Is 'Paradox' a Paradox?

A Heracletean Inquiry of the Logical Reasonability of the Foundations of Aristotelean (Binary) Logic and Duality in relationship with Non-Duality and the Logos

Presented by

Abdelrahman Mustafa[*]

(*) باحث ماجستير في المركز الهيللنستي بمكتبة الإسكندرية

ABSTRACT

The idea of 'paradox' first emerged with the Eleatic philosopher Zeno of Elea. In Zeno's very famous paradox of Achilles and the Tortoise he was following in the steps of his master the philosopher Parmenides, founder of the Eleatic school, to support Parmenides' doctrine which suggests that 'contrary to the evidence of one's senses, the belief in plurality and change is mistaken, and in particular that motion is nothing but an illusion.' This new method of reasoning allowed for the existence of paradox; an unexplained or unexplainable phenomenon, something which never existed in previous times. The notion of paradoxicality caused an unprecedented revolution in thought, for -as Zeno himself claims- it lead to the birth of the art of dialectic. Even though this dialectical method and binary logic -which was later adopted by Aristotle- became a widespread standard in consequent philosophical methodology, nonetheless when reviewing it through a skeptic, investigative lens we find it lacks firm logical foundations, and recently many researchers and academics began realizing this fact, even though Aristotlean logic remained prominent throughout history for almost 2000 years.

Aristotlean logic allows for paradoxicality because it is binary and dualistic, that is; it views different ontological categories of being as irreconcilable, as exclusive pairs or opposites (such as: good and evil, night and day, life and death) while not really taking into consideration that they've emerged from one source, or one Absolute Truth, but rather viewing them as contradictory polar opposites, or thesis and antithesis, with no possibility of coming into reconciliation or harmonious accord, as though they were in conflict with each other rather than being in a state of balance or equanimity. From this type of thinking paradox originates. Heraclitus however, as well as other Pre-Socratic philosophers, was somehow able to see the oneness which lies beyond the duality, which is the origin of all things and the harmony that holistically unifies everything. He was able to glimpse the unity which binds the seemingly irreconcilable opposites, this was namely the logos. We can thus say that the perspective of Heraclitus was universal while Aristotle's perspective was partitive and particular.

In this essay I argue that that only in a binary, particular system of philosophy (such as Aristotle's) can the idea of paradox exist in the first place, for paradox is essentially a problematic contradiction, and the famous law of non-contradiction is not a law associated with pure logic, but rather a law constrained within the domain of Aristotelean or binary logic. This is evidenced by the fact that many Pre-Socratic philosophers, such as Heraclitus, used a logic which didn't regard opposites as contradictory, but rather saw them as complementary harmonious pairs which complete each other and which in the end are emerging from a unified oneness. Some sources even claim that Heraclitus outright denied the law of non-contradiction.

So now when we try to understand paradox, we are faced with two supposedly 'opposite' positions. Firstly, that of Heraclitus, who claims that opposites are reconcilable, and if this position is true this could consequently render the concept of 'paradox' futile and meaningless. Secondly, that of Aristotle, who claims that opposites are irreconcilable, and if his position is true then 'paradox' is possible.

In this essay I will use purely logical analysis to elucidate the meaning of paradox (or lack thereof), the differences between the Heracletean position and the Aristotelean, and how they're associated with two different modes of thinking and perception; the first being oneness and the second duality. I will show how oneness has natural prominence over duality. I will also investigate whether paradoxicality is possible. Or will I -by virtue of this attempt of mine to prove the superiority of Heraclitus's position over Aristotle's, or any position over the other- be myself falling into another paradox?

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

Contents

- **Introduction**

- **What is a 'Paradox'?**

- **The Laws which Allow for the Existence of 'Paradox'**

- **A Comparison between the philosophical systems of Heraclitus and Aristotle**

- **Monoism and Dualism: Determining the difference between the Monoistic and dualistic systems**

- **Oneness and Duality as different Levels of Perception**

- **The Paradox I inevitably fell into when I tried to give prominence to Oneness over Duality!**

- **Paradoxes as Logical System Loopholes 'Glitches in the Matrix' which reveal the unreliability of its foundation**

Introduction

One of the most well-known quotations in philosophy is the famous proclamation by Socrates:

"I am the wisest man alive, for I know one thing, and that is that I know nothing."[1]

A first reading of this quote will probably stir up in the contemporary reader exclamations such as: how can someone know nothing? Or; is to know nothing the same as not knowing? What is nothing, is it all that which is not a thing? How can we perceive nothingness?

The more literal and more accurate paraphrasing of the sentence is; "I neither know nor think that I know"[2] is closer to the original Ancient Greek, but even this one appears peculiar from our current contemporary lens of interpretation, we still find a certain difficulty in making sense of such a phrase because we have (consciously or unconsciously) accepted the notion of paradoxicality as a norm, among other presuppositions.

But why does this happen? Why do we find this quotation from one of the greatest philosophers in history strange and to some extent maybe even incomprehensible, or paradoxical? Is it perhaps because of our deeply embedded presumption that to 'know one thing' and to 'know nothing' are irreconcilable opposing statements which would render the sentence unintelligible? If that is so, can we really claim that we're conscious of the mechanisms of linguistic analysis, interpretation and elimination we're using when we're logically evaluating a claim? Are we conscious of the presumptions we place before logically evaluating a sentence? Are we aware that we find this sentence strange because we're logically evaluating it exclusively from the perspective of a dualistic system, while refusing to recognize the legitimacy of a higher, universal, monadic logical system of oneness, the most logical system, the logos itself?

---

(1) Plato, Apology 29b-c.
(2) Plato, Apology 21d.

A lot of processes occur unconsciously in our minds, neither by conscious nor analytical means, but instead they rather issue from the habitual, cultural, or dogmatic understandings which are most common and prevalent in the current cultural modes of understanding and the current spirit of the ages, zeitgeist, or Temps Morales. But are these habitual judgements and prejudices really in alignment with truth? When we judge that something is paradoxical, are we really using pure logic in our judgement?

