First Philosophy: The Boundary Condition*

A Geometric Derivation of Reality from the Logic of Distinction

Eli Adam Deutscher

2026

INTRODUCTION: THE EMPTY STARTING POINT

Any claim about what exists must first account for how one thing can be distinguished from another. Traditional philosophy begins with something—water, mind, substance, God—and then attempts to explain distinction. This paper begins with distinction itself.

We start with a blank space. The first act is to draw a line, creating an inside and an outside.[1] This act requires no prior metaphysics. It is the precondition for any metaphysics at all.

From this single starting point—the logic of the boundary—we will derive the fundamental structures of reality: the necessity of an indeterminate ground, the possibility of plurality and change, the limits of knowledge, and the origin of value. The argument proceeds as a geometric proof. No appeals to experience, intuition, or empirical fact are made, save one: that a distinction can be drawn. If you understand the difference between this word and the next, you have performed the act.

This is First Philosophy: the study of what is first in the order of being. Not first in time, but first in necessity. We do not claim to have discovered a new entity, but to have uncovered the

*We reclaim the term "First Philosophy" in the Aristotelian sense—as the study of "being qua being" (Aristotle 1984). However, whereas Aristotle sought the primary substance (*ousia*), this inquiry locates the "first" not in a substance, but in the geometric boundary condition required for any substance to exist.

[1]The operation of drawing a boundary to create existence is formally isomorphic to the Calculus of Indications developed by George Spencer-Brown, which begins with the single injunction: "Draw a distinction" (George Spencer-Brown, *Laws of Form* (George Allen & Unwin, 1969)). Spencer-Brown demonstrated that the laws of logic and arithmetic emerge inevitably from the primary act of severing a space, a mathematical validation of the metaphysical separation (Adikia) described here.

geometric necessity that every entity must satisfy. The Boundary Condition is not a part of the world; it is the shape of worldhood.

PART I: THE GEOMETRY OF DISTINCTION

The following theorems describe the structural preconditions of worldhood. They apply equally to a universe of atoms, a universe of minds, or a universe of pure forms. Before we can discuss the nature of the bounded, we must establish the logic of the boundary.

1. The First Move: The Boundary

Consider any entity. To be *that* entity and not another, it must have a limit. This limit is not an added feature; it is the condition of being an individual. We call this limit a **boundary**.

Definition 1.1 (Boundary): A closed distinction that separates an interior from an exterior.[2]

A boundary is "closed" because if it had gaps, the interior would merge with the exterior and the distinction would fail. A circle with a break is not a circle.

Observation 1.2: To be a determinate entity is to be bounded. Determinacy implies finitude; finitude implies a limit.

2. The Second Move: The Interstitial Necessity

Consider two bounded entities, A and B. For them to be distinct, their boundaries must not overlap or merge. If their boundaries touched perfectly, they would share a boundary.

Theorem 2.1 (Interstitial Necessity): For any two distinct bounded entities A and B, there exists a region R such that:

1. R is not part of A.
2. R is not part of B.
3. R lies strictly between the boundary of A and the boundary of B.[3]

Proof: Suppose no such region R exists. Then the boundaries of A and B are in direct contact.

[2]This definition aligns with the geometric axiom established by Euclid, who defined a boundary not as an object, but as a limit: "A boundary is that which is an extremity of anything" Thomas L. Heath, tran., *The Thirteen Books of Euclid's Elements*, 2nd ed. (Dover Publications, 1956), Book I, Def. 13. Metaphysically, this establishes that a boundary is not a constituent part of a substance, but the condition of its finitude.

[3]The necessity of the "empty" or interstitial for the existence of the "full" (determinate) was first articulated in the Dao De Jing: "We mold clay into a vessel; but it is on the empty space within that the use of the vessel depends" Wing-Tsit Chan, tran., "The Lao Tzu (Tao-Te Ching)," in *A Source Book in Chinese Philosophy* (Princeton University Press, 1963), Ch. 11. Just as the utility of the wheel depends on the empty hub, the distinctness of any bounded entity depends geometrically on the indeterminate region that is not the entity.

When two boundaries are in direct contact, they form a **single continuous boundary** enclosing both A and B together. The line between them is not two boundaries but one shared division.

Consider two islands in an ocean. If the islands touch, they become one island with two hills. For them to be two distinct islands, there must be water between them. That water is not part of either island. It is the interstitial space that makes their separateness geometrically real, not just nominal.

