A Philosophical Outlook of Being and Possibility

Sakim Ali, [1] &
Prof: Dr. Malik Muhammad Tariq, [2]

Abstract

The problem of Being and Possibility is one of the basic problems in the study of philosophy. In one hand, the problem of Being originates the problem of stationary and change of the existence, on the other hand, the problem of possibility opens wide scope of change for possible worlds. In the history of philosophy, most predecessors thought, Being as static and changeless and homogeneous entity, Being as genius or Being as a name, mere equal to non-Being. Moreover, philosophers tried to resolve the problem of change in the relation with other concepts like, Being as a substance, Being and accident and Being as an existence. The focus in this study is a diachronic analysis of the concept of Being and Possibility respectively, and synthetic conclusive notes on different approaches. This study is an attempt to resolve the problem of Being in perspective of Possibility. The isolate Being with quality of "Isness" becomes static, and moderate Being becomes becoming, with no certainty. The logical ground require certainty. Therefore, the logical possibility is ground to comprehend the nature of Being. Although, the logical possibility has wide scope in its nature, but it is not infinite in its essence. This finitude of possibility makes it more natural then super-natural or non-natural. The expression regarding non-natural of the study, we get because of our understanding of the concept of actuality. The concept of non-actuality is the basic cause of our dichotomy of real and unreal. This study is an attempt to resolve this dichotomy.

---

[1] Lecturer, Department of Philosophy, University of Balochistan, Quetta
[2] Dean, Faculty of Humanities and Education, University of Balochistan, Quetta

An Introduction of Philosophy in the Perspective of Being

Man, by nature is a normative animal. Philosophy what I understand, is an inquiry or investigation of an ultimate substance, principle or Being, that could determine the aim of life. A simple through-going analysis of the history of philosophy shows that the major attempt of philosophy was to find an ultimate Substance, Principle or Being, according which others phenomenon including purpose of life, could be explain. Where we find any refutation of an ultimate Substance or Being, there we find an announcement of "Death of the Philosophy", and the sound of purposeless life.

In the early history of Greek philosophy, the main effort was to find an ultimate substance, through which they could explain all others phenomenon. The early Greek materialistic approach of substance can be an appropriate example for understanding, as Thales believed that the ultimate Substance or Being is water, and the water is the cause of the earth-quick and all other natural phenomenon (State, 2015-p,22).At the same way, Anaximenes 's air, Heraclitus's fire, Empedocles's elements and Democritus's atoms was nothing, but relational inquiry of basic substance or Being. The later Greek idealistic tendencies like Plato's theory of Form or Being, Aristotle's idea of substance and unmoved mover or ultimate Being was the same attempt that mentioned above.

Heraclitus of Ephesus (b.540 B.C. E) believed that the world is unified, ordered and guided by a single rational divine law, which he called the" Logos". Human soul is resemblance with divine logos, which has potentiality to open the door for true human knowledge. He thought fire is the principle of wisdom and the material manifestation of logos (State, 2015-pp,74-78). Parmenides of Elea (b.515 B.C. E) *philosophy's is the negation of Heraclitus's notion of "flux" and negation of the Ionian's fundamental principle (arche) substance of reality. He said that the perceptual knowledge is mere opinion; knowledge of truth only comes through reason, not by sense perception. Reality, for Parmenides, is One, Unchangeable and Enteral. Parmenides stated that "Being is Real" "non-being is merely illusion" "Being" is what is "is" and what "is not" is not. As Parmenides believed that n*on-being does not exists, either one can speak nor think about it. When someone speak or think, he/she speak or think about something. For Parmenides, what is not, is not possible. *(*State, 2015-pp,44,45)*.

