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Abstract: The present work examines the meaning of definition of “economy” according to the ideas of the ancient Greek philosopher Aristotle who was the first one who entered this term and the representation of categories of “oikos” (home, household) and “nomos” (law, rule) which together compose the “oikonomy”. The present article also uncovers the original conditionality of any economic thought and exposes the value of Aristotle understanding of economy for modern times. The “Home” (“oikos”) serves for Aristotle as the elementary form of social organization. In the “oikos” sphere the specific laws and rules (“nomos”) which are mostly the unwritten laws-establishments are in force, while the laws of “natural order” are identical to the form of the home itself. The “oikonomy” according to Aristotle is the appliance and the structure of “home”. In contradistinction to the medieval “The Household Management Codes” (hereinafter referred to as “Domostroy”) which are focused on own internal domesticity, the Aristotle economy was initially written into the context of Greek society and the definitions of “economy”, “policy”, “morality” and “law” are interpenetrating in it. The Aristotle approach to the analysis of “economy” can be called a social or sociological and institutional one as for another terminology. This line in economic science is not interrupted over the course of history even if it is essentially weakened by the present predominancy of “pure” (formal) economic science. From this approach the variety of real economies in virtue of their refinement into the life of society and necessity of their contextual viewing are arising. The last one means the non-preconceiving of economic form related to the structure of society. The primary one is the society as the ensemble unity which forms its own economy. The importance of Aristotle line for modern times is in the way of thinking with the help of which he finds his “economy”. The authors of the present work suppose that the study of Aristotle economic logic lies within the framework of renewal of the modern society and can facilitate the synchronization of movement of prevailed economic ideas taking into account the changes in the standards of living.
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INTRODUCTION

Considering that the word “economy” is getting the strong modern forms, we can suppose that it carries a point of some arbitrariness and conditionally to free from which is possible only due to some conventionality. The breakage with the original historic name which is interpreted as closed household (“oikos”) gives this term the meaning of a new speak, i.e. the completely artificial entity. But the modern times do not get a load of such artificiality and arbitrariness any more. A. Marshall - the father of modern theory of economy under the definition of “economy” understands mainly the content of that science he deals with. For most of contemporaries who passed the school of “Economics” the content of economy is uncovering by the pointing onto the key economic problem - the problem of efficiency of limited resources usage and/or onto the number of economic principles [1, p.221].

In consequence of breakage with original founders the word “economy” was left unclaimed and has lost its original meaning for the ancient Greeks [2, p.812]. On the presence of more "high" elements than a simple “housekeeping” in the word “economy” indicates, for example, the more close to the modern times medieval tradition of “Domostroy” books in which the connection with the ancient origins were not interrupted.

Kolesova V.V - the author of prolusion to one of the modern editions of the “Domostroy” writes about this issue the following: «We are facing not with a simple word
“economy” (this is the real meaning “Domostroy” of calque). It is infiltrated with the moral characteristics regarding the relationships between people, who compose the population of the house but at the same time they compose the state, properties and families as well [3, p.8].

Even in prerevolutionary commentaries the content of “Domostroy” was interpreted as “an ideal life which over the course of history has been composing under the influence of teaching of Church, state institutions and national traditions” [4, p.115]. Such ideal is formulated in the text of the original sources in the form of rules and instructions.

So what should we expect from the exposure to Antiquity, from touching the economic reality in its “original” and “naked” form when it is only going to get its name? Maybe when it happens the moment of commonality and universality of economic form which is reproduced by the modern times but still is hidden by formalism and conjuncture will “glimpse” and “come to light”. And in this regard it will make the recently living people to take a stock onto the modern economy which all of us believe to be natural and public even if it’s not like that in fact.

For our century the return to original sources of economy could have a great importance taking into account the common state of mind - the absence of general significance and, therefore, the certainty in the views onto the most important social phenomenon.

The German scientist N. Luhmann has fixed the present question at hand in its more general form. He saw the basis of the problem in the loss of “natural representation” by the modern society. “The entire that never present completely can not be available as something unity.” The loss of “integral reality” is compensated by the “temporalization and ideologization of many concepts” [5, p.186-203].

