

UDC [340.15: 342. 41] (477)

Serhiy H. Melenko –

*doctor of juridical sciences, full professor,
the chair of the department of European law and comparative law studies,
Yuriy Fedkovych National University of Chernivtsi
(2 Kotsjubynskiy St., Chernivtsi, 58012, Ukraine)
e-mail: s.melenko@chnu.edu.ua*

Dan V. Paraniuk –

*assistant professor, department of foreign languages for humanities,
Yuriy Fedkovych National University of Chernivtsi
(2 Kotsjubynskiy St., Chernivtsi, 58012, Ukraine)
e-mail: paranyukdan@gmail.com*

Anaximander of Miletus: the Axiological Expression of Justice

Феномен справедливості, як аксіологічно-необхідної ознаки буття соціуму, привертав до себе увагу не одного покоління мислителів, які у своїх працях виражали найактуальніші онтологічні прагнення людства. Вкажемо на те, що вираження власних гносеологічних суджень дослідниками, які працювали над зазначеною проблематикою у різні часові проміжки, не завжди співпадало дослівно, але провівши етимологічний аналіз аксіологічного змісту результатів їхньої творчості, можна прийти до висновку з приводу існування чіткої подібності розуміння ними тієї чи іншої проблеми, у тому числі й щодо визначення ідентифікуючих ознак справедливості, як одного із основних елементів буття як соціуму загалом, так й окремого індивіда зокрема.

Ключові слова: Анаксимандр Мілетський, апейрон, справедливість, божественний прояв справедливості, Іммануїл Кант, категоричний імператив, моральний закон, «моральне право».

Феномен справедливости, в качестве аксиологически-необходимого признака бытия социума, привлекал к себе внимание не одного поколения мыслителей, которые в своих трудах выражали самые актуальные онтологические стремления человечества. Укажем на то, что выражение собственных гносеологических суждений исследователями, которые работали над указанной проблематикой в разные временные промежутки, не всегда совпадало дословно, но проведя этимологический анализ аксиологического содержания результатов их творчества, можно прийти к выводу на предмет существования четкого сходства понимания ими проблематики справедливости, в том числе и по определению идентифицирующих признаков, как одного из основных элементов бытия как социума в целом, так и отдельного индивида в частности.

Ключевые слова: Анаксимандр Милетский, апейрон, справедливость, божественное проявление справедливости, Иммануил Кант, категорический императив, нравственный закон, «моральное право».

The phenomenon of justice, as an axiologically indispensable feature of society, has always drawn attention of numerous generations of thinkers, who tried to reveal the most topical ontological needs of humanity in their works. However, in the context of the issue under discussion, it is necessary to determine the direct identifying features of the phenomenon under studies in order to give a definition of the notion of “justice” as an ontological category. In different periods of human existence, its most prominent representatives distinguished a range of features that might be regarded as identifying ones, since they expressed various wants of the society in the most universal and complete way. Among the diversity of the above-mentioned features, they differentiate a particular group that has never lost its importance, which, in its turn, makes it possible to identify the phenomenon of justice in any evolutionary period of social being.

It is worth mentioning that the philosophers, who have been working on the issue under investigation at different times, did not always manage to express their gnoseological judgments properly. Nevertheless, having carried out the etymological analysis of their works, we might claim that there existed certain similarity in their

understanding of different problems. It also concerns determining the identifying features of justice, as one of the principal elements of both social and human being. Consequently, the understanding of the phenomenon of justice, as an axiological category, should begin with the analysis of the scientific heritage of one of the brightest representatives of the Milesian School of Philosophy – Anaximander of Miletus. The philosophical-legal research of his ideological concepts in the works of the thinkers of further generations, who - in the course of their own scientific search - came to the problem of defining justice, as an axiological dimension of social being, is also very important.