Plato's (428/427-424/423 B.C.E) ideas or Form are substance and merely essence of all things, they are independent, undetermined and exists by itself. "Ideas or Forms" being substance and essence, they are the first principle of the world of copy or material world. Ideas are universal, unified, and immutable. Imperishable. Each Ideas or Forms are absolute and perfect in its kind, exists outside of time and space (State, 2015-pp,188-192). Aristotle's (384-322 B.C.E) metaphysics is the best source of his theory of Being. Aristotle used word being in four different way. In all these four different ways, the most important is Aristotle's substantial being, or being as a substance. Other three way of being is: accidental being or being as an accident (accidental properties not essential; like being mathematician), being as truth (truthiness of a proposition), categories of being or being as existence, and actual and potential being or being as in actuality and in potentiality. (Brentano, 1975-pp, 3-5)

All medieval philosophy, in some extent, influenced by religion. In one hand, western philosophy influenced by Christianity, and the other hand, Muslim or Arabic philosophy influenced by Islam. Therefore, many critics argued that all medieval philosophy is nothing, but mere theology of both religions. In some degree, this might be true.

St. Agustin (354-430 A.D) concerned with the nature of Absolute Being (God). Augustine tried to depend the notion of omnipresent and omnipotent God from the anthropomorphic notion of God. He stated that God is Being itself, God is most pure and supreme form of existence. (Stumpf, 1971-pp, 136-138). St. Anselm (b.1033 A. D) stated, "No creature has anything from itself." (Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy) To having, something in itself being must be received from God. All creations have thing if they have not received from God. Conclusively, God is the essence of all creations. Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274 A.D) adopts Aristotle's Four Causes theory: material cause, formal cause efficient and final cause, but the Formal Cause is crucial in his concept of being and God. Aquinas said God is the pure Formal cause of all creation. (Stumpf, 1971-pp, 174-177).

Modern Philosophy began with Rene Descartes (1596-1650 A.D). Hedefined that substance exist indestructible and independently. For Descartes there are two kinds substance: mind and body. Moreover, He said that God is an infinite substance; God is eternal, immutable and independent substance. (Weber, 2007-pp, 248-250). Spinoza (1632-1677 A.D) Spinoza is famous for

his notion of monism and pantheism. He believed that there is only one Being (God), God is Nature and Nature is God. Spinoza claim that there is only one substance; that substance is God (Schacht,1984-pp, 75-78). "By substance, I mean that which is in itself, and is conceived through itself: in other words, that of which a conception can be formed independently of any other conception." (Spinoza, 1970-p,1).Leibniz (1646-1716)refutes Spinoza's approach of determinism. He statedthat neither substance is one, nor there is any determination among the substances.In his word's "monads" or substances are plural and windowless, each monad as an individual entity is free from other monads, neither it influences other "monads", nor it can be influenced by other "monads" (Weber, 2007-pp, 278,279).

Kant, the knowledge of metaphysics is impossible, because all experience that become part of our knowledge, constructed and extended by our consciousness (Kant,1998, p). The knowledge of beings, reality or noumenon, in Kant's words "thing them self" is not possible. Kant, argued that the question of being could be understood through ethics, not through metaphysics. He stated, intuition without concept are empty, and concept with our intuition are blind" (Kant,1781-pp,147,672) Hegel (1770 -1831 A.D) represent basic and historical context for all social and cultural sciences. Being, according to Hegel, is abstract, identical, indefinite and indeterminate, it is equal only to itself. Moreover, being is not unequal in relation to other. Being has no diversity nor with any reference outwards. Being is pure indeterminateness and emptiness. Its purity remains if it contained any determination or content. (Hegel,2010-p,59).

Martin Heidegger (1889-1976) Martin Heidegger (1889-1976) is the most significance and influential thinker regarding theory of Being. Heidegger first tried to formulate the meaning of Being. He believed that the question of Being leads us on the way to its conception. What is Being? Heidegger said that if we ask. We have within a concept of the "is". But we are unable to understand what that "is" signifies. Because discovery of Being is much complex then scientific discovery of entities. Heidegger wanted to reduce conscious analysis for the investigation of being. Heidegger distinguished the difference between Being and beings or entities. Heidegger puts the question, what makes beings as beings. Heidegger says that Being is constantly the Being of some entity. (Heidegger,1962-49-51,170). Jean Paul Sartre (1905-1980) rejected the notion of any transcendent Reality or Being, which lie

