

# On Being

Xin Yan Z.

## Abstract

“Being” or “being and beings” might be the meta-notion when philosophy and science were still sharing the same mind or minds in ancient Greek and Europe. To find its meaning and to become a part of the meaning are however more and more vital nowadays, not for philosophy but for science, especially for physics and biology.

The author proposes in this essay that this concept may mean to us nothing more or less than the unity or unification of Parmenides’ idea “being is one” and Heraclitus’ idea “all things are in flux and nothing may remain the same”. That is just as to say that a being and an entity may never be identified with the same boundary. In other words, nothing or none should ever be understood as a being.

This understanding is conceptualized and linguisticalized by the author as the compound symbol “OC”. And the OC represents a synthetic and also analytical understanding of both our universe and us together. And its value and strength may be found more obvious in his concise discussion, in the last part of the essay, on the OC’s meanings to ontology, epistemology, axiology, logic, mathematics, physics, biology, cosmogony and more.

## **Main Text (English Version)**

### **1. Method and procedure**

Some time, the only way to get a better concept or theory is to find the unity or unification of certain contrary opinions or opposite faiths.

Some time, so is it even when dealing with ontology and even when dealing with those great metaphysical ideas from ancient Greek philosophers.

Now and here in this essay, it is exactly what and how I am going to do.

### **2. Question and purpose**

“To be, or not to be, that is the question.”

Or, as Aristotle asked in his work titled “Metaphysics”, what does it mean to be?

Or, as Heidegger asked in his “Introduction to Metaphysics”, why are there beings at all rather than nothing?

In other words, why is to be to be but not to be not? <sup>(1, 2)</sup>

However, it seems to me, what asked or meant by asking such questions is not only about a philosophical concept or system, not only about a word or a phrase or the grammar of certain language, not only about all the logos found or created by logicians and mathematicians, not only about all the facts known and proved by scientists, and even not only about the meaning and the value for us as human beings and for our universe as the universe. No, it is not only

about what we sense, know, understand, think, feel, believe, imagine, say or do. It is about all of them and more, and always more.

If the phrase “all of them and more” may be understood, here in the context of this essay, as ontologically what the word “being” or “beings” mean, then the phrase “all of them and more, and always more” might also be understood as what the word “Being” means.

And the purpose of this essay is then to find something as the answer to one of the following questions:

How is to be?

How is Being different from being?

How are beings different from things?

How is not to be?

However, sometimes, “to find the answer” means the same as to find or create a better concept and to replace with it some concept that is not better in the system in question.

And, in this sense, it may also say that the purpose of this essay is to find or create a better concept, with which the ontological concept “Being”, at least “being” and “beings”, may be replaced.

### **3. The contrary concepts**

Following the requirement of above mentioned method and also according to the questions and the purpose of this essay, below two concepts are chosen to represent two contrary opinions or opposite faiths from two ancient Greek philosophers:

- CHANGE (concept C),

which represents Heraclitus' idea that all things are in flux and nothing may remain the same. <sup>(3)</sup>

Definition of the concept C:  $A \neq A$ .

Note: The "C" may be taken here as a symbol of an open ring.

- ONE (concept O),

which represents Parmenides' idea about Being, a one that is self-consistent, never changes and may not be divided into parts. <sup>(3)</sup>

Definition of the concept O:  $A = A$ .

Note: The "O" may be taken here as a symbol of a closed ring.

#### **4. Their translation and interpretation**

However, only their definitions, only the " $A \neq A$ " itself and the " $A = A$ " itself, are not enough for us to understand the O and the C completely and thoroughly.

Though not so completely or thoroughly, both of them may be translated and interpreted as the followings:

Firstly, the O may be understood as the change back to a self and the C as the change away from a self.

Secondly, “back to a self” may also be understood as a return change and “away from a self” as a one-way change. A return change alternates its direction but a one-way change not.

For example, a circle may be understood as the combination of two return changes and a sphere as the combination of three return changes. And the development of our universe might then be understood as a one-way change from one dimension, through two and three dimensions, to more dimensions. The more dimensions, the bigger it becomes.

