

Plato and the Problematic of Schematization

The Foundations of General Schemas Theory

Kent D. Palmer, Ph.D.

P.O. Box 1632
Orange CA 92856 USA
714-633-9508
kent@palmer.name

Copyright 2004 K.D. Palmer.
All Rights Reserved. Not for distribution.
Started 04.08.02; Version 0.4; 04.08.11; gst04a04.doc

Keywords: General Schemas Theory, Systems
Engineering, Systems Theory,

Cratylus

We will now survey some of the ways that Plato develops the problematic of the schemas in his works. Here we use the term *problematic* as Deleuze does in Difference and Repetition. In other words it is a horizon of inquiry which is much wider than any answers that might be given that attempt to fulfill that horizon. Plato opens up the problematic of the Schema in his consideration of the question of names in the Cratylus where the question revolves around whether they are conventional or natural. This dialogue is selected as a starting point because it is in this dialogue that Plato mentions Protagoras' saying that "man is the measure of all things." Thus, we are taking a way into Plato via Protagoras. Protagoras also appears in the Theaetetus and the Protagoras dialogues. In our consideration of the Cratylus we will follow closely the commentary of John Sallis in Being and Logos who brings out the Comic character of the dialogue and the implicit meanings beyond the literal text. However, we will also consider the work of Sedley on the

Cratylus who takes the dialogue seriously and believes that Plato himself was serious in his writing of the dialogue. This balance between comedy and seriousness will perhaps allow us to see into the dialogue more deeply than might otherwise be possible. As Sallis notes from a dramatic perspective the Euthyphro, Theaetetus and Cratylus all occur on the same day, while on the next day occurs the Sophist dialogue. That day is the day that Plato must answer the charge of impiety that has been brought against him that will lead to his death. So there is a dramatic unity to these four dialogues. It is important to note that Theaetetus is the main dialogue in which the doctrine of Protagoras is discussed in the form that perception is knowledge. Also in the Cratylus Socrates equates the doctrine of Euthydemus and Protagoras. Socrates in the Cratylus falls into a state of hubris which he hopes to have purged the following day by the Sophist. So Sallis points out how the various dialogues relate to each other. The other dialogue that deals with Protagoras is that which shows the meeting between him and Socrates when Socrates was young, just as the Cratylus recounts a meeting between Cratylus and Socrates when Cratylus was young. In fact, it recounts the point at which Cratylus embraces the everything is flux doctrine of Heraclitus, from which Socrates attempts to save him. The dialogue of the Protagoras is referenced by the Theaetetus so it is also part of the group. That dialogue gives a picture of the power of speech of Protagoras. It is not part of the temporal sequence of dialogues that form a series toward the end of Socrates life. But it is relevant because it allows Protagoras himself to speak (as seen through the eyes of Plato) and gives us an image of him. Also the dialogue of the Euthydemus is referenced in the Cratylus and thus must also be considered as part of the context of that dialogue. This is especially true because the doctrine of Euthydemus that it is impossible to say something false is equated by Socrates with that of Protagoras in the Cratylus. Our method will be to consider just these dialogues as a context for the Cratylus. We would have to consider all of the works of Plato as the

context for our genealogical work if it was not already limited by Plato himself through the dramatic sequence or by his mention of the other dialogues. If there was the time and space it would behoove us to work first backward from the Cratylus through the Theaetetus to the Euthyphro and then to consider how these dialogues are balanced by the Sophist and then compare the unnamed Sophist in general to Protagoras and Euthydemus who are considered as sophistical twins in particular. However, here given our limitations of time and space we will chiefly consider the Cratylus with brief references to the other dialogues that form the context around it. We merely start where Plato refers to Protagoras' central doctrine and then put that in context of the other dramatically related dialogues. This dramatic relation occurs because the dialogues occur when Socrates must answer the charges brought against him of impiety, i.e. at the point where Socrates enters into the shadow of the court proceedings against him at the end of his life. Thus, as a background to this drama is the Athenian court and its power over Socrates because he is a citizen of the city. We see this mirrored in the charges of Euthyphro against his own father. In that dialogue the piety of a son bringing charges against his own father is considered. This signals the impiety of the charges of brought against Socrates himself as the father of Philosophy and the guardian against sophistry and sycophancy, who is the intellectual father of the Athenian aristocracy. The sophists are seen as the unseen power behind the litigants in court and as the ones who give the sycophants their power. In the Euthydemus Socrates confronts such a sophist along with his brother who display the analogy between physical combat and combat in words. But the more powerful sophist is seen as Protagoras, whom we get a glimpse of in Socrates youth. In the Theaetetus Socrates confronts the doctrine of this most powerful of the Sophists. Finally in the Cratylus Socrates deals with the underlying problem of the roots of language itself and its relation to the world of nature. Socrates himself infected by the power of Euthyphro gives a demonstration of

Sophistic hubris and then the next day he is purified of that by the Sophist.

Since we are mostly interested in the problematic of the roots of language in nature which we are thinking in terms of schematization, it is good for us to start with the Cratylus. We have stated that Plato's final solution appears in the Timaeus where he talks about the Receptacle and the two and three dimensional form schema. But these other dialogues give us the proper background for this solution in the development of the wider problematic to which the schema is an answer. What we are showing here is that Plato is concerned more generally with the problematic of the schema. That the schema is a large background problem for Plato's philosophy as a whole. In his development of the theory of forms Plato makes many attempts that form an evolutionary sequence to solve this problem. And in some sense it is the recognition of the problematic that is more important than any of the solutions that Plato concocts. This is because there are many possible solutions to the problematic of the schema, and these solutions will be explored in the development of the Western tradition in Philosophy, but the problematic is more basic than all these solutions. The solutions merely explore different aspects of the problematic as a horizon. But what we need to understand more clearly is why this problematic exists at the root of our tradition. The problematic is the fundamental thing not the solutions to it as Deleuze says in Difference and Repetition.

The Hypothesis of the Chiasm of Physis and Logos and the meta-levels of Being.

We need a starting place in order to understand the problematic of the schema which will serve as a Hypothesis to guide our interpretation of the Cratylus. As a starting place we will first consider the relation between physis and logos. In the dialogue the key contention is the relation between names and things, whether they are conventional or naturalistic. Hermogenes contends that they are conventional only while Cratylus contends that

they are naturalistic only. In other words Cratylus believes that names that are not true to the nature of the thing named are no names at all. That is why he has said that the name of Hermogenes is not a true name and is in effect stealing Hermogenes name from him. Socrates enters at just this point where the conversation between Hermogenes and Cratylus has broken down. He is asked to mediate between them. In the course of the dialogue Socrates gets the two disputants to switch positions, and then he says farewell to them as they set off to discover the new landscape that Socrates unveils during the course of the dialogue, which is the landscape of the world of flux discovered in the etymologies of the names given to things by the ancient name-givers. Socrates hints by recounting a dream of his to them that this world of flux is not the true world and is merely a superficial view of the world. But as we know from Aristotle, Cratylus does not pay heed to the warnings and hints of Socrates and instead takes the concept of the flux of the world to an even more radical point than did Heraclitus saying that you cannot even step into the same river once, let alone twice. What is interesting about this as pointed out by Sedley is that Cratylus was Plato's first teachers. Thus the confrontation between the elder Socrates and the young Cratylus is of great significance for Plato. Sedley also hints that Plato himself changed his given name which was rare for Greeks, and thus it is suggested that Cratylus had placed Plato in a similar position as Hermogenes at some point in his personal development from being a student of Cratylus to that of being a student of Socrates. Thus we can assume that Plato is telling us something about his own intellectual development in the Dialogue. But of course, what ever Plato has to say is veiled under many layers of Irony, and so it is near impossible to tell for sure whether any interpretation of the dialogue, or any of Plato's works is correct. Socrates from the very beginning says that he cannot really comment on the problem raised by the two disputants because he has only heard the one dracma lecture on the subject by the famous sophist Prodicus. He says that if he had heard the

thirty dracma lecture he could probably answer in a satisfactory way, but as he has not heard the expensive lecture he can only help them explore the problem. Right here it is made clear that the comedy that is to unfold as Hermogenes and Cratylus exchange positions is only the lower initiation into the question and not the higher initiation. Thus we are left to speculate what the higher initiation might be like from what is not said in the comedy. Thus Sedley is right about there being a serious side to the Cratylus, but that side is hidden from the readers and must be figured out based on what is said and not said in the actual dialogue that is given to us. I am going to construct a hypothesis about the nature of the thirty dracma lecture based on my reading of the dialogue and my own consideration of it from the point of view of the problematic of the schemas.

