

USC 130.1

REFLECTION AS AN UNCONDITIONED CONDITION OF PHILOSOPHIZING

Rostislav Yakuts

*Ivan Franko National Universiti of Lviv,
Universytetska Str., 1, Lviv, 79000, Ukraine,
e-mail: rostwirt@gmail.com*

A reflection as a process which is apprehended by thinking together with philosophizing, as the act of life, is analysed in this article. The reflection is represented as a special subject, which is self-conditioned and which is apprehended in a non-linear kind of thinking. A condition is represented as an apriori principle of reflection, which is characterized not only being in modus without condition, but also reflection is no determined, it has discrete topology and chronology. While constituting the unconditioned, the reflection also constitutes the unthinking not only as the axiomatic principle but also as horizon of explication of the act of thinking, which coincides with existence.

Keywords: reflection, unconditioned condition, discrete, continuity, transcendental, philosophizing, not linear thinking.

One of the possible issues that arise when reading the title of the article relate to the choice argument of “philosophizing” instead of “philosophy”. Does the author has in mind is selecting a period in the title? To come to that “something” that mean to move from several methodological preliminary provisions. Doing philosophizing subject of metaphysical inquiry coupled with the request falls under the field condition and subject. For “something” is given together with his condition. In turn, the metaphysics inherent to limit the request for “something” in this case, the conditions at the same time is a request for unconditional terms. The condition of “something” is taken as a priori imposes unconditional. Therefore unconditional takes endless fragmentation conditions. In the grip of mental relation between a subject and an absolute prerequisite in concreto assigned a discrete point in time, the distinction between same subject, his unconditional terms and conditions of this distinction is in abstractio, and therefore this distinction, to use Kant’s terms, is an analytical and unproductive. Request a condition already implies a given condition and it is given within the status request unconditional. We call such an interpretation of absolute transcendental in the Kantian sense of the term, because the transcendental interpretation given conditional can detect absolute a priori or, equivalently, granted with the condition. Status “givens with” does not equate to a logical identity. Transcendental interpretation unconditional only says that a given condition is absolute; there can be no “meta condition” for a number of conditions. Because of the transcendental position of “reflection” brought under the predicate “absolute terms” and such supply is synthetic. Thus, the term “philosophizing” includes “reflection” as synthetically combined with the predicate “absolute terms”. However, “absolute condition” can

be interpreted metaphysically, and that these interpretations we'll keep continue. The essence of the metaphysical interpretation is to consider the same subject as maximum possible terms, which are an absolute match the subject with his condition. Metaphysical interpretation puts the emphasis not on the absolute *a priori* givens, and the moment matching items from their condition and the specifics of the subject, because not every subject in itself imposes a coincidence. Thus, our basic question can be formulated as follows: can and how can philosophizing synthetically impose their own reflection as an absolute condition? Note also that the interpretation of transcendental absolute pinned to the question: how to deduce of philosophizing analytically laid reflection given *a priori*? The answer to the last question would have to include the entry "reflection" in the logical volume "philosophizing". However, agree with I. Kant that the analytical response unproductive for learning. Therefore, avoiding abstract analytics focuses on the first question, which does not allow entry of "reflection" in the logical volume "philosophizing" or such entry is currently only problematic.

As already mentioned, the term "philosophizing" is not accidental is already included in the very title of the article. Its presence is a specific reason. The fact that the term "philosophizing" expresses procedural thinking, action, movement of thought that actually weaves it into the associative field of "life". Therefore philosophizing already imposes life, but life in the physiological sense of the word, and the metaphysical. Philosophizing, if it happens, it happens in the wake of marginal effort tensions of life. It is appropriate to mention here the metaphorical expression of Heraclitus the Dark: "The name of the bow – life, and his case – death" [6, p. 65]. (If the translation can not play the original game of words: βίος Greek means life, and onions, depending on which vowel stressed). This is a strength as an attribute of life, because without stretched like a bow string does not have a bow and a life without tension is not life. Such tensions of life called existentialists, phenomenologist – the discovery of the phenomenon, the Christian mystics were talking about the ineffable mystery of constant act of creation. Attribute this feature is its ease tensions. That is, one can not pledge me philosophies, or one day decide to think or reflect. Just can not compel myself to understand something, to love or fall out of love. No poet, no artist but unable to pledge ourselves to do, the more work according to the schedule, work plan or five years. Exactly the same is not possible to predict the time and place of philosophizing or creation. Thus, it is impossible to determine the conditions of creation, love of thinking. Nothing in this world is not conducive to thinking, endurance form of logos, rather the opposite: if you want you can find many reasons for not thinking, not understanding, not compliance. And, surprise, all such reasons can be brought under logical argument. But philosophizing does not provide a logical argument, a causal chain of strict sequences. Therefore philosophizing (and life) is shrouded in mystery, the mystery of its capabilities. And this mystery is of particular specific subject of philosophy, which Kant said as "unthinkness of some kind". However, we should not fall to the other extreme, if we can not pinpoint philosophizing, it does not mean that there is philosophizing from scratch. Willy-nilly, you remember the good old Latin maxim: *ex nigilo nihil fit*. However, again, following the philosophizing of something is not necessary and logical, and therefore – is unpredictable. Therefore, philosophizing, going forward of causal nets, not its subject, or equivalently, philosophizing holds many items. The point of repulsion philosophical thought can be anything: how high and miser as elitist and mediocre. Philosophical thought is not reduced to its subject or logical content. This philosophical thinking is not a reflection on empirical or psychological sense; it implies the existence of some of its *a priori*. Moreover, this