Keywords: *Anaximander of Miletus, apeiron, justice, divine manifestation of justice, Immanuel Kant, categorical imperative, moral law, “moral right”.*

Issue. The processes of seeking, defining and investigating justice as an axiological phenomenon of social being were in the center of research of many generations of philosophers, who worked in different fields of cognition of the Universe. Jurisprudence, which derives from the word *justicia* (justice), is not an exception. In the world of science, there exists a rational thought that in order to investigate some phenomenon, it is necessary to find the source of its origin. When studying the phenomenon of justice, scientists aim at achieving certain results, which would have some applied importance. However, they ignore the process of learning this phenomenon at the times, when humanity was just trying to perceive the axiological and ontological nature and essence of justice itself. The article under discussion deals with the very ideas of understanding of justice as a universal-social phenomenon that appeared at the time of formation of Philosophy.

The purpose of the article lies in a complex research of the phenomenon of justice in the views of an ancient Greek philosopher Anaximander of Miletus (one of the founders of Philosophy), as well in the analysis of how these ideas have been indirectly reflected in the works of a prominent German thinker Immanuel Kant.

The Main Body. When studying how Anaximander’s ideas of “apeiron” are extrapolated on the field of social being, we should be very careful with the notion of justice. Anaximander emphasized that due to its perpetual motion, the primary substance (apeiron) permanently singles out the opposites (eons). The latter exist as separate units (beyond apeiron) and acquire certain antagonistic features, which, consequently, start fighting with each other. Because of the above-mentioned process, these opposites improve and return to their primary state within the structure of apeiron [1, p.18]. We suppose that Anaximander pointed at the fact that absolute balance, harmony and justice are impossible if the structure of apeiron is not complete. It should

include all its constituent elements, without any exceptions. In this case, the structural elements of apeiron are in full balance and harmony, thus giving way to the highest category of human being – justice (*justicia*) [11, p.34-43]. Nevertheless, it is hardly possible to reach absolute peace in the Universe, as the all-inclusive apeiron is in a state of permanent, inevitable motion and activeness. In addition, the motion itself, being one of the constituents of apeiron, is mostly regarded as its indispensable ontological feature [16, p.181]. Hence, we might assume that due to its perpetual motion, apeiron is in a constant state of unrest. Consequently, its structure can never be complete. Therefore, it is impossible to reach absolute justice. While extrapolating this hypothesis on the sphere of social being, we might make another assumption: Anaximander believed there existed two types of justice – absolute and ontological. Reaching absolute justice is possible only when apeiron is in a state of its utmost structural completeness, but it may happen exceptionally in a case of absolute peace. It should be emphasized that our previous assumption is very theoretical. In other words, its practical implementation is ontologically impossible even according to Anaximander, who claimed that motion and unrest are indispensable features of apeiron. Thus, we may conclude that absolute justice is a phenomenon, which is hardly ever possible to reach. That is why we will try to approach the issue and its solution from different gnosiological positions. Using philosopher’s maxims concerning the fact, that apeiron permanently singles out its constituents in the process of motion (these structural elements acquiring antagonistic features and constantly opposing each other, thus undergoing qualitative changes and returning back to the structure of the primary substance [1, p.18]), we face two urgent questions that arise when investigating the issue under discussion:

1. Why does the process of confrontation between the opposite elements beyond apeiron bring them to the state, when they are able to return to the composition of the primary substance?

2. If the philosopher conferred the properties of infinity, all-inclusiveness, inviolability, and highest abstraction to apeiron [5, p.8], then how can one explain (with the due regard to the above-mentioned features of apeiron) its ability to single out its constituents? After all, the all-inclusive and all-absorbing apeiron fills all vacant space in the Universe!

As to the first question, we would like to point out that, taking into consideration the indispensable features of apeiron, it is in the state of permanent motion. Consequently, its structure constantly and necessarily singles out the elements (eons), which, beyond apeiron, acquire the predicates of antagonism and start opposing each other. It is widely known that motion is one of the signs of life and vitality. That is why we will try to extrapolate the above-mentioned problem on the field of social being. In fact, motion is not only a sign of life, but also an essential attributive element of any society, which is frequently presented as the object of gnoseological ideology. However, motion – according to Anaximander – may also be treated as a certain ontological category, which makes absolute balance and, consequently, absolute justice practically impossible. Motion is the “ionizing radiation” that singles out eons from the structure of apeiron. The latter structural components, finding themselves beyond the primary substance, acquire certain “freedom”, which, in its turn, performs a negative function, since it provides these components with predicates of antagonism and provokes them to oppose each other. To put it differently, the above-mentioned “freedom” is a negative-provoking category. On the other hand, apeiron acquires certain recessive features beyond motion, the latter helping to reach complete, all-inclusive harmony and balance and, consequently, - absolute justice. Nonetheless, under such conditions, the very category of being would lose all its intrinsic peculiarities. That is, motion is an ontologically essential category for the existence of any society, which makes the all-inclusive and all-absorbing absolute justice practically impossible. Then how can one combine these two mutually exclusive – according to Anaximander – categories? We suppose that Anaximander found the way out of

