

## Knowledge of the Unknown in the Known World

PHILIP OSAROBU ISANBOR  
Seminary of All Saints, Ekpoma, Nigeria.

PAUL OLORUNSOLA FOLORUNSO  
Ekiti State University, Ado Ekiti, Nigeria.

**Abstract.** Within the power and influence of human reasoning, the known world recognizes that there are many things that can be known. It rationally professed already and yet unknown, the metaphysical, to be beyond the subjection of the principles and workability of verification. The paper is to assess the indispensability of the knowledge of what claimed to be unknown in our known world. This conviction of certainty will always goes with these questions: within the known World of experience, can one separate the scientific conviction from the foundational influences of metaphysics? Is the human person solely metaphysical or experiential? The answers to these questions remain always dilemmatic but reasonable in our highly motivated relativistic world. Here, the emphasis is strongly on the knowledge of God which has always appeared very elusive to human sense of methodological verifiability, but remains very conspicuously factual within the interaction of faith and reason. With the interplay of faith and reason, the paper posits that everything is known, and there is nothing like no-thing in a known world; since nothing is something. It paper owes that knowing nothing as “nothing” is something; since it is already known as nothing. With the truth inherent in human nature, this somehow and sometimes ascertains the possibility of knowing the claimed ‘unknown’, overwhelmed the principles and practicability of verification, there is always a justification of any knowledge claimed, even in the known world surnamed by scientific and technological consciousness, since reasoning within the power of human rationality and intelligibility cannot be disputed.

**Keywords:** God, Knowledge, Verification, Science, Faith, Reason, Intelligibility

### 1. Introduction

With the phrase, “nothing is something”, “something is nothing” or “knowing the unknown”, one will be tempted to logically and socially infer some metaphysical more than epistemological interests for the linguistic analysis of some perceptive classifications of realities. This is common with some cosmological theologians. With such metaphysical phrases in inferring epistemic certainties, the professorial inaugural lecture of Professor Jim Unah comes to mind. Though, Unah delivered the lecture as an inquiry in metaphysics. It epistemologically and logically substantiated the existence of the “unseen” or the “unknown” in a world of scientific justification. In his manner of metaphysical clarity, Unah posited that there are indispensable questions that are always readily to be asked when a proposition like: “knowing the unknown” is expressed. Such questions are: how can the unknown be classified as known? What is known and what is not? Does the ‘unknown’ not presuppose its very knowledge? Is there something in nothing? Is nothing something? Does nothingness exist? These questions are not easily answered since the totality of any reality cannot be easily ascertained by the senses. They are centralised on the knowledge of the transcendence. According to Jim Unah:

*Transcendence is the voyage of the mind, the human mind, into the region of nothingness. It is the exploration of the wilderness of thought by human reason. In this voyage of the mind, there is always a movement from hither to thither, a movement from here to there.... It is the native human in man which*

*makes him restless, one state of affair to another, which makes him to project from now to not now, from what is, that is, what is available, to what is not.*

Within few percentages of social assurance that can be questioned and doubted, human epistemic community can possibly recognized that sciences grew and still growing from metaphysics. For it necessarily involves thinking on the experiential and non-experiential realities. For the human person is beyond materiality, and at such, the knowledge the human person possesses are beyond the dominance of empirical experiences. We also recognised that the known world of experience is paradigmatically orchestrated by scientific consciousness, and at such, nothing real is possible outside it, but only rationality to make what appeared to be unreal to be real.

From many of epistemic cultural concerns for the knowledge of the transcendence, the religious and theological search for the meaning of the existentiality of God seems to be douched and compromised. The dominance of scientific knowledge seems to be overshadowing the culture of intuitive knowledge, especially the transcendence. For this, when assessing the possibilities of the mind to have judgement and knowledge of non-perceptual realities, Immanuel Kant maintains that;

Appearances are the sole objects which can be given to us immediately, and that in them, which relates immediately to the object is called intuition. But these appearances are not things-in-themselves; they are only representations, which in turn have their object which itself cannot be intuited by us, and which may, therefore, be named the non-empirical, that is, transcendental objects.

Methodologically, the concern here is based on the conviction that if nothing exists, such nothing can be known. At such, anything can be known. If nothing can be known, therefore such nothing exists as something, at least, in the minds. Therefore, we examine the following: Analysis of the Unknown as Epistemic Realities; Knowledge of the Known in the World of Transcendence; Knowledge of the Unknown in the Reign of evil, and finally, evaluative conclusion. They are all directed to the belief based on the power of reasoning and dynamism of human lived-experiences, that there is nothing should be termed “unknown” since anything can be known, including those things beyond the methodological justification and verification of science.

