

PHILOSOPHY  
OF PURE REASON  
SUB SPECIE AETERNITATIS

ILYA GELLER  
NEW YORK, 1994-96

# Part One.

## Propaedeutics.

## Preface .

**"And enterprises of great pitch and moment  
With this regard their currents turn awry,  
And loose the name of action."  
*Hamlet, W.Shakespeare*<sup>1</sup>**

I can describe this work as an attempt of a dialectical realization of the concept of infinity in the context of a certain monotheistic Law immanent in substance that determines, necessarily and sufficiently, the interaction<sup>2</sup> between all parts of substance in their striving to become the Whole. In the process, it is supposed that infinity is the continuity of the interaction of the parts of substance, such that as soon as a part of substance becomes the Whole, continuity does not cease to be, nor infinity to exist<sup>3</sup>: in the end everything will have the same quality and reach the same state that it had in the beginning -- the Best.

This paradox is in fact the basis of this work. One of the main questions of this *tractatus* is the question about a 'point'<sup>4</sup>: how can one point be separated from another? If many attempts to do this have not brought positive results, is it not easier to think that no point can be separated from another<sup>5</sup>? In general, what is the meaning of the term 'point'? After all, it is a question about the "distance between" parts of the One, and its influence on the Force of Interaction. It is also supposed that intellect is the manifestation of the Law immanent in Substance<sup>6</sup> -- I state that *mind is the*

---

<sup>1</sup> For instance, the *positivistic* claim of Leibniz: "34. Thus mathematicians, using the analytical method, reduce the speculative theorems and the practical canons to definitions, axioms, and postulates"(BIB:(15.00)) is upheld by the theory of Absolute(Cynical) Positivism: *Absolute Positivism states that **SOMETHING** can be completely formalized only if it does not exist!*

<sup>2</sup> If one says 'I do not know this', is saying 'He does not know this because he does not interact with and/or is not changed by this' the correct way to speak? BIB:(19.54),[163a-164e] Is this correct: "If knowing is a kind of action, it necessarily follows that being known is an affection? And on this view reality, in so far as it is known, is acted upon by knowledge, and is therefore in motion; for that which is in a state of rest cannot be acted upon, as we affirm? Can we imagine that being is devoid of life and mind, and exists in solemn unmeaningness an everlasting fixture?" BIB:(19.66),[248e-249a] Does it mean that one knows objects as they appear to one, not as they are in their **NON-EXISTENCE**(BIB:(11.99),[*Prolegomena* #10])? Must '*Esse est percipi*'(to be is to be perceived) be transformed to '*to be*' is becoming '*to interact*'? BIB:(1.97),[#3] Does distinction between opinions by acquaintance and description exist? BIB:(22.03),[p.46-60]

<sup>3</sup> "Because time is continuous, movement must be continuous, given that it is impossible there should be time without movement; time, then, is the number of a particular continuous movement, or circular movement therefore..." BIB:(1.10),[337<sup>α</sup>,25]

<sup>4</sup> "...everyone should firmly persuade himself that none of the sciences, however abstruse, is to be deduced from lofty and obscure matters, but that they all proceed only from what is easy and more readily understood." BIB:(3.75),[p.29]

<sup>5</sup> Things which have **NOTHING** in common reciprocally do not exist, or, the same, they cannot be perceived. BIB:(22.55),[p.2,AxiomV;p.3,Prop.III]

<sup>6</sup> "...any discussion of intentionality that leaves out the question of consciousness will be incomplete." BIB:(22.32),[p.132]

*limitlessness*<sup>7</sup> that endeavors to fix itself and not to be limited by others; where universals are standards -- self-limitations<sup>8</sup>.

Also I would like to take the supposition that Zeno made that ‘*there is a plurality of things*’ and discuss it in the traditional and conservative manner of Laconical Cynics. So, I must consider what consequences must follow both for those many parts of substance with reference to each other and to One -- the Whole, and also for the Whole with reference to itself and to the many. Then again, on the supposition that there is no plurality, I must consider what will follow both for the One and for the many, with reference to themselves and to each other. Or, once more, if I suppose that ‘Likeness exists’ or ‘does not exist’, what will follow on either supposition both for the things that have been supposed and for other parts of substance, with reference to themselves and to each other. And so again with Unlikeness, Motion and Rest, Coming-to-be and Perishing, and Being and Not-being themselves. In a word, whenever I suppose that anything whatsoever exists or does not exist or has any other character, I ought to consider the consequences with reference to itself and to any one of the other part of substance that I may select, or several of them, or all of them together; and again I must study these others with reference both to one another and to any one part of substance I may select, whether I have assumed the Given part of substance to exist or not<sup>9</sup>, if I really intend to find out the truth<sup>10</sup>. Using the new-fashioned terms this research also must concern itself with these dilemmas: 1) the question of whether or not the One in its attribute and predicates should be thought of as limited; 2) another dilemma is whether substance is to be regarded as infinitely divisible or as consisting of Relict parts of substance -- Limit(s); 3) the third antinomy relates to the antithesis between freedom and necessity; 4) the fourth -- whether the world as the Whole has *the* cause or not. And the expected result of this *tractatus* may be summed up in a few words: Reality, set on one side and apart from all appearances, would assuredly be **NOTHING**<sup>11</sup>.