Furthermore, as one-way change, the C means the same as any of the following concepts if the O means the same as any of their counterparts:

“energy”, “time”, “necessity”, “asymmetry”, “irreversibility”, “determined”, “dying”,  
“will” or “nous”.

And, as return change, the O means the same as any of the following concepts if the C means the same as any of their counterparts:

“matter”, “space”, “contingency”, “symmetry”, “reversibility”, “free”, “living”,  
“intellect” or “logos”.

Though both lists may and should be much longer, concept O does not mean Aristotle’s “material cause” and “formal cause”, and concept C does not mean his “efficient cause” and “final cause”.

Finally, causation is also what the C means and reciprocal causation is then what the O means.

For example, all what Thales' "water", Anaximander's "indeterminate boundless", Anaximenes' "air" and Pythagoras' "number" tell us are reciprocal causation. What Heraclitus says, "fire lives the death of earth, and air the death of fire; water lives the death of air, earth that of water", is also reciprocal causation. So are Parmenides' "One", Leucippus and Democritus' "atoms", Spinoza's "God or Nature" and Leibniz's "monads". And so are Plato's "forms" and Aristotle's syllogism, Descartes' "I think, therefore I am" and Kant's "thing-in-itself", Hegel's "Absolute" and Nietzsche's "eternal recurrence", Russell's logical atomism, Wittgenstein's "language games", Husserl's "things themselves", Heidegger's "Dasein", Quine's "ontological commitment" and whole talks of the analytic philosophy.

Noether's theorem, "every differentiable symmetry of the action of a physical system has a corresponding conservation law", says also reciprocal causation, the reasons of concept O.

All the theories that deny the directivity in biological evolution say only the reasons of concept O.

Political and sociological concepts such as "freedom", "equality" and "fraternity" say the same reasons.

And all the Abrahamic religions do the same.

## 5. Their unity or unification

It is a fact that for more than 2000 years philosophers tried in vain to make either the O alone or the C alone to be the answer to the questions mentioned above.

And it is also a fact that unity or unification of the O and the C has been the better answer as yet. It is not only understandable but also provable for everyone in everything. For example,

we may not experience any C if without the O, we may not identify any O if without the C, and we cannot do anything if without a unification of the O and the C.

In other words, we are able to know, understand and do only because of their unification; all what we know, understand and do are nothing more or less than their unity; and it is impossible for us and our world to be anything else than their unity or unification.

And, fundamentally, we could never be observers or manipulators of being and beings, because we are part of them. The unity or unification of C and O is a part of us, so are we a part of their unity or unification, not only during the time of our existence, the same even before we came or after we go.

In the context of this essay, the word “unity” or “unification” may also be understood as what the word “identity” or “sameness” or “singleness” or “oneness” or “wholeness” or “interdependence” or “interchange” or “coherence” or “correlation” means. Both words are used here in the full meanings of all these words.

## 6. The results and the concept

As results of the method, the purpose, the two contrary concepts, their full translation and unification, we may get following proposition, concept and equations:

- Being is the unity or unification of what both concept O and C mean (Proposition One)

The phrase in proposition one, “the unity or unification of what both concept O and C mean”, may be abbreviated as the below concept:

- **OC**

Note: The “OC” should be taken together as one symbol.

And according to proposition one, we may also define the ontological concept “being” with the below equation:

- $\text{Being} = \text{OC}$  (equation 1)

And the equation 1 means the same as the below equation:

- $\text{Being} \neq \text{thing}$  (equation 2)

The word “thing” in equation 2 means the same as any entity that seems to have its own boundary and to exist independently, such as a human, an animal, a plant, a microscopic particle or a macroscopic astral body.

## 7. The difference between Being and OC

We may always find and prove that the equation 1 and 2 are true or that the ontological concept “Being” or “being and beings” mean the same to us as what concept OC does. However, I believe, what OC really mean has nothing to do with Being. OC is neither any affirmation nor any negation of what the “Being” means.

