

The Thinking Differences between Chinese and Western Philosophy from the Theory of Flying Arrow Immobile and Things Immobile

Jing Wang*

School of Philosophy and Social Development, Northwest University of Politics and Law, Xi'an, 710061, China

*18209210911@163.com

Abstract

In the history of Chinese and Western philosophy, Zeno's theory of "the flying arrow does not move" and Monk Zhao's theory of "The thing does not move" both emphasized that things are static. However, behind the same concept of movement, they have different argumentation methods and argumentation purposes. Zeno's approach was logical analysis; Monk Zhao used the methods of quoting classics, compared the present and the past, and demonstrated the cause and effect. The purpose of Zeno's argumentation was to defend Parmenides' ontology. The purpose of Monk Zhao was to emphasize the cosmology of "emptiness", and to criticize Theravada Buddhism, emphasized the eternal existence of Buddha Dharma. This reflects the thinking difference between western philosophy, which emphasizes "external seeking" and rationality, and Chinese philosophy, which emphasizes "introspection" and sensibility. Based on the social reality, analyzing the causes of the differences between Chinese and western philosophical thinking, and exploring the concrete practices we should adhere to when facing the differences between Chinese and western philosophical thinking.

Keywords

The Flying Arrow does not Move; The Thing does not Move; Chinese and Western Philosophy Differences; The Reasons for Differences; Specific Measures.

1. Introduction

In the history of Chinese and Western philosophy, the ancient Greek philosopher Zeno and the Chinese Eastern Jin Dynasty Buddhist Monk Zhao had very similar view on sports. Zeno put forward the famous idea of "the flying arrow does not move", believing that any object must occupy a certain space, leaving its own space means losing its own existence. The path of the flying arrow can be divided into countless moments. At each moment, the flying arrow occupies a space of the same size as itself. The flying arrow is always in its own space and stops at different positions in this section of the road, instead of flying from one position to another, so it is stationary. "The thing does not move" by Monk Zhao laid the foundation of his philosophical ontology, and its basic meaning is to prove that things will never change, continue and flow on the basis of affirming the "emptiness" of all things. The things of the past once produced, then the eternal stay in the past; The present thing once produced will forever stay in the present. Both of them maintain that things are static and never move. Behind the similarity, they had huge differences in argumentation purposes and argumentation methods, which are the embodiment of the differences between Eastern and Western philosophical thinking modes.

2. The Difference of the Way of Argument

The flying arrow does not move, as Zeno explained it, "if anything is at rest when it is in a space of its own size (without going beyond it), and if the moving thing always occupies such a space in the present, then the flying arrow is not moving." [1] Obviously, Zeno was against motion, believing that motion was impossible. However, our understanding of Zeno cannot stop here, for we think that Zeno did not have a correct understanding of common. In fact, as a very speculative philosopher, it is impossible for Zeno not to realize that things are in motion. What Zeno really asked was, "Can we be content with sensuous knowledge?" "Can we understand and grasp movement in our mind?" As Parmenides criticized natural philosophy, he believed that natural philosophy was not only limited to the field of perceptual experience, but also advocated uncertainty and fluidity, which made universality and stability impossible. So, in the pursuit of an "existence", Zeno's "The flying arrow does not move" also abandoned perceptual experience. After analyzing movement in the mind and finding its contradiction, the authenticity of movement was negated, and the movement was regarded as an illusion in perceptual phenomenon to solve the contradiction.

How does Zeno argued this? The short record of "The flying arrow does not move" in Physics contains profound dialectical thinking. We can analyze the process of Zeno's argumentation by means of disjunctive reasoning, syllogism and hypothetical proposition. In the first place, according to the disjunctive reasoning, the flying arrow either occupies only one point at every instant or at the same time at another point; The flying arrow cannot be on the other point at the same time; So the flying arrows occupy only one point at each moment. Then according to the analysis of the syllogism, the major premise: occupy a point is static; Minor premise: the flying arrow occupies a point at every moment; Conclusion: The flying arrow is stationary at every instant. Finally, the analysis continues according to the hypothetical proposition: if each point is at rest then the sum of points are at rest; If occupying a point is at rest then the sum of occupying many points are at rest; From the above deductions a syllogism can again be constituted. Major premise: the sum occupying many points is static; Minor premise: the process of flying is the sum of many points; Conclusion: The process of flying arrow is static. Thus Zeno's argument of "the flying arrow does not move" was completed.