Let’s consider more detailed what Aristotle could call the “economy” basing upon his first work “The Policy” dedicated to “the science about the household”, as well as his interpretation of definitions of “oikos” (home, household) and “nomos” (law, rule) which together compose the “oikonomy”.

Oikos: Eternal Home: “The law of phenomena and its internal necessity” - this is what the Philosopher is trying to recover in his work “Politics” [6, p.24]. This is the way the Aristotle general approach to the research of basic phenomenon is characterized by Skvortsov N. - the first author of translation of “Politics” to Russian language. Due to such “metaphysical task” the examined work has its “secular value”. From this the “non-casual similarity” of phenomenon under research with the “phenomenon of present days” is follows.

The metaphysical side of phenomena remains the same, so the phenomena perceived from this point can be known only in its truths [6, p.72].

In the work of Aristotle the definition of “form” answers the metaphysical side of phenomena which is necessary, everlasting and unchanged. For Aristotle the form means “the essence of existence of every thing and its first origin entity”. The form of phenomena/thing is “that in conformity with what it appears” [7, p.198].

The form of phenomena/thing is revealed in a true calling of the thing and through its functioning. It doesn’t matter which phenomena/thing we take: every phenomena/thing has such assignment. For example, Aristotle wrote: «every instrument will perfectly answer its assignment only if it was designed for performance of one type of job but not of few at the same time» [8, p.5]. In the same way every woman, slave, lord, property, family, state, etc. have their own assignments.

Actually, in the work “Politics” the word “oikos” - “home” represents the complex and manifold phenomena. Depending on the content it can means, first of all, an ordinary life similar to human which includes all the necessary things for the everyday needs satisfaction, the everyday routine [9, p.201-2011]. Secondly, the satisfaction of everyday needs is usually specified by the word “household”. But the last one can be considered in a more narrow sense like “property”. Thirdly, it means the owner (householder) who personifying with his actions the continuity of home. Fourthly, it means the family [9, p.5] that is “breathing only home” (wife, slave and lord, father and children) and together with this - the whole set of relationships between them. This is like a kind of microcosm of human relations. Fifthly, it represents the primary, elementary form of sociality - the natural coupling of people for their own human existence and, in this guise, is the element of organization of the Greek state-polis.

A man by his nature is examined by Aristotle as a public creature [9, p.259]. Out of the society and without the communication with other people he “becomes either an animal or the God” [9, p.8]. That’s why the forms and types of his “home” (the family, the settlement and the state) are the absolutely naturally due to the human nature occurred formations [12, p.187].

In this list of human forms the State is “the ending of their genesis”. And, according to Aristotle, in this “ending” the nature of the object comes to the fore [9, p.7], shows itself in absolute form and gets the
self-sufficient meaning. By virtue thereof such "self-sufficiency" the State stands ahead the "family" and
the individuum, as well as the entire takes the priority of its parts. Hereout a man is a politician creature, while
the family is the element of the State serving as the formation for citizen's education.

According to Aristotle, the State helps the human interaction to come closer to its "more perfect form"
[8, p.403]. The completeness of life manifestation is exactly what makes a man to be a man and differs him from
the "simplicity" of physical existence. This idea about a man and his "assignment" is the first supposition of
Aristotle's teachings. From this the form of the State is follows.

As a matter of fact, the properly humanistic taking its beginning in "human nature" finds its end in assignment, in the form of the State: to serve the "good" and "happy life".

If there were no polis the "home" would still exists even out of the polis life but, however, this existence would be deprived of "perfection" and "completeness" and the human form would be "incomplete".

The unicity of the polis structure was in its proximity to what is now called the common heritage of mankind. At least, the moments of such generality (the "natural humanity") were achieved in political intercourse of free population of the ancient Greek cities. It is no mere chance that almost all Greek philosophers-politicians put their theories and ideas of State into the "closest relation with the theory of morality, ethic" [13, p.387]. Till nowadays the morality is considered to be the most adequate expression of general form of humanity. Such attempts for Greek condition were not just an abstract intellectualizing. In any case it is widely accepted that the political theory of Aristotle is realistic and true one.

