**Thinking of the ancient Greek philosophers — is the key to creation of modern philosophy as a strict cumulative science**


**1. Everything is relative**

While comprehending the studies of philosophers, who lived before Socrates and Plato, Aristotle comes to the conclusion that they grasped philosophy as the science about reasons and origins that are appropriate in order to explain the whole circle of natural and social phenomena. These are four kinds of opposition, distinguished by Aristotle in “Metaphysics”: “contradictory, opposite, corresponding, privation and possession...” [1, p. 121-168]. It is not by accident that most of his works, such as “Metaphysics”, “Categories”, “Physics” and his works in logic and ethics are built regarding these origins, tightly connected with the operation of “comparison”.

It is amazing that Aristotle managed to determine these initial scientific notions uniquely, to combine them with the experience, to set unique correspondence with each of them and variety of reality objects that are within the definition of these notions.

As it occurred, “privation and possession” are a special case of “corresponding” when one of its corresponding sides degenerates into “privation”. An example can be a relation between “bigger” and “smaller”. In case when “smaller” decreases to zero, “the corresponding” turns into “privation and possession”.


Therefore, we must speak not about four but about three kinds of opposition, which are presented at the Scheme #1, where such notions as “Identical” and “Different” at the opposite sides of the Scheme determine “contradictory” - one of initial kinds of Aristotle's opposition.



Scheme 1. Aristotle's origins of being in our interpretation.

In order to complete this scheme with categories, well-known in ancient times, which reveal cause-and-effect relations, common for natural and social worlds, we gain the universal paradigm of cognition (meta cognition), which brightly reveals the essence of reasonable and mental thinking, their similarity and difference, their natural interrelation. Moreover, each of the following categories represents more common comparative notion.


Likewise we walk up the stairs, we raise from cognition of identical notions to the comprehension of their further relation and as a result to the creation of more complete theoretic models that resemble the harmony and reasonableness of the universe. Comparative notions are similarly useful in the comprehension of natural and social processes,which determines the unity of natural-scientific and humanitarian knowledge.

**

Scheme 2. The universal paradigm of cognition (meta paradigm).

The upper line of the universal paradigm of cognition through such notions as “Corresponding” and “Orthogonal 1 by Pythagoras” allow us to comprehend quantitative diversity of the world, as far as in order to comprehend “bigger” we learned how to take “smaller” as the unit of measurement (statics – metaphysics). Whether the lower line through such notions as “Opposite” and “Orthogonal 2 by Heraclitus” allow us to comprehend natural and social processes (dynamics – dialectics).

Each of comparative notions is a thinking form that reflects order of reality, harmony of one or another structure. Therefore, all comparative notions can be presented in such notions as symmetry and antisymmetry, which complication characterizes gradual ascent of mind.



Scheme 3. The universal paradigm of cognition, presented in symmetrical categories

**2. The trilogy of mind**

The application of notions in upper and lower lines at schemes # 1,2,3 characterizes mental thinking, which implies its two equal kinds: concrete-general (metaphysical) mental thinking and concrete-general (dialectical) mental thinking. As a result the whole process of thinking can be divided into three interrelated logic parts and each part is determined by the primary application of one of these three types of notional means.

* Reasonable (philological) thinking as love to the word – is thinking with the help of classification notions on the basis of formal logic laws, which initial thinking paradigm is such notion as “contrary”. Its sides represent abstract endless difference between A and non-A. Therefore, they stand one from another at a maximum distance in the universal paradigm of cognition.

- Mental concrete-general (metaphysical) thinking as love to the right word – is thinking with classification (reason), quantitative and comparative notions. Its initial thinking paradigm is such notion as “corresponding” that is followed by other comparative notions of upper line and great variety of mathematical abstractions of different complexity.

* Mental concrete-general (dialectical) thinking as love to the wise word – is thinking with the help of classification (reason) and comparative notions, which initial thinking paradigm is such notion as “opposite” . Other notions that follow it are built on its basis.

The first type of thinking reflects qualitative diversity of the world and characterizes descriptive sciences.

The second type is connected with natural knowledge and gives accurate quantitative description of reality.

The third, insufficiently applied type of thinking, is tightly connected with the second and the first. This allows us to comprehend qualitative and structural diversity of the world not only from concrete-scientific but also from dialectical-logic positions and determine the creation of contemporary philosophy as concrete-general theoretical science.

Schemes # 1,2,3, presented above, reveal graphically the trilogy of mind as the unity of reasonable and two forms of mental thinking, their similarity and difference, their natural interrelated combination within the framework of formal logic, which is understood as concrete-general method of cognition.