behind the appearances. For Sartre experience of appearance is reality. World as a construct of series of appearances and consciousness has direct relation to the being of phenomenon. The basic concept of Sartre's Being or world is the relation of being-in-itself and being-for-itself. Simply, the relation of being-in-itself and being-for-itself, we express the term 'object" for being-in-itself, and "subject' for being-for-itself. Being-in-self or object sometime understood by its physical characteristics and being-for-itself is understood by non-physical, non-essential and attributes of consciousness. This subject / object dichotomy sometime overlaps, for instance, human being as subject has the quality of consciousness, but also has the physical characteristic. (Sartre, 1977-pp,119,404)

At the beginning, we define that Philosophy is an inquire of an ultimate substance or being, through which one could determine the aim if life. May someone criticize the given definition of philosophy might be equally true for the definition of religion? Hereby it must be clear that there is a slight distinction between the definition of philosophy and definition of religion. There is no doubt that religion is also the study of the ultimate being or substance, which proved rules and regulation for the aim of life. But, religion or theology is the presumed investigation of the ultimate Being, that existence is accepted as a belief, but philosophy is direct investigation of the Being without any presumption.

Since, in medieval philosophy, we mostly found that arguments regarding the existence of the Ultimate Being, which mostly sounds the existence of Christian's or Muslim God. If so, then we are not mistaken to conclude that the medieval philosophy is not the investigation of an ultimate being, but rather than the investigation of an arguments for the Ultimate Being. With further conclusion, we can proclaim that the medieval philosophy is not philosophy in a pure sense, but mere theology.

Now we have two questions to answer. First question; is our given definition is the definition of philosophy, metaphysics or ethics. Second question, is question of Being is problem of ethics, as Kant believed, or it is question of metaphysics?

The supporting point is the given definition is the definition of philosophy. For instance, I said that philosophy is an "inquiry and investigation", (here epistemology involves with its all methodology including logic) of an" ultimate substance, principle or Being" (here involves metaphysics and

ontology) for determination of the "aim of life" (here involves moral philosophy and axiology). Axiology as we know that is the normative approach of knowledge. Axiological life would be ethical life, aesthetical life, political life, educational life and so on.

Second question requires historical support for its validation. In history of philosophy, we find "the unity of dichotomy" between epistemology and metaphysics. The term "the unity of dichotomy" does not signify any opposition or contradiction between epistemology and metaphysics but merely alternative relation between epistemology and metaphysics. In the history of philosophy, we find foundational and preceding position among the branches of philosophy. In one must be clear here, that this unity of dichotomy or alternative position of epistemology and metaphysics is not the relation between thesis and anti-thesis or any kind of dialectical relation. It is not claim that the history of philosophy does not allow the dialectical processes. However, the most important philosophical systems are the processes of grounding either epistemology or metaphysics to develop their worldview.

For example, Plato first developed his epistemology, and on the ground of epistemology, he constructed his metaphysics and other aspects of knowledge, but Aristotle first assembled his metaphysics and on the ground of metaphysics, he developed his epistemology. Plato believed that the categories of beings correspond with categories of thought but Aristotle believed that the categories of thought correspond with categories of being or reality (State, 2015-pp, 202,203,265,266). Respectively, Aristotle grounded metaphysics and Plato grounded epistemology as a foundation.

In same way, Descartes established his epistemology as a solid rock foundation, by knowing himself through processes of thinking. Descartes famous cogito, "I think therefore, I am" (Descartes, 2008-p,18). The existence of self developed through the processes of thinking or knowing. Thus, Descartes concluded his existence as a thinking substance or Being (metaphysics) from thinking or knowing (epistemology). So, for Descartes epistemology precede metaphysics. Unlike Descartes, Spinoza developed his metaphysics first as foundation, he stated that foundational substance or Being is one, infinite and eternal, which can be conceives through itself, and all other attributes and modes are determined part of this only substance or Being (Stumpf,1971-p, 241).The conception of this substance is only possible

