water sound:
notes toward a metaphysics of relation, presence and return

Modern science does not require a metaphysical exegesis of reality as fully reducible to external structure and representation, but may instead point toward a relational world in which individuality, duration, and form emerge through communal participation within a reality that remains open beyond every achieved form of closure.

We usually begin from the assumption that the world is already there. Objects surround us. Events occur. Space stretches outward. Time moves forward. Science, we are told, explains how these things behave and interact. The world appears stable because it appears composed of stable things.

This way of seeing feels natural because it works. We can measure objects, predict motions, build technologies, and represent regularities with astonishing precision. Through formal models and mathematical structures, modern science has learned to grasp patterns hidden within the natural world and to coordinate them with extraordinary effectiveness. Increasingly, however, it has become easy to forget that these models are still representations. A map may guide us faithfully through a landscape without ever becoming the landscape itself.

And yet this distinction is difficult to hold in place for long. The more successful a representation becomes, the more invisible the difference between form and actuality can seem. We begin speaking as though the formal structure simply is the reality it represents. Equations cease appearing as interpretive forms and begin appearing as the hidden substance of the world itself. The measurable object becomes more real than the encounter from which it first emerged.

This habit of thought extends far beyond physical science. We speak of the mind as though it were information, of organisms as though they were mechanisms, of language as though it were code. More and more, reality appears as something completely available to representation. The world becomes a collection of determinate objects awaiting description within an already completed framework of relations.

But there is another side to experience that resists this closure quietly and persistently.

A conversation cannot be reduced to the words that were spoken. A living being exceeds every concept we form about it. A piece of music is not present all at once before us like a geometric figure. It unfolds. Its meaning

depends upon memory, anticipation, rhythm, resonance, and participation in time. The score may appear completely before the eye, but the music itself only exists through enactment.

Perhaps this difference matters more than we usually suppose.

• • •

In science, we often speak as though form and actuality were the same thing. The assumption is so familiar that it rarely draws attention to itself. A scientific theory describes a phenomenon. A mathematical equation captures a regularity. A concept identifies a thing. Gradually, almost imperceptibly, the represented form begins to stand in for the actuality from which it was abstracted. The distinction fades into the background.

Yet in ordinary experience the distinction never fully disappears.

A photograph may preserve the visible structure of a face while failing to preserve the living presence of the person. A written score may specify every note of a composition while remaining silent until someone performs it. Even the most precise description of a landscape cannot replace the experience of standing within it. Something remains irreducible in the actuality of encounter itself.

This irreducibility is difficult to formalize because it is not simply additional information waiting to be incorporated into a more complete description. We can endlessly refine representations without ever eliminating the difference between representation and presence. The difference belongs not merely to the limits of knowledge, but to the nature of actuality itself.

Perhaps this is why certain experiences resist the language of objects altogether. A melody does not exist in the same way a geometric figure exists. We cannot hold the whole of it before ourselves at once. A melody depends upon unfolding relation. Each note receives significance through retention of what has passed and anticipation of what is coming. The meaning of the music is not contained within isolated points, but arises through continuity across time.

At first this may seem like a simple difference between static and temporal forms. But the distinction runs deeper than that. A structure may appear completely before an observer all at once. A dynamical form, by contrast, only exists through participation in its unfolding. One may inspect a structure from outside. A dynamical form must be entered into.

This difference begins quietly to transform the way we think about reality. For if some forms only exist through participation, then perhaps actuality cannot be fully understood as a collection of completed objects situated within external relations. Perhaps what appears stable and self-contained at the surface depends upon continuities that cannot fully appear all at once.

• • •

Music offers an important clue because its unity does not arise from isolated parts assembled externally together. A melody is not simply a succession of notes. The individual notes matter, but no single note contains the music by itself. Even the relation between adjacent notes is not enough. The music emerges through multiple continuities unfolding together: rhythm, harmony, phrasing, tension, resolution, expectation, remembrance. Layers of form move in synchrony across time.

Some of these patterns remain close to immediate perception. Others only become visible gradually. A theme may quietly return much later in a composition transformed by everything that has happened in between. Meaning gathers itself through participation in the unfolding whole.

What is true of music may also hold more generally. A conversation cannot be reduced to individual words. A living organism cannot be understood merely by cataloguing its material components. Even a scientific theory depends upon nested relations of meaning extending beyond any isolated proposition. In each case, what appears at the surface depends upon layered continuities operating across different scales of organization.