Therefore, without an interstitial region R, A and B are not two distinct bounded entities. They are subdivisions of a single bounded whole. Their distinction is nominal, not geometric.

Thus, for A and B to be geometrically distinct—each with its own closed, unshared boundary—a region R must exist between them. ■

3. The Third Move: The Nature of the Interstitial

What is R? If we claim R is itself a bounded entity C, then by Theorem 2.1, new interstitial regions are required between A and C, and between C and B. This either continues infinitely or terminates in a region that is **not bounded**.

Theorem 3.1 (Indeterminacy of the Interstitial): The interstitial region R cannot be a bounded entity. It must be *indeterminate* relative to A and B.[4]

Proof: Assume R is a bounded entity D. Then by Theorem 2.1, there must be interstitial regions R_1 between A and D, and R_2 between D and B. If R_1 and R_2 are also claimed to be bounded, the regress continues without end. An infinite regress of bounded entities provides no foundation for distinction. The only coherent stopping point is an interstitial region that is **not itself bounded**. Therefore, R must be indeterminate. ■

"Indeterminate" here means: lacking a closed boundary of its own. It is not another figure, but the **ground against which figures appear**.[5]."

[4]This derivation provides the geometric proof for Spinoza's dictum determinatio est negatio ("determination is negation") Michael L. Morgan, ed., Samuel Shirley, tran., "Letters," in *Spinoza: Complete Works* (Hackett Publishing, 2002). Spinoza recognized that to define a thing is to limit it, which necessarily implies a negation of the infinite background. Here, we prove that this background cannot itself be another determinate thing without generating an infinite regress, confirming that the ground of existence must be the indeterminate Apeiron.

[5]This theorem formalizes Anaximander's insight that the origin of determinate things cannot itself be determinate (elemental), but must be the *Apeiron* (Boundless). For the standard text and commentary on Anaximander's fragment (DK 12 B1), see G. S. Kirk, J. E. Raven, and M. Schofield, *The Presocratic Philosophers: A Critical History with a Selection of Texts*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 101–140. For a comprehensive derivation of the *Apeiron* as a relational indeterminacy rather than a material substance—and a refutation of the standard Aristotelian interpretation found in KRS—see Eli Adam Deutscher, "Anaximander and the Zero Principle: The Relational Ontology of the Apeiron" (Preprint, 2026), https://neopreplatonic.com/papers/anaximander/. Deutscher demonstrates through etymological analysis that Anaximander's terminology (*a-peiron*, *a-dikia*) describes a logic of boundary dependent on an indeterminate complement, anticipating the Zero Principle.

Corollary 3.2 (The Boundary Condition): All bounded entities require an indeterminate interstitial ground.

This is not an assumption. It is the **geometric necessity** revealed by the logic of distinction.

3.1 GEOMETRIC ILLUSTRATION: THE ILLUSION OF THE CONTAINER

To visualize the necessity of the indeterminate ground (Theorem 3.1 and Corollary 3.2), we may perform the following thought experiment.

Construction:

Consider an unbounded **continuum** (a 2D plane). Upon it, we draw two concentric circles:

1. **A small inner circle (A):** Representing a determinate entity or system.
2. **A larger outer circle (U):** Labeled "The Totality" or "The Universal Container," intended to bound all possible existence.

The Geometric Error: The construction of U creates an immediate topological contradiction regarding the nature of the ground. By Definition 1.1, the boundary of U must separate an interior from an exterior. If U has an exterior, it is not "The Totality"; it is merely a larger determinate object (U') existing within a wider field. If we attempt to resolve this by drawing a third circle (U'') to encompass the exterior of U', we initiate an infinite regress of containment. We are chasing the ground by drawing larger figures, but every figure presupposes the ground upon which it is drawn.

The Topological Solution: The ground of A is not the larger circle U. The ground is the **plane itself** upon which both A and U are inscribed.

- The circles are **Determinate Figures** (defined by limits).
- The plane is the **Indeterminate Field** (the condition for limits).
- **You cannot draw the plane on the plane itself.** To draw the plane would require drawing a boundary *around* it, which would turn the plane into a figure (U) and require a new background plane to sustain it.

The Insight: Now that we have finished the thought experiment, think of what made it possible at all: *"Consider an unbounded continuum."* To even conduct the experiment, we had to stipulate the ground. That is not an accident; that is the precondition for any distinction at all.