### Theory of Substance.

"...and, by its very nature, that order, when once established, supports itself for many ages if not for eternity."

D.Hume, "Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion"

---

<sup>7</sup> “What is unlimited has no *telos* (end) and is *a-telos*, which means both ‘endless’ and ‘incomplete’.” BIB:(4.31),[‘Pythagoras and Pythagoreanism’]

<sup>8</sup> “For we know that, instead of being fixed and ultimate, everything finite is alterable and perishable, and this is nothing but the dialectic of the finite, through which the latter, being implicitly the other of itself, is driven beyond what it immediately is and overturns into its opposite.” BIB:(8.10),[p.130]

<sup>9</sup> “For divine nature, which they ought to have considered before all things, for that it is prior in knowledge and nature, they have thought to be last in the order of knowledge, and things which are called the objects of the senses they have believed to be prior to all things. Hence it has come to pass that, while they considered the things of nature, they paid no attention to divine nature, and then when at last they directed their attention to divine nature they could have no regard for their first fabrications on which they had founded their knowledge of natural things, inasmuch as these things give no help to the knowledge of divine nature. No wonder, then, that they contradicted themselves at all points.” BIB:(22.55),[p.45]

<sup>10</sup> BIB:(19.55),[136a-d]

<sup>11</sup> BIB:(3.55),[p.114]

Axiom 1. There is *the* ultimate Reality -- substance, where substance is that upon on which all predicates exist<sup>12</sup>, while it is itself not predicated on anything else<sup>13</sup>.

Axiom 3. The Whole is different from any part of the Whole; substance, as the Whole, is different from any part of substance.

Axiom 4. The Whole is **NOTHING**<sup>14</sup>; substance, as the Whole, is **SOMETHING**, which becomes **NOTHING**<sup>15</sup>, in **NON-EXISTENCE**; **NOTHING** and substance are parts of any Whole definition<sup>16</sup>.

Definition -1. The absence of substance is not **NOTHING**<sup>17</sup>: for in the nature of things nothing is given besides substance<sup>18</sup>.

Axiom 5. Any cause is consequence, any consequence is cause; the continuous interaction of the parts of substance is both cause and consequence, in time<sup>19</sup>.

Axiom 6. **SOMETHING** as stable does not exist, **NOTHING** as stable exists<sup>20</sup>.

Axiom 7. Form and content<sup>21</sup> are parts of the Whole Definition which exist only for a part of substance.

---

<sup>12</sup> Any qualitative description of a part of substance which has an opposite is called a 'predicate'. In fact, such things as verbs, adjectives, participles and gerunds are qualitative descriptions -- they contain a *metrica*(a "distance between" two things which exist) within themselves. BIB:(22.03),['The World of Universals']; BIB:(20.01),[p.70] The real distinction between parts' of substance predicates and substance as the Whole is to be found only in the appearances of the Best -- **SOMETHING** is what it is by virtue of its quality, and if it loses its quality it becomes to be what it is not: **NOTHING**[p.146]. Substance must appear: substance is what exists, existence is appearance[p.199]. BIB:(8.10)

<sup>13</sup> BIB:(1.10),[1028<sup>β</sup>,35]

*Corollary I.* Existence appertains to the nature of substance.

*Corollary II.* In the nature of things, two or more substances may not be granted the same nature of attribute. BIB:(22.55),[p.3-4, Theorem 5 and 7]

<sup>14</sup> "May I not say with confidence that non-being has an assured existence, and a nature of its own?" BIB:(19.66),[258c]

<sup>15</sup> "Let us examine a little the description that is here given us of matter. It neither acts, nor perceives, nor is perceived, for this is all that is meant by saying it is an inert, senseless, unknown substance[#68]... You may, if so it shall seem good, use the word matter in the same sense as other men use nothing, and so make those terms convertible in your style[#80]." BIB:(1.97)

<sup>16</sup> God is the One(the Best: "...for the end should not be just any last thing, but the best." BIB:(1.10),[194<sup>α</sup>,30]), who does not act and, therefore, cannot be described. God is the only simple thing -- he cannot be considered wrongly and, in reality, if one tries to characterize **SOMETHING** (which is not the Best) one must and shall always contradict oneself.

<sup>17</sup> **NOTHING** is *the* Limit.

<sup>18</sup> BIB:(22.55),[p.4]

<sup>19</sup> "That is wrong, these wise men tell us, nor should we allow the use of such words as 'something'... or any other name that make things stand still."BIB:(19.54),[157b]

<sup>20</sup> 10."...I take it also for granted that all created beings, consequently the created monads as well, are subject to change, and that this change is even continual in each one".BIB: (15)

Axiom 8. The probability of repetition of any experiment exists.

Axiom 9. “What appears as active in certain respects, consequently appears as passive from another point of view...”<sup>22</sup> -- what comes into view as real in certain respects, becomes illusive from another point of view.

