

If Hartshorne is right, as I believe he is, that "[o]nly religion and philosophy can give human life a human meaning" ("The Ethics of Contributionism": 106 f.), then, surely, it must be "*philosophy*," not merely "metaphysics," that becomes necessary as and when, with the development of science and critical reflection, "myth" is no longer able to perform its most essential function. The choice, in other words, is not, as Hartshorne says, between myth and metaphysics, but between myth and philosophy ("Hartshorne on Religion and Metaphysics": 1b).

5 February 1998

Actually, Hartshorne is wrong (and I am wrong in believing him right!) insofar as religion and philosophy do not *give* human life a human meaning, except in the sense that they *explicate*, or re-present, what really does give human life a human meaning—namely, things as they really are, in their structure in themselves as well as in their meaning for us.

3 May 2009