ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY

Friedrich Nietzsche, Jean-François Lyotard and the Post Modern Critique of Classical Metaphysical Thinking.

By: Eden Abate

A Thesis Submitted to Department of Philosophy of Addis Ababa University in the Post Graduate Program in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirement of the Degree of Masters In Philosophy.

Advisor: Dr. Fasil Merawi

June, 2022
Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY

Friedrich Nietzsche, Jean-Francois Lyotard and the Post Modern Critique of Classical Metaphysical Thinking.

BY

Eden Abate

June, 2022
Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
COLLAGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCE
DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY

Friedrich Nietzsche, Jean-Francois Lyotard and the Post Modern Critique of Classical Metaphysical Thinking.

Approved by Board of Examiners

_____	_____	_____
Advisor	**Signature**	**Date**
_____	_____	_____
Examiner	**Signature**	**Date**
_____	_____	_____
Examiner	**Signature**	**Date**

Table of Contents

Contents **Page**

Introduction i
CHAPTER ONE 7
1. Classical Metaphysical Thinking 7
1.1 Dualistic Metaphysical Thinking 8
1.1.1 Platonic Dualism 9
1.1.1.1 The world of Becoming and the world of Being 9
1.1.2 Cartesian Dualism 14
1.1.2.1 Mind and Body Dualism 14
1.1.3 Immanuel Kant Dualism 17
1.1.3.1 Phenomenal and Noumena 18
1.2 Speculative Metaphysical Thinking 21
1.2.1 Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel 22
CHAPTER TWO 25
2. Nietzsche's Critique of Classical Metaphysical Thinking 26
2.1 Against classical metaphysical thinking 28
2.2 Nietzsche in developing his metaphysics 28
2.2.1 Eternal recurrence of the same 37
CHAPTER THREE 38
3. Jean-Francios Lyotard and Postmodern Critique of Classical Metaphysical thinking. 45
3.1 Postmodernism critique of classical metaphysical thinking 48
3.2 Lyotard critique to classical metaphysical thinking 57
CHAPTER FOUR 67
4. Can We Rescue Metaphysics? 67
Reference 83

Acknowledgment

I shall begin with the almighty "Adonai" for granting me all the countless blessings and for encouraging me throughout challenging times in doing this thesis. I want to use his words to praise him. "Even in the darkest of times, we can praise God for his love, his sovereignty, and his promise to be near us when we call on him." Thank you, Jesus, for your unconditional love, grace, and help.

Then I wish to express my gratitude to my advisor, Dr. Fasil Merawi, for sharing his pearls of wisdom and insightful comments. This helped me to keep my paper on the right track. I'm proud and grateful to have worked on this thesis under the guidance of Dr. Fasil.

Mom "Soul of my soul", this paper would not have been in reality without you. Thank you for always washing me with your love and patency and for being beside me in whatever I pursue. This thesis is all yours, my ultimate angel. My lovely siblings (Aster, Hiwot, Lucy), and my precious brother-in-law Abera, thank you for sharing all my burdens and for giving me everything I asked for without complaining. I wish I could do the same thing for you, my dears.

Finally, I wish to express my gratitude to all of you who have helped me with this thesis in different ways: families and friends. I want to provide a quote which I found through reading and always offer when it comes to acknowledging "There is no meaning if it is not shared." Thank all of you for sharing my meaning and for making me share yours.

Introduction

Metaphysics is one of the dominant discipline in philosophy that central theme of metaphysics intended up on essential meanings and concerns devised by the human mind in life. According to (Garret, 2006:1) “the key areas of metaphysics are reflection on existence, causation, God, temporal universals, personal identity, and truth.”

Starting from ancient Greece, metaphysics was a great concern for philosophy. The pre-Socratic philosophers, considered as the first philosophers, were primarily interested in metaphysics. They draw their metaphysical assertion highly relying in to the first principle and ultimate block of the universe. For instance, the first philosopher Thales argued that ultimate reality is water because the original state of things and the first principle of everything are made up of water. Anaximander also regarded the “Aperion” or “Boundless” as source of reality.

At first, Aristotle used the term “Prottephilosophia”, meaning “first philosophy” for metaphysics. Etymologically, metaphysics comes from the Greek words: “ta meta and ta phsica”, which means reality beyond existence. Aristotle defines metaphysics as “a form of science that exists or so far exists, as well as the study of being qua being, wisdom, or religion.” (Garret, 2006:1)

Some ancient philosophers believed that the visible world was insufficient or incapable of providing answers to ultimate reality or metaphysical questions. Here comes the distinction between “appearance and reality.” Philosophers begin to search for a transcendental world which is alienated from this visible world. Plato states that there are two different realms: the “realm of being” and the “realm of becoming.” According to him, the world of being is where the forms of the visible world are found. The world of becoming, paradoxically, is where the participants of the forms are found. According to him, “only a perfectly organized system of perfect, eternal, and unchanging objects can satisfy the mind's demand for truth and reality, and this is the world of being.” (Jessop, 1930:36) Immanuel Kant, an 18th-century philosopher, also argues for a two-world reality, though, unlike Plato, he named the two worlds differently: the world of phenomena and the world of noumena.

In the history of philosophy, metaphysics has been expanded with various transitions. There arise various metaphysical doctrines in history which shift the paradigm of their own predecessors doctrine of metaphysics.(Kuhn, 1947:37) writes: “Every negativity has its affirmative

complement. A philosophy that starts with an emphatic negative usually prepares the basis for an affirmation. Through a dialectical rebound, affirmation emerges from negation in the movement of thought from pole to pole." As a result of this philosophical tradition, various assertions about metaphysics emerged.

As I mentioned above, the metaphysics of the classical era mostly relied on the "yonder world," a world beyond our time and space and in search of ultimate reality. This creates a distinction between "appearance and reality," and traditional metaphysics concluded that there is another world beyond our experience that is inaccessible, abstract, and real in nature.

Negating ancient and medieval ways of studying metaphysics, the modern era quest for metaphysics failed under the rationalist method of philosophy. They affirm pure reason to discover the nature of reality. Rene Descartes reaches what he calls "clear and distinct ideas." Opposing the data provided by within the boundaries of sense perception, he affirms pure reason as a tool to find the transcendental God. For instance, Spinoza, using pure reason, argued that "by God, I understand a being completely infinite, i.e., a substance comprised of an infinity of qualities, each of which conveys an everlasting and infinite nature" (Steven, 2020:2)

The enlightenment philosopher Kant's conception of metaphysical competency is denied pure reason in order to access things in themselves. "Man as a reasoner," he denied access to things-in-themselves, and only by acknowledging this limitation does he discover reality in phenomenal reality." (Kuhn, 1947:37)

The ball of metaphysics being rolled has been cached by the speculative metaphysical thinker Hegel. He argues that, the physical, everyday world of particular things is undoubtedly real, but ultimate reality is the enormous orderly system of coherent and interrelated experiences. (Katen, 1973) According to Hegel, ultimate reality is "Absolute Geist" without having the nature of mentality, physicality and supersensible entity, it is something that came in to being through pure dialectical thought process alone which contain three procedures: "Thesis is the assertion of a stance; Antithesis is the negation of a position; and Synthesis is the bending of two opposing positions into one on a higher level, a stage where perfect spirit unfolds." (Katen, 1973:153)

Negating the classical, medieval, and modern doctrines of metaphysics, the existential philosopher Nietzsche argues that the modern era is not concerned with the search for the nature

of being, reality, which goes beyond what appears to us, a two-world theory, and any investigation of the first principle at all, because the being that is considered as universal and the meaning of the universe has been killed by people. Continuing in this way, the current era is concerned with the full denial of meta narratives. Philosophy named this era the "postmodernism era." The postmodernists argued that there could not be a single objectively privileged view of reality about a single phenomenon called "reality". In postmodernism, there is a reality for each group, culture and norms of speakers.

This thesis intends to demonstrate the philosophical arguments in classical metaphysics and how existentialist philosophers Frederick Nietzsche, Jean-Francois Lyotard, and postmodernism criticize classical metaphysics, which is based on transcendental being, transcendental world, beyond physicality, ultimate reality, duality, and speculation. According to both Nietzsche, postmodernism and Lyotard, this wholesome concepts must be abandoned and we need to dwell in another reality that can usher in the spirit of the age.

In his first book Human, All Too Human, Nietzsche calls the methodology that has been used for metaphysics and religion system as "the very worst methods of knowledge." (Nietzsche, 1910:9) He writes:

> *For there is nothing we might say about the metaphysical world except that it is different, it is different in a way that is inaccessible and inexplicable to us. It'd be a thing having negative characteristics. No matter how well-proven the existence of such a universe is, knowing about it is no more important than knowing how to analyze water chemically if you're a boatman in a storm.* (Nietzsche, 1910)

Nietzsche rejected the possibility of knowing the "true" world, which requires what some people call the "God's eye view". Since in order to know the external world, we have to use a particular method and process, we do not really know the world. His claim is that: how do we know this world exists if we are unable to know it. According to Nietzsche, if we humans get ourselves into his kind of speculation and fiction, we can't have true knowledge of life. The suffering and the pain will defeat us because, in hoping for another world, we forget to fight for our existing life. Therefore, Nietzsche claimed that by abandoning classical metaphysical thinking, we need to embark on another reality that describes the spirit of the age.

Nietzsche's rejection of classical metaphysical thinking, the abandoning of attachments to transcendental beings, re-evaluation of all values, adherence to perspectivism, abandoning of abstract rationality, avocation of space for multi-dimensional interpretation, broadening the horizons of subjectivity, the assertion that the grand narratives of his time have been collapsed and the only possible reality is the will to power that called for the re-evaluation of values, made him the precursor of postmodernism. The above basic ideas of Nietzsche brushed the way for assertions made by postmodernism.

This paper will also consider postmodernism as a chronological and normative movement as well. Postmodernism negates classical metaphysical thinking. "Postmodernism is a reaction to modern assumptions of certainty or objective, attempting to explain reality as a whole. They claim that reality is not something constructed as an individual tries to understand a particular situation within the boundary of his mind." (Glossary Defination Post modernism-PBS)As a result, the Postmodernism movement does not simply deconstruct what has come before; rather, it offers an alternative reality that replaces the one that has been abandoned. Abandoning the classical metaphysical thinking that attempted to discover absolute reality, they argued that we have to embark on another reality in which interpretation, context, concrete experience, relativity, interaction, culture, norms, and local narratives are entertained, and they assert that this is the exact place to find reality. They claimed that true reality in postmodernism is constructed by individuals as each of us attempts to create and define our own reality.

The postmodernist Habermas argues that in postmodernism, metaphysics, particularly the speculative classical universalistic conception of metaphysics, has no place. So he mentioned his position as post-metaphysical. In the post-metaphysical world, according to Habermas, reality is something that is substantive in its nature. Paradoxically, it is linguistically mediated in its nature since understanding reality essentially requires the study of everyday language. He calls this communicative rationality through the three validity claims called morality, empirical understanding, and art.

The postmodernist Lyotard is the other prominent philosopher on whom this thesis lays its foundation. According to Lyotard, the postmodern condition is no longer associated with what he refers to as "meta narrative" or "grand narrative," which is a theory that attempts to provide a

general, totalizing story about any phenomena and events that exists by referring to universal point of view and truth.

According to Lyotard, the fashion of postmodern culture implies the end of meta narratives. He writes, “I define postmodern as incredulity towards meta narratives.” Lyotard argues that people in postmodernism reject everything that makes them feel or see their status as referring to the grand whole. As a result of abandoning classical metaphysical thinking as a grand narrative, Lyotard creates mini-narratives. Mini narratives are small, narrow, and contextualized narratives that refer to the interconnectivity and interpretation that is held among small groups of people rejecting large belief systems. Mini narratives can host the spirit of the age and overcome the legitimation crisis that the abandoning of classical metaphysical thinking caused.

In order to provide evidence for my thesis, I will start the first chapter by offering an overview of the classical conception of metaphysics, considering two forms of classical metaphysical thinking named: dualistic metaphysical thinking and speculative metaphysical thinking. In the first section, I will consider Plato, Descartes, and Kant's dualistic metaphysical thinking. Thereafter, in the speculative metaphysical thinking, I will consider Hegel’s argument respectively. This helps to see how classical metaphysical thinking addressed metaphysics and to grasp the paradigm shifts that the history of philosophy witnessed within the subject matter.

In the second chapter, I will consider Nietzsche’s critique of classical metaphysical thinking and how he was interested in forming his own metaphysics in order to show the downfall of classical metaphysical thinking. Following that, I will present his alternative reality in order to overcome the crisis caused by the abandonment of classical metaphysical thinking known as eternal, recurrence, will to power, and overman. In the closing part of the chapter, I embrace my argument, which I will mention in the last lines of this page.

Following this, in the third chapter, I will address how post-modernists distract the whole fashion of metaphysics, specifically Habermas’s post metaphysical position and Lyotard’s conception of how grand narratives are substituted by mini narratives.

Drawing all this, I shall argue using the following question as a guide: Does Nietzsche, post modernism and Lyotard’s critique of metaphysics imply the elimination of metaphysics as a

whole or the elimination of only classical metaphysical thinking? If it is only classical metaphysical thinking, can we rescue metaphysics and understand metaphysics with Nietzschean and postmodern definitions?

Finally, it is in chapter four where my central thesis will bear its fruit. In this section I will reconsider and summarize the first three chapters. Then I will attempt to provide a positive answer for the question I raised with detailed discussion of Nietzsche, Lyotard, and other schools of thought to rescue metaphysics. I will argue that yes, we can rescue metaphysics living in the postmodern era by adjusting metaphysics to fit the spirit of the age.

CHAPTER ONE

1. Classical Metaphysical Thinking

Aristotle declares that “All humans by nature desire to know”. (Velkley, 2003:312)In philosophy there is no any taboo that spare as untouched. One of the issues that raised in and encounter with many perspectives is metaphysical thinking. Metaphysical thinking is a very profound heading of philosophy; Immanuel Kant writes that “All philosophical inquiry must begin with the question of whether metaphysics is possible.” (Fios, 2013:108)In line with this, we have seen through the great history of philosophy that metaphysical thinking concerned the investigation of the creation of the universe, ultimate reality, consciousness, existence, mind/body problems, and other concerns that needed the fundamental nature of things. That which we create experience of is “beyond physical” and “non-material” nature.

As a result of the answers to these metaphysical questions, various metaphysical inquiries arise. This entails that one philosopher or school of philosophy's way of metaphysical thinking or way of defining metaphysical concepts might not be the only way to the other. They all try to find the breaking point. This tradition of philosophy provides a wide opportunity to have various doctrines, aspects, and temptations in metaphysics. To evoke wonder, Aristotle writes that “Indeed, what is a being?” is a topic that has been posed in the past, is being raised now, and will always be a source of debate. Metaphysics is the realization that being is debatable, not just the raising of questions about it.” (Velkley, 2003:312)

Therefore, metaphysical thinking is more than an unending, massive multiplayer game. This chapter exposes the nature of classical metaphysical thinking. Throughout reading, I selected Plato, Descartes, Kant and Hegel as representatives of classical metaphysical thinking. The reason behind this is that both philosophers emerged in different eras. This shows how the discussion and gear of metaphysics shifted. The selected philosophers' ideas, even if they can be generalized under the umbrella of classical metaphysical thinking, vary from one to another. This helps to grasp unique ideas of the matter and finally to show how metaphysical traditions contain different understandings and speculations. Initially, I will attempt to show a metaphysical argument that has been entertained by Plato, Descartes, and Kant who adhere to dualistic metaphysical thinking. Following this, I will attempt to bring out the speculative way of

metaphysical thinking. For this I will provide the argument of Hegel. Finally, I will put the conclusion of the chapter.

1.1 Dualistic Metaphysical Thinking

As stated above, there is no one determined, one way of metaphysical thinking. Philosophers that take metaphysical concepts as granted try to provide various metaphysical inquiries that contain their own understanding, analysis, and speculation. The pre-Socratic philosophers, who are mostly considered the first philosophers, were primarily interested in metaphysics. It's because they are the ones who made the progress from mythos to logos. Mythos relied on narrative (fabula) and folk wisdom to obtain knowledge, whereas Logos related to logical and rational investigation of the phenomena in question. (Cambridge University press,2016) Pre-Socratic philosophers claimed that rational analysis, rather than myth, is the best way to grasp reality and the very nature of the cosmos. Using the way of logos, their metaphysical assumptions were under the concern of the ultimate constitution and origin of the universe. As a result, in order to find answers to their metaphysical questions, they rely heavily on naturalistic and materialistic thinking.

This fundamental question about the universe, being, life... is not something that has a clear-cut, determined answer or generally a done project by the pre-Socratic philosophers. Metaphysical thinking has revolved throughout the history of philosophy, encompassing the various and grandest scales of philosophers throughout time.

In laying this foundation by the pre-Socratic, which highly concerned material and naturalistic dimensions, in order to have a general picture of the universe, there arrived philosophers that were unsatisfied by the pre-Socratic way of metaphysical thinking.

According to them, in order to have a foundational reality that is responsible for the motion and evolution of ours and the universe, the physical, visible or perceived world is not responsible. As a result, they are drawn to other possible worlds or ideas that can answer the question of what is the foundation source and origin of the universe.

They argued that the transcendental- metaphysical dimension is the one that provides quality metaphysical thinking in doing metaphysics. This metaphysical thinking is dualistic in its nature.

Dualism is an ontological theory; a theory that tells us only two things really exist, or reality is divided—mind and matter, or everything else that can be said to exist as modifications of two realities.

This section includes notable and towering thinkers such as Plato, Descartes, and Kant, whose metaphysical thinking attempted to solve the metaphysical problem by reining on a dualistic way, even if they sowed different seeds that blossomed differently.

1.1.1 Platonic Dualism

Plato is the first one to lay a well-organized foundation for this kind of metaphysical thinking in Greek philosophy. It has been mentioned that Plato's metaphysical thinking is inspired by Socrates's view of the nature of knowledge. According to Socrates, we can know things for real only through ideas, and this idea applies to other objects too. Plato, in his book "The Republic," develops a theory called the "theory of forms," where the intelligible world of being is distinguished from the sensible world of becoming.

1.1.1.1 The world of Becoming and The world of Being

The key thing to understand developing this theory, Plato synthesizes opposing arguments of the two pre-Socratic philosophers. The world that we experience is a world of flux, a constantly changing world by Heraclitus, and the ultimate reality "Being' must be unchanging and eternal by Parmenides. By borrowing Pythagoras's argument, we have a priori knowledge of pure forms which are constant and unchanging. In this case, he came up with dualistic metaphysical thinking. He differentiates between two worlds: the world of being and the world of becoming. According to Plato, the world of being is the unseen, the real one and the foundation for all real knowledge. In contrast, the world of becoming is only the distant shadow of the unseen.

The description that Plato gives for the relationship between intelligible forms and sensible objects is that a form is a general pattern that has various objects as specific instantiations. Another way of describing the relationship is to say that objects acquire intelligible properties by virtue of their participation in the forms corresponding to those properties. He writes:

> *Can we be willing to think, by Heaven, that the absolutely real has no part in movement, life, soul, or Wisdom?" That is, it does not live or think, but stands*

> *completely still in solemn holiness, mindless?* "*That would be a dreadful thing to admit*. (Plato,2004)

This quote perfectly captures the pure platonic concept of forms. "We come from a world where extraordinary standards of quality were known, and we vaguely recall beauties that we haven't seen since; and we return to that world." (Jessop, 1930:36)

Plato uses his work, "Allegory of the Cave," as a symbol and metaphor to represent his account of the nature of reality. Here is the allegory of the cave in a nutshell: The cave is the only world for the prisoners, as they have been there since they existed. So for them, the world they only know and exist in is this cave. In this cave, they can only see the shadows of moving objects that are cast on the prison walls. They consider these shadows as real, not as shadows of something real. So they admitted that they have really understood the truth and the reality by the so-called real images and, to the extreme, they were inducting what shadows would do. Then, once upon a time, one prisoner from the few was set free. The moment he experienced the other world beside the cave, he realized that the objects they were seeing from the cave were shadows of the real world, and they were not real objects. He has already become aware of the true world. He realizes that light illuminates everything, just as reason illuminates the true nature of things. After experiencing the real world, he came back to the cave. His enlightenment about the true world causes him to have difficulty seeing the shadow world. Then he tried to share how he experienced the true world with his peers. But they take him as a fool and unlearned because the only world they know is the shadow world. (Plato, 2004)

In this allegory of the cave, what Plato trying to show was that the enlightenment of a prisoner represents the work of philosophy and reason to do, and that by doing philosophy we can come to understand the true nature of the world. The other thing is the form. According to Plato, the true world that the prisoner experienced outside of the cave represents his theory of forms. Forms, according to Plato, are basically a structure, pattern, or principle that is the most real, most lasting, most permanent aspect of reality. In contrast, the cave is the representative of the temporal world. It is because it only shows the shadow of the real world; it is particular rather than universal. What we encounter in the cave (the becoming world) are temporal and specific things that develop and decay; the cave is not real in and of itself, but a copy of the genuine notion or reality that the prisoner experienced outside of the cave. (Katen, 1973)

Plato thought that the immobility (unchanging) and eternal aspects of being can keep things that really are (the things that really "is") are the Forms, which are roughly the definitions of Socrates but hypostasized (turned into actual things), and which are beyond time and space, in a certain sense not even really "existing" but just "being".

