



## God: Matter or Antinature? A Critical Analysis of the Quiddity of God

BY

Socrates Ebo,

Head, Department of Philosophy, Federal University Otuoke

\*Corresponding author: [Socrates Ebo](#)

### Abstract

*The debate on the nature of God has dominated the human religious discourse since man gained the God consciousness. All religions are agreed on the existence of God or the gods. While those who uphold polytheism do not dwell too much on the nature of a god, more often than not imply a material god in their religious practices. For believers in monotheism, the quiddity of God, on the other hand, is a big deal. It is central to the belief in God itself. A material God definitely has deafening reverberations on the monotheistic pantheon. The expectations of humans from a material God would be different. Human response to such a God would definitely be different from that of a God that is other than the universe. The determination of this question has significantly decisive moral implications. It also reverberates on the meaning of human existence, and on religious expectations on the fate of man beyond death. This research disinterestedly analyses literature on the nature of God, and observed practices of man in the worship of the divine. It is the aim of this work to either take an informed position at the end of the study or throw more light on the nature the question itself.*

**Keywords:** God, Cosmos, Gods, Evolution, Existence, Reality.

### 1. Introduction

Contemporary human society has largely come to uphold the existence of the monotheistic God. In today's world polytheism holds very limited significance. The world is largely dominated by Islam and Christianity both of which uphold the existence of God who is considered to be an entity other than nature. The influences of these two religions across cultures are writ large across contemporary civilizations. These two religions, so to speak, rule the world. Their views on the nature of the divine entity are unwavering and dominant in the cultures where any of them holds sway. Of course, a God who is an antinature presents a totally different existential deal to humanity from the God who is part and parcel of the universe. A God that is part of the cosmos cannot possibly rise above the cosmos. The cosmos as an entity is regulated by the laws of nature. In fact, it is an entity that exhibits inherent laws which inexorably order its very workings. Such a God that is same as the cosmos cannot possibly offer heaven neither is it capable of retribution beyond death. Such a God would by nature be incapable of

morality. It would appear to be incapable of choice since it is fated to, like the rest of the cosmos be ordered by the inherent, inexorable laws of the universe. Personal identity beyond death would have no meaning in a cosmos whose God is part of the cosmos. Death would definitely spell the end of man as an entity as everything about him would be absorbed back into the impersonal cosmos as impersonal bits of matter [1, 2].

In a material cosmos governed by a God who is also part of the cosmos, everything would be material. There would definitely be no possibility of spirituality; at least, so it would definitely seem by the contemporary definition of matter [3]. The concept of the soul would lose its meaning, at least as it is held in contemporary religious thought. Should that be the case, religion as is currently practiced would undergo radical changes if not near-extinction. The stake on the quiddity of God is indeed that significant. It is at the heart of the controversy between the religious school of thought and the irreligious school of thought in approaches to divine phenomena. A cosmos whose God is part of the material cosmos would have little or no appeal for religion. Such a cosmos would lack religious fervour since all phenomena in

such a cosmos would be regarded as part of the natural processes of existence. Nothing would be worthy of worship. Man would scarcely conceive of a value higher than himself. If the cosmos is God, man too is God or at least a part of God [4].

Upholding a God of a nature other than the cosmos is in no wise an easy intellectual enterprise. The logical hiccups are many. If God is an antinature, how could it possibly interact with the cosmos? Who contains who? Would the cosmos be inside God or would God be contained in the cosmos? If none of both scenarios is the case, where is the buffer zone between God and the cosmos? What is that entity holding both the cosmos and God such that none of them would be able to contain the other? Is there a possibility of an outside to the cosmos? Is the cosmos bounded; if it is, what is beyond the boundary? These are no easy questions by any means. Yet, they cannot be avoided if the quiddity of God is to be comprehended. God cannot be the universe and antinature at the same time. It cannot be material and immaterial at the same time. To think otherwise is to make nonsense of the fundamental laws of reasoning. Perhaps all these problems are basically linguistic. Maybe, the way we conceive things, the words we use are the problem. The cosmos is. It is what it is. We are the ones trying to comprehend it. The cosmos does not depend on our comprehension to validate its being. Whether we comprehend it or not, it remains what it is, our misconceptions notwithstanding. The God question is an outcrop of the cosmic question. If there was no cosmos, there would be no us. If there were no us, there would be no God discourse. Of course, it is logically possible for God to exist and be what it is without us or without the cosmos. That would be irrelevant as we would never know; and it would never matter to us.

