



## **LexiClone Inc. and NIST TREC.**

Ilya Geller

igeller@lexiclone.com

The UniSearch-4.6 program created by the company LexiClone Inc. for seeking out textual information is intended to search for Reality as well as Truth. While running NIST TREC QA 2003 and 2004, virtually all answers obtained by LexiClone were Realities.

### **Philosophy.**

The program is a realization of the philosophy of Cynicism, the foundations of which were laid by those contemporaries of Plato and Aristotle, Ecclesiastes and Jeremiah. At the basis of Cynicism is the idea that there is a world of change in time and a world without change in eternity. In other words, everything that exists changes in time. And what isn't in time is unchanging in eternity.

### **Reality.**

Reality is what doesn't exist in time but exists in the eternity of immutability. This means that everything that exists in completed time – in the past, in the present, or even the future if it is in completed time – is Reality. Therefore, the answers to all Factoid questions are a search for Reality – a search for what is completed and no longer changing.

### **Truth.**

Subjective opinions, however, are Truths; and subjective Truths are always opinions<sup>1</sup>. Indeed, opinions change! As a result, the search for Truth is always subjective: LexiClone Inc. has to know *who* needs the opinion – which context and subtext the seeker exists in. In other words, one can affirm that the search for the semantic meaning of any question (other than a Factoid one) is impossible without knowing who needs that Truth.

### **Cynicism in Practice.**

Cynicism looks at the whole world through the prism of the Theory of Internal Relations: everything that happens in the Universe is always being interpreted through changes in the internal constitution of a subject and can only be evaluated subjectively. For this purpose one uses the preposition "in", which always and simultaneously corresponds to the adjective "interior" – in all human languages, without exception! Indeed, the remarkably frequent use of the adjective "interior" in the most commonly encountered predicative definitions in all languages leads one to the following thought: in the structure of predicative definitions the

---

<sup>1</sup> "For we know in part and we prophesy in part. But when that which is perfect has come, then that which is in part will be done away." Paul. Bible. I to Corinthians, 9&10

adjective/preposition "in-interior" indicates the subject's familiarity with the object/subject of a given predicative definition and its acceptance into the subject's interior world.

To take an example, in the divine Julius Gaius Caesar's summary, created on the basis of his work *De Bello Gallico*, we can see that the most frequently occurring predicative definition, which has led to the very word "Caesar" becoming a pejorative, is the triad "caesar-be-in". The next triads in the series, such as "all-be-in", "all-have-in", and "caesar-have-in" are understood as an attempt to include absolutely everything "inside". The army – "army-be-in" the legions – "legion-be-in" and the camps – "camp-be-in"- all have to be there, too. And all the divine one's enemies – "enemy-be-in" and "gaul-be-in" – must follow "into" there as well. One can assume that it is precisely the predicative definitions containing the adjective "interior"/preposition "in" that reflect Julius' acknowledgment of the subjects/objects of the predicative definitions.

Speaking of Daniel Defoe, we also see that everything must be "in" the Universe known by Daniel Defoe – "all-be-in". There's the question of a British skeptic – "if-be-in?" to which Defoe himself gives the answer – "much-be-in". This is the reading of *Robinson Crusoe*.

And now, the radiant Anton Chekhov. He believes "in" God "in" the Universe – "one-be-in" – and that we will all be there – "all-be-in". At the same time Anton Chekhov reflects on the problem of time for a closed set – "time-be-in" – and puts to himself the skeptical question: "if-be-in" (in his the Universe)? He is certain that even there, in that bright world, lies will penetrate – "lie-have-in". Nevertheless, he is ready to take everything into his Universe – "out-be-in". After all, his Universe is full of love – "love-be-in". But falsehood will penetrate even there – "lie-will-in", where nothing is – "nothing-be-in". This is the reading of "Kashtanka" and other short stories.

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

### **Cynical Skepticism.**

One of three composite parts of Cynicism – Skepticism<sup>2</sup> – is established on the assumption that a human being is always spurred by egoism<sup>3</sup>; as that by the striving to include everything "into" oneself

---

2 Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary:

Main Entry: *skep-ti-cism*

Function: noun

1: an attitude of doubt or a disposition to incredulity either in general or toward a particular object

2 a : the doctrine that true knowledge or knowledge in a particular area is uncertain b : the method of suspended judgment, systematic doubt, or criticism characteristic of skeptics

3: doubt concerning basic religious principles (as immortality, providence, and revelation)

[1,2,3,4]. The presence in all human languages, without exception, of the preposition "in", which always and simultaneously corresponds to the adjective "interior" – and the remarkably frequent use of it in predicative definitions is the supreme verification of Cynical Skepticism!