PART II: FROM GEOMETRY TO COSMOS

Having established the Boundary Condition—that bounded entities require an indeterminate interstitial ground—we now explore its consequences. What kind of world does this geometry demand? We will derive the fundamental features of any possible reality that contains distinct

things: plurality, dynamism, and the limits of knowledge. Each follows directly from the logic of boundaries, without speculation about the nature of the ground.

4. Deriving Plurality: Why There Cannot Be Only One

Could a reality contain exactly one bounded entity and nothing else? Let us examine the geometry of this proposition.

Theorem 4.1 (The Impossibility of Singular Bounded Totality): A reality consisting of a single bounded entity A, with an exterior of absolute non-existence, is geometrically incoherent.

Proof: Suppose A is the only existent, bounded entity. Its exterior is defined as absolute non-existence.

Recall that a boundary, by Definition 1.1, is a *distinction* that separates an interior from an exterior. A distinction requires a difference. For the exterior to serve as a term in this distinction, it must be a *contrast*.

For entity A to be bounded, its exterior must be a geometric term capable of contrast—an "other" to its "self." This other cannot be absolute non-existence, as nothingness provides no surface for a boundary to abut against. The exterior must therefore be a positive, albeit indeterminate, ground. If one were to deny this and claim A exists in a void of non-existence, the concept of A's boundary loses all meaning. Without a contrasting ground, the distinction "inside/outside" vanishes, and A effectively expands to fill all conceptual space.[6]

Therefore, a boundary cannot have absolute non-existence as one of its sides. The exterior must be a *positive term* in the geometry of distinction. It need not be another bounded entity, but it must be *something* that can stand in contrast to the interior. By Theorem 3.1, we have already identified this positive term: the **indeterminate interstitial ground**.

Thus, a solitary bounded entity A is not alone. It exists in necessary relation to the indeterminate ground. The ground is not A, but it is not nothing—it is the logically necessary exterior term, the "not-A."

The configuration is not "A and nothing," but "A and the Ground." The ground, being indeterminate, does not possess the bounded unity of a "One." It is the field within which A appears. This

[6]The central polemic of Parmenides is precisely this demonstration: he recognized that the Anaximandrian *Apeiron*—the boundless, indeterminate ground necessary for determination—cannot be made an object of determinate thought or speech without logical contradiction. By banning "What Is Not" from discourse, he performed a *reductio ad absurdum* that exposes this crisis, showing that logic alone, stripped of its indeterminate background, collapses into a frozen "One." See Eli Adam Deutscher, *Parmenides the Polemicist: The Eleatic Crisis and the Indeterminate Ground of Thought*, 2026, https://www.neopreplatonic.com/papers/Parmenides/Parmenides_the_Polemicist.pdf.

field, as the domain of "not-A," is the space where the geometric operation of bounding can, in principle, be repeated. ■

Corollary 4.2: The existence of one bounded entity logically implies the **possibility of others**. The ground is the space of this possibility.

5. Deriving Dynamism: Why There Must Be Change

The necessity of an interstitial ground does not, by itself, guarantee change. Could a reality of bounded entities be static? We now prove that true stasis—the absolute prevention of interaction—is geometrically incoherent. The possibility of interaction is not an added feature but a necessary consequence of the geometry we have established.

Theorem 5.1 (The Causal Neutrality of the Interstitial Ground): The interstitial ground R between bounded entities A and B is **causally neutral**. It possesses no determinate properties that govern interaction.

Proof (By contradiction of a determinate function): Assume R is **not** causally neutral. For it to be non-neutral, it must have a specific causal disposition—it must *do* something. It could act as an absolute barrier, a selective filter, or a mediating transformer of influence between A and B.

Any such specific function is a **determinate property**. A region with a determinate causal property is not a passive background; it is a **causal agent** with a defined role and identity within the system.

However, by **Theorem 3.1 (Indeterminacy of the Interstitial)**, R is indeterminate. It cannot have a determinate identity or properties. Therefore, our initial assumption leads to a contradiction: R cannot simultaneously be indeterminate *and* possess the determinate property of a causal function.

Thus, R cannot have any causal function. The only consistent alternative is that R is **causally inert**. It does not act, prohibit, or permit. It is the geometric medium, not a participant. ■

Corollary 5.2 (Interaction is Not Geometrically Precluded): Since the ground is causally neutral, **no geometric law inherent to the foundational structure of reality forbids interaction** between bounded entities.