"The way of paradoxes is the way of truth. To test reality, we must see it on the tight rope. When the verities become acrobats, we can judge them."[1]

In the previous quote by Oscar Wilde he acknowledges the presence of a Truth which lies beyond paradox, which he suggests is the aim we're ultimately seeking. Indeed, paradox can be a way to truth, but never an end in-itself. However, if we make it an end in-itself, to declare that something is paradoxical and determine that no further thing can be done about it, this would be like standing in the middle of a path, in the midst of wilderness, and declaring you have arrived to your destination, then dying out of thirst without reaching your destination (which is the reason you set out for this journey). It would be futile and meaningless to do so. This is the case with dualistic logic. It has taken paradoxicality as a means of propagating its dualistic system, and so rather than using paradoxicality as a way to elevate upwards towards Truth or oneness, dualistic logic descends with us downwards on the levels of abstraction, by serving its own self (propagating its own system) while using paradoxicality as eliminative means to occult all that which is non-dualistic.

It seems that the idea of paradox was tailored to eliminate all that which isn't dualistic, and that the binary logic of Aristotle is an attempt to do away with the logos itself, or at least its centrality as the essential reference point of all things. We can't deny that the presence of dualism is natural, and that it truly exists, but the presence of a higher order above it, that of oneness or monadism is also natural and

---

(1) Oscar Wilde, The Picture of Dorian Gray

true, if anything it is more natural and truer. And just as one comes before two, the higher order has natural supremacy over the orders below it. So why has there been many attempts historically to negate its existence? This is because the system of dualism is attempting to appear, or present itself as truth (by negating the constancy which lies beyond change, the oneness which lies beyond the opposite pairs, or logos), but it is not and cannot be truth in factuality, so it must resort to manipulation (usage of paradox, dilemma, dialectic, horned syllogism) in order to be perceived as truth. More importantly, it must also hide or occult the real truth (which resides on the level of oneness) because its mere presence threatens its false existence. This reveals to us how dualism is a system more concerned with what it seems rather than what it is. It is not truth, and it's aware that it isn't truth, thus it only cares to appear or seem truth, it's concerned merely with appearance and phenomena but lacks any real substance. The attempt to equate what seems to be with what truly isis extremely futile, yet still the proponents of dualism persist in it. That is why Aristotle's binary dualistic logic had been criticized by many logicians such as Ibn Taymiyyah who denounced it as a syllogistic logic (or as is contemporarily called term logic), which is not a formal logic or predicate logic.

The term logic, also known as traditional logic, syllogistic logic or Aristotelian logic, (as distinct from formal logic or predicate logic) is a loose name for an approach to logic that began with Aristotle and that was dominant until the advent of modern predicate logic in the late nineteenth century. This special brand of logic is based on duality and binarity, and it allows for the existence of opposites (e.g. day and night, hot and cold, life and death).

We have previously defined paradox as an 'unresolvable' or 'irreconcilable' situation. But how can we redefine paradox to elucidate what are trying to explain above? More fitting definitions would be:

Paradox: All that which doesn't fall under dualistic logic.

Paradox: A problem which arises due to us not being to prove that 2 comes before 1. (where there is no justification for our eagerness to do so except the arbitrary passions of our whims.)

Paradox: A problem which arises due to inability to place the infinite within the bounds of the finite.

Paradox: A problem which arises due to inability to choose between two false options. (Let's observe the senselessness here, the trickery of horned logic)

Paradox: A surprisingly illogical situation which arises due to our insistence on abandoning logic. (logos)

Paradox: A disappointment which arises due to our inability to equate what seems to be with what is.

When most people try to determine whether some case is paradoxical or not, they tend to view the case as something which can either be a paradox, or not a paradox, as if these are the only two possibilities. But most of those who succumb to this -very common- method, aren't aware that there are other (strictly logical) methods of looking at things, and that this way of viewing something as paradoxical/non-paradoxical itself falls exclusively under binary Aristotelean logic, which is limited, and by applying this limitation, there are limiting themselves to only one philosophical system of reasoning (one which abandons logos), probably without being aware of them doing so, and probably under the influence of the most common, mainstream and widespread ideas.

In fact the two options presented to us in the form of for/against constitute two false options, or as we shall see later a dilemma which presents us with a false dichotomy via horned syllogism, which we should be trying to escape. Yes/No ,For/Against, Paradoxical/Not Paradoxical are all dichotomies which we shouldn't be leaning to one side of, or making a choice from, but instead we should abandon their binarity entirely by negating and refuting the foundation of their systems.

For why should we -as philosophers- regard Aristotelean logic as the only acceptable variant of logic? Ideally, a philosopher should

seek Truth regardless, not accept the most readily available or common idea without thorough investigation. However, this type of reasoning could very well be acceptable it had firmly based epistemological foundations, but should we investigate the foundations of this brand of logic to its furthest extents, we shall find out that it's a dogmatic logic, i.e. the logical justifications Aristotle gives us as reason for its truth consists in his implicit claim: "because I said so". Given the lack of foundation of this logic, we should naturally seek to explore other options if we are truly searching for a logic with firm epistemological foundations, and if we refuse to remain within the constraints of dogmatic arbitrary opinion (Greek: δόξα) which pretends to be pure logic,and if we're earnestly trying to see if paradoxicality is a legitimate conception or not, otherwise our inquiry would be meaningless because we would be carrying out our inquiry within the constraints of dogmatic logic whilst ignoring the wider possibilities of pure logic, which would render our inquiry futile, or perhaps even paradoxical!

