

What is properly meant by “reality,” or “the real”?

By “reality,” or “the real,” is properly meant, not simply “whatever happens to exist, *taken in its contingent aspects alone*,” but rather “that to which true affirmations refer,” or “the object of correct affirmations (that which measures their truth)” (*Wisdom as Moderation*: 65 f.). On this meaning, not only the contingent, or “that which *contingent* true assertions affirm,” is real, but also the necessary, or what *necessary* true assertions affirm. (Hartshorne is right: the best word for what contingent true assertions affirm is not simply “reality,” or “the real,” but “fact,” in the sense of “something in nature that, having been made or produced [*facere, factum*], might conceivably not have been as it is.”)

By “the necessary” here is properly meant “the common element of all possibility,” and so “reality as such,” which “is neither a fact, nor something merely ‘behind,’ or additional, to all facts[,] but rather something *in* them all” (63, 65 f.).

March 1998; rev. 18 August 2003