For Plato, the forms of a thing are like the concept of a thing found in the world of being. According to Plato, the world of being does not exist in our minds, rather it exists in reality. Their residency is in the fundamental ultimate reality realm. This ultimate reality is only accessible through reason and reason. According to Plato, reason is the only path to this ultimate reality, which contains the true nature of something or its essence.

Plato argues these forms have the following features: They are objective in the sense that they exist "out there" as objects, separate from our minds and wills. They are transcendent, as they exist "out there," but not in space or time: they exist above or beyond space and time. Eternal: Because they are transcendent realities, they are not affected by time and so do not move or change. They are the models for everything that exists or could exist. Archetypal: They are models, since they are transcendent realities that cannot be understood by the senses but only by intellect. Flawless: they embody absolutely and flawlessly all of the characteristics of the things for which they serve as models. (Miller, 1984).

The case of triangles serves as a very good illustration. We all know about triangles in the real world. But none of these are perfect triangles. For example, no matter how carefully we draw a triangle, the lines will not be completely straight. A true triangle, according to the precise definition (a closed polygon consisting of three connected straight lines), exists only in the abstract. That is the form of a triangle. This becomes a metaphysical concept if we allow that the form of a triangle would exist even if there were no physical triangles or even if the entire material universe came to an end. According to Plato, what is real is not a particular thing, for instance, aromatic perfume, which is only a physical thing, but the idea of aromatic, which is a universal quality. We can only come to know what aromatic perfume is by having the idea of aromatic. Aromatic is unchanging and thus eternal. It is not a concrete physical thing, rather it is universal. We could never judge any particular thing or perfume as being aromatic unless we had some standard by which to make such a judgment. Therefore, for Plato, reality is edios, which

may roughly be translated as idea or form, is more real than matter or empirical factors and found in the world of being.

Plato secondly, considers the other layer of reality called the world of becoming as the visible, the realm of material objects and the world of experience, unlike that of the world of forms (the ultimate reality). The relationship between the world of being and the world of becoming is that the forms are described or shown by the constantly changing world, the visible world, and the apparent world. The residents of the realm of becoming have one constant reflection, that is, they all endure only for a time and then pass away. Plato writes:

> *Nothing is one in itself, and you can't claim it's anything or something else, or that it's of a certain kind." Quite the opposite. If you can claim it's big, it'll turn out to be small; if it's heavy, it'll turn out to be light, and so on. nothing is one, nothing. As a result of the movement and change, all of the things that we often refer to as [any of these things] are becoming these things.* (Plato, 2004)

In his dialogue named "Theaetetus", Plato argues that reality cannot be grasped by perception and knowledge about reality is not, as Theaetus proposed, "knowledge is perception". According to Plato, the proposition by itself is problematic because if knowledge is perception, we may only have beliefs, which mean only opinion rather than knowledge. For instance, according to Plato, if you taste something sweet or you see something beautiful, you may think that it is sweet and beautiful, but according to Plato, it is only an opinion. In the world of becoming, you may think that you know what a man is because you have seen many men, but this is just a belief without knowledge of the forms of man-ness found in the world of being. It is a belief that you could easily make a mistake between a man and a dog, because for Plato's theory of forms, what we see and perceive are simply reflections of the perfect forms, which can't be taken as reality as Theaetetus proposed. For instance, if I go into an ice cream shop and order vanilla ice cream, then the waiter gives me vanilla ice cream. According to Plato, it's not really vanilla ice cream. It's an imperfect reflection of the real perfect vanilla ice-cream in the true reality.

The other philosopher that Plato used in order to explain his world of becoming is the pre-Socratic philosopher Heraclitus. "You cannot step twice into the same river." It is a famous dictum apparently uttered by him. According to Heraclitus, change and becoming are thought in terms of life and death; being is overcome by not-being and vice versa, a quality is conquered by its opposite, and so the cosmos, always becoming, is a field of constant war. According to him,

everything is in a state of flux as everything is in constant movement. For instance, according to him, “cold transforms into heat, which transforms back into cold.” This implies that a given thing (the wind) may appear differently to one man than to another, or at different times. (Bostock, 1988)Plato believes that Heraclites is right about the world always changing. However, for Plato, this only works for the world of becoming, the secondary and inferior world. Rather, there is a world of being, a world of models, which is the forms and the models of a changing world.

For Plato, knowledge is a true, justified belief rather than a perception, because the definition that Theaetetus proposed for “knowledge is perception” has the following implications, truth is relative; this is a universe in flux, a universe of individual things. He argues that true knowledge comes from knowledge of the forms. The perceived qualities in the world of becoming are not in the object or in the thing. Plato believes that there is no such thing as a “blue sky,” but rather an object that, when interacting with sight, generates a perception of blueness. The line one draws is never completely straight but only an approximation of the perfect real line, which is the ideal.

The question “How do these two worlds interact or relate to each other?” is the big issue in Plato’s dualism. This mass of copper and porcelain beside me that I perceive must somehow come into contact with its form. That’s what makes it a lamp. But how does this happen if its matter is in the natural dimension and its form in a dimension that transcends nature? Plato’s answer is that the world of becoming, the world of material things, participates in the world of being. Only the philosopher king, according to Plato, understands the relationship between the empirical (the word of becoming) and the real (the world of being) because they know what is good and can identify specific manifestations of the good.

Generally, Plato is arguing that there exist dual worlds “the world of being and the world of becoming.” In the world of being, we understand eternal perfection, but in the world of becoming, we understand appearances as participants in the world of forms. As a result, the mind's demands for truth and reality can only be met by a perfectly organized system of perfect, eternal, and unchanging objects. This form can only be accessible through reason. Therefore, Plato's metaphysical thinking is enveloped by the belief in a transcendental world of eternal absolute beings going to discover is possible.

1.1.2 Cartesian Dualism

Descartes is the one who did the transition from the medieval era to the modern age. (Eaton, 1927)In the Medieval period, metaphysics can be defined partly by the process of rediscovering the ancient culture that developed in ancient Greece. They considered metaphysics to be the way to discover God's existence, so they baptized the metaphysics of Plato and Aristotle with Christianity. The focus of philosophy shifts to faith and eternity at this point since the beginning of metaphysics, as far as history reaches, no theory has occurred that elaborates on body and mind dualism as Descartes did. He developed a new system of metaphysics and an era in the history of philosophy. Even if both Plato and Descartes were adherents of dualistic metaphysical thinking, they addressed it in different fashions. Plato's dualism is concerned with appearance (participants and particulars) and reality (ideals and forms). However, Descartes's is between the material (body) and the non-material (mind). In modern thought, Descartes marks a new thought generally characterized by its shift to the subject. The manner in which this question was raised in modern times must be distinguished from the nature of philosophical orientation in previous times. (Navickas, 1976)

1.1.2.1 Mind and Body Dualism

Cartesian dualism came as a philosophical breakthrough in the 17th century, propounded by Descartes. In his work "Meditations on First Philosophy 1941," Descartes is the first to draw a sharp line that separates thought from being, cognition from reality, beginning with his famous dictum "I think therefore I am." He argued that there is an absolute distinction between mental (mind) and material substance (body) as they refer to different kinds of entities. According to Descartes, they have their own qualities. The body occupies space while the mind is conscious or thinking.

Argumentatively, Descartes questions everything except what he was thinking. *Thinking necessitates a thinker (him) *. As a result, he exists. Alternatively, *thought exists. As a result, he exists since thought can not be divorced from him. All of these arguments culminated in his famous "cogito ergo sum" ("I think therefore I am") statement. This, together with the following functions of the human mind, is defined by Descartes as; "we cannot doubt our existence while we doubt." The ability to think rationally, imagine, feel, think, willingly, and have sensations

about something is a mental property, not a feature of the body, because the mind is a non-extended, immaterial substance.

Cartesian dualism is integral to the formal- objective reality distinction where greater and lesser degrees of reality are argued for. According to Descartes, ideas, thoughts, and as-it-were (tanquam) can be representations that do not actually resemble their objects, and thus these ideas only have "objective reality," whereas actual existent things have "formal reality". Descartes writes:

Undoubtlly, the concepts that represent substances to me amount to something greater and, in a sense, have more objective actuality inside themselves than the ideas that only describe modes or accidents. (Quintana, 2018)

Here we understand that there are degrees between objective reality and formal reality based of the hierarchy (substances, modes) considered.

For example, the idea of the mind as a thinking substance is a complex idea. We can deny any other principle attribute to the mind, such as extendedness. The mind is spiritual, private, alienated from mechanical interactions, and it exists only within the boundary of time. However, matter is an extended substance which exists in a mechanical fashion.

For his position on the derivation of mind-and body dualism, Descartes used two arguments. The separability and the divisibility argument In his book: "Meditation on First Philosophy," he writes that:

First, I know that whatever I clearly and plainly comprehend by God in such a way that it corresponds completely to my understanding of it. As a result, the fact that I can clearly and precisely grasp one thing apart from another is sufficient to convince me that the two things are distinct, because they can be distinguished, at least by God. The question of what type of power is needed to achieve such a separation has no bearing on the conclusion that the two entities are separate. Thus, just by knowing that I exist and recognizing that my nature or essence consists only of being a thinking thing, I may deduce that I am a thinking thing. I believe I can accurately deduce that my essence is only comprised of the fact that I am a thinking being. True, I may have (or, to forecast, will undoubtedly have) a body that is inextricably linked to me. However, I have a clear and distinct idea that I am a thinking being that existed without appealing to matter: and I

also clear and distinct idea about the existence of my body that extended in its nature. In effect of this, I am certain that I am separate from my body and that I can exist without it (Descartes, 1996).

The Divisibility argument is easier to understand. He argues that a physical substance is divisible by definition. We can split a corporeal substance in our minds even though we can't literally break it into bits. The mind, on the other hand, is unmistakably indivisible. The mind cannot be understood as a collection of components, but rather as a whole (unifying). This implies that the mind and the body are two separate things.

So, as we try to understand, Cartesian dualism claims that there are two different types of substance, the material and the immaterial (body and mind). Implicitly, these must be governed by different sets of rules or they would simply be the same substance. The big drawback to dualism is the question of how these different sets of rules would actually interact; how they relate to each other (for example, how does the mind perceive pain, pressure, etc. exerted on the body, or how does the body seem to follow what the mind wills). This is known as the problem of interaction. Descartes's answer is that “God orchestrates the body's and mind's actions.” He also offers another answer: “The pineal gland (a little structure at the top of the brain) is where the mind and body connect.” (Katen, 1973:167)

To generalize, Descartes understood reality divided into two separate entities. This is where his metaphysical dualism rests. According to Descartes, there is mental or spiritual substance (God and the Res Cogitans) and physical substance (the things we perceive). For Descartes, reality is dichotomized in the following: Mind is spiritual, whereas the body is material. Mind is not subject to mechanical laws, whereas the body is. Mind exists in time only, whereas the body exists in time and space. Mind is internal and has consciousness, whereas the body is public and open to inspection. Descartes’ attempted was to reach the point of “clear and distinct ideas”, so for him, reality is clearly and distinctly a world of mind and matter and, by using reason as a tool, discovering transcendental being is also possible. Therefore, Descartes's metaphysical thinking is enveloped by two realities in which the first one is that the mind is the first responsible being to prove that man exists because Descartes writes “I think therefore I am,” meaning “I know I exist because I am thinking.” And since the infinite idea cannot be attained

from the finite (body), therefore metaphysics that entertains transcendence is possible and the tool for attaining such knowledge is pure reason.

1.1.3 Immanuel Kant's Dualism

Like Plato and Descartes, Kant was an adherent of dualistic in metaphysical thinking. However, Kant developed a new system of dualism and the open enlightenment era. Commentators write that in some respects, Kant was a latter-day Cartesian and a latter-day Platonist. However, he did highly criticize the line of metaphysical thinking and status of his predecessors. Kant argued that dogmatic metaphysics (pre-Kantian metaphysics) had gone wrong by trying to exceed the limits of reason but that he had found a way to study metaphysics in a scientific manner, examining the limits of any possible experience, thus explaining the possibility of synthetic a priori truths, the truths on which science depends. It is central to metaphysics and it points to the possibility of what Kant calls a science of metaphysics. Because metaphysics deals with the transcendent realm of noumena, he refers to his "Critique of Pure Reason" as a work of transcendental philosophy; his goal was to motivate metaphysicians in a new direction and to the end of a metaphysical science.

To reach in this conclusion Kant credited David Hume in the following lines "I openly acknowledge that my recall of David Hume was the precise thing that many years ago, initially jolted me out of my dogmatic slumber and sent my speculative philosophy research in a completely new route." (Miller, 1984: 232) Hume started from important notion specifically, that the relationship between cause and effect (together with the consequential concepts of force and action, etc). (Lucas, 1783)Hume argues that I can understand the law of cause and effect for instance if someone slap me I experience the pain when he did slap me but to say what's wrong for him to slap me well there's gap between the fact he slap me and the value he shouldn't slap people. So what Hume arguing is that I can't actually experience the glue that intersect this caused this only relaying to sense experience so my mind is the one that glue the two events(the cause and the effect) together.

Considering this as having a legitimate use, Kant tried to answer this question: "Is metaphysics thus knowledge a priori, or out of pure understanding and pure reason?" For this, Kant forwarded the book, the "Critique of Pure Reason"."Kant was the first thinker to institute the subjective a

priori, wherein intelligibility has its source." (Navickas, 1976:7) The transcendental inquiry of Kant is not concerned with the object itself, but only and exclusively with the possibility of the precursory apprehension of it. According to Kant, there are two sources of knowledge: the first one is capable of receiving perception, and the second one is capable of converting the representation to knowledge. Therefore, Kant makes the following assertion: the content of thoughts is gathered or initiated from sense experience, but the mind is the one that organizes and arranges the unorderly grasped thoughts, then changes them into meaning. So here, alienated from Plato and Descartes, he boldly marks the limit of the power of reason.

1.1.3.1 Phenomenal and Noumenal

Kant's primary question is "whether metaphysics as a science is possible." He has differentiated between phenomenal and noumenal worlds. The noumenal world is the knowledge of things as they actually are. The phenomenal world is all about sensuality alone. Kant asserts that we can't get reliable knowledge about things in themselves using reason. Rather, using reason, we can have a reliable knowledge of things as they appear to us. This knowledge is not a priori but also not "empirical" as it comes from a special mode of acquisition, which is a sort of multi-layered abstraction performed by the mind. Kant argues that transcendental ideas like God, freedom, and immorality of the soul should be cleansed completely from empiricism. These transcendental ideas are "things in themselves" that transcend our ability to know. We can think about them, but we can't know them certainly. So why do we need to know nomenclature reality? Even if we cannot have certain knowledge about things in themselves, at least we mustthink about them in our mind. If this doesn't happen, absurdity will follow, which claims there is no appearance without something that appears. So we can state that phenomenal and noumenal worlds are not two types of different worlds, but two points of view of the same world. The noumenal world is the world as it is, independently of our representations. The phenomenal world is this same world, but as it appears to us, after it affects our senses and the signals from the senses are processed by our understanding and represented in time and space in our minds.

In the Kantian view, the world is a "manifold" of sensations that we put into an intelligible order by applying concepts and names to them. A concept is a set of properties in virtue of which something counts as a certain kind of object, and a name is a label that stands for a uniquely

identifying description of some particular thing. According to Kant, pure and fundamental metaphysical knowledge can be provided only by the realm of phenomena, not because reality is limited, but because our mind or knowledge about reality is limited, because we know things only as they are organized by our mind. We don't know things as they actually are. We don't know the reality behind them.

In this way of looking at things, it seems that the world we know is the world as we make it intelligible to ourselves, and the closest we can get to a fundamental understanding of reality consists of knowledge of the workings of our structures of intelligibility. What reality is like in itself, however, the traditional domain of metaphysics is beyond our grasp or capacity.

The phenomenal world is populated by facts that are empirical. Any facts associated with this world, such as rocks, trees, rivers, and the elements from which they're formed, as well as our conscious selves, are of this phenomenal world and they can be studied as facts.

The phenomenal world is what we can know through space and time (think science). When we determine ourselves (morally), we are in time and space. When we choose to determine ourselves to act in one way or another, we either follow nature working through us or we (in Kant's terminology) obey the moral law. Kant develops personality or character to explain how every one of us creates themselves on the basis of both of these kinds of decisions."Kant's metaphysical renewal excludes the possibility of knowing things in themselves, or things as they may exist without the framework of knowledge that the human mind supplies." (Velkley, 2003:323)

The noumenal world does not exist, in the strict Kantian sense of the word. Existence means extension in both time and space. Time and space are merely the categories of sensibility. The noumenal world is not sensible but carries the potential of sensibility. Only the phenomenal world exists, having been processed through sensibility.

However, the facts in the noumenal realm transcend the empirical facts that exist in the phenomenal realm. Noumenal world cover ideas like God, and we can add, as Kant does in the introduction to his Critique of Pure Reason, the ideas of Freedom and Immortality. We obviously exist in the world of concrete facts, but our mind can think beyond this world to these other

objects of our thinking. We cannot see and experience God in the same way that a rock or a tree can, but we can live in this noumenal world in our minds. Our thinking is not confined only to those things that make up the material world. The idea of God, therefore, can make sense as the concept of a higher being that transcends the phenomenal world and who acts as the cause of the material world. We are not just physical beings. We are also mental/thinking beings, and our thoughts, while they may be of material things, are not themselves material, and need not be confined merely to material objects.

(Velkley, 2003:323) asks the following question: “Why then does Kant still call his investigation a kind of metaphysics?” What Kant did show was what was necessary in the way of proving the world of noumenal (God, for instance) by using pure reason, and this is twofold: the method has to be grounded in a priori reasoning through and through. It cannot be mixed up with empirical judgments that are grounded in the phenomenal world. It must be the world of noumenal, and the understanding derived by means of pure reason that deals with this noumenal world of ideas must be such that it helps us to make sense of the phenomenal world. We cannot just divorce ourselves from one world and free ourselves entirely from the other world. There must be a synthesis of these two separate worlds. This is the whole purpose underlying Kant’s mission, as put forth in what’s known as his critical philosophy.

Kant argued that there would have to be something causing the perceptions. If we are perceiving, then does it not follow that there must be something to be perceived? Unfortunately, Kant knew that had to be the case. He did not know what that something was, so he called it the "thing in it self" and admitted that it was unknowable. Kant made a strong case for the thesis that experience is not chaotic but given a rational structure by the mind. According to him, everything was logical and meaningful, and yet one did not know what it was causing the experience. One could never know just what the things in themselves were.

So generally, Kantian dualism is not that much stray as that of Plato and Descartes. His metaphysical thinking is with restriction. Kant moves the dualism mountain that Plato and Descartes were concerned about and gives it a different shape. As we have seen, Kant mentioned two worlds: the world of noumenal and the world of phenomena. The world of phenomena (things as they appear) is made possible for us to know they are being squeezed by the logical

categories of time and space and causation. Concrete facts that are associated with the existing world exist so they can be studied as facts. The noumenal world (things in themselves) are behind the phenomenal. The residents of noumenal reality transcend the concrete facts that exist in this possible world. Kant didn't deny thinking and investigating about noumenal reality because, according to Kant, nominal reality, whether we wanted or not, existed in our mind. For instance, the existence of God or angels can't be grasped empirically or experienced but we can have thoughts about them in phenomenal reality therefore, the idea of things in themselves make sense in the world of our thoughts and think of a being that transcends the empirical world who acts as a cause of the empirical world as we are not only physical beings. In this way, Kant argues that there is a restriction on reason. Metaphysical assumptions really exceed the limits of reason. Therefore, reason can only be the perfect tool for attaining phenomenal reality. In order to grasp the nominal reality, we have to appeal to practical faith. Therefore, even if Kant provides a new way of viewing and understanding reality, we can assert that for him, metaphysics is possible within restrictions.

1.2 Speculative Metaphysical Thinking

The assertion that Kant made that we can't know the so-called things in themselves, bothered Hegel and made him go for further investigation.Hegel argued that there is no valid basis to conclude that there are some mysterious things called "things in themselves" beyond the world of appearances. So, rather than understanding things in themselves as mystical things, Hegel interpreted them as the systematic order of appearances, arguing that we must not think of reality as something lying beyond what actually appears to us. According to Hegel, "Reality is the sum total of all appearances; it is not beyond appearance, it is the whole." (Katen,1973:148)

Speculative philosophy of history is concerned with history as a whole, which includes explicitly relating the past to the present and the present to the future. Hegel called his inquiry speculative because he viewed history as alienated from didactic and practical notions. It views history as conforming to a pattern or patterns, overarching tendencies that describe a direction toward which historical events are presumably heading.