So, what is this pure logic, which has firm foundations and justified proof? And what's the difference between it and Aristotelean or binary logic? And shall we be favoring one of them over the other? To be clear we will first propose definitions by which we will attempt to differentiate the two types of logic. Now if we are to call dualistic, binary logic 'Aristotelean' we may call pure, monadic, non-dualistic logic which resides on the level of oneness 'Heracletean', even though it wasn't exclusively used by Heraclitus but it was unsurprisingly used by many other Pre-Socratic philosophers, because it's based on the oneness of substance which is an intuitive and natural way of perception. However, we can find in the Fragments of Heraclitus many references to the usage to monadic logic, unity, oneness, universality, and the harmony of opposites, such as:

Fragment 19

"Wisdom is the oneness

of mind that guides

and permeates all things".[1]

Fragment 35

"Many who have learned

from Hesiod the countless names

of gods and monsters

never understand

that night and day are one".[2]

Fragment 46

"From the strain of binding opposites comes harmony."[3]

Fragment 56

"The cosmos works by harmony of tensions, like the bow and the

lyre, therefore good and ill are one."[4]

Fragment 58

"Good and ill to the physician surely must be one, since he derives his fee from torturing the sick."[5]

As we can see from the quotations above from Heraclitus' Fragments, he believed in a oneness which lies beyond all things; a oneness which lies beyond the opposites and harmoniously bounds them. From this we can safely assume that Heraclitus was a proponent of

---

(1) Heraclitus, Fragments.
(2) Heraclitus, Fragments.
(3) Heraclitus, Fragments.
(4) Heraclitus, Fragments.
(5) Heraclitus, Fragments.

universal, monadic logic, monoism, or oneness. On the other hand, dualistic systems sever these binding ties and cause a schism between opposites, it disrupts the connection between opposites and prevents unity.

No wonder Heraclitus was called 'the obscure' by contemporary proponents of dualistic logic, for to obscure, occult and obfuscate all what relates to monadic logic is their main task. To them the existence of paradoxicality is very beneficial as it substantiates dualistic and syllogistic logic.

However, we're primarily concerned with nature of paradox in this paper, and the possibility thereof, and thus our exposition which we carry of the logical systems is primarily in association with the question of paradoxicality. In the attempt to determine the possibility or impossibility of paradox, we've determined that investigating logical systems is only a natural consequence which is necessary if we're trying to think about paradox. However, we're not investigating logical systems per se as this paper is concerned basically with paradox.

What is a Paradox?

The Meaning of Paradox (or Lack thereof)

At the beginning of our investigation we need to define the topic at hand using precise philosophical definitions. If the question is 'What is a paradox?', perhaps we can find the answer in the etymological dissection of the word. 'Paradox' consists from the Ancient Greek terms *para–* 'distinct from' and *doxa* 'opinion', which literally translates to 'distinct from opinion'. This suggests that paradox maybe attempts to aim at some neutral objectivity. As if it's a situation which is objectively unsolvable, or as if paradox is trying

82

to establish an objectivity independent from any perceiver. From oneness we see everything as subjective, everything is mind, everything is one substance or *prima materia*. From dualism we see everything as one side of a pair, either good or bad, right or wrong, me or them. If paradox aims to be distinct from opinion, subjectivity, *doxa*, it can only do so by instilling something in its place, namely objectivity, or *dogma*. A dogma, however, isn't naturally justified, but follows the opinion *doxa* of the one who instills it! So, isn't the existence of paradoxicality itself paradoxical? Hence, we should really ask: "Is Paradox a Paradox?"

Paradox as Two; Dichotomy, Binarity, Dialectic, Dilemma and Horned Syllogism

If we accept the notion of paradoxicality we are consequently forced into accepting 'dilemma' as a form of reasoning. The word dilemma (Greek: δίλημμα "double proposition") consists of the Ancient Greek terms *di–* 'twice' and *lēmma* 'premise', denoting two premises, which itself proves the necessity of binary (from late Latin binarius, from bini 'two together', "consisting of two," from bini "twofold, two apiece, two-by-two") logic as a foundation to paradoxicality. A dilemma by definition provides *two* possibilities from which we must choose only one. But we're unable to choose this one choice authentically because not only are the two possibilities false, but the system of dualism itself is falsely pretending to be truth, insofar as it tries to elicit one from the two options, instead of remaining within the dual bounds of two, the balance and

equipollence which constitutes its natural limitations as a dualism of opposites. For how can we elicit a unitary (one) result from something that is by definition binary? This is not paradoxical, but rather senseless, for if we go against the laws of nature we're bound to fall into error, this shouldn't be surprising. To go against the laws of nature and logic (as we shall see later, this necessarily involves the abandonment of the *logos*), yet still except to achieve results corresponding to our whims is pure foolishness. The futile attempt to extract *one* conclusion from the *dualistic* system is logically equivalent to attempting to get the child to give birth to his father, or to produce the Creator out of the created, or extract the original from its copy. By attempting to replicate a 'Truth' (by nature monadic) by downward motion towards a third (which lies below dualism) rather than seeking it upwards in upward motion towards oneness, it disrupts the balance, equivalence, or *equipollence* (according to the skeptic terminology used by SextusEmpiricus) which maintains the pairs of dualism, because it lets one of the sides appear as absolute truth while negating the other side, this is obvious in the choice out of two is obliged to make in a horned syllogism.

What dualistic, syllogistic logic is trying to do, is reminiscent of what French thinker and orientalist scholar René Guénon said about what modern man is trying to do:

"Modern man, instead of attempting to raise himself to truth, seeks to drag truth down to his level."[1]

---

(1) Guénon, René. The Crisis of the Modern World.

A paradox is thus not seeking to reach Truth, but rather it seeks to reach a (dogmatic) conclusion or inference, irrelevant of the truth value it contains. However, it insists to pretend that this dogmatic inference *is* truth (as if it resides on the level of oneness, when in reality it's not even on the level of two, but rather on the synthetic level of three), and is thus an inversion of Truth, and thereby attempts to eliminate pure universality or oneness. Hence one of the major criticisms directed at Aristotelean 'logic' was that it's a *syllogistic logic*.