Such a belief does not mean that we may know something about the “Being”. It means only that we believe that we may always find and prove that both O and C are equally essential and fundamental to the being of our universe and us.



The equality of both O and C means that the C in OC, in other words, open or incompleteness in being or beings, is ontologically as well as scientifically essential and fundamental.

Though having not been treated equally, the C in OC means also a lot to science, especially to physics and biology. For example, it explains the incompleteness of the periodic table of elements and also predicts the incompleteness of the standard model of elementary particle physics, both of which have only been reasons of the O. And, without the C, neither natural selection nor molecular biology may ever explain biological evolution, because both of them are only reasons of the O.

#### 8. Ontological meanings of the OC

- Being is what beyond anything or anyone. Except the OC, nothing or none really exists.
- Being is what beyond any change or motion. Except the OC, no change or motion really exists.
- O and C are reference-frames relative to each other. Therefore OC is always independent of Newton's or Einstein's time and space.
- Though full of communications, there is no information or semantic information exchanged in OC. <sup>(4)</sup>
- No birth or death may ever be found from any OC. Anything or anyone that may be born and then die is only a name or text.

Gorgias (about 400 years BC) may be the first one who draws such a line between Being and entity, or between beings and things, with his three sequential arguments of that nothing

exists, that if anything exists it is incomprehensible, and that even if it is comprehensible it cannot be communicated. <sup>(3)</sup>

Protagoras believed that man is the measure of all things but I would trust that OC is the measure of all beings. George Berkeley declared that to be is to be perceived but I would say that no being may ever be perceived.

At least what “Being” or “being and beings” mean should not be understood as what that may be divided into “subject”, “predicate” and “object”, that has the ability to know itself, to think itself and to talk about itself, or that is self-evident to itself. Otherwise, what hidden behind this concept is not intellect but only a will, not philosophy but only a religion.

## 9. Epistemological meanings of the OC

- OC means that there is no subject-object or self-other or mind-body or human-thing distinction.
- OC means that knowing or doing never takes place between a human and a thing, but always between will and intellect. For example, it may take place either between a thing’s will and a human’s intellect or between the human’s will and the thing’s intellect. That is the reason why Einstein’s theory of relativity is only about light’s will and quantum mechanics only about light’s intellect, but neither may ever be about both the will and the intellect. Epistemologically the differences between will and intellect are more fundamental than those between a human and a thing.
- Relatively, belief is something more like C and knowledge more like O, which is the reason why knowledge is more valuable than belief, either true or false.
- OC means that understanding does not occur only in human minds.

## 10. Axiological meanings of the OC

- If the O in OC is what that is real, right, good, beautiful, logical or computable, the C is then the limitation of the real real, the right right, the good good, the beautiful beautiful, the logical logical or the computable computable.
- If the O is the freedom and the C is the will, then, there is no “free will” in any being. In other words, the C has nothing to do with freedom. And freedom is only the O or the equality between self and others, between humans and things, between God and us, and between any equality and any other equality.
- OC means that happiness should not only be sought by us within the O.

## 11. Logical meaning of the OC

- OC means that all what logical are based on what not logical, held by what not logical, driven by what not logical, also from and to what not logical.

## 12. Cosmogony's meaning of the OC

- OC means that we are in a universe of holism, in which parts are created and selected by the whole and its change, not by “God” or “nature”.<sup>(5)</sup>

## 13. Religious meaning of the OC

- God as God, religion as religion, have nothing to do with each other.
- God is the reason of the C in OC, everything else is the reason of the O, including all what called as “modernity”. However, neither is reasonable if without their unity or unification.<sup>(5)</sup>

Altogether, the concept OC might mean to believe that there is something, always there, which we, however, may never know or can never do, no matter how much more we may still know and can still do.

It works however, when we work together.