## 2. What is God?

Although this question is at the heart of this research, at this stage it is necessary to attempt a definition of what God is, etymologically or as fundamentally portrayed in popular thought. God in capitalized form is the deity which is considered to be the supreme being. It is popularly conceived to be extra-cosmic, though not in clear terms. God is generally believed to be the author of the cosmos, the focus of existence and the end of history. God is given attributes of perfection. It is considered to be all-powerful. It is considered to be all-merciful. It is considered to be all-knowing. God is always attributed moral perfection. It is considered to be just, good and sinless. Above all, God is considered to be eternal. These attributes of God are echoed by the school of thought that upholds a universal monotheistic deity. Prominent in this school of thought are Judaism, Christianity, Islam and philosophers who posit an intellectual God. This group of people may not have conceived God in exact same ways but it is generally believed that all the four groups refer to the same deity. No doubt, most of the religions mentioned above did

have to borrow from the philosophic rendition of God to augment their traditional concepts of God from time to time. But all three religions mentioned above fundamentally disagree with the culture of the philosophic God. The culture that breeds the philosophic God is an irreligious culture, an attitude of mind that is fundamentally injurious to the religious spirit. The God of philosophy is no product of revelation. It is an outcome of critical reasoning, an attitude that is frowned upon in religious circles. The religious cognitive milieu promotes faith, which basically is a deliberate suspension of reason. That is unphilosophic. What is unphilosophic in this regard incidentally is regarded as virtuous in religious circles. Faith is unreason.

In specific terms, God is the object of worship of the Christian faith. While the Christians say that it is eternal and uncreated, they still uphold Jesus Christ as the “only begotten son of God” [5]. Some Christian sects consider Jesus to be God but at the same time forbid that he thought of as a separate God different from the God Christians inherited from Judaism. They got around this problem with the doctrine of trinity. God is a trinity of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. To shield the doctrine from logical scrutiny, it was declared to be a mystery beyond human understanding. Logically speaking, this is a worship of three versions of God under the concept of a trinitarian God. Some Christians, it must be stated do not recognize Jesus as God but as a sort of demi-God.

The Judaic God was never traditionally called God. It was Yahweh. The name literally means “I am”. The Hebrews also referred to this God with some aliases including Elohim which means “Lord” [6]. Tagging the Hebrew God as the Christian God is clearly an approximate application of the principle of equivalence. What the Christians call God and what the Hebrews call God, definitely do not tally in specific terms. The Jews themselves do not believe that they worship the same entity as Christians. The average Judaic worshiper would rather address God as Yahweh or Elohim than use the term “God” even if he was praying in English language. The Moslems have a similar attitude. The average Muslim would rather address God as Allah. This is a clear indication that all Gods do not mean exactly the same thing. The preference of the Jew or the Muslim is to be clear that they are referring to a specific deity; a specific God. The specific differences of the major religions in the conception of God notwithstanding, there is a global intellectual consensus that all of them are attempting to refer to the same entity.

## 3. The gods

The gods are not the subject of this research. This research is centered on the capitalized God. The gods are generally regarded as material forces but with supernatural or preternatural powers. They are rarely conceived as antinature. More often than not, they are thought to be part of the cosmic processes. It is not surprising that the planets, the days and months were named after the gods. Even when the gods offer

eternal life after death, they seem to offer it in a special part of the cosmos, not outside the cosmos. The gods are always physical. Their symbols are always in the temple. Most at times, they are thought to be one with the symbols which incarnate them. Humanity does not think much of the quiddity of the gods most of the time. After all, the gods are manmade. They are the works of man, not the other way round.

Some religions worship the gods as lesser gods but still recognize a supreme being which they do not represent with any symbol [7]. Some religions teach enlightenment and fulfilment without being focused on any God. It is generally believed that the conception of God is an evolutionary improvement on the idea of the gods. The gods are not subject to elevated cosmic questions since their era is generally believed to have phased out or is phasing out. They are never attributed the kind of excellence that God connotes. The gods are generally seen as cosmic forces performing specific cosmic functions. They are never given omnibus responsibilities neither are they given omnibus powers like God. Man does not approach them with the kind of dread he approaches God. So, it does not matter to man whether a god is a part of the universe or an antinature because man sees the gods as tools with which to navigate nature. Man, rarely saw any god as the purpose of his lifetime endeavor.

