

0:1 (“Deity and Divinity”)

from Foreword

© 2016, 2019 Matthew Block

Source for 0:1

- (1) Charles **Hartshorne**, *Man’s Vision of God and the Logic of Theism* (Chicago: Willett, Clark & Company, 1941)

Key

- (a) **Green** indicates where a source author first appears, or where he/she reappears.
- (b) **Yellow** highlights most parallelisms.
- (c) **Tan** highlights parallelisms not occurring on the same row, or parallelisms separated by yellowed parallelisms.
- (d) An underlined word or words indicates where the source and the UB writer pointedly differ from each other.

Work-in-progress Version 19 March 2016
© 2016, 2019 Matthew Block
Revised Dec. 4, 2019

FOREWORD

I. DEITY AND DIVINITY

0:1.1 The universe of universes presents phenomena of deity activities on diverse levels of cosmic realities, mind meanings, and spirit values, but all of these ministrations—personal or otherwise—are divinely co-ordinated.

0:1.2 DEITY is personalizable as God, is prepersonal and superpersonal in ways not altogether comprehensible by man. Deity is characterized by the quality of unity—actual or potential—on all supermaterial levels of reality; and this unifying quality is best comprehended by creatures as divinity.

0:1.3 Deity functions on personal, prepersonal, and superpersonal levels. Total Deity is functional on the following seven levels:

0:1.4 1. *Static*—self-contained and self-existent Deity.

0:1.5 2. *Potential*—self-willed and self-purposive Deity.

0:1.6 3. *Associative*—self-personalized and divinely fraternal Deity.

0:1.7 4. *Creative*—self-distributive and divinely revealed Deity.

0:1.8 5. *Evolutional*—self-expansive and creature-identified Deity.

0:1.9 6. *Supreme*—self-experiential and creature-Creator-unifying Deity. Deity functioning on the first creature-identificational level as time-space overcontrollers of the grand universe, sometimes designated the Supremacy of Deity.

0:1.10 7. *Ultimate*—self-projected and time-space-transcending Deity. Deity omnipotent, omniscient, and omnipresent. Deity functioning on the second level of unifying divinity expression as effective overcontrollers and absonite upholders of the master universe. As compared with the ministry of the Deities to the grand universe, this absonite function in the master universe is tantamount to universal overcontrol and supersustenance, sometimes called the Ultimacy of Deity.

0:1.11 *The finite level* of reality is characterized by creature life and time-space limitations. Finite realities may not have endings, but they always have beginnings—they are created. The Deity level of Supremacy may be conceived as a function in relation to finite existences.

0:1.12 *The absonite level* of reality is characterized by things and beings without beginnings or endings and by the transcendence of time and space. Absoniters are not created; they are eventuated—they simply are. The Deity level of Ultimacy connotes a function in relation to absonite realities. No matter in what part of the master universe, whenever time and space are transcended, such an absonite phenomenon is an act of the Ultimacy of Deity.

0:1.13 *The absolute level* is beginningless, endless, timeless, and spaceless. For example: On Paradise, time and space are nonexistent; the time-space status of Paradise is absolute. This level is Trinity attained, existentially, by the Paradise Deities, but this third level of unifying Deity expression is not fully unified experientially. Whenever, wherever, and however the absolute level of Deity functions, Paradise-absolute values and meanings are manifest.

0:1.14 Deity may be existential, as in the Eternal Son; experiential, as in the Supreme Being; associative, as in God the Sevenfold; undivided, as in the Paradise Trinity.

0:1.15 Deity is the source of all that which is divine. Deity is characteristically and invariably divine, but all that which is divine is not necessarily Deity, though it will be co-ordinated with Deity and will tend towards some phase of unity with Deity—spiritual, mindal, or personal.

0:1.16 DIVINITY is the characteristic, unifying, and co-ordinating quality of Deity.

0:1.17 Divinity is creature comprehensible as truth, beauty, and goodness; correlated in personality as love, mercy, and ministry; disclosed on impersonal levels as justice, power, and sovereignty.

0:1.18 Divinity may be perfect—complete—as on existential and creator levels of Paradise perfection; it may be imperfect, as on experiential and creature levels of time-space evolution; or it may be relative, neither perfect nor imperfect, as on certain Havona levels of existential-experiential relationships.

I: THE FORMALLY POSSIBLE
DOCTRINES (Hartshorne 1)

The seven cases can be arranged, in several different ways, into three main groups. The following of the possible triadic arrangements seems the most useful:¹

Absolute perfection in *all* respects.

Absolute perfection in *some* respects, relative perfection in all others.