## **References:**

1. Van Inwagen, P, and Sullivan, M., 2017: "Metaphysics", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Winter 2016 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.),  
  
<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2017/entries/metaphysics/>
2. Sorensen, R., 2017: "Nothingness", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2017 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.),  
  
<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2017/entries/nothingness/>
3. Curd, P., 2016: "Presocratic Philosophy", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Winter 2016 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.),  
  
<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2016/entries/presocratics/>.
4. Zhang, XY. 2019: "The source and the nature of life and consciousness",  
  
<https://philpapers.org/rec/ZHATSA-4>
5. Zhang, XY. 2014: *Be Human in the Paradise*, In Amazon ASIN: B00IHE5QS2A, 2014,  
  
<https://www.amazon.com/dp/B00IHE5QS2>

# “存在”真实义

## 心言

### 中文摘要

一个幽灵，一个本体论上称之为“存在”的幽灵，在西方哲学近两千六百年的演化过程中时隐时现，从未真正现身亦未真正地消失。时至今日，理解它并置自身于其中，对我们能否人性地去思考和行为来说，依然至关重要，甚至更加重要。

作者在本文中建议，把这个“存在”理解为巴门尼德所说的“ONE”与赫拉克里特所说的“流变”的统一或同一。并补充说：仅仅通过实体，仅仅通过种种所谓的“存在者”，无论是人抑或是物，无论是动物还是植物，无论是宏观星体抑或是微观粒子，我们所理解到的都还不是存在本身，既不是主观存在本身也不是客观存在本身。

作者将上述理解归结为一个新的概念，并以“OC”这样一个对大家都比较方便的符号来称之名之。在本文中，OC代表着对存在的一种既综合又分析的理解。

在文章的最后部分，作者将这一理解在本体论、认识论、价值论、逻辑学、宇宙进化论和宗教学上的意义，择其精要，逐一点到。正是在这些地方，OC这个概念真正显示出了自己的价值和力量。

将“OC”与“存在”相提并论，甚至用OC取代古希腊人所说的那个存在，应该有助于，在未来，使本体论由天上降到大地上，使哲学、数学、逻辑学、经验科学和艺术向彼此回归，使上帝、凡人、万物和虚无向相彼此回归，使我们能够摆脱“现在”而同时既向过去又向未来迈进。

因此，本文亦可以看作是作者对现代性的后现代哲学批判的一种建设性批判。

## 关键词

OC；存在；认识论；价值论；上帝

## 附注

本文部分地基于作者在第二十四届世界哲学大会一个形而上学主题分组会上的发言。

## 正文

### 一. 方法与途径

如果想要得到一个更好的概念，有的时候，唯一的途径是，发现一对彼此相反的意见或相互对立的信念之间的统一或同一。

有的时候，即便是在与哲学本体论打交道的时候，即便是在与古希腊哲学大师们那些伟大的形而上哲思打交道时，这依然可能会是唯一的一条出路。

而这也正是本文在以下部分中将要做的事情。

### 二. 问题与目的

“存在，或不存在，此乃问题所在”，如果时至今日，哲学，在其根基处，依然可以被归结为本体论，而本体论依然可以被归结为哈姆雷特的这样一个问题。<sup>(1,2)</sup>

或者如亚里士多德在其《形而上学》中所问：存在意味什么？

又或者如海德格尔在其《形而上学导论》中所问：何以存在存在而不存在不存在？

然而，在我看来，这问题所要问的或者提出这问题所意味的，并非仅仅只是关于一个哲学概念或特定的体系，并非仅仅只是关于一个语词或特定的语言，并非仅仅只是关于逻辑学家们和数学家们所发现或创造的那些逻辑斯，并非仅仅只是关于科学家们所揭示并证实的那些事实，并非仅仅只是关于人作为人而宇宙作为宇宙的那种意义或价值。并非仅仅如此，并非仅仅只是关于我们所能够感觉、知道、思考、理解、爱恨、信仰、想象、言说或付诸行动的那一切，而是关于所有这一切，比所有这一切更多又更少，且永远更多又永远更少。