We often imagine hierarchy as a rigid arrangement imposed from above. Yet there is another way to think about it. A hierarchy of forms need not be a ladder of separate levels. It may instead be an unfolding depth of participation in which broader continuities sustain and gather more localized expressions into coherence. The larger pattern does not erase the particular. It allows the particular to become meaningful within a wider field of relation.

This changes the meaning of interiority. We usually imagine the interior as something hidden inside an object, as though depth were merely concealed location. But the depth of a piece of music is not hidden inside the notes. It exists through the layered continuity of the unfolding itself. Depth belongs to relation before it belongs to containment.

Perhaps the same is true of reality more generally. What we encounter immediately may not be self-sufficient in the way we often assume. The visible form of a thing may be the surface stabilization of deeper relational

continuities that cannot fully appear all at once. The object seems complete only because the depth from which it emerges remains partially concealed within the immediacy of its appearance.

Yet this concealment is never absolute. We continue to sense, however dimly, that reality exceeds the structures through which we attempt to represent it. Sometimes this excess appears not as abstraction, but as presence. A particular moment. A voice. A gesture. Something irreducibly here. Something that cannot be exchanged without loss.

. . .

It is tempting at this point to treat depth itself as the ultimate reality, as though the visible world were merely a thin illusion suspended over a deeper process beneath. Yet this temptation repeats, in another form, the same movement we have already begun to question. We simply replace static objects with hidden dynamical structures and imagine that we have gone further into reality. But actuality continues to resist this reduction as well.

For the actuality of something is never exhausted by the role it plays within a larger pattern. A living being is not merely an instance of biological form. A voice is not merely a modulation within a linguistic system. Even in music, no performance can be replaced by another without remainder. The form may persist across performances, but each enactment remains singular. Something irreplaceable enters the world in the event itself.

We encounter this constantly in experience, though we rarely pause to reflect upon it in science. Certain moments seem to gather reality into unusual intensity: a sudden silence in conversation, the expression on a face before words arise, the way light appears briefly across a familiar room. Such moments are often ordinary. Nothing "supernatural" interrupts the world from outside. And yet the experience can carry a strange inexhaustibility, as though the actuality of what is present exceeds every attempt to contain it conceptually.

In science, this excess is difficult to speak about because scientific language naturally moves toward generality. Concepts stabilize repeatable forms. Without this capacity, thought itself would become impossible. Yet actuality always appears as particular. Here. Now. This. No matter how refined our scientific concepts become, they never fully absorb the singularity of the encounter from which they arise.

Perhaps this is why the world cannot finally be reduced either to isolated objects or to formal systems of relation alone. Form matters because without form there would be no continuity, no intelligibility, no enduring patterns through which meaning could gather itself over time. But actuality matters because reality is never encountered in general. It is always encountered in particularity.

The difficulty is that we often imagine the particular as though it were simply a smaller version of the general: an individual object instantiating a universal form. But actuality does not merely instantiate form. Actuality discloses form through participation while simultaneously exceeding every formulation of it. The living moment both reveals and surpasses the structures that make it intelligible.

It may be that this tension lies near the center of metaphysical reflection. We seek continuity because reality exhibits continuity. We seek intelligibility because the world is not chaos. Yet every act of understanding also encounters something irreducible in the actuality before it. Something that remains present without becoming fully containable.

And perhaps it is precisely here that another possibility of thinking begins to open.

. . .

Modern thought has often tried to resolve this tension by choosing one side over the other. Some approaches privilege stable forms and seek certainty through fixed structures, universal laws, and completed systems of explanation. Others privilege becoming, flux, and process, dissolving enduring form into movement alone. Yet neither approach seems fully adequate to experience. For reality appears neither as a collection of frozen objects nor as an undifferentiated stream without continuity. We encounter enduring forms, but we also encounter the living actuality that continually exceeds them.

Perhaps the difficulty arises from the tendency to think of relations as external connections between already completed things. If objects are taken as primary, then relation appears secondary: a bridge constructed afterward between independent units. But many aspects of experience suggest something different. The identity of a melody depends upon relations internal to its unfolding. The meaning of a word depends upon its place within a living language. Even the continuity of a self depends upon memory, anticipation, embodiment, and participation in a world shared with others. Remove these relations entirely and the supposed “independent object” becomes strangely empty.

