prigogine, I. Stengers. 1986. *La nouvelle alliance. Metamorphose de la science*; H. R. Maturana, F. J. Varela. 2009. *Autopoiesis and cognition: the realization of the living*.

the being of the world, for its “transcendancy” in relation to the world: that is to say, it must have a nature not limited to that of the world, not subject to determinism, and in this sense “transcending” the world.

Now there are two extreme hypotheses, which both, after all, cannot be maintained. One is to consider such “transcendancy” absolutely similar to that which is acknowledged to human freedom: that is to say, just as the freedom of man is immanent in man’s body, in the same way the Freedom which creates the world would be immanent to the world itself, as its “soul”.

The other hypothesis, on the contrary, is to exclude any present relation between the Freedom which creates the world and the world itself.

The first hypothesis seems to be so interesting that many, even starting from different theoretical positions from mine, that is to say, of *freedom* as original being, have formulated the hypothesis of the Creator considered as “Soul” of the world.

But if we think more deeply, we must admit that, in the “analogy” between God and man, there is also a substantial difference, because the creative Freedom has not had before it a “body” to give life to, but a reality, indeed, to “create”. The “transcendancy” of the Creator is only partially similar to that of human freedom. It is a “transcendancy” which must be thought as existing in itself, even without the world, that it has radically put into being, where, on the contrary, human freedom exists in relation to a “body” which it has not created, and of which it is, in fact, the “soul”.

I think, therefore, that an accurate reflection drops the hypothesis of the creative Freedom as “Soul of the world” as it happens with the human freedom in relation to the body. The world cannot be the “body” of the creative Freedom in the same way as it happens between the soul and the body of man.

The second hypothesis is that of such “transcendancy”, of the Creator, that it excludes any relation between God and the world, beyond the creative moment, in the sense of the exclusion of a “care” that God might have of the world: it is the hypothesis that, even starting from different positions, follows the line of the Aristotelian idea of God as First Immobile Mover, who “moves” the world only as a final Cause.

Now, such hypothesis cannot be maintained at all in the thesis I am presenting here, of the Creator as Freedom. As a matter of fact, also on the human level, what happens because of a free act is “wanted”

explicitly by the author of the act; it is therefore natural that the “author” *wants* his actions to be “completed”. Therefore, it is natural and logic to think that the creative Freedom wants and works in order that the Creation may reach its “accomplishment”.

This action of God-Freedom, which goes beyond the “initial” creative act, has a well definite name: it is the Divine Providence. This Providence is, in some way, the continuation of the first creative act. The world, we could say, has not been created all at once: it comes to a “completion” gradually during the course of time, in which, together with the *natural laws*, and with the *free actions* of man, the creative Freedom, which is God, continues to act.

The analysis which has been carried out up to this point has therefore brought us to acknowledge the *original Being* as made by *freedom*, precisely by the *transcendent Freedom*, by a transcendency which is not anyway totally alien to the world; a freedom which identifies itself with the religious concept of God, who should be considered as Freedom, precisely as Absolute Freedom.

But, once we have established the concept of the *original being* as *freedom*, with the consequences that follow, and above all the idea of God as Freedom, we have not yet concluded the *metaphysical speech* relative to the *original being* as *freedom*: we shall see that such *being-freedom*, both as Absolute Freedom, and as “given freedom”, is not a completed being, if we consider it only as *freedom*. Precisely on this “incompleteness” and on the process of its “accomplishment”, I shall insist in the following paragraph, which will be the height of my speech.

#### “LOVE” IS THE LAW OF THE “ACCOMPLISHMENT” OF FREEDOM, STARTING FROM THE ABSOLUTE BEING

If we carefully examine *freedom*, we acknowledge that it is essentially “power” of “initiative”, that is to say, of putting something “new” into being, something “not limited” necessarily by deterministic laws, as the laws which govern the world of nature reveal themselves to be.

Now, the putting into being of new entities has a well definite name: that is to say, *love*. Love is exactly donation of being; indeed, it is donation, donation of one’s own being (on this subject, on the “natural” level, the best example is the emblematic figure of the “mother”). Therefore *freedom*, as power of “initiative”, of “creativity”, of donation of being, reveals itself, if we examine it closely, as “power” and “possibility” of *love*. So it “fulfils itself”, it passes from

the “possibility” to the “act”, when it becomes “donation”, that is to say, when it becomes *love*. Consequently it is logical to say that the “fulfilment” of *freedom* is *love*.