1.2.1 Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel

Hegel is considered as one of the towering philosophers in the history of philosophy. Hegel absorbed the Cartesian way of metaphysical thinking (subject object dichotomy) that is said to exist in the external world. The Enlightenment fascination with reason started and found wanting its basic tenet of viewing reason as the only criteria for judging how human beings evaluate themselves and their society. Hegel attempted to overcome the Cartesian dichotomy by "Absolute Spirit."

He argues, we should consider human beings as always evolving, of a melding with the minds of other men and women to produce what he would later term the Absolute, the final stage in the evolution of human consciousness. (Navickas, 1976) He clearly argued that: for spirit, however, the ultimate achievement is self-knowledge, which includes not only intuition but also thought-the clear conception of oneself and this it is obligated to do, and it is also destined to do accomplish.

So, in line with this quote, we can grasp two points in his metaphysical thinking: The first one is what he calls "absolute spirit" trying to reveal itself in concrete and temporal human society. He used moments in history for this. For instance, of moments in history, the first one is the "Master-Slave Moment": two individuals from competing clans engage in a fight. Say over "watering hole" They fight and fight, until the soon to be victor sees that he is better off enslaving the other than he is killing him. He sees his opponent as a mere object. Thus, consciousness evolves. Instead of only knowing immediacy, the new master realizes that he, too, could become a mere object to someone else. As an object, he becomes self-conscious. The other is "The Life of Socrates": the reason why we have to be me. Socrates challenges his dialectical opponents to reflect and think about something instead of adopting the customs of the culture they are living in. He always asks them, "What reason do you have to do what you do?" By challenging others to think for themselves, Geist becomes intricately aware of its own unique individuality. We can also take the "Life Of Jesus": before God, all men and women are equal. One is a sinner and knows himself as such. Though saved, one learns that his actions are unique to himself.

Hegel claims that Geist advances and manifests in the growth of these moments. Consciousness, to Self-Consciousness, to Universal-Consciousness, and lastly, to Absolute-Consciousness. The argument that history is over is based on the fact that reason logically recognizes itself as reason. Absolute Self-Knowledge is achieved when Geist recognizes itself as Geist. There are interpretations of Hegel's "Giest" that refer to Christian God, but the compatibility of Hegel's absolute spirit and Christian God has been a point of contention, but Hegel never stated that absolute spirit has a connection with transcendental God; rather, what he mentioned is that absolute spirit is a creative activity that philosophizes about history, not a material being or supersensible reality (God-like thing).

It is also significant that it didn't have to be with Socrates, Jesus, or Hegel (the actual people) that these moments occurred. They are “replaceable.” What matters is how Giest/Spirit developed, and the fact that it did. Socrates, Jesus, and Hegel, the actual people, are contingent facts of history, whereas the moments are necessary facts of history for "Geist" to know itself as "Geist." According to Hegel, “The great history shows that all previous philosophers contributed to the completion of the system that encompasses all reality.” (Velkley, 2003:325)

Secondly, he tried to describe the development of the absolute spirit by looking at the different stages in the development of human cognition. The stages are: Sense certainty: here he describes the most immediate form of experience. Like Kant, he rejects the view that knowledge is limited to immediate experience. He shows that since language is universal, it cannot name particulars. He argues that knowledge cannot be immediate but can only be mediate. Perception: here Hegel studies a frequent theme in modern philosophy where perception is typically understood as "the discovery, by means of the senses, of the existence and properties of the external world." Force and understanding is the sum of sensecertainty and perception. Even the main line of thought is not always obvious; he used Kantian categories as a means of giving shape to the world of everyday physical objects. Self-Certainty: I exist and I am able to use my thinking potential in order to have knowledge of the world. Hegel said self-certainty emerges with the realization that the self is the foundation of all cognition. Reason and Rationality: In this case, the subject and object are the same; there is no antagonistic relationship. The unity of the subject and the object is affirmed at this stage, but the absolute spirit doesn’t have a culmination stage; it never finds itself satisfied. It is cyclical for Hegel. “The world was a place of perpetual change, but it was

not arbitrary since it appeared to follow a well-defined pattern or technique, and absolute reality is dynamic rather than static." (Katen, 1973:153)

Using this, he developed a theory called inter-subjectivity. In this theory he attacked posing dichotomies of subject and object, individual and society. He argued that intersubjectivity is the unity of the two because the thinking mind, the individual subject, cannot be understood alienated from the external world, the object, or society, so according to Hegel, this unity and the antagonistic elimination come into existence in the stage of reason and rationality.

To analyze this cognition, he introduced the method of historical dialectical idealism. Dialectics is characterized by the German word which has both meaning of retention and negation. According to Hegel, absolute spirit is always found in this process of dialectics. This full reflexivity is what Hegel calls absolute reason, and it overcomes the self-contradictions of previous "rationality." For Hegel, what we perceive is the phenomenology of the phenomenal reality of the teleological, ideative Geist, toward the fulfillment of which all things are moving dialectically: history, aesthetics, you name it, all subsumed under this teleological idealism.

To conclude, among the modern thinkers, it is Hegel who tried to reconcile subject and object by refuting the Platonic two worlds (the world of being and the world of becoming), the Cartesian dichotomy (subject and object dualism), and Kantian (world of phenomena and noumenal). Hegel didn't really think of the physical realm and the conceptual realm as fundamentally distinct from each other. Hegel thinks that Greek ethical life and Christian spirituality evolved through European culture, causing human beings to see themselves as persons and subjects. Hegel argues that this is a particular manifestation of the absolute spirit, the moment the absolute spirit comes into appearance by the process of dialectics, the moment the dichotomy, bifurcation, dualism is omitted because it is not a material or sensible object, rather it is a force that engulfs dichotomies passing through human cognition, containing possible human relations. Therefore, his metaphysical thinking rests on what he calls "absolute spirit" as a teleological agency underlying worldly appearances and directing itself toward its own total actualization (Pure Spirit) through a continuous dialectical process that moves stepwise through three recurring stages: thesis-antithesis-synthesis.

Therefore, we have seen in this chapter that both philosophers, Plato, Descartes, Kant, and Hegel, were concerned about ultimate reality. Plato thinks that we should study the realm of forms, the ultimate, eternal, changeless reality, instead of appearance. Descartes thinks that appearance, acquired through our senses, actually hinders our study of reality. We can only access the ultimate truth through reason. For Kant, we can't have true knowledge about things in and of themselves, but we can think about them, and for that, we need to make room for faith. While, Hegel argued for an ultimate reality that can be discovered solely through thought processes. Therefore, both philosophers show that, in one way or another, universalistic and abstract metaphysics is possible.

CHAPTER TWO

2. Nietzsche's Critique of Classical Metaphysical Thinking

In the first chapter, we have seen that classical metaphysical thinking and classical metaphysical thinkers like Plato, Descartes, Kant, and Hegel were more interested in ultimate reality than in appearance, even if they explained "ultimate reality" in their own different dimensions. Plato argues that we should study the realm of forms, the ultimate, eternal, changeless reality, instead of the appearance, so what he calls the soul is separated from the body (appearance) because the soul is eternal in nature. For Descartes, appearance, acquired through our senses, actually hinders our study of reality, and we can only access the ultimate truth through reason. Even if both Descartes and Plato argue that we can grasp ultimate reality through reason in their theory of dualism, unlike Plato, Descartes argues that the mind is a form of the body in the same fashion, unlike Plato. Descartes thinks that we can have reliable knowledge about the existing world.

The enlightenment thinker Kant's dualism contains quite different assertions from that of Plato and Descartes. The reason is that Kant is a critique of pure reason. For instance, according to Descartes, we can conceive of a perfect being using our rational capacity, which is one of the grandest metaphysical assertions, but Kant argues that we can't have real knowledge about things in themselves. These things in themselves include whether a necessary perfect being exists. In this case, Kant declares that reason's reach exceeds its grasp if we allow our rationality to grasp things in themselves. The content of knowledge comes from the senses and the organization of these contents is done by the mind (reason). In this case, he limited the power of reason and argues that we can think about them and for that let's provide room for faith.Hegel tried to omit the dualism that was created by differentiating the different stages of cognition. He argued for an ultimate reality, what he calls the absolute spirit, that is neither a material nor supra-sensible being, but a higher reality, an ultimate reality that reconciles and merges dualism in the stage of rationality, as they are aspects of a single ultimate reality that we can come to know through pure thought processes alone and "This reality isn't beyond appearances; it's the sum of all appearances; it's the entire" (Katen,1973:148) Therefore, both philosophers expressed that, in one way or another, metaphysics is possible.

Avoiding all this classical metaphysical thinking that floats in the high slopes Friedrich Nietzsche declares that the history of classical metaphysical thinking is dead. Nietzsche strives to radicalize the two requirements which are at the birth of philosophy: critique the evidences that caver the world and trouse by creating the surprise in the face of the irreducible riddle it holds." (Nestorahoyo, 2002)So he comes up with a plan to change the overall metaphysical thinking game to another level and form. Amazingly, in order to show the downfall of classical metaphysical thinking, which is bounded up by ultimate reality, supra sensible, ontological being, higher reality, and yonder world theory, Nietzsche was interested in metaphysics. Peter Poellner has recently written that: one of the interpretive questions that has historically split Nietzsche's philosophy interpreters is whether Nietzsche is, basically, or at least among other things, a metaphysician. (Mitchell, 2017) I would say Nietzsche is critic of classical metaphysics in order to develop his own metaphysics derived by his own assertion. (Nestorahoyo, 2002) argues that metaphysics of Nietzsche, is a metaphysics of immanence because it makes the last principle of things exist within the things rather than outside them and then he uniquely developed a metaphysical thinking which is cyclical, material, empirical in its nature called "Eternal Recurrence" and metaphysical principle "The will to power" and the manifestation of this principle called "The over man".

Therefore, this chapter intends to show metaphysical thinking developed by Nietzsche in order to show the down fall of classical metaphysical thinking. Through the process: the first section of the chapter provides Nietzsche's criticism of classical metaphysical thinking. According to him classical metaphysical thinking is grounded in errors which highly privileged unfinable accessible concepts against ascetic thinking that regrets the sensuous world, sensory experiences and appearance. He mention that this privileged idea brushed a way to transcendental world. , Because of this, Nietzsche tended to conceive classical metaphysical thinking in general as an unscientific, erroneous and ultimately frivolous mode of inquiry, one that's inconsequential for flesh-and-blood human and doomed to disappear. In the second section I seek to show that his attempt to criticize and overcome classical metaphysics situated him in developing his own metaphysical thinking through the metaphysical principle that determines the totality of existence concepts named "will to power" and the manifestation Uebermensch (Overman), and the system Eternal recurrence, in order to replace the classical metaphysical thinking by will and desire. In the closing, using this all as premises this chapter going to answer the question: Does

Nietzsche's way of metaphysical thinking show only the down fall of classical metaphysics in order to create another form in metaphysics or is it elimination of metaphysics as whole?

2.1 Against classical metaphysical thinking

The qualities of classical metaphysical thinking like abstract, that tries to explain human existence as created by a transcendental being or supersensible entity, a life-denying, built by slave morality, universalistic, speculative, are absolutely against Nietzsche's philosophy. As Nietzsche's professor of ancient philology, he was heavily influenced by various ancient traditions. As a result, his thoughts are frequently based on criticizing various previous traditions. those, classical metaphysical thinking is the one that fall under the bitter criticism of Nietzsche.

Nietzsche was very curious about the assumption of classical metaphysical thinking pillar point "transcendental world." The world that exists beyond our experience is beautiful and true. However, the visible, empirical world we see and experience is always a deceived one. He considered the methodology of classical metaphysical thinking and religious systems as "the very worst methods of knowledge." He argued that it's because the argument set by classical metaphysical thinking is set with "the world beyond the world," which might be called the "yonder classical world."

According to Nietzsche, Yonder World Theory is a product of classical metaphysical thinking in its distinction between the "real and the appearance," the "form and the participant," and the "being and becoming." So he contends that by this thinking we realize and understand how classical metaphysical thinking is fictitious and drives us towards a state of nihilism. According to Nietzsche, besides the classical metaphysics, the contribution of science as a path to throwing people into the state of nihilism is a great one. He argues that science also contributed to nihilism because people relied on science as God. People occupy the throne that God placed for Science, viewing it as a source of principle and meaning in life. According to Nietzsche, the scientists that were in the enlightenment era continued the project of classical epistemology that attempted to discover objective truth, but according to Nietzsche, there is no truth to be discovered, rather it is based on one's perspective and interpretation.

Classical metaphysical thinking, according to Nietzsche, must be abandoned for the following reasons: one , existence of nature in its totality cannot be explained by relying on

transcendentalism or a concept beyond the sensuous world. The other one is that classical metaphysician metaphysical thinking is wholeheartedly embedded in ratiocinative to find what they call absoluteness on the one hand and beyond the horizon of a sensible world or sensible entity, which leads to acetic morality on the other. According to Nietzsche, this assertion of classical metaphysical thinking doesn't consider man leaving in the existing world but rather in the transcendental perfect world. In one way or another, Nietzsche's criticism generally rests on the above two stems; other criticisms are the branches of them.

Socrates is the main target of Nietzsche's criticism. (Evangeliou)It's because according to Nietzsche in western culture philosophy emerged because of a transition from mythos to logos, "A myth is a conventional account of allegedly historical events that helps to unveil part of a people's world view or explain a behavior, belief, or natural phenomena without appealing to critical judgment" (Merriam Webster)and logos is reason or rationality. According to Nietzsche, in western culture, philosophy emerged where there was a transition from mythos to logos. So Nietzsche is arguing that this paradigm shift from mythos to logos develops a new tradition called Socratism. As we all know, Socrates was a character and historically existing philosopher who mostly has a part in Plato's dialogues. Thus, Socrates becomes the proponent of Platonism and the assertion of the truth value of transcendental, eternal things-in-themselves. Nietzsche, being a strong materialist, despises this view and deems it self-debilitating and pointless.

The other criticism is that the metaphysical forms that were embraced by Socrates, as written in Plato's dialogue according to Nietzsche, are equal with ascetic morality. He argues that classical metaphysicians cut off the way that early Greek's has blossomed by searching absolute truth and by reducing Greek heroism to what he calls slave morality. For this he also blamed Christianity as a contributor for embracing of slave morality. According to Nietzsche, there are two kinds of morality named "master" and "slave." The slave mindset generates a binary universe of "good" and "bad," whereas noble or master morality is capable of transcending good and evil (Nestorahoyo,2002) to symbolize this he used two Greek gods who possess two different forces called "Apollo" and "Dayonisus". They represent the elements which generate the mythical period in the life of humanity (mythico- metaphysical configuration). Nietzsche championed the Dionysian over the Apollonian, because according to him the latter represent reason, wisdom, law, order etc., while the former represents joy, power, appreciation of life etc.

So, according to Nietzsche, classical metaphysical thinking and Christianity create a slave mentality, so they are “Apolloian”. Nietzsche's whole project was to “overturn” this image of philosophy grounded in a rational, truth-seeking subject and devise a “philosophy of the future,” one that would be more appropriate after we've shrugged off the shackles of Platonistic, Cartesian, Kantian, Hegelian, and Christianity. The Nietzsche conviction of "becoming who we are" entails that this becoming has no goal, destination, purpose to achieve or to stop. It is a process that is always in flux, an ongoing process and engagement without destination. Throughout this, people examine themselves as they embrace contradictions of different wills, and this is a manifestation of will to power through the process of becoming.

Nietzsche argues that self-awareness and critical examination occur and continue without giving a goal and a purpose, i.e., a dream to impose our will. In Nietzschean metaphysical thinking, unlike classical metaphysical thinking, the two: Diyonisian and Apolloian, are balanced against each other, but in classical metaphysical thinking, Appolloian was too much in the ascendant. So, starting from Socrates, searching for universal truth that is aided by reason, ended up in an embracing ascetic form of life, which is a life denying morality.

Nietzsche’s metaphysical thinking or system and morality go hand in hand. He contended that we must evaluate every metaphysical theory in terms of what a moral system is attempting to prove. For instance, Christianity preaches in its rituals that the existing world is a temporary one, a finite one, where war, suffering, and death exist and to judge it as a bad one, so people judge this world as a hell and see life pessimistically. So, according to Nietzsche, classical and Christian metaphysics provide a whole package of life-denying systems of values for people to follow.

Another of Nietzsche’s criticisms against classical metaphysical thinking is regarding the concept of change. In this case, Nietzsche used Heraclitus’s conception of the world as always changing, always being in flux. Nietzsche argued that the classical metaphysicians regarded the underlying metaphysical principle beyond this world as permanent, divine, stable, real, and beautiful and the visible world as defective, changing, and evil because change entails pain, suffering, strife, hardship, anxiety, breakup, and death, and they want to escape from this truth.

He explained that their search for a metaphysical being and a world is nothing more than an escape from the very reality of suffering to a world in which self-contradiction, competition, and suffering exist. He argues that classical metaphysicians teach and live this because they have a secret desire to escape from reality under the cover of searching for reality.

In contrast to this metaphysical thinking, Nietzsche develops an underlying metaphysical force that manifests itself in different forms of human and natural evolution and in different modes of existence because, for Nietzsche, there is only one reality and that is the existing, empirical and physical world. According to Nietzsche, in this existing world, there is an underlying metaphysical principle called the will to power. Unlike classical metaphysical thinking, the underlying principle of will to power is not something transcendental but rather energy that is mediated, defused, and situated in the real, sensuous existence of human beings. To support this, Heidegger claimed that traditional metaphysical thinking ignores human beings' true existence. According to him, metaphysics should not be far removed from the reach of the human mind; rather, it must be situated in the possible existence of human beings. To elaborate on this, according to Heidegger, there are two modalities of existence that are available to the Dasien way of being in the world. On one hand, there is dwelling and comportment, embracing oneself in terms of inter subjectivity relations with others in a given community, and on the other hand, there is also a relationship of instrumentality. We are trying to identify the usages of instrumental technical reason where everyday physical objects are identified in terms of a utilitarian consideration and a pragmatic value in general. Individuals who believe in transcendental reality, according to Nietzsche, are weak because, no matter how horrible life is, the world is terrifying and tragic to live in, one must face it and master it. According to Nietzsche, master morality can be enjoyed by affirming life, by saying yes to life. Rather than waiting for another transcendental world beyond the existing one, one should be clear and affirm that suffering, pain, and hardship are inevitable parts of human existence.

Nietzsche's harsh criticism of classical metaphysical thinking is based on the dichotomy they have developed thus far: "appearance versus reality. Nietzsche writes: What does “appearance” mean to me now? Certainly not the polar opposite of some essence—what could one possibly say about any essence other than to describe the predicates of its appearance? Certainly not a dead mask that could be used to put on an X and then removed. (Nietzsche, 2001)There is no

such thing as a real and an appearance in Nietzsche's world; there is no so-called dichotomy or dualistic world; there is only real, which is this world.He fundamentally and critically disagrees with the idea of a hidden reality and sees the idea as pernicious for how it removes us from experience. It seems to Nietzsche that classical metaphysical thinkers rely on dichotomy because they think that “who wants us to focus on the reality in front of us?”

According to Nietzsche, classical metaphysical thinking and Christianity want everyone to think about the immortality of the soul and other world that we pass when we die. However, Nietzsche attempts to overcome the disappearance of the "real world" that classical metaphysical thinking embraced. He argues we are human, all too human, and will die. There is no other world. The best we can do is to live a life we love to live, to give meaning to our meaningless suffering. We all have one life to live. We have to deal with self-overcoming.

According to Nietzsche, one can be part of self-overcoming when he expresses his actions in energy, facing every suffering that he encounters with energy, by facing the reality in the existing world, challenging the pain but not to eliminate it but to overcome it, because self-overcoming entails evolution and growth. *"What does not kill me, makes me stronger." So* Nietzsche argues that anybody who tells us there is another one, a world apart from this, is lying or telling a fairy tale because they want to engender a slave morality to give or surrender ourselves in the name of eternity. However, we have to emphasize worldliness.

Nietzsche’s other criticism against classical metaphysics is influenced by Charles Darwin, Nietzsche brought evolutionary perspective to his views of society, and he sees society as evolving through time to suit the power structures with one set of rules. However, classical metaphysical thinking saw the shape of the world in terms of eternal ideals, where as Nietzsche saw it in terms of historically contingent change. However, this change doesn’t aim to attain perfection because he doesn’t believe that there is perfection either.

The other manifestation of classical metaphysical thinking is that it dwells in rationality to the extent that rationality should overcome irrationality. However, Nietzsche sees the dominance of rationality over classical metaphysical thinking as the key problem of human beings that classical metaphysical thinkers produced because, according to Nietzsche, there has to be a

balance between the forces of mind/order (Appolian) versus the forces of passion/chaos (Dionysian). According to Nietzsche, the elevation of reason over passion is completely wrong because it ignores the fullness of earthly life. He claims that Socrates and Plato, for example, were preoccupied with how to live a good life, how to find absolute truth and conclude it must be based on the conviction of the immortal soul, and that conviction is related to a faith in eternal forms rather than earthly, worldly, temporal, and existing reality.