through itself, thus, substance or Being (metaphysics) is a priori then its conception (epistemology). In the same sense, Kant first established his epistemology, and through his ground of epistemology, he rejected the possibility of metaphysics. Unlike Plato, Kant does not believe that the categories of thought correspond with categories of beings; nor he agree with Aristotle that categories of beings correspond with categories of thought. Kant believed that mind structured by certain categories and these categories do not correspond with the being, objective world or things-them-self (Stumpf,1971-p,293). In his philosophy, we found pure dichotomy of epistemology and metaphysics. Therefore, Kant refuted the possibility of metaphysics, but he built his ethical notion, as a ground for his metaphysics.

When this process of "unity of dichotomy" came in the philosophy of Hegel, like his dialectical processes it looks that both dichotomies merged in a single unity. As Hegel stated, "what is relational is real and what is real is relational" (Stumpf,1971-p, 310) it sounds that Hegel combined epistemology and metaphysics or Plato and Aristotle in a single unity. According to this statement, the categories of thought correspond with categories of beings and the categories of being equally correspond with categories of thought. However, it is mere an expression of combination or union, the basic question is, which one is ground for Hegel? Without any doubt, for Hegel, epistemology is the ground for his metaphysics. For the reason that the dialectical processes as a method (epistemology) give the impression as a ground or foundation for his other aspect of his philosophy.

One further example, we find in the philosophy of Husserl and Heidegger. To developing an epistemological foundation, Husserl established an exploratory system, that he called "phenomenological method". He defined, the "phenomenological method is descriptive study of experience of consciousness" (Husserl, Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy). Experience of consciousness means the mental act of consciousness, and it is the processes of intentionality, means consciousness also contain some mental objects. Moreover, purpose of phenomenological method is study of these mental objects. Husserl tried to develop a science to study experience as a mental object for the foundation of epistemology. Husserl's effort was to study or comprehend the "eidos" essence of the mental objects, not physical objects out-side of our mind. To study of essence of mental objects apart from physical object, Husserl developed his notion of "epoche" means suspension

of judgment or bracketing, in other words "epoche" is reducing of all naturalist or objective assumption, historical background and psychological judgment from intentional act or mental objects. Husserl main purpose was to study direct experience or pure experience, so, he tried to construct a foundation for epistemology. Unlike Husserl, Heidegger focus on metaphysics, where Husserl tried to grasp pure experience or consciousness, there Heidegger want to grasp pure Being. Like Husserl, Heidegger also adopted the phenomenological method to hold the concept of Being. at the same way Heidegger use the term "epoche" as Husserl used, but for Heidegger epoche is the intrusion of thinking being (epistemology), Moral being (ethics), historicism, psychologism, and all kinds of beliefs regarding with concept of Being. Heidegger focus was to comprehend the pure Being(Heidegger, Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy).

Without any doubt, the answer is our second question is now clear, that the question of Being is the question of metaphysics or ontology. Although for this question, thinkers adopt many different grounds to establish their notion of Being, but it doesn't mean that the question of being belong to other branch of philosophy. The question of Being is the question of metaphysics particularly, and question of philosophy generally. Here I pay my agreement with Heidegger that the question of Being is more fundament, significant and importance in in the study of philosophy (Heidegger, 1926).

Man is a Normative Animal

As mentioned, that man by nature is a normative animal; in here the words "normative" does not connote any moral characteristics. It does not mean that man is ethical or moral animal, we know better that man can be unethical and immoral, without any doubt. Normative what I understand that creating standard, criteria, rules or principles. Now the premises that man is normative animal, only means that man is standard maker or criteria sitter animal.

All basic human knowledge (philosophy, religion, science, and literature) are the attempt to construct or discover the standards, criteria or principles. It seems that all human efforts, in all over the history, is constructing and discovering standards or principles for the above mention fields or deconstructing old standards or replacing new one.