It is clear that naming is projection of logos onto physis. So the Cratylus is basically about whether that projection is merely freeform and completely imposes itself on the target of naming by convention or whether in the naming there is some trace of actual nature of the thing named. Did the lawgivers of names have any insight into the nature of the thing named when they came up with the original names and projected them onto things? It is taken for granted here that there is a projection process in naming. In our tradition the understanding of the nature of this projection process gets deeper and deeper until with Kant it includes the projection of Space and Time themselves as the background for everything else in experience. So in this first example of the consideration of the relation between physis and logos in Plato it is assumed that in this duality logos imposes itself as a projection onto the physis. The real question is whether the nature of the physis is itself suppressed in that projection or whether there is anything of the voice of the things that comes through the names due to the wisdom of the Gods or the first name-givers. So in this investigation into the relation between names and things it is assumed that names are projections onto things and the whole question is whether anything of

the nature of the things shines through this projection process. Duality and the suppression of the lower dual by the higher dual is assumed. The question is whether the lower dual, *physis*, can be seen at all in spite of its suppression, or whether it is utterly suppressed which is the position of conventionalism and of the arbitrariness of word reference.

In order to understand this overall process of projection within which schematization appears as a moment we will construct a hypothesis as to the nature of the entire field of the projection. We can do this because of the conjecture developed by modern Continental Philosophy that Being itself is fragmented into meta-levels or kinds. This presents us with a fine grained striation of Being which we can infer to apply also to *physis* and *logos* because they are the fundamental dualism within the compass of our worldview encompassed by Being. *Physis* and *Logos* are the two main duals within our worldview in the meta-physical era. We posit that between and prior to them is the non-dual of order. These three regions of our worldview have a relation to each other similar to that of the three fundamental algebras defined by Grassmann based on $xy=0$, $yx=xy$, and $yx=-xy$. In other words, there is a region in which duals cancel, where they are inverted, and where there is a substitution of the negative of one is given. It is by the progression of inversion and substitution that we move from the realm of canceling duals to the realm of the non-dual. Derrida pointed out the logocentrism of our culture. In the case of the duality between *logos* and *physis* there is a suppression of the *physis* by the *logos* so that one dual completely dominates the other, in the manner that eventually is recognized in Cartesianism as Mind over Body dualism where the *Cogito* lords over the *Res Extensia*. The dualism turned monism that suppresses the dual becomes more and more reified and extreme as the tradition develops. We deal with *physis* and *logos* because we want to deal with the primordial duals, at the point of the opening up of that duality when one has not completely suppressed the other as yet. It is when the

duals are still considered equal or cancelable, that we can, if we suspend Aristotle's dictum of the excluded middle, still see how it is possible to get to the non-dual of order, by substitution and inversion. In other words inversion allows us to see that the relation between *physis* and *logos* can be swapped, and if we substitute the negative of one then we can enter into the non-dual realm during that swapping. Of course the negation is of the realm of the *physis* because it is the *physis* that is eventually suppressed. This appears in the fact that matter, energy, information and entropy all have negative states. *Logos* is not negated. By swapping *physis* and *logos* and negating the *physis* we enter the non-dual realm. In that realm order becomes apparent as the non-dual between *physis* and *logos*. We experience this in the fact that we can construct theories based on math to explain physical phenomena. This is one of the deepest mysteries of the universe how this can be possible. But if it were not possible there would be no science and we could not understand the nature of our world. There is order in language and order in nature. We use these two orders to discover the deeper order that pervades both. But Socrates wants to know whether the order of language can really comprehend the order of *physis*, or whether it is a pure projection. If *physis* did not go into negative states then there could be no forces discovered in nature which we construe as the laws of nature. But the laws of nature do not seem to reflect the laws of language. So how is it that we see the laws of nature in spite of the imposition of our projections on nature. This is the fundamental question which the *Cratylus* both in jest and seriousness addresses.

We can construct a conjecture concerning the field within which this question unfolds. That conjecture is as follows: There is a duality between *physis* and *logos*, i.e. the unfolding of nature and the unfolding of speech and thought. But both of the duals are articulated as meta-levels that correspond the meta-levels of Being that encompass their duality. We know the meta-levels of Being as the kinds of Being called Pure, Process, Hyper, Wild, and Ultra

Being. We postulate that the both Physis and Logos articulate themselves likewise in parallel to Being into meta-levels. We also postulate that there is both the abstract relation between the two duals and also the chiasmic relation in which they can be reversed in relation to each other. The abstract relation does not care about ordering while the chiasmic relation does care about ordering, and thus the non-dual of order enters into the relation between the duals. Let us further conjecture that this chiasmic relation occurs at each level of the meta-levels of both Logos and Physis. Now if we make this conjecture as to the articulation of the field between physis and logos then we have mapped out the territory of the problematic of the relation between physis and logos within which the

schema can be articulated as a moment in the interaction of the two in this field. Our purpose is to speculate on all the moments in this field of articulation and to thus give a context to the specific interaction between physis and logos we call the schemas. Plato is concerned with the entire problematic not just the schemas. But the schemas arise out of this interaction between physis and logos as a specific moment of interaction which is significant. But the entire field needs to be understood if we are to comprehend the significance of the schemas in relation to all the other possible interactions between physis and logos across the entire field.

Table 1 Abstract Relations

	Logos ⁵ Foreign Tongue, externality of language	Logos ⁴ Exceptions	Logos ³ Phonemes, syllable, words, prefixes and suffixes, compounds	Logos ² Grammar,	Logos ¹ Langue, logos	Logos ⁰ Opinion, parole, rede
Physis ⁵ Externality of nature (different Games)	Incomprehensible					
Physis ⁴ Anomalies (distortions)		Uncategorizable				
Physis ³ Things, Stuff, Events, Times (pieces)			Categorization through dialectic			
Physis ² laws of nature (rules)				Reason		
Physis ¹ nature (play)					Science – (order- Mathesis)	
Physis ⁰ Appearances, befindlichkeit, (moves)						Phenomena

Table 2 Chiasmic Relations

Plato and the Problematic of Schematization -- Kent Palmer

	Logos ⁵ Foreign Tongue, externality of language	Logos ⁴ Exceptions	Logos ³ Phonemes, syllable, words, prefixes and suffixes, compounds	Logos ² Grammar,	Logos ¹ Langue, logos	Logos ⁰ Opinion, parole, rede
Physis ⁵ Externality of nature (different Games)	logos ⁵ of physis ⁵ foreign language of external nature <u>alienness</u> physis ⁵ of logos ⁵ external nature of foreign language					
Physis ⁴ Anomalies (distortions)		logos ⁴ of physis ⁴ anomalies <u>errors,</u> <u>opacity, AI</u> physis ⁴ of logos ⁴ exceptions				
Physis ³ Things, Stuff, Events, Times (pieces)			logos ³ of physis ³ bits <u>intelligibility,</u> <u>non-</u> <u>representability,</u> <u>(software)</u> physis ³ of logos ³ codes			
Physis ² laws of nature (rules)				logos ² of physis ² causality <u>Turing</u> <u>Machine,</u> <u>Algorithmizati</u> <u>on,</u> <u>Calculation</u> physis ² of logos ² implication		
Physis ¹ nature (play)					logos ¹ of physis ¹ schemas <u>comprehensib</u> <u>ility,</u> <u>Philosophical</u> <u>Categories</u> physis ¹ of logos ¹ Logic	
Physis ⁰ Appearances, befindlichkeit, (moves)						logos ⁰ of physis ⁰ opinions of appearances <u>understanding</u> physis ⁰ of logos ⁰ appearances of opinions