this dilemma by himself, having claimed that beyond apeiron, its structural components acquire the predicates of antagonism and oppose each other. In this way, they receive new qualitative features, the latter enabling them to return to the structure of the primary substance. In other words, the above-mentioned opposition erases all antagonistic features, thus leading to harmony and justice beyond apeiron. All these processes take place beyond Anaximander’s primary substance. Therefore, we might claim that justice is a constant, universal category, which will necessarily find its way not only within the structure of apeiron, but also beyond it. Taking into account the features of apeiron’s all-inclusiveness and permeability, justice may be presented as a somewhat esoteric category, as it can exist both within the primary substance and beyond it, even within certain spheres, where apeiron is not able to get. Justice may also exist either in the state of theoretically absolute peace (within apeiron) or in the state of perpetual motion (beyond apeiron), which proves that this philosophical category is universal and even esoteric. In social-ontological sphere, justice may make its way both directly and indirectly. Due to this, we might claim that, apart from Anaximander’s justice, there also exists another justice in social and other spheres of being.

As to the second urgent question, it should be noted that numerous researchers of Anaximander’s scientific heritage have interpreted the existence of apeiron within the paradigm of materialism. Relying on the direct empiric antagonistic features, determined by Anaximander (warm and cold, dry and wet, formation of vapor (air), ashes (earth)), this approach is rather good. Suppose that apeiron, as the highest abstract notion without any empiric features, does really exist in the material field. Consequently, its constituents are singled out in the beyond-material field, due to the effect of motion. Here, it would be expedient to remind that the category of justice can exist in both empiric and esoteric dimensions. Combining the features of esoterism, being, justice, and motion, we cannot neglect the doctrine of Thomas Aquinas about the five ways (five arguments that prove the existence of God) from his work “The Summa” [19, p.110-113]. In this work, the philosopher has determined the five factors proving God’s existence. These were:

1. “From motion to the First Engine”;
2. “From the connection of reasons and consequences to the Root Cause”;

3. “From coincidence to the Inevitable Essence”;
4. “From world’s imperfection to Absolute Perfection”;
5. “From expediency in the world to the Creator of the World”.

Thomas Aquinas proclaimed motion as the first proof of God’s existence. He emphasized that motion is essential for the nature. Nothing can move on its own, there should be external source of action. The endless search for the source of previous actions makes no sense. That is why there should exist “something”, which is the primary source of any motion. This “something” cannot move by itself. This is God – an “immovable mover” [19, p.112]. In other words, accepting Thomas Aquinas’ theory on the divine nature of motion, we might assume that God (through motion) is not only the source of being, but also the source of justice – due to overcoming injustice. Really, would we ever be able to determine the features of such a complicated ontological phenomenon as “justice”, without understanding extremely diverse, but at same time negative manifestations of “injustice”? Would it be possible to understand the phenomenon of justice without singling out the eons from the structure of apeiron, without their acquiring the predicates of antagonism, as well as their balancing opposition to each other? Nevertheless, all these processes that make up for better understanding of such a philosophical-ontological phenomenon as “injustice”, are possible only due to motion and, consequently, to God. Is it not “redemption” and further balance of apeiron constituents (eons), which occur because of motion, stipulating the cognition of the highest philosophical-legal category – “justice” (justicia)? After all, to understand the essence of the notion of “justice”, it is necessary to distinguish a certain object with a relevant set of axiological constituents, which will allow making a comparison. It is hardly possible to perceive and to describe the empiric essence of warmth without experiencing cold; it is impossible to characterize the properties of light not knowing what it is like to live without it; saturation is impossible without hunger, well-being – without poverty, etc. What is more, Creator himself is frequently revealed in comparison with his antipode.

