

Philosophical Reflection on the “Null” as “Emptiness” or *Unfolding the “Nothing” into “Something” out of Numbers*

Alex Popov

South-West University “Neofit Rilski”

sascho.dimov@gmail.com

Abstract: Why does the Pythagorean teaching not say anything about the zero? Why, provided it has been clarified that the number three for instance symbolizes the completeness, nothing has been said about the beginning “before the initial ONE”? Why numbers in the Pythagorean teaching explain the existence however nothing explains the non-existence as a factual undoubtedness – the non-existence of things is undoubted as much as their existence. Could the Pythagorean teaching have been “scared” of the “non-existing” things and their wisdom, which was not practically realized as a numeric expression and image?

Keywords: Pythagorean teaching, monades, universe, Eastern philosophy.

Can we say that the world originates from nothing? The answer sounds convincing enough when both affirming and denying this possibility. If we assume that the world originates from nothing, do we have enough grounds and courage to measure it. In other words, to “calculate” it. A complicated action lacking logic. But just at first sight. To have a clear “calculation”, the result must be checked. Is it possible that, trying to measure the world we exist in, we run the check with an alluded “result” in it, prior to its actual “calculation”? Moreover – do we need to search for the result with our reason and do we want it to contain any reasoning (thinking, logical, subjected to our image and comprehension of truth) nature?

These are questions awaking the need to inquire sources explaining via knowledge the so called “basics” referring to the nature of our research. The problem is that, without thinking incorporating imagination, the “calculus” would hardly be real enough. Why is such a statement stealing in between the lines? The answer – many of the things preventing us from being accurate in our calculations, are those we have skipped, due to our incapacity or lack of will to see the “invisible to the eyes” – the imagination.

Definitions exist for all numbers. They are carriers of wisdom and world harmony is measured via them, the one guaranteed by the law of nature which we always construe as “the Creator’s design”.

Pythagoras and the numbers

Let us address the comprehension of numbers in Pythagorean teaching. The string of questions forming the inquiry objective starts there: Do the numbers measure harmony or they rather explain the relations of the various conditions for harmony? This is a question setting a frame that is complicated to the eye „vision“. It incorporates that grasp of wisdom hidden as an accurate, measurable and mathematically utilized message about the worldly things. And not just measuring the “things existing to the eyes” but of those, I would say, “rescuing” and at the same time giving the required load of spirits as a part of us enabling the comprehension of justice, harmony to a not merely a definition but realization... via their value in numbers.

To the Pythagorean teaching, the **number 1** is grasped as the foundation of everything and an element of all the rest of the numbers. The wisdom symbol of knowledge in this number according to the teaching is the living man, the number as a unit, which separates and connects everything (Petrova 2020: 45-50).

Again, according to this teaching, the **number 2** has been realized as a contraposition of the „unit“, symbolizing the courage, difference since it is a „symbol of the first number, separated from the unit of God.“ (Petrova 2020: 45) This number is comprehended by the Pythagorean teaching as a symbol of the matter due to its ability to multiply.

The number 3 is a symbol of knowledge and mind, exact sciences and music, stability and completeness.

The remaining numbers are a sum of these, as the idea of the Pythagorean teaching is that the person clearly accounts for the accuracy and fair knowledge (the accuracy of use of knowledge) used for creating the Universe. The knowledge measurability provision is extremely important. In this particular research, the question is why knowledge needs measuring? It is too early for an answer but what was mentioned until now suggests that the measurability is not the objective of the accurate measure of wisdom and it is a process of realization of its infinity contained in the nature of numbers and the consequence of their interaction. In brief, the Pythagorean teaching explains the infinity in measuring the knowledge we are capable to touch via the endless effectiveness of the interaction of knowledge to knowledge. In other words – numbers are the symbol of wisdom used for the creation and functioning of the harmony in the Universe.

First questions about the Null

1. Why does Pythagorean teaching not say anything about the null? Why is it clarified that the number three for instance, symbolizes completeness however it does not say anything at all about the beginning „prior to the initial ONE“?