也许，在本文上下文中，这个“比所有这一切更多又更少的一切”可以被归结为本体论所追问的那个小写的存在，单数的 **being** 或复数的 **beings**，而那个“永远比所有这一切更多又更少的一切”则或者可以被归结为那个大写的存在，那个 **Being**。

如此，本文的目的便是试图给以下这样几个问题以答案：

- 何以存在？
- 大写的存在与小写的存在有何不同？
- 种种小写的存在与种种实体又有何不同？
- 何以虚无？

（以上问题中的这些“何”字所表达的都是英语中“how”的意思，而不是“what”的意思。）

不过，有的时候，所谓“给问题以答案”其实不过是要发现或创造一个或一些更好的概念，并以其来替代问题所在的那个系统中的一个或一些不那么好的概念。

因此，写作本文的目的同样可以说成是：去发现或创造一个更好的概念，并以其替代“存在”那个本体论概念，至少是替代那个小写的 **being** 或那些小写的 **beings**。

### 三. 意见与信念

为了用以上方法给以上问题以一个答案，或者说，为了发现或创造一个比“存在”更好一点的概念，首先就需要找到一对或多对，能够作为以上的那些问题的甚至还能作为以上那些问题的不那么好的答案的，已经为前人所提出并一直为许多人所信奉的意见或信念。于此，我觉得，作为西方哲学史上最早被提出来的，因而也应该作为本文首选的，似乎是古希腊两位哲学大师以下这样两个相反的意见或对立的信念：

- **CHANGE**，或者也可以称之为“概念 C”。

概念 C 代表赫拉克里特的意见：一切皆流变，无物恒存在。<sup>(3)</sup>

概念 C 的定义： $A \neq A$ .

在这里，这个“C”应该被看成是一个块形的符号。

- ONE，或者也可以称之为“概念 O”。

概念 O 代表巴门尼德的信念：存在是一个自洽、不变且不可分的一。<sup>(3)</sup>

概念 O 的定义： $A=A$ .

在这里，这个“O”应该被看成是一个环形的符号。

#### 四. 翻译与诠释

然而，相对于本文所要回答的问题与所要达到的目的，上面所说的这个“ $A=A$ ”和“ $A \neq A$ ”似乎还远远不够充分，不够包容，不够精确也不够具体。为了更好地揭示 O 和 C 这两个概念的内涵和外延，似乎还应该对它们作以下这样一番翻译与诠释：

首先，概念 O 可以被理解为向一个自我的回归，而概念 C 则可以被理解为对一个自我的背离。

其次，“回归一个自我”可以被理解为一种往返变化，而“背离一个自我”则可以被理解为一种单向变化。往返变化的变化方向自相矛盾而单向变化的变化方向则始终如一。例如，一个圆可以被理解为两个一维的往返运动的结合，而一个球则可以被理解为三个一维的往返运动的结合。我们这个宇宙的演化则可以被理解为一个由一维，

经过二维，向三维甚至更多维度的单向变化，或者说，因为含有越来越多的维度，所以宇宙会显得越来越大，也越来越复杂。

再者，作为单向运动，概念 C 在意义上与以下这些概念相同：

能量、时间、必然、非对称、不可逆、命运、死亡、意志、信念、Nous

而作为往返运动，概念 O 在意义上则与以下这些概念相同：

物质、空间、偶然、对称、可逆、自由、生命、智慧、知识、Logos

可以分别归入以上两组的概念应该还有很多。不过，我们却不可把亚里士多德的“质料因”和“形式因”添加到与概念 O 相同的那一组概念中去，也不可把“动力因”和“目的因”添加到与概念 C 相同的那一组概念中去。