This does not mean that individuality disappears into a vague relational whole. On the contrary, relation may be precisely what allows actuality to become determinate in the first place. A note receives significance through its relation to the unfolding composition. A gesture receives meaning through the living context in which it appears. A person becomes who they are not in isolation from the world, but through participation within layered continuities of language, memory, culture, embodiment, and care.

At the same time, participation never fully dissolves particularity into general form. No person becomes interchangeable with another simply because both participate in the same language or culture. No performance becomes identical to another merely because the same composition is played. Relation sustains continuity without eliminating singularity.

This may help explain why reality so often appears deeper than our representations of it. We naturally seek stable objects because stable forms make thought possible. Yet what we encounter concretely is never simply a detached object standing alone before observation. Every actuality appears within a field of relations extending beyond immediate visibility. The visible thing gathers within itself histories, potentials, meanings, and continuities that exceed what is explicitly present at the surface.

We sense this especially strongly in encounters that matter to us. A familiar place carries memories that are not visibly contained within its physical structure. A single word can reopen an entire world of feeling and association. The face of another person is never merely a visible arrangement of features. Something addresses us through it that cannot be reduced to what is objectively given.

It is difficult to speak carefully here because language quickly pushes us toward abstraction. Yet perhaps abstraction itself depends upon something more primordial: the living possibility of relation through which actuality becomes meaningful at all. Before the world becomes an object of explanation, it first becomes present through participation.

. . .

This possibility becomes difficult to ignore once we begin to notice how deeply our understanding of the world is intertwined with our understanding of ourselves. We often imagine that metaphysics concerns only abstract theories about reality “out there,” while our inner lives belong to a separate domain of psychology or subjective experience. Yet the distinction is not so clean. The way we imagine the structure of reality quietly shapes the way we imagine our own existence within it.

If reality is understood primarily as a collection of isolated objects governed through external relations, then the self naturally comes to appear in similar terms: a self-contained individual located within an external world, confronting reality from a position of separation. Knowledge then becomes a matter of constructing increasingly accurate internal representations of an independently existing exterior order. Meaning becomes information. Relation becomes exchange between already completed units.

This orientation has produced extraordinary achievements, particularly within the natural sciences. Yet it also leaves behind a persistent sense of estrangement. For our actual experience of being is never entirely reducible to detached observation. We do not first exist as sealed entities and only afterward enter into relation. From the beginning, our lives unfold within networks of language, memory, embodiment, culture, affection, dependence, and interpretation. Even solitude presupposes a world already shared.

Participation may not be something added afterward to already completed identities. A child enters language long before understanding language conceptually. Meaning arrives through participation before it becomes an object of reflection. Recognition gathers gradually through continuities extending across time. What we call a self may emerge within these layered continuities rather than standing apart from them. The self, then, may not be an isolated object possessing relations secondarily. It may instead emerge through continuity of participation within relational fields that precede explicit self-awareness. Identity itself may involve layered continuities extending across time.

This does not abolish individuality. On the contrary, it may help explain why individuality possesses such depth. A person is not merely a point-like unit bounded by external limits. Nor are they simply dissolved into collective process. The continuity of a self depends upon the ongoing coordination of innumerable relations unfolding across different scales synchronously: bodily rhythms, memory, perception, language, social life, aspiration, care, imagination. Some of these relations remain near conscious awareness. Others operate silently beneath it. Yet together they sustain the continuity through which a life becomes recognizable as this particular life rather than another.

Perhaps this is why the self can never become fully transparent to itself. We often seek complete self-knowledge as though the self were an object that could eventually be grasped in totality. But the very continuity through which understanding becomes possible exceeds any isolated moment of reflection. We participate within forms of meaning larger than what can be held explicitly before consciousness all at once.

The same may be true of reality more generally. What appears immediately at the surface may depend upon layered continuities that cannot fully become objects of representation without losing something essential in the process. Depth withdraws not because it is unreal, but because participation always exceeds complete exteriorization.

And yet this withdrawal is not merely absence. It is also what allows the world to remain capable of disclosure.

• • •

Perhaps this is why disclosure always carries a strange reciprocity within it. What becomes present is never simply imposed from one side alone. A world wholly exterior and fully complete in itself could only be observed from the outside. But neither could disclosure arise from an isolated interior detached from reality. Something else seems to occur in genuine encounter: a mutual participation through which meaning gradually comes into presence.