Someone may argue that man is not normative animal, but un-normative animal. This premise sounds strong, but the deconstruction of a standard requires a standard. There will be two possible arguments to deconstruct the

standard: first argument, that all standards that have been introduce by human since today, are failed to solved human problems, therefore there are no absolute standard, and second argument, there is still no reasonable agreement for any one universal standard. Conclusively, there will be possible for a universal standard. Both arguments have same logical premises, but have different conclusion. First emphases that we still have no ground for standard, and second proclaim that we will not be able to achieve any standard, in short, infinitely.

Agreed partially, that still we have no any universal standard, but we have particular standard in our life, and these standards are involves in all over in our life. For instance, we find standards in our family life, school, office, social, political and so on. As such, that man is normative animal; it does not mean that the standards must be universal. The question involves in both arguments is focus on the nature of universality or absoluteness. Standards, in a flexible way, have possibility, or can exist without having any nature of universality or absoluteness.

Second conclusion, that there will be no possible standard, seem to a radical skeptic's point of view, because it rejects all possible way infinitely. This conclusion has two loopholes: first loophole is his nature of induction; we best know the problem of induction that is the assumption of a general concept from particular premises. From the premise, that all human efforts failed to provide any universal standard, therefore, no universal standard is possible. Here involves an infinite "logical leap". Second loophole is inducing the problem or refutation of possibility from the available observation, in other words, inducing the problem of possibility (a priori concept) form actuality (a posteriori concept). The concept of possibility (logical possibility) can be best comprehended through laws of deduction, and the concept of actuality through induction. The logical loophole of the conclusion is the inference of deductive (a priori) concept from inductive (a posteriori) ground. Therefore, it would be unreasonable to exclude possibilities from human knowledge.

Being and Possibility

The question of Being is difficult and hard to experience, because the signification of Being appears as an empty notion and empty content, in other words without content. Because, the notion of Being is highly and supreme abstract. Like others philosophical problems the problem of Being and

Possibility has been discussed among philosophers through ages, sometime partially and sometime wholly. However, we did not find any comprehensive outlook on this problem as a united perspective. Possibility has several kinds, but particularly my most important focus is on the logical possibility. Although possibility as general concept will be our concern, but mostly the word "possibility" without any extension, connotes "logical possibility".

What is thinkable is logically possible, but according to real or scientific possibility, what is experienceable is really possible. The real possibility differentiated from logical possibility. For real or scientific possibility, only those things or objects are possible that comes in the realm of experience. This category of possibility never extends the dominion of experience. as per the dominion for logical possibility is concept, as such for real or scientific possibility is things or objects. According to Kant, the real possibility is one which refer to possible things or objects in domain of experience. In addition, for Kant logical possibility is one which free from contraction to its concepts (Alfonso,1942-pp, 35,36).

Being as in general sense is the quality of existence or "Is", and possibility is the condition of "may be". Possibility in philosophy is the idea of some permissible condition within the limited structure, form or framework. In metaphysics possibility upon consider the opposition between necessity and contingency and in logic possibility is the status of proposition, which does not have contradiction in itself. A proposition considers possibly true if it does not contradict itself. A possible or logical possible proposition is one, which either true or will be true. Possibility is also one of the fundament problems of philosophy, especially in logic and metaphysics. Philosophers, logicians and mathematicians introduced several kinds of possibility, but my focus will be on logical possibility as mentioned before, which famously define the proposition, which have no contradiction. For further Simplicity, here define once again that a statement is logically possible (somehow true) if it is free from the fallacy of self-contradiction.

Both concepts are very crucial in the field of philosophy. When we search the meaning of Being in any dictionary, we find that it is quality of existence, and it is also common understanding regarding the meaning Being. It connotes both aspect of existence, subjective existence and objective existence. Objective existence is the existence of objective things or entities, and subjective existence is the existence of imagination, feelings, mental objects

(ideas) and conceptual objects like mathematical objects or facts. In this study, the meaning of Being is much broader sense than common understanding.