On this ground we must say that freedom is not given once for all, but that it is governed, in some way, by the law of *self-realization, self-fulfilment*: freedom has in itself the law – which is an “invitation”, not a constraint, otherwise it would not be freedom – of *self-fulfilment*, precisely in *love*.

Now, this “law” – “law-invitation” or “law call”– of *freedom*, according to which freedom is destined to “fulfil itself” – and it fulfils itself when it becomes *love* – is working, I think I can say, in the reality of God (by saying that, I do not mean to enter the Mystery of God, but if it seems so, I apologize). I mean that Freedom, which is God, has fulfilled itself, eternally and completely, and has become *Love*.

Therefore, the idea of God as Love, peculiar to the Christian truth, would not only be a truth revealed from the supernatural level, but it could be reached, in some way and certainly in a much more imperfect way, by the human reason, provided that we start, as in the present paper, from the ontological supremacy of freedom.

And more: the idea of the “fulfilment” of Freedom, which is God, in Love, could be included, in some way, in the Trinitarian Mystery, in the sense that Love, which is God, becomes real in the “Generation” of the Word and in the “Procession” of the Holy Spirit, as concrete and precisely “personal” forms, together with the Father, of the Love which is God.

I think that this “new way” of considering the transcendency and the truth of the absolute Being, that is of God as Freedom, represents also a new way of considering Metaphysics, which could be defined the Metaphysics of Freedom, of the *being-freedom*.

This point of view (which is not the principal and fundamental one) gives a new value, on the philosophical and strictly theoretical level, to the emerging theme of *freedom* which characterizes the modern age on the social and political level, through the assertion of the democratic idea.

The present paper, even if it has not started from the *social* background – but from a *historical* background, of history of philosophy – has so found again, from the height of the metaphysical level, the concrete historical and social reality of the contemporary world, of which it could be – I dare to say – a superior interpretation

and also an implicit philosophical evaluation of the historical and social reality of the contemporary world.

But it could also represent an implicit essential indication for a further development of such contemporaneity. Now it is this theme I would like to mention, just mention, as a summary and integration of my speech. This “mention” wants, however, a fundamental specification. I would like to say once more that *freedom*, on all levels – individual, social, political -, even though it is a great, enormous value, it is not anyway a definitive value – and we have already seen the reasons -. To give a name to this idea of mine, I say that freedom as it is generally understood, is the “initial freedom”, only “initial”: it is not all the freedom.

Indeed, peculiar to freedom, I repeat, is the fact of being “power” of “initiative”, of “creativity”, “power” to produce something not in a deterministic way, as it happens, on the contrary, for the common “natural” world. In freedom there is, therefore, on one side, the non-determination, and, on the other side, the “power of initiative”, of “creativity”. Now, freedom on the social and political level as it is generally known, consists on one side only in the “non-determination”; but this is only the basis of freedom, it is not the whole freedom; it consists, above all, in granting, on the social and political level, precisely, the faculty of acting in a non deterministic way, and in having some power “to choose” who should govern, not to be obliged by some external authority, as it happens, on the contrary, in the absolute governments.

But freedom, as power of “creation”, cannot be limited to the *non-constraint*: this could be called, in some way, “negative freedom”, in the sense, precisely, of the *non-constraint* in the social and political environment. Freedom – I say – is also and above all “positive”, it is power of “initiative”; and finds its fulfilment only when it carries out its “possibility”, that is to say, when it becomes initiative, creativity “in act”.

And the creativity in act, the “donation of being” – as it is, in fact, the creativity in act - has a precise name: as I have already said, its name is *love*. That’s it: the realization of the *initial freedom* is *love*.

Therefore we can say that the “vocation” (and this is another essential term of my paper) of *freedom*, is to become *love*. I say “vocation”, because while reflecting on itself, freedom feels its “possibility” of “initiative”, a possibility that, like all possibilities, “calls” to its fulfilment. Likewise (to give a simple but useful

example), a person who feels he “can” walk, feels the “call” which invites him to carry out this possibility (we find proof of that in all physical activities especially physical training).