The preservation and restoration of polis and its universal human moments (forms) have required the whole polis (and "oikos" and the State) to be built at least in theory, in converging evidence. For Aristotle such converging evidence means the moral (ethical) ideas about the natural assignment of a man [13, p.143].

The practice of "oikos" life is mostly cutting across with the accepted grounds. Aristotle understood this properly himself. He explains the infatuation of people with pursuit of money by their "life instincts" but not by the "desire to have a virtuous life". But since the "will to live" is illimitable, the aspiration to get those means which are serving for such thirst satisfying is also unlimited. And even those people who are strongly desire and trying to have a virtuous life are searching for something that can afford a physical pleasure to them and since they consider the property to be the means to get that, the whole their activity is aimed onto the profit receiving [9, p.26].

So if all people are striving to "life in general", then what is possible to do about this? Maybe, the only thing left to do is to take such attempts as a "human nature" but not as the different "good abilities"?

Bowing to proper rootedness and extent of a "will to live" Aristotle refuses this moment in university and sees the achieved in conditions of Greek society element of freedom - the possibility to choose another variant, the variant of "virtuous" behavior line. According to Aristotle, the Moral Virtue always belongs to the mid-field: for example, the generosity lies between the "prodigality" and "greed" [14, p.86, 88]. The moderate prosperity is preferable because it combines the individual and community interests more successfully.

Aristotle finds the "mid-field", "harmony" and "balance" in everything: inside the family all these elements are adjusted with each other, while the family in its turn is harmonized with polis. In conditions of balance every element performs its assignment and bears the mark of its nature in the best way [13, p.110]. The same conditions provide the stability, survivance and capability of reproducing of integral whole and of the separate parts at the same time. By that the inclusion of "eternity" is taking place. In such a manner the "eternity" is stemming from naturality of origin and assignment of each element from one side and in their coordination with each other and with the surrounding world from another side.

The form of "oikos" overgrows as an element of "clearly" human organization and is the original sociality, the simplest form of life. If there were no polis the family would still exists even out of the polis life but, however, this existence would be deprived of "perfection" and "completeness" and the human form would be "incomplete". With such form of existence a man would never become "human" and would simply return back to nature and brutality. The literal manifestation forms that minimum on the boundary of which the "humanistic" is arising. The "achievement" of "humanistic" provides the exact formation the receiving of polis and "oikos" life in which institutions of feeding and reproduction are getting the secondary, service position.

"Eternal" is the "home" as the form of human life general organization. In Aristotle works the universal (panhuman) things are running together with polis in many directions: starting with the rational specialization of labor (mental and physical) in which every free person
has the opportunity to display his assignment and finishing with polis democracy with the elements of equality and freedom.

To be “eternal” does not mean simply “always to be” [15, p.223]. The “home” can’t be eternal if it does not overgrow from the “eternal” humanity. Here Aristotle with his naturally-eternal man has exceeded the key human problem onto the formulation and solution of which the modern mankind is only leading up. This is the problem of finding by every individuum of his human assignment, as well as the accomplishment and correspondence to it.

The display of true human nature has always been and left to be problematical in virtue of material suppositions, historical organization of society and understanding of exact individuums. But nowadays we have much more of material and universal elements for that than people had in the times of Aristotle.

The Aristotle thought even being uptight by the existing institutions of polis and first of all by slavery, is rising above the historical reality due to reliance on these institutions and is a part of universal (panhuman) dimension. In Aristotle work the form of Greek “oikos” on the same basis is actually acts as elementary form of general organization of society, the origin sociality. The existence as “eternal home” is the pretension, the claim of Greek "oikos" according to Aristotle's version. This eternal, unchanged and universal in "oikos", its form, is exceeding the limits of both, the unmediated existence as exact “home” and available Greek states. It belongs to the whole mankind. But at the same time this is the moment of unmediated life which, probably, can not be noted by most of people but which has the fundamental importance for the history of mankind. Aristotle has connected its existence with the stability of polis and its livability - the survival of a man not as just a biological entity but as a generic and public one in complete entirety of his life manifestations.

