

Being and B_ecoming: Symbol and Analogy, 4/13/76

Charles Hartshorne, Journal of Philosophy 55/2 (1958) 946:

"... There is, of course, a tradition that becoming is a secondary mode of reality, inferior to and less real than being. Our view affirms the contrary, that becoming is reality itself, and being only an aspect of this reality."

Being as aspect: being as minimum in connotation and maximum in denotation (decadent Scholasticism; mind as black box whence emerge terms, propositions, inferences of logician; Hegel's being so poor that nothing merely is, and so being flops over into nothing)

Being as comprehensive: the notion constituted by our a priori drive ~~ix~~ to inquire and its exclusion of all obscurantism
Of itself it intends everything about everything

- " it tends towards knowing everything about everything
- " it actually knows nothing generic or specific about anything

Through questioning and answering it comes to know something about some things.

Contrast: the idea of being, the content of an unrestricted act of understanding; the concept of being, the intrinsic relation of every concept to affirmation or negation, and thereby to referring to what is or what is not; knowledge of being, affirmative answers to questions of fact, possibility, probability.

Being as analogous: knowledge of being arises when there occurs a true judgement, X is; but such true judgements rest on the fulfillment of appropriate conditions; and the appropriate conditions vary:

logical: terms are genere, differences, species, properties, accident
propositions are affirmative negative, categorical modal
inferences are valid ilnvalid

mathematical: relations of identity or reequivalence between
individuals or sets

hypothetical: constructs that may perhaps be verified

actual: when constructs are verified

transcendent: what in itself has no conditions whatever, but
as known by us is a conclusion conditioned by the
truth of its premisses.

Symbol and Analogy, 4/13/76

#2. If God is conceived ~~x~~ on the analogy of ultimate explanation, it will follow that God is unchanging

But the process theologian might conceive the universe on the analogy of ultimate explanation, and then the complete explanation of the universe would be unchanging, while God and the rest of the universe would change in accord with the invariant correlation.

#3. If God is conceived on the analogy of perfect understanding, then God is unchanging

Perfect understanding of all the possibles that might be realized in the existing process of emergent evolution, C.

Perfect understanding of the very possibles that in fact have been and will be realized in the process of e. e., sub-D prior to the event; both Ar and Aq agree that what is both future and contingent cannot be known with certainty

If knowledge of the future is certain, then here and now ^{there exists} objective evidence for the certainty; if evidence available, then future event must be a necessary consequence, and so not contingent.

If future event is contingent, then it can be other than the predicted event

#4. Some perfect understanding or complete explanation is condition for the possibility of systematic thought

The ideal of systematic thought is idealist: Fichte Schelling Hegel aimed at restoration of pure reason by offering complete system. Complete system does not leave room for contingent events, probability schedules, etc. Aliter contingency is just reality as imperfectly grasped; probability is just a cloak for ignorance.

What is true is that the exclusion of all obscurantism supposes the possibility of complete explanation; the possibility of complete explanation supposes the actuality of an unrestricted act of understanding that grounds all possible universes. Aliter: the possibility of complete intelligibility is the existence of unrestricted understanding as ground of the universe that exists and of all universes that could exist.