To eliminate the *logos* or universal logic, Dualistic logic had to attempt to do away with justification. So, when dualism dogmatically and unjustifiably presents its two false options, it will try to negate the very possibility of asking the question: Why these two options? Why not something else? It tries to do away why the *Why* itself, with the *teleology*, with the *need for justification* itself, and the only way it can do this is by imposing a dogma, which basically translates to: 'because I said so' without giving any justifications, for there are none.

A good example of a dualistic logic in action can be observed in the following statement by Bertrand Russell; "The universe needs no explanation; it is "just there, and that's all".[1]

But why doesn't it need an explanation? Because I said so. Such is the 'logic' of binary dualistic systems. We can see he denounces any need for explanation or justification. The elimination of justification

---

(1) Russell, Bertrand.

involves the elimination of curiosity, wonder, investigation, intuition, purpose, reasons, among other fundamental things.

Thus, paradox forces us to use binary logic, for only within dualistic, binary logic is there any possibility for paradox. If we regard it from other logical standpoints (monadic logic for example) then it will cease to be a paradox. If we look at a paradox from the higher level of oneness or universality then it will cease to be a paradox, in fact from this level the conception of 'paradoxicality' itself would be rendered meaningless.

Paradox as Dilemmatic Logic or False Dichotomy

What we mean by the dilemma used in dualistic or binary systems is a type of logic in the form "you must accept either A, or B" where A and B are exclusive propositions each leading to some further conclusion. But when applied incorrectly, the dilemma constitutes a false dichotomy, that is, a fallacy. The choice you're making here is between either correctness or incorrectness. This method doesn't aim to reach truth, for it presents us with two false choices, its aim is that *we make a choice*, because if we do this would be regarded as though it were a legitimate truth, for we would have accepted one of its two falsehoods and thus submitted to it, and by eliciting a reaction from us it has control over our decisions, and thus it is approved and is able to propagate its dichotomous system further. What is the solution then? To refuse the binarity

entirely and take neither of the options it presents us with. As we shall see below this is called *escaping the horns of the syllogism*.

The typically used dichotomous methods classify dilemma as a type of "*horned syllogism*" (for traditionally whenever we think of horns, we think of *two* horns). This emerged from a sophistic practice derived from the Latin name *cornutus*.[1] The first usage of the word *horns* in English is attributed to Nicholas Udall in his 1548 book 'Paraphrases', translated from the Latin term *cornutainterrogatio*.[2]

The dilemma is sometimes used as a rhetorical device. The first time it had been incorporated in textbook material and curriculums goes back to Hermogenes of Tarsus in his work On Invention.[3] C. S. Peirce defined *dilemmatic argument* as any argument relying on the *law of excluded middle*.[4]

In propositional logic, dilemma is applied to a group of rules of inference, which could be in themselves valid rather than fallacious. They each have three premises, and include both the constructive dilemma and destructive dilemma. Such arguments can be refuted by

---

(1) Hamilton, Sir William (1863). The Logic of Sir William Hamilton, Bart. Moore, Wilstach& Baldwin.
(2) Erasmus, Desiderius (2003). Paraphrase on Luke 11-24. University of Toronto Press. ISBN 9780802036537.
(3) Lucia CalboliMontefusco, Rhetorical use of dilemmatic arguments, Rhetorica: A Journal of the History of Rhetoric Vol. 28, No. 4 (Autumn 2010), pp. 363–383, at p. 364. Published by: University of California Press on behalf of the International Society for the History of Rhetoric. DOI: 10.1525/rh.2010.28.4.363 JSTOR 10.1525/rh.2010.28.4.363
(4) Ghosh, Sujata; Prasad, Sanjiva (2016). Logic and Its Applications: 7th Indian Conference, ICLA 2017, Kanpur, India, January 5-7, 2017, Proceedings. Springer. p. 177 note 5. ISBN 9783662540695.

showing that the disjunctive premise — the "*horns of the dilemma*" — does not in fact hold, because it presents a *false dichotomy*. For you are presented by two options, and you are asked to accept either "A or B", when in fact the options presented are in themselves irrelevant, for the methodological system which is trying to oblige you to make the choice is itself based upon a falsehood. To successfully undermine that premise via negating the dualistic logic itself is called "*escaping through the horns of the dilemma*".

Even though the notion of paradox appeared with Zeno, dualistic, binary, or as we now should call it *Dilemmatic* reasoning had existed earlier. It had existed before Aristotle (though it was Aristotle who formalized it and gave it primacy which continued for a long time) and it has been attributed to Melissus of Samos, a Presocratic philosopher whose works survive in fragmentary form, making the origins of this strand of logical reasoning in philosophy imponderable.[1] It was established with Diodorus Cronus (died c. 284 BCE).[2] The paradoxes of Zeno of Elea were reported by Aristotle in dilemma form, but that may have been to conform with what Plato said about Zeno's style.[3]

(1) Harriman, Benjamin (2018). Melissus and Eleatic Monism. Cambridge University Press. p. 44. ISBN 9781108416337.
(2) Sedley, David (2018). "Diodorus Cronus". The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University.
(3) Palmer, John (2017). "Zeno of Elea". The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University.

Paradox as a Product of Irreconciliation

Looking at the matter in another way, or following the common contemporary understanding, we will suggest that paradox is "an irreconcilable situation", that is; a case which logic itself stands helpless in the face of. But in a system of oneness, everything is reconcilable, because all is one and there is only one substance or prima materia which ultimately exists. Dualistic logic is the progenitor of 'irreconciliation', for by severing the ties which unites opposites (abandoning logos) it placed the arbitrary conceptions of dualism which deem opposites as irreconcilable, while in truth (on the level of oneness) they are reconcilable, and everything is.

