

The early part of the 6th century B.C. marks the beginning of a change in the world's view of the universe. Before this time, most people viewed the universe and world as a creation of Deity. However, in the 6th century B.C., greek philosophy came into existence. The records we have indicate that Greek Philosophy began in Miletus, which is on the coast of Southern Ionia. Heraclitus, an early Greek philosopher from Miletus, was a good example of someone who taught this early Greek philosophy. He gave us his view of the universe when he said, "This world-order did none of the gods or men make, but it always was and is and shall be: an ever living fire, kindling in measures and going out in measures.(David C. Lindberg, The Beginnings of Western Science, p. 29)." So Heraclitus seemed to associate the origin of things with fire.

These early Greek philosophers saw the old, archaic world views as irregular and chaotic. These Greeks created an orderly, predictable world in which things behaved according to their natures. As Lindberg says, *kosmos* was being substituted for *chaos* (Lindberg, p. 27). There are three concepts which distinguished these early Greek philosophers from their ancestors. Lindberg tells us about these three differences. He said,

"In the first place, the Milesians asked a new sort of question: what is the origin of things, or what is the simple underlying reality that can take on a variety of forms to produce the diversity of substances that we perceive? ...Second, the answers offered by the Milesians contain none of the personification of deification of nature that we saw in Homer and Hesiod. The Milesians left the gods out. ...Third, the Milesians seem to have been aware of the need not simply to state their theories, but also to defend them against critics or competitors.(p.29)"

So people did not simply believe the ideas of the Greek Philosophers as fact without questioning them. These early Greek Philosophers had to defend and prove their arguments. The views of the archaic world, however, did not need to be defended, because the archaic people and ancient Greeks believed their myths and accepted them as tradition. As we will see, however, there were many similarities as well as many differences between the Greek philosophical world views and the archaic world views.

First, there were many similarities and differences between the thoughts of Thales, Pythagoras, and other pre-Socratic philosophers. Thales seems to have taught that the earth is a flat disk which floats on water. As explained earlier, Heraclitus saw the fundamental reality as being fire. The Pythagoreans took a different approach. They saw numbers as the fundamental reality, or at least the Pythagoreans saw mathematics as a basic tool for investigating this reality. Leucippus and Democritus believed that the universe consisted of *atoms* which came together to create objects. One important thing connects all these views together. These philosophies were all based on their observations and, for the most part, the philosophers left divinity out of the picture. The archaic world, however, attributes everything to the gods or God and views everything as having been created by them.

There are, however, many similarities among the archaic world views and the world views of the pre-Socratic philosophers.

Heraclitus, for example, saw fire as the fundamental reality. The early Hebrew world view was nearly the same if we think of fire as being another word for light. In Genesis 1:3, we learn of the first words God said in the Bible: "And God said, Let there be light: and there was light." So light or fire was not only important to Heraclitus, but also to the early Hebrews. In addition, many archaic civilizations worshipped some form of sun god.

Empedocles saw the earth, the air, fire, and water as four fundamental elements which all other things were based on. If we compare this to the account of the creation of the world in Genesis, we can see an interesting relationship between the elements of Empedocles and the account of the Creation. First, God created the light (fire) and divided this from the darkness. He then created the firmament (air). Finally, God created the seas and land (water, earth). In addition, Empedocles wrote that from earth, air, fire, and water "sprang all things that were and are and shall be, trees and men and women, beasts and birds and water-bred fishes, and the long-lived gods too.(Lindberg p.31)" That really sounds like the Hebrew account of the creation. So we know that while the purpose of the pre-Socratic philosophers was to explain the universe scientifically, many of their ideas were similar to the archaic world views.

In addition to the pre-Socratic philosophers, Plato's philosophy was very similar to many archaic world views. First of all, Plato saw two distinct realms. Not only did he see the material world, but he also saw another world of forms or ideas, contain-

ing the perfect idea for everything in the universe (Lindberg, p.36). As part of his material world, Plato used the earth, air, fire, and water just as Empedocles had. The archaic world, as well as much of the Christian world today, believed many of the same types of things as Plato did long ago. The archaic world as well as us today are taught to be concerned less with material things and be concerned more with the higher good (with God or with the gods). Plato taught this when he compared the material world to his world of forms or ideas. The forms were the most important fundamental reality to Plato, but a person could not gain access to these forms without deep thought. Plato taught that to gain access to these higher realities, a person must "escape the bondage of sense experience and climb out of the cave (the material world) until we find ourselves able, finally, to gaze on the eternal realities, thereby entering the realm of true knowledge.(Lindberg, p.37)" So just as Plato saw his forms as the highest reality, the archaic civilizations and even us today see it as important to overcome the physical world and material objects and seek the higher reality. The second commandment, "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image...(Exodus 20:4)," is an example of archaic world views not to seek physical things, but the higher good.

Not only were Plato's ideas about the fundamental realities similar to the ideas of the archaic civilizations, but he also believed in a God and a pre-earth life and an post-earth life. In fact, in Plato's work, The Trial and Death of Socrates, he proves through his logic that there must be a pre-earth and a

post-earth life. Plato seems to assert that in the afterlife, we will constantly contemplate to ourselves and with other intelligences about the forms and especially about the highest good, or God. This is especially similar to the Christian view of heaven, where we would go if we accept the Savior and praise God in the eternities. So Plato had many similarities to the archaic world views.

After Plato came Aristotle, who obtained many of his ideas from Plato, but refused to accept Plato's forms as the fundamental reality. There were many differences between Aristotle's philosophy and the myths of the archaic civilizations. As stated before, Aristotle did not accept Plato's forms alone as the fundamental reality, but instead, he argued that "we can never, in actuality, separate form and matter; they are presented to us only as a unified whole. If they were separable, we should be able to put the properties in one pile, the matter in another-an obvious impossibility.(Lindberg, p.49)" So Aristotle placed emphasis on the corporeal objects, while much of the archaic world taught to meditate and ponder the will of the gods.

Of the four causes of change proposed by Aristotle - formal, material, efficient, and final cause - the archaic world tended to concentrate on the final cause of changes. For example, if an earthquake happened in Greece before the rise of the philosophers, the people would assume that it was a god who caused it and they would question the purpose of him doing such a thing. But if it happened in Aristotle's day, Aristotle might wonder what kind of physical phenomenon would cause the earth to shake

in such a way. Finally, Aristotle completely denied the possibility of a beginning. He argued that if the universe came into being at a point in time, that would mean that something would come from nothing, which was an impossibility to him. Where Aristotle did not believe in a beginning, most archaic civilizations believed in a beginning and a creation.

We have seen that Greek philosophy contains ideas very similar to the views of the archaic world as well as ideas very different from those of the archaic world. First, the pre-Socratics tended to leave deity out of their philosophies and often explained the fundamental reality in terms of material things, with a few exceptions such as Empedocles. With Plato, on the other hand, many of the archaic world views were resurrected as he concentrated on forms as the fundamental reality. Finally Aristotle argued that the material object is the fundamental reality and that instead of seeking the unseen, to look at the world and learn from these material objects.