In the XVIII-th century, having carried out a profound logical analysis of Thomas Aquinas’ proofs of God’s existence, Immanuel Kant, in his work “The Critique of Pure Reason”, has pointed out that there were only three ways of proving the existence of God, according to the speculative

reasons. These were physical-theological, cosmological, and ontological ways. There exist no other ways and cannot exist any [18, p.511]. Further on, in the same work, Kant proved the improbability of ontological [18, p.512-519], cosmological [18, p.520-528] and physical-theological [18, p.532-539] proofs of God’s existence. Justifying his own vision of the issue of God’s existence, as well as taking into consideration the five reasons of Thomas Aquinas, Kant claimed that all the rational proofs of Creator’s being were insignificant. They did not prove the fact of God’s existence, but only reflected the craving of the mind to perceive this phenomenon. In this case, the mind functions in compliance with the laws of social and individual being, thus covering the sphere of the logics of God’s existence with the sphere of the logics of social being. The causal interaction is just a result of individual’s terrestrial being. In case he/she gets to Heavens (to other, celestial spheres of being), the model of the causal relationship has nothing to do with the factor of the root cause. As it turned out later on, the proofs of God’s existence by Thomas Aquinas mostly testify that the mind develops according to certain laws that are distinctly seen in each of philosopher’s five ways. However, within the issue under studies, there arise the following essential questions: what is the source of the above-mentioned laws and how do the higher ideas, like those of Creator, appear? Unfortunately, no human being is capable of answering these questions since his/her mind, within the field of understanding the truth, is considerably limited by the paradigm of his/her acquired experience. Besides, there also exist certain fields of cognition, where human mind is unable to get. Kant referred to these spheres, unreachable for human mind, as “matters in themselves”. They have some impact upon an individual, remaining, however, rationally inexplicable and ontologically unreachable. Relying on the philosophical nature of the above maxims, Kant came to understand that the proofs of God’s existence lie beyond a rational “horizon”, whereby perception of the Higher Essence can be achieved only by means of belief. Owing to the latter statement, Kant has completely annihilated Thomas Aquinas’ proofs of God’s existence, having transferred the issue beyond the rational boundaries and having claimed that he had to restrict knowledge in order to make some space for belief (Ich musste also das Wissen aufheben, um zum Glauben Platz zu bekommen) [18, s.37]. Kant’s conclusions have

practically destroyed the entire system of Thomas Aquinas' proofs of God's being. However, in his another prominent work "The Critique of Practical Reason", Kant developed and justified his own system of proofs, which has outlived all others till the present day. This proof is referred to as "moral" or "anthropological". The scientist claimed that all people have a sense of morality, which he called a "categorical imperative". The thinker has focused his attention on the fact that sense of morality does not always motivate an individual to perform actions that might bring him/her some direct (indirect) ontological terrestrial bonus. Hence, somewhere beyond the material world, there ought to be a certain motivation, which stipulates everyone to moral behavior. In this way, an individual gets to the spheres of "immortality", Highest Court and God, the latter being the highest essence of justice and morality, as well as awarding people for the good and punishing them for the evil [17, p.166-168]. It is also worth mentioning that Bible contains an indirect "clue" to the existence of Kant's imperative. It runs as follows: when the Pagans, who have no laws, commit naturally legal actions, they show that the matter of law is in their hearts, which is proved by their conscientiousness and pure thoughts, accusing and justifying each other in turns (Rome.: 2:14-15) [2, p.1090].

Analyzing logical essence of Kant's maxims, we might assume that moral imperative is, actually, a moral law, that is a part of God in every individual. If there exist "**moral laws**", then there should also exist a much broader philosophical-legal notion of "**moral right**". Here immediately arises a very logical question: what is the relationship between moral law and moral right? Taking into account the postulates of the General Theory of Law that moral right is a much broader term than moral law [7, p.9-27], as well as that moral law (categorical imperative) is a considerable constituent of every individual, it would be possible to conclude that moral right is an expression of God himself. To put it differently, it is a manifestation of the highest, all-inclusive, celestial justice. Such assumption may be justified by the fact that moral law, according to Kant, is a part of God in every individual's soul. Consequently, if there is "a part", there should also be "a whole". Hence, if moral law is a part of God, moral right (which is an outgoing phenomenon for moral law) is God himself. In other words, Creator is the highest axiological expression of justice.