is not possible a priori to think linearly, that should make efforts to abstracted from the usual linear course of thinking. In our case, if given a priori to think linearly, it is inevitable illusion allegedly given a priori there is no thinking mind as a finished result, product or structure, as a gift given to us at birth. In a similar illusion often catch readers "Thoughts of a first philosophy" R. Descartes when making a conclusion about the existence of "innate ideas" as something finished, given to us at birth. Illusion is natural, because strain own thinking and work out for yourself experiment Descartes much harder than pathetically criticize this mysterious philosopher by the so-called "innate ideas". But the Descartes gives the reader a hint of what "innate ideas" not thinking ahead, "I" at the time. So the modus of non going forward in time reveals a fundamental feature of mental time – discrete. Consider these snippets of text "Thoughts of a first philosophy", "should acknowledge that if I minded thing and wear a certain idea of God, that would be the reason that pre-defines me, it must also be a thinking thing that has the idea of all the perfections that I attribute to God" [4, p. 41]. "I am speaking not only for the reason that once bore me, but mostly about the one that saves me now" [4, p. 42]. "All the power of my proof is in the fact that I acknowledge my existence as unthinkable as I am by nature, and it is laid out in me the idea of God, if God does not exist so truth – the same God, whose idea of me living, God – holds all those perfections which I did not able to understand, but which I can definitely touch the thought, God, that has no flaws" [4, p. 43]. Thus, the modus of non going forward in time means that, for example, the idea of God we can not think linearly. God creates me, but as a work that is ahead of me in no time. No wonder we tend to attribute due attention to accidental key words of Descartes, "is", "now that", "in the moment".

The same applies to "Critique of Pure Reason" Immanuel Kant – one of the most enigmatic works in the history of European philosophy. Such a mystery when it seemed like purity and transparency, actually caused the already mentioned verticality of thinking, or, as he called himself I. Kant, transcendentality. Given a priori conceived only as transcendental reflection, this unusual and alien to the average mind. Transcendentality indicates the ability of the mind abstracted from the intentional object and go noematic-noesistic horizontal, change the angle of contemplation to include it yourself. This site is different philosophical thinking from psychological thought processes. Thus, reflection provides a distraction from the immediate subject change givens and look at the very thought. Yes, you can think of anything, but this thought is not philosophizing. Philosophical thought is born by the Logos, the apogee supernatural force maximize presence, that is not the thought which might accidentally fly into the head and even before in the final, finished form. Actually for the finished product, complete form requires efforts soul, which is under the law of the Logos. Indeed, the very existence of the law, does not mean its observance. Remember the famous saying of Heraclitus the Dark, "a lot of knowledge does not teach wisdom". Know that say steal – to steal and sin – different things that are not related to each other according to the law of causality. In turn, the enforcement of the law can not be done mechanically, automatically. Each with each action making every move we make efforts to sustain the form, the form of the Logos or the law. Even on an ordinary household level person understands that, for example, draw a straight line is much harder than to curve. Or order at home – not mechanical, automatic, by itself it is natural. On the contrary, there are many factors that contribute to the disorder. Order – is an effort, and effort to do something through. There is no "quasi harmony" because quasi harmony – further confusion. Half wash the floor – its dirtier floor. Thus, teleology efforts are not in the effort, and by the end of the Logos. Unfinished is devoid of form, so devoid of meaning, a