## **2. Truth, Metaphysics, and Human Knowledge of the Transcendence**

The concern to transcend beyond knowledge of the materiality or physicality of existence is to arrive the real truth of such existence. “To transcend limit in search of excellence (the capacities of scientific culture) refers to the human mental power of beyondness. It depicts the ability to transit beyond the ordinary meaning of things into the transcendental world of abstraction and imaginative visioning, it is at this level that the world is recreated and repackaged a new for onward application to crass human experience.” This has been the concern of metaphysics in the history of philosophy, especially on the notion and explication of the deterministic adaptability of metaphysics for the historical characterization and classification of the known and unknown worlds.

The justifications of knowledge or the affirmation of truth are based on the availability of epistemic evidence or conceited facts. According many positivistic epistemologists like Alfred Ayer (here, Ayer is so concerned about what can be analysed and subjected to scientific rudiment and routine) and David Hume (Against metaphysics, Hume especially is driven to the conclusion that, while virtually all our knowledge depends on the assumption of the existence of a causal nexus within the world, belief in such a causal nexus is itself founded on nothing more secure that our mental habits), no possible knowledge outside the availability of facts. That is, any epistemic proposition is evidence based, and therefore, it can be analyzed and verified. For them, the perception of the “unknown” is subscribed within the epistemic pavilion of non-verifiability. The expression of the unknown becomes virtually, usually and factually classified as knowledge within the sanctuary of rationality, which is the pathway of reasoning that necessarily gives meaningfulness to the atoms of experience and truth.

Metaphysically situated is the existentiality of truth of every unseen reality, transcendently; inherent in the personality of God especially, unperceived in his very self, but perceived through the truth in nature. According to Peter Van Inwagen;

Metaphysics, then, attempts to get behind appearances and to tell the ultimate truth about things. It will be convenient to have a collective name for “things”— for everything. Let us call “everything” collectively ‘the World’. Since ‘the World’ is a name for everything, the World includes even God (if there is a God). We are therefore using the word in a more inclusive sense than that employed by the religious believer who says, “God created the world.” If we should later decide that there is a God who created everything besides

Himself, it will be easy enough to find another word to use as a collective name for everything other than God—‘the universe’, say.

Against this metaphysical position on the knowledge of the unseen realities like God, we can rationally recognise the affirmation or justification of knowledge claim by the positivist epistemologists. According to Amaechi Udefi, when examining the distrusting epistemic nature inherent in the Archimedian views of the social application of philosophy, and asserts that; “the justification condition simply suggests that merely having a true belief is not sufficient for knowledge. What is sufficient therefore is that such true belief be justified.” What can be truly justified as knowledge in affirming true belief, since some experiences can be deceptive and elusive? Is it only what is perceived that is known? To be known, according to science, “there must be sufficient reasons or justification for believing a particular proposition. Put differently, a sufficient reason of justification presupposes that there must be something that supports or provides evidence for the truth of what one believes.” For science, such justification can be faulty. But how dependable is such justification when sense perceptions are not reliable. Within the purview of methodological justification of knowledge, science remains a source of certainty with less questioning and doubting of its outcomes.

### 3. Analysis of the Unknown as Epistemic Realities

Within the purview of the known world that is made possible by the historicity of human lived experiences, knowledge claims remain very limited. More straightforwardly, “this is true because sometimes people worry about whether they actually know what they claim to know.... Thus, the belief cannot be guaranteed without sufficient reason or justification.” Specifically, such knowledge and their models of verification or investigation are related or based strongly on the rational disposition of the human person. On this conviction, metaphysical realities and knowledge are aside this scientific conventional modulation, and subject such knowledge to human religiosity and emotional appellation. Here, we remembered the thought of Godfrey Ozumba, that:

*Knowledge cannot be ascertained in only one way due to human nature, and actually the word ‘knowledge’ is noun form of the verb ‘to know’. There is more than one way of defining knowledge. Suffice it for us to define it as the state of awareness of a given. Knowledge can also be seen as the fact of*

*understanding, information acquired through learning or experience.*

The known are within the reign of justification, always on the pavilion of what is to be believed based on the certain evidences that have been gathered and can be confirmed to be very true in accordance to the working of the senses and the structures of experiences. For Simon Critchley, when giving an insight into alluring natures of scientific thinking and the development of technologically-related worldviews, asserts that, “we are all acutely aware, we live in a scientific world, a world where we are expected to provide empirical evidence for our claims or find those claims rightly rejected.” Such knowledge claims are rejected due to methodological incompatibility; and such knowledge claims include the notation of God, spirit and Angels.

