**A child in a language environment: ascent from reason to mind and wisdom**

The boundaries of our language define the boundaries

 of the world we have mastered. L. Wittgenstein

**1. Language and thinking. Classification of language means**

Mastering the language, the number of concepts used, as well as the quality of their possession is considered in modern education as the basis for the development of consciousness and the upbringing of children, their knowledge of the world around them with the help of specific sciences.

The only problem is that the boundaries of the language we use, based on classificatory concepts, do not allow us to expand the boundaries of the social world we have mastered. Hence the problem of the discrepancy between the development of the natural sciences, engineering and technology and the humanitarian thinking that governs all this. Therefore, it is necessary to eliminate this gap by teaching new thinking to children from early childhood.

In the process of development of the human community, thinking and language feed and mutually condition each other, forming a single speech-thinking complex. Thinking is a necessary condition for the emergence of language, while language, having arisen and developing, becomes a form of existence and a way of functioning of thinking. In other words, thinking and language are genetically linked.

The question arises, how similar do people who speak different languages ​​think, or how adequate is the thinking of the humanities to the thinking of natural scientists? Often it is linguistic differences that explain the psychological types of different peoples, different social strata, the difference between rational and reasonable thinking. How to bring these people to mutual understanding, how to bring to mutual understanding people who, in essence, speak the same national language, but cannot understand each other.

 To address these issues, consider three groups (types) of concepts identified by R. Carnap.

The first group is the (absolute) classificatory concepts by which we name things, their properties, we designate various ideas. These are the concepts of ordinary colloquial language.

The second group is the (relative) comparative concepts, the concepts with the use of which specific sciences begin. It is heavy and light, long and short, rich and poor, etc.

The third group is quantitative concepts. They appear in science only when, in any of the comparative concepts, “less” is taken as a unit of measurement, which allows one to move on to comprehending “more” with the help of numbers that reveal the relationship between quantities.

This classification of concepts is given by R. Carnap in his book, in which he collects not only the concepts of science, but also the concepts of everyday life into three main groups. According to the scientist, “comparative concepts are more effective for expressing information” [2, pp. 97-99].

I want to note that the quantitative concepts allocated by R. Carnap to a special group, in fact, are not a special group, but are nothing more than comparative concepts. Therefore, we should talk not about three, but about two, fundamentally different groups of concepts: classificatory and comparative, which I divide not into two parts, as R. Carnap did, but into three: quantitative, concrete-scientific and concrete-universal comparative concepts of different kinds.

Attention is drawn to the fundamentally important connection between many specific scientific comparative concepts, such as heavy and light, long and short, rich and poor, as the beginnings of specific sciences, which I call "comparative concepts of the gradation type." And two concrete-universal comparative concepts singled out by Aristotle as the beginnings of scientific philosophy - **“Related”** and **“Opposite”**, which I call “concrete-universal comparative concepts of a gradation type”, aimed at the integration of knowledge.

If we go further, we can reveal a fundamentally important connection between many concepts, such as exchange and use values, potential and kinetic energy, electric and magnetic fields, slavery and feudalism, and many other concepts of specific sciences, which I call "concrete-scientific comparative concepts of orthogonal form. And the concepts of scientific philosophy, the meanings of which we find in the teachings of Pythagoras and Heraclitus, which I call "concrete-general comparative concepts of an orthogonal type."

The split between reason and intelligence, which determined the split between the humanities and natural sciences, is precisely determined by the difference in the use of conceptual means. Classification concepts, i.e. the words of ordinary colloquial language, many of which are ambiguous, are used by representatives of the humanities. Whereas the language (beginnings) of modern natural sciences is a multitude of specific scientific comparative concepts of various types, which, ultimately, not only divided knowledge by subject, but also split culture into two parts: humanitarian and natural science. Moreover, in addition to classification and comparative concepts, including numbers, specific sciences began to use mathematical abstractions.

The difference in approach to the choice of beginnings was successfully reflected in his painting The School of Athens by Raphael. In its center are the figures of Plato and Aristotle. Plato points his finger at the sky, while Aristotle points at the earth. If we follow Plato, who chose classification concepts as the beginning of philosophy, we find ourselves in a labyrinth of rational thinking, which determines the pluralism of opinions. If we follow Aristotle, who chose comparative concepts, we enter the operational space of cumulative scientific philosophy with its dictatorship of truth.

So, in Metaphysics, Aristotle puts forward clearly defined objective "causes and beginnings", which make up the unity of four types of opposition, as he called the concrete-universal comparative concepts of Stagirite: "contradictory", "correlated", "opposite", "deprivation and possession", as well as the first “from where” and the last “where”, which are due to various kinds of emergence and destruction” [1, p. 121-168].

This is the Aristotelian Matrix, and in order to better comprehend it, we divided one of the Aristotelian types of opposition - "contradictory" into two parts - into two completely independent comparative concepts: "Identical": A = A and "Different": A and non-A. Whereas “deprivation and possession” was referred to “correlated” as its special case, when the smaller side acquires a zero value.