These two tables represent our articulation of the field of interaction between the physis and logos duals within the metaphysical worldview encompassed by Being. The first table represents the abstract unordered relations between the various meta-levels of physis and logos. The diagonal which is labeled represents the abstract relation between the two duals. The second table represents the chiasmic relation between the two duals at the various meta-levels of Being. Here order matters. The change in the arrangement of the duals at the various meta-levels is the minimal interaction of order with their duality. The diagonal labels relate to each ordering and then attempts to name what the two orderings have in common which is different from the abstract relations between the duals. In this way we lay out an entire field of interactions between the duals at the various meta-levels of Being. The point is that Being has structure given by its meta-levels and it confers this structure on the duals it contains. But the structure articulates the meaning of the differences differently in the dualities than it does in Being itself. Our hypothesis is that Plato was aware of this field, at least vaguely and that it was this field that he was attempting to explore in his metaphysical excursions. It was his understanding of the field that allowed him to be so sure that the doctrines of the sophists were incorrect. Ultimately his exploration was to delve into the hierarchy of non-duals such as order, right, good, fate, etc. But in order to delve into that deeper exploration of the structure of the worldview one must find an entry point. And the best entry point in the metaphysical era is the articulation of the field of interactions between the parts of the main duality between physis and logos within the Western worldview. One reason that I am so sure that this differentiation of the physis and logos and their interaction chiasmicly is the way into an understanding of the problematic that Plato was working on when he discovered the schemas is that he specifically calls out the positions of Protagoras and Euthedemus as being equal to each other and this pairing is an excellent image of Physis⁰ and Logos⁰. In other words the relativism of Protagoras leads

to the idea that perceptions are all relative and thus mere *appearances* and the concept of Euthademus that anything is true of everything, i.e. you cannot make a false statement, i.e. the image of *opinion*. The combination of appearance and opinion may be thought of as a definition of phenomena. In the case of Protagoras given a frame of reference what ever phenomena you see is true for you. In the case of Euthademus anything you say is true and thus your opinions are all true. Notice we are using one of the aspects of Being, i.e. truth, to validate our perceptions or opinions. When we take the opinions about appearances or the appearances of opinions together chiasmicly then we discover the minimal understanding of things, events, stuff and times. In other words understanding comes from the intermixing and interaction of appearances and opinions. This can appear as propositions about states of affairs. But in the case of the Cratylus we will speak of this in relation to the process of naming. Naming is saying something about something which expresses opinions about appearances or which appear as opinions themselves without any anchor in the events, times, things or stuff. This is only to say that opinions are phenomena themselves. Socrates is quick to get Hermogenes to identify his position with that of Protagoras and Euthademus, and it is from that point that the refutation of conventionalism proceeds. Conventionalism in the eyes of Socrates amounts to the assertion that the higher meta-levels of Being do not exist. In other words there is no way out of the cave to the real world in which we can view the Good. For the Sophists and Hermogenes as a conventionalist there is nothing other than the cave itself and our being tied down in our places viewing whatever the sophist wants to show us by fire light through the shadows on the walls of the cave. Strangely enough this is very similar to the view of Dasein given by Heidegger in Being and Time. Appearances are like the *befindlichkeit*, or discoveredness, of our situation, Opinions are empty talk or *rede*, and understanding or *verstehen* is what comes out of the interaction of these. So we can see that in many ways the structure of the

relations between logos and physus at the phenomenal level is like the structure of Care in Being and Time which is exactly what Heidegger would want as dasein as being-in-the-world is a universal structure of human beings. Heidegger posits ontological difference and then the difference between present-at-hand and ready-to-hand in order to posit the structure of dasein as a type of being that projects the world, i.e. for whom the duality between physus and logos is an issue of his Being. But Heidegger explores this territory only in relation to Being itself as a more general structure that encompasses physus and logos. Here we are exploring it again in relation to the duals and their interaction with each other. But it is good to keep in mind that the lowest level, prior to ontological difference has the structure of dasein itself which is related to temporality. That is why many of the etymologies in the Cratylus will say that the ancient name-giver had a preference for flux in name giving. The experience of flux is endemic to our experience of phenomena and especially our experience in ourselves of ourselves. But Plato wants to say that there is an intermediate position between the direct experience of pure flux and the experience of stasis which we see all around us in our world. He accepts the claims of Parmenides that there is Being, and that Being does not change. His whole effort is to describe a situation where both change and changelessness can exist at the same time as the Sophist says must be the goal. Empedocles was the first to attempt a synthesis of these two positions of Heraclitus and Parmenides. And as we saw in the earlier chapters Protagoras also came up with a synthesis of these two perspectives that was unique and formidable. His position is an early version of perspectivism like that of Nietzsche after him. It constructs a relativity that by inverting Parmenides is able to mitigate Heraclitus and thus achieve a powerful synthesis of the two views, a synthesis which in many ways can be said to have won out through time and forms the basis of what we call Relativity Theory in physics today. Plato wants to produce a counter synthesis in which Being rather than Becoming holds sway, and

he does that by creating the realm of the forms, i.e. the realm of schemas outside of space and time which he then relates back to space and time, as when a craftsman creates a table from the ideal of a table. His point is that nothing new can come into Becoming if there is nothing outside of the flux itself. But he sees that outside as a static realm and so there is a dualistic division maintained between the flux of becoming in the world and the stars of the forms outside the world which like the stars serves as a basis for navigation in this world. However, this view of Plato does not take into account his concern for non-duality. In effect he does not just posit that there is an unchangeable world of templates where the forms reside but he is also concerned with the non-duality between change and changelessness and the various levels of non-duality like order, right, good and fate, etc. This is what makes Plato's philosophy so deep, i.e. that he recognizes the role of the Special Systems as a mediator between the world of forms and the world of flux. But this deeper reading of Plato in terms of non-duality is not needed here. Rather what we are discussing at this point is merely the entry way from the realm of Becoming to the realm of Being. Socrates is concerned to lift Hermogenes and Cratylus out of the world of flux into the recognition of the world of Being. Hermogenes makes the transition, but Cratylus goes back even more strongly into the world of flux to the extent that his position becomes even more radical than that of Heraclitus eventually. But the question becomes first whether we are merely going to be trapped in appearances and opinions. That is to say he must first get his interlocutors to recognize the aspects of Being, like truth, reality, identity, and presence before he can actually talk about the meta-levels of Being. He must get them to recognize that everything we see is not real and everything we say is not true. Illusion and fiction are endemic to both perception and talk. He sees Protagoras and Etheudemus as being trapped in the surface of things because they do not recognize the importance of the aspects of Being in the distinguishing of things, events, times, and stuff in the world of our experience.