Thus, syllogistic logic admits the falsity of the premises it presents, yet still persists in presenting them, and still expects 'logical' results, even after it abandoned *logos*! But isn't the logic which stands helpless in the face of any premise self defeatingly faulty or at least trapped within an incomplete logic? Shouldn't a faulty logic be expected to produce paradoxes? Why do we insist on using an incomplete logical system while at the same time insisting that the result be comprehensible? This is like an attempt to put bounds and limitations on the infinite and then being disappointed that our attempt didn't succeed in being efficient limitations to the infinite! To prevent an untimely brevity of the paper which very quickly puts an end to the argument, we will suggest another definition for paradox.

Paradox as Contradiction, or the Legitimacy of Opposition

"Do I contradict myself?

Very well then I contradict myself;

(I am large, I contain multitudes.)"[1]

Walt Whitman, Song of Myself

Paradox is the "the inability to reconcile two categories, because they're assumed to be opposites." From this we determine that the notion of paradoxicality inherently assumes that:

1) Opposites exist.

2) Opposites cannot be reconciled.

3) Paradoxicality arises due to irreconcilability.

From this way of viewing paradoxicality the problem with reconciliation arises from the difference we perceive in the nature of the categories, but is this difference true? To answer this, we must ask ourselves what do we mean by opposites?

Etymologically, the term 'opposite' comes from Old French oposite, from Latin oppositus, perfect passive participle of oppōnō ("I oppose"). Opposite means facing in the other direction. Thus, in a pair of opposites (such as good and bad, for example) one side may act as the negative force and other as the positive force, but even though they may be opposite in direction, they are equal in force, for they both cooperate to achieve a neutrality of zero. Both sides are needed and important, neither of them has supremacy over the other. This neutrality is the maintained balance or equipollence which the logos rests upon. To deny the logos is to increase the force of one side over another

---

(1) Whitman, Walt. Leaves of Grass.

in a pair, give one of them supremacy over the other, and thus disrupt the naturally neutral equibalance. Therefore, irreconcilability doesn't occur naturally, it occurs only when we try to increase the force on one side of a pair of opposites through employing dualistic, syllogistic systems. It occurs only when we disrupt the natural balance, equipollence, and stillness of the logos in the level of oneness.

This leads us to a conclusion that the notion of paradoxicality itself exists entirely within the limits of the dualistic mode of thinking, or binary Aristotelean logic, because the two premises which we surmise from the proposed definition of paradox agree with this system of logic. In the dualistic logical system pairs exist, and pairs as opposites such as: (night and day, life and death, heavens and earth, love and hate, etc.), but there is an imbalance on one side of the pair and a disruption in the equipollence of the logos, hence chaos occurs.

One of the reasons pairs exist as 'irreconcilable opposites' that are not complementary and not harmonious in Aristotelean logic, is because this system applies the law of non-contradiction and the law of excluded middle. In the Heracletean system pairs exist as opposites that are complementary and harmonious, and this system doesn't apply law of non-contradiction and the law of excluded middle.

We must notice that without the law of identity, the law of non-contradiction and the law of excluded middle the notion of paradox would be rendered nonsensical. These three laws are fundamental for the possibility of existence of paradoxicality. We must also notice that these laws are not absolutes, and that they exist only within the boundaries of dualistic, binary, dogmatic logic.

The Laws which Allow for the Existence of Paradox

1. **The Law of Identity**

2. **The Law of Non-contradiction**

3. **The Law of Excluded Middle**

The Law of Non-contradiction

The Law of Non-contradiction states that according to logic, opposites contradict, a thing cannot be A and B at the same time. From this we deduce that the main difference between the Aristotelean and Heracletean systems boils down to whether the pairs are reconcilable (complementary and harmonious) or not.

This law is essential to the existence of paradox because it creates a discernible schism between the contradicting opposites (e.g. A and B) and from this schism emerges the possibility of their irreconcilability.

The Law of Excluded Middle

(or the principle of excluded middle) states that for any proposition, either that proposition is true or its negation is true. It is one of the so called three laws of thought, along with the law of noncontradiction, and the law of identity. The law of excluded middle is logically equivalent to the law of noncontradiction by De Morgan's laws.

This law is essential to the existence of paradox because it forces the acceptance of either a thesis or an antithesis, a truth or a negation, and therefore it allows for irreconcilability since it posits that truth lies only on one side of the duality, and negation on the other side, so it seeks truth within a dualistic and not a non-dualistic framework. This necessarily renders one side of the duality truth and the other non-truth, and from this emerges the possibility of paradox, for a paradox would

occur whenever two dualistic truths conflict, and they would seem like an impossibility. To seek truth on one side of the duality is to seek the one in the two, a futile impossibility.

The law of Identity

States that each thing is identical with itself.

This law is essential to the existence of paradox because it limits identity to the subject, and thus isolates identity from oneness by placing it within duality. For if the thing is only identical with itself, it would necessarily exist only in itself, and consequently by necessity it will not exist within the other. This creates the thing-in-itself/Other-things dichotomy which necessarily falls under dualistic logic.

A Comparison between the philosophical systems of Heraclitus and Aristotle

A Criticism of the Achilles and the Tortoise paradox

The most famous paradox in history or the mother of all paradoxes is Parmenides Achilles and the Tortoise, which Aristotle recounts as follows:

"In a race, the quickest runner can never overtake the slowest, since the pursuer must first reach the point whence the pursued started, so that the slower must always hold a lead."[1]

Now as we have mentioned earlier, the problem with dualistic logic is that it abandons the real logic, and instead presents us with an apparition, an appearance, a semblance, a syllogistic logic which seems like logic but isn't truly logic, because the real logic which resides on the level of oneness is the logos. It only assumes the appearance of logic.

---

(1) Aristotle, Physics VI:9, 239b15

Thus, in this paradox Zeno presents us with a seemingly problematic situation, which is in truth a false premise, albeit a false premise which appears to be logically problematic.