Now we address our basic question, what is Being? According to this inquiry, "Being is Possibility". Moreover, "Non-Being is Non-Possible". For further clarification Being "is" Possibility should not be mixed with Being "has" possibility. Being has possibility, somehow takes us towards Aristotelian notion of potentiality. "Being is possibility" is distinct form "Being has possibility" or potentiality. Now we try to comprehend why the notion of Being becomes so problematic through ages, and try to solve these problems with help of new premise (Being is Possibility).

The Parmenides notion of Being that the Being is one, unchangeable and eternal, and the "isness" is the essence and definitional quality of Being, what "is" is Being, non-being cannot be think, speak or utter, so, Being can be think, speak or utter. Now in the philosophy of Parmenides, the notion of the thinkability or conceivability of Being shows the idea of possibility, but his idea of unchangeability and eternity excludes this idea of possibility from his philosophy. Thus, for Parmenides, what is, is eternal and unchangeable, what is, is simple is. Neither it came nor will it go. The conceivability of Being requires change, but in the philosophy of Parmenides there is no room for change. If we accept that the Being is Possibility, then we do not require any option to accept Heraclitus notion of "non-being" and "becoming", because the possibility has in itself the notion of becoming or change.

Here same critical ground for the notion of Heraclitus's Being, non-being and becoming. Non-being is non-possible; therefore, non-being has no possibility to be an anti-thesis of Being. Because there must be a common ground for dialectical unity, but Being and Non-being, have no such common ground to be unified in a single dialectical union. If there is not ground for dialectical union, then there is no possibility for further synthesis of becoming. If we isolate his theory of Being from his idea of non-being and becoming, although it will be very tough to comprehend his complete philosophy, mere for an assumption, his theory on-going Being express the notion of possibility, but his unified philosophy accepted that only "becoming" is real. Moreover, the static condition of all things (Being and Non-being) are mere illusion.

At the same way the problem of one and many related with the idea of change and stationary condition of Being. The question Being is "one or many" is the same question that Being is changeable or unchangeable. Plato tried to manage this question by dividing world into two part: world of idea or world of matter, in short, world of particulars and world of universals, or world of eternal from and world of extinguished objects. This division of from and matter have been criticized through ages in the history of philosophy. But the notion of the possibility of Being has satisfactory ground to resolves the problem between "one and many". Being is Possibility, and possibility is power, activity or force. Being or possibility as a force or power is qualitatively one and quantitatively many. In other words, the countenance of Being or power becomes multiple.

Being as substance also includes the concept "Being as an essence or necessary", and essence is differentia and necessary quality of beings, being that must be, which related with the concept of accidental being, being that may be. According to Aristotle, substance is that what is and must be. "What is" related with his concept of "actual being" and what "must be" with the concept of "potential being" (State,2015-p, 279). The distinction of essence and property is very crucial in philosophy, particularly in Greek philosophy, in western philosophy, generally. Mistakenly, they believed that the essence is the ground of differentia, but the property. Identity belong with property not with essence. For instance, difference between table and chair, one can found the difference between properties of table and chairs. If we count all difference, are nothing but mere properties of objects. So, the concept of essential being is no more satisfactory, in a same way the concept of potentiality. If one accepts, the concept of potentiality must accept the concept of essentiality. What has potentiality, has essential quality in itself. Aristotle concept of potentiality is distinct from the concept of possibility, because Aristotle's concept of potentiality includes the concept of essentiality in it. A thing becomes actual, has the potential before to be actual. Aristotle's notion of actual being and potential being has the problem of essentiality. However, the concept of Possibility does not have any presume essential quality in the Being. Being has no essential quality, therefore, I distinct above early, between "Being is Possibility" and "Being has Possibility". The foremost purpose is to place a line between "Being as essential potentiality

and Being as pure possibility. The concept of essential potentiality makes the concept of Being very narrow and limited.