Plato is a realist and a moralist who believes that there is something beyond mere phenomena and something beyond just talk. If we merely look at things relativistically as Protagoras would have us do, or we can say that anything we say is true then we will never experience the difference between becoming and Being. There are deep issues at stake here. The issue of relativism eventually results in the concept of Intersubjectivity and its opacity from the point of view of the Transcendental Subject for Husserl. Heidegger's whole approach to ontology in *Being and Time* attempts to get around this fundamental problem that Husserl's solipsistic philosophy encounters. Similarly if we think that everything is merely language games as Wittgenstein does then there is no external guarantor of the truth of any statement. Thus these problems percolate through the whole history of philosophy right up to the present time. They are such fundamental issues we cannot get beyond them. Plato basically says that there are those that ignore the problem or push it under the table, and there are those that confront it. He identifies those that avoid the problem with the sophists and tries to show how that makes things worse not better. In his dialogue the *Sophist* we find that there are different levels of initiation. The man of earth believes only what he can hold in his hand and touch. Those initiated into the greater mysteries know that there are invisibles that need to be taken into account. Of those initiated the *Sophist* is the one that uses his knowledge of the invisibles to trick the men of earth. The philosopher is the one who goes beyond that trickery to actually leave the cave and encounter the non-duals like the Good. That one who encounters the Good and the other non-duals is the hierophant who organizes the initiations of the both levels of the mysteries. The lower level believe that everything is in flux, but the higher level initiates know about existence of Being as the stasis of the forms of understanding. It is the Hierophant (called "the stranger" in the dialogue named the *Sophist*) who knows that there is both change and changlessness at the same time without interference because of the

non-duals. In the *Cratylus* this distinction between the levels of initiation is called the difference between the one and thirty drama speeches. We are given the speech about flux and that convinces Cratylus to go further into the flux, into an even more nihilistic stance toward it than Heraclitus himself. But hopefully Hermogenes escapes and becomes a higher initiate. So we are forced to imagine the thirty drama speech and that is what our tables are attempting to do, that is to say we are imagining the full panoply of interaction between physis and logos at the various meta-levels of Being.

The basis on which we are imagining those meta-levels of interaction between physis and logos is the schema of the system. Both language and play are the two fundamental analogies for the system. Thus when Wittgenstein refers to language games he is fusing these two fundamental analogies into a meta-analogy. The point is that the system schema has a different form at each of the meta-levels of Being. At the system⁰ level there are the things and relations that we take to be a system. At the system¹ level there is the system itself as a whole on the analogy with living organisms. At this level the whole system appears before our minds eye, not just as a collection of gestalts but as a concept that is unified and totalized and ultimately whole. At the system² level there is the process of the system becoming itself. It takes time for something to be itself, as G.H. Mead always said. At system² level there is a process of something becoming itself. But this process is not just the flux of appearances or opinions, it is instead the deeper level of becoming in which becoming is embedded in Being, as time impinges on Being. For games this level gives us the rules and for language the grammar. In other words the becoming is organized by rules. At the system³ level something strange happens that is unexpected. At this third level we get the production of the things that make up the system, its objects, and its relations. In other words first there is the whole, then the rules by which the whole functions, and finally the objects and relations appear out of the

interaction of those rules. The fact that the game pieces or the phonemes and other elements of language like words come out of the higher meta-level of Being is something extremely unexpected. But this is also a very important point that Socrates makes in his dialogue when he talks about phonemes giving us access to the true nature of things. Finally at system⁴ level we get the exceptions and anomalies. Games have exceptions to the rules, in the physis there are anomalies. Language also has exceptions to the rules of the grammar. All the deformations of the system that appear at this fourth meta-level of the system. At the system⁵ level we see the externality of the system itself. We see the system from the outside. We see it in relation to other games, to other languages, to other physical systems. So we can see that given a particular schema we can walk up the series of meta-levels and see what is happening at each level. This is generalized in Category Theory in the differences between arrows, functors, natural transformations, and modifications. It is general across all the schemas that the upper meta-levels are different in all cases and the various levels have analogous articulations across the schemas. But here we are only interested in understanding what these systematic descriptions of the meta-levels are like when applied to both logos and physis. So for instance, when we move up from appearances to physis¹ we see nature as a form of Pure Being. Then when we move up to physis² we see the laws of nature, which are so named on the analogy with human social laws. This level is analogous to Process Being. The application of the rules to get manifestations of things are processes. When we move up to physis³ we then get the differentiation and articulation of the events, times, things, and stuff of nature, i.e. the kinds of things. This third meta-level is a manifestation of Hyper Being. When we move up to the physis⁴ level we get anomalies that do not fit inside the projected schema of the system. These anomalies appear at the Wild Being level. Finally at physis⁵ level we get the externality of nature which is related to Ultra Being. Going the other way deeper into language we

start off at the logos⁰ level with opinions which means just chatter, called by Heidegger talk or rede. Saussure called this Parole. But when we move into logos¹ we enter the realm of language as a whole at the Pure Being level. Saussure called this Langue. At the logos² level we get grammar which is related to Process Being. At the logos³ level there is the production of the phonemes, words, syllables, suffixes and prefixes, or compounds and this is related to Hyper Being. At the logos⁴ level there are the exceptions that appear in languages, the distortions that occur because of a variety of reasons and this is related to Wild Being. At the logos⁵ level we get the externality of language when we relate it to other languages and hear foreign tongues. That externality is related to Ultra Being. The articulations of Physis and the articulations of Logos are arrayed opposite of each other. There is a resonance between the two duals at the various meta-levels when we think of them as a system. We could think of them using the other schemas. But for now we will suspend this possibility of re-schematization and stick with the most obvious case. The point of Socrates is that at each level there are resonances between the physis and the logos and the way we understand the nature of things through language names is because there is an entanglement between the opposites behind the scenes. This entanglement becomes clear when we relate the physis to the logos or the logos to the physis in a certain chiasmic order, rather than viewing them as isolated duals. This is what table two does. It relates the physis to the logos or the logos to the physis. The two chiasmic reversible relations are seen to produce a different meaning, by the minimal syntactic operation of reversal. So if we ask what does it mean when we think about the physis of the logos, then we must think about the internal constraints of language itself, and our attention immediately becomes fixed on logic, because logic is the minimal ordering necessary for something to make sense when we start putting statements together to form syllogisms. On the other hand when we ask what it means to think about the logos of the physis then we begin to see what is meant in

the Cratylus when it talks about true names. True names is where the phenomena talks to us and speaks with its own voice through us as primal name givers. That talking with its own voice we see in terms of the various rhetorical modes discussed earlier. In other words it is by the use of the rhetorical modes that we can articulate the true nature of the things themselves. But beyond this, there is the necessity of pointing out the thing referred to in our rhetorical modes. That pointing out means to capture its spacetime articulation. It is in the spacetime articulation of the things that the proper concept of the schema appears. What ever we say about the things, trying to get at their true nature, and what ever we do to try to allow them to speak with their own voice, fundamentally what speaks for them most eloquently is their own spacetime articulation or embodiment. So the ability to point out that embodiment is what the geometrical and mathematical schemas allow us to do. The most eloquent expression of the things themselves is their own embodiment in spacetime, and we point that embodiment out by means of its dimensional articulation. Each dimensional articulation has its own organization and we call that the schemas. Schemas are the dual of the dimensions. The schemas are not the dimensionality itself. Between the schemas and logic there is articulated the Philosophical Categories, such as those of Plato, Aristotle and Johansson. These are the highest concepts and they are concepts about the relation of the physis and the logos. Schemas are a spin off from these categories as are the elements of Logic. They encompass quality/quantity, part/whole, causality and other fundamental concepts which are the roots of all other concepts. The philosophical categories are the basis of Science. But science also needs the orders of the mathematical categories. It is through this non-dual order that Science can create ordered theories that correspond with the order of nature. The rhetorical modes are used to state the theory. Theory means vision, it is a vision of the way that the things fit together and function together. But it is only by finding the parallel structure in the math that this order in

