

Theology as a Cognitive Discipline

Arsen A. Movsesyan, engineer-physicist,
independent researcher, plars7@mail.ru

The article provides a solution to the problem of classification of the Theological Disciplines. This important problem is solved on the basis of a new Theory of Cognition, which is built proceeding from some general physical representations and heuristic glance at the basics of General Psychology. The criterion for completeness of any cognitive system, which is critical for classification of the Theological Disciplines is also formulated and justified. Relevant Theological Disciplines are represented in tabular form. This shows that Theology is an important fundamental cognitive discipline. A substantiated assertion about the unity of the processes of scientific and theological cognition is one of the important conclusions of this article.

Keywords: Theology; Classification; Criterion for Completeness;
Impact; Motion; Rest; Space; Time.

Introduction

*Theology is not a science,
but a cognitive discipline*

Is there anything in common between the religious and scientific methods of cognition, or are these methods antagonists? The answer to this question is important for determining the place of Theology in the cognitive process. From the outset, it should be noted that the author is not a theologian, philosopher or religious philosopher, but an engineer-physicist, so all the constructions and justifications will bear predominantly naturally-cognitive character. The answer to the above question will be given on the basis of a new Theory of Cognition, which is built proceeding from some general physical representations and a new glance on the basics of General Psychology. It is accepted that Theory of Cognition is the prerogative of Philosophy. But this is not true, because Theory of Cognition has a fundamental importance for the entire spectrum of the cognitive process, and for the construction of foundation one need to use all tools of cognition. However, firstly, Philosophy uses mainly the tool "mental simulation", it is that, what philosophers call "reflection", and secondly, Philosophy is not a science, but it is one of the forms of the scientific and religious methods of cognition, and this will be shown in the article. It is for this reason that Philosophy cannot solve the problem of classification of the Sciences for many centuries. This is an important task, since its solution allows us to see the vector of the development of Fundamental Science in general. Many philosophers tried to solve the problem of classification of the Sciences, among them Sen-Simon, Conte, Bacon, Hegel, Engels, Kedrov et al., but were not able to. They all are smart people, the matter is not in it, but is that this problem is insoluble within the scope of Philosophy. Why have I focused attention on this issue? Because its solution allows us to classify, including, the Theological Disciplines, thereby defining the place of Theology in the cognitive process.

To understand the current state of affairs on the issue concerning the classification of theological disciplines, it suffices to cite the following excerpt from a book published by the Institute of Philosophy of the Russian Academy of Sciences, «The division of Theology into historical, systematic and practical disciplines is the main result of the “metatheology” of the XIX century. The main trend of the XX century is further modifications of the same three-part structure with new accents, “readings” and private differences». [7,54] Thus, the Theological Disciplines are determined on the basis of historically established trend, and there is no scientifically substantiated principle and relevant criteria from which the Theological Disciplines would be come out. However, this problem has already been solved on the basis of the above mentioned new Theory of Cognition.

At the beginning, let's have a brief look at a new Theory of Cognition and a new glance on the basics of General Psychology. Then, consider the criterion of completeness of any cognitive system, which is important not only for the classification of Sciences, but for Theological Disciplines as well. And at the end of the research, Theological Disciplines will be presented in tabular form with the necessary explanations.

1. Briefly about the New Theory of Cognition

A few words are about the structure of the process of cognition. There is a link between cognition and natural numbers from one to five. If the process of cognition is associated with number one, then the *ways* of cognition will match number two, because there are only two *ways* of cognition: 1. Empirical; 2. Theoretical. Methods of cognition correspond to number three, because there are three methods of cognition: 1. Scientific; 2. Religious; 3. Intuitive. Levels of cognition correspond to number four, since there are at least four levels of cognition: 1. Physical; 2. Psychical; 3. Informational; 4. Absolute. The foundation of the theory of cognition corresponds to number five, since only the presence of five conditions allows us to build a complete system of cognition: 1. Noncontradictory; 2. The principle of conformity; 3. Completeness; 4. Correctness; 5. The principle of dual compliance.

1.1. Ways of Cognition

The empirical *way* of cognition, associated with the possibilities of human perception, has two **tools of cognition** – **observation** (1) and **measurement** (2). And the theoretical way of cognition has two related but essentially various manifestations: **the thinking**, which is associated with the mind, that is, with the ability to logical justifications; and **the reflection**, which is associated with the reason, that is, with the ability to the discretion of ties. Thus, **logical design** (3) and **mental simulation** (4) are the tools of the theoretical way of cognition. Simple combinatorial considerations suggest that the number of possible combinations of the four elements is equals to fifteen. Therefore different combinations of the four instruments of scientific cognition predetermine fifteen possible forms of scientific cognition: description (1), computation (2), logic (3), philosophy (4), practice (1+3), designing (1+4), analysis (2+3), experiment (2+4), empirical generalization (1+2), theory (3+4), engineering (1+2+3), technique (1+2+4), general approach (1+3+4), application (2+3+4), foundation (1+2+3+4). These fifteen forms of scientific cognition engender the very same number of classes of the scientific cognition, which are specified by means of Table 1.