Zeno suggests that: "All motion is impossible because travelling from any location to another location should take an infinite amount of time, hence all motion is impossible."

To traverse a distance in X time you have to spend the time ½ X, and to traverse ½ X, you have to first spend the time ¼ X, and so on infinitely. There are infinitely many finite distances to be crossed.

Total time for the journey= 1/2, 1/4, 1/8, 1/16, ...

has infinitely many terms, each of which is of finite size greater than zero. The sequence has no last term, but it does have a limit, namely zero. (Roughly: no matter how close to zero you want to get, there is a term in the sequence that gets you at least that close.)

If we add together all the terms in the sequence above, we get an infinite series:

$1/2 + 1/4 + 1/8 + 1/16 + ...$

Halving distances into finite intervals Zeno presumes (here is the faulty logic) that an infinite number of distances must necessarily produce an infinite sum, when mathematically it is possible for an infinite number of distances to produce a finite result.

The implicit proposition which the paradox makes is that "An infinite sequence of numbers should necessarily yield an infinite result", which is false because determining the nature of the sequence itself is irrelevant to the sum, as what is relevant to the sum is exclusively the numbers themselves, which are finite, not the sequence they form. Here Zeno was looking at the form (appearance of the sequence) while

neglecting the substance (the finite numbers themselves). This is typical of syllogistic logic which as we have stated gives supremacy to appearance over truth, and to form over substance.

Logos as the Non-dualistic system of Heraclitean Logic

Heraclitus states in his Fragments that: "This principle (logos, the hidden harmony behind all change) bound opposites together in a unified tension, which is like that of a lyre, where a stable harmonious sound emerges from the tension of the opposing forces that arise from the bow bound together by the string."[1]

If Heraclitus means that logos, or logic binds opposites together, does this mean that in a dualistic system where opposites are separate from each other (or antithetical to each other) we are abandoning logos? According to various non-dualist philosophers and monoists who believe in the absoluteness of oneness, we certainly are. Whenceforth comes paradox then? It emerges from the abandoning of logic in order to obtain a convenient result. The abandonment of Truth in order to gain a practical result through means of trickery, for as we shall demonstrate below, the abandonment of pure logic in the dualistic systems depend on the usage of syllogism and dilemma, where one is obliged to choose between two false options.

In a Fragment (as quoted in SextusEmpiricus, Against the Mathematicians) where Sextus quotes Heraclitus the following is said by the latter:

"Men have no comprehension of the Logos, as I've described it, just as much after they hear about it as they did before they heard about it. Even though all things occur according to the Logos, men seem to have

---

(1) Heraclitus, Fragments

no experience whatsoever, even when they experience the words and deeds which I use to explain physis, of how the Logos applies to each thing, and what it is. The rest of mankind are just as unconscious of what they do while awake as they are of what they do while they sleep."[1]

Now if we take a closer look at the model postulated by Heraclitus and his idea of the unity of opposites, we will deduce from his Fragments that change is the only constant, and that the world is in a continuous state of flux, and that it is only logos which subsists beyond the incessant change, and thus the opposites are bound by it. This logos, which is in the system of oneness, is the logic that always is, and it is not subject to change.

Dualism as Syllogism

If logos is that logic which always is, and which binds opposites together, and this binding is denied and a separateness or irreconcilability replaces it in dualistic systems, then is logos itself negated in dualistic systems? Logically, we can certainly claim so. In this sense paradox is a contradiction that is not logical, because it abandons logic altogether, it is in fact anti-logical or alogos, a term etymologically derived from the Ancient Greek ἄλογος (álogos, "unreasoning, speechless", adjective). In fact, it doesn't even necessarily pretend to be a logic, for syllogism is derived from Latin syllogismus, from Ancient Greek συλλογισμός (sullogismós, "inference, conclusion"). The dualistic system of inference does not seek to reach Truth, it seeks to reach a (dogmatic) conclusion (irrelevant of the truth value it contains).

To deny the constancy beyond motion is to deny oneness and refrain from using monadic logic. To refrain from using monadic or

---

(1) Empiricus, Sextus. 'Against the Mathematicians', Fragment 1

monoistic unitary logic, is to negate the very premise of logos, for logos is itself the constant beyond change, the unity beyond the opposites. From here what dualism seeks to establish becomes obvious, it tries to eliminate the constant logos which is subsistent, making the relativism of dualism itself an absolute. Can we claim that the Logos consists of all the paired opposites in the universe? What is the nature of the Logos as the composite of all paired opposites?

In the Aristotlean binary, dualistic, systems, we're still bound within a dualistic system, which can be transcended if we look beyond duality itself. To look beyond duality means to ask ourselves: do opposites really exist? From the perspective of a pure unitary system, a non-dualistic system of oneness, which regards everything in existence as one prima materia (hyle); the only truly existing formless, primaeval substance or first matter which suggest that opposites doesn't exist, and that there is only one element from which reality consists.

This system of oneness was followed by many Pre-Socratics, but they differed on what that element was. Thales said the prima materia was water, Meno said it was air, Anaximander proposed it was the unbounded or the infinite; Apeiron (ἄπειρον). Heraclitus thought it was fire, whilst Plato mentions in his Timaeus that "there is the most translucent kind which is called by the name of aether (αίθηρ)."[1] And he regards it as this aether, which is contemporarily called: quintessence.

Aristotle's Dualistic Hermeneutic Interpretation of His Predecessors

Aristotle (not able to see past binary logic) inferred a group of dualities from the systems of oneness which predecessor philosophers proposed. In his Categories Aristotle says:

---

(1) Plato, Timaeus, 58d.