the theory can be precisely projected onto the natural phenomena. Science is the process of finding the underlying order that is beyond the differences that appear in the phenomena and expressing it. Mathesis is the process of creating mathematical categories and orders. Thus Mathesis stands behind Science as a foundation. The discovery of new orders underlies the discovery of how things relate to each other. Here we then have our fundamental framework which has been outlined as the framework within which the Schema should be considered. The schema stands opposite logic and related to it though the Philosophical Categories. Then Mathesis stands opposite both of these where it is related to the schema though representation theory and it is related to logic though model theory. It is this fundamental triangle between Mathesis, Schematization and Logic that we want to explore here. But we must see this triangle on the basis of deeper triangles that Plato finds important. For instance, when we advance to the next meta-level chiasm between logic and physis we see something very interesting. Logos² of Physis² can be seen as *causality* while Physis² of Logos² can be seen as *implication*. Causality is the heart of the laws of nature, implication is the heart of logic. When we place causality together with implication we get a Turing Machine as the minimal computational unit. Turing machines express algorithms which can do implications within a causal matrix. Here the tape is seen as the causal matrix and the state machine transitions are seen as the implications. If we read Robert Rosen and take seriously what he had to say in Life Itself then the Turing Machine is seen as the definition of a simple machine. A Turing machine can play games by the rules and can construct sentences using grammars. It is the embodiment of Reason in terms of the Algorithm. Reason is the use of grammar to understand the laws of nature. Reason is the higher order that comes from the interaction of these two lower order sources of rules. Reason realizes the line of reasoning, the argument of the syllogism or the statement in pervasion logic. Reason understand the algorithm, argument or proof and that is done

on the basis of the structure of the Turing machine which can follow the reasoning and do the proofs automatically. Science depends on Reason. The Turing machine implements the fundamental differences seen in the Philosophical Categories and make them run as a whole operational machine which does rudimentary thinking. We call the attempt to understand the human brain and mind in terms of the computational metaphor Cognitive Science. We have pushed very far in the direction of automation of reasoning and the use of the Turing machine in our software systems as a way of augmenting our reasoning abilities.

But when we transition to the third meta-level of the interaction between *physis* and *logos* something strange happens. Suddenly we get the production of the phonemes and words from the after the grammatical rules articulated and we get the production of the things, events, times, and stuff after the natural laws have been laid down. In a system the objects and their relations come out of the wholeness of the system and its rules of operation. This suddenly takes us beyond the Turing machine and what is computable. To set up a Turing machine someone has to create the codes and use the bits to specify them. This coding and decoding aspect relates to representability and also intelligibility beyond computability. As Robert Rosen points out there has to be an encoding and decoding between the causal physical system and the implicative model. Through the encoding and decoding the realms of implication and causality communicate. His point is that this is not computable. Where there are necessarily many models of something we have complexity, while adding Turing machines together, i.e. what he calls simple machines, only gives us something more and more complicated. What is interesting is that the relation between physical things, or their connection in systems, and phonemes, or their connection in words, is related to categorization. Thus we have categorization as deeper than *mathesis*. And that is exactly what Plato says. The dialectic is a way to create categorizations through

question and answer. Socrates in the *Cratylus* says that it is the dialectician who should measure the work of the name giver. He says that it is by creating categories systems that we understand how things are related to each other. But we do not expect categorization to be a deeper phenomena than reason. But that makes sense when we consider that reason manipulates categories that are already created. This is just as Turing machines are based on codifications that already exist. Models and Representations are forged at this level to appear already formed at the lower level where model theory and representational theory are called out as the relation between the schema and *mathesis* or logic and *mathesis*. Our point here is that intelligibility is something deeper than computability. There is something about the Mind that Cognitive Science cannot capture. And it is this thing that Parmenides and Heidegger both identify with Being. Parmenides says thinking and being are the same. Heidegger calls Being intelligibility. Intelligibility relates to the ability to distinguish kinds of things and to reach beyond the boundaries of the representable and the modelable. It is at this level that Heidegger says that there can be a bridge built between the things and the names. Phonemes have meaning in some indeterminate sense and so do things which they share at this third meta-level. By the secret communication between things and phonemes we get true names. Names that respond to the things which are intelligible to us. We analyze things by our categorizations through our dialectics in order to measure the trueness of those names. That is to say how well they speak in the voice of the things themselves despite the projection process. Beyond meta-level three at the next meta-level we merely have opacity and beyond that alienness at the fifth meta-level. At the fourth meta-level we get sparks of illumination, and scintillations of the true nature of things as if through a glass darkly, we get intimations of meaning but that level is too narrow to think conceptually in any sustained way. At the fifth meta-level we lose the ability to think at all and we are confronting the externality of our own

projection mechanism which we find alien. At the fourth meta-level we encounter the uncategorizable, and at the fifth meta-level we encounter the incomprehensible. Plato wants us to move beyond representation that is possible at the second meta-level and to comprehend the non-representable intelligibles which we can access through the third meta-level. It is at this level we can experience the non-duals which are all non-representable intelligibles because they are neither one nor many, but something else. At the fourth meta-level intelligibility itself fragments and then it vanishes at the fifth meta-level. Reason is important but intelligibility is more important because intelligibility can make the non-nihilistic distinctions that Reason cannot make. All of Plato's works are about making non-nihilistic distinctions. In one way you can see the sparks, intimations, illuminations that appear at the fourth meta-level as the intuitions of those non-nihilistic distinctions. But the ability to justify those distinctions occurs at the third meta-level not the fourth. The fifth meta-level itself can be seen as a non-nihilistic distinction from the outside, i.e. as embedded in nihilism, as the distinction between emptiness (time) and void (space). When we fall back from genuine emergence at the fifth meta-level into artificial emergence levels below that then these other views of the non-nihilistic distinction within Being appear. First as sparks of illumination, intimations, scintillations etc, then as non-representable intelligibles, and ultimately being reduced to representable intelligibles, which are based on the philosophical categories and finally are reduced to everyday understanding before falling off into mere appearances and opinions. The reason that the *Cratylus* revolves around the names and things is because that is the level where non-representable intelligibles appear. That is the key level that is the aim of the divided line to articulate in the *Republic*.

I think now the structure of the entire field of the interaction between logos and physis at all the meta-levels is clear. We see how the schemas show up in this entire field at the level of the chiasm where physis is modified by

logos. That is the point where the reflection back into logos of what bounces off in the projection and thus what might carry some intimation of the true nature of the physis might be revealed, if anywhere. Schematization has to do with the spacetime embodiment of the things, events, times and stuff. That embodiment is the most eloquent speech of the things themselves regarding themselves. Plato thinks that there is some resonance between the third meta-level of language with the third meta-level of the things and that in the chiasm of reversibility between physis and logos there might be some communication of that true nature to us despite our overwhelming projections onto the things themselves. So this position is that the noumena are not all dark. It is similar to the concept of the Bekenstein bound that means that black holes are not completely closed to either information as well as being according to Hawking not closed to energy transfer out of the black hole again. According to Socrates there is a secret communication between the things and speech because they are both embodiments of Being in the world. Each has its externality, but inwardly they are intertwined and it is that inward intertwining that allows them to communicate and thus makes the conventionalist argument of Hermogenes two radical a separation between the two regions. That is why Socrates uses the analogy of the leaky pot, or a man whose nose is running for the flux hypothesis. Things in flux do not have stable boundaries. But in the chiasmus of reversibility between the logos and the physis there is some leakage as well between the two regions so that we can have meaningful names. Conventionalism and Naturalism both draw too hard a boundary between the regions. Our model of chiasmic reversibility between them allows for some leakage between the two realms despite their being separated so that we get enough intimations of the true nature of things that we can make non-nihilistic distinctions between them. If the realms were sealed off securely from each other that would be impossible. The chiasmic reversal is a step toward non-duality itself. For the full duality the substitution of

negation will have to occur as well on the physis side. So we are in the intermediate realm between the duality and non-duality when we are entering into the chiasm of reversibility between the realms. This halfway house is the place where the leakyness can occur without bringing down the distinction nor sacrificing non-duality.