Definition O<sup>23</sup>. Any parts of the Whole Definition, of any Whole Definition, are Nonpredicatively defined: it is impossible to define one part of the Whole Definition without using in it all the remaining parts of the Whole Definition; modification of one part of the Whole Definition is a modification of all the remaining parts of the Whole Definition;

Any parts of substance, as of the Whole, are Nonpredicatively Defined: it is impossible to give a Whole Definition to any part of substance without defining its Interaction with all the other parts of substance; modification of one part of substance is a modification of all the remaining parts of substance.

Definition 1. Any part of substance, with the exception of the parts of the substance of the Limit, is an open Set of the continuously interacting parts of substance, or an accumulation Point<sup>24</sup>, or simply - a Point.

### **The Immanent in Substance T'ai Chi Law of the Supreme and Infinite Ultimate**<sup>25</sup>.

Any part of substance which has the continuously modifying meaning of its owned<sup>26</sup> Force of Interaction with all other parts of substance strives<sup>27</sup> to become Substance, as the Whole<sup>28</sup>; its own

---

<sup>21</sup> The terms “content” and “matter” are equal in their meaning. “By the matter I mean... the bronze, by the shape the plan of its form, and by the compound of these the statue.”BIB:(1.10),[1029<sup>α</sup>,5]

<sup>22</sup> “There is no passive till it meets the active, no active except in conjunction with the passive; and what, in conjunction with one thing, is active, reveals itself as passive when it falls in with something else.” BIB:(15);(19.54),[157a]

<sup>23</sup> Or, what is the same, the definition of paradox. See the *Attachment 1*.

<sup>24</sup> An accumulation point of a set of points is a point P such that there is at least one point of the set distinct from P in any neighborhood of the given point. Therefore, by an accumulation point(invariant group) Cynicism understands those which are not finite and have a determined existence; if several of them so concur in one action that they are all at the same time the cause of one effect, the method considers them all thus far to be one individual thing. BIB:(22.55),[Def VII,p.38]. An accumulation point is an open system that constantly changes itself and others' condition of substance.

<sup>25</sup> “The problem we have to discuss is whether there is any reason for believing in what is called ‘the uniformity of nature’. The belief in the uniformity of nature is the belief that everything that has happened or will happen is an instance of some general law to which there are no exceptions.” BIB:(22.03),[p.63]

<sup>26</sup> The term ‘own’ means that this Force of Interaction reflects a defect of this peculiar part of the Whole substance.

<sup>27</sup> “...the suggestion that nothing is, but rather becomes, good, beautiful or any of the things we were speaking of just now.”([157d]) “We are wrong when we say they ‘are’, since nothing ever is, but everything is coming to be.” BIB:(19.54),[152e]

“We see that God has implanted in all things a natural desire to exist with the fullest measure of existence that is compatible with their particular nature.” BIB:(19.37),[p.7]

Force of Interaction with all other parts of the Whole is somehow proportional to the continuously modifying meaning of Inertia of this part of substance, and is the Measure of Ether<sup>29</sup> in the sum with 'own' of all other parts' of substance<sup>30</sup> Forces of Interaction.

Definition 2. Substance has three conditions:

- *Yang*; substance has three measures for any point: form is space, matter is mass and time<sup>31</sup>;
- *Yin*; substance has two measures for any point: form is space, matter is mass;
- *Li*<sup>32</sup>; substance has only one measure for any point: Existence<sup>33</sup>.

Postulate 1. For any part of substance there exists a pair of constant meanings of the Moduses<sup>34</sup> of the Inertia of mass and space that are the Limit for any part of substance: every moduse, which necessarily and infinitely exists, must of necessity have followed from the absolute nature of the attribute of the Best<sup>35</sup>.

Postulate 2. For any part of substance there exist a pair of constant meanings of the Moduses of the Inertia of mass and space, which are continuously modifying at any period of time.

Definition 3. Substance has only one attribute: Existence in eternity, where this attribute is not the continuity and infinity of changes; no other attribute of substance can be truly conceived, from which it would follow that substance can be divided into parts<sup>36</sup>.

Definition 4. Kepler's Law of Gravitation. For any constant meaning of the Moduse of the Inertia of mass there exists only one constant meaning of the Moduse of the Inertia of space, and vice versa:

$$m(k)-l(k), m(f)-l(f),$$

---

<sup>28</sup> "...the movement of any part is for the perfection of the whole..." BIB:(19.37),[p.111]

<sup>29</sup> The measure of all things exists: of the things which exist, that they exist, and of things which do not exist, that they do not exist. BIB:(19.54),[152a]

<sup>30</sup> *Corollary III.* Everything in so far as it is in itself endeavors to persist in **NON-EXISTENCE**.

*Corollary IV.* The endeavor wherewith a thing endeavors to persist in **NON-EXISTENCE** is nothing else than the actual essence of that thing. BIB:(22.55),[p.91]

<sup>31</sup> Time, mass and space are mere appearance: all exist and must somehow in some way belong to the Best. To explain them, in the sense of showing how such appearances come to be, and again how with contradiction they can be real within the One, is certainly the object of thinking.

<sup>32</sup> the ideal substance *Li* is primary while the material substance (predicatively defined) is secondary: "the secondary qualities, therefore, are appearance, coming from reality, which itself has no quality but extension". BIB:(3.55),[p.10] The ideal substance *Li* is devoid of form and properties and is inaccessible to sense perception. BIB:(28),[*Chu Hsi*].