2. Why in the Pythagorean teaching numbers are the explanation of the existence however nothing is in place for the non-existence as an actual indisputability – the non-existence of things is as indisputable as their existence.

3. Is it possible that the Pythagorean teaching was „scared“ of the „non-existing“ things and their wisdom that is practically not realized as a numeric expression and image?

„East from the West“ – the discursive beginning of realization of the „Null“

It is of paramount importance for the research here to investigate (and not as an end in itself) a reference to the Pythagorean realization of the number 3, and the practically realized wisdom of the same number in the Eastern (more exactly the Chinese and Indian) philosophy. This is the first key to disclosing a “secret idea” about the essence of the “Null” as a number. But before we get there – the connection between the number 3 and the fundamental practical notion of the same number in the Chinese philosophy.

In the Pythagorean teaching, numbers are a symbol of wisdom, coded in the processes of “development”, “unfolding” of the “concurrent-being” proving itself via this motion and changeability. The process of permanent progressing of things and their natural wisdom as a natural catalyst of this progress is rationalized via the number punctuality. The question – does this original truth suffice the overall rationalization? What the research is seeking here, if it may so, is both the answer to this question and the „evolution“ and unfolding in its proceeding simply referred to as interpretation.

The Eastern philosophy gives the phenomenon “world” (the event of the world) an explanation which is to decompose the knowledge of it to minimally signifiable cognitive elements. And that is needed due to the fact that the numbers are the end of the phenomenon and its signification. But before them, before the numeric rationalization of being as a phenomenon there is something which is unmeasurable, in the sense of practical truth in the grasping of the world (of things). Therefore, in our research, we confer with the number 3.

In its essence, it is a digital expression of the wisdom to reconcile the differences and turn them into an overall, harmonic, sensually separated and signified as an ending complex.

In the foundation of things, of the world of things, is energy, “the whole universe is energy” (Nikolova 2022). Here is a fundamental evidence for the unfolding in energy aspect, signified by numbers, before they turn into a symbol embracing in itself the “value” of being:

“The literal translation of Tao is Road... To the Taoists, the Road is the unity of static and dynamic. It is not related to the idea of a pointed course in which things move, it is not the Road from substantial point of view, it is the movement potency itself. The Road by itself goes nowhere. It IS, and containing the capacity for change. And this specific potentiality discloses the essence of movement according to the Taoists. It is not a spatial relocation, it is not unidirectional, linear and purposeful. On the contrary: the main principle of movement of Tao is “return to itself” (Nikolova 2003: 40).

The „Road“ is what the fundamental movement of the non-things is towards their transformation into things. It is not random that the research departs on its „Eastern-philosophical“ plane of research. Nothing is before all. And it has its numeric charge and identification as a non-numeric value. In other words – perfect value that cannot be limited in the non-concurrently-being world. It is free and able to symbolize two processes of “change” at the same time – unfolding and „change of the change to the non-change before the change“ – shrinking or returning which would turn out to be the foundation for the new unfolding. This practical approach in the Chinese philosophical thought is not just convenient but also preserving the knowledge in its purity without the interference of the discloser’s Self, the objectives and „wishes for mental“ comfort originating from it.

But how exactly the energy unfolding affects the practicality in the numeric expression? Why is the „threesome“ important? The answer is that, via the „threesome“, the energy complex (the something) acquires absence of contradictory expression and creates via its factual concurrent-being a stability that is a foundation with no dissonance in the natural essence (of the something). In other words – the energies, in their variance, following the principle of devouring and penetration of one into the other create an integrity which, by itself, born via this „conflict“ is only and solely useful via the expression of its completeness and in it, it can be practically rationalized as an entity which can be “measured”. Here is the more detailed explanation of this unfolding as presented by Assoc. Prof. A. Nikolova:

„The first unfolding of Tao in multiplicity is in the One (Tao gives birth to the One), and on the other side, the biggest approximation to Tao is the idea of One. On a second level, this idea is no longer an idea of the one but of the unity that displays the way to it on the side of

multiplicity. The first unfolding of the unity is the duplicity, the dyad: "One engenders two". And the poles of the dyad and the ratio between them is the threesome already: "Two engenders three". Exactly from the level of the threesome – the poles, stepping into relations, covering the entire specter between them – the most comprehensive unfolding of the multiplicity originates: "Three engenders the billions of things". The relation between the one and the multiple is dynamic, continuous and bilateral. Upon movement of one to the multitude Tao discloses as a radiating spread in numerous multitudes and particularities and from the multitude to the one - as a synthesis of endlessly devouring profundities. The two processes are indistinguishable, they are two aspects, two directions of the same pulsing vibration: potency-expression, potency-expression" (Nikolova 2003: 47-48).

Why does the research pass through this aspect of numbers consideration? The answer – because before and after the numbers, before and after the things, there is something „secret“ and „mystic“. Something that, by its expressibility, is undefinable, however at the same time, via its undefinability, it proves its existence, the nature existentiality via undefinability. What is this thing? This thing embraces in itself the energy of the „one“, the energy of the „two“, the energy of „three“ as a result of interaction of the energy differences. What is specific to this thing? The specific for this thing is that its undefinability gives it the understanding of nothing. Non-presence of something in the nothing. Or presence of nothing in something which cannot be defined. The important thing here is not the interpretation of the sounding of the fact but rather the determination of its essential (mechanically expressible and explanatory) expressibility. This „thing“ should be understood as an energy storage. Energy that has no direction, no motion and no interaction to other energy. The courage here – this energy can be called „sleeping“, „non-seeking“, which, by its non-purposeful expressibility fails to meet „the others“ in this storage. This is the condition whose presence could explain the lack of interaction of knowledge, wisdom. Every knowledge in this thing is a separate sleeping thing and produces no „multiplicity“ of things via synthesis of knowledge (energy) due to lack of coercion (of contradictions), considering the lack of direction for unfolding. Here is how this “thing“ has been explained in a lecture of Eastern philosophy read by Assoc. Prof. Dr. A. Nikolova:

„A major idea in Madhyamika or Shunyavada is the teaching of emptiness. It has two aspects. Emptiness in terms of the world of phenomena and emptiness in terms of the absolute reality. In the first case Shunya means that the objects of the external world we

perceive are unreal however at the same time we cannot say about what we perceive that it does not exist. Nagarjuna proves the emptiness of the empirical being by disclosing the internal contradiction of the categories through which it is described. Its starting predisposition is that the real is non-contradictory and what is contradictory, is unreal. Emptiness both denies, and does not deny. In terms of the genuine being emptiness means that we cannot say anything about it, again it negates and does not negate. Tzu Tzan and his followers continue the development of the teaching of emptiness, focusing on such aspects as medianity, non-duplicity, non-expressibility. It is emphasized that the comprehension of emptiness in negative sense as absence, is incorrect. Negation in this school is not so destructive as constructive. The disapproval of the non-genuine is at the same time approval of the genuine” (Nikolova 2020).

And here comes the question – why „emptiness“ is considered in this research as something before the numbers and their expressibility of wisdom? The answer – nothing is before all. This nothing is full of the potential of the billions of things to happen as an unfolded energy interaction whose outcome we call “being”. And then what is the lack of that being? What is there where there is no being? „Nothing“, which in the Chinese philosophy is separated from „emptiness“, however with the clear idea that it is an integrity of many „no-things“. And here is that key suggested at the beginning of this part – if the unity – the world (universe) is one, then the contents of the „one“ involves all concurrent-being. However its contents also includes another thing – the non-concurrent being. The non-existing. What is it? „Emptiness“ is one of its name. But its numeric expression is null. Here is the evidence. Again the study refers to an extract of a lecture of Eastern philosophy of Assoc. Prof. Dr. A. Nikolova:

„Three types of emptiness are discerned:

1. Emptiness of I

2. Emptiness of the Dharmas

3. Emptiness of the emptiness

„Emptiness of I“ means non-reality of the empirical I.