Such a redistribution is due to the different functions of the mental means identified by Aristotle. "Contradictory" has to do with speech and the consistent rational thinking associated with it by classificatory concepts. As for the other types of opposition, they determine natural and social connections, the possibility of measuring them, counting, and, ultimately, rational thinking by comparative concepts.

**2. Three stages in the development of the mind: reason, intelligence, wisdom**

It so happened that when choosing the beginnings, the philosophers did not follow Aristotle, who saw the difference between concrete-scientific and concrete-general comparative concepts of a gradational type, but Plato. Therefore, since then, philosophy has gone further and further into the labyrinth of rational thinking, based on many classification concepts of varying degrees of generality. While the types of opposition identified by Aristotle (the Matrix), on the contrary, brought philosophy to the operational space of cumulative philosophical science. At the same time, each of the comparative concepts (be it a concrete-scientific or a concrete-universal concept) gave the same objective points of view for all, which, ultimately, would lead observers not only to an understanding of certain relationships, but also to mutual understanding [4 , S. 140-151].



Scheme 1. Matrix: Aristotelian types of opposition in our arrangement

Continuing the work of the ancient Greek thinkers, we collect the more complex concrete-universal comparative concepts identified by them and combine them into a single system. So, in Pythagoras we find his famous theorem, connecting two gradations at right angles (Pythagoras' **Orthogonal 1**). Whereas in Heraclitus we find the harmony of the bow and lyre (**Orthogonal 2** of Heraclitus), linking two pairs of opposites at an angle of 90 degrees. As a result, we obtain a cumulative series of specific-universal comparative concepts, each of which incorporates a set of specific-scientific comparative concepts of the corresponding type [3, pp. 146-164].



Scheme 2. Natural series of comparative concepts

Thanks to the concept of “orthogonal”, it is possible to comprehend not only all the rhythms of nature, but also various social processes. What is important here is that the division of linguistic means into classification, quantitative, concrete-scientific and concrete-universal comparative concepts of gradation, orthogonal, additional and other types made it possible to demarcate between three fundamentally different stages in the development of the human mind - reason, reason and wisdom. which are explained by linguistic differences.

**Reason** operates with the language of classification concepts. It is connected with the classification of facts and phenomena, with the systematization of diverse knowledge based on the relations of identity and difference as the ultimate abstractions of identification and difference.

**Intelligence** uses not only classificatory, but also specific scientific comparative concepts of gradation, orthogonal and other types, numbers, arithmetic and other mathematical abstractions. It is associated with a concrete scientific understanding of nature and the social world.

**Wisdom** stands above reason and reason due to the fact that in addition to classificatory, concrete-scientific comparative and quantitative concepts, in addition to various mathematical abstractions, it includes in thinking the language of concrete-general comparative concepts.

 Over their centuries-old history, the humanities have not learned to use the language of concrete-scientific and concrete-general comparative concepts, which means that they have not been able to master either Intelligence, much less wisdom - Sophia. We will eliminate this lack of humanitarian thinking by showing the way of ascent from rational thinking to Intelligence and wisdom through the use of comparative concepts [5, p.68].

At the same time, a new approach to the philosophy of education makes it possible to comprehend society not through a multitude of subjective opinions that force people to live in different social worlds and understand society differently. And from the same objective points of view for all, which leads not only to an understanding of social processes, but also to mutual understanding between people.

**3. Conclusion**

As a result, we can conclude that the operation "comparison" and a number of comparative concepts determine the universal paradigm of cognition, moving along which, as along the "ladder of beings", we cognize reality.



Scheme 3. Philosophical "theory of everything"

Like a set of numbers, we build comparative concepts in two parallel rows, and as we get to know reality, we supplement them with new concepts. As if by steps, we rise from the knowledge of the identity of things to the comprehension of their ever more distant relationship, and, therefore, to the creation of more and more complete theoretical models that reflect the unity of the world. Moreover, the upper row of Scheme 3, through the concept of "correlated", makes it possible to comprehend the quantitative diversity of reality, while the lower row, through the concept of "opposite", understood only as an excess and a lack of relative to the intermediate - the processes of self-motion.

In fact, we are talking about a new image of philosophy, which differs from all previous philosophical trends in its objectivity and its cumulative nature (cumulative) due to the use of a new conceptual apparatus - a natural series of comparative concepts aimed at understanding more and more general relations of reality.

On this basis, it is proposed to change the approach to school education. If now it is split according to the subject principle, and each item is placed in small pieces in the heads of children, and knowledge split into subjects is again collected from them. That new approach, on the contrary, will collect knowledge in the head of the child, not only by subject, as is the case today, but also by the interdisciplinary panlogical principle, aimed at understanding the most general relations of reality.

The main thing in the new approach is that philosophy, as “knowledge of the general”, forms a scientifically based holistic picture of the world and with this knowledge comes to a general education school to teach children not only reason and Intelligence, but also wisdom [6].
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