<sup>33</sup> BIB:(3,4,7,9,12,17,23)

<sup>34</sup> "In Spinoza's philosophy Moduse expressed the endless plurality of things and their transient qualities, in which the singular, eternal and infinite material was manifested." BIB:(28).

<sup>35</sup> BIB:(22.55),[p.27]

<sup>36</sup> BIB:(22.55),[p.10]

such that:

$$P = \frac{m(k)}{l(k)} = \frac{l(f)}{m(f)},$$

where  $m(k)$  and  $m(f)$  are the constant meanings of the Moduse of the Inertia of mass, where  $l(k)$  and  $l(f)$  are the constant meanings of the Moduse of the Inertia of space, where  $k$  and  $f$  are whole and positive numbers, the ordinal numbers of the Pairs of constant meanings of the Moduses of the Inertia of mass and space in Set  $T$ <sup>37</sup>, where  $P$  is the constant Density of substance and is called constant Density of any Monad and the Supreme Monad, or Density of substance as the One<sup>38</sup>.

Definition 5. The continuously modifying meanings  $dm$  and  $d1$  of the constant meanings of the Moduses of the Inertia of mass and space are called, respectively, the Increments of these meanings<sup>39</sup>.

Definition 6. That Density of substance such that:

$$P' = \frac{m(k)}{l(k) + d1} \text{ and } P' = \frac{l(f)}{m(f) + dm}$$

is called the continuously modifying Density of substance<sup>40</sup>.

Definition 7. First Law of Newton. When the continuously modifying Density of substance is constant:

$$P' = \frac{m(k)}{l(k) + d1} = \text{const} \text{ and } P' = \frac{l(f)}{m(f) + dm} = \text{const}, P' \neq P,$$

the continuously modifying Density of substance is called the Density of "things-in-themselves".

Definition 8. A part of substance with the *Yin* condition of substance in itself is called a "thing-in-itself", or a point of Whole Accumulation<sup>41</sup>, which contains all parts of substance from its neighborhoods in itself<sup>42</sup>.

<sup>37</sup> Thus, if there is to be any diversity between things, there must be the diversity reducible to different parts' of substance Meanings of Inertia and these parts' numbers of Pairs of Moduces of Inertia in the Set  $T$ .

<sup>38</sup> 1. "...the monad, is nothing else than a simple substance, which enters into the composites; simple meaning, which has no parts."

BIB:(15);BIB:(4,14,17,19)

<sup>39</sup> "A defect in any of these particulars destroys the form,.. till it unite itself to some other regular form." BIB:(11),[p.50]

<sup>40</sup> "49.Creatures are said to act outwardly in so far as they have perfection, and to suffer from other creatures in so far as they are imperfect." BIB: (15)

<sup>41</sup> or, the same, a point which is the Limit. A "thing-in-itself" is an isolated system that has no exchange with the surrounding.

Postulate 3. The constant Density of substance is the immanent quality of the *Li* condition of substance.

Postulate 4. Any continuously modifying Density of substance is the immanent quality of the *Yang* condition of substance.

Postulate 5. Any Density of a "thing-in-itself" is the immanent quality of the *Yin* condition of substance.

Definition 9.  $In = P' - P$   
is called the continuously modifying Meaning of Inertia; or simply the Meaning of Inertia of a part of substance; or is called original imperfection and perfection<sup>43</sup>.

Definition 10. The Set T is the Closed Set bounded from below and above, the Set of whole and positive cardinal numbers:

$$1 \leq k \leq N,$$

where N is the greater number of the Pair of constant meanings of the Moduses of Inertia;  
where k is the number of any Pair of constant meanings of the Moduses of Inertia<sup>44</sup>.

Definition 11. Parts of substance with a pair of constant meanings of the Moduses of Inertia with numbers 1 in the Set T are Parts of the substance of the Limit, or Quantum<sup>45</sup>: it is the One, which cannot cause a prime move<sup>46</sup>.

Definition 12. Lorenz Transformation. The least constant meaning of the Moduse of Inertia of space corresponds to the greatest constant meaning of the Moduse of the Inertia of Mass, and vice versa:

$$1(1)/1(N) = m(N)/m(1) = N$$

---

<sup>42</sup> This kind of points does not exist -- they are ***NOTHING*** because a "thing-in-itself" has to have simultaneously positive and negative meanings of Inertia which allow a "thing-in-itself" to not interact with other parts of the Whole. No one part of the Whole may have different properties simultaneously but it strives to have them.

<sup>43</sup> 42. "...The created things' original imperfection manifests itself through the natural inertia of all bodies."BIB:(15)

<sup>44</sup> see Nicholas of Cusa's conception of 'absolute maximum' and 'absolute minimum': "We speak of a thing being the greatest or maximum when nothing greater than it can exist. But to one being alone does plenitude belong, with the result that unity, which is also being, and the maximum are identical... Since the subsistence in plurality of the universe is necessarily finite, we shall study the plurality itself of things in order to discover the one maximum in which the universe finds especially and most completely its actual and ultimate subsistence. this maximum in the universe is united with the absolute, for the absolute is the ultimate term of all; and as this maximum... is the most perfect realization of the purpose of the universe and entirely beyond our reach..." BIB:(19.37),[p.9]

<sup>45</sup> or an *apeiron*, where an *apeiron* is a closed set.