"But it is better to assume principles less in number and finite, as Empedocles makes them to be. All philosophers... make principles to be contraries... (for Parmenides makes principles to be hot and cold, and these he denominates fire and earth) as those who introduce as principles the rare and the dense. But Democritus makes the principles to be the solid and the void; of which the former, he says, has the relation of being, and the latter of non-being. ...it is necessary that principles should be neither produced from each other, nor from other things; and that from these all things should be generated. But these requisites are inherent in the first contraries: for, because they are first, they are not from other things; and because they are contraries, they are not from each other."[1]

What we learn from this quote corroborates our proposal. Aristotle, being trapped in dualistic logic, interpreted Empedocles in a manner which confirmed the perspective of his own system, even though Empedocles wasn't necessarily a dualist, as evidenced by his quote:

"God is a circle whose center is everywhere, and its circumference nowhere."[2]

Which strongly suggests a sense of oneness, universality and all-inclusiveness, for a circle has one center and one circumference and emerges from one point. This wasn't alluded to directly because the linguistic methods of communication used in Pre-Socratic times were necessarily aphoristic and symbolic, and also non-dualistic as evident by the accessible literature from this period, for it is among the consequences of Aristotelean logic that language became formalized into its current form where semantics are generally used in a literal rather

(1) Aristotle. Categories, Book I, Ch. VI, pp. 53-55
(2) Empedocles, The Extant Fragments

than metaphorical sense. This reveals how even a greatly influential thinker like Aristotle wasn't able to see past his dogmas and the bounds which he set up for himself.

In another quote Empedocles says:

"The force that unites the elements to become all things is Love, also called Aphrodite; Love brings together dissimilar elements into a unity, to become a composite thing. Love is the same force that human beings find at work in themselves whenever they feel joy, love and peace. Strife, on the other hand, is the force responsible for the dissolution of the one back into its many, the four elements of which it was composed."[1]

There is a direct allusion to unity here, as we find in the writings of many other Presocratics as well. Here it's interesting to notice how the philosophical systems developed throughout history and how they passed from the phase of pure oneness with the early Pre-Socratics (Thales, Anaximander, Meno, Heraclitus), to the phase which I call oneness with an awareness of duality with Heraclitus, ending with a phase of pure duality marked by Aristotle's system, which the influence of continued for a long time afterwards (perhaps 2 millennea). It's also interesting to notice how this development or evolution in philosophical literature is reflected or paralleled in language and linguistic systems.

When we look at paradox again while keeping what we mentioned previously in mind, we will now realize that by leaning to one side and not another in any paradox, means that we're within a binary system, and that by denying the notion of paradoxicality altogether, we thereby submit to a system of oneness. Thus, whenever we're thinking about

---

(1) Empedocles, The Fragments of Empedocles.

paradox, our thinking is necessarily confined by the underlying system within which paradoxicality or non-paradoxicality is either possible or impossible. The question then always inevitably reverts back to the systems of Dualism and Oneness.

The Reconcilability of Oneness and Dualism

But what if we ask the same question, which we asked before about the pairs, are the systems of dualism and oneness themselves reconcilable? Do oneness and duality together make up a pair in the dualistic system, or do all pairs cease to exist in a system of absolute oneness? This yields another paradox, which could spiral into a fractal infinity. To give an answer which favors one system over the other is not possible, because the answer depends on the perspective you look at things. So for example if I favor the system of duality over the system of oneness because I think pairs obviously exist, I will have to face the problem that those pairs inevitably emerged from one source and one energy (this is proven both by pure logic and modern physics). Conversely, if I favor the system of oneness over the system of duality, I will have to face that the existence of pairs is obvious in the world. ((Theologically, though, the pairs are created, and the ONE is the CREATOR)). I must then abstain from favoring one system over the other. Both systems exist and neither of them exist. Both and neither. This could be seen as a paradox, and it could be seen as not a paradox.

It appears that duality and nonduality are best thought of as levels, not as separate systems which must either be reconcilable of irreconcilable. Simply, at the level of duality (duality comes from dual, or the number two) things exist as pairs, however at the level of oneness (Oneness comes from number one) things exist as one. When we think of the chain of numbers we count, we can't say 1 is right and 2 is wrong,

but we can say that 1 comes before 2, one precedes two, it is on a higher degree. Similarly, oneness comes before duality, one is higher than duality and duality is below oneness, but this doesn't mean that one is right and the other (two) is wrong. By saying that oneness is superior to duality or that it precedes it, we aren't favoring it because we're not making arbitrary judgements, but rather describing the levels as they occur in natural order.

Another definition states that: "A paradox is a statement that, despite apparently valid reasoning from true premises, leads to an apparently-self-contradictory or logically unacceptable conclusion. A paradox involves contradictory-yet-interrelated elements that exist simultaneously and persist over time."

The key word in this definition is "apparently". One of the strongest criticisms directed against Aristotelean logic is that it's a simulacral logic, which is valid only in appearance. This naturally leads us to the question: are premises true? It's possible that the reasoning carried out on the premises is valid, but valid reasoning with faulty premises would render the whole process futile. We have to make sure that all the elements of the logic syllogism is true, otherwise we would be falling into incoherence. Thus 'apparently valid reasoning' would not suffice. This again relates to how dualistic logic seems logical but is not truly logical.

It is obvious that there's a difference between the Heraclitean and Aristotelean systems. But are they really incompatible?

According to both Plato and Aristotle, Heraclitus held extreme views that led to logical incoherence. For he held that:

(1) everything is constantly changing and

(2) opposite things are identical, so that

(3) everything is and is not at the same time.

These rules by Heraclitus would indeed seem incompatible with the Aristotlean system, for a binary system is based on creating separatory schisms, so a law such as (opposite things are identical) would be a premise that negates the very foundations of the Aristotelean binary system, thus it is only natural that Aristotle would point it out. From here comes the apparent incompatibility of the two systems. We can see how the two systems are different where in binary dualism opposites exist while in oneness only oneness exists.