Kant stated that only two things are able to fill a soul with new, strong surprise and awe the more often we think of them – a starlit sky above me and a moral law inside of me [17, p.205]. This quotation lets us observe a direct comparative analysis of macro-cosmos (a starlit sky) and micro-cosmos (the inner world of a human being). The philosopher drew a direct analogy between them, pointing at their similarity in such fields as non-cognition, infinity, grandeur and, no matter how strange it may seem, temporal constancy. He indirectly continued the doctrines of Democritus and Socrates – "learn yourself". In this way, he came to discover the phenomenon of categorical imperative. Learning a human being and his/her inner world has led Kant to a discovery of the factor of God's existence, its all-penetrating essence and nature, thus inventing the sixth, undeniable and most constant proof of God's being [4, p.11-27]. Democritus and Socrates called individuals for self-cognition. They subconsciously showed the way to Creator or, in other words, to the truth and the highest expression of justice. It should be emphasized that the above-mentioned processes were rather popular in the ancient times, when, according to Bible, the ideological postulates of Judaism were formed. Later, Judaism laid the fundamentals for the development of Christian world perception. It is expedient to note, in this respect, that human essence often possesses a tendency for dominance of his/her intellectual and psychological powers over his/her sacral, divine nature. We suppose this phenomenon to be a direct proof of God's desire (after he gave people soul, mind and ability to think) to create someone, similar to himself. However, eventually, the above factors have caused the commitment of a primordial sin instead of getting closer to Creator. Sometimes it seems that humans' ability to choose their mode of behavior, no matter what it might be, has played a fatal role. All divine and immortal creatures, higher than humans, were also given this quality and did not always use it for the good. The immortal angel Danica, who rebelled against his Creator out of mere ambition and was turned into Woland, is a vivid example. However, even this story proves that God's will is expressed everywhere and in everything. Letting a human being fall from his grace, Creator left him/her an opportunity to get back. With this purpose, he granted all people's souls with kind of a fuse – a categorical imperative. The latter served as a means of transmitting moral laws and Holy Script from God

to humans through the prophets. In this way, God coordinated individuals' activities with his will. What is more, Creator did not grant his angels with such an opportunity.

Conclusions. Heraclitus used to emphasize the divine origin of law, Socrates found some features of morality in it, whereas Kant (by means of morality), in the process of search for the sources of moral behavior, came to discover categorical imperative (moral law). In other words, morality being the phenomenon that helped Kant find God, he returned to the maxims of Heraclitus – the circle closed.

However, let us get back to the sources of the above-mentioned “circle”. Extrapolating the notions of moral law and moral right on the sphere of Anaximander's “arche”, we may see a distinct interconnection between Kant's and Anaximander's doctrines. The analysis of the nature of both “apeiron” and “categorical imperative” shows similarity between the two notions. Eons (particles) that come out of the structure of apeiron due to motion, may be compared to categorical imperative (a part of God). After all, eons are constituents of apeiron, while categorical imperative in each individual's soul is nothing but a part of God. Eons, beyond the structure of apeiron, acquire antagonistic features in the way some individuals feel dislike or hostility to each other, even having a part of God in their souls. Being beyond apeiron, eons gradually acquire harmony and balance and thus get ready for returning to apeiron structure. The same happens to a human being. Throughout his life, he faces the processes of socialization and revaluation of values.

He can even drastically change his attitude towards the surrounding world and towards other individuals or society. Thus, relying upon our own assumptions, we might claim that Anaximander's apeiron is a prototype of God. Milesian philosopher realized it subconsciously and, applying the philosophical ideas of his epoch, described the phenomenon in the best possible way, as well as made it the root cause of being. Kant has actually proved Anaximander's hypothesis. His concept of categorical imperative - which is practically a part of God that returns to Creator after individual's death in a new, modified form – looks very similar to the theory of Anaximander's eons that return to the structure of apeiron. Eons, like individuals, often express opposite views. Nevertheless, life and society make them acquire completely new features by the end of their existence. At the same time, categorical imperative shows every individual a proper, divine way that may (through redemption) take him/her to the highest form of being – absolute justice and God.