Moreover, in an eco-philosophical theological assessment of the valuation of nature, Allan Savage recognises that; “through a misunderstanding of the Scholastic method, truth has come to be equated with concrete experiential objects and to be perceived as valid as the terms used to express the truth. Those thinkers, not aware of this aberration in which the means become conterminous with the ends, continue to make interpretive.” We live in and for truth even without expressing them. It is experienced than being expressed. That is nature, and that is metaphysics of the human person who lived in the world of experiences, and something, these are mistakenly misrepresented due to the limitedness associated with human nature, not in God. “Such interpretive mistakes are not possible in phenomenological understanding. Since ideological concepts have no independent existence outside of the consciousness of the knower, ideas have no opportunity to become fixed or to take on an independent existence. Phenomenological perceptions are in perpetual flux within the consciousness of the knower.” Such rejection of unknown facts has a place in and for science, since atoms and molecules do not have spiritual nature, or they cannot be regarded as metaphysical bodies. Such phenomenological theology is thus freed from all allegorical limitations in its language of meaning and imposition. For this, Terry Copper and Cindy Epperson explicated that:

*Many theorists, while claiming to be operating strictly as scientists, make metaphysical or ultimate claims about life. In other words, they clearly reach beyond science and become philosophers. We believe that this is perfectly appropriate if they realise that they have “switched hats” and are now speaking as philosophers. Ultimate statements about what is and is not possible clearly move beyond the limitations of*

*a scientific framework. Science cannot tell us what is beyond science. Nor can it say with any degree of certainty that there is “nothing but” science. Science is simply a methodology. Yet while claiming to be operating in the name of science, some scientists “smuggle in” philosophical assumptions that eliminate from the outset certain aspects of reality. In other words, they justify a philosophical bias in the name of a strictly empirical methodology. But again, an empirical methodology cannot tell us about non-empirical things.*

In the development of the known world, the scientific frameworks and methodologies for the suitability of knowledge become relevantly indispensable. For Critchley, “scientific conception of the world... dominates the way we see things and, perhaps even more importantly, the way we expect to see things. We expect to see things somewhat like spectators in a theatre where we can inspect them theoretically.” In science, God is not an object of analysis, thus, we may ask, how can God be known since God cannot be analysed. Science will constantly claim that such knowledge will remain very vague and elusive. Even in religion, one cannot be a spectator to God and the knowledge of him can only be theoretically rationalized as a product of the mind. In science, according to Critchley, “things are present as objects that are empirically and immediately given in the form of sensations or representations. Science gives us the knowledge of the nature of such things,” not the integral nature of things, for there are the unseen nature of every reality, and God being a spirit, as claimed religiously, whose very nature different from other realities, both material and metaphysical, cannot be subjected to scientific modulation of interests in order to certify his existence and real nature.

The conceptualisation of the “unknown” in relation to the human nature presupposes some ideas of the said “unknown.” The unknown becomes a reality in the minds of the human persons as subjects of lived experiences. Even the scientifically-minded individuals or professionals succumb to such conviction, especially seeing some discoveries that are beyond scientific imagination and powers of analysis, thereby, they imagine the unseen world in the known world. Although, the scientists may claim that such unknown world is a product of mere human rational and emotional projection and imagination, which is subject to series of epistemological altercations. For science, what is real is what can be verified. Nothing else matters outside what can be scientifically verified. According to Nicholas Maxwell, when assessing the revamping nature of

science in relation to the valuation of the human person, asserts that:

*Knowledge-inquiry... all too often fails to nourish “the holy curiosity of inquiry”, and may even crush it out altogether. Knowledge-inquiry gives no rational role to emotional and desire; passionate curiosity, a sense of mystery, of wonder have, officially, no place within the rational pursuit of knowledge... knowledge-inquiry hardly encourages the view that inquiry at its most fundamental is thinking that goes on as a part of life; on the contrary, it upholds the idea that fundamental research if highly esoteric, conducted by (philosophers) in contexts remote from ordinary life.*