This can be difficult to notice because we are accustomed to thinking in terms of separate poles: subject and object, inner and outer, self and world. Once these divisions are taken as primary, relation appears only afterward as a secondary connection between already completed terms. Yet many forms of experience resist this interpretation. In conversation, for example, meaning often emerges between speakers in ways neither fully possesses in advance. In music, the listener does not merely receive a completed object passively from outside. The music becomes itself through the unfolding participation that allows its continuity to gather into presence.

Something similar may be true more generally. What we call “the world” is never encountered as a collection of neutral surfaces alone. Nor is meaning projected arbitrarily upon an otherwise empty reality. Disclosure seems instead to depend upon a reciprocity between layered continuities that partially mirror one another without ever becoming identical. Meaning arises through this resonance.

Perhaps this is why depth so often withdraws precisely at the point where we attempt to isolate it completely. Once relation is frozen into externally bounded objects, the living continuity through which disclosure occurs begins to disappear. Yet the withdrawal is not merely concealment. It also preserves the openness through which further disclosure remains possible. What withdraws does not vanish into absence; it continues to sustain the possibility of meaning from beyond what can be fully exteriorized at the surface.

This may help explain why the world can suddenly appear transformed without anything materially changing. A familiar place, a remembered phrase, a passing sound may become newly present through a subtle reorganization of relation. The visible world remains the same, and yet something deeper begins to disclose itself through it. Not as hidden information added onto the surface, but as a change in the continuity through which the surface itself becomes meaningful.

The more carefully we attend to this movement, the more difficult it becomes to think of reality as either a closed system of objects or a purely subjective construction imposed from within. Disclosure belongs neither entirely to the world nor entirely to the observer. It emerges through participation in relational continuities that exceed both poles while sustaining the possibility of each. And perhaps it is precisely this excess that allows actuality to remain inexhaustible rather than finally reducible to completed form.

. . .

Once relation is understood in this way, infinity can no longer mean simply endless extension. We often imagine the infinite quantitatively: more space, more time, more objects added indefinitely together. But the inexhaustibility encountered in disclosure possesses a different character. It does not appear as boundless accumulation. It appears through depth.

A single moment may disclose more than can ever be fully articulated within it. A piece of music may continue unfolding new significance long after its final note has passed. The face of another person cannot be exhausted by any description we give of it. Even the most familiar places sometimes appear suddenly renewed, as though something within them had remained quietly waiting beyond habitual recognition.

This excess is easy to overlook because it does not usually announce itself dramatically. It often appears within ordinary experience precisely at the point where representation begins to thin out and actuality becomes strangely present. We sense that something more is there, not as hidden information waiting to be extracted, but as a depth that cannot be fully converted into objectified form.

Perhaps this is why reality continually resists closure. The difficulty does not arise merely because our knowledge remains incomplete, as though a sufficiently comprehensive representation might one day eliminate every remainder. Rather, disclosure itself seems to depend upon a kind of openness that cannot be fully sealed without destroying the very possibility of meaning. If everything could be made completely exterior and fully present all at once, nothing new could ever genuinely appear.

This openness belongs not only to thought, but to actuality itself. Every moment participates in continuities larger than what can be explicitly contained within it. Yet these continuities do not abolish the singularity of the moment. On the contrary, they allow actuality to disclose depths that exceed every attempt at final formulation. The particular remains inexhaustible not despite its finitude, but through it.

Perhaps this is why certain ideas have always occupied a strange place within human thought. Infinity, unity, nothingness, origin — these do not behave like ordinary objects of representation. The moment we attempt to grasp them as completed conceptual things, they begin slipping beyond the boundaries we impose upon them. They seem less like objects among other objects than signs pointing beyond the possibility of complete closure itself.

And yet these signs remain inseparable from ordinary experience. They emerge wherever actuality exceeds the forms through which we attempt to contain it. They appear whenever disclosure opens onto depths that remain real without becoming fully exteriorized. The world continues to become present through this excess, and thought continues to unfold within it.

• • •

Perhaps this is why closure has always exercised such fascination within human thought. We long for a final standpoint from which reality might become fully intelligible at once: a complete system, a perfect representation, a total explanation requiring nothing beyond itself. The desire is understandable. Continuity invites understanding, and understanding naturally seeks completion.