Table 1. Classes of Scientific Cognition

№	The combination of the tools of cognition	The form of cognition	Classes of scientific cognition	Representative of the class
1	Observation	Description	Descriptive Sciences	Geography
2	Measurement	Computation	Quantitative Sciences	Mathematical Physics
3	Logical design	Logic	Logical Sciences	Logic of Psychology
4	Mental simulation	Philosophy	Creative Sciences	Philosophy of History
5	Observation + logical design	Practice	Practical Sciences	Metallurgy
6	Observation + mental simulation	Designing	Engineering Sciences	Bionics
7	Measurement + logical design	Analysis	Analytical Sciences	Analytical Chemistry
8	Measurement + mental simulation	Experiment	Experimental Sciences	Experimental Physics
9	Observation + measurement	Empirical generalization	Empirical Sciences	Geology
10	Logical design + mental simulation	Theory	Theoretical Sciences	Theoretical Mechanics
11	Observ.+measure.+ logical design	Engineering	Engineering Sciences	Strength of Materials
12	Observ. + measure.+ mental simul.	Technique	Technical Sciences	Aircraft Construction
13	Observ.+log. design+mental simul.	General approach	Natural Sciences	General Biology
14	Measur.+log. design+mental simul.	Application	Applied Sciences	Electronics
15	Obs.+measu.+log. design+men. sim.	Foundation	Fundamental Sciences	Physics

Since no one but the person himself can objectively determine (measure) the level of the faith of human, then in the religious method of cognition two empirical tools of cognition merge into one, which can be called *an emotional-sensual self-observation*, or briefly ESS, and as a result we have three tools of the religious cognition: ESS (1), logical design (2) and mental simulation (3). The number of different combinations of the three elements is equals to seven. Therefore different combinations of three tools of the religious method of cognition predetermine seven possible forms of religious cognition: ethics (1), logic (2), philosophy (3), practice (1+2), interpretation (1+3), theory (2+3), foundation (1+2+3). These seven forms of religious cognition engender the very same number of classes of the religious cognition, which are specified by means of Table 2.

Table 2. Classes of Religious Cognition

№	The combination of the tools of cognition	The form of cognition	Classes of religious cognition	Representative of the class
1	ESS	Ethics	Moral Theology	Teotetics
2	Logical design	Logic	Logic of Theology	Apologetics
3	Mental simulation	Philosophy	Philosophy of Theology	Eschatology
4	ESS + logical design	Practice	Practical Theology	Liturgics
5	ESS + mental simulation	Interpretation	Hermeneutical Theology	Exegetics
6	Logical design + mental simulation	Theory	Theoretical Theology	Patristics
7	ESS + logical design + mental simulation	Foundation	Fundamental Theology	Evangelistics

In the intuitive method we cannot measure or observe anything, but just estimate and contemplate, and only jointly, so both empirical tools of cognition, "observation" and "measurement", are transformed and merge into one tool, which can be called *a contemplative assessment*. As the peculiarity of the intuitive method of cognition is the state of "disconnected consciousness", the theoretical tool of "logical design" becomes unnecessary, but can be useful in the future for analyzes of the received information, and as a result we have two tools of the intuitive method – **mental simulation** (1) and **contemplative estimate** (2). The number of different combinations of the two elements is equals to three. Therefore different combinations of the two tools of intuitive cognition predetermine three possible forms of intuitive cognition: **mindsight** (1), **contemplation** (2), **insight** (1+2). The word "mindsight" is formed by combination of two words – mind and sight, and as a result we obtain an important word, which literally means – *the eyes of mind*. These three forms of intuitive cognition engender the very same number of classes of the intuitive cognition, which are specified by means of Table 3.

Table 3. Classes of Intuitive Cognition

№	The combination of the tools of cognition	The form of cognition	Classes of intuitive cognition	Representative of the class
1	Mental simulation	Mindsight	Figurative knowledge	Literature
2	Contemplative estimate	Contemplation	Contemplative knowledge	Art
3	Mental simulation +contemplative estimate.	Insight	Insightful knowledge	Music

As can be seen from Tables 1 and 2, Philosophy indeed is a form of scientific and religious methods of cognition, not a science, that is to say, Philosophy is the tool of science, undoubtedly important and necessary one, nevertheless, the tool.

1.2. Methods of Cognition

General principles of the scientific and religious methods of cognition are identical, because both use some initial notions and assertions that are taken on **trust**. In the scientific method these initial assertions are called axioms, and in the religious method they are called dogmas, that is, in this sense the words axiom and dogma are synonymous. The intuitive method is connected with the possibility of the non-rational discretion of the gist of cognizable object when a person **believes** that he saw the right decision, but this decision acquires the status of knowledge only after an appropriate experimental confirmation.

Each method of cognition uses the way of empirical generalization that is characteristically to them, or otherwise, the tool of method. For the scientific method, these are the organs of human senses (sight, hearing, smelling, etc.), which can be reinforced with the help of devices. ESS is for the religious method, and for the intuitive method it is contemplation. As a basis for **theoretical justification** a ligament of "**a means of method – the source of a means**" is used. So, the following ligaments are characteristic for the scientific method: 1. Axiomatization – faith; 2. Idealization – abstraction; 3. Formalizing – formula (symbol). The religious method can be characterized by the following ligaments: 1. Absolutization – Absolute Beginning; 2. Dogmatization – faith; 3. Formalizing – cult. The intuitive method is characterized by the following ligaments: 1. Disconnected consciousness – volitional effort; 2. Concentration – involuntary attention; 3. Persuasion – faith. For clarity, we shall submit the above said by means of Table 4.

