Ilya Geller
igeller@lexiclone.com

Cynicism and Preposition "In".

The full understanding of a text is impossible without an understanding of what the human being who created it is. Philosophy is traditionally considered to be the science that deals with examining the question of human nature.

What is Cynicism?
Cynicism is a school of thought which categorically rejects anything that cannot be confirmed by experience to be an event with multiple repetitions. That is, Cynicism is a school of thought which recognises only what can be supported by experience.

Cynicism in Practice.
As a confirmed Cynic, the author of this article speculates that everything in the universe -- all things, all people, animals, etc. -- are points of accumulation [i], open sets, which strive to include in themselves something from the surrounding world in order to become closed sets (material points) and to cease to change in themselves. In other words, the universal motivation to change (or to preserve an already-achieved immutability) is acknowledged to be always self-interested.

When one examines texts this concept finds itself confirmed by the presence of the preposition "in" in the most important (i.e., most frequent) key phrases in the "summaries" created from the key phrases of texts. But first, let us look at the idea of "summaries".

Borrowings and Adaptations.
First of all, the author would like to clarify the meanings of the terms "predicative" and "non-predicative". As is well known, *praedicatum* in Late Latin means "what has been said (previously)". In Aristotelian and subsequent forms of traditional logic a predicate was understood to be one of the two terms for the judgement of a subject (the one in which something is said about the subject of speech). In his treatment the author counts as predicative any definition of a subject or object in which something is said about an observable subject or object as it changes. In addition, the author proposes as the sole measure of change the movement of a subject or object with acceleration: if a subject or object is immobile or moves evenly, it cannot be observed and, consequently, cannot be defined *predicatively*.

More: as is well known, Bertrand Russell introduced the notion of a "non-predicative" definition, in which what is to be defined is brought in through its relation to a class of which it is an element. For example: "the set of all sets that are not elements of themselves". It is said that the use of "non-predicative" definitions leads to paradoxes, so they should be dealt with carefully. The author adopts Russell's definition, but in a new mode: one counts as non-predicative any definition of a subject or object in which something is said about a subject or object that is unchanging. For example, according to the author there are no closed sets in the world of change -- a set can strive to be the set of all sets, but no more.

The Text.
A text is made up of words. But what is a word? First of all, a word is made up of letters, which are, in practice, meaningless if separate. And yet a word, as the joining together of several letters, already, beyond any doubt, has a certain meaning . But the existence of synonymy makes the meaning of words, taken separately, vague and lacking in concreteness. For example, the word "red", taken by itself, can mean anything: beginning with a colour and ending with a pejorative name for a Communist.

In order to understand the "true" meaning of a word one must first identify in what minimal lexical construction of speech and in what slang a given word is being used.; where:
I. A minimal lexical construction of speech, also called a predicative definition, is the articulation of three words, relating to three parts of speech - substantives, verbs and adjectives - in the context of a sentence. All other parts of speech, with the exception of prepositions and interjections, can be, in some way or other, taken to be substantives, verbs, or adjectives, where:

1. A substantive has the meaning of the abstract Name of certain points of accumulation[ii];
2. A verb defines the abstract Name of an action;
3. An adjective is the abstract Name describing points of accumulation in the process of change.

II. A slang is an aggregate of predicative definitions used with a strictly specialized meaning, particular to each and every type of human activity .

This triad of non-predicative definitions is indispensable to defining the subjective evaluation of a fact, when faced with the possibility and the need to include the objects and subjects of the fact within the context of a given point of accumulation. In other words, a person has to evaluate a sandwich from all sides: he has to understand that it's a sandwich, and to decide whose it is, whether he should eat it or not, whether it's fresh and tasty, etc.

Moreover, the presence of at least one predicative definition is absolutely necessary and sufficient for the creation of a sentence, even if it's missing one or more words from the substantive/verb/adjective triad. Such a word or words can be reconstructed on the basis of the context and subtext of the predicative definition; where:

1. The context consists of those predicative definitions where a substantive is used as the abstract Name of points of accumulation and abstractions;
2. The subtext consists of those predicative definitions where pronouns and interjections are used as the abstract Name of points of accumulation and abstractions.

For example, having said the word "unfresh", one can reconstruct the words "sandwich" and "exists" if we know in what context and subtext the word "unfresh" appears. And if we don't know the context and subtext of a given predicative definition, then the word "unfresh" can be used with, for example, the words "fish" and "smells". Only a text, being a collection of predicative definitions grouped together in meaningful sentences, can provide, more or less identically, the context and subtext of every one of these predicative definitions. That is, a text is considered to be completed in so far as its context and subject are, more or less identically, defined.

Processing the Text.

The task comes down to extracting all the predicative definitions from every sentence of the text, and then counting how many times each one occurs in the text. Such a collection is termed a summary; the number of times each predicative definition occurs in the text is referred to as its weight. A summary, being an ordered list of triads, is susceptible to rapid processing by computer. The margin of error in the cloning is lessened in roportion to the amount and size of the texts being used.

Examples of Summary.

The entire summary of George Bernard Shaw, created on the basis of his books as found on the Internet at the URL http://promo.net/pg/ , contains a little over 320,000 triads occurring more than once. The first triad - it-be-in - occurs 4 755 times; the second in order of frequency - i-be-in - occurs 2 534 times. The most frequently repeated triads in George Brenard Shaw's books therefore contain the preposition "in", signifying -- as the author of this article supposes - Shaw's striving to include everything in a certain closed set; in -- to use the language of philosophy - a whole.