„Emptiness of the Dharmas“ means non-reality of the objects of the empirical world.

„Emptiness of the emptiness“ means that the emptiness as such does not exist. Emptiness is a conventionality such as all it negates“ (Nikolova 2020).

If in these three types of “emptiness” we put “null” instead of “emptiness”, the following would result:

„Null of I“ means non-reality of the empirical I.

„Null of the Dharmas“ means non-reality of the objects of the empirical world.

„Null of the null“ means that the null as such does not exist. Null is a conventionality such as all it negates.

Practically “this intentional check” has the objective not to prove the nature of null as emptiness but to provide more clarity about its essential expression. It denies the lack of definable things until via the potential of this non-reference and symbolic signification of things the very affirmation happens after the unfolding of the „nothing“ undefinable to „something definable“. In this sense “emptiness” as “null” and the “null” as “emptiness” have in their nature undefinability which is by itself denying the existencia of something in itself via its undefinability.

Why is this research not saying anything about “beginning”? Why is the „null“ not a beginning? Because the requirement for a beginning is an „end in itself“. This is a frame in comprehension which limits the limitless and endless. The “beginning“ by itself, when referred to as numbers and the wisdom, coded in them, is an end deprived of meaningful cognitive character. The research has set another objective – to consider things „in“ and „outside“ integrity, „in“ and „outside“ the multiplicity. This is the frame which guarantees endlessness and limitlessness of the value of wisdom as it is itself and as it defines its own limitlessness (the endlessness of numbers and time) through its inexhaustible potential.

„West from the East“ – The „null“ and its practical rationalization as „emptiness“

When the research has considered the required to demystify to a minimal extent the nature of “null“ as „emptiness“, it returns to the „bizarre applicability“ in the potential of the „null“ in the „Western world“. Generally, everywhere the „null“ is used, the idea it is referred to is – nothing. The null signifies nothing. However, after having passed through the Eastern

philosophical rumination about the null, this research would disagree with this definition. The null is anything else that could replace the “nil” but a “nothing”.

The null as vacuity and sign of emptiness

The „null“ has its contribution to the scripture of wisdom. When null is used as a number, signifying nothing or no value of itself, this is the whole wisdom. For as per the above stated in the Eastern philosophical reading, the energy is present in the nothing even in its inexhaustibleness (of wisdom and knowledge), however its movement is expressed as a vibration on the spot with no steer-way. In other words this vibration can be perceived as a non-elicited, non-existing knowledge which stands, and is unusable and not interacting to anything else and not producing any new, unfolded knowledge. Thus the null by itself, comprehended as emptiness contains in itself the potential of wisdom with no direction, a sign whose value is unmeasurable due to its “invisibility” (non-eventfulness) in being. And it lives.

The null as vacuity

The „null“ is the asylum of the non-evented values of knowledge. The non-realized values of knowledge. The numbers outside the null reflect the extent of unfolding and realization of this knowledge (energy). As vacuity, the “null” embraces in itself the whole wisdom of all numbers. It is already clear why. Before being numbers with certain value of knowledge, they are knowledge with no value due to the lack of actual expression of its potency (capable of measuring via the steering direction, interaction to other knowledge, rising intervals (evolution) and deployment (return to a previous stage)). The meaning of the „null“ as vacuity is the following: In the Eastern philosophy, the idea of devouring, transformation from one to another, of one into the other and its return on the natural way of knowledge into “itself” is concerned more than once. If we consider numbers and what follows from all mentioned so far about them, these are the outcome of energy interactions (wisdom with different strength and nature), which sooner or later in time “return” to themselves. In other words – the foursome beforehand has been a part of a vacuity between the other numbers – it has been a number with no value (wisdom and energy with no application and interaction), located in the „null emptiness“. This is valid for all numbers from 2 to 9.