Table 4. Distinguishing Features of the Methods of Cognition

No	The method of cognition	The tool of method	A means of method	The source of a means
1	Scientific	Organs of sense	1. Axiomatization	Faith
			2. Idealization	Abstraction
			3. Formalizing	Formula (symbol)
2	Religious	ESS	1. Absolutization	Absolute Beginning
			2. Dogmatization	Faith
			3. Formalizing	Cult
3	Intuitive	Contemplation	1. Disconnection of consciousness	Volitional effort
			2. Concentration	Involuntary attention
			3. Persuasion	Faith

If perceive the tool of religious method as a centre of sensually-emotional component of a person, we can say that the tool of scientific method is directed from the centre outwards, that is, in aside of the material world, and the tool of intuitive method is directed from the center inwards, that is, in aside of the spiritual world. Thus, the tools of methods, on the one hand, demarcate methods and, on the other hand, unite them. The second important notion, which unites three methods of cognition, is **faith**. The third factor uniting the three methods of cognition is the **interrelation** of methods. Indeed, many scientific discoveries occurred thanks to the intuitive insight, for example, the analytical geometry by René Descartes, periodic law by Mendeleev D.I., structure of the atom by Rutherford-Bohr. Many scientists were (and are) true believers (Galileo, Euler, Descartes, Leibniz, Kepler, Pascal, Faraday ...). Naturally, they introduced their own religious experience into science. And even some most important scientific and philosophical ideas were expressed by Priests of God, for example, Gregor Mendel (the laws of heredity), Nicolaus Copernicus (heliocentric system), Joseph Priestley (opening O₂, HCl and receiving NH₃).

The commonness of the tools of methods, the total source of a means (faith) and an internal interrelation of three methods of cognition allows us to make the following assertion: *the scientific, religious and intuitive methods of cognition are seen as different manifestations of the **unified natural method of cognition***. Thus, the scientific and religious methods are equivalent in terms of methodology, only the objects of their study are different, that is, we are not talking about the possibility of studying the Holy Scriptures using a scientific method, or, for example, of studying the crystal structure of niobium using a religious method, but we emphasize that although the reality is manifold, nevertheless, the process of cognition is a united process, and this fact else will be justified. The answer to the question in the introduction of article can sound like this: yes, there are common features, and these methods are not antagonists, but mutually complement each other in a single cognitive process. And the intuitive method of cognition is a bridge, which connects the scientific and religious methods. Without the intuitive method the process of cognition cannot be complete. It must be emphasized that the intuitive cognitive disciplines do not exist, because this method is subjective, but there may be empirical and theoretical generalizations, which are listed below in Table 5.

1.3. Levels of Cognition

A human most fully and clearly contains in itself three levels of cognition: physical, psychical and informational. Therefore, these three levels can be considered on the example of a human. It is here that arises a need for a fresh look at the basics of General Psychology. In addition, as can be seen from Table 4, the concepts of "faith" and "will" are important for the theory of cognition, and these concepts are closely interrelated, so we can't do without Psychology.

The essence of a new look is as follows. As a physical substance consists of four main phase states (solid, liquid, gas, plasma), and in doing so there is some mechanism to convert the substance from one phase state to another, likewise all structures of a human (physical, psychical, informational and unifying levels) consists of four main phase states with the relevant mechanisms of phase transitions. Each of the four levels of human consists of three sublevels; totally there are **twelve** of them. We cannot consider all of them, because the format of article does not allow (the interested reader can, if desired, refer to the sources [6]), so we shall consider only those sublevels, which are important for the purposes of this article. These are two sublevels of psychical level – the mind and the will of mind and two sublevels of informational level – the reason and the will of reason. But before, in order to facilitate the

perception of characteristics of these sublevels by the reader, for comparison, I will adduce the characteristics of one of the three sublevels of the physical level of a human – matter.

Matter is the substance from which the ambient world and human himself consist. *Basic phase states* are **solid bodies, liquid, gases, plasma** (transitional form is *an amorphous body*). *The structural unit of phase states* is **atom, molecule**. *The basis of structural unit* is **elementary particles**. *The characteristic of mobility of the structural unit* is **the temperature**. *The mechanism of phase transitions* is the change in temperature by means of **heating** or **cooling**. *The source of temperature change* is **heat**. *The essence of heat* is **electromagnetic waves**, that is, the **photon flux**. Depending on the photon **energy** we can distinguish the following classes of electromagnetic waves that form **Spectrum**: 1. Radio waves; 2. The infrared radiation; 3. The visible light (red, orange, yellow, green, blue, indigo, violet, which in the aggregate form white light); 4. The ultraviolet radiation; 5. The x-ray radiation; 6. The gamma radiation.