Absolute perfection, relative perfection, and “imperfection” (neither A nor R), each in *some* respects.

Absolute perfection in *some* respects, imperfection in all others.

Absolute perfection in *no* respects, relative in all.

Absolute perfection in *no* respects, relative in some, imperfection in the others.

Absolute perfection in *no* respects, imperfection in all (H 8).

0:1.19 When we attempt to conceive of perfection in all phases and forms of relativity, we encounter seven conceivable types:

0:1.20 1. Absolute perfection in all aspects.

0:1.21 2. Absolute perfection in some phases and relative perfection in all other aspects.

0:1.22 3. Absolute, relative, and imperfect aspects in varied association.

0:1.23 4. Absolute perfection in some respects, imperfection in all others.

0:1.24 5. Absolute perfection in no direction, relative perfection in all manifestations.²

0:1.25 6. Absolute perfection in no phase, relative in some, imperfect in others.

0:1.26 7. Absolute perfection in no attribute, imperfection in all.

SOURCE OR PARALLEL

URANTIA FOREWORD

1. See Exhibit A for Hartshorne's uncropped list.

2. In the first edition (1955), the clause read:

5. Absolute perfection in no direction, relative perfection in all other manifestations.

The word 'other' was removed in the second edition, published in 1967, and all later editions.

⊗ EXHIBIT A

whatever"; while the joint negative of these two, "in *no* respect," gives the third possibility.

Combining the two meanings of "none" with the three meanings of "greater" we derive seven possible cases, only one of which is the unequivocal negation of "none greater," or of "unsurpassability even by the conceivable." Thus it is proved that [the question, Is there a perfect being? is six distinct questions rather than one.] Has anyone a right to assure us, in advance of exploration of the other five, that the Anselmian (unconscious) selection of one among the six — as the faithful rendering either of the religious question or of the most fruitful philosophical one — is safely established by the fact that the choice has been repeated no less unconsciously by multitudes of theologians? If anyone asserts this, I must doubt his understanding of the elementary requirements of good reasoning.

The seven cases can be arranged, in several different ways, into three main groups. The following of the possible triadic arrangements seems the most useful:

GROUP	SYMBOL	CASE	SYMBOL	INTERPRETATION
I	(A)	1	A	Absolute perfection in <i>all</i> respects.
II	(AX)	2	AR	Absolute perfection in <i>some</i> respects, relative perfection in all others.
		3	ARI	Absolute perfection, relative perfection, and "imperfection" (neither absolute nor relative perfection), each in <i>some</i> respects.
		4	AI	Absolute perfection in <i>some</i> respects, imperfection in all others.
III	(X)	5	R	Absolute perfection in <i>no</i> respects, relative in all.
		6	RI	Absolute perfection in <i>no</i> respects, relative in some, imperfection in the others.
		7	I	Absolute perfection in <i>no</i> respects, imperfection in all.

EXPLANATION OF SYMBOLS: A stands for absolute perfection, R for relative perfection, I for the joint negative of A and R, X for the negative of A (and thus for the disjunction of R and I), and (A) or (X) for the factors occurring throughout a group.

NOTE: It will be shown in the appendix to this chapter that imperfection can be subdivided into two possible forms, making fifteen cases in all, though the additional eight seem of little importance — despite the fact that all eight express modes of unsurpassability, and so of perfection in the most general sense!

In a different mode of presentation we have:

GROUP	I	II				III		
A in	<i>all</i>	<i>some</i>				<i>no</i>	respects	
	(A)	(AX)				(X)		
CASE	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
	A	AR	ARI	AI	R	RI	I	

NOTE: It might be thought that God's "supremacy" requires not only that he cannot conceivably be surpassed, but that he cannot even be equaled. Anyone who wishes to experiment with this conception of the *unrivaled as well as unsurpassed* is of course at liberty to do so. My reason for neglecting the concept — which might be called "incomparability" — is that I agree with the usual verdict of theologians that the unsurpassable is bound to be unique, so that if superiority is out of the question, equality is also. If good reason for doubting this verdict can be found, then "incomparability" should be substituted, at least experimentally, for "unsurpassability" in the definition of perfection.

So far as I know, this is the only rigorous *formal* classification (which as formal and a mere classification is beyond intelligent controversy) of possible doctrines about God — except mere dichotomies (e.g., God is or is not eternal, one with all reality, etc.), which are never very helpful because only one of the two classes has positive content. Yet, though formal, the classification is relevant to religion, if religion believes in an unsurpassable being. And it certainly is relevant to philosophy; for the seven cases (as formal possibilities) follow automatically from concepts which philosophy is bound to use.