This “vocation” for love, which is present in the “initial freedom”, is peculiar, first of all and above all, to the *individual* (the social and political freedom does not feel, at least immediately, this “vocation”: it is limited, normally, to the “negative freedom”, which consists in the defense of an aspect of the *initial freedom*: that of the *non-constraint* in some social and political environments). But could we say that the “vocation” to mature freedom to become love is also, after all, peculiar to *society* and *politics*?

With regard mainly to society, I would say that at least in its origin, such “vocation” is real and working. In fact, in the *family* – which is the living cell of society – we should understand, I think, that there is a passage from the “initial freedom” of the single consorts to the ripening of such freedom into *love*, which is precisely the soul of the family. It is for that reason that the family is “donor” of being, as it gives birth to children.

As the family is the cell of society, it is logical to think that the law which governs and guides the family should also be the law of *society* –that is to say that also in society there could be space for the maturing of *freedom* - which in society is, mainly, as we have seen, “negative” freedom (in the sense above mentioned) - there could be space, I say, for the maturing of this freedom to become *love*.

We cannot certainly think that this happens normally, and that we can find societies in which freedom matures to become love. Anyway it is not impossible to find some examples: I think of “religious societies” of the Christian world which, if they are true, they are governed indeed by *love*, as Christian “charity”. In them the “initial freedom” of the single individuals has become a mutual *love*, which keeps them together to share the same ideal of life. If, therefore, we can say we cannot normally see this passage from the *initial freedom* to *love* – but this happens with difficulty even with the single individuals and maybe very seldom- we can say that we find at least some partial sign of it – as we have seen – which could be the beginning of its development also in society in general, even if partial.

With regard to the States and the world of “politics”, the problem is even more complex. Anyway it is not impossible to see some indicative signs of the thesis which has been presented here. With regard to this, we could consider the engagement of the State – at least

of some States – to take the initiatives that had been characteristic, until now, of the charitable action of the *individuals* and of some religious associations. Won't it be possible to read, in this phenomenon, a vague reference to what could be called the “maturation” of the “initial freedom” – that, on the political level, more than on the social level, is only “negative freedom” - towards a form of “fulfilled”, “realized” freedom, that is to say, a new form of love?

## CONCLUSION

Looking back to the path I followed in this speech, I think I can say that, a “metaphysics of freedom”, as it is presented here, can find a confirmation, on the level of the human being and on the level of the Divine Being.

Indeed, the Divine Being considered as Freedom, allows to acknowledge, even in a rational speech (in the sense of not depending essentially but depending historically – on a supernatural revelation), the Christian conception of God as *Love*, considered, precisely, as the “maturation” of Freedom which came from eternity in God – therefore to be considered not as a fact of the past, but as present in every moment of time (which is embraced by eternity: it is not external to it), so that we may say, in some way, that God continuously becomes Love.

And such “maturation” in Love should be regarded – in harmony and in a renewed “interpretation” of the data of the Christian Revelation according to the Christian theology – as that which eternally gives origin to the “Generation” of the Word and to the “Procession” of the Holy Spirit.

In the Divine Being, therefore, the “maturation” of Freedom in Love is so perfect, that it can be identified with Love itself, which is God, differently from the freedom of the creatures, which has never completely matured in Love, which is never completely *love*, if not in what in the Christian conception is called Paradise, of which we have a very high interpretation in Dante Alighieri's *Divine Comedy*: but it is a truth of a supernatural order, not of a rational datum.

This maturation is reached by the Saints more than by the common people, and anyway with a huge gap between them. But, since the “law” of the *being* is, in some way, a “call”, an “invitation”, immanent in the *being-freedom*, such “maturation” knows also inferior forms, on the level of the common people. So – as we have seen – it is of the “families”, where we see a maturation of freedom which is both

spiritual and physiological, and where it resumes and realizes, in a sense, on the level of the “natural” world, the idea of the maturation of the “initial freedom”.

Some form of maturation of freedom in love can be found also on a social level – as we have seen -, in the *ascetic, religious* associations which aim, as such, to the exercise of *charity*, as the Second Vatican Council stated (see Vatican Council II [1965] 1966), “charity” which is love of God above all, but which is also love for the neighbour, therefore love on the social level.

With regard to the other form of the social *human*, that is the State, the “law- invitation” of the maturation of *freedom in love*, could be seen operating, at least as a “sign” – I repeat -, in the initiatives of the States, of some States, to manage some business born as expression of charity: for example nursing service, helping the poor and so on.