The mind is a mechanism allowing a person to **knowingly** operate with various objects of reality, giving them **titles** with the use of **words**, which are representing themselves as the unit notion or the general **notion**. *The basic phase states* are **notion, judgment, inference, theory** (the transitional form is *a definition*). *The structural unit of phase states* is **knowledge** recorded in the neural memory, and *the basis of structural unit* is **consciousness**. *The characteristic of mobility of the structural unit* is **the degree of awareness**. *The mechanism of phase transitions* is the change in the degree of awareness by means of **thinking** or **unthinking**. *The source of change of the degree of awareness* is **reasoning**. *The essence of reasoning* is the search of **justified ties**. The spectrum of justified ties will be mentioned a little later.

The will of mind is a **decision-making** mechanism at the level of consciousness with the purpose to meet the sensual **needs** of human. *The basic phase states* are **need, inclination, desire, passion** (transitional form is *an intention*). *The structural unit of phase states* is **the aspiration of mind**. *The basis of structural unit* is **consciousness**. *The characteristic of mobility of the structural unit* is **the awareness of need**. *The mechanism of phase transitions* is the change of the awareness of need by means of **concentration** or **dispersal** the attention of mind. *The source of change of the awareness of need* is **motivation**. *The essence of motivation* is **the decision-making** in the process of constructing logically interrelated **arguments**. Depending on the **liberty** of decision-making we have the following **Spectrum** of Decision-making: 1. Negative voluntary; 2. Negative voluntary, but after overcoming doubts; 3. The decision-making does not depend on the free will of individual (negatively forced, negatively forcible, a negative decision after the voluntary transfer of one's will, positive forcible, positive forced, a positive decision after the voluntary transfer of one's will, the lack of decision after the voluntary transfer of one's will); 4. Uncertainty; 5. Positive voluntary, but after overcoming doubts; 6. Positive voluntary.

The reason is a mechanism that enables a person to **mentally** handle with various objects of reality, **displaying** them in physical reality by means of **images** with the use of **signs**. *The basic phase states* are **sign, symbol, meaning, idea** (transitional form is *an allegory*). *The structural unit of phase states* is **information**, and the basis of structural unit is **thought**. *The characteristic of mobility of the structural unit* is **the degree of comprehension**. *The mechanism of phase transitions* is the change of the degree of comprehension by means of **reflection** or **thoughtlessness**. The source of change in the degree of comprehension is **shrewdness**. The essence of shrewdness is **mindsight**, that is, the flux of ties. The justification of mind and the mindsight of reason form a united Spectrum of Understanding what provides interrelation of psychical and informational levels, which in its turn stipulates a holistic perception of reality. Depending on the **depth of penetration** of the tie we have the following **Spectrum of Understanding**: 1. Visual; 2. Explanatory; 3. Logical (distinction, comparison, analogy, excretion, generalization, analysis, synthesis); 4. Figurative; 5. Contemplative; 6. Insightful.

The will of reason is a mechanism of **orientation in** the aspirations and hopes of human when implementing his spiritual **installations**. *The basic phase states* are **installation, opinion, belief, faith** (transitional form is *a worldview*). *The structural unit of phase states* is the **argument** in respect of the issues: "Do I act correctly?" and "What is my purpose?". *The basis of structural unit* is **thought**. *The characteristic of mobility of the structural unit* is **the assessment of correctness**, briefly – **assessment**. *The mechanism of phase transitions* is the change of assessment by means of **concentration** or **dispersal** the attention of reason. *The source of change of the assessment* is **goal-setting**. *The essence of goal-setting* is dual: 1. **The aspiration** of spiritual gaze of a human; 2. **Trust**. Depending on the **directivity** of the gaze of human, bearing in mind his spiritual aspirations, we have the following **Spectrum of Aspirations**: 1. Pecuniary; 2. Soulful; 3. Social (individual, family, genus, nation, country, Earth, the Universe); 4. Cognitive; 5. Spiritual and moral; 6. Absolute. Depending on the **landmark**, at which the

spiritual gaze of human in the evaluation of the correctness of his thoughts, aspirations and actions is aimed, we have the following **Spectrum of Trust**: 1. On a case; 2. On the personal experience; 3. On an individual consciousness (scheme, plan, theoretical calculation, project, model, awareness, comprehension); 4. On the help; 5. On prediction. 6. On God. Prediction can bear different character – from encouraging loved ones to Biblical prophecy. As for God, each person perceives Him in their own way: for someone God is nature, higher intelligence, etc., but there are those for whom God is the One Whom Christ called His Father.

So, the will is a complicated two-level concept, and it is always necessary to distinguish between the will of mind and the will of reason. Such representation of the concept "will" allows us to define another complicated concept by form: **faith** is the fourth ("plasmic") state of the will of reason. Next, we will try to establish the interrelation between the mind, the will of mind, the reason and the will of reason.

Just as the source of energy for the atoms is thermal photons, the source of energy for the aspirations of mind and the arguments of reason are the arguments of mind and the aspirations of reason, respectively. If thus, take into account that the arguments of reason as the structural units of phase states of the will of reason are associated with the arguments of mind as the quanta of conscious decision-making process through the Spectrum of Understanding, then we obtain the following **Remarkable Ligament**: *the aspirations of reason* → *the arguments of reason* ↔ *The Spectrum of Understanding* ↔ *the arguments of mind* → *the aspirations of mind*. The resulting ligament shows that when committing free action (physical, psychical, informational) the aspirations of reason are prioritize relative to the aspirations of mind. The act committed by the subject of action, endowed with the freedom of action, can be considered free if the will, which manifested through motivation and/or goal-setting, wears voluntary nature. The priority of the aspirations of mind is possible only in the case when an action is accomplished involuntarily, that is, forced or forcible, or without understanding, that is, without awareness and/or comprehension. This means that any researcher, whether he wants it or not, quite naturally uses the concept of "faith", provided that his research is not a superficial but profound, because faith is the "plasmic" state of the will of reason, without which the research is impossible. And even if a certain researcher announces, that he does not use the concept of "faith", but uses only the experience, he simply does not understand what he is talking about. So, faith is important for any method on any level of cognition.