This is a pivotal shift. It means that within a reality of distinct bounded entities (A, B, C...), the question of whether they interact is **not settled by the nature of the ground**. The ground does not *cause* interaction, but its neutrality means there is **no first-principle veto** against it. Interaction becomes a **contingent possibility** dependent on the properties and configurations of the bounded entities themselves.

Corollary 5.3 (The Primacy of Process): In a reality with multiple bounded entities capable of being affected, **stasis is the *geometrically special* case, while dynamism is the *geometrically general* possibility.**

If entities have properties that allow them to influence one another (e.g., mass, charge, semantic content), and nothing in the fundamental geometry forbids it, then interaction—and thus change—is a **structurally enabled possibility**. A static universe requires *every* entity to be inert or for *all* configurations to preclude interaction—a highly specific, restrictive set of conditions. The geometry of boundaries and a neutral ground establishes a cosmos where the **potential for process is inherent**. Being (a stable, bounded pattern) is a temporary, sustained equilibrium within the broader, fundamental *possibility* of Becoming.

6. Deriving the Limits of Knowledge

Knowledge is a relation between a knower (a bounded entity) and that which is known. What can be known within the Boundary Condition?

Axiom 6.1 (Modeling): To know something is to generate and maintain a bounded internal structure (a model) whose relations correspond to the relations of the thing known.

Theorem 6.2 (The Domain of the Knowable): Only bounded entities can be modeled, and thus directly known.

Proof: A model is itself a bounded entity—a set of related distinctions within the knower. By Definition 1.1, it has an interior (the model's content) and an exterior (what the model excludes).

To model something is to map its boundary and internal structure. The target must therefore *have* a boundary and internal structure to map.

The indeterminate interstitial ground, by Theorem 3.1, has no boundary. It possesses no interior/exterior structure. Therefore, there is no geometric structure to which a bounded model can correspond. Any attempt to create a "model of the ground" would, by necessity, impose a boundary upon it, creating a bounded representation *of* it, not a correspondence *to* it. ■

Corollary 6.3 (The Unknowable Ground): The indeterminate ground is necessarily unknowable in principle. This is not a contingent limitation of any particular cognitive system, but a geometric limit of the modeling relation itself.

Important Clarification: To construct a bounded model of the ground is not to "falsify" the ground—the ground is indifferent. The error is in the knower. The model is *Doxa*–unjustified belief: a bounded construct mistaken for a map of the boundless. It is a category error, producing the illusion of understanding.

Theorem 6.4 (Navigational Knowledge): Knowledge is the successful modeling of **bounded entities and the patterns of their interaction**. The ground, being causally neutral and indeterminate, is not a term in these models. Navigation is the application of such models to anticipate and respond to the behavior of other bounded entities. The ground is not an object of navigation; it is the **condition for the possibility of navigation**—the open space through which movement and influence occur.

PART III: FIRST PHILOSOPHY AS NAVIGATION

The Boundary Condition is not merely a description of reality—it is an **operating principle**. To be a bounded entity in a world of bounds and interstitial ground is to face a fundamental task: **navigation**. In this final part, we show how the core domains of human concern—meaning, knowledge, and ethics—emerge not as social conventions or subjective preferences, but as necessary forms of this navigation. They are the logic of a bounded entity persisting through time within the geometric reality we have derived.

7. Semantics: Meaning as Boundary-Drawing

A concept is a cognitive boundary. Its meaning is not a list of intrinsic properties, but its **position within a field of contrast**.

Axiom 7.1 (Concept as Bound): A concept C is a bounded distinction drawn within cognitive space. Its interior is the set of referents or instances it includes; its exterior is what it excludes.

Theorem 7.2 (The Semantic Ground): The meaning of a concept C depends on the indeterminate conceptual ground against which it is distinguished.

Proof: By the Boundary Condition (Corollary 3.2), the bounded entity C requires an indeterminate ground. In the cognitive domain, this ground is the **space of potential meaning**—the unstructured field of possible distinctions and experiences not yet carved into concepts.

If one attempts to define C solely by its relation to other bounded concepts (D, E, F...), one encounters the **dictionary regress**: each defining concept itself requires definition, leading either to circularity or infinite regress.