In science, knowing the unknown, including God, is possible when they are not esoteric and elusive to the working of human sense perception. Such realization of the knowledge of the “unknown” is beyond scientific academic paper works or researches. According to Unah; “every academic discipline is a study of some form or other of reality. Every academic discipline is a study of defined and delimited region of reality, that is why academic disciplines are classified as *metaphysical specialis*, that is, specialized sciences or regional ontology, whereas pure metaphysics or ontology is classified as *metaphysical generalis*.” With such generalisation inherent in scientific engagement, the notion of nothingness of existence becomes something for investigation. “Even though the aim of inquiry may, officially, be human knowledge, the personal and social dimension of this is all too easily lost sight of, and progress in knowledge is conceived of in impersonal terms, stored lifelessly in books and journals.

#### **4. Knowledge of the Known in the World of Transcendence**

In science, the conceptualization of transcendence can be equated with that of nothingness. Just as in the abyss of nothingness, no knowledge in it and of it is possible, simply according to science. Contrarily, in the World of faith, we project the transcendence in the exacting knowledge and development through the human minds. The transcendence represents something in nothingness. Only the mind can locate it from nowhere. The human mind is the seat of nothingness but a hallmark of everything that exist. It projects itself as something in the abyss of emptiness, meaninglessness and oblivion. As Unah puts it:

*Transcendence is the projection of the mind into nothingness as a field or region of encounter to establish and re-establish what is. Transcendence describes the activity of the mind happen as the*

*domain of nothingness. The activity of the mind happens as a conscious reaching out or going beyond something to the region as the nothingness to affirm what is.*

Such projection of the mind brings the non-experiential beings into the world of certainty, especially God. Existentially put, the unknown remain ever transcendental. The mind is the avenue of faith, and with human faith, the knowledge of the unseen world is always realistic. It is about the attainment of religious truth from non-epistemic entities and propositions. For instance, God the creator of all that exist, and this is religious faith, situating a creation of the known world by unknown God, but supreme and powerful. It is very transcendental to the human sense of perception. For David Odunsi:

*To be 'transcendental' is to go beyond the physical, to present the ideal, to aim at the objective and be guided by the truth. It is, in fact, to move to the metaphysical. At the human level, it is to be a model, the ideal of what one should be. At the academic level, it is to be beyond the ordinary and reach the very core or essence of the object of investigation. At the general level, it is to hold unto the raison d'être of any object, the essence which is most appropriate to the existence from which further deductions can be made. In fact, to be transcendental is to be truthful.*

For truth of knowledge, verifiability is a method of enquiry and knowledge development, and it remains very tenable and reliable, but also limited, in knowing the very true and holistic nature of a thing under any epistemological investigation. For Anthony Quinton; "if any beliefs are to be justified at all..., there must be some terminal beliefs that do not owe their credibility to others. For a belief to be, it is not enough for it to be accepted, let alone merely entertained, there must be good reasons for accepting it." Beside these good reasons, there are the possibilities of the unknown, including God. This assertion about God remains questionable indeed; still claimed to be reasonable, since everything can be thought of. Hence; God, who cannot be empirically represented in order to be epistemologically investigated, is away from this scheme of empirical verifiability. The nature and *beingness* of God, according to theologians and religionists, is a pure spirit, known through his manifestation in the created world of experience, especially as the minds of faith-filled personalities can project Him. Considering the *Hermeholionic* God in Pantaleon Iroegbu's philosophy, Nelson Ukwamedua argues that:

*The unravelling of beings in the architectonic of hermeneutics demonstrates that there is God. This*

*God is omnipotent and personal, he is not magical, neither is he mischievous. The ultimately ultimate is a straightforward God not precarious, and he makes the lucid in the confidence he has on its creature to grow and develop accordingly.*

The hermeneutical postulation of non-verifiable facts about the existence and nature of God and the world of the spirits and angels has only been sympathetic to what science holds so dear and sacrosanct. From this epistemological contextualisation of the being as God by Ukwamedua, following the Platonic World of Forms and Augustinian Doctrine of Divine Illumination, we theologically ascertain, not generally philosophical, that such knowledge of the unseen God is hinged on the perceived nature of things in the world. The world presents before the human person: the freedom of reasoning and the reasoning in freedom, in the acquisition of knowledge. According to Benedict XVI, "as far as the two themes of 'reason' and 'freedom' (which in many cases is science) are connected, here we can only touch upon the issues connected with them. Yes, indeed, reason is God's great gift to man, and the victory of reason over unreason is also a goal of the Christian." Such world of experience is full of hidden nature of God which are known by the hermeneutic reflection of things, seeing the spiritual nature being hidden the material nature of reality. Ukwamedua goes further to posit that,

He is a mature God with all the power that there is and in his kindness and simplicity gave re-creative powers to the creature to develop and grow into higher beings. This God is the creative power of all and this explains why he is fullest meaning to the totality of reality. Without him there is nothing, but with him we can explain our existence for 'ex nihilo nihil fit'.