According to Nietzsche, as he is his adherent of perspectivism, there is no such thing as absolute truth, universal truth that is driven by conceptual analysis that can be grasped by relying on the transcendental world. For Nietzsche, truth is a product of a person's interpretation and perspective that is geared by will to power or a person's interest.

So, for Nietzsche, classical metaphysical thinking fails under reason and reason alone; they try to apply a logos to the world but ignore the poetic, chaotic, and affective elements of the world. Nietzsche claimed that human beings not only have a rational part but also an affective nature. This is why he writes in non-traditional formats like aphorisms, songs, and poems. So, according to Nietzsche, the sterility of classical metaphysical thinking is bound by rationalism and ended by collapsing.

The other criticism is based on the concept of "things in themselves" that classical metaphysical thinking insisted on. Things, according to Nietzsche, are a way of discounting the value of this world and elevating the transcendent metaphysical world in the hierarchy. According to Nietzsche, we cannot think of this world as if it is a participant in some other transcendental, indefinable, untouchable, inaccessible world. The only world we know is things in here. This is the only possible world and possible entities. There is no such thing as the so-called ideal mind. Forms are things in themselves that are separate from things from the visible world and that arise from the transcendental kingdom.

Nietzsche argues that we can use the term "things in themselves" not as an idea about an essence; a thing in itself is an idea about the defining or otherwise salient properties of a thing, not an idea about a metaphysical substance in which properties are here. Classical metaphysical thinking of appearances or phenomena rationally organized by transcendental theory is a "pale

shadow" of the conception of truth, according to Nietzsche. This is inherited by classical metaphysical thinking and is yet another step toward its dissolution. Nietzsche was very much concerned, as Kant was, with the difference between appearance (reality as we know it) and being (reality as it might be in itself). According to Nietzsche, the thing in itself was a way of discounting the value of this world and ranking more highly the transcendent metaphysical one. Nietzsche writes that:

> *We could say nothing about the metaphysical world except that it is different, a differentness that is unreachable and inaccessible to us. It'd be a thing having negative characteristics. Even if the existence of such a world could be confirmed, knowing about it would be the most insignificant of all knowledge, even more insignificant as knowing about the chemical analysis of water must be to a boatman confronting a storm*. (Nietzsche,2001)

As a result, he declared in his book "Thus Spoke Zarathustra" that "God Is Dead." He felt that a world composed of individuals who did not believe in true world theories would be a much better world because they would come to know the real existence of them, which is embedded in the existing world and explained in its own principle and own cause.

In order to show the down fall of classical metaphysical thinking he uses the analogy of a madman to proclaim his statement God is dead" in which a madman with a lantern in the marketplace cries: "I'm looking for God! I'm on the lookout for God!" He is scoffed at and mocked: "Has he been lost, then? asked one. Did he lose his way like a child? asked another. Or is he on run? Is he afraid of us?" The folks in the marketplace are not only aware that there is no God, but they also place no value on it. They've long since learned to live without God, ; the non-existence of God causes them no alarm. Then the madman switches gears. "'Where is God?' he cried; 'I'll tell you! We have killed him – you and I! (Nietzsche, 2007) So what is the madman trying to refer by the name "God" really needs quite careful interpretation.

Nietzsche expounds on the idea that we as an "enlightened" society have killed God, However, he is referring to the concept of the "God" of the middle ages, as well as the God that religion supposedly created and is no longer applicable to his society. Modern thinking people live in a concept of God and classical metaphysical thinking seeking of transcendental beings is no longer relevant in society. Therefore, his proclamation "God is dead" symbolized the end and death of classical metaphysical thinking.

Let's see this in the following scenario: If we ask a person 1000 years ago about God, he would say God is a supernatural being. Then if we ask him, where is the place that God lives? He would answer in the sky. There is a place called heaven. Those people believed that it was a prosperous year because God was pleased with our pious actions, and natural disasters such as storms occurred because he was dissatisfied with our actions, as he did with the world-engulfing flood described in the bible, Exodus. And then, closing the era, the Enlightenment period comes into existence. The scientific method was codified. People started making the distinction between science and non-scientific inquiries because European civilization as a whole was becoming increasingly secular. Many were becoming atheist or agnostic and everything that we once believed God was responsible for was shown to be the product of purely natural phenomena. It rains because of the natural water cycle. Diseases are caused by microbes. Good fortune follows the rules of probability.

According to Nietzsche, God, analysis, and attempts to find reality outside of the visible world simply did not make sense to modern man in light of secularization, and so on. At some point, someone even did the math and found that praying for something did not increase the likelihood of it happening. Objectively speaking, Plato's world of being, Descartes's God, Kant's realm of things in themselves, and Hegel's ultimate reality "Absolute Geist" have no empirically observed effect on the world. The world runs entirely without transcendental metaphysical beings' intervention. Therefore, the concept of seeking a transcendental world is dead in the effect that the mad man attempted to assert a new meaning that will be elaborated in the following paragraphs.

So, going back to the mad man, the people that the mad man was talking to in the marketplace were men of the Enlightenment and the Scientific Revolution. People of the enlightenment understand themselves to have explained the world without appealing to God, which makes them atheists. But these apparent unbelievers are in fact holding on to the belief in God in another form. That is, bound up with the idea of God, the most important thing that human beings can do is to subordinate themselves to a value that is independent of their desires and interests—an objective value. Scientific knowledge, they believe, is of such value. That's why Nietzsche argues against classical metaphysical thinking, that animating from them, there are a few individuals who affirm this life and are faithful to the visible world, who overcome suffering and

give meaning to suffering. Even if he argued so, he mentioned the limits of science. Nietzsche died in the 19th century when modern science started to blossom, so it is better to know that Nietzsche was only aware of the conception of science at that time. According to Nietzsche, science helps people to be alive, strong, and so on. However, this scientific moral assumption is a very barbarian cycle of antagonism and amoral tasks, as Nietzsche is focused on morality.

Nietzsche's criticism of traditional metaphysics in general indicates that the way metaphysical thinking is shaped on the ground of transcendental abstraction, in findable, inaccessible abstraction that is beyond human capability to grasp in this sense has no relevance, especially in the enlightenment era, because this concept way of analyzing concepts no longer has the strong spirit to solve human real problems that happen in existence because the existence of the moment entails and people are already in the way of believing the spatial temporality of life.

So how do we encounter the problem of existence? Nietzsche would say we need to embark and start exercising the idea of existence that is natural and human in its nature, a forceful relation with others that existed in the system of affirming life, and try to re-challenge and re-examine things in life.

So Nietzsche asks the most important question: "What do we do after the death of God, particularly as we have killed him?" This is after shattering of classical metaphysical thinking, because Nietzsche realized that the absence of God, in the event there is no God, left human beings orphans for eternity, and that the absence of belief in a higher entity renders people without a purpose to serve.In this situation, people are no longer left with a solution to their universal problem of "why do we exist?" In Nietzsche's words, they laid the groundwork for an age of nihilism. Nihilism, according to Nietzsche, "involves the will of nothingness." (Nestorahoyo, 2002:6)The state of nihilism is the belief that nothing matters or has value in this life. The psychologist Victor Frankl explains nihilism in his book titled "The Unheard Cry for Meaning":

> *Since long time ago we are dreaming which we are on the way to waking up :the idea that if we just improve people's socioeconomic circumstances, everything would be well and they will become happy. The fact is that as the battle for survival has subsided, the question of surviving for what? has arisen. Today, an increasing number of individuals have the means to live, but no meaning to live.* (Krasko, 2007)

Nietzsche states that, human beings can live with suffering, but they cannot live with pointless, unreasonable, inexplicable suffering. Nietzsche's realization that faith in God could not survive as the basis for morality and that the loss of faith would lead to widespread nihilism is what pushed him to search for a more reliable, fundamental basis for objective morality, which he eventually developed into his theories on the will to power. However, he contended that we cannot care for reality unless we overcome this suffering. We have to give meaning to our suffering; we have to overcome it.

2.2 Nietzsche in Developing his Metaphysics

Abandoning the transcendental being, Nietzsche writes, Look, I'm going to teach you how to be an overman." The meaning of the earth is the over-man. Allow your voice to proclaim, “The meaning of the universe is the superman! “My brethren, I implore you to stay true to the ground and not to trust those who speak to you of otherworldly aspirations! They are poison-mixers, whether they realize it or not. They despise life, rotting and poisoning themselves, and the land is tired of them, so let them go. The greatest sin used to be sin against God; nevertheless, God died, and the killers perished with him.” (Nietzsche, 2006)

Therefore, Nietzsche provides a solution to a problem created by his declaration "God is dead." According to Nietzsche, we therefore must create a new man, an "over man" (Ubermensch) and for this overman to be actual, what he calls "will to power" is the building block of this reality. Here the question can be posed: Does the overman (Ubermensch) decay as the classical metaphysical thinking decayed through time and create a chance for the people to fail under the state of nihilism again? According to Nietzsche, the superman is not something that stands for some goal and culminates in history, but rather something that evolves over time by allowing will to power to manifest in him always existed in the evolution of human beings as a defused and depressed entity, so there is no way that it will stop and start to bore human beings because it is always in a state of flux.

Matter, unlike classical metaphysicians, arises as a will to power, even in the smallest particles.We find the building block of reality known as the will to power at every level of appearance: will to power at work, will to power at school, will to power at race... through this, what we always encounter is appearance and appearance only. According to Nietzsche,

appearance is the only manifestation of the will to power, and power is a matter of effect, contradiction, strife, war, chaos. Nietzsche's will to power manifests in different things like, nature, individuals, groups, and dominions of animals by human kind. So Nietzsche is trying to say that the only principle that manifests itself in different modes of existence is the will to power, like nature, knowledge, art, politics, etc. Nietzsche calls them "formations of domination. "Nietzsche declares, I found the will to power where I found the living, and I found the desire to be master even in the will of the servant." (Nestorahoyo, 2002:4)So will to power animates our actions because it lacks a specific form or system in which to manifest itself, such as knowledge, science, religion, friendship, and so on; it can manifest itself in any form. The will to power, according to Nietzsche, is the most intimate essence of being. That is, the will to power is the fundamental character of being as being.

In nature, for example, will power has an effect. The earth rotates around the sun because of the power exerted on it by the sun (this power is called gravity). The will to power is the will to effect. The earth too exerts its power upon the sun. But, the earth also contains contradicting forces. There are rivers eroding away these mountains as they climb ever higher. There are colliding storm systems, giving birth to tornadoes, and there are creatures clinging to the surface of this planet, each with their own centers of will to power. The will to power is in effect in individuals who are also composed of many centers of will to power. Individuals who compute for domination, individuals who contradict for authority. A person with passions has to decide which desire he/she will Will because the power of expressing emotion, passion is, by default, according to Nietzsche, an expression of energy. This energy becomes power because in all contradiction and emotion, we are all trying to affirm our will to power. The will is what decides which desires will be given their "way and measure". The will to power also describes groups of individuals who voluntarily come together to accomplish the same goal; that obviously appeals to the individuals' will enough so that they are willing to give up autonomy for that purpose.

2.2.1 Eternal recurrence of the same

Nietzsche's attempt to show that even when reality and truth have died, mankind may still have something resembling a gay science or joyous knowledge. (Nietzsche, 2007)As a result of his opposition to the classical metaphysical thinking paradigm, Nietzsche develops his own metaphysics. So, estranged from the criticized, challenged, and questioned characteristics of

classical metaphysical thinking Nietzsche pioneered a new approach to metaphysics by arguing that the physical world is more real and important than the unknown fanatical world, and that human perspectives are more important than mysterious beliefs. In this case, Nietzsche was an individualist as he adhered to perspectivism, which allows people to interpret things from the point of view of them. So he provides the idea of eternal recurrence of the affirmation of the will to power as an attempt to capitalize on war, chaos, strife, competition, egoistic as the possible world that we know and as a true world in abundance and disappearance of the true world that classical metaphysicians have thought.

In Nietzsche's eternal recurrence, we are surveyed against acknowledging the conception that there is beyond this life and in affirming of the existing system without connection to the other invisible world, all we have is this system. In his book Gay Science, he embraces his grand project, eternal recurrence:

> *What if a devil come over in the time you are completely alone and said the following words the life you are living now will repeat infinitely without new thing in it every bits of it even I myself. will you gnash your teeth and curse the devil that spoke this when the endless hourglass of existence is flipped upside down? or have you ever had a life-changing event that you'd want to share? Have answered him.* (Nietzsche, 2001)

To elaborate on the above quote, Nietzsche asks us to imagine a moment when we are completely alone. At that moment, evil appears and announces that the life you once lived will continue and rescue again and again everything good and bad that happens in us. Every kiss and every heartbreak will be experienced to infinity. This is eternal recurrence. It is the idea of all events in the world repeating themselves in the same sequence in an infinite number of circles, but not to have access to an ultimate goal or purpose.

Most of the time, the Eternal Recurrence is interpreted in different paradigms; here are the two most influential interpretations. The first one is that Nietzsche was doing a thought experiment. If we knew that our life was all that we had, and that there was no world thereafter, as Nietzsche believed, then would we be willing to Will an eternal recurrence of our life? It simply means that our life is worth living if we are willing to have it to live every moment of it again and again. The other interpretation is that Nietzsche might have interpreted the eternal recurrence as a cosmological argument in that he thought that the universe existed circularly, similar to that of

some pre-Socratic philosophers, a true cosmic assertion. It wouldn't be beyond the realm of belief: Nietzsche often complained that everyone after Plato was a poison to Western philosophy. Either way, what Nietzsche attempted to describe is that one's life, existence is continuing without referring to a transcendental world and transcendental life and a direct relationship between metaphysical considerations and the way in which we live our day-to-day life. Here, Nietzsche's project was not to give telos or purpose to life.

There is no purpose in life. The only thing that there is affirmation, challenging, examining of life. If it has a purpose or telos, it again throws us to nihilism, so we live in the evolution system. If Nietzsche takes the idea at its value, he believes we actually have access to this type of immortality. If he presents it as a test for life, it gives people who are appropriately oriented toward their own lives some of the comfort of immortality. (Pappas, 2014)

There are two major factors that should be considered in Nietzsche's Eternal Recurrence: time and space. According to Nietzsche, we can consider time as infinite and it is not bounded by matter in the universe. Matters in so-called space, on the other hand, are finite; these are matters that exist in the universe contained within space. So these finite matters shuffle around innumerable times in this infinite time line when matters come back to this exact moment over and over again, innumerable times. That's what we call Eternal Recurrence.

So recurrence must be tied to this system, the visible world, rather than something beyond or metaphysical. The idea of reincarnation is not something new that has been suggested by Nietzsche for the first time. It has been suggested and discussed by philosophers and religious institutions. But first of all, what does reincarnation mean? According to (Encyclopedia Britannic,2020) in religion and philosophy, reincarnation, also known as transmigration or metempsychosis, is the rebirth of an aspect of an individual that remains beyond physical death, whether it is awareness, mind, soul, or some other entity in one or more consecutive lives. These beings may be human, animal, spiritual, or, in certain cases, vegetative, depending on the tradition.

The Buddhist concept of reincarnation states that: There is no everlasting "soul," "spirit," or "self," but rather a "stream of awareness" that connects life to life," says the author. Punarbhava (Sanskrit) or punarbhava (Pli), meaning "becoming again," or bhava, "becoming," refers to the

actual process of transitioning from one life to the next. The cultivation of high degrees of meditative focus is discussed in early Buddhist writings as a means of recalling former incarnations. (Nagaraj , Nanjegowda, & Purushotma, 2013)Christian reincarnation is One might preserve the notion of reward and punishment while modifying the values that the ultimate Judge is meant to use to decide their application. (Zuboff, 1973)What makes Nietzsche's proposal special is unlike others Nietzsche deals with the problem in completely material way.

This type of recurrence is the most materialistic form of reincarnation possible. There is nothing otherworldly or mystical about it. So through this system, according to Nietzsche, the best formula for human greatness and the answer to the question, how to live your best life? is amour fati (love of one's fate). Even if we consider failures, breakups, the death of a loved one, strife, and hardships, we should be happy. We should learn to incorporate mistakes, imperfections, and sorrows into the beauty of the whole. We should construct our lives. We should basically decide who we want to be and how we want to be. But this doesn't mean we have a predetermined fate, a defined fate that we will achieve. So, rather than being duped by fiction, let us affirm life.

> *To embrace your fate is to understand that everything that has happened in your life, good, terrible, and ugly, has shaped who you are and what you are doing right now."To accept any aspect of life, you must embrace all aspects of it. Attempting to construct yourself may result in some failures, but accepting those failures with your accomplishments will help you re-ignite your love of life and see the purpose in even the darkest situations* (O'Briem, 2017)

Everything that happens to you there is no way out it is good to know who we are that limited beings mortal Amour Fati defeating our morality we still die but we still say yes to death.

The movie titled "Arrival" is the best example to understand the concept of Amour Fati. The film is about 12 mysterious space crafts that appear around the world. Luwis, played by Amy Adams, is a linguistic professor, and she is called on by the government to interpret the language that the apparent alien visitors are speaking in along the way. Luwis mates her newfound colleague Ian, played by Jermhy Ranner, together and with the team of scientists they focus on cracking the aliens' written language, which is portrayed in smoke like symbols. As Luwis begins to learn the language, she experiences flashes of memories in which she was introduced to her daughter Hannah together. When Luwis finally understands an alien language, the language acts as a key and unlocks our consciousness. She can now perceive time in a cyclical fashion, seeing

everything past, present, and future. At the end of the film she said that “Despite knowing the journey where it leads I embrace it and I welcome every moment of it” (Villeneuve, 2016) and Nietzsche writes that: we must face our fate with bravery.

So generally, we can point out the following points about Nietzsche's critique of classical metaphysical thinking and his metaphysics. The first one is that Nietzsche embraced a free-floating view of perspectivism, whereas classical metaphysical thinking argued for an objective reality or pattern behind human grasping and capability phenomena in general. The second point is that this classical metaphysical thinking throws human beings into the state of nihilism because God is metaphorically dead, but we should not stay in this state of nihilism because the lack of God doesn’t mean the death of the whole world or any sort of objective morality. Even if Nietzsche argues against objective or universality, when it comes to morality, he goes with universality.

He is not arguing that there are no absolutes with respect to morality. However, he neglects faith in God or absolute transcendental being as the basis of morality. So, according to Nietzsche, we can overcome the nihilistic state by burying the thinking that classical metaphysics has taught us for so long. To replace this, he developed the concepts "will to power," "over man," and "Eternal recurrence" as replacements for classical metaphysical thinking, which are derived from other sources rather than classical metaphysical thinking. The third point is in order to show the downfall of classical metaphysical thinking.

Nietzsche develops metaphysics in different versions. His theory is not like traditional metaphysical thinking in that it is abstract, unchanging, and constant, but it is always dynamic, evolutionary, flowing, changing, and evolving. In his declaration "God is dead", he argues that we must therefore create a new man, "overman." In this case, he is confronted with God using over man and religion with will to power.

In order to build his metaphysical theory of the will to power, he used Buddha’s two truth philosophy: ultimate truth and conventional truth. Nietzsche was in favour of conventional truth because ultimate truth entails the first principle of self and God. He accepted conventional truth as it seemed useful to follow his metaphysical theory of will to power and as the over man is essentially a creation of new values, which are not tied to the ultimate truth as an eternal being

and God since there is no God who imbues us with it and as we no longer believe in them because they have been thoroughly debunked. So generally, As Nietzsche forwarded the following key messages, the first one is that society no longer believes in and has a need for God. Therefore, human beings should construct their own value and meaning in order to stand on their own feet.

The value they are going to make is in the sense of embracing the temporal nature of existence, the apparent meaninglessness of life for the better facing of reality. According to Nietzsche, our life is worth living if we are willing to have it to live every moment of it again and again. If you say yes, you are expressing your “will to Power,” and the man who is in the middle of the being is referred to as "the over man. According to Nietzsche, since the days of Thales, who is the first actor in the transition from mythos to logos, argued that a fundamental constituent of all life, the universe, and everything is water. Nietzsche proposed that this fundamental element is the will to power. So, throughout our material existence in all of its forms, the struggle for dominance, the will to win, is a result of the struggle for power. For example, a queen may reside in only one space at a time, but her power extends to all of the potential spaces she may occupy. So we only have to embrace this life, the only possible life, because if we are seeking for eternity, transcendental beings, we are beasts. If we choose to give our meaning of life and are the manifestations of will to power, we are God.

So, does Nietzsche's way of metaphysical thinking show only the downfall of classical metaphysics in order to create another form of metaphysics or is it the elimination of metaphysics as a whole?