最后，概念 C 说的同样是前因后果的道理，而概念 O 说的则是互为因果的道理，因为概念 C 否定后果终究可以成为前因的可能性，而概念 O 却恰恰相反。

例如：泰勒斯所说的“水”，阿那克西曼德所说的“indeterminate boundless”，阿那克西米尼所说的“气”或毕达哥拉斯所说的“数”，所说的都是互为因果的道理，赫拉克里特所说的“土生火，火生气，气生水，水生土”亦然。与它们相同的还有巴门尼德的“one”、留基波和德谟克里特的“原子”、斯宾诺莎的“上帝或自然”和莱布尼茨的“单子”，还应该包括柏拉图的“理念”、亚里士多德的“三段式”、笛卡尔的“我思故我在”、康德的“自在之物”、黑格尔的“绝对精神”、尼采的“永恒回归”，罗素的“逻辑原子主义”，维特根斯坦的“语言游戏”、胡塞尔的“事物本身”、海德格尔的“此在”，蒯因的“存在论承诺”，勒维纳斯的“我与他者”，哈贝马斯的“交往行为”，以及种种现代分析哲学家们的种种说法。

理论物理学家诺特的定理，“在物理系统中，连续对称性总是对应着守恒量”，也是一种互为因果的道理，也是概念 O 所表达的那部分道理。

那些否认生物进化具有特定方向性的观点，都还仅仅只是说出了概念 O 的道理。

政法文献和社会学中常常会用到的“自由”、“平等”和“博爱”等概念，虽然看似不同，其实却同根同源，说的都依然只是概念 O 的道理。

亚伯拉罕一神诸教教义中的道理大致如此，亦仅仅只是 O 的道理。

## 五. 同一或统一

显而易见，对本文所提出的那些问题和所要达到的目的来说，无论是概念 O 还是概念 C，都还不是那个更好的答案，或者说，都不可能单独成为那个答案。直到今天为止的西方哲学全部发展历程已经证明了这一点，相信物理和生物学的全部发展历程将同样会证明这一点。

之所以 O 或 C 不可能单独成为那个答案，主要是因为，无论是对我们还是对我们这个宇宙来说，O 与 C 都缺一不可。至少，如果没有 O，我们将无法经验任何 C，如果没有 C，我们将无法识别任何 O，如果没有 O 与 C 的统一，我们将无法做任何事情。

换句话说，O 与 C 的同一或统一，虽非“不证自明”，却可知可行，并可透过这知与行被我们每个人从每一件事中证实：我们之所以能够知道、理解和行为，无非就是因为 O 与 C 的统一或同一；我们的一切知道、理解和行为本身，无非就是它们的同一或统一；我们这个宇宙本身的生与死，其中一切星体的生与死，包括我们自己在内的一切生物的生与死，我们和它们演化的每一步和全过程，亦无过于此。

再换句话说，之所以 O 与 C 的同一或统一才是那个更好的答案，主要是因为，不仅那个答案是我们的一部分，而我们也是那个答案的一部分；不仅那个答案不能独立于我们，而我们也同样不能独立于那个答案；不仅现在如此，即便是在我们出现之前或消逝之后，就已然如此并将依然如此。

这里还须强调一句：“统一”与“同一”这两个词固然不完全相同，“统一”本还可以被理解为“相互依存”、“相互转化”、“相辅相成”或“同生共死”等等，而“同一”却绝无此义，尽管如此，本文对它们在使用上的不予取舍、兼驱并任，却绝非含糊疏漏，而是有意为之、刻意为之，因为只有这样，只有同时说“O 与 C 的同一或统一”，才更完美地表达了本文想要表达的那个意思，那个隐藏在“存在”背后的，因其更大又更小、更多又更少、更简单又更复杂、更彰显又更隐匿，而原本并无法用语言表达的语义，或者说，非语义的语义。

总而言之，无论是在我们这个宇宙之中还是在我们自身之中，无论何时抑或何地，O 与 C 都既不可被混淆也不可被分割，因为我们本就如此这般地存在着，所谓“存在”无非就是它们的同一或统一。

## 六. 结果与概念

作为对上述方法的遵循，对上述问题的提出和回答，对上述两个相互对立理念的选取和理解，对它们意义的翻译并使之更具体化，对它们之间那种同一或统一的发现并将我们自己置身于其中，作为所有这一切的共同结果，现在，最合情合理的，当然就是要用以下这样一些命题、概念和公式来取代西方哲学本体论中所说的那个“存在”，至少是取代其中那个小写的“being”或那些小写“beings”：