Similarly, at the URL http://lexiclone.com/SummarySample_Fyodor_Dostoevsky.htm the reader can see an extract from Fyodor Dostoevsky's summary (a part of which is reproduced below), created on the basis of his book The Brothers Karamazov (the numbers to the right represent the frequency of each triad-phrase's occurrence in the text):

it - be - in : 1 466
i - be - in : 1 347
it - have - in : 996
you - be - in : 936
you - be - your : 798
i - have - in : 664
all - be - in : 657

it - will - in : 535
my - be - in : 496
all - have - in : 473

Clearly, it is the Ethical subtext that predominates in Dostoevsky's text. In another summary - that of Patent #6.199.067 - it is context that predominates:

one - say - least : 1 447
segment - say - least : 1 124
datum - item - plural : 1 025
system - say - remote : 950
datum - say - plural : 888
computer - say - remote : 845
datum - item - linguistic : 845
system - say - least : 844
computer - say - least : 818
one - say - remote : 805

It appears that the preponderance of subtext can be explained by the fact that certain texts concentrate on the Ethical component in the process of a person's becoming whole -- on the question, what will happen if certain points of accumulation are included in the vicinity of a given? - rather than on the Aesthetic component. On the other hand, texts of the kind we might call "technical" are primarily concerned with the Aesthetic component, examining not the consequences of the inclusion but rather its mechanism, and therefore context predominates in them.

That is, texts that don't state facts from an emotional-Ethical point of view have hardly any self-interested underlying cause to them, in the sense that they don't contain instructions for a person's becoming a closed set, but rather establish the facts of existence in an Aesthetic-descriptive, unemotional way.

To show summaries in their entirety would be impossible because of their extremely large (up to 5M) size.

The Preposition "In".

There is, therefore, a Cynical hypothesis that persons strive for an absolute solipsism of enclosure in rest, by including in themselves everything that is required for achieving this, and annihilating and not-including everything that impedes it.

One can take as a demonstration of this notion the existence, in all languages known to the author, of the preposition "in" which appears *simultaneously* and *always* as the adjective "interior" when creating summaries.

To take an example, in the divine Julius Gaius Caesar's summary, created on the basis of his work *De Bello Gallico*, we can see that the most frequently occurring predicative definition, which has led to the very word Caesar becoming a pejorative, is the triad "caesar-be-in'. The next triads in the series, such as "all-be-in", "all-have-in", and "caesar-have-in" are understood as an attempt to include absolutely everything inside the whole. The army -- "army-be-in" the legions -- "legion-be-in" and the camps -- "camp-be-in"- all have to be there, too. And all the divine one's enemies -- "enemy-be-in" and "gaul-be-in" - must follow into there as well. One can assume that it is precisely the triads containing the preposition "in" that reflect Julius' most intimate desires. Speaking of Daniel Defoe, we also see that everything must be "in" the whole -- "all-be-in". There's the question -- "if-be-in?" to which Defoe himself gives the answer -- "much-be-in". An original reading of Robinson Crusoe, isn't it?

And now, the radiant Anton Chekhov. He believes in God "in" the whole - "one-be-in" - and that we will all be there - "all-be-in". At the same time Anton Chekhov reflects on the problem of time for a closed set - "time-be-in" - and puts to himself the skeptical question: "if-be-in"? He is certain that even there, in the bright world of the whole, lies will penetrate - "lie-have-in". Nevertheless, he is ready to take everything into the whole - "out-be-in". After all, his whole is full of love - "love-be-in". But falsehood will penetrate even there - "lie-will-in", - where nothing is - "nothing-be-in". Doesn't a reading of *Kashtanka* and other short stories give us grounds for such conclusions?

And here are the ideas that predominated in the mind of Lenin in the year 1919: the country, the Party, the Communists, the bourgeoisie, and all people must be in the whole -- "country-be-in", "party-be-in", "all-be-in", "communist-be-in", "bourgeois-be-in", "mass-be-in". Everything, "inside" the whole, must be Soviet -- "soviet-be-in"; and all classes (social classes, obviously) must be in the whole -- "class-be-in". As a true revolutionary -- "revolution-be-in" - Lenin is persuaded that struggle is everything -- "struggle-be-in". In such conditions the Party must be the party of the majority, the party of the Bolsheviks, and not just anything -- "party-be-party", "must-be-in", "most-be-in", even within the whole. Nevertheless, Lenin is a true believer: "one-be-in", although the triad "party-be-in" has a significantly greater weight.

The four most frequent triads in the Bible: it-be-in 3 499; lord-be-in 3 341; all-be-in 3 278; i-be-in 3 083.

Without the aforementioned unwieldy theory of Cynicism the author might make the same mistake as Peter D. Turney: "Words with less than three characters are removed from the list, as are stop words (words like "and", "but", "nor", "from", "she", . . .), using a predetermined stop word list [9]. Unfortunately, Peter D.Turney doesn't realize that a text not only has a context but a subtext as well.

Conclusion.

Thus Cynicism, resurrected from non-existence, proclaims itself, in keeping with a tradition honoured by millennia of oblivion, a democratic current within philosophy [1,2,3,4,5,6,7], demonstrating as it does the absence of any ideal person in this world, and the primordial self-interest involved in all human existence. It was, after all, only such a beginning that could have led to the appearance of democracy in Europe, and to its triumph in the USA, the author's present refuge.

References.
[1] Calvin J., A Compend of the Institutes of the Christian Religion;
[2] Declaration of Independence of the Thirteen Colonies
[3] Ecclesiastes, The Bible
[4] Hobbes Th., The Leviathan
[5] Jeremiah, The Bible
[6] Locke J., Two Treaties of Government
[7] Machiavelli N., Prince
[8] Nicolas Cusanus, Of Learned Ignorance
[9] United States Patent 6,470,307

---

[i] A point of accumulation is the boundary point of the set M - the point x of the topological space X>M, of which any vicinity contains an indefinite number of points of the set M.