**The Search for Answers.**

All Factoid questions, without exception, contain in themselves the use of the preposition/adjective "in-interior" in their predicative definitions (and they require its presence in their answers – in the predicative definitions as well) with certain other non-predicative definitions in strict sequence. For example, the questions "What?" "Where?" and "When?" are purely Factoid questions, simply inconceivable without the use of the preposition/adjective "in-interior" (and certain other non-predicative definitions) in the predicative definitions of both the question and the answer.

**Compatibility.**

The adequateness of answers is defined according to a standard formula, called Compatibility:

$$\text{Compatibility} = \left( \frac{\text{Sum} \left( \text{Weight-of-the-same-predicative-definition-User} * \text{Weight-of-the-same-predicative-definition-Text} \right)}{\sqrt{\text{Sum} \left( \text{Weight-of-each-predicative-definition-User}^2 \right) * \text{Sum} \left( \text{Weight-of-each-predicative-definition-Text}^2 \right)}} \right) * 100$$

**Tautology.**

From questions and answers it is evident that Compatibility arrives at maximum significance -- at 1 (100%) -- only in the case where the search results in a tautology -- only when what was asked is repeated literally.

It means that Ludwing Wittgenstein was right: ". . .the tautology and the contradiction that they say nothing. The tautology has no truth-conditions, for it is unconditionally true. Tautology and contradiction are, however, not nonsensical; they are part of the symbolism, in the same way that "0" is part of the symbolism of arithmetic<sup>4</sup>."

The use of Compatibility as a controller leads to the creation of a tautology: the asker of the question formulates in his answer a subjective Truth, which he would like to hear either confirmed or refuted.

The program UniSearch-4.6 creates an answer using smaller and specific databases and is looking for tautologies as answers.

**Cynicism and Mysticism.**

3 Main Entry: **ego-ism**

Function: *noun*

**1 a** : a doctrine that individual self-interest is the actual motive of all conscious action **b** : a doctrine that individual self-interest is the valid end of all actions

4 [4.4], Ludwig Wittgenstein. Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus

Cynicism is the Theory that considers the Universe as the closed set, as the Whole<sup>5</sup> into eternity; where the Whole is the Result.

Ludwing Wittgenstein said about this philosophy:

“6.45 To view the world sub specie aeterni is to view it as a whole – a limited whole...

6.522 There is indeed the inexpressible. This *shows* itself; it is the mystical<sup>6</sup>.”

I assumed that the limited Whole makes itself manifest because “the absolute maximum is beyond our comprehension yet intelligible, able to be named whilst remaining ineffable<sup>7</sup>... Every affirmation puts, so to speak, in God something of the thing it signifies; but He is as much all things as He is something; therefore, all affirmations are inappropriate. If, therefore, affirmative names are used, they can only apply to Him in relation to creatures<sup>8</sup>...” In this regard, “...the mystical is the concrete unity of just those determinations that count as true for the understanding only in their separation and opposition. ...everything rational can equally be called “mystical”; but this only amounts to saying that it transcends the understanding. It does not at all imply that what is so spoken of must be considered inaccessible to thinking and incomprehensible<sup>9</sup>...”

Cynicism is the mystical philosophy only and only because it is based on the idea that there is a world of change in time and a world without change in eternity.

#### **Conclusion.**

The results obtained by LexiClone Inc. in NIST TRECs are a factual confirmation of the philosophy of Cynicism!

The fact in question gives me the full right to proclaim: as of now, the humanities have become exact sciences.

#### **References.**

- [1] Calvin J. A Compend of the Institutes of the Christian Religion
- [2] Dostoevsky F. Notes from the underground.
- [3] James W. Pragmatism
- [4] Hobbes Th., *Leviathan*

---

5 Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary:

Main Entry: whole

Function: *noun*

1: a complete amount or sum : a number, aggregate, or totality lacking no part, member, or element

2: something constituting a complex unity : a coherent system or organization of parts fitting or working together as one

6 Ludwig Wittgenstein. Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus

7 Nicolas Cusanus. Of Learned Ignorance. New Haven Yale University Press, 1954; [p.14]

8 Nicolas Cusanus, Of Learned Ignorance. New Haven Yale University Press, 1954; [p.55]

9 Hegel W. The Encyclopedia Logic. Hackett Publishing Company, Inc., Indianapolis, 1991, [p.133]