- 存在是概念 O 与 C 的同一或统一。（命题一）

命题一中所说的“概念 O 与 C 的同一或统一”，也许可以简约或归结为以下这样一个概念：

- 概念 OC

在这里“OC”应该被作为同一个符号来看待，一个既如环又似玦的符号。

按照命题一，我们也可以用以下公式来定义“存在”这个本体论概念：

- 存在 = OC (公式一)

同时还应该用以下这个公式来补充公式一，使要表达的那个意思被表达得更完美：

- being ≠ thing (公式二)

公式二中的“thing”等同于一切看起来似乎有自身确定的界限并独立存在着的“实体”，等同于一切所谓的“存在者”，无论是人抑或是物，无论是动物抑或是植物，无论是宏观星体抑或是微观粒子。

## 七. 大写的 Being 与 OC

在我们自身和我们的这个宇宙中，无论在何时或何地，我们总是能发现并证实公式一的正确，或者，对我们来说，存在总是意味着 OC 所意味的。然而，OC 与那个大写的 Being 却毫无关系，OC 并不意味着那个 Being，并不意味着对那个 Being 的任何肯定或否定。

这样说绝非出于对那个大写 **Being** 的任何认识或理解，而仅仅只是出于对 **OC** 本身的坚守，仅仅只是因为：**OC** 中的 **O** 说的固然是“圆满即存在”的道理，但其中那个 **C** 却意味着，开放和不完全也同样是存在的本性，在哲学上如此，在科学上亦然。

无论是西方的哲学本体论还是东方的儒释道，包括基督教信仰在内，包括经验科学，特别是物理学和生物学，对于 **OC** 中这一 **C** 的认识都多少有点不够充分，至少也是对 **O** 认识较多而对 **C** 认识较少，对 **O** 与 **C** 完全平等、彻底平等的认识就更少了。

例如，这个 **C** 不仅能解释化学元素表的不完整性而且预言着基本粒子标准模型的不完整性，因为这两者说的都还仅仅只是 **OC** 中那个 **O** 的道理。再例如，如果没有这个 **C**，生物学终究不能完美解释地生物的起源和演化，因为，无论是达尔文的自然选择还是现代分子生物学，所说的亦仅仅只是 **OC** 中那个 **O** 的道理。

数学亦无过于此，哥德尔不完备定理所说的不过是这个 **C** 的一个特例，此外的全部数学则不过是那个 **O** 的一个特例。

总而言之，“存在”这个本体论概念，至少对我们来说，无论何时何地，都意味着且仅仅意味着 **OC** 所意味的，而绝非大写的 **Being** 所意味的。这一点亦可归结为以下这个公式：

- $OC = \text{Human reality}$  (公式三)

公式三并不否认任何一元论信念的可能性，而只是否认其现实性。但是，它也没有因此而肯定任何二元论或多元论信念的现实性。

八. **OC** 的本体论意义

- OC 之外无存在。
- O 和 C 是彼此的参照系，因而，OC 独立于牛顿或爱因斯坦的时间和空间。
- O 和 C 之间可以有通讯却绝没有信息或语义信息的交流。<sup>(4)</sup>
- OC 之内无生死。任何有生有死者，不过一名称或一文本而已。

古希腊的高尔吉亚(约公元前四百年)也许是将存在与实体分别看待的第一人，因此他说：无物存在，或不可知、不可思、不可表达。然而，这与巴门尼德所说的“思维与存在同一”和“只有存在可知”<sup>(5)</sup>倒也未必一定相互矛盾。

虽然海德格尔说“语言是存在的家”，但其实，OC 才是我们一切所知、所想、所做、所说的的那个家，是知之所知、想之所想、做之所做、说之所说的那个家。虽然贝克莱说“存在就是被感知”，但实际上，存在并无法为我们或上帝所感知。虽然普罗泰戈拉说“人是万物的尺度，是存在者存在的尺度，也是不存在者不存在的尺度”，但我却坚信，只有 OC 才是存在本身的尺度。