quasi-existence. A striking example of such quasi-existence can serve the famous “sturgeon second fresh” M. Bulhakov from the novel “Master and Margarita”. It turns out the second freshness, as there is no third. However, what is particularly interesting in the minds of millions of people’s “freshness” exists. And in order to get rid of the illusion of the existence of “second freshness” as the effort required to complete the operation’s thinking through. Illusion and (automatically or miraculously) itself does not disappears. Reprobate mind keeps it as a dream, and hold, creates mechanisms for maintaining himself in a dream or illusion. As the illusion of separation is always painful, the probability liberation from delusion is very small. The same is the small number of philosophers – people who is able to work out. Philosophy begins with going beyond the illusion, and such withdrawal involves courage and cruelty. It pardon illusion – it means more to be her slave. Reveal is an illusion – then start thinking differently, in their own way, not like others. Rene Descartes once aptly said that thinking can reach the truth, even based on false premises, if strictly and consistently adhere to the rules of the method. Lost in the woods – go one way and not depart from it once already decided to go. Sooner or later you get out of the forest. Then stroll around someone who does not adhere to any logos possible way. Yes, “Meditations of the method...” read: “My second rule was to remain so rigid and resolute in my actions as I was capable, and with less regularity follow even most doubtful idea if I took them for quite correct. In this I’m like that lost in the forest: they should not spin or wander from side to side not, moreover, remain in one place, and should go as flat as possible in one direction without changing direction through worthless excuse though is beginning to take their chance precisely this direction” [3, p. 264]. Thus, the philosopher – not the one who can not get lost, but he who can find their way and follow the logos of the way. And its philosophy is the same as the way in which the duration of the essence, not passingness.

Thus, philosophizing already provides philosopher, not some abstract and the concrete, here and now. Efforts reflection – a specific individual’s efforts, it may not be collective and formalized. Upon reflection, re-created world. Terms implement reflection does not exist if we admit the existence of the world freely individual. Thinking the same to the reality in which I is our freedom. Recall the words of F. Shelling in “The system of transcendental idealism”: “I am pure act, pure act, in which knowledge should not be entirely objective – namely that it is the principle of all knowledge... Of the knowledge must be absolutely freely, just because everything else is not free knowledge...” [10, p. 257].

For Rene Descartes as a priori point is God, transcendental entity that creating ego, not ahead of it at the time. In the “Critique of Pure Reason” Immanuel Kant find similar nodal point: “first pure reasons knowledge on which to base all further use of reason, and which, however, it does not depend on any conditions sensual perception – a basic principle of the initially synthetic unity of apperception” [5, p. 209].

Leaving the position of a priori since it is evident that the condition coincides with the act of reflection, the very act of reflection. Time of reflection – the eternal present, this follows the conclusion that reflection – non-linear process. And taking into account the nonlinearity of reflection and extrapolating this nonlinearity on the logic of cause-effect relationships, it becomes clear a priori certainty as point’s continual process of philosophizing. A priori, thus not something that exists philosophizing, and that is when philosophizing when thinking back to her. George Hegel in “Science of Logic” aptly notes: “It is very important to recognize the opinion... that moving forward is returning back to basics, to the original spirit and truth, which depends on how