Zeno's "The flying arrow does not move" was recorded in the history of the original texts of only a few dozen words, Zeno from the given conditions to come to the conclusion that the process contains a thick Dialectical thought, so it is easy to understand, Why does Hegel also call him the first person of dialectics in the history of western philosophy "point is the dialectics of Zeno's excellent...He is the creator of dialectics." [2]

Compared with Zeno, Monk Zhao's argument on the theory of "things do not move" are diverse. First of all, the Monk Zhao cited the classics to demonstrate. "Let's talk about it, The Tao says: The dharma didn't come from anywhere and didn't go anywhere. Middle view says: Look at the distance to know that you are leaving, leaving people can not reach the distance. This is seek stillness in motion, to know that things do not move" [3] Monk Zhao quoted the words in the Tao Xing Prajna, "Empty comes from nowhere and goes nowhere, so is the Buddha." [4] In the original text, "emptiness" was changed into "various dharma". The Dharma is empty, The Dharma is empty and neither comes nor goes. This is "things do not move"; And quoted the words of Zhong Lun to come product, "Has been in the past is not in fact the past, now did not leave." [5] Obviously, it was a negation of "going", because "going" can be divided into three stages: "went", "not gone", and "gone", which respectively represent the past, not yet arrived, and has left. None of the three stages can be called "going", because there is no "going", so Monk Zhao Came to the conclusion that "no going, no moving".

In addition, Monk Zhao also negated the connection between the present and the past from the contrast of time changes to demonstrate that "things do not move". "The reason why is static,

the past things can not come to today, so it is static rather than movement. movement rather than static, because it will not come. Static rather than movement, because it will not go." [6] Monk Zhao demonstrated the difference between "movement rather than static" and "static rather than movement", Although agreed that things in the past "do not come" to the present, Monk Zhao thought that it is "static rather than movement", and agreed with "do not go", that is, things in the past will always stay in the past, and things in the present will always stay in the present. Monk Zhao cited the example of the Brahma Zhi: "The Brahma Zhi said: I am a former man, not a former man." Monk Zhao keenly saw the discontinuity in the movement, Strive for stillness and deny discontinuity in motion, thus came to the conclusion that things do not move.

Finally, Monk Zhao from the causal relationship to prove "things do not move". "The result does not contain the cause. The cause does not disappear, the cause does not come today." [7] Obviously, Monk Zhao used cause and effect in different times to demonstrate that things do not move. Cause is in the past and effect is in the present, but there is no contradiction between Monk Zhao's view about cause and effect, The effect develops from the cause, and the cause is the internal basis of the development of the effect. There can be no decisive split between cause and effect. Monk Zhao did not deny this, but he took a different position, emphasizing the discontinuity of causality in time rather than in logic. Therefore, it is natural to draw the conclusion that "things do not move" through different time of causation.

3. Differences in the Purpose of the Argument

Through the interpretation of the concepts of "the flying arrow does not move" and "The thing does not mov", we can see that Zeno negated the continuity of motion in space, while Monk Zhao negated it in time. Both reveal the contradiction of movement, and the different ways of revealing them are the subtle manifestation of their different philosophical aims.