Heavy criticism of one form of metaphysics does not imply the abandonment of metaphysics as a whole; rather, it opens the door for other alternative metaphysical forms and goals. Nietzsche’s criticism against classical metaphysical thinking really shows the downfall of classical metaphysical thinking, an already decayed way of metaphysical thinking, but not eliminating metaphysics, because, as we see, Nietzsche seems to be arguing that my version of reality is better than your version (classical metaphysical thinking) of reality. In his very denial of classical metaphysical reality, Nietzsche was making a metaphysical assumption. What Nietzsche was trying to do is, by abandoning classical metaphysical thinking, he wanted to birth

his own metaphysical thinking in different versions by understanding metaphysics as every day metaphysics, that is material, sensuous, spatial, temporal, and appearance, an existing version, evolved through history of philosophy. The metaphysics of Nietzsche, like other modern metaphysical systems, is a metaphysics of immanence because it makes the last principle of things reside inside the things and not outside of them.A supernatural principle, a prime mover, or an organizing intelligence, according to him, does not originate or determine natural existence in its entirety, but it is its own cause, its own principle (Nestorahoyo, 2002)He gave metaphysics another form, which is different from the classical metaphysical way of conception as it goes beyond physics. By overcoming this definition, he tries to develop his own metaphysics of physical reality and everydayness. Therefore, Nietzsche's critique doesn’t eliminate metaphysics but rather give a physical flavor to metaphysics, unlike classical metaphysical thinkers.

CHAPTER THREE

3. Jean-François Lyotard and Postmodern Critique of Classical Metaphysical Thinking.

In the first two chapters, we considered the nature of classical metaphysical thinking and Nietzsche's critique of such a tradition, respectively. In chapter one we have seen that classical metaphysical thinking classifying in to two different streams called dualistic metaphysical thinking and speculative metaphysical thinking, generally embedded in abstract, transcendental, ideal, ultimate reality and yonder world theory.

In the case of dualistic classical metaphysical thinking, we have considered the idea of Plato, an attempt to draw the world of forms that is eternal, unchangeable, and absolute, which is the benchmark for the world of appearance and can be accessed through ratiocinative and dialectics. Hereafter, the idea of Descartes considered, Descartes' metaphysics was embarked on to the shift of the subject. His metaphysical thinking bifurcate two realities: the subject mental (mind) and the material substance (body) as referring to two distinct tasks and entities. The Cartesian subject is a closed system that contains abstract and essential paradigms. In the case of these, it never attempts to provide space for another alternative truth. So, according to Descartes, in order to have "clear and distinct ideas" about all the distinctions and, overall, about every concern, rationality and relying to transcendental being is the only way and option.

The other idea considered is Immanuel Kant's dual realms: things in themselves as noumenal reality and things as they appear to us as phenomena reality. He argues that we have to provide room for faith in order to know about things in themselves, as reason capability doesn't allow us to grasp the reality out there. Thereafter, Hegel's idea is considered within the stream of speculative classical metaphysical thinking as an attempt to describe ultimate reality as "Absolute Spirit" that is neither a material entity nor a supersensible higher reality rather simply energy that manifests itself in history. This classical metaphysical thinking appeared and reformed itself through the history of philosophy as a result of the transition from mythos to logos.

The German philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche caused another transition in philosophy. Nietzsche shifted from classical metaphysical thinking reality into another metaphysical reality called will

to power, which manifests itself in different forms in the world. Nietzsche argued that classical metaphysical thinking is on its last breath, and for this he declared, "God is dead." This is both an annunciation and bad news.

It is an annunciation because it alienates and tweaks human beings from a slave morality and ascetic form of life to a master morality and life affirming form of life. It's bad news because as human beings live in the fiction that classical metaphysical thinking forms, when this declaration comes to be, people find themselves in a state of nihilism. According to Nietzsche classical metaphysical thinking is an end project and a cause that throw people in the state of nihilism so it must be abandoned because it worships a non-existing reality this exploited and hide a way for people to grasp the existing reality and to fight for this world but according to Nietzsche we can construct meaning in such world (that all of the narratives that once give meaning for all forms of life like: religion, life, tradition, culture, etc. were slowly fading).

Nietzsche's attempt was to overcome the state of nihilism and to embark to reality that existed in the possible world in which human beings could create their own values. According to Nietzsche, classical metaphysical thinking is an end project and a cause that throws people into the state of nihilism, so it must be abandoned because it worships a non-existing reality. This exploited and concealed a way for people to grasp the existing reality and to fight for this world. So, Nietzsche's attempt was to transcend nihilism and embark on a reality that existed in a possible world in which humans could create their own values. According to Nietzsche, the best we could do is try to make a world that would give rise to strong people as they could create their own values using the power of their will. This is will to power and a system called eternal recurrence where everything dies and everything blossoms again eternally. The meaning of the world over man is psychologically strong enough that he can simply decide something is meaningful for him and create his own values, instead of having his values handed down by some transcendental being. Therefore, will to power, Eternal Recurrence, and over man are the new constructed meanings as the way to overcome the state of meaninglessness and as the way of reviving the metaphysical tradition. As a result, Nietzsche was not anti-metaphysical, but rather anti-classical metaphysical thinking, and after criticizing and noting that classical metaphysical thinking had collapsed, he developed a new form of metaphysics that embarked on the possible world.

Friedrich Nietzsche is generally considered as one of the precursors of postmodern philosophy, the basis of which are: Antichrist (rejection of any devotion to God) and a demand for a re-evaluation of all values, a rejection of traditional metaphysics, stress on perspectivism, rejection of Enlightenment rationalism; and invocation of will to power. (Chen,2019) This all entails that Nietzsche paved the way for postmodernism to come into being by noting that all the grand narratives before his time and of his time had been collapsed. People's foundation and reference to assess things like reason, truth, and value were destroyed. To support Habermas writes that: Nietzsche as a turning point into postmodernity, since he rejects a further revision of the idea of reason and bids farewell to the enlightenment dialectics. (Habermas, 1981)Habermas negates the dialectic of enlightenment because Theodor Adrono and Max Horkimer attempt to show how the enlightenment's instrumental reason has come to dominate over all other forms of reason, limiting the chance that the enlightenment will be able to fulfill its promise of freedom, truth, and equality for all humanity. (Plooy, 2015) However, Habermas refutes the dialectic enlightenment's assumption of instrumental reason's dominance over nature and all other forms of reason, as well as the enlightenment's self-destruction and humanity's ultimate end." (Ibid) Habermas argues that, other than instrumentality and emancipation, reason has communicative and inter subjective elements because reason has the task of ushering communication within people.

In this chapter, I will try to give a summary of the status and assumptions that are drawn by postmodernism on the assertion that classical metaphysics needs to be abandoned since it is a decayed, obsolescent, outdated conception and no longer represents the postmodern condition. So the postmodernism project asserts that everything should be embarked upon, dwelling on social and historical philosophy rather than sticking to something that has lost acceptance and that people have already given their back to. In this section I will attempt to provide Habermas's argument. Thereafter, this chapter will provide arguments by Lyotard that were highly shaped in order to criticize classical metaphysical thinking. Lyotard engaged in abandoning grand narratives in order to replace them with mini-narratives in order to host the postmodern condition. In the closing, as I did in the case of Nietzsche, this chapter is going to answer the following question: "Does the condition of postmodernism and Lyotard really show the elimination of classical metaphysics in order to develop metaphysics that is suitable for postmodern conditions or is it a complete elimination of metaphysics as a whole?"

3.1 Postmodernism Critique of Classical Metaphysical Thinking

(Merriam Webster) defines postmodernism as “relating to or being an era following the modern age.” Postmodernism is a mid-twentieth-century movement that emerged in order to pump salpinx to the end of the modernism era, which lasted from the late nineteenth to early twentieth century’s. Postmodernism is often characterized as a reaction to modernism. Modernism is a movement based on reason and rationality, using scientific analysis to gain certain knowledge about transcendental beings or ultimate reality. Modern times' quest for metaphysics failed under the rationalist method of philosophy. Unlike medieval philosophers, proponents of modernity used pure reason to discover objective truth and the nature of reality. In contrast, the postmodernist celebration of reason, if it is measured by modernism standards, is based on an unscientific, irrational thought process and rejects logical thinking because it considers reason as a discursive and situated entity to society's activities. So, in the postmodern era, the crumbling of the modern conception of truth as absolute, abstract, and universal made space for another alternative form of truth, which is the interpretative, relative, particular, and contextual nature of truth. In the case of the postmodernism moment, the following question arises: is postmodernism one stage of modernity or is it a particular sufficient moment? Sarup writes that as there is a sense in which if one sees modernism as a culture of modernity, postmodernism is the postmodernism is the culture of post modernity. (Nath, 2014)Therefore, rather than one stage of modernism, postmodernism is a particular moment that is populated by its own particular manifestations.

Even if Postmodernists rejected Kant’s analysis of transcendental deduction, they embraced his critics of the three classical areas of knowledge. The first one is on pure reason; the second one is regarding practical reason; and the last one is on pure judgment. Despite the fact that Kant classifies things in themselves as a category unattainable by our ratiocinative capacity, he assures us that they may exist by referring to them as things in themselves (normative reality), but he makes strict analysis of them as a means of obtaining reliable knowledge.

According to Kant, philosophy and also metaphysics should investigate only scientific knowledge, existing moral systems and existing artistic knowledge because he believes that human beings can have appropriate and reliable knowledge only about concepts in the realm of phenomena rather than things in themselves. To assert this, the postmodernist Habermas takes

this conception of Kant to another level called universal pragmatism. Universal pragmatism developed in order to replace the classical way of metaphysical thinking, Universal pragmatism studies assertions like tradition, interaction, cultural experience, and others that exist in our day-to-day life and language. In the following sense, Habermas can be taken as Kantian. The first reason is that, using Kant's critique of three areas of knowledge, Habermas develops three validity claims in order to make them the foundation of language. So, using Kant's critique of pure reason, Habermas develops a validity claim that refers to the objectivity of physical objects that are found in the outside world. Secondly, using Kant's work critique of practical reason Habermas develops a validity claims that refers to moral statements and, finally, using Kant's critique of judgment, Habermas draws a validity claim that refers to the work of subjectivity in aesthetics. There is a difference on the way out. Kant believed that restrictions must be developed on classical metaphysical thinking, whereas Habermas believed that classical metaphysical thinking needs to be abandoned. In doing this, Kant provided a transcendental method of deduction, whereas Habermas used a method known as universal pragmatism, a study of everyday communication as the implicit assertion for the question, what is the new foundation within which truth and rationality must be developed?

So, the post-modernism movement strictly and bitterly criticizes the absolutistic, universalistic, transcendental, and anti-worldliness conceptions of classical metaphysical thinking. There are two points that need to be noted in this case. The first one is that the post-modernism pillar argument: because we are living in a post-modern condition, we no longer believe in grand narratives, absolute meaning, but rather in a meaning embedded in randomness, alienating from what classical metaphysician's modern era teaches. Therefore, classical, universalistic metaphysical thinking should be abandoned from the realm of philosophy. According to (Picorino, 2001) for postmodernists, there can be no single reality, preferred version of reality, or even understanding of absolute reality since for postmodernists, there is no single objective or true means to check any claims about a solitary phenomenon called "reality". Thus, in postmodernism, by deconstructing the modern conception, they construct an alternative reality that is situated in the interaction of society. The other point seems an answer to the following question: if we are already in a world that is postmodern in its nature, what should we embark on to continue? The Postmodernist would argue that we should dwell on and study socio-historical

philosophy, claiming that truth is an embedded and situated entity rather than an abstract and absolute entity.

Postmodernist assertions were shaped in the following (Picorino, 2001) points: They were against classical metaphysical thinking celebration of objective reality. According to (Metaphysical-Glossary Of Defination)"an objective reality is a reality concerned with understanding aspects of reality that exist beyond the physical world and our immediate senses." So, for postmodernists, the classical metaphysician attempted to build an ideal, conceptual construct that is far removed from the everyday reality that people encounter. Reality, according to postmodernism, is not something embarked on in the abstract that is alienated from what individuals, societies, or individuals can assess or experience; rather, it is embarked on those practical entities or events in relation to day-to-day interaction. Classical metaphysical thinking was embedded in the search for absolute truth as the foundation for all things, including nature, so according to classical metaphysical thinking, truth is absolute and objective in general. Postmodernists would say we have already jumped the period of the question of truth. We are in a post-truth world where there is no such thing as truth. Cambridge Dictionary define post truth as "Relating to a scenario in which individuals are more inclined to accept an argument based on their emotions and opinions than facts, in effect of that traditional truth qualities such as absolute and universal have vanished, and modern truth attributes are entrenched in context."

The second point is in relation to the instrument that classical and modernists used to reach what they called objective, ultimate reality and truth called logos, reason or rationality, and furthermore, especially the modernists, go with the technology that science provided in relation to the first. According to them, rationality is something that provides a good life. To elaborate, according to classical thinkers, rationality is a stage that connects human beings with eternity, truth, reality, and clear and distinct ideas to fully comprehend humanity, and enlightenment promised that scientific knowledge is something that liberates people from chaos and allows them to live a simple, prosperous, and good life. However, postmodernists argued that both tools derived from sane human beings, including scientific knowledge, were tools of World War II, in which many people were killed, displaced, and psychologically traumatized.

Therefore, postmodernists deny this tool as a way to touch the height of good life and reality because it denies the existence of any ultimate principles, and it lacks optimism about the

possibility of there being a scientific, morally religious truth which defines everyday life. Therefore, there is no goal of a good life that you will achieve in life; rather, a good life is subjective and embarked on subjective interpretation. What postmodernists overlook in the matter of reason is that the classical metaphysician wants reason to be universal in order to assess reality. Postmodernist argument is that reason cannot be applied to everybody that exists, and for those specific thinkers that argued for reason as innate rather than learned, postmodernists would say that rather than a metaphysical entity, reason is something learned or socially determined.

According to postmodernists, there is no such thing as the so-called truth to be searched for in the outside world. There is no metaphysical transcendental entity, no actual, objective, eternal truth that can be found by investigating the outside world, as Plato calls it in the world of forms, as Cartesians attempted to do. It is not a primordial matter, as the pre-Socratic philosophers attempted to discover, for postmodernists, truth exists but does not have the qualities and attributes of classical metaphysical thinking. Rather, it is mediated in the existing world rather than in the transcendental world; it is discursive and describable rather than being objective and abstract; it can be grasped by investigating the day to-day interaction and connection of society rather than appealing to the transcendental world generally. The postmodernist argues that truth is not a whole sum package of metaphysical assertions but rather an existing entity in this discursive world. What postmodernists share or support from the bifurcation result of Cartesians is the "I". As it has been asserted so far, "cogito ergo sum" by Descartes. It was the bell that signaled the beginning of the modern era because it described the subject "I," the human being, as the center of every discourse, as well as the beginning of the demise of classical metaphysics because religion, authority, norm, theory, eternity, and transcendentalism were at the center and human beings were not as important as those aspects, because the "I" was highly suppressed in the patterns of classical metaphysical thinking. In postmodernism, there is no ground or reference to define the human subject as unified for or considering "I" as encountering the outside world as Cartesian cogito, because this kind of conception of "I" crumbled in postmodernism. Therefore, "Unlike Cartesian cogito, postmodernism is very dubious of explanations that claim to be accurate for all beings out there, focusing instead on the relative truths of each individual." (Glossary Defination Post modernism-PBS).

The postmodernist Habermas would say classical metaphysical thinking doesn't have any relevance in the postmodern era. It no longer has a place in postmodern societies. It is already a dead concept. As we can't grasp truth, reliable reality appealing to the way of classical thinking, we need to break this philosophical thinking free from speculative and transcendental nature to another form in order to create another philosophical tradition. Therefore, Habermas argues that the new thinking that replaces classical thinking has the following aspects: It is post-metaphysical, it takes the historical linguistic turn, it considers reason as mediated in the day-to-day life of human beings, and it also has the attribute of being pragmatic as it is not simply a theory, rather a theory that will be reduced to practice. So, using these aspects, he attempted to replace classical metaphysical thinking with a theory called post metaphysical thinking to show that reality is founded on language rather than abstractness and substantiveness.

To elaborate, Habermas is arguing that in a post-metaphysical, post-modern, post-truth world, it is a mistaken way to search for reality within a transcendental being or world. Habermas speaks of metaphysics as a key philosophical issue from ancient Greece to Hegel's time. (Puntel, 2012) He mentioned that his So to arrive at this position, he used two ways: The first one is the history of philosophy. In this case, he looks over the metaphysical thinking in the history of philosophy that makes him conclude his time is a post-metaphysical one and classical metaphysical thinking is a dead issue. The other path is communicative action rationality. Here he argued that reality's definition is not found in the way classical metaphysical thinking defines it as something that is found by constructing ideal concepts, abstract and beyond human reality, but rather it is something linguistically oriented in the social and communicative interaction, and life world of human beings. Habermas argued that reason has traditionally been regarded as fundamental to the idea of transcendence, but it is at the heart of achieving mutual relations and communication among groups. The ability to use reason or reasons to achieve intersubjective acknowledgment for critical validity claims is central to his idea of understanding. (Habermas, 1981) Therefore, neglecting the classical way of finding reality, he provides communicative action rationality as a real discipline that philosophy should address.

As mentioned above, the first way he used to reach his post metaphysical thinking was by analyzing the history of philosophy. According to Habermas, classical metaphysical thinking has three limits: purely ontological, purely linguistic-analytic, and purely epistemological. These

three limits are the limits of logocenterism because Habermas wants rationality to go with communicative rationality, which is mediated in day-to-day social interaction. So he characterized classical metaphysical thinking in four aspects. The first one is identity thinking. According to Habermas, classical metaphysical thinking attempts to find the first principle for the whole, or one of the many. In his words:

> *The basic relation that metaphysical reasoning comprehends both as logical and as ontological is the one and the many, abstractly defined as the relationship of identity and difference: the one is both axiom and essential foundation, principle and origin." Many is derived from it in the sense of both grounding and beginning. The many is recreated as an ordered multiplicity as a result of its genesis.* (Habermas, 1992)

The second one is what he calls “Idealism”. According to him, the history of philosophy is grounded in the tension between two kinds of realities or contradictions. The first one is the appearance. The second one is the “ideal or the participant”, and the form which was first entertained by Plato. However, for Habermas, there is no such thing as the so-called two kinds of realities. There is only one reality that is found in the possible world embedded in communicative rationality. The third aspect that Habermas listed out has a relationship with the second one. In this aspect, Habermas tried to understand idealism in the modern sense.

According to Habermas, in the modern era, idealism's subject was changed rather than investigated ontology. In modernism, idealism shifted to subjectivity or self-awareness. So, modern idealism takes up metaphysics from an ontology level to a consciousness level. The fourth aspect is the strong concept of theory. Habermas argues that classical metaphysical thinking is highly concerned with theory rather than subordinating it to practice. Therefore, Habermas considers classical metaphysical thinking as a great deal in philosophy from the ancient era to Hegel, so abandoning it, he reached his post-metaphysical position using the following historical developments in philosophy.

In doing so, Habermas listed out four developments that led him to conclude that classical metaphysics is obsolete and to form post metaphysical thinking. The first one is what he calls "procedural rationality": this historical movement developed in the 17th century with the emergency of empirical methods of natural science. This movement attempted to smash the metaphysical thinking that has a "totalizing" nature. The second, factor that contributed to the

development of post-metaphysical thinking is "situating," which emerged from the development of humanities in the second half of the nineteenth century. Humanities concerned themselves with understanding people through their culture, language, and societal manners. Thus, according to Habermas, this different experience, which relied on situating reason in the possible world, becomes more convincing than the infinite reason that classical metaphysics relied on. The other factor is what Habermas called the linguistic turn. It was originated by Wittgenstein. Analytic philosophers' thought is related to language and the analysis of concepts. Their thought is loosely related to traditional philosophical problems like those raised in the realm of classical metaphysical thinking. It refers to philosophy that is neither embedded in matter nor supersensible entity but rather related to logical analysis of complex interrelationship concepts that will be solved by relying in linguistic analysis. According to Habermas, the last factor that led to the development of post-metaphysical thinking is the extra-everyday, where he attempted to use Marxist as a form of critique in the role of reason as a matter to change theory to practice. He writes:

> *The traditional priority of theory over practice could no longer stand up against the mutual dependencies that were emerging ever more clearly. The realization of the importance of everyday contexts of action and communication arose from the embedding of theoretical accomplishments in the practical contexts of their birth and utilization. In the idea of a living world backdrop, for example, these circumstances have a philosophical importance*. (Habermas,1992)

So, using the Historico philosophical path, what Habermas attempted to argue is that classical metaphysical thinking is obsolete and no longer has relevance in the current activity and situation. Habermas, a critic of classical metaphysical thinking, argues that abandoning classical metaphysical thinking leads to exaggerated and unattainable rationality. Therefore, he concludes that we have to shift to another reality that is post-metaphysical in its nature. So, arguing in this manner, he introduced the other path to his position, known as the thematic path, with two basic and fundamental assumptions called methodological and continual:

The methodological one concerned on the new concept of reason. This concept of reason is that truth or reason is not something that is going to be discovered in the outside world, but rather it is something that is acted upon. As Habermas tried to put it, classical metaphysical thinking takes reason exaggeratedly. For Habermas, the postmodern condition has a different definition. In

postmodern conditions, reason is something that is mediated, something that exists in the possible world rather than in a substantive manner. In the world of forms, as Plato mentioned, it is not a higher capacity to discover being qua being, a transcendental one to attain the outside world, or an extremely analytic one, but rather a discursive entity that is mediated in the day-to-day interaction and communication of society.