The life itself is a direct sign of motion. Consequently, it is the cause of violation of the Universal Symmetry. Hence, it is the source of injustice. On the other hand, this symmetry gradually recovers, acquires new forms and improves itself throughout certain time due to motion and life. It acquires the predicates of all-inclusiveness and legal completeness, thus becoming a divine phenomenon.

References:

1. V. H. Anishkin, *Great Thinkers: History of Philosophy and Its Basic Trends* / V. H. Anishkin. – Rostov-on-Don : Phenix, 2007. – 333 p.
2. Bible. – Warsaw : Under Edition of B. Hetze, 1939. – 1340 p.
3. Robert S. Brembo, *Ancient Greek Philosophers* / Translation from English by L. A. Ihorevskyi / Robert S. Brembo. – Moscow : ZAO “Tsentrpoligraph”, 2010. – 345 p.
4. M. A. Bulgakov, *Master and Margaret* / M. A. Bulgakov. – Moscow : Astrel: ACT, 2010. – 571 p.
5. M. Wundt, *Greek Ideology* / M. Wundt; Translation from German under Edition of M. N. Schwartz. – Moscow : Publishing House “LIBROCOM”, 2010. – 170 p.
6. O. A. Donskikh, *Ancient Philosophy: Mythology in the Mirror of Reflection* / O. A. Donskikh, A. N. Kochergin. – Moscow : KRASAND, 2010. – 280 p.
7. M. V. Kostytskyi, *The Genesis of Dialectical Interrelations between Law and Legality* / M. V. Kostytskyi // *Philosophical and Methodological Issues of Law*. – Kyiv, 2016. – Pp. 9-27.

8. M. Koshkarian, *From the History of Philosophy. Ancient Philosophy : Lectures* / M. Koshkarian. – Moscow : Izdatelstvo Humanitarnoy Literatury, 2009. – Part 1 – 240 p.
9. S. Ya. Lurie, *The Surveys on the History of Ancient Science* / S. Ya. Lurie. – Moscow – Leningrad, 1947. – 617 p.
10. S. A. Maltseva, *Western Philosophy from Ancient Times until Present Day. Antiquity and Middle Ages, 1-2* / S. A. Maltseva, D. Antiseri, J. Reale. – St. Petersburg : Pnevma, 2008. – 704 p.
11. S. H. Melenko, *The Ancient Greek Sources of Ukrainian Philosophy and Law : monograph* / S. H. Melenko. – Chernivtsi : Technodruk, 2013. – 432 p.
12. B. Russell, *The History of Western Philosophy and Its Connection with Political and Social Conditions from Ancient Times till Today : in three books* / B. Russell; 7-th Edition, stereotypical. – Moscow : Akademicheskiiy Proekt, 2009. – 1008 p.
13. J. Rolls *The Theory of Justice* / J. Rolls Translation and Scientific Edition : Tselishchev V. V. / J. Rolls. – Novosibirsk : Novosibirsk University, 1995. – 535 p.
14. S. N. Trubetskoy, *Metaphysics in Ancient Greece* / S. N. Trubetskoy. – Moscow : Mysl, 2010. – 589 p.
15. K. Vorländer, *The History of Philosophy. Middle Ages* / Karl Vorländer; Translation from German. – Moscow : LIBROCOM, 2011. – 280 p.
16. A. N. Chanyshv, *Philosophy of the Ancient World : University textbook* / A. N. Chanyshv. – Moscow : Vysshaya Shkola, 1999. – 703 p.
17. Immanuel Kant, *Kritik der praktischen Vernunft* / Kant Immanuel. – Leipzig, 1922. – 220 s.
18. Immanuel Kant, *Kritik der reinen Vernunft* / Kant Immanuel. – Leipzig, 1919. – 864 s.
19. Santo Tomas de Aquino. *Suma de Teologia* / de Aquino Tomas Santo – P. I. – Madrid : BIBLIOTECA DE AUTORES CRISTIANOS, 2001. – 992 p.