If we carefully watch the existence of human creatures on all levels, it would really seem that, beyond the moral deviations, beyond the refusal that the “law- invitation” receives by many, maybe by most people, it finds its way, somehow, in the life and in the history of human creatures.

However, we must remark that the idea of the “law-invitation” of the maturation of the *freedom in love* does not eliminate, it does not want to eliminate all that is outside the “invitation”, that is the world of the “constrictive laws”, codified in the law and operating necessarily in the concrete life of the individuals and of society.

But with regard to the “law-invitation”, peculiar to freedom, and, more precisely, with regard to the *being* as such, or, more exactly, the finished *being*, the reality of the *world*, to be considered as a “participation” of the Freedom which is God, we must say that it, the world too (as it is exactly a “participation” of the being of God, who is Freedom) should be considered, taken as a whole, on the way to a “maturation” similar to the one which is eternally realized in God.

In this sense the action of the divine Providence should be understood, as an action which aims at the realization of a superior harmony and goodness – as it is precisely *love* – in the whole reality of the world. Here some passages of the Holy Scriptures, which speak precisely of a possible future superior peace, freedom and harmony

among all creatures of the world<sup>4</sup>, find their - in some way also - “rational” place.

I think that the theory I upheld here, can confirm the thesis of the *metaphysics of freedom* as a possible interpretation – besides, of course, its primary ontological value – of our “post-modern” world, which has lost confidence in the absolute supremacy of *reason*, a supremacy which has characterized the modern age, precisely a “rationalistic” age. Nihilism can neither answer nor be the only consequence of the crisis of *reason* – as some would say -, but exactly a philosophy which leans on another faculty, or, it would be better to say, on another aspect in which the “spirit” reveals itself, that is to say, *freedom*. On the other hand, while freedom justifies the emergency, on a social and political level, of the *democratic* regime, it should be considered – and this is quite a new theory in the philosophy of freedom – as a “dynamic” freedom “inside” (not only in its working “outside”), that is to say, a freedom which is not given once for all and wholly, but which gradually finds the way to “realize” itself. This freedom must conquer itself, and become *love*, by analogy, we would say, with what we see in the creature which is at the top - we might say – of the world, as she was the last to be created by the Creator: I mean the *woman*, who (considering here only the “natural” level - and not the “spiritual” one, which is peculiar to human creatures -) is not happy and fully satisfied with herself when she sees her beauty contemplated (even though this can already be considered the supreme expression of the splendour of the world), but she is happy and fully satisfied when she can hold the fruit of her own love in her arms.

Translated by Ornella Castellani

#### REFERENCES:

- Bergson, Henri. 1950. *Ecrits et paroles*. Paris: P.U.F.  
Gesché, Adolphe. 1994. *Le cosmos*. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf.  
Guitton, Jean, Grichka Bogdanov, Igor Bogdanov. 1991. *Dieu et la science: vers le métarealisme*. Paris: B. Grasset.  
Maine de Biran, François-Pierre. 2001. *Essai sur les fondements de la psychologie*. Paris: Vrin.

---

<sup>4</sup> See St. Paul. *Letter to the Romans*, VIII, 21: “the whole creation itself might be freed from its slavery to corruption and brought into the same glorious freedom as the children of God” [https://www.catholic.org/bible/book.php?id=52&bible\\_chapter=8](https://www.catholic.org/bible/book.php?id=52&bible_chapter=8) [accessed: August 16, 2018].

- Maturana, Humberto R., Francisco J. Varela. 2009. *Autopoiesis and Cognition: The Realization of the Living*. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- Pareyson, Luigi. 1955. *Ontologia della libertà*. Torino: Einaudi.
- Prigogine, Ilya and Isabelle Stengers. 1986. *La nouvelle alliance. Metamorphose de la science*. Paris: Gallimard.
- St. Paul. *Letter to the Romans*.
- Vatican Council II. [1965] 1966. Decree on *Perfectae caritatis*, October 28, 1965. In *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, 58: 702-712, *Enchiridion Vaticanum* 1/702-770.
- Verducci, Daniela. 2012. *La Fenomenologia della vita di Anna-Teresa Tymieniecka*. Rome: Aracne.