Zeno's contribution to philosophy in his life was mainly to defend the theory of "ontology" proposed by his teacher Parmenides. As Whitehead said: "Parmenides, through his philosophical poetry, left a great legacy not only to his immediate successor Zeno, but to all Greek philosophers, and to the later Western tradition of thinking after Greek philosophy." [8] Parmenides was an ancient Greek philosopher in the mid-sixth century, in order to reach light, he took a path of justice and fairness "includes both the unshakable core of persuasive truth and the mortal believes, even if there is no true faith in it." [9] This was the way of his philosophy of "being". Parmenides did not explain the specific meaning of the path of "existence" in *On Nature*. Instead, he mentioned at the beginning of *Truth*, "a path exists and cannot not exist... The other way, (it) does not exist, (it) must not exist." This road is Parmenides' "path of truth", which takes "existence" as cognition. And Parmenides' purpose was to lead people's eyes from the numerous and disorderly phenomena to the permanent and unitary essence.

The goal of Zeno's negation movement was to achieve what Parmenides called the invariable, the only, the immovable being, Zeno opposed the movement of being "to defend those views of Parmenides against those who would condemn him." [10] The content of his defense can be divided into two aspects, one was to demonstrate the existence of a single but against the numerous existences, the other was to demonstrate the existence of immobility against the movement of existence. "Flying arrow immobility" is just one of the four examples (including dichotomy, aquiline chasing turtle, playground) of Zeno's argument of immobility against existential movement. The two aspects of the defense are inseparable: only pluralism acknowledges movement and pluralism inevitably acknowledges the infinite divisibility, and finally the two aspects of Zeno's argument neatly focus on the immobility of being. This goes back to the theme of Parmenides' philosophy, all the arguments are to give Parmenides' philosophy of existence a strong theoretical support.

The directly purpose of writing *Zhao Lun* was to correctly explain "emptiness" in the face of the incomplete understanding of "emptiness" by "six schools and seven schools". the concept of movement and the explanation of "emptiness" of Monk Zhao are directly derived from Nagarjuna. Nagarjuna divided "going" into "going time" and "going method" in *Zhong Guan*. At the same time, it emphasized that "going time" and "going method" should not be separated from each other. What is the relationship between "goer" and "going method"? Nagarjuna negated the goer and explained the ontology with emptiness. For the state of going, Nagarjuna led to "no going" and emphasized the concept of "emptiness". Therefore, it can be seen that the view of motion is only a mean to prove "emptiness", and his finally foothold is emptiness ,and anything is pseudonym.

In addition to the criticism of the "six schools and seven schools" and the construction of the universe ontology of Mahayana Buddhism. Again, this theory is a rejection of Theravada Buddhism. According to Buddhism, we now speak of no exercise for those who do not understand the true meaning of Buddhism. Finally, Though the Tathagata merit had been through the ages, it will not be diminished but will become stronger. Monk Zhao from the "things do not move" to show that the Tathagata's merits and virtues are eternal.

Obviously, both Zeno and Monk Zhao opposed the movement, and they opposed the movement for completely different purposes. Zeno negated the movement of existence Monk Zhao negated the movement of self-nature. the goal of Zeno's denial movement was to defend the sole and immovable existence, while the goal of Monk Zhao's denial movement was to criticize the six schools and seven schools, and the Theravada Buddhism, to show the essence of the "emptiness" based world, thus proved the perpetuity of the Dharma.

4. The Difference of Thinking Mode

About things being static, Zeno and Monk Zhao's positions are different, but both are bold refutations of common sense. Zeno explained that things are static in space, Monk Zhao explained that things are static in time. No matter quoting Buddhist Scriptures or applying cause and effect and comparing the past and the present, it is possible to understand the true meaning of "things do not move" based on time.

Zeno's method was a thinking mode of "seeking outside" of external senses, while Monk Zhao was "introspection" of internal senses. "Externally seeking" and "introspection" are typical manifestations of the differences between Eastern and Western philosophical thinking modes. Western philosophy "seeking outside", the focus of its attention is the external "nature" as the ancient Greek philosophers to seek the origin of all things first from the external environment and from the external exploration to obtain self-knowledge satisfaction. The "introspective" thinking mode of Chinese philosophers makes them focus on "human", which is completely different from western philosophers. Introspection makes Chinese philosophers pay more attention to "life" and the meaning of individual life.