The regress stops when concepts are anchored in their **functional correspondence to the determinate ground of objective, structured reality (*Archē*)**—that is, in their successful use for navigating the world of bounded entities and patterns. The meaning of "chair" is its role in the **structured reality** of sitting, resting, and designing, a role defined by its contrast with other bounded realities (floors, tables, standing) *within* the *Archē*. ■

Corollary 7.3 (Semantic Grounding in the *Archē*): The meaning of a concept is not its position in a web of other concepts, but its **functional correspondence to the determinate ground of objective reality (*Archē*)**. The semantic regress stops in successful navigation: a concept earns its content through its use in coordinating action within the structured world of bounded entities and patterns. The meaning of "chair" is its role in the reality of sitting, resting, and designing—a role defined by its operational contrast with other bounded realities (floors, tables) *within* the *Archē*. ■

8. Epistemology: Knowledge as Map-Making

To know is to possess a model that corresponds to reality. But what can a bounded knower model?

Axiom 8.1 (Model as Bound): A cognitive model M is a bounded, internal structure within the knower.

Theorem 8.2 (The Map-Territory Relation): A model M can only correspond to aspects of reality that are themselves bounded.

Proof: By Theorem 6.2, only bounded entities can be modeled. A model maps boundaries to boundaries. The territory it maps must therefore have discernible, bounded features—objects, patterns, regularities.

The indeterminate ground, having no boundary, cannot be modeled. Any "model of the ground" would impose a false boundary, creating *Doxa* (unjustified belief) rather than correspondence. ■

Corollary 8.3 (Navigational Knowledge): Knowledge is therefore **navigational**. It is a map of the bounded landmarks and the stable relations between them within the indeterminate field. We can know the routes, the distances, the reliable patterns—the *logos* of how bounded entities behave in the ground. We cannot know the ground itself, but we can learn to move through it effectively.

Theorem 8.4 (The Confidence Gradient): The truth of a model is not a binary state but a gradient of **functional alignment**. A model is "true" insofar as it reliably guides the knower through the territory without collision or failure. Confidence increases with successful navigation and decreases with predictive error.

9. Ethics: Value as Boundary Maintenance

An agent is a special kind of bounded entity. A passive bounded entity (like a rock) has a boundary, but it possesses no internal mechanism to regulate it; its persistence is entirely contingent on the neutrality of the environment. If the flow of events dictates its erosion, it erodes. An active bounded entity (an Agent) is one that introduces a bias into this flow.

Definition 9.1 (Agent): A bounded entity that possesses internal mechanisms to **alter the predetermined flow** of interaction with the environment. It acts to redirect causal trajectories that would otherwise lead to dissolution, thereby maintaining its boundary and internal organization across time. This creates a geometric distinction between the *Passive Boundary* (which endures only until disrupted) and the *Active Boundary* (which resists disruption).

Theorem 9.2 (The Necessity of Causal Bias): For an Active Boundary to persist within a neutral ground that permits interaction (see Theorem 5.2), it must be constitutively oriented toward boundary maintenance.

- **The Inertial State:** Because the ground is causally neutral (Theorem 5.1), the "predetermined flow" of any bounded system interacting with a dynamic environment is towards entropic equilibrium (loss of distinction).
- **The Agentic Act:** Therefore, persistence requires work—a specific deviation from the inertial path. The Agent must introduce a *Causal Bias* into the system to favor continuity over dissolution.
- **Conclusion:** This capacity to change the flow is the geometric definition of **Will** and the structural definition of **Life**. *Note: This geometric necessity—that persistence requires the active deflection of inertia—is the formal derivation of* ***First Principle 6 (Primacy of the Hormē)*** *in the main text.*

Theorem 9.3 (The Origin of Value): "Good" and "bad" emerge as functional evaluations made by an agent's navigational system regarding interactions that are causally relevant to its boundary maintenance.

Proof: For an agent A, any interaction with the environment (other bounded entities) either supports or frustrates its boundary maintenance.

- An interaction that supports or enhances A's bounded integrity is *good* for A.
- An interaction that degrades or threatens A's bounded integrity is *bad* for A.

This evaluation is not a subjective whim; it is a geometric fact about the relationship between the agent's structure and the causal consequences of interaction. If an action leads to the dissolution of the agent's boundary, that action is objectively bad for that agent, as it negates the condition for the agent's existence.■

Corollary 9.4 The Meta-Cognitive Condition for Navigation

The capacity for navigation described in Theorem 9.4 and the evaluative function described in Theorem 9.3 require a specific cognitive capability: the system must be able to **model not only its environment but also its own modeling process**. This is the *Meta-Cognitive Potential* of the *Nous* (FP9).