Why do we skip the „one“? Because, by the sense of the Eastern-philosophical interpretation, the unity (one) contains in itself the „emptiness“ and the latter contains in itself

the unity (the whole world), which, before being a unity, had the conduct (the nature of non-something, which was a perfect something with absolute value (non-value)) of nothing. The residues of this unity (one), which lack value and interaction, are the expression of emptiness in the world and accordingly, the numeric signification of the null. Or – in the one (unity) the vacuities are countless, because with their nature and expression, they do not change the wisdom of the world, being a part of it. They are inscribed in it and have the potential to embrace in themselves even the one itself which, before being a unity, has been wisdom with no interaction (energy with no steering and interaction).

The null as a sign of emptiness within the troops of the endless

To grasp the „null“ as a sign and token is not a matter of mere interpretation of the meaning of the words „token“ and „sign“. The numbers, besides the „null“ are above all signs on the way of wisdom unfolding. They are, so to say, the stops of its fundamental states of unfolding. This periodicity of unfolding the knowledge (wisdom and energy) has its peak and end. In the Eastern philosophy, these are the stages of unfolding of the inner energy – three stages – beginning, peak, end. And here it is already appropriate to say something about the beginning. The “beginning” is the moment (the edge of the nothing as steerless energy), when the energy has its significant expression of knowledge corresponding to its sign of progressing and unfolding – a unity. The first stage after the beginning has its three moments 1 (unity), 2 (interaction of various energies and contradictions and achievement of a concurrent integrity), 3 (the concurrent integrity has its life and as such, it unfolds). As a consequence this first stage of the „Beginning“ has its peak in 6 (six – interaction of four and two, two threesomes, a five and a one). The peak is expressed as after 1 (one) each number, each energy difference and contradiction, whether it is a simple energy unit or a complex (synthesis of interacting energy units) interacts to any other value (number) of the row till 6 (six). This is by itself an evolution of the energy on the first stage – the “Beginning“ from 1 to 3. „End“ is the stage of „return“ to emptiness. It is expressed in the preparation of the unfolding for a new beginning. The preparation is expressed as interactions which, during the synthesis, result in numbers (values of wisdom), which suffices by charge and knowledge and has the potential to return to the nothing where it had been – „emptiness-null“.

Here is the row:

1, 2, 3 –

4 - (3+1), (2+2), 5 - (4+1), (3+2), 6 - (5+1), (4+2), (3+3);

7, 8, 9

10

Here exactly in the row, „emptiness-null“ is a token and sign of the „return of wisdom“ into the nothing however provided that something remains on its way to this return. What remains is knowledge contained in the unit (in the world, to enable the steering of things). Therefore the period of three stages is retained however the null serves for numeric reflection as a sign of the deployment rate of wisdom and for accounting with each „return“ of the accumulation of the “steering” knowledge which remains in the unit as „the steering energy for deployment“.

Thus for instance from 1 to 10 the energy steering things as knowledge is smaller than the energy of the second deployment from 11 to 20. The null is that token that defines the raise of that energy as knowledge and wisdom. By itself, it does not endow value to the “residual energy” with which, after the “return to emptiness”, it initiates a new deployment.

The accumulation of the remaining steering knowledge contains the wisdom for variations interaction, congruence of contradictions – in other words – knowledge of harmony. And the world is a unit for that reason – because it is harmony. Thus the „null“ is affirmed as „emptiness“, containing non-harmony, as much as embracing the wisdom for achieving 1 (harmony – world) via the knowledge of the energy interaction, contained therein.

Then what is the sense of return to emptiness? What is the sense of withdrawal into the „null“? The answer suggestion: The return bears external energy from the concurrently-being world while it withholds energy from the “emptiness”. Thus the “return” appears as the „postal dove“ of knowledge. The incorporated knowledge, the knowledge of return to the emptiness is the energy “steering” the “sleeping energy” in the “null-emptiness“. This could abstractly be referred to as the “deployment experience”. Via this experience of the energy, it returns changed and capable to interact and cause a new steered motion.