What we mean by a problematic is this field opened up between the duals of physis and logos through their articulation of the meta-levels of Being. How this field is characterized may differ depending on the perspective one takes to this field. Plato has made a partial characterization in his dialogues of this field among other subjects. In the *Cratylus* his articulation of the field is fairly deep, but of course he does not cover the whole field because he did not think of the problematic in those terms. In the *Cratylus* the problematic is thought out in terms of the correctness of names. The projection of names onto things is seen as the fundamental relationship between the duals. The question is whether there is any *talking back* of the things within the projection that would give the one projecting some idea of the nature of the things beyond their projections. The dialogue is about the voice of the noumena talking back within the compass of the projection. In this sense it is about the relation between self and otherness, and our ability to hear the other, as it is in itself, and respect its own voice, and what it has to say about itself.

A Reading of the Dialogue

[Hermogenes] Suppose that we make Socrates a party to the argument?

[Cratylus] If you please.

[Her.] I should explain to you, Socrates, that our friend Cratylus has been arguing about names; he says that they are natural and not conventional; not a portion of the human voice which men agree to use; but that there is a truth or correctness in them, which is the same for Hellenes as for barbarians. Whereupon I ask him, whether his own name of Cratylus is a true name or not, and he answers "Yes." And Socrates? "Yes." Then every man's name, as I tell him, is that which he is called. To this he replies- "If all the world were to call you Hermogenes, that would not be your name." And when I am anxious to have a further explanation he is ironical and mysterious, and seems to imply that he has a notion of his own about the matter, if he would only tell, and could entirely convince

me, if he chose to be intelligible. Tell me, Socrates, what this oracle means; or rather tell me, if you will be so good, what is your own view of the truth or correctness of names, which I would far sooner hear.¹

The dialogue starts out with an impasse between Cratylus and Hermogenes in which Cratylus is denying Hermogenes his name. Cratylus is acting ironical, mysterious and oracular, much like Plato himself, his one time student. Sedley says that Plato himself might have changed his name under the influence of Cratylus. Cratylus goes on according to Aristotle to become more radical in his support of the concept of the flux of existence than even Heraclitus. The whole question revolves around Cratylus becoming intelligible. Cratylus is acting the part of the Physis and Hermogenes is acting the part of the Logos. Thus Hermogenes is speaking up and looking for help while Cratylus is remaining silent as if he were a thing to be interrogated by some oracular means. Thus the difference between the two interlocutors stands for the relation between the Physis and Logos duals. Hermogenes turns from the account of Cratylus which he cannot pull from him to hear the account of Socrates, who stands for the non-dual between the two opponents. Since the two interlocutors are standing in for Physis and Logos it makes us suspect that we are dealing with an intersubjective expression of physis and logos within the city, rather than what we now think of as physical objects as the primary objective of the research that Socrates will be making.

[Socrates] Son of Hipponicus, there is an ancient saying, that "hard is the knowledge of the good."

Socrates does not use his name but the name of his father. So from this we cannot tell whether Socrates agrees that Hermogenes name is correct or not. Socrates immediately points to the non-dual of the Good, which has a prominent role in The Republic as the goal of our seeking after deep knowledge beyond the cave.

¹ B. Jowett translation; See

http://www.classicallibrary.org/plato/dialogues/6_Cratylus.htm

And the knowledge of names is a great part of knowledge.

Socrates says that a knowledge of names is a great part of knowledge in general which he traces back to the Good. This is an important point because the Good is the source of variety production. Knowledge is of things which represent the variety within the world. But knowledge itself is articulated with words which participates in the variety of language. So there are two varieties that knowledge is caught up in, the variety of language and the variety of things. What they have in common is variety production of the Good itself. What is good for you is not good for me and vice versa. For each of us to have what is good for us there must be variety or difference production. This difference production effects both things and language equally.

If I had not been poor, I might have heard the fifty-drachma course of the great Prodicus, which is a complete education in grammar and language- these are his own words- and then I should have been at once able to answer your question about the correctness of names. But, indeed, I have only heard the single-drachma course, and therefore, I do not know the truth about such matters; I will, however, gladly assist you and Cratylus in the investigation of them.

This is a key point because it lets us know that this lecture is about the lower initiation not the higher initiation. This is the one drachma lecture and we must infer from it what the thirty drachma lecture would be like. We have hypothesized that the thirty drachma lecture would fully articulate the differences between the Physis and Logos and their chiasmic interactions. The thirty drachma lecture would have been serious while this lecture is on the surface a comedy as Sallias says. However, we must infer the serious content of the thirty drachma lecture from the frivolity in this lecture so because of this there is a serious side to the comedy as Sedley suggests.

When he declares that your name is not really Hermogenes, I suspect that he is only making fun of you;- he means to say that you are no true son of Hermes, because you are always looking after a fortune and never in luck.

Here is the first signal that this is a comedy. Cratylus is said to be making fun of Hermogenes and the difference between his name and his fate in economic terms. Cratylus

is reading the name and comparing it to the fate of the named. Then Cratylus judges the name to be unfit for Hermogenes. Perhaps Cratylus did the same for Plato and that is why Plato changed his name. Denying someone's given name is an affront to their dignity. Especially when he affirms the names of Socrates and his own names as correct. Cratylus is saying he knows more about Hermogenes than his own parent who named him. Cratylus is looking at the name in the context of the history of Hermogenes while the parent was looking at Hermogenes at the time of naming of the infant which is after the first year of life in ancient Greek times². So the name giver of Hermogenes was looking forward in time hoping for a good fate for the child being named, while Cratylus is looking back over the life of Hermogenes and judging the outcome of his economic fate. But Hermogenes also means the gift of Hermes, and Hermes is the equivalent of Thoth among the Egyptians who was the giver of language itself. So if Hermogenes is a representative of Logos then he is really aptly named.

But, as I was saying, there is a good deal of difficulty in this sort of knowledge, and therefore we had better leave the question open until we have heard both sides.

Socrates says that we should leave open the question as to who is correct. This leaving open the question is the allowing of the problematic to stand without closing it off. It is the problematic of the relation between Logos and Physis embodied by Hermogenes and Cratylus and their argument. The namer or the one who bears the logos is vociferous while the named is silent as Cratylus is silent through the first part of the dialogue. When Socrates leaves the question open he is allowing multiple answers to exist in a tension with each other until each one has been tested in the dialectic. So here we have the explicit opening of the problematic of the relation between physis and logos as embodied by the two interlocutors.

[Her.] I have often talked over this matter, both with Cratylus and others, and cannot convince myself that there

² Check reference

is any principle of correctness in names other than convention and agreement; any name which you give, in my opinion, is the right one, and if you change that and give another, the new name is as correct as the old- we frequently change the names of our slaves, and the newly-imposed name is as good as the old:

Here the example given by Hermogenes is the changing the name of a slave. The slave stands in the place of the *physus* which is enslaved by the *logos*. *Logos* stands over the *physus* in a position of possession. Thus the one who has the *logos* has the power of possession over the things named. Thus we see the duality at work between *logos* and *physus* where *logos* dominates *physus* as one would a slave from the point of view of the conventionalist argument. The fact that we are talking about renaming of a slave as the object of changes of names, reinforces our suspicion that primarily we are primarily talking about the highest representatives of *physus*, i.e. humans within the city rather than in animate physical objects. The highest representatives of *physus* happen to be the only representatives of *logos*.

for there is no name given to anything by nature;

What is forgotten here is that humans are part of nature.

all is convention and habit of the users;- such is my view. But if I am mistaken I shall be happy to hear and learn of Cratylus, or of any one else.

What is important here is the flexibility of Hermogenes. He is teachable while Cratylus is intransigent. Cratylus has the intransigence of nature itself which stands mute before us and seemingly unspeaking.

[Soc.] I dare say that you be right, Hermogenes: let us see;- Your meaning is, that the name of each thing is only that which anybody agrees to call it?

