ABSTRACT. It is necessary to take into account that every ontology and also every scientific system draws a picture of the World according to the abstractions and presuppositions which were accepted, consciously or unconsciously, during the construction of the system. That is why Aristotle, Hegel, and the paraconsistent logics gave us different world views. On the basis of contemporary logics, including paraconsistent logics, we can better understand what the objects of the Aristotelian logic are, what are the presuppositions used in it, what are the meanings of its terms and how their meaning was changed when used in other theories.
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The world is indubitably one if you look at it in one way, but as indubitably is it many, if you look at it in another. It is both one and many – let us adopt a sort of pluralistic monism.

(W. James)\textsuperscript{1}

I agree with this view of James and one of the objectives of my paper is to provide some arguments in support of this thesis.

1. DIFFERENT LOGICS WITH DIFFERENT WORLD VIEWS

1.1. Aristotelian logic

For a long time in the history of logic it was generally accepted that Aristotelian logic, as an ontology, gave us ‘the true world view’

\textsuperscript{1} W. James, \textit{Pragmatism}. Dover, New York 1995, p. 5.

i.e. the real picture of the world without subjective elements. Even today, according to many logicians, the task of modern symbolic logic is nothing more than pointing to and signifying an improvement of a development of the Aristotelian ontological theory on the basis of ‘the most certain principle of all’, i.e. the ontological principle of non-contradiction.

But, the fact is that Aristotle could not find the most certain principles of all things. The Aristotelian ontology with its basic principles is subsumed under a special way of looking at the World.

It is necessary to take into account that every ontology, as also every other scientific system, draws a picture of the World according to the abstractions and presuppositions which were accepted, consciously or unconsciously, during the construction of the system. If the abstractions and/or the presuppositions about the World are changed then we may get a different world view. Thus, according to the different structures, we obtain different ‘actual worlds’, each of which can be regarded as giving a picture of the World at a certain level of abstraction with certain presuppositions, but none can be regarded as free from them.²

The Aristotelian ontology is based on some characteristics of natural language. We would not be able to use natural language, if we wouldn’t suppose that in the World

(a) there are some things that have the same properties, and
(b) there are other things that lack these properties.

That is, we suppose that in the World some things are in some respect identical or at least similar, and that there are other things that are, in the same respect, different from them. It is also necessary to suppose that in the World

(c) things do not change their properties every moment in every respect, and
(d) if something has a property P, then it will possess it for a relatively long time. It will not loose it as soon as it receives it.