Now again, as we have seen we're faced with two logical systems, one which contains laws which allow for the existence of paradox, and another which doesn't contain these laws. But what do we meet by compatible? How can we bring into concord things of different nature? If on the level of oneness there is unity and one the level of dualism there is separateness, how can we being unity and separateness together, or better yet, does this unity/separateness dichotomy itself constitute a duality, or are unity and separateness the same thing and they're both composed by the selfsame substance of oneness? The answer will always depend on how we view the matter and which level do we reside on.

So, are we saying we should or shouldn't favor Truth over non-Truth, and logos over alogos? Aren't we leaning to one side of a duality by saying so? Aren't Truth/Non-Truth, Oneness/Duality, Logos/alogos still dualistic pairs? If we are perceiving them from the level of dualism, sure they are. But from the level of Oneness all is Truth and Oneness and Dualism itself doesn't yet exist, for oneness precedes it. So, in the end what matters ultimately is the level we're looking at things from.

So, is there paradox or not, and is the concept of paradoxicality real? and does the dualistic pair of paradoxical/not-paradoxical truly exist? The answer is perhaps paradoxical, it depends on how you view things. But you may say you need a definite answer, something you could see a valid, established and concrete? Well, if we insist on a definite answer, we'd be leaving the possibility of an indefinite answer hence creating another duality of Definite/Indefinite. Why do we insist of defining things when things are by nature undefined? Isn't this paradoxical?

Determining the difference between the Monoistic and dualistic systems

"The oldest, shortest words - 'yes' and 'no' - are those which require the most thought."[1] Pythagoras

Why did Pythagoras think that these two words required the most thought? And why are 'yes' and 'no' the oldest, shortest words? We can think of yes and no as the most basic levels of the duality of negation and affirmation, the most substantial manifestation of binary dualistic logical systems. If these two were indeed the oldest words suggests that language itself was born with duality, and the oneness which preceded this duality was the pure undifferentiated soup of existence. But since language came to create schisms and boundaries, to lay down definitions (notice that definition comes from to define, which necessarily implies setting boundaries), and differentiations, saying this is different from that, thus language itself uses binary logic, for a language -by definition- attempts to define the undefinable, because it tries to capture the spirit of God (which is transcendent) in words (which are finite). Now the spirit

---

(1) Kaikobad, Vera. Numerology for Relationships: A Guide to Birth Numbers (2006), p. 78

of God is this primordial undifferentiated soup of pure oneness, which is by definition undefined.

Paradoxicality will inevitably arise whenever we try to define the undefined, or affirm that which is negated. The moment we try to define the Undefined we are resorting to a dualistic syllogism where we create the pair Defined/Undefined. Thus, the only way to define the undefined is to not define it. This may appear paradoxical, but perhaps it isn't paradoxical.

Conclusion:

Is 'Paradox' then, the result of faulty abstraction or corrupt thinking?

Whether there is a possibility for paradox, or whether its impossible, or even if this answer for the question of paradox is paradoxical in a manner which continues ad infinitum, there is no doubt something to be learned from this.

Before the modern sense of abstraction (or duality), there used to be only pure oneness or intuition. Thus, the dualism which emerged from non-duality is actually the birth of -not only a new mode of abstraction- but an entire mode of perception, an entire new reality which emerged into the human consciousness. This is nothing short of historical. The question of paradox then can be used to shed light on this monumental shift in consciousness which occurred circa the 3rd century B.C. (We noticed that this consciousness resulted in much pain and trouble throughout the world which lead the emergence of doctrines such as Stoicism). This shift in consciousness was not a mere paradigm shift or new law or new way of looking at things, but it was a much more fundamental change which changed the course of history.

How does paradoxicality relate to all this grand narrative scheme of things? To clarify by example: Before non-duality and the notion of paradox, humans used to accept all things as manifestations of oneness, but after non-duality and the notion of paradox, humans stars to see things as separate, and the intuitive mode of thinking started to deteriorate. Separateness was thus born, and the possibility of chaos and irreconcilability came into being. This also affected the general conception of God, for God is one, but now after the dualistic system prevailed, God became on one side of the duality.

The Futility of Paradoxicality

By bringing paradoxicality into existence we are accepting the existence of meaningless and futility. For by seeing paradox as paradox, accepting a situation as unresolvable, accepting the existence of a thing that has no cause and no true solution, only a dogmatic inference or conclusion, is to accept meaningless and futility itself. It's to accept disorder and chaos, albeit in a systematic way, for dualism has a systematic method which attempts to mimic the logos without being truly logical. This is reminiscent of the term order out of chaos.

Paradox as Absurdity

To even attempt to produce coherent results when you have abandoned logos is undoubtedly an absurdity itself, and dualistic, binary, syllogism logic follows this absurd method. The problem is not with absurdity, but with the legitimization of absurdity as not only something acceptable, but as a rule! As if absurdity is the normal, as if the truth is absurd, and as if a lack of absurdity indicates deviation from the norm, and as if truth which is real truth (Truth-in-itself) is a heretic! Looking back, we see that indeed Aristotelean logic in parallelism with absurdity has been prominent on all levels of knowledge (except gnostic and religious) and in all levels of society. Why did this happen? Why did most people readily accept absurdity as a rule? Perhaps because absurdity is the nature of human beings. Or perhaps, human beings are so subjected and servile that they'll accept anything as their truth or God, no matter how absurd, even if its absurdity per se!

Paradox and Logic

It is true that paradox abandons the logos, but was the usage of the logos ever something commonplace? Is it really considered human

nature to use the logos or to think logically? Heraclitus himself said in the Fragments that it seems that no one understands it[1]. Absurdity is much closer to human nature. Is it really paradoxical then if we abandon logic and resort to paradoxicality? Given our past history and the state of the human mind, is it surprising to see hostility towards Truth and logos? Is really paradoxical that we take paradoxes for granted?

---

(1) Heraclitus, Fragments.