Each logic is determined by its own origin and as a result by language that sets objective points of view in order to comprehend the reality. Moreover, the reason separates abstract differences of A and non-A without accepting them in the same relation: either A, or non-A. Mind, in contrary, grasps concrete differences in unity, as long as one side of “corresponding” and “opposite” as well as other concrete differences cannot exist without the other side.

As a result we can assume that operation “comparison” is the main operation of thinking. It sets the rise to the whole cognition, while determining the existence of some universal paradigm – the trilogy of mind as a combination of three logic trends, combined with one common idea of comparison.

**3. The philosophy of Pre-Socratics**

The problem of philosophy and other trends of social-humanitarian knowledge is because the notion of “opposition” is now used in wide meaning – as abstract-general notion that includes endless variety of concrete-general meanings. This is the main disadvantage that claims for reasonableness of not only classical dialectics but also social-humanitarian knowledge.

In this relation Aristotle who consolidated with notion of “opposition” only one meaning, as long as he grasped oppositions as “excess” and “deficiency” of one substratum relatively to “intermediate”, occupied the most grounded position. An example can be “bigger” and “smaller” that in relation one to another will be “corresponding” notions, whereas in relation to “intermediate” position they will be “opposites”[2, p.79-86]. A lot of Pre-Socratics understood oppositions in such a way and comprehended this relation with the help of a well-known in ancient times “image of scales”. Moreover, most of these philosophers we know thanks to Aristotle.

Another ancient image – is the image of drawing the bow, gave a visual representation of another opposition – orthogonal disposition [3, p. 86-88]; it reveals interrelation of not just one but two interrelated pairs of opposition (dike and adike).

One of them, a convergent pair (dike) is combined to the ends of the drawing bow. The propagandist of this thinking form in ancient Greece was Heraclitus who suggested in order to comprehend cyclic, i.e. exchange processes, to use such notion as “convergent-divergent”, determined by the harmony of “bow and lira”. Plato exemplifies the words of Heraclitus who says (Plato, The Feast, 187 ab) that “when the single diverges [~feuding], it converges with itself [~getting on] like the harmony of bow and lira” [4, p.199].

But all the attempts directed at the implication of orthogonal disposition in the philosophical knowledge that reflects the energy of natural and social exchanges (rhythms, cycles, fluctuations, waves) turned to be absolutely unclaimed. “They do not comprehend how a thing agrees being at variance with itself; it is atunement which turns back on itself, like that of the bow and lyre” [DK, Fr. 51].

The reasonable thinking of contemporary humanitarians also rejects this abstraction, while showing thereby its disability to become mental. And the result of this is our contemporaries' disability to think over the way the thinking process was proceeding with Ionics philosophers and later with Aristotle.

At the same time, in order to comprehend society, grasped as the process of resources exchange, it is not enough to use such concrete-general notion as “opposite”, as long as not just one but two pairs of opposition (dike and adike), according to Heraclitus, take part in the process of exchange. In common they create more complex notion - “convergent-divergent” that combines two processes into one more complex process (orthogonal), like the “cell” that allows to comprehend all exchange processes and their combination.

If antecedents of Heraclitus and Aristotle applied alternately one origin (dike) or another (adike) in order to comprehend the processes of appearance and destruction, Heraclitus, in contrary, found more complex thinking form, thanks to which he comprehended the world order as the combination of exchanges. “All things are exchanges for fire, and fire for all things, as goods for gold and gold for goods” [DK, Fr.90].

Therefore, wisdom, according to Heraclitus, is “to know everything as the one”, i.e. like cosmic principle, like universal exchange, like harmony of bow and lira. However, the study of Heraclitus was not understood by his contemporaries and by the time of Plato and Aristotle it was completely forgotten.

After 25 centuries we can find Heraclitus wisdom in humanitarian sciences only in the studies of K. Marks and F. Engels who took the exchange of goods as the “cell” of bourgeois society, introduced methods of natural study into the sphere of social sciences. Thereby they managed to make their reasonable thinking rise into a higher mental level that resembles not only logic but also cause-and-effect natural and social relations. In this relation the thinking of K. Marks and F. Engels remains unrivaled scientific-philosophic achievement. Unfortunately, it is impossible to use their dialectical method nowadays, as long as the following generations of philosophers could not lead it to its logic end, to perfection.

**Literature**

1. Aristotle. Works in four volumes. V. 1. Edited by V. Asmus. Moscow, “Mysl”, 1975. - 550 p.
2. Aristotle. Works in four volumes. V. 2. Edited by Z. Mikeladze. Moscow, “Mysl”, 1978. - 688 p.
3. Yuriy Rotenfeld. Non-classic dialectics. - Moscow, “Luch”, 1991. - 184 p.
4. The fragments of early Greek philosophers. Part 1. From epic theocosmogonies to the creation of atomistic. - A. Lebedev. Moscow, “Nauka”, 1989.