1.5. The Foundation of the Theory of Cognition

We will not consider all five concepts of the foundation of the theory of cognition, because of the limited the format of article, but in more detail we will consider the most important criterion for the purposes of this article – the criterion of completeness of any *cognitive system* (CS).

Under the **essence** of the object of cognition we will understand the totality of its characteristics relative to manifested properties, possible movements, states, structures and their changes over time. The definition of completeness of the foundation of CS sounds as follows: *the foundation of CS is **complete**, if composed of a minimum number of assertions, which are sufficient for the development of CS with a view to reveal the essence of the object of cognition*. There is a criterion that is related to number **five**. For example, the foundations of classical Geometry, Physics and Chemistry consist of the **five** assertions, and the Torah consists of **five** books. Is it a chance occurrence or is regularity?

Here I will provide two assertions from General Physics: 1. Every process is a motion that takes place in space over time; 2. To lead out a body from a state of rest, it is necessary to have a certain impact on it. These two assertions contain **five** important and interrelated concepts: 1. **Impact**; 2. **Motion**; 3. **Rest**; 4. **Space**; 5. **Time**. The impact there is the cause, the consequence of which is motion, i.e. the deducing of the resting body from the state of equilibrium, associated with a change in the order of arrangement of the body in space. The impact is also the cause of the change in the position of the body relative to the initial, and the arising motion allows measuring these changes at predetermined periods of time, forming interrelation between the various positions of the body in space. Taking into consideration the above said, one can compose the following ligaments: 1. Impact – cause – change; 2. Motion – consequence – measurement; 3. Rest – equilibrium; 4. Space – order; 5. Time – linkage. Thus, one can formulate the following condition for the completeness of the foundation of CS: *the foundation of CS is complete, if it consists of the five groups of assertions, each of which bijectively expresses its relation to one of the following concepts: 1. Impact; 2. Motion; 3. Rest; 4. Space; 5. Time*.

And it is natural, as, indeed, our whole life consists of a totality of different processes, that is, those or other motions that occur in the space and time, and every motion begins with an impact, as well

as every system tends to the equilibrium state. The condition of completeness of the **research** is a particular case of the condition of completeness of the foundation of CS, and sounds as follows: *any research is complete, if substantial characteristics of the object of cognition identified during this research in some way correspond to the following criteria of completeness of the research: 1. Impact; 2. Motion; 3. Rest; 4. Space; 5. Time.* This condition of completeness and will help us in the issue of classification of the Theological Disciplines.

2. Expanded List of the Levels of Cognition

For a start, we shall try to determine the possible types of empirical and theoretical cognition in some general format, and the forms of cognition arising from these types. It's very simple to do, if one recalls aforesaid about the Theory of Cognition that the cognition process is carried out in two ways with the help of three methods on the four levels. Using simple combinatorial arguments, we conclude that there are potentially twenty four possible types of cognition ($n=2 \times 3 \times 4=24$), which spawn the relevant theoretical and empirical forms of cognition presented in Table 5.

Table 5. The Types and Forms of Cognition

№	The type of cognition	The form of cognition
1	Scientific-empirical cognition of physical reality	Empirical Sciences about matter
2	Scientific-theoretical cognition of physical reality	Theoretical Sciences about matter
3	Scientific-empirical cognition of psychical reality	Empirical Sciences about psyche
4	Scientific-theoretical cognition of psychical reality	Theoretical Sciences about psyche
5	Scientific-empirical cognition of spiritual reality	Empirical Sciences about information
6	Scientific-theoretical cognition of spiritual reality	Theoretical Sciences about information
7	Religious-empirical cognition of physical reality	Empirical Creationism
8	Religious-theoretical cognition of physical reality	Theoretical Creationism
9	Religious-empirical cognition of psychical reality	Mysticism
10	Religious-theoretical cognition of psychical reality	Existentialism
11	Religious-empirical cognition of spiritual reality	Spiritual Practice
12	Religious-theoretical cognition of spiritual reality	Religious Philosophy
13	Intuitive-empirical cognition of physical reality	Natural Philosophy
14	Intuitive-theoretical cognition of physical reality	Metaphysics
15	Intuitive-empirical cognition of psychical reality	Arts
16	Intuitive-theoretical cognition of psychical reality	Literature
17	Intuitive-empirical cognition of spiritual reality	Music
18	Intuitive-theoretical cognition of spiritual reality	Fiction
19	Scientific-empirical cognition of the Absolute Reality	Impossible
20	Scientific-theoretical cognition of the Absolute Reality	Impossible
21	Religious-theoretical cognition of the Absolute Reality	True Faith
22	Intuitive-theoretical cognition of the Absolute Reality	True Knowledge
23	Religious-empirical cognition of the Absolute Reality	Executed Promise
24	Intuitive-empirical cognition of the Absolute Reality	Revelation