According to Habermas, the rationality that going to develop in the post-metaphysical realm, it must possess two basic characteristics. The first one is that it must attain particularity. It's because, for Habermas, rationality needs to be considered in day-to-day communication or language since it is situated in particular historical and cultural contexts. For this, he mentioned three validity claims: The first one is the claim to truth. This claim refers to the objectivity of physical entities. The second one is normative rightness. This claim refers to the moral structure of society. The last one is sincerity. This refers to subjectivity in the effect or artistic judgment.

For Habermas, reason/rationality is inherent in communication; it is a constituent of the inner structure of communication. Habermas wants communicative rationality to have the effect of creating mutual understanding. Communicative rationality serves as a bridge to transmit knowledge derived from a society's cultural norms and customs in order to discover the nature of truth. When validity claims are defended argumentatively and discursively, communicative rationality is achieved. This assertion frees rationality from classical metaphysical thinking control because, rather than as an instrument to grasp absolute abstract knowledge, reason is mediated into three validity claims to describe reality in morality, empirical work, and art. So, Habermas frees reason from the world of abstraction. He situates reason in three validity claims because he argues that the perfect place of reason is communicative rationality.

According to Habermas, communicative rationality in procedural form occurs in the real world, which consists of daily interaction and language practice in order to create interaction within each other. He asserts that higher levels of engagement within everyday language, customs and norms of society in the past and present, the moral structure of society, and the history of ideas in general, are the initial points from which our existence began. According to Habremas using this engagement we can discover the nature of truth without appealing to transcendental reality. For example, claims about the truth of what we say in relation to the objective world; or claims about

the rightness, appropriateness, or legitimacy of our speech acts in relation to the shared values and norms of our social life world; or claims to sincerity or authenticity in regard to the outward manifestations of our intentions and feelings." (Habermas,1981) Reason and rationality are intersubjectively mediated and embedded in day-to-day interaction because truth is not found in the subject or in the object, but rather it engulfs both the subject and the object. The intersubjective nature of it overcomes the subject and object dualism and communication of individuals and philosophy. According to Habermas, we should look over the procedures and clarification of norms and modes of justification to determine the validity of claims of others that people use in their day-to-day interactions. This is so because this is generalized at the heart of communicative rationality.

Therefore, Habermas argued that classical metaphysical thinking and the subject matter of philosophy should be changed. In doing so, he replaced classical metaphysical thinking with communicative rationality, and philosophy must be conceived as post-metaphysical. Habermas replaces classical metaphysical thinking with analysis of everyday language, and the only subject matter and task of philosophy is to analyze rationality based on validity based in communicative practice and social interaction. Here in communicative rationality, according to Habermas, The rationality inherent in everyday communicative practice points to the practice of argumentation as a court appeal that allows communicative action to continue with other means when disagreement cannot be resolved by everyday routines and cannot be resolved by the direct or strategic use of force. (Habermas, 1981) Therefore, intersubjectivity is going to be entertained to the fullest so people are able to challenge what they believe argumentatively. So much truth is going to be discovered from this challenge. The winner will be the better argument because validity claims can be criticized. There is a possibility of identifying and correcting mistakes, that is, of learning from them. If this is done on a reflective level, reasoning forms emerge that may be passed down and developed within a cultural heritage, and even embodied in specific cultural institutions. (Ibid) Thus, seeking truth by appealing to the transcendental world is out of place; rather, truth is something that emerges from this communicative rationality, which is linguistically mediated by nature.

To conclude, Habermas argues that the way philosophy in general, and metaphysics in particular, evolved, beginning with platonic idealism, which preaches something that cannot be

grasped in the human mind. Therefore it must be abandoned. According to Habermas, the history of philosophy and developments that negate classical metaphysical thinking contributed to post metaphysical thinking that considers philosophy as analyzing the interaction in the life world that is communicative action practice and experiences in day-to-day life. I argue that behind his assertion called "post-metaphysical" there is an implicit origin of metaphysics (classical metaphysical thinking). It's because when he argues we communicate with each other using language, it entails that there is ontology behind the theory that makes us share one world and communicate with language, and it recalls a question “can language stand alone without ontology?” So in this way, we can understand the metaphysical origin behind Habermas's theory that we inhabit. He also attempted to "draw our attention to the larger context of individual purposeful activities, to the social interaction structures in which teleological actions take place." his change in focus from the teleological to the communicative dimensions of social activity necessitates a study of language as the primary means of communication, which is also necessary for creating the groundwork for social theory.”(Habermas, 1981) So, according to Habermas, abandoning metaphysics that is beyond the boundaries of the human mind, given by nature, we have to embark on a reality that is discursive and pragmatic in its nature.

3.2 Lyotard critique to classical metaphysical thinking

The other major critique of classical metaphysical thinking that this chapter intends to address is Lyotard's. Lyotard argues that Habermas is offering “one more grand narrative of emancipation.” (Lyotard, 1979:60) Not only does Lyotard criticize Habermas’s quest but also post-modernists like Focult, Derrida, and others. The main criticism towards Habermas is based on his thought that modernity is an unfinished project and there is a chance to rescue modernity. According to other postmodernists, including Lyotard, modernity must be abandoned at its fullest with its quest for truth, rationality, epistemological analysis, and metaphysical thinking.

Lyotard conceives post modernism as “incredulity towards meta narratives”Post-modernism is characterized as a shift from modernity to postmodernism, universality to particularity, pure rationality to winning argumentation, truth to post-truth, reality to interpretation, reason to passion, one center to multiple centers, and generally a condition in which we no longer need to refer to a single universal center. Lyotard calls this center "Grand Narrative" or "Meta Narrative." "Grand narrative" or "Meta narrative" is developed by Jean François Lyotard to mean

a theory based on the appeal to universal truth or universal ideals that aims to offer a totalizing, complete account of numerous phenomena. historical events, experiences, and social and cultural phenomena. (Lyotard, 1979)

Generally, grand narratives attempt to explain other stories. Among grand narratives, scientism claims that science is very close to the point of explaining everything that existed. Modernism advocates that modernism is better than the medieval and the ancients because they used invalid approaches. In contrast, modernism takes the highest level of rationality. Therefore, to celebrate validity, we have to rely on modernism. Marixism argued that societal good is measured by economic prosperity, and this can be achieved by the death of capitalism and by distributing ownership of the means of production. So this and other grand narratives were explored and prospered by criticizing other grand narratives of the time, so there was a chance that one grand narrative would be replaced by another. According to Lyotard, classical metaphysical thinking is embedded in a process that entertains grand narratives that serve as reference and legitimation for societies in general. These narratives might be in knowledge, religion, spiritual life, science, history, metaphysics, morality, aesthetics, and more so. For instance, classical metaphysical thinking is highly concerned with forming grand narratives simply because its existence is concerned with meta narratives. For instance, Plato draws that if we really need reliable, certain knowledge and to discover truth, we have to rely on reason and the world of being. So in this sense, Plato's grand narrative for knowledge is reason and the reference for truth is the world of being. So in this sense, Plato's grand narrative for knowledge is reason and authority for truth is the world of being. So in this sense, Plato's reference In Descartes' case, he argues that reason is innate, and the only way to have "clear and distinct ideas" is to have knowledge about transcendental God. So Descartes is setting a grand narrative that will explain and give meaning for all phenomena, Cartesian dualism is an abstract dualistic essentialist paradigm that draw foundation for every knowledge and this attributes of it never allow a space for other alternative truth and context.

In Kant’s case, he was also setting a meta narrative, which is an enlightenment reason as well. According to Kant, even if we can’t explain the transcendental world using reason, we can get knowledge of morality, aesthetics, and science using reason as the center of discourses. The speculative philosopher Hegel conceives absolute spirit as ultimate reality as a universal schema

for everything that exists, social and various events that have occurred in history. According to Lyotard, appealing to systems of ideas, generalized systems, and universalistic thinking is already an obsolete matter in postmodernism. The feature that distinguishes classical metaphysical thinking from postmodernism is that we no longer believe in grand or meta narratives. Consequently, classical metaphysical thinking in its nature sets grand narratives in different dimensions, but postmodernism sets quite a distance from this thinking, from thinking that attempts to draw legitmation strategies on a universal level.

Lyotard argues post modernism is an attempt to abandon authority in order to eradicate universal knowledge and embark on mini, local narratives. Unlike grand narratives, to give standard or value, we rely on contexts. He writes, the old standards of attraction... are losing their attraction. (Lyotard,1979) Lyotard, what describes the postmodern condition is the increasing degree of elimination towards the totalizing grand narratives, as this authoritative modes of reference have less impact in today's society.

According to Lyotard, the grand narratives are not only in the metaphysical realm but also in the general systems of the world, like in religion, where most people accept them as the way to transcendence, science, history, politics, social affairs, and the economy in general, all systems that have involvement in human interaction are grouped as meta narratives. For instance, Lyotard would say, for instance, rationality, the concept that classical metaphysical thinkers get crown for it to discover the truth out there, to order information and convert it to knowledge, to explain everything that exists, has lost its acceptance as being a reference for others. In postmodernism, we no longer believe in those grand narratives, and we no longer refer to them for legitimation as they lost impact in postmodern society.

For Lyotard, the destruction of the grand narrative resulted in what he refers to as legitimation crisis. So what is legitimation crisis? It was coined by the postmodernist Habermas to describe a situation in which an administration or institution, or what Lyotard refers to as the grand narrative, lost their power or capability to continue as a reference, tower, and forming structure in order to achieve their goals. As the grand narratives were shattered, people lost faith in them as historical references and administrators of the time. According to Lyotard, in post modern society as a result of the legitimation crisis, there is no such thing as the so-called true, all false.

People can’t decide if something is right or wrong. The change in the consciousness of the people and the change in intellectual activity lead to the assertion that we can not have epistemic certainty and ultimate knowledge. It no longer emancipates us as knowledge reduced to a commodity, which leads to the legitimation crisis. This concept recalls Nietzsche’s state of nihilism. As we have seen thus far, Nietzsche's rejection of classical metaphysics in modern society leads to the problem of nihilism, or a state of meaninglessness. People that encounter nihilism want to commit suicide as they conceive life as meaningless. People can’t distinguish good actions from bad as there is no God to refer to. People no longer live in the conception that there is a transcendental world which classical metaphysical thinking thought of as it has collapsed so far in their hands. People are not interested in discovering truth as now they are in the situation that a thing can be both true and false.

Similarly, for Lyotard, the abandonment of grand narratives in the post-modern era caused a problem called the legitimation crisis. A situation that is quite the same as the state of nihilism being in a legitimation crisis, everything can be true and false, right and wrong, good and bad, as long as grand narratives that provide legitimation, general stories are avoided. As there is no platonic truth and forms that will lead us to eternal knowledge and emancipation, as there is no system of rationality that Descartes introduces as the way to grasp clear and distinct ideas to discover the transcendental God and to know the very essence of mind and body dualism, as there is no powerful reason that Kant told us to analyze concepts such as morality to know good and bad, as there is no ruled-based ethics in postmodernism, As art fails under the judgment of every single individual that has access to see what is going on, which tells us there is no certain, distinct judgment for that matter. Since what Hegel’s argued about absolute spirit as engulfing power of the earth no longer has relevance in the postmodern society.

Therefore, Lyotard argued that since not only classical metaphysical thinking as being a grand narrative but also other grand narratives of the time have been abandoned and this has culminated in the problem called the legitimation crisis, we need to embark on other realities which can rescue society from this legitimation crisis, just as Nietzsche tried to overcome the state of nihilism by embarking on other realities called will to power, eternal recurrence, and over man. So for Lyotard, mini narratives are the option (legislators) that we need to embark on.

For Lyotard, the condition of being in a legitimation crisis initiates people to form their own narratives because in the world that grand narratives were in the throne, contradictions and inconsistence didn't get the space, but in forming mini narratives, individuals celebrate contradictions and differences that are inherent in society. Lyotard calls this narrative in which individuals form themselves by referring to their condition, status, belief, and interpretation as mini narratives. Mini narratives, unlike grand narratives, refer to mini practices, stories, local traditions, local norms and customs of a society, and these mini narratives are particular rather than universal, temporary rather than, permanent, situational rather than fixed, provincial rather than national. Generally, mini-narratives aren't formed to discover absolute truth, ultimate reality, supersensible being, transcendental reality, eternal entity, and also not formed to provide legitimation on a universal level; rather they are localized and small narratives that are embedded in diversity and always provide localized legitimation for the society that develops its own narrative. Local or little narratives, in sharp contrast to the legitimacy game performed in the west, provide immediate legitimation. (Lyotard, 1979) The relapse of the grand narrative is caused by the relapse of the enlightenment project because, as the enlightenment field tries to fully fulfill its promises, it leads to its downfall. According to Lyotard, mini narratives that replace the grand narrative only focus on particular societal matters, contexts of society, local traditions, diversity of interaction and human experiences and are going to entertain multiple dimensions of stand points, and they are not only theoretical but practical streams that really avoid sanctions in social interaction. They are not grand that encompass whatever exists out there.

These mini narratives, according to Lyotard, will compete with other mini narratives in order to be the winning mini narratives of society in order to replace the grand totalitarian and universal narratives. This makes the postmodern conditions bounded by subjectivism, relativism, individualism, and plurality. For him the grand narrative has lost its credibility, regardless of the style of unification used, whether it is a speculative narrative or an emancipation narrative." (Lyotard,1979) Mini narratives placed in post modernism abandon the jargon claims like rationality, truth, ultimate reality, ultimate knowledge, which attempt to give a totalizing, comprehensive, universal, engulfing account of different experiences of the world like metaphysical, political, science, ethics, and etc. Little narratives, as opposed to grand narratives, define any phenomenon without appealing to universal truth or transcendental totalizing schema.

Thus, only local truths (narratives, points of view) are available after the destruction of old grand narratives.

Furthermore, the post-modern condition seems to smash this pillar principle of thought, “All humans by nature desire to know,” because as the legitimating crisis appears, things fail under the interpretation, the way individuals understand it, since the pillar standards have less impact. In post modern conditions, the thought that knowledge leads to emancipation means that classical knowledge is celebrated in the box of uselessness. For instance, to affirm this sentence, "the creator of the universe is a transcendental being", we need grand narrative and the classical would say, of course, yes, using religious or spiritual grand narrative. In the postmodern era, art that depicts a banana held by plastic plaster is considered art, even if it is a beautiful art work, because the grand narrative of art that elaborated art world must reflect reason at the center and art must embrace objective truth was abandoned, so that while postmodernism conception of art considers people's perspectives and unique subjective assumptions of individuals, it violates the classical grand narrative rule.

As a result, a mini-narrative, according to Lyotard, can host the standard for judging whether something is good, bad, or beautiful, taking context into account. As a result, postmodern conditions have lost the knowledge system that classical metaphysical thinking evoked. This literally led to the abandonment of the classical definition of knowledge. The attempt to discover metaphysical truth is highly related to the concept of discovering truth as it is the basis of all knowledge that exists. According to Lyotard in postmodern condition it fails to the assertion of power and commodity. In post-modern conditions, people want to have knowledge in order to have power, to be more financially stable than others rather than considering knowledge as a way to progress.

Therefore, Lyotard argues that rather than trying to rescue grand narratives, the better way is to accept the postmodern condition that we no longer believe in ultimate reality, objective reality, objective truth, and the assumption that reason, underlying universal truth, and knowledge, leads to emancipation. As a result, we must immerse ourselves in mini-stories that are contextualized in our situation. He argues: knowledge is and will be generated in the postmodern state in order to be sold, and it is and will be consumed in order to be valorized in fresh production; the

purpose in both circumstances is exchange. (Lyotard,1979) So context is what we should embark on.

So generally, we can pin the following points that are drawn by postmodernists in general and Lyotard in particular in the process of abandoning classical metaphysical thinking. For the postmodernists, in the postmodern condition, there can not be an objective reality, an ultimate reality, a single truth that can be discovered in the outside world, and at the same time, not only is there no such thing as an ultimate reality, but also there is no way or instrument to discover such a truth. To mention, most classical metaphysical thinkers consider rationality to be the way to discover knowledge that exists in the world of being, and a few thinkers like Kant argue that reason is the way to discover the truth that exists in the possible world, as we have no chance to discover a transcendental world using reason. So, for postmodernists, there is no truth or singular phenomenon called reality that is abstract, transcendental, eternal, ideal in its nature; rather, reality exists in the day-to-day life of each party and the interaction of human beings in society.

The other point is that, as we no longer believe in the classical metaphysical system of thought, Habermas would say the postmodern condition, rather than being metaphysical, is post-metaphysical because all the systems that classical metaphysical thinking provided have been abandoned and the post metaphysical paradigm has the following attributes that distinguish it from classical metaphysical thinking: one, it takes the linguistic turn rather than taking the form of ultimatness and transcendence, and second, reason is mediated and discursive in the social situation rather than substantive.

Another point is that the post-modern condition is against logocentrism. It reduces theory to practice rather than being idealistic. Lyotard would say the post modern condition is the elimination of grand narratives drawn so far that are totalizing, comprehensive, general, and universal because in the post-modern condition, these grand narratives have already lost impact on telling the stories of others and being referenced to others.

There is also a point that for Lyotard, the abandoning of grand narratives really gets society to a problem, what he calls the legitimating crisis. It means that people failed to understand the situation that there is no distinction between true and false, a situation that is really hard to

decide as good or bad and right or wrong. It is a situation that we can't decide if it's a beautiful piece of art or not since there is no standard grand narrative for art.

Another point is the postmodernist attempt to provide a solution to this legitimation crisis, or the problematic situation that people tend to live in as grand narratives are abandoned. In this way, Habermas argued that we should discover truth in communicative rationality by studying day-to-day interactions of human beings like language, experience, custom, tradition, and other related practices. In this way, we can relate ourselves to communicative rationality. Quite similarly, Lyotard provides what he calls "mini narratives" in order to overcome the legitimation crisis, not only to overcome it but also to rely on the possible reality that existed. According to Lyotard, mini narratives are not grand narratives that attempt to define the story of the world; rather, they are contextualized and refer to subjectivity, interpretation, tradition, and customs of society, and they have characteristics such as particularity, subjectivity, and interpretative nature. According to Lyotard, in postmoderncondition, grand narratives are abandoned and replaced by little narratives. To sum up, postmodernism really abandoned classical metaphysical thinking and dwelled on a reality that is made subjectively suitable for the condition of postmodernism.

So does post modernism way of thinking imply the elimination of classical metaphysical thinking or metaphysics as a whole? if it is only eliminating classical metaphysical thinking is there at least a little spark to rescue classical metaphysical thinking living in post modern condition?

In fact Lyotard and Nietzsche criticism of classical metaphysical thinking is close to sameness however the solution they provide to overcome the crisis that come to the place because of abandoning of classical metaphysical thinking and the placers of classical metaphysical thinking is quite different. For instance, Nietzsche abandoned classical metaphysical thinking as a movement that attempted to discover something that doesn't even exist at all. For this, he forwarded the dictum "God is dead" in order to show the downfall of classical metaphysical thinking guru exactly the same as to this. Lyotard abandoned what is known as "grand narratives of classical thinking" because they do not refer to or identify the postmodern condition of classical metaphysical thinking, and Nietzsche plays a role in Lyotard's abandonment of grand

narratives. And according to both, the abandoning of classical metaphysical thinking leads to a crisis. Nietzsche calls it nihilism, and Lyotard calls it a legitimation crisis.

According to Lyotardthe rule of consensus, this guided Enlightenment narratives and portrayed truth as the result of reasonable minds agreeing, has now crumbled. (Peters,2006) Both nihilism and the legitimation crisis emerge as a result of society's abandonment of grand narratives, and both philosophers attempt to find a solution to this crisis. Here appears the difference for Nietzsche. In order to overcome the state of nihilism, he came up with what he called will to power, eternal recurrence, and overman because he believed that only after experiencing nihilism do we discover for the first time what these values really meant and what real value they had, and only at that point do we realize that we require new values.

According to Nietzsche, these are the new realities that a person creates for himself in order to overcome nihilism. Will to power is not about external principles controlling people's energy of will to internal power that manifests itself in human beings and other beings that exist in the possible world who adhere to the will to power, the will to courage, and the will to be strong.