#### 4. The Conception of God as the Antinature/Antiuniverse

What would be the existential consequence of the perception of God as an entity other than nature – the antinature? Assuming that God is a substance other than nature; a sort of antinature or in plain words, a spirit which created the universe, the meaning of existence would definitely be constructed in congruity to this fact. That is exactly the hypothesis of the creationist school of thought. It is a foundational belief of the three most outstanding capitalized God-claiming religions. Judaism, Christianity and Islam, all acknowledge God to be a spirit: a substance other than nature. It is said to have created the cosmos out of nothing. Although the sequences of the mythologies of these religions do not tally neither do the mythologies care about logical accuracy, their central thesis is that it is revealed that God existed before the emergence of the cosmos. He is of a nature other than the cosmos. This is the foundational creed of these religions from which their conception of the cosmos is derived.

The hypothesis of God as the antinature who created nature, incidentally poses serious epistemological challenges that cannot be glossed over. The first question is about a necessary middle nature that would have enabled the two substances: nature and antinature to be differentiated. If God created the world, he definitely did not create it within himself. If he did, he and the world would be same. That would imply a same nature God-cosmos. The cosmos would exist in him and would definitely be part of him. In that case, the cosmos would be God. If the cosmos is different from God, where is

the necessary middle nature that is neither God nor cosmos that would have made the differentiation possible? Logically and existentially, it is not possible for two things to be differentiated without a containing medium. If God exclusively preexisted without any medium, it would be practically impossible for any, space, any entity, any substance to emanate from him [8]. There would be practically no room for any other being other than him. How then would he produce a nature other than himself?

The theological answer is zero. God made the world from zero: not from himself; not from something else. Zero. God created the world out of nothing [9]. This principle of zero defies logic and science as we know them today. For Parmenides, nothing can possibly come from nothing. In physics, energy cannot be created nor destroyed. All are conversions of matter [10]. The divine creating principle defies these laws of knowing and being. But does not appear to be the same as creation. So, according to this school of thought, God who is an antinature, made the world from zero. If God made the world from zero, the world is in principle, possibly reducible to zero.

A spiritual God would not necessarily conform to the laws of reason or the laws of physics. If God were the antinature, it would be illogical to require it to conform to the laws of nature. It must not necessarily be understood by man. If God is the antinature, it would not be subject to the operations of the universe. It would have its own nature and its own self-contained laws governing its nature. In this logic, it is imaginarily possible for God and the cosmos to have parallel existence, each operating in its own realm of being. That is the summary of the God-worshipping religions' account of the God-nature relationship. An antinatural God is a free God, free from the limitations of nature and free from our understanding of nature. It is distinct in ways different from our nature. Such God is befitting of the title, "God". It is beyond nature. Since it is considered to be the source of nature, it could as well be considered to be the maker of nature, it could be considered to be the unriddle(r) of nature.

The idea of an antinatural phenomenon or an antiuniverse is not entirely theological. There are roughly similar scientific theories and hypotheses. Cosmologists in their models of the cosmos had posited the existence of antimatter, antiverse, multiverse, dark matter, dark energy etc. These phenomena scientifically suggest the existence of nature other than matter or nature as we know it. Cosmologists posit that there is a mirror universe, an antiuniverse that creates balance for our universe. It is believed to be moving in inverted direction from our universe. Scientists believe that matter as we know it constitutes about 5% of the universe while dark matter constitutes about 27% of the universe. Dark energy on the other hand is said to constitute a gargantuan 68% of the universe [11, 12]. Dark matter and dark energy are sorts of antinature. They are not matter as we know it, they are of a

different nature imperceptible to us. We cannot see them due to the kind of matter we are but their existence is inferred from the gravitational effects they have on the universe.

If science recognizes the antinatural (nature other than the material nature), can the possibility of a being other than nature, a God be reasonably dismissed? Since it is scientifically believed that these phenomena existed before the formation of the universe in the big bang, it is evident that the possibility of a nature before the current nature is not entirely theological. It is indeed a scientific fact that something preexisted the big bang. These are points of convergence between science and religion. Could these phenomena be the effects of God on the cosmos? Could they be tantamount to scientific discoveries of what is religiously known as the spiritual? It is huge that science recognizes the existence of a nature other than nature as we know it. It is also huge that science recognizes the possible existence of a universe of some nature other than nature as we know it. These scientific admissions make it impossible to dismiss the possibility of a God who is the author of the universe. If there is a mirror cosmos that is of a different nature, that is the cause of the universe, that might be the God.