When we discussed the levels of cognition, the expression "as minimum" was mentioned. This means that there are more than four levels of cognition, but they all stem from these four. To understand the aforesaid, it is necessary to touch upon the issue of the origin of the levels of cognition. All four levels of cognition are interrelated, so the following two ligaments are possible: 1. Top-down – "Absolute ↔ informational ↔ psychical ↔ physical"; 2. Bottom-up – "physical ↔ psychical ↔ informational ↔ Absolute". For clarity we will call the first ligament *Grace*, and the second one – *evolutionism*. Which of these two ligaments is true? This question, in essence, is some form of statement of the question, which is called "the basic question of Philosophy". If the top-down ligament is true, then God is the Creator of the whole Universe and everything that exists in it, but if the bottom-up ligament is true, then God is coined by human, and exists only in his "rich" imagination, or does not exist at all due to uselessness. If so, the notions psyche, information and "God" arise from one another, starting from the matter. We aren't going into philosophy now, but I shall formulate the assertion about **insolubility of the fundamental question of Philosophy**: *insolubility of the fundamental question of Philosophy, and hence, inability to prove the*

existence of God, as well as the denial of the possibility of His existence, is **the fundamental principle of the Universe**. Here we need **faith**.

This principle can be regarded as an axiom, since it is the objective reality which nobody can refute. It is as objective as the fact that every day periodically gives way to night thanks to the Sun and the Earth's rotation around its axis.

So, when the thing comes to choosing a ligament "Grace or evolutionism?" then, in my opinion, one should not philosophize on this subject, because it is useless in accordance with the indicated above principle. One must be guided by the common sense. When we accept Grace, we get all the variety of actually existing forms of cognition that are reflected in Table 5, by the most natural way. But when we accept evolutionism, then a lot needs to "adjust", and something completely "drops out". Personally I am for the common sense and call upon the reader to this. Thus, the top-down ligament is being avowed as the correct one, and besides, the levels not arise from one another, but all three others levels arise from the initially existing Absolute Level. Consequently, these four levels although are interconnected, but may exist separately. And if it is so, then they may form combinations the number of which is equals to: $N = 1 + \sum_{n=1}^4 C_4^n = 16$, where the C_4^n is the number of combinations from four elements by $n=1\div 4$. Let's list the appropriate levels of cognition with the help of Table 6, previously having entered the following designations: Absolute – A; informational – i; psychical – ψ ; physical – ϕ . When listing the combinations we will not use "+" sign, but the sign of conjugation "o", signifying a deeper unity.

Table 6. Extended Checklist of the Levels of Cognition

№	The designation of level	The title of the level of cognition	Brief title
Levels that are inaccessible to cognition			
1	A	Absolute Beginning	Existing Eternally
2	Aoi	Absolute Reason	The Spirit Holy
3	Aoio ψ	Absolute Consciousness	God the Father
4	Aoio ψ o ϕ	The Physical Manifestation of Absolute	God the Son
5	Ao ψ	Absolute Conscious Beings	Archangels and Angels
Levels available for cognition			
6	o ϕ oi	Information carrier	The Light
7	I	Informational	Spirit
8	Ψ	Psychical	The Soul
9	Φ	Physical	Matter
10	ψ oi	Invisible world	Psi-world
11	o ϕ o ψ	Plant world	Flora
12	o ϕ o ψ oi	The animal world	Fauna
13	o ϕ o ψ oi+x	Humanity	Socium
14	A→ ϕ	Items of supernatural character	Miracle Matter
15	A→ ψ o ϕ	Manifested Absolute Consciousness	Miraculous Phenomena
16	A→io ϕ	Manifested Absolute Information	Holy Scripture

Here we perform a brief analysis of Table 6. We will not touch upon the first five levels because they are not within the scope of this article. The sixth level is the light which provides interconnection of levels 6÷9. Although the official science casts doubt on the existence of the tenth level, but nonetheless, various psychophysical phenomena, that do not have a proper scientific explanation, are present in our lives, and as shown in Table 6 have the right to real existence. The main conclusion relative of the levels 11 and 12 consists in the fact that the representatives of the plant world possess a dynamic psyche, and the representatives of the animal world, in addition, possess a dynamic information structure. The bold line means that a person is something special, which is associated with the presence at him of an element "x". What is element "x"? "So God created man in his own image, in the image of God he created him" (Genesis 1: 27). Element "x" is a characteristic of the specified likeness inaccessible for scientific cognition, which serves a condition for the appearance of the additional unit in the above formula. This is what differs a man from an animal, and the sign of conjugation is replaced by the plus sign, because not every person understands and accepts this important distinction. The bold line also indicates that levels 14, 15 and 16 exist solely for a person, and the presence of arrow in the levels designations emphasizes the one-sided character of manifested information. To objects of the level 16 relate to The Sacred Texts of all three world religions. One can specify on following three criteria, proceeding from which one text or

another can be attributed to the 16th level of cognition: 1. God-pleasing, for example, the Book of Job; 2. The Divine Inspiration, for example, the Torah; 3. The Divine Revelation, for example, the Gospel. Note that the expanded list of the levels of cognition is also associated with the number four, since $16=4^2$.