To enable the research clarification of the contribution of the “null-emptiness” in this process, it should study the meaning of the „soul“ of number and the „value of the soul (as a wisdom carrier)“ of the number.

The null as emptiness, containing the elements of things

The idea of the soul of numbers seems pretentious however only in appearance. Wisdom by itself is a soul. The soul is an integrity of knowledge with its own expression and appearance. Considering what was said above, the expression of wisdom is energy that is by itself knowledge and constitution of the soul. Thus every number has its soul behind appearing as wisdom and knowledge, whose symbol is the number itself. But what could we say about the “soul” of null? The research should focus here on the fundamental work created in this direction – “Monadology” of Gottfried Leibniz.

In his work Leibniz reconstructed being to the smallest and essentially definable part of it he referred to as monad. But how is to be comprehended? What exactly is the monad? Here is the definition of Leibniz:

“The monad, of which we shall speak here, is nothing but a simple substance which enters into compounds; simple, that is to say, without parts. There must be simple substances because there are compounds and a compound is nothing other than a mass or aggregate of simples. Now where there are no parts, neither extension nor shape nor division is possible. These monads are the true atoms of nature. In a word, they are the elements of things” (Leibniz 2016: 62-63).

This definition of the monad gives another evidence that theoretically, the integrity of the concurrent being of the palpable world is built of units defining it as something different from the null. On its behalf this affirmation defines the lack of being, the non-concurrent-being part of the Universe as different from the unit. The above written and deduced provides a clear sign that the lack of substance is definable as nothing and this, by itself, is the provision for the affirmation of emptiness with its natural expression of the nothing as null.

What certainly opens a new horizon for analysis is the theme for the monads and the comprehension input in Leibniz’s work. The monad is capable to “receive information, energy and impact“ through the monad next to it. In other words, the whole eventfulness of the palpable world has been built of units with exact locus in time and therefore they can interact. It is important that the „impact“ is understood as direction of action of the type „hand over“, and not the specific understanding for energy interaction (specific to the East), whereat one energy withdraws of the energy of another through interaction (penetrating and devouring energy from the other).

Why does this research focus on the “Monadology”? Because through this work and the understanding of the monads it can easily be explained that interaction or impact is a

capability when a substance is in place. And it is of a simple substance. The lack of substance is the key found by the research here. The lack of substance predefines the lack of interaction as well as of course the lack of motion. However motion itself is to be grasped as motion of something – that is of a substantive defining itself via its existence in a natural, essential expression. The lack of this condition enables the statement that the lack of substantive entity defined via itself, even if the simplest, does not enable its “moving” in time and space. And when we return to the idea of the “postal dove”, we reach exactly the sense of something substantive (single definable) in its structure – it is that thing which, except for an energy carrier in terms of information is also a means for steering the energy. This conclusion confirms the Null as lack of substance and as emptiness where the lack of substantively defining elements defines via itself (via this lack) the presence of nothing or highlights the provision for “emptiness”.

Returning to the idea of the “postal dove”, the research comes across an important explanation by Leibniz. Here is what he says:

“Also, we should not fear from decay and no comprehensive way exists for a simple substance to perish naturally On the same ground, no way exists in which a simple substance may occur naturally if not being formed via composing. So it can be said that the monads may neither occur, nor vanish except simultaneously, i.e. they cannot appear in another way except via creation and vanish in other way except via destruction“ (Leibniz 2016: 65-67).

In depth, this thesis of Leibniz is capable to confirm and deny at the same time the root cause of the beginning, stated in the opinion herein. The “beginning” by its limit specificity and “edge” has its scientific meaning as a token of an event and passing of one into another, however by itself, it is a way to be skipped or neglected “prior to the beginning” and “after the beginning”. Ignoring “prior to the beginning”, the scientific and cognitive meaning of the root cause dilutes. And sometimes it can be missing. It may appear as though the cause is simply “reason”, “supreme reason” and that could be all. However to explain that “supreme reason” at least in this research, is a way to ruminate on something completely different from the objective of this research – the meaning of the supreme things. In other words – every thing in its origin is a supreme reason and its supreme nature weakens to turn the nothing into its palpable and concurrent-being expression. And to have it more accurate – the supreme, the absolute of a thing is its shapelessness, non-definability as a thing, the absence of its natural