“We Nomos” (Rule, Law): “Human Institution” and “Order of Nature”: The sphere of “home” according to Aristotle is the area of existence in which a man is mainly stays “at home”, “at his mercy” and “unjust regarding his property”, i.e. is not a subject of “what was established” by others - by state, by someone’s opinion, etc, as well as he doesn’t need an external regulation. The slaves and the children are the part of the lord which would never harm himself knowingly. Consequently there are no violations against them, as well as there is no sense to talk about the obeying the state laws and regulations [15, p.284].

The state law enforces the law to those “who are by nature inherent to have a law: to those who are equally involved in the authority and submission structures” [9, p.159]. The relations of such type usually exist outside the “home”. Inside the “home” the “law” and “justice” are presented in relations between a husband and a wife. But this is already a “family law” which differs from proper state regulations.

For ancient Greeks the Law (“nomos”) means the human “establishment” and it speaks for itself: the established by people and depended on them norms of behavior which they can change and which they should follow consciously. This is how they differ from the governance of “folklaw” the origin and sense of which are “dark and hidden” and do not depend on mind. It is impossible to cancel or replace them. If the folklaw, as a rule, is an “unwritten” norm, then the norms of behavior exist in law in a form of notes. This makes them more available to every person, gives them a regular and exact characteristic and limits the arbitrariness of their supreme elucidators and interpreters. According to Cassidy F.H - the famous researcher of Greek antiquity, the moment of “noting” turns the “folklaw” (“themis”) into the “human establishment” - “nomos” (the law, legal provision, established rule) [17, p.195].

In his works Aristotle gives more deep, as to our mind, comparison and opposition to establishment (“nomos”) regarding what is called “consonant with the nature” and “true”: «Establishment is the opinion of most of people but wise people is saying something on the assumption of what is consonant with the nature and truth» [9, p.559-560].

Everything flowing out of the nature (things) is “natural”, “unchanged” and “everywhere has the same force and does not depend on acceptance or rejection of it by people”.

According to Aristotle, the state law (justice) is natural in parts, as well as partly legitimated [9, p.160]. The “flowing from the nature” and “legal establishments” which are based “on persuasion and mutual advantages” are intermingling in it.

Thus, the “natural” and “established” are both belong to one and the same world of human interaction. They characterize the different sides of structure of society and its separate areas: the preexisting moments of conditional and unconditional (absolute), external and internal order.

From another hand, the “order is a law” [9, p.481] and stands against the arbitrariness of separate individuums. Thus, the law-governing is the order which arises in
human society from the action of “power of necessity” that “entailing everything into the limits of every individuum” [9, p.33]. This order is similar to the natural world of space which in Greek philosophy symbolizes the proportionality, balance and harmony. But the natural powers plough their way in the human world just in the form of written law or, which is more often, in the form of “internal order”. Everything that flows out of the nature also brings the human world to “order”, as well as the “establishments-laws” do [17, p.195]. Herewith the natural order could be called a sphere of the “first laws” as it in this case coincides with what Aristotle calls “the essence of thing”, its form. «Actually, the nature is both, what something is appearing from and what it appears in alignment with» [9, p.198], i.e. the form of the thing.

Aristotle «Oikonomy: Appliance of Home: Let’s summarize. In the sphere of “oikos” (“home”) some specific laws and rules (“nomos”) are operating. These are mostly the non-written “laws-establishments” and the “natural” order laws are identical to the form of the thing - the form of “home” and of everything present there (people, property, etc). In other words, the “oikonomy” is the construction of “home” in its nature.

That’s why the medieval “Domostroy” books exactly follow of what if written in their Greek ancestor. But why don’t they follow the “spirit”? It seemed like both of them are related to one and the same sphere of “home economy” (household) and the laws in both of them have the features of “moral establishments” - they establish the norms of proper human behavior.

The fact is that the “Domostroy” is a moral constitution, the Code of family and house life. Its paragraphs are precept for the practical moral (and official) following the approved pattern of behavior [4, p.9]. The Aristotle “oikonomy” gives a life to the new unique science - the “oikonomics” which in Russian translation means “the science of household”. The “oikonomics” contains the rules of proper behavior which are flowing from the nature of things and are matched up with human intellect that takes the decisions about the practical implementation of established scientific “laws” itself. The everyday life is brightened here with the mind and the science in its turn is appealed by the mind as well. In Aristotle’s sense the norms of rigidly patriarchal family life are closer to the folklaw (“themis”) than to the “nomos” - the human establishments. The “law”, according to his position, is “the Mind free of unaccountable impulses” [9, p.482].