This is the epistemic fate and the rational situationism of the faith in God as the unknown reality. The unknown which or that which remain unknown, but yet known only by the rational minds. God is known by the epistemic virtue of being able to be expressed by and through the aisles of rationality-seeing the unseen, faithing the faithless, perceiving the unperceived, and situating the transcendent. In all science can adduced, God remains transcendent even in the faces of material classification of the knowledge of beingness. Moreover, meaningfulness is a natural imperative of the human mind. The mind is a loss at explaining the totality of reality within its horizons alone. It must search further. It necessarily needs an external explanatory reality, one which is in itself, self-explanatory and which is thus an adequate explanation of all other realities. This is God.

### 5. Knowing the Unknown in the Reign of Evil

From the causal conception of God in theistic tradition of European philosophy, which is not distant from African traditional conception of God, that, if there is a belief in evil, then there can be a belief in God, and vis-à-vis, for only in the presence of negativities that humanities their limitedness, and then they seek for the unseen. God is in nature working on His very self, because He distant Himself from what He has created and still creating by being present in it. The presence and existence of evil, just as the reign of good in the known world, presupposes the existence of God; since both good and evil are claimed by different religions to be from God. So, scientists relate event to what can mostly explained scientifically and God is emphatically exclusive, as Michael Sasa will explicate the causality in related to moral evil, that;

Scientists have their own understanding and explanation. They do not believe that pain, toil, and death are caused by sin. They, however, believe that are causally related to one another. Toil and death, they say, are the consequences of the finely tuned laws of physics that allow us to be here. The pain of childbirth is due to the large heads of human infants, which are necessary to house brains large enough to learn language, and ultimately to pray, and learn philosophy, chemistry, physics and mathematics, etc; and also, tragically, to sin. It is not every human action that is good. Man always creates room to sin. Too bad!

According to Godwin Adeboye, from his philosophical analysis of human physical social and political corruption as a moral evil in our contemporary times of industrial, technological and moral relativistic development:

*One of the major puzzles that man has to grapple with is the logical incompatibility that ensues from the existence and reality of evil in a world that was supposedly created by an all-good, all-powerful, and all-knowing God. The understanding of God as a Being who is omnipotent, omniscient, and omnibenevolent poses some philosophical dilemma which every rational man will continue to contend with.*

For many thinkers, only in such plenitude of dilemmatic confusions or arguments on the presence of evil in the world that God can easily be claimed to exist. It presents the array of hope of better future for human persons when evil is overcoming with good. According to Benedict XVI, in his encyclical: *Spe Salvi*, “this unknown ‘thing’ is the true ‘hope’ which drives us, and at the same time, the fact that it is

unknown is the cause of all forms of despair and also of all efforts, whether positive or destructive, directed towards worldly authenticity and human authenticity.” Such authenticity is about the hope humanities have, owing that there is always reason or purpose for any creation, and the reign of evil is not an exception or it can never be. Explicating the connectivity of the creation and sustainability of the world in the conflicting natures of both good and evil, Nick Trakakis recalls that:

*God brought the (physical and non-physical) world into existence, and also keeps the world and every object within it in existence. Thus, no created thing could exist at a given moment unless it was at that moment held in existence by God. Further, no created thing could have the causal powers and liabilities it has at a given moment unless it were at that moment supplied with those powers and liabilities by God.*

Over the time, many thinkers reasonably opine that, even within the religious circle, that it will be very unwise to associate the reign of evil in the known world with the personality of God, and at such, that will be limiting God, since evil is in the negative. In doing so, they illogically disassociate the existence of evil from the existence of good, forgetting the epistemic contrasting knowledge, that it takes evil to know the good, and the good to know the evil. The problem of evil is the problem of good, because, if there is no evil, the known world cannot reasonably value the good. Whichever ways it is viewed, there are no satisfying answers to the problems of evil, since the known world is always consciously comfortable with the good. God is for both evil and good in exacting his existence in the known world. For Philips Phenix:

*The problem of evil is perhaps the greatest of all difficulties to religious faith. No satisfactory rational solution to the apparent contradiction between the reality of the loving creator and the actuality of evil (whether as sin or otherwise) has been offered, and it is regarded as the duty of the faithful to affirm the love and the power of God in spite of the mystery of evil, and to make good their faith by taking an active part in the conquest of evil.*

Why interrogate “What evil is” if it does not exist? If it exists, does it have any origin? Reflecting on the human faith on God’s involvement on human pain, poverty and suffering, Albert Nolan says:

*To believe in God is to believe that goodness is more powerful than evil and truth is stronger than falsehood. To believe in God is to believe that in the end, goodness and truth will triumph over evil and falsehood and that God will conquer Satan. Anyone*

*who thinks that evil will have the last word or that good and evil have a fifty-fifty chance is an atheist.*

Following Nolan's assertion, it means to believe in the reign of evil is to believe in God. Based on the relationship between God and man, better understanding of the reign of evil can be reasonably inferred from what humanities are to comprehend. According to Terry Cooper and Cindy Epperson; based on their reflection on the thought of J. B. Russell's power of the created nature, simply asserted that "the power of evil is not a principle independent of God but rather a creature of God. The evil in him proceeds not from his nature, which was created good, but rather from his free choice of hatred." This definitely comes from somewhere or created by some entity that is not by the known world, through the perceptions of the known world. According to Cooper and Epperson, "God permits man to choose evil and to remain evil because true moral freedom is necessary to the divine plan: God creates the cosmos for the purpose of increasing moral goodness, but moral goodness entails freedom to do evil." The presence of evil in the known world indispensably presupposes the presence of good. For both good and evil exist together. The knowledge of good made the knowledge of evil possible in the mind of the world, for when and where there is good, there is God.

#### **6. Existential Possibility of the Unknown in Epistemic Interaction of Faith and Reason**

With the projection of the mind, many things or events are constantly beyond the operation of science. With such limitation in science, the known world will constantly be with the metaphysical conviction that creation is with purposes. Creation is driving or moving towards its end, which is creation itself. Only with human transcendent reasoning can such knowledge be established. To Christological Theologians, most especially, it takes the God's knowledge and willingness for the universe to be ordered and remains orderly. It is only being displaced in some certain level by misplaced applications of human freedom and morality. According to Karl Rahner,

*Creation is intrinsically ordered to the supernatural life of grace as its deepest dynamism and final goal. This ordering is made concrete in man- the crown of creation- whom God created in such a way that he could be a receptacle of divine life in knowledge, love, and freedom; and at the same time that this divine self-communication remains a wondrous, un-exacted gift to man, and for which he continuously thirsts as his fulfilment.*

More reasonably, John Paul II holding on the interaction of faith and reason for the existential understanding of the cognitive power of the human person, posits that; "within visible creation, man is the only creature who not only is capable of knowing but who knows that he knows, and is therefore interested in the real truth of what he perceives." The coordinated cognitive ability of the human persons makes the knowledge they possess and acquire intelligible and rational away from other created beings. It makes them ask questions and to proffer answers to questions, and that makes them human. According to John Paul II, "people cannot be genuinely indifferent to the question of whether what they know is true or not. If they discover that it is false, they reject it; but if they can establish its truth, they feel themselves rewarded." With the power of interrogation, the human persons have the capacity and capability to truthfulness and falseness of knowledge claimed in order to establish the collegiality of ideas.

With such ordering of creation and by creation, the known world cannot be fully known by one singular compass of enquiry, justification and verification of knowledge, which is science. Such ordering of affairs indicates that there are many things beyond science, which only reasoning enlightened by faith can assess and sustain as knowledge. Within the interaction of faith and reason in the pursuit of truth, phenomena beyond methodological verification through the employment of sense perception, will be known by what are known in the known world, including God, Angels, Spirits and Demons.