3. Classification of the Theological Disciplines

Eight levels, progressing from the sixth to the thirteenth, together form the **Universe**. To study the objects of Universe there sixty *operator* Fundamental Sciences exist, and altogether, taking into account the different forms of scientific cognition, eight hundred and eighty-six Sciences are exist, without consideration the Interdisciplinary Sciences, about which we will not discuss here, due to the limited of the format of article. If desired, the reader may refer to the source [6].

And now let's talk about the Theological Disciplines, which are designed to study only and exclusively the objects of level 16. In doing so, let's get to arrangement, that we will call the texts of Holy Scripture – *The Word of the Lord*, and our understanding of these texts and there is the *Theology*.

Now we will apply the condition of completeness of the research. With the purpose of discretion of the characteristics of the object of cognition, corresponding to the criteria of completeness of the research, let us analyze and try to reveal the most important in *The Word of the Lord*. In my opinion, these important points are as follows: 1. **The Word of the Lord** to those who are willing to accept this Word – about Love, Faith, Trust, Patience and Humility. These Words, if properly understood by a human, have a strong **impact** on him; 2. The Word of the Lord is about His **Ways** and about **ways** of human, which lead to Him; 3. The **Covenant of the Lord** with the people. The Testament and the laws arising of it establish **an equilibrium** between the members of society on the one hand, and between society and God on the other hand; 4. The Word of the Lord about **the order of world**, that is exists and that will be coming; 5. The Word of the Lord is about the **linkage** of *past, present and future* events; about **prophecies** and their subsequent **execution**.

Thus, to the criteria of completeness of the research one can juxtapose the following characteristics of the object of cognition: 1. "Impact – Favored Word"; 2. "Motion – Ways of Lord "; 3. "Rest – Testament"; 4. "Space – the order of world "; 5. "Time – the execution of prophecies". The following Theological Disciplines correspond to the specified characteristics: 1. The discipline that studies the **Favored Word** we will be called **Euangelistics** (from the Greek *Euangélion* – The Glad Tidings); 2. The discipline that studies the **Ways of the Lord** we will be called Teotropology (from the Greek *Theós* – God and *trópous* – way); 3. The discipline that studies the **Testament** we will be called **Levitology** (from the book *Leviticus*); 4. The discipline that studies the issues of **the order of world** we will be called **Pandianomics** (from the Greek *Pán* – all and *dianomi* – distribution); 5. The discipline which tracks **the execution of prophecies** we will be called **Teoektelesics** (from the Greek *Theós* – God and *ektelesi* – execution).

If we accept the seven different forms of religious cognition as the vertical conditional axis of coordinates, placing them from top to bottom, and the five characteristics of the object of cognition as the horizontal axis of coordinates placing them from left to right, we shall get a tabular representation of possible Theological Disciplines for studying *The Word of the Lord*, which are specified by means of Table 7.

Table 7. Theological Disciplines

№	Characteristics of the facility		Favored Word	Ways of the Lord	Testament	The order of world	Execution of prophecies
	The form of cognition						
1	Ethics	Ethics of Evangelistics	Ethics of Evangelistics	Ethics of Teotropology	Ethics of Levitology	Ethics of Pandianomics	Ethics of Teoektelesics
2	Logic	Logic of Evangelistics	Logic of Evangelistics	Logic of Teotropology	Logic of Levitology	Logic of Pandianomics	Logic of Teoektelesics
3	Philosophy	Philosophy of Evangelistics	Philosophy of Evangelistics	Philosophy of Teotropology	Philosophy of Levitology	Philosophy of Pandianomics	Philosophy of Teoektelesics
4	Practice	Practical Evangelistics	Practical Evangelistics	Practical Teotropology	Practical Levitology	Practical Pandianomics	Practical Teoektelesics
5	Interpretation	Hermeneutics of Evangelistics	Hermeneutics of Evangelistics	Hermeneutics of Teotropology	Hermeneutics of Levitology	Hermeneutics of Pandianomics	Hermeneutics of Teoektelesics
6	Theory	Theoretical Evangelistics	Theoretical Evangelistics	Theoretical Teotropology	Theoretical Levitology	Theoretical Pandianomics	Theoretical Teoektelesics
7	Foundation	Evangelistics	Evangelistics	Teotropology	Levitology	Pandianomics	Teoektelesics
Theology							

Some of the disciplines indicated in Table 7 already exist, but they are called in a different way. So, *Evangelistics* is usually called *Biblical studies*. *Practical Evangelistics*, in its essence, is the discipline about the practice of preaching work, which is called *Homiletics*; *Practical Teotropology*, in essence, is the *Life of Saints*; *Practical Levitology* is the practice of Divine services (liturgy, the mass), which is called *Liturgics*; *Practical Pandianomics*, in essence, is the study of the doctrine of Church, and is differently called *Ecclesiology*; *Practical Teoektelesics*, in essence, is the *History of Church*, since the existence of the Church is a confirmation of the execution of prophecy, "And I also say to you that you are Peter, and on this rock I will build My Church; and the gates of hades shall not prevail against it." (Matthew 16: 18)

Actually, it is not so much important how to call a particular Theological Discipline – it is the prerogative of theologians; I see my task in the designation of scientifically grounded approach to the discretion and classification of the Theological Disciplines. And if it was succeeded, then it's good.