The argumentation of Zeno and Monk Zhao on "immobility" also clearly reflects the differences between Chinese and Western philosophical thinking modes. Zeno used logical reasoning, physical demonstration, mathematical demonstration and rational analysis. There were three kinds of argumentative methods of Monk Zhao. Except the argumentative method of citing classics, the other two methods can be attributed to the perceptual and intuitive thinking with time as the node, which is completely different from the rigorous logical argumentative methods. Although Monk Zhao didn't have the rational analysis and argumentation, it cannot be denied that both them are full of strong Speculative thinking, which can be described as the similarity between Chinese and Western philosophies. in addition, his argumentation method of quoting classics and scriptures deeply reflects the "worship of the ancient" characteristic of Chinese philosophy.

5. The Reason of the Difference between Chinese and Western Philosophy Thinking Mode

Zeno and Monk Zhao had different interpretations of "things do not move", and the differences in thinking modes between Chinese and Western philosophies can be understood from the different interpretations. There are profound reasons behind the difference in the way of thinking between them. As Marx and Engels pointed out in the *German Ideology* "The production of thought, idea and consciousness are directly interwoven with people's material activities, material communication and real life at first." [11] The mode of thinking, as the conceptual mode of constructing the world, is ultimately rooted in the mode of social production, depending on the material basis of society, it will become relatively independent, once it forms a relatively stable mode of thinking. In the long run, this kind of thinking can affect all aspects of our lives.

What is the root cause of the difference in thinking mode between Chinese and Western philosophy? In addition to the "material activities" mentioned above, there are four specific reasons.

First, from the social background. The ancient Greek society emphasized individual characteristics and freedom; Society is characterized by individualism. However, the ancient Chinese society emphasized the relationship between individuals and society, which was mainly characterized by collectivism. The different living backgrounds of Chinese and Western people in ancient times lead to different philosophical thinking. Thus, different forms of philosophical thinking emerged.

Secondly, from the perspective of social cognition system. People in the East and the West have different perceptions of life. The complex social relationships of Chinese people force them to focus on the inner part of social life, So the self-structure of Chinese people is dependent; On the contrary, westerners have simpler social relations, so they are more likely to focus their attention on the object and their own goals. In this social cognitive system, social organization has a direct influence on the cognitive process. What is more important is that this characteristic has been maintained, has produced a wide range of effects on the psychology and behavior of people living in reality. Chinese focus on the situation, westerners focus on the individual; Chinese view the world in a passive way, while Westerners conquer the world in an active way.

Finally, from the ecological background. Chinese civilization belongs to agricultural civilization, which has created a complex hierarchical society. In this kind of society, social harmony is emphasized. Greek civilization generally belongs to the maritime civilization, which has no relatively stable production mode. Influenced by the natural environment, Marine civilization has higher requirements on personal quality. Thus, it can be seen that eastern civilization emphasizes group harmony, while Western civilization emphasizes individual quality. It is because of the difference of ecological environment that people in the east and the west have different thinking about philosophy.

In fact, the difference between Chinese and Western ways of thinking are rooted in the path that Chinese and Western nations have chosen in their transition from barbaric society to civilized society. In China's transition from primitive society to civilization, did not break the original clan system. Based on the clan system, it establishes an ethical system to link blood ties. In addition, the birthplace of Chinese civilization Yellow River basin has mild climate and fertile land , which is very conducive to the development of agriculture. People live a peaceful and stable farming life of "working at sunrise and resting at sunset", the relationship between man and nature is relatively harmonious. As a result, Chinese people pay much attention to the real life and pay little attention to the nature outside of human beings themselves. even if it focuses on, it is based on its own needs.

Western society took a different path in its transition from primitive society to slave society. The original clan system was broken, the umbilical cord of blood was quickly cut and a union world was established based on individuals. Individuals must explore the outside world in order to sustain themselves. Therefore, in the eyes of westerners, world is always an alien world. In addition, the Greek peninsula, the birthplace of Western civilization has very bad natural conditions. Therefore, westerners do not pay attention to the real social life, do not pay attention to the coordination of interpersonal relations, and pay attention to the nature outside human beings. Therefore, they try to understand and explore nature in the process of live. Thus, forming the way of thinking that westerners emphasize positivism and speculation.