#### **7. Conclusion**

From the foregoing, "to know", "to be known," or "to have knowledge," indicates that the possessor or processor of knowledge has the facts of its justification, having the ability and the epistemological grounding to convince others on such belief. The knowledge claims of the realities which commonly appear or are classified to be "unknown", seems not to have methodological justification for someone to convince the others. The fact remains that when something is classified as an "unknown", the knowledge of such thing or reality has been consciously or unconsciously expressed through the mind, for the minds remain the theatres of justification and verification of knowledge due to the metaphysical nature of the humanities which cannot be removed from the same humanities. As Oredipe puts it thus:

*This is the direct challenge to the exaggerated view of human freedom and the present-day culture's distorting of the proper dialectic that must exist between what is objectively true and what is truly false. We need to surrender to the truth of real things before proper human fulfilment can be attained. This objective truth is the truth of the being of things that is in them independently of my thinking about them. It is a higher type of truth that logical or epistemological truth. Living according to that makes one free. Error in the mind and evil in the will are a type of bondage or slavery that divert man from his true end, the reason of his existence. This truth and the good are inseparably connected.*

In all, sometimes, there is a common rational belief about having knowledge of metaphysical facts, from the interdependency of the human minds. For God and other metaphysical realities only exist in the human minds. The possibilities to be convinced metaphysically, rationally, or idealistically, are always factual due to the possession of minds. The human body does not physically or possibly possessed knowledge, but reasonably integrates other bodies in order to substantiate the contents of the mind. There are interdependences of the minds just like the interdependences of the bodies. Such interdependences of the bodies or minds are situated on the working of creations which defines the indispensable interdependence of human knowledge based on the contents of the experiential worlds. It is owned to the nature of human person- the composition of body and mind. The knowledge of the contents of the minds is beyond physical verification, but they can be inferred, documented and sustained rationally.

## References

- Jim Unah (2006). *Even nothing is something*. Inaugural Lecture Series, University of Lagos (Delivered on the 19<sup>th</sup> April 2006 and Published by University of Lagos Press)
- Jim I. Unah, *On being*: *Discourse on the Ontology of Man*. Lagos: Fadec Publishers, 2002, cf. Pp. 83-85.
- Onwuchekwa Okorie, Instituting the Culture of Transcendence in Contemporary Global Education: Issue, values and challenges. *Falsafa: Journal of Philosophy*, Vol. 3, No. 1, 2020, pp. 95-115. Cf, p. 100.
- N. K. Smith (tans) (1968). *Immanuel Kant's Critique of Pure Reason*. New York: St. Martin's Press, p. 137.
- F. N. Ndubuisi and C. B. Okoro (2005), *Reflections on Epistemology and Scientific Orientations in African Philosophy*. Lagos: Foresight Press, p. 36.
- Z. B. Ogundare (2006). The Indeterminacy of Determinism in Western and African Traditional Thought. *12<sup>th</sup> Conf. of Int'l Society for African Philosophy and Studies*, University of Leicester, UK, April 20-24<sup>th</sup>.
- Sidney Hook (1997). Modern Knowledge and the Concept of God. In P. Angeles (ed). *Critiques of God: Making case against the existence of God*. (pp. 21-42). UK: Prometheus, p. 30.
- P. O. Isanbor and P. O. Folorunso (2019). Epistemology of God and Metaphysics of Minds in Berkeley's Immaterialism. *Philectics: Benin Journal of Philosophy*, 2(2), 2019, pp. 22-33, Cf, p. 25.
- Z. B. Ogundare (2006). The Indeterminacy of Determinism in Western and African Traditional Thought. *12<sup>th</sup> Conf. of Int'l Society for African Philosophy and Studies*, University of Leicester, UK, April 20-24<sup>th</sup>.
- G. O. Ozumba (2001). *A Concise Introduction to Epistemology*. Calabar: Ebenezer, p.16.
- Peter Van Inwagen (2009), *Metaphysics*. 3<sup>rd</sup> edition. USA, Boulder: Westview Press, p. 4.
- Amaechi Udefi (2014). Distrusting the "Archemedeian View" of Philosophy: A plea for tolerance in the 'voices and conversations of mankind.' *West African Journal of Philosophical Studies*, Vol. 16, p. 14.
- Micheal Scriven (1997). God and Reason. In Peter Angeles (ed). *Critiques of God: Making case against the existence of God*. (pp. 95-114). United Kingdom: Prometheus, 1997. Cf, p. 100.
- G. O. Ozumba (2001), *A Concise Introduction to Epistemology*. Calabar: Ebenezer, p.16.
- R. A. O'Donnell (1995), *Hooked on Philosophy: Thomas Aquinas made easy*. NY: St Pauls, p. 3.
- S. Critchley (2001) "The gap between knowledge and wisdom." In S. Critchley, *Continental Philosophy: A Very Short Introduction*. NY: Oxford University, p. 1. <<http://www.oup.co.uk/pdf-0-19-285358-7-pdf>>
- Allan Savage (2006), *Ecological Philosophy and Christian Theology: A "New to You" View*. Canada: Trafford, pp. 29-30.
- Terry D. Cooper and Cindy K. Epperson (2008), *Evil: Satan, Sin & Psychology*. Mumbai: St Paul., p. 35.
- P. O. Isanbor and A. I. Bature (2019), The Epistemic Meta-Religiosity of God's existence in