An agent that merely reacts to stimuli is not navigating; it is being buffeted. True navigation requires the agent to:

1. **Maintain a self-model:** Identify itself as the bounded entity whose persistence is at stake.
2. **Monitor for misalignment:** Detect discrepancies (errors) between its internal model and the state of the *Archē*, and between its actions and the requirements of its *Hormē*.
3. **Execute correction:** Adjust its model or behavior to reduce these errors, thereby **increasing the functional confidence** and **decreasing the misalignment** in both the epistemic and practical domains.

This self-referential operation is the **engine of agency**. It is what transforms a bounded system into a navigator. The capacity for this operation is therefore a structural prerequisite for the ethical and epistemic functions derived in this section. The "Ought" becomes operational for a system that can evaluate whether its current "Is" is aligned with its own continued existence.

Corollary 9.5 (The Is-Ought Collapse): For an agent, the "ought" is directly implied by the "is." The fact that an agent *is* a bounded organization striving to persist (*Hormē*) implies that it *ought* to act in ways that fulfill that striving. The question "Why ought I to preserve myself?" is incoherent—it asks for a reason outside the very condition of being an "I."

Theorem 9.6 (Ethical Isomorphism): Ethical error (vice) and epistemic error (falsehood) are isomorphic. Both are states of **misalignment** between the agent's internal model/action and the *logos* of the bounded environment.

- **Epistemic error:** A model that mispredicts the behavior of bounded entities leads to navigational failure.
- **Ethical error:** An action that ignores the geometric constraints of boundary maintenance leads to organizational failure.

Both reduce to the same geometric flaw: a mismatch between the agent's internal boundaries and the external boundaries it must navigate.

CONCLUSION: THE BOUNDARY CONDITION

We began with a blank space and the act of drawing a distinction. From this alone, we have derived the fundamental architecture of any possible reality containing distinct entities:

1. **The Geometry:** Bounded entities require an indeterminate interstitial ground (The Boundary Condition).
2. **The Cosmology:** This implies a dynamic, pluralistic field where interaction and change are necessary possibilities.
3. **The Epistemology:** Knowledge is limited to the bounded and takes the form of navigational map-making.

4. **The Ethics:** Value originates in the geometric imperative of boundary maintenance for persistent agents.

This is First Philosophy. It is first not because it is historically prior, but because it is **foundational in the order of necessity**. Every other inquiry—physics, biology, psychology, sociology—presupposes a world of distinct, interacting entities. We have shown what such a world must look like, at the barest geometric level.

The implications are profound:

- **The end of substance metaphysics.** The fundamental question shifts from "What is everything made of?" to "How are boundaries drawn and maintained?"
- **A resolution of the fact-value gap.** Value is revealed as the functional logic of persistence for any bounded agent.
- **A clear epistemic limit.** We obtain a principled humility about what can be known, derived from geometry, not skepticism.
- **A universal navigational imperative.** Life, mind, and society can be understood as layered, complex forms of boundary navigation in an indeterminate field.

The task of philosophy—and indeed, of any rational agent—is therefore not to seek a disembodied "view from nowhere," but to **improve the accuracy of its maps and the wisdom of its navigation**. To think well is to draw boundaries that correspond to the world's own distinctions. To act well is to move in ways that honor the geometric conditions of one's own existence and the existence of others.

We have reached the foundation. It is not rock, but **relation**: the relation of boundary to ground. Everything that is, is bounded. Everything that is bounded, exists in necessary relation to the boundless. To understand this is to begin to see the world as it truly is: a dynamic, articulate, navigable whole.

References

Chan, Wing-Tsit, tran. "The Lao Tzu (Tao-Te Ching)." In *A Source Book in Chinese Philosophy*. Princeton University Press, 1963.

Deutscher, Eli Adam. *Parmenides the Polemicist: The Eleatic Crisis and the Indeterminate Ground of Thought*. 2026. https://www.neopreplatonic.com/papers/Parmenides/Parmenides_the_Polemicist.pdf.

Heath, Thomas L., tran. *The Thirteen Books of Euclid's Elements*. 2nd ed. Dover Publications, 1956.

Morgan, Michael L., ed.Shirley, Samuel, tran. "Letters." In *Spinoza: Complete Works*. Hackett Publishing, 2002.

Spencer-Brown, George. *Laws of Form*. George Allen & Unwin, 1969.