Science officially recognizes the dark region of reality; the unclear reality where the laws of physics as we know them do not apply. Science recognizes a region between the natural and the unnatural. Even the scripture talks about dark matter in its creation account. It recognizes that after God made heaven and earth, the earth was formless and void. There was darkness all over the place. The “dark matter” simply existed, and had no form, was void and darkness was all over the place [13]. The accuracy of this passage of the bible in relation to contemporary cosmology is strikingly surprising considering the relatively very low level of science and technology at the time the scriptures were written. The passage recognizes the existence of earth and non-earth in the beginning. It is clear that “earth” in that passage implied the universe. The realm other than earth was called heaven. The comparative accuracy of this creation mythology to modern cosmology is breathtaking.

But the passage does not identify God with heaven. While it is clear that the passage considers heaven and earth to be of different natures, it clearly considers God to be of a nature other than and higher than both heaven and earth. Rather than see God as the antiverse, the passage implies two antinature(s) and a universe. There is the earth which implies the universe, there is heaven which is an antinature to the earth, and there is God which is an antinature to both heaven and earth. Of course, that God is antinature to heaven does not dismiss it from being antinature to earth. The passage is still congruous with the possibility that God might be antinature to the universe. In other words, God is not part of the universe but is apart from it even though it acts on the universe.

## 5. The Conception of God as the Cosmos or Part of the Cosmos

Many thinkers have conceived God to be a principle in the Cosmos, while some have viewed the entire cosmos to be God. Either way God is perceived, it would mean that God has no existence beyond the cosmos. Depending on whether the cosmos is conceived to be solely material or a duality of mind and matter, God would either be a principle of the cosmos or the cosmos itself. It might not necessarily be personalized since it is just a principle or nature itself. Such a God is neither necessarily worshipped nor bequeathed with intentionality. It is not bequeathed absolute powers in any guise. Such a God is never cast in anthropomorphic mold. Such a God was regarded as god until it was inducted into the pantheon of the capitalized God in the 6<sup>th</sup> century by Christian thinkers.

Many philosophers subscribed to the idea of an impersonal God that is a principle of the cosmos. Socrates stood tall among them. Socrates did not devote any portion of his philosophical teachings to the concept of God. Rather, he referred to the Greek gods of his day in passing. He did not believe them to be real or intrinsically worthy of worship since they were mere images, and of capricious behavior. In his cosmology he did not have any role for any god or God. The cosmos was thoroughly natural and eternal. Just as the cosmos is eternal, the human being has a soul which is immortal. While this soul will survive death, it is not subject to any god or God. Simply put, God is the principle of good in the cosmos. He held God to be the Good. He did not see it as a person neither did he bequeath any powers to it. Socrates did not consider God worthy of worship. It was just a principle in the universe. There was neither an afterlife reward nor punishment for worshipping or not worshipping God. Knowledge alone was all it needed to do good, for “to know the good is to do good” [14]. Doing good is its own reward. God was neither pivotal to the life of man nor to the cosmos. Socrates considered knowledge to be the supreme good. The world according to Socrates, was made by the demiurge, using formless matter and the ideas. The demiurge was not God in Socrates’ estimation. For him, God was just there as an almost ineffectual principle in the universe. It has no personhood, no omniscience, no omnipotence, no capacity for reward or punishment, no capacity to affect the world. Such was the cosmic God according to Socrates. It was not a subject of worship neither had it any influence over the cosmos.

Like Socrates his mentor, Aristotle was another philosopher who considered God to be an impersonal cosmic principle. He saw God as part of the natural processes. God was the first cause, the unmoved mover [15]. That was it – just a principle. Aristotle did not consider the entire universe to be God. He was not religious. Therefore, did not deify the cosmos. Although he saw God as the final cause and purpose of the universe, Aristotle did not consider God to be worthy of worship. In his scheme of thought. God was the perfect



substance. The world is material according to Aristotle; thoroughly material. God was not capable of acting independently of the material world. It had zero influence over morality. It is just a natural principle. Most ancient philosophers echoed the dispositions of Socrates and Aristotle towards the idea of God.