- inseparability of faith and reason. *Benin Journal of Religions and Society*, 3(2), pp. 28-40.
- Gregory E. Ogbenika and Philip O. Isanbor (2017), On Interdependency of Minds in African Epistemology. *Ewanlen: The Journal of Philosophical Inquiry*, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 70-80, see, p. 72.
- David Mary Odunsi (2010). Authority as the most Veritable Source of Knowledge: An Essay in Transcendental-Existentialism. *Enwisdomization Journal*, 4(3), 2010, pp. 27-46.
- Anthony Quinton (1973), *The nature of things*. London: The Macmillan Press Ltd, 1973, p. 119.
- N. Ukwamadu (2005) God and the Question of His Existence: The hermeholiontic panacea of Pantaleon Iroegbu. In G. Ukagba (ed). *Father Kpim: Philosophy and Theology of Pantaleon Iroegbu*. Ibadan: Hope, p. 194.
- H. Lorenz (2008), Plato on the Soul. In *The Oxford Handbook of Plato*, G. Fine (ed.). Oxford: Oxford University
- C. K. Ngamen (2017). On Plato's Political Philosophy. In Matthew A. Izibili, et al. (eds). *Studies in Philosophy and Society*. Kagoma: Albertine Institute, 2018, pp. 246-263; D. Ilodigwe, Plato's Concept of Metaphysics, *Ekpoma Review*, Vol. 3, 152-167.
- Emmanuel Ogundele (2018), Divine illumination as "Conditio sine qua non" for true knowledge in the philosophy of St Augustine. *Ekpoma Review*, 4, pp. 1-15
- John Niyiring (2005) Augustine's Search for God as Trinity. *Igwebuike: An African Journal of Arts and Humanities*, 1(3), pp. 60-72;
- A. I. Kanu (2014). Augustine as the thought-current of the Church's doctrinal tradition: reflections on Pope John Paul II's Augustinum Hipponensem. *Igwebuike: An African Journal of Arts and Humanities*, 1(3), pp. 73-82,
- P. Oredipe (2014). Augustinian privation theory of evil: Matters arising, *Ekpoma Review*, 2, pp. 1-34.
- Benedict XVI (2007). *Spe salvi*. Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, No 23.
- Pantaleon Iroegbu (2002), *The Kpim of Theodicy: Proving the existence of God via hermeholiontica*. Ibadan: Hope, p. 112.
- M. S. Sasa (2011), The Dialogue between Philosophy and Theology on the Problem of Evil. *West African Journal of Ecclesial Studies*, 9(1), pp. 13-20.
- G. O. Adeboye (2018) Corruption as a Moral Evil: A Philosophical Analysis. In B. O. Igboin (ed). *Corruption: A New Thinking in the Reverse Order*. Oyo: Ajayi Crowther University Press, p. 105
- Benedict XVI, *Spe salvi*, no 12.
- Nick Trakakis (2014) The Evidential Problem of Evil. *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, UK, 2014.
- Phillip Phenix (1964), *Realms of Meaning*. London: McGraw-Hill Books, p. 251.
- Albert Nolan (2007), *Jesus before Christianity*. Mumbai: St Paul Press, p. 129.
- T. D. Cooper and C. K. Epperson (2010), *Evil: Satan, Sin and Psychology*. Mumbai: St Pauls, p. 27.
- Karl Rahner (1972), *Theological Investigation*, Vol. 13. New York: The Seabury, 1972, p. 306.
- John Paul II (1998), *Fides et ratio*. Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, No. 25.
- G. E. Ogbenika and P. O. Isanbor (2017), On Interdependency of Minds in African Epistemology. *Ewanlen: The Journal of Philosophical Inquiry*, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 70-80. Cf. p. 78.
- Paul Oredipe (2002), *The Interrelation of Faith and Reason in the Search for Truth: An Appraisal of John Paul II's fides et ratio*. Doctorate Thesis in Philosophy, Rome: Pontifical University of Holy Cross, p. 115.