<sup>46</sup> see the Footnote to Definition 17

Definition 14. A modification of a meaning of Inertia that is continuous in time is called ‘movement’.

Definition 15. A part of substance with a Pair of constant meanings of the Moduses of Inertia of mass and space with a number N in the Set T is called the Real Continuum<sup>47</sup> -- the Supreme Monad.

Definition 16. If  $In < 0$ , the meaning of Inertia is negative; if  $In > 0$ , the meaning of Inertia is positive.

Definition 17. Newton’s Second Law. The Whole Definition for any two parts of Substance can be chosen from:

$$0=(m(k)/(l(k)+dl))*tr(dl/dt)*(m(f)/(l(f)+dl))*tr'(dl/dt)*d(L/M)-F$$

or

$$0=(l(k)/(m(k)+dm))*tr(dl/dt)*(l(f)/(m(f)+dm))*tr'(dm/dt)*d(M/L)-F$$

where tr and tr' are trigonometrical functions chosen by July's Rule;

where 0 is **NOTHING: SOMETHING** in **NON-EXISTENCE**;

where dl and dm are called ‘appearances’: if  $dm=0$  and/or  $dl=0$  then  $(l(k)/(m(k)+dm))*tr(dl/dt)$  and/or  $(m(k)/(l(k)+dl))*tr'(dl/dt)$  are equal to 0 -- this thing is **NOTHING**;

where F is the continuously modifying Meaning of the Force of the Interaction;

where dt is an interval of Time less than an interval of Time between two *extremums*; where an *extremum* is a moment of time, when the Meaning of Inertia of the Given part of substance changes its sign, or ceases to exist;

where L/M or M/L is the Factor of the Event Associativity of substance, called Zolt Factor<sup>48</sup>;

The Lomonosov - Lavoisier Law of Preservation of Substance:

$$m(k) + m(f) + 2dm + dM + M' = M_{on},$$

$$l(k) + l(f) + 2d1 + dL + L' = L_{on},$$

---

<sup>47</sup> “A thing is called one if it is a continuum, or if it is indivisible, and we also call things one if one and the same account is given of what the being of each would be: as, for instance, wine and the grape. Now if the universe is continuous, the one will be many; for continua are divisible without limit... Is the universe one, then, in that it is indivisible? Then nothing will have any quantity or quality, and what is will be neither unlimited... nor limited... For it is limits which are indivisible, not limited things.” BIB:(1.10), [185<sup>β</sup>,5-10] Cynicism asserts that any Cantor set consists of two independent continuums: the continuums of Irrational and of Rational numbers. The set of Natural cardinal numbers(also a continuum), which counts Cantors sets, has the biggest possible power -- the Infinity.

<sup>48</sup> which is presented as the constant in Column’s and Kepler’s Laws and if **SOMETHING** fixed exists it confirms that the Whole *must* exist; Cynicism states that any part of the Whole comes to be and it is quite indifferent to whether it is observed or not (“The action has then a *double entente* not only in the sense that it is an act done to itself as well as to the other, but also in the sense that the act *simpliciter* is the act of the one as well as of the other regardless of their distinction.” BIB:(8.11),[‘Lordship and Bondage’;p.72]); it remains and stands even though it is not examined, where opinions about a particular of substance do not exist if their object is not there: “...all things stand in some sort of relation to one another; that, in virtue of this inter-relation, all the individuals constitute one universe and that in the one Absolute the multiplicity of beings is unity itself.” BIB:(19.37),[p.25]

where  $M_{On}$  and  $L_{On}$  are the mass and space of the Supreme Monad; where  $M'$  and  $L'$  are the sum of Moduses of Inertia mass and space of all parts of substance of the Limit which do not have Meaning of Inertia, and are called Relict parts of substance, or Ether.

If the Increment of the constant meanings of the Moduses of Inertia of mass and space of one part of substance is  $dm$  and of a second is  $d1$ , then the constant meaning of the Moduse of Inertia of mass of a new part of substance is  $m(n)$ :

$$m(n) = m(k) + m(f) + dm$$

and of Space is  $l(n)$ :

$$l(n) = l(k) + l(f) + d1$$

if sum  $m(k) + m(f) + dm > ((m(n) + m(b)) / 2)$ ,

and sum  $l(k) + l(f) + d1 > ((l(n) + l(b)) / 2)$ ,

where  $b$  precedes  $n$  number of Pair of meaning of Moduses of Inertia in Set  $T$ , or a new part of substance is  $m(b)$ :

$$m(b) = m(k) + m(f) + dm$$

and of Space is  $l(b)$ :

$$l(b) = l(k) + l(f) + d1.$$

Definition 18. The Increments,  $dm$  or  $d1$ , are positive, if the Meaning of Inertia is negative; and are negative, if the Meaning of Inertia is positive.