至少，对于“存在”这个本体论概念，我们不应理解为什么可以被分为主谓宾的，或者是什么有能力知道自己、思考自己或言说自己的，再或者是什么不证自明的。否则，隐藏在该理解之后的，就不是智慧而只是意志，不是哲学而只是宗教。

## 九. OC 的认识论意义

- OC 意味着，并不存在什么精神与物质、主观与客观、自我与非我、心灵与身体或“为人”与“为物”的区别。
- OC 意味着，知与行并不发生于人与物之间，而是发生于意志与智慧之间，既可以发生于物的意志与人的智慧之间，也可以发生于人的意志与物的智慧之间。这也就是为什么，爱因斯坦的相对论可以说只是关于光的意志，量子力学则可以说



只是关于光的智慧，而却皆不可能同时既关于智慧又关于意志。在认识论上和认识过程中，意志与智慧的区别实在要比人与物的区别更根本。

- OC 意味着，存在既可以理解又不可完全理解。然而，无论这理解还是这不理解，都绝非如海德格尔所说，只有通过“此在”才有可能。

#### 十. OC 的价值论意义

- 如果 OC 中的那个 O 意味着真善美，意味着逻辑性和可计算性，那么那个 C 则意味着真善美的有限，意味着逻辑性和可计算性的有限。
- 如果 OC 中的那个 O 意味着自由而 C 意味着意志，那么，在存在中便没有什么“自由意志”。换句话说来说，意志与自由毫无关系，一切意志都是不自由，而一切自由都不过就是那个 O，是“自己”与“自己”的平等、“我”与“人”的平等、“人”与“物”的平等、“上帝”与“我们”的平等，是任何平等与其它平等之间的平等。
- OC 意味着，对幸福的追求不应止之于 O。

#### 十一. OC 的逻辑学意义

- OC 意味着，一切逻辑的都基于某种非逻辑的，都为某种非逻辑的所加持，都为某种非逻辑的所驱动，都来自又终究都回归于某种非逻辑的。

#### 十二. OC 的宇宙进化论意义

- OC 意味着，我们身处一个整体论的宇宙，在其中的一切部分都为其整体所创造和选择，而非“上帝”或“自然”之所为。<sup>(6)</sup>

### 十三. OC 的宗教学意义

- 上帝之为上帝，宗教之为宗教，彼此间没有一丝一毫关系。
- 上帝是 OC 中那个 C 的道理，其它一切，包括所谓的“现代性”在内，则都仅仅只是那个 O 的道理，然而，无论对我们还是对我们这个宇宙来说，一旦脱离了彼此，无论是 O 还是 C，皆毫无道理。<sup>(6)</sup>

总而言之，OC 这个概念，对我们来说，其所意味着的也许不过是：有那么一些事物，虽然就在那里，虽然一直就在那里，我们却永远不可能知道或做到，无论我们在未来还有可能知道多少或做到多少。

然而，这也许并非坏事，反而倒应该是一件好事。

## 参考文献

1. Van Inwagen, P, and Sullivan, M., 2017: "Metaphysics", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Winter 2016 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.),

<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2017/entries/metaphysics/>

2. Sorensen, R., 2017: "Nothingness", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2017 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.),

<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2017/entries/nothingness/>

3. Curd, P., 2016: "Presocratic Philosophy", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Winter 2016 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.),

<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2016/entries/presocratics/>.

4. Zhang, XY. 2019: "The source and the nature of life and consciousness",

<https://philpapers.org/rec/ZHATSA-4>

5. Palmer, J. 2016: "Parmenides", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2019 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2019/entries/parmenides/>>.

6. Zhang, XY. 2014: *Be Human in the Paradise*, In Amazon ASIN: B00IHE5QS2A, 2014,

<https://www.amazon.com/dp/B00IHE5QS2>