[Her.] That is my notion.

Socrates verifies that he understands the position of Hermogenes before he starts to question him applying the dialectic to his position in order to test it.

[Soc.] Whether the giver of the name be an individual or a city?

[Her.] Yes.

Hermogenes does not care whether the name giver is one man or an entire city. Thus this is

not just the private language argument that is appealed to by Analytic Philosophy. A whole city can give a name to something, and what ever name they give it is the same as if one person decided on a name and gave it to something as part of his private language. Private language is not an issue but conventionality itself no matter how the convention is generated, by an individual or intersubjectively.

[Soc.] Well, now, let me take an instance;- suppose that I call a man a horse or a horse a man, you mean to say that a man will be rightly called a horse by me individually, and rightly called a man by the rest of the world; and a horse again would be rightly called a man by me and a horse by the world;- that is your meaning?

[Her.] He would, according to my view.

Here Socrates differentiates the individual naming from the group naming. Hermogenes says that an individual naming practice can be different from the naming of the rest of the world. Which seems to be an attempt by Socrates to drive Hermogenes toward the private language argument, which Hermogenes has not made in the previous lines.

[Soc.] But how about truth, then? you would acknowledge that there is in words a true and a false?

[Her.] Certainly.

[Soc.] And there are true and false propositions?

[Her.] To be sure.

[Soc.] And a true proposition says that which is, and a false proposition says that which is not?

[Her.] Yes; what other answer is possible?

[Soc.] Then in a proposition there is a true and false?

[Her.] Certainly.

Socrates gets Hermogenes to admit that there is a difference between truth and falsehood. These are aspects of Being. It is the aspects of Being that are used to create the necessity for moving away from conventionalism toward a recognition of the truth in names, i.e. their correspondence with something in the *physus* that is more than just the naming contains as an arbitrary assignment.

[Soc.] But is a proposition true as a whole only, and are the parts untrue?

[Her.] No; the parts are true as well as the whole.

[Soc.] Would you say the large parts and not the smaller ones, or every part?

[Her.] I should say that every part is true.

[Soc.] Is a proposition resolvable into any part smaller than a name?

[Her.] No; that is the smallest.

[Soc.] Then the name is a part of the true proposition?
[Her.] Yes.
[Soc.] Yes, and a true part, as you say.
[Her.] Yes.
[Soc.] And is not the part of a falsehood also a falsehood?
[Her.] Yes.
[Soc.] Then, if propositions may be true and false, names may be true and false?
[Her.] So we must infer.

Truth pervades the propositions to their smallest parts, i.e. the names. If the whole of the proposition is true then the names within that whole have to be true as well. The fact that Truth pervades the whole and brings all the parts into harmony with this aspect of Being is in itself interesting. If there is any untruth in a proposition then it infects the whole proposition. False names would lead to false propositions and thus to false reasoning. So it is important that names be true to their objects, because if they are not then it vitiates our talk all together.

[Soc.] And the name of anything is that which any one affirms to be the name?
[Her.] Yes.
[Soc.] And will there be so many names of each thing as everybody says that there are? and will they be true names at the time of uttering them?

Here we start to see Protagoras entering the conversation. Each person has their reference frame and each names from that reference frame so that each naming is true to that reference frame. So at the time of naming all the names from the different reference points would be true. There can be as many names as there are reference frames and all names at the time of utterance are true even if this causes apparent conflict between names at different times or from different reference frames.

[Her.] Yes, Socrates, I can conceive no correctness of names other than this; you give one name, and I another; and in different cities and countries there are different names for the same things; Hellenes differ from barbarians in their use of names, and the several Hellenic tribes from one another.

Here is a fact that Hermogenes is trying to explain which is if there are true names then how can their be different names in different languages. This is a very convincing argument, and that is why conventionalism has won this argument in modern times. All naming references are considered arbitrary since

Saussure. Hermogenes is representing our general modern opinion which follows Protagoras that names are conventional and are generated within language arbitrarily.

[Soc.] But would you say, Hermogenes, that the things differ as the names differ? and are they relative to individuals, as Protagoras tells us?

This is where we get the full entry of Protagoras's doctrine into the fray. Socrates says that names differ as things differ. In other words as Saussure says both words and things are diacritical. And that diacriticality is relative to frames of reference of individuals. So truth of statements is relative as is the reality of the things and their difference from each other that lay on a continuum with respect to their properties.

For he says that man is the measure of all things, and that things are to me as they appear to me, and that they are to you as they appear to you.

Here is the mention of the fundamental axiom of Protagoras that establishes relativity. Man is the measure of all things. But here we see that man is take to be the individual man, not the community of men. Hermogenes said in the beginning that he was indifferent whether the names were established by one man or a community. But Socrates has driven the argument to the identification of Man with the individual rather than the antropos, i.e. the representative man within the city. Thus things are reduced to appearances which we measure as individuals, so we are estranged from their reality or truth, i.e. the fundamental measures of Being by its aspects.

Do you agree with him, or would you say that things have a permanent essence of their own?

[Her.] There have been times, Socrates, when I have been driven in my perplexity to take refuge with Protagoras; not that I agree with him at all.

Hermogenes states that he has been driven to agree with Protagoras because he has not found a better argument. So he is asking Socrates to provide that better argument. The mere appearances of things is contrast with the concept that things have a permanent essence. That permanent essence must subsist in Being as far as Plato is concerned. Protagoras and reality is thus exiled outside of Being in

Becoming, i.e. the flux of Heraclitus is the flux of appearances and opinions. But the way is opened up for Hermogenes to take the upward path out of the cave where there are only appearances. He is willing to take that upward journey to the Sun of the Good. But we must first unbind him and allow him to look around the cave, to see the Sophist and the things that the Sophist carries in front of the fire that cast the shadows that give us the appearances. Hermogenes has agreed with Protagoras in the past but is open to changing his stance if Socrates can come up with a better way of reasoning about the situation which can make non-nihilistic distinctions within the relativistic and nihilistic landscape. The problem with conventionalism is that it leads to nihilism, because there is no basis nor foundation for names then any name is as good as another, even crazy names like calling a man a horse and vice versa which would destroy the possibility to communicate. This example that Socrates gives is the hint that conventionalism leads directly to nihilism. But then again Cratylus' truths about names leads to silence which is the other nihilistic extreme from the mere chatter which is meaningless. The reason we need to find a way out of the grips of Protagoras is that we need to avoid nihilism and the only way to do that is to find a way to talk about the non-dual. But that is difficult in the lesser initiation. That should be done at least in the thirty dracma lecture. Of course, even the thirty dracma lecture is a joke because true knowledge has no price. Thus there is something even beyond the greater initiation, which is the position of the hierophant, i.e. the one who organizes all the initiations of what ever level. The stranger in the Sophist takes the position of the Hierophant and says that what we seek is change and changlessness at the same time. The lower initiation tells us about flux. The higher tells us about Being. The hierophant tells us about the non-dual as a way beyond both flux and the stasis of Being. True names concerning things with permanent essences are rooted in the stasis of Being. Conventionality is rooted in flux because not only the individual but the community can change their mind as to the name so of the

things that they possess and enslave. But true names rooted in permanent essences are too fixed. These are again nihilistic opposites and we need to find a happy medium between their extremes. Finding that happy medium prior to the arising of the extremes of flux and stasis is what is hard.

[Soc.] What! have you ever been driven to admit that there was no such thing as a bad man?

It is interesting that Socrates says this about there being a "bad man" right after the mention of Protagoras. He is alluding to the fact that Protagoras himself is a "bad man." Notice that he uses the concept of being driven, which is the same word that Hermogenes uses when he said he was forced to agree with Protagoras even though he did not what to do so.

[Her.] No, indeed; but I have often had reason to think that there are very bad men, and a good many of them.