Modern philosophers among them: Spinoza, Carl Jung, Einstein and Nietzsche on the other hand would see the entire nature as God. Everything that exists, exists in God. God itself exists in itself. God made itself and has always been in itself. There is no being before or beyond God. Nature and God are one. God is immanent in everything; everything is derived from God [16]. This school of thought did not find any point in the worship of a personalized or an anthropomorphic God. God is nature. Even the human being himself is derived from God; therefore, is part of God. In this light, man, worshipping God would be tantamount to man worshipping himself or God worshipping itself since the human person as well as everything else in the world are part and parcel of God. This equation of nature to God is known as pantheism. It is the kind of God most God-believing scientists uphold. It is not subject to any religious ritual or ownership by any institutionalized religion. It is an intellectual God that is upheld by many scholars as a necessary consequence of deepened ratiocinations on the existence of the cosmos. This is significant since science has not been able to prove or disprove the existence of God. Most pantheists have strong scientific or empirical background. Their cosmology is always fundamentally materialistic. Their pantheism is a logical consequence of their epistemological disposition. They are core empiricists.

The empirical paradigm does not veer into the spiritual realm. It does not reckon with that which cannot be apprehended by the senses. Empirically, only the cosmos and its contents could be known as the existent reality. This epistemological disposition does not give room for the existence of extra-cosmic realities [17]. Therefore, if there must be God, it must be the cosmos, otherwise, it cannot exist. To admit the existence of God with a nature other than the cosmos is to relinquish the empirical epistemological standpoint. The belief that God is the same as the cosmos is a linguistic concession. It is a different way of declaring that only the cosmos exists. A God who is same as the cosmos is inconsequential to the cosmos as far as its operations are concerned. Such a God could as well not exist. To admit it exists seems like saying, "Oh the cosmos which we know exists, which we are part of can be called another name; that name is 'God'". The pantheistic God is incapable of either freedom or freewill. It is a slave of the laws of nature. It is not worthy of worship or veneration. For all practical purposes, such a God might as well not exist.

## 6. The Third Way Possibility

Perhaps the relationship between God and the cosmos should not be viewed from the prism of either or. Maybe, there could be a middle ground. From the foregoing, it appears that there are two mutually exclusive ways of defining God and its relationship with the cosmos. one must necessarily choose either of these ways and remain in opposition to the other. Supposing there is a third way of looking at the nature of God. Is there not a possibility that our traditional diametrically opposed ways of viewing God either as the universe or the antiuniverse, might after all, be faulty? It should be borne in mind that it is not our definition of God that makes it what it is. If God is; it exists irrespective of whether we perceive its existence correctly or incorrectly. The existence or otherwise of God, does not necessarily have to depend on our conceptions thereof. Our conceptions of God also have to do with our nature - our epistemological limitations and language.

We traditionally conceive existence in terms of mind and matter; the material and the spiritual. Since Aristotle, mind and matter; or the spiritual and the material have been considered as mutually exclusive, opposite entities. This mode of thinking was a fiat by Aristotle. It was not based on evidence but on choice of evidence. Aristotle couldn't have gathered enough knowledge of the cosmos to declare what ought to constitute its nature and what ought not, considering the skeletal levels of science and technology in his day. He rather chose what made most sense to him in the face of myths, hypotheses and philosophies regarding the origin and the nature of the world of his day. Aristotle simply yanked off what could not be seen or observed in his conception of the cosmos and the consequent opinion on God. Although Aristotle had the god consciousness as evident in his writings, he did not consider God or any god worthy of philosophizing on. Aristotle was searching for certainty. He simply restricted himself mostly to the observable world. Aristotle declared the world to be material, and also declared mind to be material. He banished the realm of the spiritual and defined the cosmos to be an entirely material process. He did not dwell much on the possibilities of the origin of the cosmos. This enabled him to solve the problem of dualism created by Plato in his conception of the cosmos. Aristotle did not see a place for God in his philosophy since he considered the world to be eternal, thoroughly material and governed by the laws of nature. The adoption of this ultra-materialistic view of the world led to the establishment of the scientific method of enquiry which has been extremely successful in understanding nature in bits but has been found severely limited in interpreting nature as a whole.

Plato before Aristotle had centrally placed the spiritual in his conception of the world. There was a preexistent plane where everything previously existed until they appeared in the world. Everything's authenticity could be found in the preexistent realm. The preexistent realm creates the room for a God who is the antiuniverse. His was a universe that was an admixture of the material and the spiritual [18]. The difficulties inherent

in the conceptions of these entities as opposites notwithstanding, Plato still managed to nebulously fuse these entities in his conception of reality. Those difficulties persist today, the scientific and technological advancements of the contemporary world notwithstanding. They arise predominantly from the compartmentalized definitions of matter and the spiritual. We traditionally conceive matter to be somewhat dead, unconscious and incapable of will. In other words, we consider matter to be incapable of “spiritual” activities.