More importantly, Chinese and Western cultural systems are different. In China, the dominant idea is the unity of man and nature; In the west, the dominant idea is the dichotomy of subject and object. And this is the real reason why Chinese and Western ways of thinking are different. The thought of the unity of man and nature in the history of Chinese philosophy emphasizes the integration of man and the world. This idea is always reflected in Chinese traditional culture. On the contrary, western traditional philosophy emphasizes the dichotomy of subject and object. As the subject of knowledge, man stands outside the world to know the world.

6. The Attitude We should Adopt in the Face of the Difference between Chinese and Western Philosophical Thinking

Zeno and Monk Zhao had different thoughts on the same philosophical problem, which showed the difference of thinking mode between Chinese and Western philosophy. In the era of globalization, we should learn others' way of thinking while adhering to our own way of thinking. How do we do that? Here are three suggestions:

Unity of wholeness and empirical analysis. Modern analytical science has developed to the point of being quite incisive, it studies the whole world from different degrees, it provides a scientific basis for people to grasp the nature and internal relations of objects. But, the nature of the parts of anything is not the same as the nature of the whole. We should pay more attention to grasp the overall object of scientific synthesis. The whole analyses and integrate in people's minds are different from the whole before analyses. Therefore, totality and positive analysis is an important development path of Chinese and Western philosophical thinking.

Unity of autonomy and openness. In a pluralistic world, acknowledging difference does not mean alienating oneself. Always maintain self-integrity and independence is also the character of The Times. Raising the national essence is an important symbol of modernization. However, while maintaining autonomy, should also attach importance to openness. Today's world is an open world, the essence of emancipating the mind is to reform and optimize the way of thinking, Isolation means self-elimination. Therefore, can keep own survival and development only by constantly updating the way of thinking according to the changing situation.

Unity of Compatibility and creative. From the perspective of historical development, the development of all ethnic groups is a history of constant integration of different ethnic groups and ideas. The continuous and perfect development of human beings is inseparable from the mutual integration of ideas. Learning the strong points of other nations and changing the shortcomings of our own can make the progress of different nations. Of course, while paying attention to compatibility, should expand our thinking, should create continuously.

References

- [1] Aristotle. *Physics*. (The Commercial Press, China, Beijing 2006), p.191-192. (In Chinese).
- [2] Hegel, translated by He lin. *The first volume of lectures on the history of philosophy* (The Commercial Press, China, Beijing 1959), p.272. (In Chinese).
- [3] Monk Zhao. *The theory that things do not change. Tibetan tripitaka*. (All kei publishing house, Japan 1932), v.45. P151. (In Japan).
- [4] Daoxing Prajna. *Tibetan tripitaka* (Japan All Sutra Publishing House, Japan 1932) v.8. p.473. (In Japan).
- [5] ZhongLun. *Tibetan tripitaka*. (Japan All Sutra Publishing House, Japan 1932) v.30. p.30. (In Japan).
- [6] Monk Zhao. *The theory that things do not change. Tibetan tripitaka*. (All kei publishing house, Japan 1932), v.45. P151. (In Japan).
- [7] Monk Zhao. *The theory that things do not change. Tibetan tripitaka*. (All kei publishing house, Japan 1932), v.45. P151.
- [8] Translated from English by David Gallop. *Parmenides' Remains*. (Guangxi Normal University Press, China, Guilin 2011). p.5 (In Chinese).
- [9] Translated from English by David Gallop. *Parmenides' Remains*. (Guangxi Normal University Press, China, Guilin 2011). p.71 (In Chinese).
- [10] Plato. *Complete Works of Plato* (People's Publishing House, China, Beijing 2018), p.128. (In Chinese).
- [11] Marx and Engels. *Complete works of Marx and Engels* (People's Publishing House, China, Beijing 1995), p29-30. (In Chinese).