where to start and what really generates the top. – Yes, consciousness is on its way to direct where it starts, driven back to absolute knowledge as to his inner truth” [1, p. 127–128]. So said motion back – a metaphor for the return of thought to himself. That time paradox philosopher may be someone who is a philosopher. Similarly – a moral man may be the man who has a moral, and not only that intends, desires, plans to be so tomorrow. Or like someone who already loves, not the one who loved today or tomorrow will love. Today may not be a factor today or tomorrow. Immoral yesterday’s achievements to explain the current state of affairs, which by the way can often be heard in the political propaganda when bad life today due to bad government yesterday. The common denominator of these “explanations” is itself an exception since “now”. And if something is not now, it is not at all. If you are immoral, then yesterday’s morality does not make you moral now and will do tomorrow. There is no automatism because morality is equally as there is no automatism of thought. The only way the existence of morality, thought, reflection – is “every again”. It is appropriate to recall the famous phrase of Blasé Pascal: “Jesus endure torment by the end of the world. All this time you should not sleep” [8, p. 331]. There can be no moral adequacy, sufficiency of thinking. Unable to think ahead, thinking always thinks every time anew. That’s how we come to some kind of paradoxes, which can be briefly expressed as follows: discrete is continual. Aporia not be solving if taken to its Organon formal logic, discrete because there contradictories towards continual. However, philosophical reflection goes beyond what is permitted and formal logic is a specific form of expression meaning – Aporia. Incidentally, the famous author of aporias Zeno of Elea resorted to aporia precisely in order to bring the reader to the fact that the movement does not exist, that being – immutable, indivisible. And if so, then you really being characterized in that it just is. And there is permanently. However, it is not obvious. Only the thought of being reveals itself and only thinking being can comprehend. But thinking is not something granted. Thinking coincides with the supernatural, metaphysical force, has in its moment of heroism, or in the words of Giordano Bruno – heroic enthusiasm. In thinking life is not a life to thinking and after thinking and thinking if there is, it is being which is conceived. Discretion is just starting point “is”, “is”, “here”. It is no accident “Being and Time” Martin Heidegger we find just existential being, already-being- in. Think of life we can not abstract categories that distract us from our own that’s already here. Therefore reflection related to their non avoiding “for” his “here”. Since the discrete time points beyond itself to a chronological, that can not pass, exactly the same can not be measured and elevated to a scientific study, but only intuitively accepted, it is in itself imposes duration. Within the discrete reflection is relevant, that lasts a duration matches the duration of the mindset that asking questions about his ability comes to unconditional or that may be caused. Constituent unconditional, reflecting both constitutes unthinkable that can not be explained. And if so, how aptly says Immanuel Kant, a non intelligibleness can only accept. What does take non intelligibleness? Do not try to reduce it to some clear circuit and thereby simplify the picture of the world, but rather to keep and maintain the horizon of reflection, which is not ahead at the time the act of reflection. Non intelligibleness is non intelligibleness. Reflection is given, together with their horizon of thinking has put himself in the impossible. But what if the same becomes void by: absolute reflection as a condition of their deployment, a concentrated stress duration, which is also called philosophizing. This existential tension philosophical thinking is different from other mental acts. So thinking philosopher has a unique specificity, which has, say math thinking. Recall interesting phrase George Hegel: “Who thinks abstractly? – Ignorant people not enlightened. In polite society does not think abstractly because it’s too simple, too ignoble (ignoble not in the

sense of belonging to the lower layer, and not through the vain desire to lift up the nose before then do not know how to do, but because of inner emptiness this session” [2, p. 41–42]. Abstract thinking, according to Hegel, is a sign of amateurish thinking if the abstraction does not reach the concrete. So and philosophizing – not flight in abstract worlds philosophy if there is not a thread becomes pathetic trivial expressions involved in specific things, because concrete – abstract truth. Existential experience the fullness of time – what could be more specific for careful and intense soul of the philosopher? That’s why Martin Heidegger parable about the nature of abstract non existential onto-theological categories which are unsuitable for real philosophizing at all. Be present – to take place “worlds inward present”, not only to pass his “here” is not retiring after “is”. Presence understands, and understanding is the presence in advance, because this is her modus be in the world. Thus, Heidegger in “Being and Time” writes: “In the presence of pre-why understanding – in the mode of sending himself – is in-kinds-what it is ahead of, their existing permits to meet. In-why self-understanding as sending in-kinds-which allowing meet their existing existential way be-cause there is a phenomenon of the world” [9, p. 86]. Existential intelligence “presence” – topos combination of ontology and phenomenology. Non determinativeness presence exactly the same as non determinativeness reflection – metaphysical horizon of every possible philosophizing. Therefore it is difficult to disagree with him genius georgian philosopher of the twentieth century. Merab Mamardashvili “every true philosophy is metaphysics and metaphysics only. The old, traditional sense of the word” [7; c. 815].

Author’s translation of the article

LIST OF USED LITERATURE

1. Гегель Г. Наука логики. М., Мысль, 1970. Т.1.
2. Гегель Г. Кто мыслит абстрактно? // Знание – сила, 1973. №10. С. 41–42.
3. Декарт Р. Рассуждение о методе, чтобы верно направлять свой разум и отыскивать истину в науках // Соч. в 2 т. М.: Мысль, 1989. Т. 1.
4. Декарт Р. Размышления о первой философии, в коих доказывается существование Бога и различие между человеческой душой и телом // Соч. в 2 т. М.: Мысль, 1994. Т.2.
5. Кант И. Критика чистого разума: в 2 ч. Ч. 1 // Сочинения на немецком и русском языках. М.: Наука, 2001–2006. Т. 2.
6. Кессиди Ф. Геракліт. М.: Мысль, 1982.
7. Мамардашвили М. Картезианские размышления // Философские чтения. СПб.: Азбука-классика, 2002.
8. Паскаль Б. М.: Изд-во имени Сабашниковых, 1995.
9. Хайдеггер М. Бытие и время. СПб.: Наука, 2002.
10. Шеллинг Ф. Система трансцендентального идеализма. Соч. в 2 т. М.: Мысль, 1987. Т.1.

An article received by the Editorial Board 3.06.2013

Accepted for publication 24.06.2013