There could possibly be a third way. What if the world is neither material nor spiritual but matserial? What if reality is neither made of matter nor spirit but matser, a dynamic entity that exhibits the attributes we traditionally refer to as material as well as the attributes we traditionally refer to as spiritual [19]? If reality is matserial, the logical conflict on how a spiritual God could interact with a material world disappears. If the cosmos is matserial, then it is beyond what we traditionally designate as physical. In that case, it would have the attributes we traditionally designate as spiritual. In that case also, it could be traditionally designated as divine. Supposing God itself is matserial? Then all conflicts between the existence of God and the cosmos neutralize.

The cosmos-God dichotomy is a problem of the limitations of human nature and human language. This falls under the limitations to human knowledge as a result of human nature that Francis Bacon categorized as the idol of the tribe [20]. As humans, we ontologically view the rest of reality as other than ourselves. Our natural inclinations interfere with our perception of reality. Language also has its own limitations. Definitely, the terms: matter and spirit do not exhaustively explain reality as we experience it. Neither of the terms satisfactorily explains reality yet the terms are mutually exclusive. All that we need to do is to introduce new terms that would capture our improved understanding of reality. The world is definitely not material in the way we define matter today neither is it spiritual as we define spirit. What can be inferred is that the makers of language attempted to verbalize their experiences of reality using the terms: matter and spirit. Reality is already what it is. The words are attempts at codifying human experiences of reality into sound-bytes.

For God to create and interact with the world, it must have some commonalities with the world. If not, interaction would not be logically realistic. Even if we reduce the existence of the cosmos to the big bang, what caused the big bang; where did it take place? Definitely the nature of the cosmos is broader than “matter”. The most befitting categorization of the nature of God is matser. A fundamentally matserial God would be related to reality with less contradictions. It would also broaden the human mind in the quest for the explanation of the cosmos. In like manner, a fundamentally matserial cosmos would be related to God with less contradictions.

Humans habitually proceed from the known to the unknown. It is from the knowledge of the cosmos that we form our opinions about the nature of God. Our knowledge of the cosmos is linguistically flawed. The language of descriptions of God and the cosmos is a significant factor in the confusion and incompatibilities we encounter while defining God. We cannot even be certain that reality is divided into God and the cosmos. Reality could after all be one. Cohesive linguistics would do better than our separative choices of words regarding matter and spirit. The concept of “matser” is ad rem. It is a term that would make the spiritual and the material attributes of reality to cohere and inhere in one substance. This would go a long way into reducing the dichotomies in our language of God and the cosmos.

## 8. The Implications of Infinity and Eternity in the Conceptions of God and the Cosmos

Matter is said to be indestructible but can be converted from one state to another. It is equally said that energy can neither be created nor destroyed [21]. Energy is the dynamism in matter. Matter is said to exist in infinite quantity. Just as it cannot be destroyed, matter cannot be created. All these are laws of physics. They are operational scientific paradigms. If matter exists, and is truly uncreated, it means it has always existed; and if it has always existed, it is eternal. If the cosmos is eternal, it would certainly have no need for an antiuniverse to be either responsible for its existence or to alternate it. To exist uncreated implies that matter is a self-contained entity. This in turn would imply that it is infinite. If matter is self-contained, it is not bounded by any entity other than itself; it means that it is not in contact with any entity other than itself. If it is not bounded in any way, it is ipso facto, infinite [22]. If its existence is uncreated and unbounded, matter is definitely eternal.

What is the place of a God or an antiuniverse in the cosmos painted above? Zero. Of course, depending on how we conceive God. A God that is an antiuniverse would totally be unnecessary, irrelevant and nonexistent. An eternal and infinite cosmos definitely has no need for a God. It is uncreated by a God. It is not sustained by any God. It is self-sufficient. What would it need a God for? If infinity and eternity were truly attributes of the cosmos, then the universe would be Godless. The God of the triad: Judaism. Christianity and Islam would not be applicable to the universe in that case. The ability to create the world, the ability to be different from the universe, constitute essential attributes in the definition of the god of these religions which is generally capitalized as God. The worldviews of these religions position God as the source, sustainer, purpose and focus of the universe. Such a God is definitely incompatible with an uncreated, eternal, self-sustaining universe. Such God would have zero significance in the affairs of men and the fate of man. It simply would not exist. The logical religious consequence would be atheism or

theistic agnosticism. This is the God atheists generally oppose: an omnipotent, omniscient being with attributes that are not consistent with an uncreated universe [23].