The sphere of “home” is the space of human freedom. Father, husband, lord follows his assignment himself. And no one and nothing (even the State) can’t make him to choose another way. Different variants of behavior, ways of life are coming around in everyday life. But one of them - “the best” one, the “virtuous” one is corresponding the form of “home”. It is grounded by science. Everyone decides himself whether to accept it seriously or not [9, p.20].

The Aristotle teaching about the “virtuousness” is the science. But this ethic is specific and unique. The ethic at the same time is the politics, or more exactly, “a part and a beginning of politics” [9, p.296]. The ethic as the beginning of politics coincides with “economics” - the study about the structure of “home” as here the origin norms are established. That’s why it is no mere chance that the “economics” studies goes before the work “Politics” and is the Aristotle’s first book. According to Aristotle, “economy” includes the naturally legislative element - the laws and rules of “home” which regulate the everyday life.

In contradistinction from the restraint of rigidly patriarchal family life on proper home life, the Aristotle economic prototype of them reflects the integrity of public life in its completeness. According to Aristotle, the “home” runs far beyond the closed, restraint “household”. Here the definitions of “economy”, “politics”, “right” and “morality” are interpenetrating and are interdependent. And such interpenetration flowing from the life gets the conscious expression in categories of “Politics”.

For Aristotle there is no exact problem of “vivification” of economy by the ethic in the form in which it exists starting from the Middle Ages and finishing with the present days. For Aristotle the “oikonomy” is initially moral by its nature [19, p.47]. However, the life of Classical Greek home (“oikos”) contains the proprietorial element which is the source of non-virtuous attempts [20, p.260]. But when the “profit” turns into the goal in and of itself, Aristotle brings such phenomenon beyond the limits of “oikonomy” and even finds a special expression for them - “chrematistics” which means that they are simply stand against the proper “economics”. If we deprive the “chrematistics” its “economic” status, we will see how it starts to deny its regularity (the law of nature) even noticing the availability of deep roots of this phenomenon - the “life instinct”.

For arising of specific problem of “economy” and “morality” junction these two definitions primary should be separated from each other in reality and in
consciousness. The “mating” of their completeness and maturity can be achieved only through the transformation of “economy” and “ethics” into the separate independent essences which exclude each other in their nature. The “economy” should turn into chrematistics, as according to Aristotle teachings the element of “proprietary” (“trading”, “monetary”, “material” and “housewifely”) which has turned into the goal in and of itself and is developing according to its own logic, absolutely excludes the morality [22, p.292].

Such devolution of “economy” has really happened and represents the “conquest” of Modern times, or, more exactly, of what we call the “capitalism” - the production for production. In the K. Marx analysis of capital and “self-movement of value” the reviewed economic element achieves the highest “purity” and together with it - the salience from other spheres of social life through the separation from them and contraposition to them in all the sharpness as some kind of antisocial nature. Here the formal or “pure” economy stands again the same formal and “pure” sociality. But as the heatless “economic machine” (“automated device”) is intent into the known social sphere and is examined in the connection with it, the “pure” economy analysis then does not loose its content-richness and at the same time turns into the research of exact society. That’s why the present economic sphere in its “purity” does not belong exactly to economics but to the historically developing economic system. So what is often presented as a general economic form, in fact is a concrete historical form of economy.

Another approach to economic form abstraction at which the overall “purity” of economic form is achieved by the complete breakage of connections with any sociality is possible. At the best case the “social” is taken out of the limits and is acting like a fixed (explicit or implicit) “institutional” supposition to the economic analysis. The economic form itself looks like an aforegoing to any analysis, requisite, always (for ever) existing and unchangeable thing - as an absolute economy. It can either be postulated, or be grounded with the help of, for example, economic principals.

However at any approach it is difficult and even impossible to avoid the notorious conventionality. The independent from any sociality “absolute” economy is impossible in reality: it has never existed and cannot exist in such an abstract form. At the best case, it is possible to fix a partial fragment of reality which the pretending to be absolute form is corresponding to, while at the worst case a general economic form is expressed into the obvious formalism or into the same formalism that lies in the universalization of form which is actually a local one.