Generally, the will to power manifests when there is an embracement of master morality and power. Eternal recurrence is the system that replaces the crumbled system of classical metaphysical thinking with a system that generates the possible world. This system functions when there is an overman, a God who cuts our relationship with a transcendental God and who creates values for himself. However, Lyotard provides mini narratives for the revival or recovery of the notion of narrative. According to Lyotard, mini-narratives are local and popular at the local and popular level as a form of traditional, cultural, or ethnic knowledge. Therefore, for Lyotard, the legitimation crisis can be overcome by this mini narrative. These local or small narratives provide quick legitimacy, in stark contrast to the game of legitimacy played in the West, because they set competence and performance criteria, defining rights of what may be said and done in a specific culture. (Peters,2006)

He argues they are legitimated by this simple fact that they do what they do" (Lyotard, 1979) can be overcome to replace the classical metaphysical thinking. So for Nietzsche, the system of classical metaphysical thinking was crumbling, so this takes people into the state of nihilism. And Lyotard came to be in the already crumbled system of the world, so he argues that as the

grand narratives are collapsed, people encounter a legitimation crisis. So their difference is that they both embark on will to power, overman and system called eternal recurrence. In contrast, Lyotard provides mini narratives for overcoming the legitimation crisis. These narratives are a product of interpretation, day to-relational experience and interpretation.

Therefore, I argue that postmodernism and Lyotard really do abandon the classical conception of metaphysical thinking at the fullest but not metaphysics, because the history of philosophy tells us that conceptions of metaphysics varied from time to time and era to era. For instance, the conception of that which Plato embarrassed and Kant did is quite different, but both of them were doing metaphysics. The same is true in postmodernism, where Lyotard and, of course, Habermas were interested in searching reality, but not in the classical metaphysical sense, but in the day-to-day interaction, communicative rationality, custom, tradition, moral norms, and mini-narratives that engulf this experience for a specific society. I argue that postmodernism really understands metaphysics at a social level, unlike classical metaphysical thinkers who understand metaphysics in the external world. My claim is that postmodernism has come up with a different consciousness of metaphysics; they really understand metaphysics as the relationship between individuals and reality that is mediated in society and interaction. To conclude, I argue that postmodernism, including Lyotard, uniquely understands metaphysics in another form by overcoming the classical metaphysical conception of metaphysics as finding reality in the outside world. They try to develop their metaphysical assertions by dwelling on day-to-day communicative rationality, relationships, and interactions of human beings in society. Therefore, postmodernism and Lyotard critics of classical metaphysical thinking don’t eliminate metaphysics as a whole; rather, by showing the downfall of classical thinking, they give a relationship, contextual, interaction, and individualized flavor to metaphysics.

CHAPTER FOUR

4. Can We Rescue Metaphysics?

In the previous three chapters, we have seen that the history of philosophy is full of surprises regarding the contemplation of ideas and thoughts. (Velkley, 2003:311) writes that “philosophy began in ancient Greece as metaphysics, and the history of metaphysical investigation has continued virtually uninterrupted into the twentieth century; moreover, metaphysics is a great example of the prime position of philosophy." So whenever a human being thinks questions like, “What is being?” or “What does it mean to exist?” or “Why is something there?” “What is merely being?” “What does it mean by the name being?” “What is the cause of the universe to exist?” “What is the first principle of the world?” “How does one principle unify all things that exist?”, “What makes anything one?” “Does the universe exist accidentally and randomly or does it have a perfect designer?” “What is meant by transcendence?” There is metaphysics.

From attempting to find reliable answers, different ideas and thoughts arise, but there is a common ground that for all attempts to find answers, relying to abstract and yonder world theories, even if the degree of reliance varies from theory to theory, philosopher to philosopher, that is exactly classical metaphysical thinking. In chapter one we have considered the nature of classical metaphysical thinking, classifying it into two broad domains: one dualistic metaphysical thinking and the other speculative metaphysical thinking. Dualistic metaphysical thinking assumes that reality is divided. For this, Plato’s dualistic metaphysical thinking, and a very different view of understanding dualistic metaphysical thinking by the modern philosopher Descartes were considered. Thereafter, the very different way of understanding dualistic metaphysical thinking by the enlightenment philosopher Kant was in place. So, in general, both philosophers argued that metaphysics is possible but at different levels and understanding. As we have seen, Plato argues that there are two layers of reality. (Jessop,1930:36) writes that the following is pure Platonism: “We come from a world where extraordinary standards of quality were recognized, and we vaguely recall beauty that we haven't seen since; and we return to that world. “Furthermore (Katen,1973:141) writes that the popular song of Conway Twitty titled “It’s only make believe” consist with Plato’s dualistic metaphysical thinking because the song

contains the information that the world's not being real, "but it wouldn't be make believe if you believe in me"

For Plato, there is a difference between appearance and reality; they are two worlds on different levels. For Plato, the world of appearance is only a make believe world, an existential copy of the world of being. Paradoxically, the world of being is not a make-believe world but a real world populated by what Plato calls Forms. Forms are models or causes of the particular things that exist in the world of being. This form can only be accessible through reason and reason. Therefore, for Plato, metaphysical thinking that is enveloped by the belief in the transcendental world of eternal absolute being is going to be possible.

The other philosopher whom we considered in chapter one who is an adherent of dualistic metaphysical thinking is the modern philosopher Rene Descartes. He understands reality divided into two separate entities. This is where his metaphysical dualism rests. He argues there is a subject called "I" that sees the outside world separately. So, according to Descartes, the mind and body are distinct substances: the body is intelligible and exists independently of the mind, and the mind is rational. So Descartes' aim was to reach a state of "clear and distinct ideas." In doing so, he gave the ultimate place for reason to discover every reality out there, including transcendental God. Therefore, for Descartes, dualistic metaphysical thinking that is abstract, concerned about ultimate reality and transcendental being is possible.

Following this, Kant's dualistic reality has been considered. Kant's dualistic metaphysical thinking is much further away from that of Plato and Descartes. Because he limits the power of reason, he argues that there is a metaphysical assumption that really exceeds the limits of reason. Reason can only be the perfect tool for attaining phenomenal reality. In order to grasp the nominal reality, we have to appeal to practical faith. Therefore, even if Kant provides a new way of viewing and understanding reality, for him, metaphysics is possible within restrictions. In general, chapter one's first section embraces how classical metaphysical thinking is addressed in the dualistic tradition that elaborates in one way or another how metaphysics is possible.

The other dominant section which has been taken as representative of classical metaphysical thinking in chapter one is speculative metaphysical thinking. Here Hegel's ideas are considered. Hegel was concerned with dialectic reality, a reality that contained contradictory dualism that

would be overcome through unification. At the end of every dialectic process, something new will be created. That something new is the guru of Hegel's philosophy, called Absolute Spirit. So, according to Hegel, ultimate reality is absolute spirit that is discovered through thought, but this ultimate reality is not a material entity, nor is it a sensible higher reality, but rather energy. Therefore, Hegel's classical metaphysical thinking also asserts that metaphysics is possible. In general, chapter one asserts classical metaphysical thinking, which is highly embedded in the abstract, far removed from human day-to-day life, contemplative, universal, and speculative in nature.

In chapter two, Nietzsche's argument against classical metaphysical thinking and his new form of metaphysics has been considered. In the case of Nietzsche avoiding classical metaphysics, he gave metaphysics another form, which is different from the classical metaphysical thinking assertion of metaphysics as beyond the physical world. Nietzsche tried to overcome this aspect of metaphysics and gave a physical and temporal flavor to reality. As a result, he attempted to examine reality, but not in the sense of a transcendental world or being, but rather in the world of becoming, which is the only possible world that exists.

In chapter three, the movements of postmodernism, Habermas, and postmodernist Lyotard critique classical metaphysical thinking and the new alternative reality that they propose to replace it considered. For postmodernists, there is no such thing as universal reality, transcendental reality, and, of course, any privileged way or instrument to attest to true belief, reality, or any specific method or way to obtain universal reality. So they reject any quest or attempt to investigate universal reality. The Postmodernists asserted that we must embark on a new reality that is socially constructed and subject to change. The idea served by Lyotard, called "mini narrative," declares that there can be multiple simultaneous realities. Therefore, mini narratives are the realities that replace the grand narrative.

In our time, metaphysical thinking that mostly attends to transcendentalisms, abstracts, and yonder world theory is under bitter criticism as today's thinkers regard it as obsolete. In this chapter I will embrace my argument with the guidance of the following question: "Does this bitter criticism imply the destination for classical metaphysical thinking to its elimination specifically or is it the rejection of metaphysics as a whole?" If it is only the elimination of the

classical way of metaphysical thinking, is there a way to rescue metaphysics containing another form? This is the question that I will address and provide a positive answer to.

So in order to help me reach and to celebrate my argument, I will look up the following activities in this chapter. In the first section, I will attempt to provide arguments forwarded by those who claim we cannot rescue metaphysics. In the second section, I will present the arguments of those who believe that yes, we can save metaphysics. Thereafter, I will celebrate my argument, which is based on the claim that yes, we can rescue metaphysics in Nietszchean, post-modernism, Lyotard, and other alternative ways of understanding reality. In doing so, I will use different philosophers and schools of thought to strengthen my argument. Finally, I will put the conclusion of the thesis in bold.

Those who say it cannot be rescued

As there is an argument that claims metaphysics can be rescued, there are also groups who maintain that it cannot. As I tried to provide the heavy criticism of metaphysics in the previous chapters, in this section I will forward the claims of David Hume and the Logical Positivists' argument that metaphysics must be denied.

Socrates is the one who criticizes metaphysics before postmodernist critics before logical positivist objections against metaphysics. After he studied the pre-Socratic philosophers' ideas, he soon became disillusioned with their ideas as he felt that the philosophical questions they devoted their attention to had no bearing on the quality of individual life. Socrates decided to turn away from metaphysical questions and investigate how to live the best life possible. To support this, Cicero writes that:

Socrates brought philosophy down from the heavens and forced it to address concerns of virtue and evil in the cities and homes of mankind. (Cicero, 1959)

Hume claimed that any system that is not based on reality and observation, no matter how nuanced or creative, must be rejected. According to Hume, metaphysics and theology attempt to investigate principles that give us a deeper understanding and certain knowledge of ultimate reality. Hume would argue that these attempt to go beyond anything we can possibly experience; they transcend the accessibility of our understanding. Therefore, they must be denied.

Following the influence of the age of science, technology, and power, contemporary philosophers give their back to metaphysics. Logical positivists (logical empiricists) are a group of philosophers that belong to a group called the Vienna Circle that arose in the 1920s and maintained that traditional metaphysical assertions must be categorized as meaningless inquiry. Their reason is that "metaphysical propositions are incapable of empirical verification and thus find the field of metaphysics to be nonsense." So they reject metaphysics because it cannot be addressed by empirical verification. They identified two forms of truth: The first one is analytic truth. These are forms of truth that are true by definition or meaning and whereas synthetic truths are forms of truth that are true in reference to sensory experience and data. So, logical positivists assert that sources of knowledge like metaphysics, morality, and religion cannot be verified using the two truths as they claim more than verifiability. As a result, they conclude that metaphysical inquiry must be abandoned to the fullest.

Those who say it can be rescued

The definition of metaphysics varies from time to time, as we have seen in the history of philosophy. The definition of metaphysics has changed over time and will continue to change in the future. So there are attempts that claim, yes, we can rescue metaphysics. In this section, we will go through four ways that attempt to provide arguments that assert rescuing metaphysics in the contemporary world is possible.

The first one is the metaphysics of possibility. Metaphysics of possibility claims that metaphysics' task is not to study the ultimate principle of the world, not to discover a higher reality, not to investigate a supersensible being. The Metaphysics of Possibility points out that the platonic theory of transcendence, in order to investigate and have true knowledge about reality, Descartes' investigation of transcendental God, Kantian dualism, Heglean idealism, Aristotlean immanence, and other attempts designed to investigate reality from an abstract point of view must be changed. The adherents of metaphysical possibilities argue that we can rescue metaphysics in this contemporary world by changing the task of metaphysicians and metaphysics. According to the Metaphysics of Possibility, the task of a metaphysician is to investigate different modalities of existence that existed in the possible world, and to account for the change and continuous dynamism, as well as the general possibilities that are found in the

world. Therefore, avoiding the theories of classical metaphysical thinking like idealism, materialism, naturalism, transcendentalism, and immanence according to the metaphysics of possibilities, the only thing that the metaphysician should seek to explain is that the world of possibilities is change dynamism, continual gradual modalities that are found in the physical world and by not resigning an attempt to prove the existence of a supersensible world.

The other way that attempts to rescue metaphysics is realism. As metaphysical possibilities, realism tells us we need to abandon the traditional metaphysical things that are far removed from every day experience and reality of people. In effect of this, according to realism, metaphysics' point of investigation should escape from abstract, unreachable reality and transcendental entities. They argue that metaphysics should study the day-to-day experience of people and the reality of individuals that are always found in this empirical world. Therefore, the theory of realism claims that we can rescue metaphysics by adjusting it to study the day-to-day lives of human beings.

The other way that attempts to rescue metaphysics is called the state of affairs. The State of affairs attempted to embed the task of metaphysics in one of the dichotomies that have been made by Kant and Plato. According to current events, metaphysics should investigate the phenomenal reality and the world of becoming, which are temporal, sensible, empirical, physical, finite, changing, and existing in time and space. According to the current state of affairs, there is only one reality, and that is the appearance; thus, ignoring the transcendental world, the metaphysician's task is to describe the physical world that exists.

The fourth way encompasses all the ways that attempt to study metaphysics in different dimensions, including the transcendental metaphysics, Nietschean metaphysics, Lyotard's conception of reality, state of affairs, metaphysics of possibility, metaphysics of sociality, realism, and others that have existed and are going to exist in the future, ontological pluralism. They claimed that there is no single way to metaphysical thinking, rather there are ways of being modalities of existence in the current time. Metaphysical being is not unified; it is something that is dissolved and diffused in different forms.

Transcendental-metaphysical dimension, in the current era, the transcendental metaphysical dimension is under heavy criticism, but we do not come to this stage out of nowhere; it is stage

by stage. So in metaphysics, we are dealing with something more like a family tree of different dimensions. Oliver L. Resier says, gloomy prophecies regarding the human race's future have been made throughout philosophy's history. One of the more realistic forecasts is that man would someday bury himself behind the mounds of factual material entity, he is accumulating with each passing year. At this moment, the classical concept of metaphysics is being disregarded more than ever." (Oliver, 1958)The new spirit of Nietzsche, post-modernism, Lyotard, and other critiques of classical metaphysical thinking is different. Therefore, I argue that Nietzsche, post-modernism, and Lyotard critiques don't show the elimination of metaphysics, rather it is an attempt to contain project, which is by criticizing classical metaphysical thinking, which is universalistic, abstract, speculative, transcendental, and two-world theory, we need to dwell in another metaphysical reality which describes the spirit of the age, because classical metaphysical thinking no longer represents the spirit of the age. It is far removed from what really exists.

I argue that Nietzsche, avoiding classical metaphysics, gave metaphysics another form, which is different from the classical metaphysical thinking assertion of metaphysics as being beyond physics, which means beyond the physical world. Nietzsche tried to overcome this aspect of metaphysics and gave a physical flavor to reality. As a result, he attempted to examine reality, but not in the sense of a transcendental world or being, but rather in the world of becoming, which is the only possible world that exists. Fios writes that Nietzsche's metaphysics, like other modern metaphysical systems, is metaphysics of immanence since it places the final principle of things within them rather than outside them. (Fios,2013)

For Nietzsche, natural existence in its totality is not created or determined by a supernatural principle, a prime mover or an ordering intelligence-but it is its own cause, its own. In this case, he developed a metaphysical system called eternal recurrence. As we have seen Eternal recurrence is the idea of all events in the world repeating themselves in the same sequence in an infinite number of circles. It is an understanding of reincarnation in a material way. The assertion that we will live in this world, accepting all the things the world gives us and assuming they will repeat again. So he understood reality and embarked on the everyday challenge of human beings.

As there is a generation gap between the ancients and Nietzsche, he develops eternal recurrence to suit the spirit of the age and current man because, knowing that his life will repeat again, he

decides to choose the good choice that helps him to decrease the bad bits of life and enhance the good bits of life. No one wants to live a disgusting, painful life again and again, so the concept of eternal recurrence was taken as a bell when we came to choosing our life. Let me postulate it through a scenario. I am aware that after I die I will reincarnate and repeat every minute and bit of life. So, knowing this, I will be sure to choose the right one because I will repeat it infinitely. So Nietzsche understood recurrence as an underlying metaphysical reality that is bound to this very system, the visible world, not to something beyond or to a transcendental system.

The other point that Nietzsche's metaphysics rests on is that he develops the meaning of the universe from the universe rather than from the outside world. As he mentioned, the meaning of life is the over-man, not God. This man is a being that entertains master morality and the manifestation of the will to power. Therefore, Nietzsche's metaphysical reality is the over-man. He argues that the man in flesh is not the abstract man but the man in flesh. Overman does not mean the crude glorification of arbitrary acts of violence, to which men have been accustomed hitherto. Unlike the current man's plain and straightforward exaggeration, becoming overman will turn man into a new sort of human." (Nestorahoyo, 2002) Therefore, for Nietzsche this new type of man with new attribute is the meaning of reality.

Even if we consider failures, the breakup of our relationship, the death of a loved one, strife, and hardships, we should be happy. We should learn to incorporate mistakes, imperfections, and sorrows into the beauty of the whole. We should construct our lives. We should decide who we want to be and how we want to be. For Nietzsche, metaphysics studies human reality that is embedded in their feelings, because in a Nietzschean sense, the will to power is a soul capacity that psychology has long distinguished from reason and sensation. According to Nietzsche, the will to power is the most intimate substance of the Being. the essential essence of the being as being is the will to power. (Nestorahoyo, 2002).

So generally, Nietzsche's metaphysics rests on the will to internal power, not on external, outside principles and the world. Our internal will to power is what gives us the upper hand over men and frees us from our illusionary relationship with transcendental beings and the transcendental world. Therefore, the implication is that metaphysics should dwell on the improvement of our existence, an existence that is physical and spiritual (in relation to internal power, not

abstract or eternal), because that is the case we should maintain and make us vital. Those who overcome their inferiority and are manifestations of the will to power become superman by substituting the classical metaphysician God, and the eternal recurrence is the existing system we are embraced of by substituting the system that is transcendental. Therefore, critiques of metaphysics do not imply the death of metaphysics; rather, it is the breaking point to give another form to metaphysics by mesmerizing principles that are fundamentally metaphysical in relation to the spirit of the age.

Therefore, using the above points as premises, I argue that by abandoning classical metaphysical thinking, Nietzsche gave metaphysics another form. Rejecting classical metaphysical thinking's assertion that reality is found in the outside world and the assertion that the only thing we encounter within the visible and empirical world is an apparent reality, which has its reference in the outside world, he argued that we need to embark on another reality that represents the interaction of society and the spirit of the age.

As people evolve through time their view of universe and reality may vary. I argue that postmodernism doesn't imply the elimination of metaphysics rather they give metaphysics another form abandoning classical metaphysical thinking. "The goal of postmodernism is to find reality. In the postmodern worldview, interpretation is everything: reality only exists as a result of our particular interpretations of what the world means to us." (Glossary Defination Post modernism-PBS) "In the postmodern worldview, interpretation is everything: reality only exists as a result of our particular interpretations of what the world means to us. Reality is performing social action. " (Ibid) Thus, in postmodernism, there is a reality for each group of speakers that chooses to use the word and accepts that usage of it.

The postmodernist Habermas's investigation of reality is embedded in his post-metaphysical position. Reality, according to Habermas, is found in communicative rationality. Communicative action serves as a bridge to transmit cultural knowledge in order to achieve mutual communication and understanding. It then coordinates action towards social integration and solidarity. As a result, his post-metaphysical assertion is not devoted to the search for absolute reality in the outside world and transcendental world, but rather to revealing the possibility of reason, emancipation, and rational critical communication latent in modern institutions and the human capacity to deliberate and pursue rational interests. According to Habermas, to discover

this reality that is linguistically oriented in the social and communicative interaction and life world of human beings, using reason, but not the reason of having the definition of classical metaphysical thinking, but rather discursive and mediated in society, culture, norms, politics, communication, or general interaction of society.

Mini narratives are the new realities, forwarded by the post-modernist Lyotard, because grand narratives insist on totalizing, universalistic, and comprehensive accounts of discourse, they are far removed from the reality of the people. It is mini narratives that rescue them from legitimation crisis that the abandoning of grand narratives causes. Because mini narratives go to discover reality that is particular, social, cultural, contextual, and interpretative, thus different groups can have different realities that are equally accurate and true. The idea of reality is seen as a construct that performs certain functions Therefore, the idea served by Lyotard called "mini narrative" declares that there can be multiple simultaneous realities. Therefore, mini narratives are the realities that replace the grand narrative and rescue metaphysics.

