

CLARIFICATIONS TO THE APPENDIX #2A

Clarification 1. It is necessary to touch, in the traditional laconical manner of Cynics, on the question of agnosticism. Cynicism states that as far as one is a scientific man without a

religious belief, as far as one has a set of opinions that is provoked to exist by one's common experience, one thinks oneself able to have *the* knowledge; outside one's science, in spheres about which one knows that they concern *the* Reality which cannot be grasped by hands, one translates one's ignorance into physics and this is called by Cynicism the 'new-fashioned agnosticism'¹.

The famous claim: "*Ignorabimus!*" sounds everywhere and at any time. We will not know what? Who makes these frames? Does one try to smash them? What must an experiment be done for? It is evident, then, that any experiment must establish the right connections among the general Principle for particles and the absence of the One's Principle: how universals are connected with the appearances of Reality.

Clarification 2a. If one will ask another: "What are you reading, my prince?", the answer, most probably, will be: "Words, words, words..."

Words, words, words!!! To illustrate, the search for Heraclitus' true meaning of the term "meadow" does not make any sense for a Cynic. In any scientific theory, a Laconical Cynic looks for a thought which must determine an operational system of words that can be used practically, but not for historical references or philological exercises.

Clarification 2b. It must be said that the true meaning of any word and idea cannot be found unless it is taken within the context of the human activity². A Cynic must consider only the practical effects that might follow from one's deed³ and then one's conception of these consequences will be the whole of one's conception of the action⁴.

Clarification 3. From where does Laconical Cynicism, which is a furious enemy of any manifestations of agnosticism, translate its opinions? Laconical Cynicism arises from the ideas of: Anaxagoras of Glazomenae; Parmenides of Elea; Heraclitus of Ethesus, Protagoras of Abdera; Empedocles of Acragas; Antisthenes of Athenes; Democritus of Abdera; and, of course, Socrates, Plato, Diogenes of Sinope and Aristotle; Nicholas of Cusa, Hume, Leibniz,

¹ BIB:(18.45)

² Cynicism assumes that an idea formulated by one is an opinion and it cannot be evaluated by another one as pure knowledge, which is the only knowledge that does not have an alternative treatment: one takes into consideration only *extremal* ideas(Limits) which(ideas) have opposites, where these opposites can annihilate each other. There are reasons to infer that if one's understanding of an idea is wrong another mind will correct one's mistake. In conclusion: "But it is better to say the idea is the meaning. ...an idea, if we use idea of the meaning, is neither given nor presented, but taken." BIB:(3.54),[p.8]

³ "In the beginning was the deed." Goethe, '*Faust*'

⁴ BIB:(19.45),[\$9;\$18]

Spinoza, Kant, Hegel, Bradley, Marx, Lenin; Poincare, Alexandrov, Cantor, Dedekind, Kolmogorov, Mendeleev, Lobachevskii, Reiman.

Clarification 4. In connection to the preceding, is new a revolution or plagiarism? I do not think that the question is formulated incorrectly! Really, if we think that this universe is closed we should return to the same problem each time but with a different point of view -- Cynical thinking is, in fact, far less a discovery than a re-discovery⁵, a remembering, a return and a homecoming to a far-off, ancient common-household of knowledge, out of which those ideas formerly grew⁶ in attempt to decrease the distance between the common system of opinions and the adequate knowledge.

Clarification 5. If **DEATH** is the logical and legitimate end and beginning of all -- the Limit⁷, or the moment of absolute rest⁸, or **NON-EXISTENCE**, can one look beyond **DEATH**? No, one cannot! But one can conjecture with an element of certainty what will be after, due to one's opinion⁹ of the Principle of substance.

Can the fear of **DEATH** and **NON-EXISTENCE** be a reason for the stopping of motion in a living part of substance? Cynicism infers that one exists, in contrast to traditional conjectures, till and because one's thoughts are full of contradictions; till and because this universe is a tangle of problems. The rule for a Cynic who strives to be high-principled¹⁰ in one's *unprincipledness*¹¹:

⁵ For instance, I think that Aristotle was right: "But if the Forms or the numbers are to exist, they will be causes of nothing..." but I cannot agree that "...if not that, at least not of movement" because if **SOMETHING** cannot be **NOTHING**, it must become **SOMETHING**, which is the "prime move" BIB:(1.10),[1075^β,25]

⁶ BIB:(19.36),[p.16;29]

⁷ The One becomes others, others become the One, and so on *ad infinitum*.

⁸ the Limit;

⁹ Any imagined world must be an unchanging one because it is the product of one's inherent wish to rest forever: one's illusive world must not be disturbed. It will be better for one, therefore, to never see the present world if one would like to be apathetic.

¹⁰ The existence of principles is the starting point of any investigation and the final result of them must be the arriving at complete unprincipledness.

¹¹ One, who is now "dead and turn'd to clay, might stop a hole to keep the wind away", said impulsively that a dead lion is better than a live Cynic. I assert that if a Cynic and a lion have a different density when entering into the ellipses, which have strictly determined size for any part of substance, I have to discuss either two incomparable parts of substance or two kinds of Cynic. After very careful examination, overcoming doubts and hesitations which torment me, I risk to conclude that one, who "should patch a wall t' expel the [winter's] flaw", used the preceded expression metaphorically: there are principled and unprincipled Cynics! From this standpoint it may follow that a 'dead lion' is the principled Cynic, who wished to be a(the

7. Ask and it shall be given to you; seek, and you shall find; knock, and it shall be opened to you. For everyone who asks, receives; and who seeks, finds; and to him who knocks, it shall be opened.

13. Enter ye in the strait gate: for wide is the gate, and broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat:

14. Because strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it.¹²

Supreme) Monad. Thus, if one would like to repeat "*Et tu, Brute!*" one has to be a principled one at the right time and place.

So, being a principled one means that '*this*' one has a character - an ability and desire to act, and that one has a definite purpose in mind. As Goethe says, someone who wants to do great things must know how to restrict oneself -- how to find one's own self-limitation(s). In contrast, an unprincipled one is one who wants to do everything but really wants to do **NOTHING**, and brings **NOTHING** off(BIB:(8.10), [p.126]); and any character is caused to become '*the*' character by the actuality of one's dogmas existence, in which dogmas the limits are becoming one's faith: "faith is a miracle, and yet no man is excluded from it; for that in which all human life is unified is passion, and faith is a passion[p.58]". For that reason, one who is to become '*the*' passionate person can use deductive and inductive methods of reasoning with the same certainty. BIB:(4.25),[Kierkegard, *Fear and Trembling*]

¹² BIB:(2), Matthew, Chapter 7