July's Rule for choosing the Whole Definition for any two Parts of Substance.

if a Given part of substance reciprocally operates on another part of substance and

- if at the same time, the Meaning of Inertia is negative, then the Law of modification of the Increments,  $dm/dt$  or  $d1/dt$ , is *sec*,
- if at the same time, the Meaning of Inertia is positive, then the Law of modification of the Increments,  $dm/dt$  or  $d1/dt$ , is *sin*, if another part of substance reciprocally operates on a Given part of substance and
- if at the same time, the Meaning of Inertia is negative, then the Law of modification of the Increments,  $dm/dt$  or  $d1/dt$ , is *cosec*,
- if at the same time, the Meaning of Inertia is positive, then the Law of modification of the Increments,  $dm/dt$  or  $d1/dt$ , is *cos*.

Definition 19. Parts of substance with an Increment  $dm$  are called White parts of substance, and have Magnetic properties. Parts of substance with an Increment  $d1$  are called Black parts of substance, and have Electrical properties.

Definition 20. Newton's third Law. A change in the Given part's Meaning of Inertia as a consequence and as the cause produces an equal change in the Meaning of Inertia of another part(other parts) of substance.

In one and the same time interval  $dt$ , Increments  $dm$  and/or  $d1$  of two Interacting parts of substance are identical only for two parts of substance, which will soon form the Supreme Monad.

Definition 21. The imagined projection of the Monad on two imagined planes of projection, one of which is perpendicular to the direction of Movement of part of the substance which will soon form this Monad and the other perpendicular to the first, are rounds of a strictly determined size for each Monad.

The imagined projection of the Supreme Monad on the imagined plane of projection is the point which doesn't have size<sup>49</sup>.

Definition 22<sup>50</sup>. The straight line, which is the projection of the Given part of substance of this Monad on the plane in the particular moment of time that the Given part of substance has the biggest possible Meaning of Inertia is equal to the sum of three axes of the *orisphere*, in which the Monad of the Given part of substance can be inscribed, and:

- the sum of three axes of the *orisphere* of a Given Monad is constant,
- for any "Thing-in-itself" its projection on the imaginative plane of projection can be inscribed in an ellipse, the axial sum of which is constant and equal to the size of a straight line of the Given part of substance of this "Thing-in-itself" in that particular moment of time.

Commentary on the plan of the Whole Definition of a part of substance.

- the value  $m(N)$  and  $l(1)$  is taken as the unit of calculation on the axis of modification of the constant meanings of the Moduses of the Inertia of mass and space,
- the unit of calculation on the Time axis is arbitrary,
- the 0 point is the referent,
- points A and A' is a "thing-in-itself".

### **Cosmogony**<sup>51</sup>.

Definition 23. The Set of two parts of substance, of which the Pair of constant Moduses of the Inertia of mass and space has the number 1 in one and N in the second, is a closed set which is called the Supreme Monad<sup>52</sup>.

Definition 24. The Supreme Monad(Monads) is(are) the Point(s) of Absolute accumulation, or simply, the Point(s), which does(do) not have any parts of substance in its(their) neighborhoods, or Substance, as the Whole<sup>53</sup>.

---

<sup>49</sup> "According to the well-known hypothesis, each such body was initially in a liquid state; it took its present form before solidification, having previously received an unchanging form as the result of internal friction. Assuming this, the shape of a celestial body must be one of those which can be mutually attracted one another according to Newton's law, or, at east, must differ little from such a figure of equilibrium of a rotating liquid"(BIB: A.M Lyapunov, "Selected Works",p.303, Moscow-Leningrad, 1953). Lyapunov's theory can be renewed trough the assumption that all celestial bodies are composed by parts of Absolute with different Density of substance within themselves, which difference determine their 'Measure of strangeness'. For that reason, all bodies must be considered from the point of view of their non-uniformity and non-homogeneity, where the similar strives to be concurred with the similar or/and with the better. Next, a new class of celestial things have to be examined: the class which can be called the 'class of Spindles'.

<sup>50</sup> Cynicism attempts here to show how a thing's forms can be described.

<sup>51</sup> "...Cosmology dealt with the word, with its contingency, necessity, and eternity, with its being limited in space and time, with the formal laws and their modifications, and further with the freedom of man and the origin of evil." BIB:(8.10),[p.72]

<sup>52</sup> BIB:(15)

The Law of the Unity and Struggle of Opposites.

All parts of substance continuously interact.

The Law of the Transformation of Quality<sup>54</sup> to Quantity.

Any open set of parts of substance of a Given has a meaning of Inertia which is smaller than that which any part of substance from this open set had before association in the open set of a Given part of substance<sup>55</sup>.

The Law of the Negation of Negation.

Modification of the Conditions of substance is continuous<sup>56</sup>.

Definition 25. The Force of the Interaction of any part of substance with all other parts of substance is the Measure of the Ether, at a particular moment of Time<sup>57</sup>.