So, the thirty-five Theological Disciplines, five of which are fundamental, are necessary for study of the 16th level, while other religious disciplines study the rest of the levels, relying on the 16th level. For example, we can study levels 14 and 15 with the help of the religious method, but since these levels can also be study by the scientific method, then it is possible to create a unified discipline called **Theophysics**. Using the religious method, we can also study the levels which differ from levels 14, 15 and 16, but, of course, not fully but only theoretically and empirically, in accordance with table 5. We mean such directions as Empirical Creationism, Theoretical Creationism, Mysticism, Existentialism, Spiritual Practice, Religious Philosophy, Metaphysics. I should emphasize once again, that these directions are not theological ones, but namely religious, for example, Religious Philosophy and Philosophy of Theology are two different disciplines, as the first of them is mainly related with the study of the 7th and 8th levels, relying on one or another Holy Scriptures, and the second one is directly related with the study the 16th level.

Brief conclusions

1. A new Theory of Cognition, built on the basis of general physical representations and a new look at the fundamental basics of General Psychology, allows us to elicit a community of three possible methods of cognition – scientific, religious and intuitive, which makes it possible to characterize these methods as parts of the *unified natural method of cognition*. In doing so, it is not about the mechanical unity of science and Theology, but about their unification on the basis of the concept "cognition". Although the methods of science and Theology have much in common, but they are competent only within their fields of research: science studies the Universe in its various manifestations, and Theology studies the Holy Scriptures. Both the Universe and the Holy Scriptures are special objective objects of cognition, therefore both science and Theology are cognitive systems, and it is precisely the concept "cognition" allows us to speak about the unity of science and Theology. So, *Theology is not a science, but a cognitive discipline*.
2. The new Theory of Cognition also allows: 1. Establish the possible forms of cognition and the classes of scientific, religious and intuitive cognition arising from them – fifteen, seven and three classes of cognition, respectively (Tables 1-3); 2. Identify twenty-two possible types of empirical and theoretical cognition (Table 5); 3. Indicate on the presence of sixteen possible levels of cognition (Table 6); 4. Elicit the condition of completeness of any research; 5. Solve the problem of classification scientific and theological disciplines not on the basis of historically established trends, but on the basis of the scientifically substantiated principle and relevant criteria.
3. On the basis of the elicited condition of the completeness of research and relevant criteria, thirty-five possible Theological Disciplines necessary for studying *The Word of the Lord* are presented in tabular form (Table 7).
4. It is necessary to distinguish the actually Theological Disciplines, designed to study namely *The Word of the Lord* reflected in the relevant Holy Scripture (level of cognition 16), and religious disciplines, predominantly related to the theoretical and empirical study of psychical and informational reality, as well as related to the study of objects and phenomena of supernatural character (levels of cognition 7, 8, 14 and 15).
5. The solution of the problem of the classification of cognitive disciplines allows us to see the vector of the development of both scientific cognition and theological, and also allows us to outline the way for leading cognition towards the single-piece process.

References

1. *The Holy Bible*, King James Version, edited by Barry Moser, Viking Studio, 1999.
2. *The New King James Version, New Testament*. Edited by Thomas Nelson, Inc., 1979.
3. Kislyuk K.V., Kucher O.N. *Religiovedenie*. Rostov-na-Donu: Feniks, 2004
(Kislyuk K.V., Kucher O.N. *Religious studies*. Rostov-on-Don: Phoenix, 2004).
4. Kuz'min O.V. *Perechislitel'naya kombinatorika*. M: Drofa, 2005
(Kuzmin O.V. *Enumerated combinatorics*. M: Drofa, 2005).
5. Maklakov A.G. *Obshchaya psihologiya*. SPb.: Piter, 2008.
(Maklakov A.G. *General Psychology*. SPb.: Peter, 2008).
6. Movsesyan A.A. *Glavnoe prednaznachenie zemljan*. Razvilka: Plars-M, 2013 (2 izd.)
(Movsesyan A. A., *The Main Predestination Of Earthlings*. Razvilka: Plars-M, 2013 (2 ed.)).
7. Shohin V.K. *Teologiya: Vvedenie v bogoslovskie discipliny*. Uchebno-metodicheskoe posobie. M: Institut filosofii RAN. Gos. universitet gumanitarnyh nauk, 2002
(Shokhin V.K. *Theology: Introduction to Theological Disciplines*. Teaching manual. M: Institute of Philosophy RAS. State University of Humanities, 2002).
8. *Elementarnyj uchebnik fiziki*. V 3 t. / Pod red. G.S. Landsberga (12 izd.). M: Fizmatlit, 2001
(*Elementary textbook of physics*. In 3 t. / Ed. G.S. Landsberg (12th ed.). M: Fizmatlit, 2001).
9. *Filosofskij enciklopedicheskij slovar'*. M.: Sovetskaya enciklopediya, 1983
(*Philosophical encyclopedic dictionary*. M.: Soviet encyclopedia, 1983).

11.02.2015

© Arsen A. Movsesyan