To bolster my case, we can also find metaphysics in other alternatives. As we are living in a world where class struggle, contradiction, and a big gap between the wealthy and the poor, everything in the world is embedded in matter. We have enough problems to deal with in this visible world. I argued that metaphysics should study reality in the world that can eliminate this material gap, at least to reduce it. To support my claim, the following attempt to rescue metaphysics in terms of material essence is supportive. Marx states that "The philosophers have only interpreted the world in various ways." The point, however, is to change it. He was a materialist and he used to see reality in terms of material things. This implies that we must overcome the extreme distance between owner and labor in the economic realm in metaphysics. He states that we have to get busy with our daytime activity, which is to change the world materially. We need to focus ourselves here on our earth. We need to go away from idealism and transcendentalism. Therefore, we can rescue material essences from metaphysics.

I also argued that there must be different notions of reality and approaches to find them. Because claiming ontological monism in a world of more than 6 billion people is unrealistic. It is true that we live in a diversified world, a world which is diversified by different ideas, a world in which there are infinite needs, so how this all can take their journey in one way is quite near to impossibility. In Dostoevsky's book called "The Brothers of Karamazov", in chapter five titled

"The Grand Inquisitor", the Grand Inquisitor argues that people want to see mystery, power, miracle, authority, earthly bread, and even though he tells Jesus that religion and God are not the same, because the church alienated from God and found the way in which to search for a reality that fit with the reality of human beings. To add it up, people use different approaches to search for reality, like faith, logic, and miracles, so and so forth. Therefore, I don't think metaphysics should only be addressed in the way that restricts human kind to going in one way. Human beings should be set free to address reality in some other way. To strength this claim ontological pluralism, claimed that there are different ways, kinds, or modes of being. The ontological pluralist rescues metaphysics by questioning "Why should we think there is just one existential quantifier?" (Turner, 2010) Unlike classical metaphysical thinking that insisted on ultimate reality and ultimate quantifier, the ontological pluralist gives some kind of freedom for human beings to search, whether we call it quantifier or reality in different ways and approaches. That's how they attempt to rescue metaphysics.

I also argue that we can only have clear, sensible, meaningful, certain knowledge only about the visible world. We don't know what is happening in the outside world, certainly, or we don't know if it is there. Even religious people don't know where to find the other world, which is distinct from this visible world. Even if we are curious and eager to know or to discover the other world, it will be an ambitious project. It might be because of two possibilities: The first one is that maybe our minds are limited to what we know. The second possibility, is that maybe there is no such kind of world or concept. It's just an illusion. So I argue that metaphysics should study the reality of appearance. Therefore, Metaphysics can be rescued by studying phenomenal reality a reality in which we know certainly and surely.

According to realism, truth and reason are cultural constructs with very limited value. They contended that metaphysics is a misbegotten creation of Western intellectual arrogance, led by allegedly timeless and universal logic principles in the pursuit of a non-existent "objective" and "complete" truth. (Lowe, 1998)I argue that realism is also another alternative to rescue metaphysics because, within the bounds of realism, they call reality just some human construction statured by interest driven by interpretation. I found the concept of freedom in realism because if a human being is free, they can have the full right to make their own reality. For instance, we can consider the era we are in currently. It will be a joke guiding a postmodern

society to believe in this and don’t believe that it is an era of interpretation. As a result, metaphysics can be saved by bringing it down from the sky and placing it under the interpretation of a culturally bound, interest-driven conception of a new own world.

According to (Schmitt, 2003)It is the proposal ("idea constructionism") that our categorization of things and people into sorts are created by social conditions rather than by nature. It is also claimed that human distinctions (gender, race) are created by societal factors (e.g., assessment) rather than innate ones. I argue that human beings are the outputs of society, the quest to search for reality, truth is highly shaped by this society ideology to the extreme the proof for God existence is different society from society simply by reading the scripts that wrote by someone it is highly probable to rightly predict from what kind of society the author belongs to. So in this notion metaphysics revived under as Schmitt called the metaphysics of sociality. There we can rescue metaphysics in the trend of metaphysics of sociality.

So to conclude my argument, I argue that there will always be metaphysics as we create more knowledge and questions containing the spirit of the age. The current spirit of the age tells us to embrace contextuality, particularity, and existing interaction so metaphysics can be adopted in the above fashion as a quest for reality in social, cultural, contextual, interpretative, linguistic, etc. ways that help us understand the current situation. We should not consider metaphysics to have a single goal; rather, metaphysics may have multiple goals such as practical goal, social goal, epistemic goal, aesthetic goal, moral goal, logical goal, cultural goal, and so on. Therefore, we can rescue metaphysics by considering different aims and understanding it in the context of the change in the spirit of the age that society or the universe is going through.

Conclusion

There is no one way of doing metaphysics. Classical metaphysical thinking maintains that transcendence is the only way to grasp reality. This assertion has now become under heavy criticism, but this doesn't show the death of metaphysics, rather it opens the door for other dimensions in metaphysics to investigate reality in different forms, which shows its growth. Fios writes: modern philosophers' critique of metaphysics as transcendent, abstract, and universal philosophy supports the existence of perfected metaphysics. (Fios,2013) Metaphysics might have different aims. Therefore, this thesis developed having the central argument that rescuing metaphysics is possible.

In doing so, the thesis contained four chapters. Chapter one is intended to show the central arguments drawn by towering philosophers. As we have seen in chapter one, classical metaphysical thinking, starting from pre-Socratic philosophers, appeared as a result of the transition from mythos to logos. In this case, they were considered the first philosophers. Their metaphysical thinking is highly intertwined with the assumption that there is an ultimate constitution or origin of the universe and it needs to be discovered. As a result, they attempted to discover reality, the essence of things, the underlying principle that grapples with the entirety of our existence. In general, their metaphysical thinking is assigned to the investigation of ultimate reality. Having the pre-Socratic philosophers' attainment of ultimate reality as base, there appears the other tradition of classical metaphysical thinking. For this tradition, the speculation of the pre-Socratic philosophers was important because they lie at the roots of the first major philosophies, and in this respect, yet another point must be made, namely the progress of the pre-Socratics toward the discovery of the form. So, using this as a precursor chapter, one attempted to oversee the classical metaphysical tradition, dividing it into two broad concepts: dualistic metaphysical thinking and speculative metaphysical thinking. Plato's dualistic metaphysical thinking and the modern philosopher Descartes' different understanding of dualism were taken into account for this, and after the enlightenment philosopher Kant's dualistic metaphysical thinking with restrictions was in place. In general, both philosophers argued that metaphysics is possible but at different levels and understanding. In general, chapter one asserts classical metaphysical thinking, which is highly embedded in the abstract, far removed from human day-to-day life, contemplative, universal, and speculative in nature.

Throughout history, philosophy has expanded at various times. Philosophy has had a patterned metaphysical paradigm from the days of ancient antiquity. (Fios,2013) The existing paradigm will stay until another paradigm comes along in order to replace the former. The existential philosopher Nietzsche is the one who shifts the gears of metaphysical thinking. He argues that classical metaphysical thinking is culminating in the state of meaninglessness. In effect of the downfall of classical metaphysical thinking, he develops his own metaphysical thinking, taking the spirit of the age into consideration. Chapter Two considers Nietzsche's critiques of classical metaphysical thinking.

So, Nietzsche was interested in metaphysics in order to show the downfall of classical metaphysical thinking. The major critics that Nietzsche forwarded can be presented into the following points: Nietzsche argues that classical metaphysical thinking is involved in preaching acetic morality. According to Nietzsche, ascetic morality denies life. It is not in the process of affirming life because classical metaphysical thinking, including Christianity, preaches that there exists another world, another form of life which is perfectly designed, which ultimate reality rests on, so using this as a reference, people didn't have the appetite to affirm the possible and existing world by missing the world which they didn't ever know of. So, according to Nietzsche, this form of metaphysical thinking must be abandoned and we need to embark on master morality, a morality that is an affirmation of this life, a life which is full of suffering, chaos, breakup, and pain. So he shifts from one gear of classical metaphysical thinking, which is ascetic morality (life-denying morality), to the gear of master morality (life-affirming morality). The other main criticism against classical metaphysical thinking that Nietzsche mentioned is that in fact the world is always in the state of change, as the pre-Socartic philosopher Heraclitus put it, but the classical metaphysical thinkers deny this reality and embark on another reality which has an empty existence world as having a permanent, universal, abstract, ultimate, stable, and the only possible reality, Nietzsche would say this is a very wrong assertion made by classical metaphysical thinkers because we never experience this kind of world. We only know the empirical world that is always changing. As a result, Nietzsche shifted another gear in classical metaphysical thinking, which is bounded by dualistic reality into one possible world called the empirical/physical world or abstract to worldliness.

The other criticism is that classical metaphysical thinking highly and ultimately relies on rationality as a tool to discover every possible reality that exists out there. Nietzsche would say that using reason as the only nature of a human being and a tool to discover reality is wrong because it goes against human nature and the system of the world. So Nietzsche shifts the other gear of classical metaphysical thinking, which is reason, to another gear that balances both reason and passion. So, using this and other points, Nietzsche argues that classical metaphysical thinking no longer describes the spirit of the age and the incompatibility between classical metaphysical thinking and the spirit of the age creates a crisis called nihilism.

According to Nietzsche, nihilism is a state of meaninglessness, a space that can't provide an answer for "why," so to rescue people from this meaninglessness It's "the overman" with the energy called "will to power" within the system called "Eternal Recurrence of the same." This is where Nietzsche's classical metaphysical thinking rests. It is not created by an eternal being to attain eternity, not by a transcendental being to attain transcendence, not by an infinite being to attain infinity, but by a finite being to attain good staying time in the finite and temporal state.

According to Nietzsche, the over man is the meaning of the world having the building block called will to power. Will to power is energy, an energy of the will to master that manifests in all possible forms of existence and always in the state of appearance of its formation of domination. And both the over man and the will to power are enveloped by the system called eternal recurrence. It is a system that acknowledges the appearance and function without appealing to the invisible world but by appealing to the empirical world. So eternal recurrence is the idea of all events in the same sequence in infinite serious circles. So who doesn't want to be a winner, a master in all this infinite circle? This is the metaphysics of Nietzsche, which comes up with different versions of the understanding of metaphysics. So he attempted to change the classical metaphysical thinking bible to the Nietzsche metaphysical thinking bible by understanding metaphysics in its material, sensuous, spatial-temporal existing version. So chapter two ended up with the embracing of the following argument, which is the central thesis of this paper: the Nietzsche project is not a full denial or elimination of metaphysics, rather it is an attempt at the elimination of classical metaphysical thinking in order to embark on another form of reality. Therefore, there is an implication that there is still a way to understand metaphysics in a different version than what classical metaphysical thinkers sought.

The third chapter contains the critiques of classical metaphysical thinking that used Nietzsche's critics as a precursor to continue. In this chapter, Postmodernism and Lyotard critics have been considered. Postmodernism is an era that came after modernism. So the following major critics of classical metaphysical thinking is considered: According to postmodernism, classical metaphysical thinking should be abandoned because in the postmodern era, a theory that attempts to draw a totalizing, universalizing, comprehensive absolute account is obsolete because it no longer identifies the postmodern condition that is embedded in randomness, interpretation, and post truth. The other point developed in conjunction with the first is that postmodernists argued that there is no way to investigate for objective truth or ultimate reality that existed in the outside world because it never shows the everyday life of human beings that is social, political, or historical in nature. for postmodernists, reality or truth exists in the day to-day lives of human beings and, rather than being objective, it is discursive and interpretative. Furthermore, postmodernists were against the assertion that classical metaphysical thinking has made, which is that reason is considered to be the ultimate reality.

According to postmodernist theory, reason's task is not to discover ultimate reality, but rather to describe the interaction of people. According to Habermas, classical metaphysical thinking is already obsolete, and the spirit of the age is being replaced by post-metaphysical thinking that is embedded in historical linguistic turn and reason, and that is situated in human beings' day-to-day lives. Therefore, rather than drawing ideal theories as classical metaphysical thinking has done, post metaphysical thinking is embedded in practicality because it is investigated in language culture and in societal manners. As a result, Habermas attempted to replace classical metaphysical thinking with post-metaphysical thinking, which asserts that reality is found in society rather than the outside world.

The other prominent philosopher's critique that chapter three addressed is Jean-Francios Lyotard's. According to Lyotard, the postmodern condition is "incredulous towards meta narratives." He argues that the postmodern condition is not suitable for embracing those grand narratives that classical metaphysical thinking has sought. In the postmodern condition, we no longer believe in those grand narratives that attempt to give a totalized, comprehensive, universalistic account for everything that exists in the world, but according to Lyotard, the abandoning of these grand narratives doesn't get human beings to heaven, rather there exists a

problem called the legitimation crisis. This legitimation crisis is highly compatible with Nietzsche's account of the state of nihilism, which people encounter as the result of abandoning grand narratives as a way out of this meaninglessness In the case of Nietzsche he forwarded will to power and over man as the meaning of the world. In the case of Lyotard, to avoid the legitimation crisis, he came up with what he called "mini-narratives." These are narratives that the specific society forms to describe its own specific situation. Mini narratives express mini practice, subjective interpretations, contradictions, differences, diversity, and customs of specific societies.

So these mini narratives, unlike the grand narratives of classical metaphysical thinking, are particular, temporal, and situational. So, avoiding classical metaphysical thinking that is embarked on pure reason, ultimate reality, mini narrative, going to discover truth that is embedded in the interpretation and contextual status of the given society. Therefore, in the closing of chapter three, I claimed that postmodernism's critiques of classical metaphysical thinking don't really show the abandoning of metaphysics as a whole, rather it shows the abandoning of classical metaphysical thinking in order to embark on another reality.

Therefore, in the closing of chapter three, I claimed that postmodernism's critiques of classical metaphysical thinking don't really show the abandoning of metaphysics as a whole, rather it shows the abandoning of classical metaphysical thinking in order to embark on another reality. This implies that they are still interested in reality, albeit in a different context and understanding than classical metaphysical thinking. In chapter four, I attempted to celebrate my argument. I argued that we can rescue metaphysical living in the current era by changing the theme of metaphysics, as we have seen in the cases of Nietzsche, postmodernism, Lyotard, state of affairs, realism, metaphysics of possibility, ontological realism, and other forms that understand metaphysics in another form that represents the spirit of the age. Therefore, I conclude metaphysics is still possible and stays resonant in the vortex of human beings.

Reference

Anderson, P. (1998). *The Origins Of Postmodernity.* New York : Verso.

Baker, L. R. (2008). *A Metaphysics Of Ordinary Things And Why We Need It*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press .

Bostock, D. (1988). *Plato's Theaetetus.* New York: Clarendon Press Oxford.

Britannica. (2020). *Encyclopidia Britannica* . Retrieved from The Editors Of Encyclopidea : Britannica, The Editors of Encyclopaedia. "Reincarnation". E https:// www.britannica. com/topic/reincarnation

Cambridge Dictionary . (2021).

Cicero. (1959). *Leo Strauss seminar in political Philosophy* . The University of Chicago.

Copleston, F. (1946). *A History Of Philosophy.* Westminister : Newman Press .

Descartes, R. (1996). *Meditation on First Philosophy.* New York: Cambridge University Press .

Doyle, T. (2018). *Nietzsche's Metaphysics of the will to power the possibility of value.* New York: Cambridge University press .

Eaton, R. M. (1927). *Descartes Selections.* New York: Scribners.

Evangeliou, c. c. (2003) Nietzsche On Tragedy and Socratism. *Towson Unievrsity* .

Fios, F. (2013). *Critics to Metaphysics by Modern Philosophers: A Discourse on Human Beings in Reality* . Bina Nusantra University .

Cambridge University.(2016). *From Mythos And Irrationality Towards Logos and Rationality.* Cambridge University Press .

Garret, B. (2006). *What is This Thing Called Metaphysics.* London and New York .

Gilson, E. (1950) *The Unity Of Philosophical Exeprience* . New York: Charles Scribner's Sons .

Glossary Defination Post modernism-PBS. (n.d.).

Habermas, J. (,1992). *Postmetaphysical Thinking: Philosophical Essays.* (W. M. Hohengarte, Trans.) London: MIT Press .

Habermas, J. (1981). *The Theory Of Communicative Action.* (T. McCarthy, Trans.) Toronto: Fitzhenry and whiteside Limited.

Hegel, G. (2001). *Philosophy Of Right.* (S. Dyde, Trans.) Canada: Batoche Books Kitchener.

Jessop, T. E. (1930). The Metaphysics Of Plato. *Jstor* .

Kant, I. (1998). *Critique Of Pure Reason* . United Kingdom : Cambridge University Press.

Katen, E. (1973). *Doing Philosophy* . New Jersy : Library Of Congress Catalogue .

Krasko, G. (2007). Viktor Frankl: The Prophet Of Meaning. *Say no to Boredom* .

Kuhn, H. (1947). Existentalism And Metaphysics. In *The Review of Metaphysics* . Philosophy Education Society Inc.

Lowe, E. J. (1998). *The possibility Of Metaphysics* . New York: Clarendon Press Oxford .

Lucas, P. G. (1783). *Immanuel Kant Prolegomena To Any Future Metaphysics that will be able to present itself As a Science* . Manchester University Press .

Lyotard, J. F. (1979). *The Post Modern Condition: Report to knowlage* . Minneapolis: University Of Minnesota Press.

Merriam Webster . (n.d.).

Metaphysical-Glossary Of Defination . (n.d.).

Miller, E. L. (1984). *Questions That Matters An Invitation To Philosophy* . U.S.A: Library of Congress Catalogue company .

Mitchell, J. (2017). A Nietzschean Critique Of Metaphysical Philosophy. *Jostor* .

Nagaraj , A., Nanjegowda, R., & Purushotma, S. (2013). The Mystery Of Reincarnation. *Indian J Psychiatry* .

Navickas, J. L. (1976). *Consciousness And Reality: Hegel's Philosophy Of Subjectivity* . Martinus Nijhoff -The Hague .

Nestorahoyo, F. (2002). *A critic Of Nietzsche Metaphysics* . University of Ibadian .

Nietsche, F. (2008). *The Birth Of Tragedy.* (I. Johnston, Trans.) canada: Vancouver Island University.

Nietzsche. (2006). *Thus Spoke To Zarathustra.* (A. D. Caro, R. B. Pippin, Eds., & A. D. Caro, Trans.) New York: Cambridge University Press.

Nietzsche, F. (1984). *Human All-Too-Human.* (M. Stephen, & F. Lehmann, Trans.) London, U.S.A: Nebraska Press Lincoln.

Nietzsche, F. (2007). *On The Geneology Of Morality.* (C. Diethe, Trans.) New York: Cambridge University Press.

Nietzsche, F. (2001). *The Gay Science* . New York : Cambridge University Press.

O'Briem, W. (2017). The Meaning Of Life Early Continental and Analytic Perspectives. *Internet Encyclopedia Of Philosophy* , 25.

Oliver, R. L. (1958). *The Integration Of Human Knowladge* . Boston: Sargent publisher .

Pappas, N. (2014). How is Nietzsche's Will to Power related to his notion of Eternal Recurrence? Wikipedia suggests a connection, but does not elaborate. thanks PS: I am not a student and this is not a homework assignment. *Ask Philosophers* .

Peters, M. A. (2006). Lyotard,Nihilism And Education . *Research Gate* .

Picorino, p. A. (2001). Introduction to Philosophy . *Study Web* .

Plato. (380 B.C). Allegory Of The Cave. In Plato, *Republic* (A. Shawn, Trans.).

Plato. (2004). *Republic* . Indianapolis : Hackett Publishing .

Puntel, L. A. (2012). Habermas Postmetaphysical thinking: ACritique. *Jstor* .

Quintana, T. (2018). Is There A Priori Knowlage . *Medium* .

Rochelle, G. (2012). *Doing Philosophy* . Edinburgh: Dundedin Acadamics Press Ltd .

Rorty, R. (2001). Habermas and Lyotard on Postmodernity. *PhilPapers* .

Rosen, S. (2003). *The Philosoper's Hand Book: Essential Reading from Plato To Kant* . Radom House Reference .

Rusell, B. (1950). Logical Positivism. *Jstor* .

Schmitt, F. F. (2003). *Socializing Metaphysics.* Maryland: RowMan and Littlefield publishers PlC.

Schmitz, L. K. (1986). Radical ,Comprehensive, Determinate Discourse . In *The Review Of Mtaphysic* . Philosophy Education Society .

Spada, M. F. (1996). David Hume, The Caliph Omar and Burning issue of Metaphysics. *Jstor* .

Stang, & Nicholas, F. (2021). Kant's Trancedental Idealism . *The Stanford Encyclopedia Of Philosophy* .

Steven, N. (2020). *Baurch Spinoza* . The Stanfors Encyclopediaa Of Philosophy .

Turner, J. (2010). Ontological Pluralism. *Jstor* .

Velkley, R. (2003) What Is Metaphysics. In S. Rosen, *The Philosopher's Hand Book.* Random House Reference.

Villeneuve, D. (Director). (2016). *Arrival* [Motion Picture].

Zuboff, A. (1973). Nietzsche And Eternal Recurrence . *Research Gate* .