Yet something in experience continually resists this movement toward final enclosure. The more completely we attempt to exteriorize reality into determinate structure, the more the living depth through which disclosure occurs begins to withdraw. Meaning flattens into information. Relation hardens into mechanism. Presence becomes increasingly difficult to distinguish from representation.

This withdrawal is often interpreted negatively, as though it signaled only limitation or failure. But perhaps the situation is more subtle. Perhaps the inability of reality to become fully closed within representation is not merely an obstacle to understanding, but one of the conditions that makes understanding possible in the first place.

A piece of music can continue disclosing new significance precisely because it cannot be exhausted by a single listening. A life remains meaningful because no isolated moment completely contains its continuity. Even scientific inquiry depends upon the assumption that reality remains capable of further disclosure beyond what is already known. If the world were fully exteriorized all at once, inquiry itself would come to an end.

In this sense, limitation may not simply oppose meaning. It may participate in sustaining it. Every act of understanding takes place within horizons that it cannot fully bring before itself simultaneously. Thought depends upon continuities larger than what any isolated act of reflection can explicitly contain. Language depends upon meanings inherited through participation before they become objects of analysis. Identity depends upon forms of continuity that exceed immediate self-presence.

Perhaps this is why certain signs behave differently from ordinary concepts. Infinity, for example, does not function like an object that can simply be placed before the mind among other objects. The moment infinity is reduced to a completed thing, it ceases to function as infinity. The same may be said of unity, origin, or even being itself. These

signs seem to indicate not determinate objects within a closed system, but the impossibility of the system fully containing the conditions of its own disclosure.

And yet these conditions are not elsewhere than actuality. They appear through the world itself, through the inexhaustibility of relation, presence, and form. The openness of reality does not stand outside the world as a second hidden realm. It appears whenever actuality exceeds the structures through which we attempt to make it fully present to ourselves.

Perhaps this is why understanding remains inseparable from humility. Not because reality is irrational, nor because thought is powerless, but because disclosure continues to unfold beyond every achieved form of closure.

• • •

What continues to unfold beyond closure is not simply indeterminacy. The world does not dissolve into incoherence merely because it cannot be fully exteriorized all at once. Continuity remains real. Meaning remains real. Identity remains real. But their reality no longer appears as the fixed permanence of isolated objects. It appears through ongoing participation in forms of relation that continually sustain and renew themselves through time.

Perhaps this is why continuity depends not upon static self-identity, but upon return.

A melody remains recognizable not because every moment is identical to the last, but because themes return transformed through the unfolding of the composition. Meaning deepens through recurrence. Memory does not merely preserve the past mechanically; it continually reorganizes the significance of what has been in light of what emerges afterward. Even understanding itself develops through repeated return to what once seemed already understood.

Return is therefore not repetition in the simple sense. Nothing genuinely living repeats itself without change. Each return occurs within a different horizon of relation. The continuity persists, yet the meaning becomes newly disclosed through the movement of re-engagement itself.

The same may be true of identity more generally. We often imagine identity as something that simply remains the same beneath change, as though continuity depended upon an unchanging core hidden behind appearance. But lived continuity rarely appears this way. A life remains recognizable not because nothing changes, but because

continuity is continually renewed through participation in layered forms of relation extending across time. What returns is not static sameness, but intelligible continuity through transformation.

This may help explain why disclosure itself possesses a rhythmic character. Meaning often emerges retrospectively through patterns of return that gather scattered moments into coherence. A phrase heard earlier in a conversation suddenly becomes newly significant much later. A memory once unnoticed quietly reorganizes the meaning of the present. A piece of music returns to a theme that now carries the weight of everything that has unfolded in between. Continuity deepens through recurrence without collapsing into repetition.

Perhaps reality itself discloses in a similar way. The world remains intelligible not because everything is immediately transparent, but because continuity continually renews itself through forms of relation that remain open to further disclosure. Withdrawal therefore does not oppose meaning. It participates in sustaining the depth through which meaning can continue unfolding.

And perhaps this is why actuality never becomes fully exhausted by any achieved form. Every disclosure remains capable of further return.

• • •

Maybe this is why the world can never become merely an object standing fully before us. The more deeply we participate in reality, the more clearly we encounter both intelligibility and inexhaustibility together. Forms gather themselves into continuity. Meaning unfolds through relation. Actuality discloses itself through singular presence. And yet no disclosure finally seals itself into complete closure.