**Reason.**

Definition 26. Reason is the Manifestation of the Supreme and Infinite Ultimate of the T'ai Chi Law. Any reason is Pure Reason inasmuch as it can consider "reality pure and by itself."<sup>58</sup> Therefore, the *Yin-Li* condition of Substance is: an object of non-sensuous contemplation, or Kant's

---

<sup>53</sup> This(these) point(s) does(do) not exist -- it(they) is(are) ***NOTHING***: "for a Thing without qualities is clearly not real. It is mere Being, or mere Nothing, according as you take it simply for what it is, or consider also that which it means to be. Such an abstraction is palpably of no use to us." BIB:(3.55),[p.112]

<sup>54</sup> "Quality is, to being with, the determinacy that is identical with being, in such a way that something ceases to be what it is if it loses its quality." BIB:(8.10),[p.136] "Relation presupposes quality, and quality relation. Each can be something neither together with, nor apart from, the other; and the vicious circle in which they turn is not the truth about reality[p.21]. And hence a relation... without qualities is nothing[p.27]." BIB:(3.55)

<sup>55</sup> Hence, it follows that something must come into being out of nothing, and also that what is more apathetic(that is, what contains in itself a smaller meaning of Inertia) can come into ***NON-EXISTENCE*** from what is less impassive. BIB:(3.76),[p.28]

<sup>56</sup> "There is not probably, at present, in the whole universe, one particle of matter at absolute rest." BIB:(11),[p.50] Also, the Supreme Monad's loop of changes can be compared with Carnot cycle of changes; where entropy does not exist.

<sup>57</sup> *Lemma I.* "Bodies are reciprocally distinguished with respect to motion or rest, quickness or slowness, and not with respect to substance.

*Lemma II.* All bodies agree in certain respect."

*Lemma(Cynical) III.* A body in motion or at rest may not be determined for motion or rest by some other body but by its own nature -- it must exist. BIB:(22.55),[p.48]

<sup>58</sup> BIB:(19.50),"Phaedo",[66b]

*Noumenon*<sup>59</sup>; “*Nirvana*” in Buddhist’s tradition; Plato’s Forms<sup>60</sup>; the condition of one’s unconscious -- the Self of the Upanishads.

Definition 27. The value IntL:

$$\text{IntL} = \frac{dT}{dT'}$$

where dT is an interval of Time in which the Given part of substance does not change its condition of substance,

where dT' is the interval of Time in which the Given part of substance had the *Yang* condition of substance,

where any interval of time can be measured as equal for any two parts of substance only if these two parts have an equal Pair of meaning of Moduses of Inertia in the Set T, and both parts have an equal Meanings of Inertia, is called the Measure of Reasonableness of a Given part of substance, or substance, as the One, in the case of the Supreme Monad<sup>61</sup>.

Definition 28. A(the Supreme) Monad has a Measure of Reasonableness IntL=1; a(the Supreme) Monad's Reason is called Pure Reason, or God’s Reason. Any part of substance has a Measure of Reasonableness<sup>62</sup> IntL < 1.

### **Cancer<sup>63</sup>.**

Definition 29. The association of a part of substance from the open set of a Given with parts of substance that do not enter before into the open set of a Given part of substance, that increases the meaning of Inertia of a Given part of substance, is called Cancer and is the cause for a “mutation” for any part of the One<sup>64</sup>.

### **Death.**

---

<sup>59</sup> By contrast with phenomena, the objects of experience, noumena are things-in-themselves, unconditioned by the categories of understanding. According to Kant, noumena are essentially unknowable, yet must be posited to account for phenomena, or things as they appear to be.

<sup>60</sup> Forms are the causes both of being and of coming into being. BIB:(1.10), [1080<sup>α</sup>,5]. The existence of Forms as of Limits determines *the* existence of substance: Forms exist as **NOTHING**.

<sup>61</sup> “...if you are not yourself astonished at suddenly finding that you are the equal in wisdom of any man or even a god? -- Or do you think the Protogorean measure isn’t meant to be applied to gods as much as to men?”BIB:(19.54),[162c]

<sup>62</sup> “Intellect, finite or infinite in actuality(*actus*), must comprehend the attributes of God and the modifications of God and nothing else.” BIB:(22.55),[p.24]

<sup>63</sup> Cancer is the manifestation of the “equal right” of all parts of the Whole to become the Best.

<sup>64</sup> “Whatever brings it to pass that the proportion of motion and rest which the parts of the human body hold one to the other is preserved, is good; and contrariwise, that is bad which brings it about that the parts of the human body have another proportion mutually of motion and rest.” BIB:(22.55),[p.169]

Definition 30. The cessation of a thing's change is the cause, called Death, of the disintegration of the open set of parts of substance into its constituent parts of substance<sup>65</sup>.

### **Pragmatical Esthetics.**

Definition 31. Any part of substance that makes it possible for a Given to become the Whole, has a positive(good) quality for the Given part of substance: the necessity is the beauty but a beauty may not be the necessity<sup>66</sup>.

### **Geometry of transformations for invariant groups<sup>67</sup>.**

Definition 32. For the *Li* Condition of Substance:

if there are the Given geodesic path(line)  $a$  and a point  $A$  not on  $a$ , there is more than one geodesic line (path) through  $A$  which lay in the plane containing both  $a$  and  $A$ , which lines do not intersect; there is not a path that can be drawn through the point  $A$ .

Definition 33. For the *Yin* Condition of Substance:

if there are the Given geodesic path  $a$  and a point  $A$  not on  $a$ , there is only one geodesic line (path) through  $A$ , which lies in the plane containing both  $a$  and  $A$ , and which does not intersect.