The Role of Aristotle Economy for Modern Times: From the point of “pure” economic form, as it was established by the modern science, the Aristotle economy is not considered to be economy: it is more social for this. In Aristotle works, reads Schumpeter J. only the “grounds” of economy science are found [22, p.292] and the proper “economic reasoning” are merging with the “general philosophy of State and society”, while any economic question had been “rarely considered for its own sake”. In general, the economic science for ancient Greeks “was not able to reach the independent statues and hasn’t got even an exact name: for them the economy (oikos - home and nomos - law and rule) was only the practical wisdom of household management” [22, p.64]. Probably, Schumpeter J. is judging here about the Aristotle economic outlooks not basing on his original works but basing on the “Domostroy” interpretations of Greek “economy”.

As to our mind, it is not fair in respect of Aristotle. The only reliable grounding for such conclusions making is the absolutisation of actually conditional concept of “pure” economics and related to it analytical tooing which the modern economic science is basing onto. The practice of modern social market economy which, according to its theorists and commentators, is the result of social market “grafting” is pointing at this absolutisation. The “economy” which in this case is associated with the market has a very different quality than the “pure” economics and indicates onto the presence of limits of competence of the last one abstraction.

The Aristotle approach to the analyses of “economy” can be determined as a social one or, as to another terminology, sociological, institutional [22, p.292]. This approach is acting as an ancient predecessor of modern institutionalism. The social line in the economic science doesn't interrupt throughout the centuries, though is considerably weakened by the dominating intention to “purity” in modern economic science. The principle variety of real economy follows from it due to their vision of the context and the need to adapt itself to these contexts in order to have an adequate idea about it. The last just means the basic uncertainty of the “economy” and its structure. Society as whole is here primary and therefore each society creates its own
economy. At the same time these pointed contexts are connected with distinctions in initial ideas of society. And therefore the economic structure can accept various options depending on the dominating element inherent in this society or it attributed. In these or those versions of institutionalism such elements of society as moral, mental, political, legal, cultural, etc. create a difficult economic form and apply for a role of economic structure.

As to our mind, the main value of Aristotle line for the modern economic science lies not in those groundings of “pure economy” the elements of which can be found in his works (thoughts about values, money, exchange, percentage, etc) - all of these have become a thing of the past, - but in that way of thinking with the help of which he founds his “economy” and “reaches” it. Or in other words, what and why he determines as the “economy”.

His “economy” is a theoretical formation and is important for the general system of coordinates of “Politics”. That’s why it has no chance to serve as some prototype or reference element of “economical” for the modern times. The modern times must work out their personal style of economical way of thinking and their own “economy” in the way they both should be. But to judge the Aristotle economy with the usage of “pure” economy would be wrong. At the same time it contains some elements that could be taken as universal.

The universalism is included into the Aristotle economy from the material which serves for its building: eternal human nature and the “home”. The Aristotle economy is a “pure” human establishment. The human nature is understands on the basis of ethic ideas. The laws, rules and structure of “home” - these are the corresponding proper norms of ethic. Besides, the last ones are coming laden with the mark of conditions of slave-holding society. The eternal and absolute are interweaving here with movable and relative.

The Aristotle economy is a result of synthesis of many elements of social reality like “everyday life”, “home economy”, “laws”, “politics” and “ethic” - on the basis of ethic and at its priority. This is the ethic “economy”. From here flows the limitation and restraint of “pure” economic element. It is controlled by ethic.

The Aristotle position regarding the integrity of human life and his logic of economy searching suggest the following:

Fist of all, the vision of economy in integral human life. The economy is the subjectively selected in the integrity element but not the kind of some independent reality. The reality is the human life which goes in the forms of “home” and “polis”. Aristotle has mentioned the structure of home or the rules of “home economy” conduction. He had all rights to do that because he was the first one who formulated the definition of economy according to his own understanding of life in the Greek polis [21, p.423]. Another thing is the subsequent determinations of economy which should be agreed with their Greek original at least in theory. However, this did not happen. And the Aristotle economy has become synonymous to archaic “stringently ruled family life”.