A universe that is uncreated, self-sustained, self-contained, infinite and eternal, would be identical with God since such a cosmos cannot admit another being other than itself [24, 25, 26]. The pantheistic view of God would be correct. In that case, our language should be amended. God and the cosmos should not be spoken of as if they were separate entities. It is difficult, really difficult to cast such a God in anthropomorphic terms. It would rather seem comelier to see such a God as, a principle, dynamism or force in the scheme of the cosmos. The idea of the creation of the universe would rather be shoved aside since the universe is autonomous. Change would be the manifestations of the dynamism of the universe: not creation; not destruction. A cosmos that is infinite and eternal is indestructible.

## 9. Conclusion

As far as human experience is concerned, the cosmos existed before God. It is from the knowledge of the cosmos that the existence of God is inferred. In this quest to understand the quiddity of God, the limitations of the human mind come to play. Our senses are contingent. We can't rule out the element of probability in our understanding of the cosmos. There is always the probability of the existence of what we as humans, are not capable of knowing. Such possible knowledge might be key to the unriddling of the universe. The issue of the relationship between God and the cosmos is one that we might not necessarily get all the answers. Whichever way the quiddity of God is viewed the ramifications would be sweeping on the fate of the cosmos and the destiny of man.

God cannot be part of the of the universe and be an antiuniverse at the same time. Even if God is the universe, a universe that creates itself poses a significant challenge to the doctrine of cause and effect which is one of the bedrocks of the scientific method. It is not possible to take a logically conclusive decision on whether God is the cosmos or an anticocosmos, at least on the basis of knowledge available to humanity for now. Our scientific knowledge of the cosmos is too limited, too incomplete to admit either conclusion. God remains an open-ended question which might ultimately be resolved with time or never resolved at all. The cosmos remains an unresolved puzzle to science and religion. The entire endeavor of science is geared towards understanding the cosmos either in bits or as a whole. As humans debate the whatness of God, they are invariably debating the whatness of human nature. If God exists, humans must necessarily owe some obligations to him. If God however is an impersonal principle in the cosmos, it would lose personal significance to humans. It would be deemed to be one of the many forces of the universe; therefore, irrelevant to the meaning of human

existence. But then, God has no obligation to conform to our epistemological models. Afterall, God is God – a class of its own; a category of its own.