Definition 34. For the *Yang* Condition of Substance:

if there are the Given geodesic path  $a$  and a point  $A$  not on  $a$ , there is not a geodesic line (path) through  $A$ , which lies in the plane containing both  $a$  and  $A$ , and which does not intersect.

Definition 37. Any plan of projections is a surface of constant negative curvature with a constantly changing radius of curvature.

Definition 38. Any line(path) between two *extremum* points of motion of a Given part of substance can be imagined as a line of intersection between two surfaces of constant modifying negative curvature of

---

<sup>65</sup> 41."But where there are not limits, namely in God, perfection is absolutely infinite." BIB:(15.00) Cynicism, in contrast to Leibniz, defines that God is the Limit and that the One's existence is eternal not in the infinity of changes and that both terms 'perfect' and 'imperfect' should not be used for the description of the Best which 'is' not in time. **SOMETHING** can be pictured in qualitative terms only if there is the original force which is always giving a perpetual restlessness to substance. BIB:(11.00),[p.51]

<sup>66</sup> BIB:(1.10;19.50-19.55) Also, "the good is one thing; the pleasant is another. These two, differing in their ends, both prompt to action." BIB:(24.45),[*Katha*, p.16]

<sup>67</sup> "If, then, there is a constant cycle, something must always remain, acting in the same way. And if there is to be generation and destruction, there must be something else which is always acting in different ways." BIB:(1.10),[1072<sup>α</sup>,10] Next, "Reality... is not the sum of things. It is the unity in which all things, coming together, are transmuted, in which they are changed alike, though not changed equally."BIB:(3.55),[p.432]

two parts of substance and, therefore, lies in a shell of one of these two parts of substance for the *Yang* condition.

Definition 39. An *orisphere* is a sphere with a constantly changing radius, which strives to become infinitely big; where “big” does not mean a size in comparison with some arbitrarily chosen measure of space, but a measure of quantity of parts of substance of the Limit, which are united in this open set of a Given part of substance, in comparison with their entire quantity.

Definition 40. The sets of parts of substance with equal Meanings of Inertia within a Given corresponding to the same Density of substance are called shells<sup>68</sup>.

Postulate 9. Any closed set has a power equal to the power of the empty set<sup>69</sup>.

### Numbers<sup>70</sup>.

---

<sup>68</sup> The shell is a space such that any path which joins any two points with the same Density of substance is wholly within this space.

<sup>69</sup> By applying this suggestion I can infer that  $0=1=2=3\dots=\infty$ ; where  $\infty$  is the quantity of all parts of substance of the Limit; where  $1,2,3,\dots,\infty$  are the whole Natural numbers, or closed sets.

$\lim$  ‘a part of substance’ = 1 = the Best = a Monad,

Meaning of Inertia  $\rightarrow$  min

$\lim$  ‘a part of substance’ = 1 = the Supreme Monad,

Meaning of Inertia  $\rightarrow$  max

where max and min are, correspondingly, the biggest and smallest possible Meanings of Inertia for a Given part of substance. It is assumed that this contradiction is *the* prime cause for **SOMETHING** to exist:  $1,2,3,\dots,\infty$  cannot be 0, 0 cannot be  $1,2,\dots,\infty$ ; but they are equal. Also, the Unity itself cannot be many or, *idem*, Plurality itself cannot be the One -- there is only the Best, but(and), in reality, it seems that there are many Bests. Therefore, if the Best does not know contradictions it cannot be simultaneously the One and the Ones -- otherwise, it endeavors to sit on the fence! “If the Many are supposed to be without internal quality, each would forthwith become nothing, and we must therefore take each as being internally somewhat. And, if they are to be plural, they must be a diversity somehow coexisting together. Any attempt again to take their togetherness as unessential seems to end in the unmeaning. We have no knowledge of a plural diversity, nor can we attach any sense to it, if we do not have it somehow as one. And, if we abstract from this unity, we have also therewith abstracted from the plurality, and are left with mere being (BIB:(3.55),[p.124])” -- “29.For whom he did foreknow he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren(BIB:(2),[Paul to the Romans, Ch.8]).”

<sup>70</sup> Aristotle, “Metaphysics”, Book 1, Chapter 9,[990 $\beta$ -993 $\alpha$ ]. Laconical Cynicism shares Pythagorean doctrine that consists of numerology and number ‘mysticism’: the world can be understood through mathematics and vice versa, where ‘the One’ and ‘one’ are *the* proper names for things. The universe was created when the One ‘breathed’ liveliness into some ‘void’ (**NOTHING**, but not in vacuum). The basic principles of things are the Limit and the

Postulate 6. All Natural numbers are the immanent quality of the *Li* condition of substance.

Postulate 7. All Rational numbers are the immanent quality of the *Yin* condition of substance.

Postulate 8. All Irrational numbers are the immanent quality of the *Yang* condition of substance.

---

Unlimited: the Unlimited(the infinity of changes of substance) exists through the existence of the Limited(the eternity of the Whole).

Also, “number... includes all things that are capable of comparison... That is why Pythagoras was so insistent on maintaining that in virtue of numbers all things were understood.”  
BIB:(19.37),[p.8]