expression of a fact. This by itself is a hint that the supreme thing, in its perfect sense is nothing which is reconstructed to something. And more specifically, from “null” something “weakens” to “a unit”. It takes its way of weakening and “return” to its supreme state of nothing. Where it has always been – emptiness. However, having returned, it is already a “dying thing”, turning again into a nothing, with a memory of its existential determination as “something”. Thus we can reach to the fact that the unit and the null, the concurrent-being world and “emptiness” differ by the fact that the concurrent-being world has a memory via its units and the “emptiness” has a simple knowledge as a supreme reason. Memory should be comprehended as a remembrance from experiencing the “collision with the challenge of concurrent-being“, whereas the supreme reason and its knowledge is the core for living of the “nothing” as “something” and collecting its “memory”. In other words, the “null” has an idea of the way everything in it can live as a „unit“, however it has no “memory” of deployment of this experience due to its own indivisibility. Impossibility to divide in one and potential to contain multiplicity, countless units.

And here is the most appropriate place for the question – what enables the “null” to contain knowledge via the supreme reason but to have no memory? And what is that thing enabling the unit to have memory despite of the nature of the knowledge of the supreme reason in it?

Here is a genuine statement from Leibniz:

“Also, there is nothing else that could be found in the simple substance except for that, i.e. the perceptions or their alterations. And only that could contain all internal actions of the simple substances. The name entelechia could be given to all simple substances or created monads since they possess certain perfection (εχουσι το εντελες), available in a self-sufficiency (αυταρκεια), which makes them sources of their internal actions and, so to say, non-corporal automates. If we want to call soul all that possesses perceptions and wishes in the general sense I have just explained, all simple substances or created monads can be called souls; however as the sensation is something more than a simple perception, I agree that the general name of the monads and entelechias suffices for the simple substances that have no such; and that we call souls only those whose perception is more elicited and provided with memory“ (Leibniz 2016: 83-86).

What is understood about emptiness is that it is capable of “memory” only if employed via “perishing” of the simple substance and its “return”.

Next questions about the “Null“

The next questions referring to the nature of „Null“ fulfill a logical series of conclusion searches:

Is it possible that the null defines itself as emptiness, through its potential to embrace the infinite, however not be divided nor multiplied by it?

To what extent is the null a meaningful phenomenon of infinity and to what extent it can define itself through the infinite? To what extent the infinite and inexhaustible multiplication defines the null?

To reach the answer which is almost certainly clarified with the asking of the question, we must focus on a statement of the book “History of philosophy of physicists and mathematicians” of B.G. Kuznetsov:

“The image of the Everything is outlined – of the Universe as a whole, whose evolution is inseparable from being and transmutation of elementary particles. This is no longer the abstract being deprived of definitions but a supreme particularity, a subject with countless predicates“ (Kuznetsov 1980: 14).

Attention should be paid to „...This is no longer the abstract being deprived of definitions but a supreme particularity, a subject with countless predicates.“ It appears as though the “image of the Universe” may be interpreted as “subject with countless predicates”, which with their “particularity” also define the “non-particularity” of non-being and its nature of infinity due to the overall infinity of the “Everything”. In other words – the supreme form of particularity, self-defining via inexhaustible series of predicates defines the potential of the supreme form of “non-particularity” in non-being from which particle develop to an ingredient of particularity, definable by and from an attribute.

In what way Kuznetsov supports this idea of the present research?

“The idea of uniformity and unchangeability of being became in the V c. BC a main idea of the Eleatics, and philosophy of Heraclitus became an incarnation of the idea of heterogeneity of being and its alteration. These two ideas turn out to be inseparable from one another. The full identity of being in a series of consecutive moments means shrinking of time to null. On its behalf, the absolute immobility of being and the absolute non-identity of the following moments results in vanishing of the subject of alterations to losing the

subject in the statement “something moves”. The thing identical to itself, the invariant of the reformation is a required characteristic of the altering heterogeneous being” (Kuznetsov 1980: 15).