This does not diminish the reality of the world. If anything, it deepens it. The visible surface of things no longer appears as a self-sufficient exterior detached from hidden depth, nor does depth become a second invisible world concealed behind appearances. Rather, actuality continually discloses itself through layered continuities that remain open beyond every achieved form of representation.

Perhaps metaphysics matters because it quietly shapes how we participate in this disclosure. When reality is imagined primarily as a closed system of externally related objects, the world gradually flattens into structure alone. Meaning becomes increasingly difficult to distinguish from information. Presence becomes difficult to distinguish from representation. Thought seeks certainty through complete exteriorization.

Yet experience continually reopens another possibility. We encounter forms that cannot be fully detached from participation in their unfolding. We encounter meanings that deepen through return rather than closure. We encounter actuality not as inert presence, but as something capable of continual disclosure.

This does not require abandoning science, rationality, or formal understanding. On the contrary, it may allow them to be situated within a richer understanding of relation, continuity, and participation. Scientific inquiry itself depends upon the openness of reality to further disclosure. Thought remains possible because the world continues to exceed every completed formulation of it.

Maybe this is why understanding and humility belong together. Not because reality withdraws into irrational mystery, but because disclosure remains inseparable from participation in depths that cannot be fully exteriorized all at once. The world continues to become present through this openness.

And perhaps this openness is not something added onto reality from elsewhere. Maybe it belongs to the very way actuality discloses itself through form, relation, and return.

In the likeness of a poem,
perchance.

drifting on the lake
stars above below

a trout surfaces

Further reading

Recursive Continuity, Dynamical Form and the Generative Opening of Determination: Semiotics, hierarchy and relational ontology in physics, biology and formal logic

This paper develops a hierarchical relational ontology in which determination emerges through recursively organized continuity rather than through the interaction of pregiven objects, substances, or representations. Bringing together relational, semiotic, and process-oriented approaches to organization — including Spencer-Brown's logic of distinction, Rosen's relational ontology, and Bohm's notion of ordering — the paper develops a recursive logic of determination operating across physics, biology, and formal logic. By distinguishing continuity-preserving operators from distinction-enacting sign-processes, the paper develops a relational account of synchronization, signaling, hierarchical organization, and dynamical form as an evolving interpretive organization through which open systems progressively bring their worlds into determination. Recursive determination is argued to remain constitutively open: every achieved order of organization encounters signs whose implications exceed its existing interpretive continuity, giving rise to rupture, return, transformation, and transcendence as intrinsic features of recursive organization itself. The resulting ontology is relational, hierarchical, interpretive, and permanently incomplete.

How is a Relational Ontology Formally Relational? A phenomenological exploration of the semiotic logic of agency in physics, mathematics and biology

A phenomenological exploration of the distinction between a relational formal ontology (also called a process ontology) and a classical formal ontology (also called an object ontology) for modelling physical phenomena that exhibit relationally-mediated holism, such as phenomena from quantum physics and biosemiotics. Whereas a classical formal ontology is based on mathematical objects and classes, a relational formal ontology is based on mathematical signs and categories. A relational formal ontology involves nodal networks that are dynamically sustained through signalling. Nodal networks are systems of constrained iterative processes (dynamical nodes) that have individual semiotic agency within a matrix of determinate possibilities (a semiotic scaffolding). The nodal networks are hierarchically ordered and exhibit characteristics of deep learning. Clarifying the distinction between classical and relational formal ontologies may help to clarify the role of interpretative context in physics (eg. the role of the observer in quantum theory), the role of signalling in biological systems and the role of hierarchical nodal networks in computational simulations of learning in generative artificial intelligence (AI). Two experiments are conducted to explore the application of key principles of relational ontology in AI, namely, complex pattern abduction involving hierarchies of categories and progressive determination through placeholder signs.

On the Principle of Number in Modern Physics: A phenomenological study of limitation in theoretical speculations about the natural world

A phenomenological exploration of the meta-physics of categories, relations, and signs as encountered in physics and the natural sciences.

Against Objects as Metaphysical Primitives in Theoretical Physics: Aquinas on reading nature

In the context of physics, Aquinas offers a way to speak about unity that remains aware of the infinitude of the paradox that One is both immanent and transcendent.

Timothy M. Rogers, University of Toronto,
In a structured interaction with ChatGPT [DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.20426898],
May 25, 2026