Hegel distinguished between determinate Being and indeterminate Being, in other words between Being and beings. Hegel define pure Being is indeterminate; without any quality or characteristic. Neither essence nor any other position can determine it; Being is reflectionless, "Being---is immediately in its own self alone." (Hegel, 2010-p,59) According to Hegel, pure "Being---has no diversity within itself nor any with a reference outward." For Hegel Being held purity, homogeneity, indeterminateness, emptiness and immediateness; in simple worlds, Being is equal to nothing. Hegel stated that pure Being is contrast to indeterminate being or being in general. In short, pure Being is indeterminate, characterless, reflectionless and non-qualitative and being in general is determinate and constitutes its quality. Moreover, Not-Being or "nothing" for Hegel is "complete emptiness, absence of all determination and content". Thus, both Being and nothing are same in its own self.

Now my question is, if both are same, how both can have different identity. Moreover, how both could be unified? In its very nature, we cannot find any contradiction, the only contradiction we find is the contradiction of two different words: Being and nothing. However, in very nature of both words by definition there is no contradiction at all. In addition, by rules of logic, same identical things should not be considered two different things or identity, nor same identical things could be unified, only two different identical things could be unified. Therefore, we cannot find any room for his synthesis: unity of Being and Not-being or Nothing, in short, for becoming.

Conclusion

The meaning of Being was the supreme abstraction without any content, empty notion itself. because of this notion, the meaning of Being became very hard and frighten to address. Because the concept contains with in itself many other key philosophical challenging notions. For instance, the notion of change and stationary, one and many, and eternity and non-eternity. In addition, notion like: Being as genus, Being as species, Being as Absolute entity, Being as particular entity, Being as verb "is", or Predicate, Being as a potentiality, actuality or possibility, Being and existence, Being and essence, subjective Being, objective Being. conclusively, the given proposition (Being as a possibility)help to comprehend all these notions.

The Being neither empty nor content less, Being is full of possibility in itself, or its content is possibility. Being as possibility or Being is possibility is indeterminate, active, full and homogeneous, it is ground of all existence. There is no difference between existence and possibility, because all existence is in full of possibility. What exist, we cannot state that it will exist at the same manner eternally, because there is change (possibility). The existence and possibility are combined in a Heraclitan manner of flux, it is and is not at the same time and same respect. Conclusively, possibility is will of Being. In other words, Being is Possibility.

References:

Alfonso, D', Joseph (1942) "Some Metaphysical Implication of the Category of Potentiality" Boston, University Graduate School.

Brentano, Franz, (1975) "On the Several Senses of Being in Aristotle" London, University of California Press.

Descartes, Rane, (1641) "Meditations on First Philosophy", with Selections from the Objection and Replies, Translated, Moriarty, Michael, (2008) UK, Oxford University Press.

Hegel, G.W.F., (1812) "Science of Logic ", Edited and Translated, Giovanni, George. DI, General Editor, Baur, Michael (2010) New York, Cambridge University Press.

Heidegger, Martin. (1926) Trans. Macquarrie, John & Robinson, (1962) Edward," Being and Time" Oxford UK& Cambridge USA, Blackwell.

James Fieser and Bradley, General Editors, Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy "Husserl" "Heidegger", https://iep.utm.edu/heidegge/https://iep.utm.edu/husserl/

Kant, Immanuel. (1781) "Critique of Pure Reason" The Cambridge Edition of the Work of Immanuel Khan, Translated and Edited by Paul Guyer & Allen Wood (1998), U.K.& USA, Cambridge University Press.

Sartre, Jean Paul, (1943), "Being and Nothingness, Translated by Barnes, B. Hazel, (1977, January) 9th Printing, New York, Washington Square Press.

Schacht, Richard (1984) "Classical Modern Philosophers: Descartes to Kant" London and New York, Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Spinoza, Baruch. (1970) "Ethics" Translated, Boyle, Andrew, London, Everyman's Library.

State, W. T. (2015) "A Critical Study of History of Greek Philosophy, Lahore, National Book Foundation.

Stumpf, Samuel, (1971) "Philosophy: History and Problem, The University of Michigan McGraw-Hill.

Weber, Alfred, (2007) History of Philosophy, New Delhi, Vishvabharti Publications.