The return and the simultaneous determination of the particularity via confirmation of the non-particularity and “sufferability” of being is the way for the “emptiness” itself and “null” accordingly, except for a beginning, to be viewed as eternal, absolute value with their absence of value and particularity. This is the incredibility of the perfect non-things. To be non-things and thus to find their particular confirmation in their negation via the “perishing” of things onto which they could specifically reflect.

This study could continue its march forward in a next moment however currently it would be extremely reasonable to stop here and to enable the conclusions live their own life as continuous knowledge realization. Then the promise remains to provide a background for evolution in knowledge about division and multiplication of the nothing as something and its overall particular determination via its essence of nothing. However this is certainly a challenge for the continuation of this research about the null. The topic of the new research shall “escape” from the provision of “null” and “emptiness” to give will to the knowledge about the naturally created and naturally “returned” to itself via its natural determination something.

In no way the research fails to enjoy a satisfactory result so far. On the contrary. The satisfactory aspect of the result is that the questions multiplied and the answers are still far. There are conclusions as well – here they are.

1. The null contains the non-definability of the nothing and thus defines the presence of one (as an aggregation of things, expressible and embraceable through their nature in a single entity – one thing)
2. The null is not a simple substance and neither is emptiness, it is defined by itself through the absence of substantiveness in its expression.
3. The null and “Emptiness” are the same thing because they could not be defined as separate elements of things but as a unifying entity of things in their pre-initiality, expressed as non-things and thus the null and “emptiness” have no soul as opposed to all the rest.
4. The absence of soul in the „Emptiness“ and „null“ is not a reason for the non-being world to be comprehended as a soulless world. Because knowledge in the null and

emptiness is the prime source of soul which by itself means that the absence of soul however presence of knowledge is the “pre-initial condition” of the soul – the raw knowledge to enable things to “breath and develop themselves through their soul“.

5. The “Everything” and the “Universe” are defined via the palpable, concurrently-being world however it has been defined by its “pre-initial non-concurrent-being” in the null or “emptiness”. Thence the “nothing” of the “emptiness” is a part of the “Everything” which, in the concurrently-being world is expressed with numbers. In other words – the null is contained in every number but no number may be contained in the “null” unless “perishing” as such to return to its “emptiness”.
6. The complexity of the “emptiness” and its inability to be divided and multiplied comes from its infinite potential for divisibility of things that could turn from nothing into something thanks to their inner energy (knowledge). And due to the fact that the “null” captures all things in their “pre-initiality” of non-things.
7. The energy of the “null” and “emptiness” is the same – living, however static, which makes non-being existing through the energy and defines it as such through the non-deployment of the energy in it, and is determined via its capability to exist in its simplicity – “stand-by vibration” which is its “pre-initial” potency, expressing motion.
8. The “Null” and “Emptiness” are the same thing. And after all said above, the Universe is composed of 0 and 1, as 0 is non-being and 1 is being, 1 is a part of 0 or being is a part of non-being and non-being is a part of Everything embracing being as well. This by itself enables the “emptiness” to exist in the Universe without changing its value and measurability.

Even if all these conclusions find their refutation, this would be an exclusive progress for the research. For what is more meaningful than the cause, if not the result...

References

- Kuznetsov, B.G. 1980. History of philosophy for mathematicians and physicians. Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo.
- Leibniz, G. 2016. Monadology. Sofia: Iztok-Zapad.
- Nikolova, A. 2003. The Language of Emptiness. Sofia: Aquarium Mediterranean.

Nikolova, A. 2020. Lectures of Eastern philosophy. SWU “Neofit Rilski”.

Nikolova, A. 2022. Philosophy of dynamics. Sofia: Iztok-Zapad.

Petrova, S. 2020. Pythagoras and the cosmology of numbers. Sofia: Millenium.