## References

1. Ebo, S. (2024). Random thoughts on philosophy and meaning. [https://ijrehc.com/uploads2024/ijrehc05\\_117.pdf](https://ijrehc.com/uploads2024/ijrehc05_117.pdf)
2. Ebo, S. (2019). Death in Igbo African ontology. *Skhid*, 3(161), 22–28. [https://doi.org/10.21847/1728-9343.2019.3\(161\).171815](https://doi.org/10.21847/1728-9343.2019.3(161).171815).
3. Reichenbach, B. (2004). Cosmological argument. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/cosmological-argument/>
4. Patterson, S. (2019). Understanding God as nature or the universe. <https://steve-patterson.com/understanding-god-as-nature-or-the-universe/>
5. The Nicene creed: The only begotten Son of God. (2023). *Clearly Reformed*. <https://clearlyreformed.org/sermon/the-nicene-creed-the-only-begotten-son-of-god/>
6. Davies, R.C & Hoskisson, P.Y. (2013). Usage of the title Elohim. *Religious Educator* · vol. 14 no. 1 [https://rsc.byu.edu/sites/default/files/pub\\_content/pdf/Usage\\_of\\_the\\_Title\\_%E2%80%8BElohim.pdf](https://rsc.byu.edu/sites/default/files/pub_content/pdf/Usage_of_the_Title_%E2%80%8BElohim.pdf)
7. Turaki. Y. (2000). “Africa Traditional Religious System as Basis of Understanding Christian Spiritual Warfare” in *Lausanne*. <https://lausanne.org/content/west-african-case-study>
8. Ebo, S. (2022). Random thoughts on the concept of mind in a material cosmos. <https://ejournals.org/gjahss/vol10-issue-5-2022/random-thoughts-on-the-concept-of-mind-in-a-material-cosmos/>.
9. John Paul II. (1989). In creation God calls the world into existence from nothingness. <https://inters.org/John-Paul-II-Catechesis-Creation-Nothingness>
10. CERN. (2025). Dark Matter. <https://home.cern/science/physics/dark-matter#:~:text=Dark%20matter%20seems%20to%20outweigh,the%20content%20of%20the%20universe>
11. Nkrumah, K. (1964). *Consciencism: Philosophy and Ideology for Decolonisation and Development*. [https://books.google.com.ng/books/about/Consciencism.html?id=1PfyAAAAMAAJ&redir\\_esc=y](https://books.google.com.ng/books/about/Consciencism.html?id=1PfyAAAAMAAJ&redir_esc=y)
12. Zohuri, B. (2018). First law of thermodynamics. *Physics of Cryogenics*. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/chemistry/first-law-of-thermodynamics>
13. Genesis 1:2
14. Kedrick, K. (2012). “To know the good is to do the good” – Socrates? [https://kenschenck.blogspot.com/2012/03/to-know-good-is-to-do-good-socrates.html#google\\_vignette](https://kenschenck.blogspot.com/2012/03/to-know-good-is-to-do-good-socrates.html#google_vignette)
15. Olson, R.M. (2013). Aristotle on God: Divine nous as unmoved mover. In: Diller, J., Kasher, A. (eds) *Models of God and Alternative Ultimate Realities*. Springer, Dordrecht. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-5219-1\\_9](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-5219-1_9)
16. Astore, R. (2017). Spinoza on God, affects, and the nature of sorrow. *Philosophical Review* XVII issue 1. <https://cah.ucf.edu/fpr/wp-content/uploads/sites/3/2019/11/Astore-1.pdf>
17. Ebo, S. (2019). A critique of ultra-material empiricism in the philosophy of Kwame Nkrumah. *Nnadiabube Journal of Philosophy (NJP) vol 3 No 1*. <https://www.nigerianjournalsonline.com/index.php/NJP/article/view/134>
18. Blakeley, S., Cummings, E. & Wilkerson, G. (2023). Plato’s theory of forms. <https://study.com/learn/lesson/plato-theory-forms-physical.html#:~:text=Plato's%20philosophy%20asserts%20that%20there,exists%20beyond%20the%20physical%20realm>.
19. Ebo, S. (2019). The “matser” made world: A new conceptualization of matter and spirit. *Skhid* (159)1. <https://skhid.kubg.edu.ua/article/view/157444>. [https://doi.org/10.21847/1728-9343.2019.1\(159\).157444](https://doi.org/10.21847/1728-9343.2019.1(159).157444)
20. Street, F. (2025). Francis Bacon and the four idols of the mind. <https://fs.blog/francis-bacon-four-idols-mind/>
21. Moskowitz, C. (2024). Fact or fiction?: Energy can neither be created nor destroyed. <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/energy-can-neither-be-created-nor-destroyed/>
22. Ebo, S. (2022). Infinite cosmos. *ASUU JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES A Journal of Research and Development Vol 6, No. 1*. pp 1-15. [https://ejournals.asuu.org.ng/editor/uploaded\\_articles/EBO,%20S.%201-The%20Infinite%20Cosmos.pdf2040.pdf](https://ejournals.asuu.org.ng/editor/uploaded_articles/EBO,%20S.%201-The%20Infinite%20Cosmos.pdf2040.pdf)
23. Megill, J. (2016). God, the meaning of life, and a new argument for atheism. <https://philarchive.org/archive/MEGGTM>
24. Ross, H. (n.d). Astronomical evidences for the God of the bible. <https://www.leaderu.com/orgs/reasons/astroevid.html#a>
25. Navarro, S.M. (2023). Existence is necessarily eternal and uncreated — why something instead of nothing. <https://sergio-montes-navarro.medium.com/existence-is-necessarily-eternal-and-uncreated-5fe57626a60b>
26. Ebo, S. (2022). A Cosmological Construction of an Infinite Cosmos. *IOSR Journal of Applied Physics (IOSR-JAP) e-ISSN: 2278-4861. Volume 14, Issue 1 Ser. II*. <https://www.iosrjournals.org/iosr-jap/papers/Vol14-issue1/Ser-2/E1401025964.pdf>