Secondly, in Aristotle definition of term of “economy” lies not only the specific theoretical understanding of Classical Greek life. From this understanding of definition of economy flows its ideological significance [19, p.30]. Together with the cognitive function the ideological function was involved into its formation as well. In a modern phonation the ideology follows the vivid expression made by M.K Mamardashvili and performs the role of “glue” for social structures, the “method of homogenization of social structures or the way of making them homogeneous” [23, p.64]. The author writes: “If any system of representations does not depend on the issues of truth, is not the result of searching for truth and serves only for reproduction of data of public relations, then you understand that the ideology, by its definition, must inside itself prohibit the issue of what kind of grounding have the data of public relations and what right to exists do they have” [23, p.65-65]. According to exact modern understanding of ideology the creative thought of Aristotle was seeking for such “social glue” which could help to make the Greek polis more stable and would ensure it with the function of reproduction. He found such glue in the process of following the moral rules in the stable home life.

Among all modern economists the essential element of ideologization of economic concepts and ideas was more sharply marked by J.K. Galbraith who has noticed the prevalence of this element in the modern economic theory that has become a tool of “inculcating of useful beliefs” and assistance in power exercising. He has even promulgated his own variant of this theory implementation which reduces it to return to the “more ancient, more traditional, more scientific theory that explains the functions and lets in the attempt to understand the real state of things” [24, p.32]. The immensity of what is called the “modern economy” in
a greater or lesser degree contributes the domination of instrumental functions of theoretical economics which greatly complicates the vision of the real situation. The phenomena of economy has grown so much in the present times, that it just can’t be completely covered as a separate integral structure.

The ideological function of modern economic concepts has a somewhat different character than it has in Aristotle’s works. The subjective vision of social relations, which we had noticed in the works of Aristotle, has obtained the form of an objective vision. According to K. Marx, the existing forms of economic relations in the form of their functionaries have turned into the “walking forms of thinking” of these relations and now they provide the automatic nature of their reproduction. The disclosure of objective vision of public production relations in his famous work “Capital” is one of the cornerstones of his critique of political economy which systematize the observed forms of these relationships and thus perform the instrumental function.

The objective vision of economic relations becomes absolutely impenetrable and obtains the absolute character in such forms as “national economy”, “real economy”, “market economy”, etc. It turns out that behind them there is a certain reality, a special economic matter but not the same “walking” forms of economic thinking, conventionality of language, including a set of contexts that depend on location and time. Although over the last 20 years we could assure ourselves of how much movable the real economy and national economy can be when the running factories and plants have fallen to desolation and on their places different shopping centers, banks, residential quarters, etc. have arisen, or in how much the market can be unstable.

Thirdly, the Aristotle position of contextual vision of the economy assumes the possibility of many types of economy and the economic diversity existence.

The domination of observed forms of economic relations makes it difficult to disclose such diversity. All the more so the modern economic theory is based on available economic forms and existing - given - social context. And this actually does not allow to take a position of conventionality of economy concept that meets the actual movability of social life. To take such a position one should see that the “attach of significance” is an essential element of the modern concept of economy and its functioning. The present fact under consideration mostly remains unnoticed in the modern economic science.

CONCLUSIONS

The modern economy in its biggest part has an artificial character. It was formed by the previous generations of people and is reproduced by the contemporaries basing on their “economic ideas”. After all, the economy is that how it is represented by the recently living and acting people, as well as that which stigmas of thinking and behavior they have. These wide-scale submissions cannot be overcome by simply specifying onto their origin, conditionality and relativity and even on how they provide the reproduction of a separate dominant economic form supported by the structure and organization of power authorities. Such a partial economic form becomes the basis for construction of the world around. Therefore, the determining of origin of the wide-scale economic visions, their actual place and importance in the public life are the supposition for a critical outlook onto forms of modern economic life and scientific thought. Here comes the possibility to create a variety of economic positions and visions of new ways of development.

The study of Aristotle economic logic lies in the line of modern society renewing and can contribute to the synchronization of established economic concepts moving with some changes in conditions of life. Each society must again and again look for and find their economy which is forming at the intersection of different life problems, in the context of its life integrity.
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