[Soc.] Well, and have you ever found any very good ones?

[Her.] Not many.

[Soc.] Still you have found them?

[Her.] Yes.

[Soc.] And would you hold that the very good were the very wise, and the very evil very foolish? Would that be your view?

[Her.] It would.

Goodness, wisdom and truth are identified and contrast to badness, foolishness and falsehood.

[Soc.] But if Protagoras is right, and the truth is that things are as they appear to any one, how can some of us be wise and some of us foolish?

[Her.] Impossible.

[Soc.] And if, on the other hand, wisdom and folly are really distinguishable, you will allow, I think, that the assertion of Protagoras can hardly be correct. For if what appears to each man is true to him, one man cannot in reality be wiser than another.

[Her.] He cannot.

Wisdom and foolishness is something that can be distinguished. Because we can distinguish them we can distinguish good and bad. If we can distinguish good and bad then we can distinguish truth and falsehood. If we can distinguish truth and falsehood then things cannot be relative. Notice that wisdom is related to goodness which is related to truth. This means a relation to knowledge, is related to a non-dual which is related to an aspect of Being. This series is seen as a refutation of relativism, and thus nihilism. The key here is

that it is Knowledge that has real permanence in this life. The non-duals are what allows us to see beyond nihilism and relativity. It is the aspects of Being that allows us to go beyond flux. Socrates is connecting these to each other in a implicative series. The point here is that aspects of Being go beyond Being and are aspects of Existence as well. Similarly the non-dual goes beyond the nihilistic opposites. And wisdom as the combination of knowledge and experience goes beyond just the permanence of knowledge itself. Knowledge is the most permanent of things and experience is the realm of flux.

One way to take Plato, is as an epistemological realist. In other words Knowledge is the most permanent of things and thus it is knowledge that has Being. Since knowledge is based in language then having Being as its metaphysical principle makes a lot of sense for Indo-Europeans. Notice that the aspects of Being apply equally to existence and are not limited to Being alone. A case could be made for the idea that knowledge itself when combined with experience to yield wisdom produces a non-dual, that is something rooted in existence. Thus it would make sense for knowledge to imply distinctions between aspects of Being. These would be non-nihilistic distinctions to the extent that they are rooted in existence as well as Being.

[Soc.] Nor will you be disposed to say with Euthydemus, that all things equally belong to all men at the same moment and always; for neither on his view can there be some good and other bad, if virtue and vice are always equally to be attributed to all.

[Her.] There cannot.

Here we move from the view of Protagoras regarding appearances to that of Euthydemus that ascribes all things equally to all men which concerns the projection of opinions. These two positions establish the Logos⁰ of opinions and the Physus⁰ of appearances that are the basis of our framework for the interaction of Physus and Logos at higher meta-levels. Hermogenes takes up a position in opposition to both of these sophisticated twins. It is interesting that Euthydemus in fact has a sophisticated twin, his brother. The two fight

both physically and intellectually, and train others in both sorts of fighting. There sophisms are of the most transparent sort, merely word games with the multiple definitions of words. Socrates reduces the position of Protagoras to that of one who says that perception is knowledge. But, in fact, the position of Protagoras is more complex than that as we have seen and he actually ranks as a pre-Socratic philosopher rather than just a sophist. But all opponents of Socrates are painted with the same brush. The point is that although Socrates here sets the two positions as equal, he does so polemically, for he must know that the position of the later is more complex than that of the earlier twin sophists. The quality of the teaching of Protagoras is higher than the quality of the teaching of Euthydemus. This leveling and making equal that which is not equal should not escape our notice.

[Soc.] But if neither is right, and things are not relative to individuals, and all things do not equally belong to all at the same moment and always, they must be supposed to have their own proper and permanent essence: they are not in relation to us, or influenced by us, fluctuating according to our fancy, but they are independent, and maintain to their own essence the relation prescribed by nature.

[Her.] I think, Socrates, that you have said the truth.

How is it that the statement of Protagoras and that of Euthydemus is seen to be the same. And why is having a permanent essence the only alternative to that. This is not explained by Socrates. In Protagoras each individual has its frame of reference. This means that the relativity connects the frames of reference in such a way that there is a transform between individuals, but that each individual sees something different from the others. So the truth of what one sees is connected to the frame of reference of the individual, so that different things may be seen at the same time or different times concerning the same object. On the other hand, Euthydemus says the opposite when he says that everyone has the same qualities of virtue at all times. Thus the individuals are made a homogeneous plenum with the same qualities. This means that everyone's opinions are equal because you cannot distinguish between the qualities of different individuals. What amounts to saying something false is no more than not saying

anything at all. Thus Euthydemus maintains that there is no falsehood, because what ever we say is true, due to the fact that everyone has all qualities at all times. So one view emphasizes the individuals difference, while the other emphasizes the sameness of the individuals. We can almost say that the Protagoras view is Set-like and the Euthydemus view is Mass-like. Difference is handled as non-speech by Euthydemus while sameness is handled by a transform between frames of reference by Protagoras. But Euthydemus is a lower sort of sophism because it clearly makes anything anyone says the same as saying nothing. But the sophism of Protagoras is more subtle because there is a difference between the local difference of appearances and the global connectedness between frames of reference.

But even if we consider these two sophisms as the same then the question arises how it is that the opposite of them is the idea of a permanent essence. There are many other possible positions. We are not forced to think that if Euthydemus and Protagoras are incorrect then we have to accept the inevitability of permanent essences that are independent of us and “maintain to their own essence the relation prescribed by nature.” In a way he is saying that if opinions and appearances are not untied to anything then they must be tied. Here the tie is to nature through the essence of the thing, which is separate from the appearances and our opinions. An essence is a constraint on attributes of a substance. A substance is according to Aristotle something that persists that has attributes based on its properties that inhere in the substance. Properties pervade the substance. This whole way of talking is the set-like approach to things perfected by Aristotle. If we go back to Plato then we find a more mass-like picture where the “Forms” pervade everything that is associated with that Form. In Aristotle only the properties still pervade the things themselves that own those properties. But Forms or Ideas no longer pervade all of nature as templates on the basis of which we build images. Aristotle has moved from the analogy of craftsmen to the analogy of natural

things, and from a transcendentalism to a practical and immanent approach.

But it is a giant leap to assume that just because we can negate the sophisms of appearance only or opinion only we can then jump straight to the idea of a permanent essence for things that is independent of us. In a way that move is too extreme in the other direction. But it can be seen as the move from the flux of becoming to Being.

[Soc.] Does what I am saying apply only to the things themselves, or equally to the actions which proceed from them? Are not actions also a class of being?

[Her.] Yes, the actions are real as well as the things.

So there is a corrective in store for us immediately. Socrates immediately moves to look at actions. Actions are the things in movement. Hermogenes readily agrees that actions have their own essence as well as things.

[Soc.] Then the actions also are done according to their proper nature, and not according to our opinion of them? In cutting, for example, we do not cut as we please, and with any chance instrument; but we cut with the proper instrument only, and according to the natural process of cutting; and the natural process is right and will succeed, but any other will fail and be of no use at all.

[Her.] I should say that the natural way is the right way.

[Soc.] Again, in burning, not every way is the right way; but the right way is the natural way, and the right instrument the natural instrument.

[Her.] True.

[Soc.] And this holds good of all actions?

[Her.] Yes.

Actions that have their natural form are quite different than the permanent essences of static things. In fact, here we can say that Socrates is distinguishing between what is later called Pure and Process Being. In fact, this could serve as the locus classicus of the difference between present-at-hand and ready-to-hand. Saws and Fire are ready to hand and part of a referential totality. They are related to natural actions rather than something that is merely occurrent³ or extant⁴. So here Plato is establishing the difference between Pure and Process Being.

³ cf Dreyfus

⁴ Cf translation of Basic Problems of Metaphysics by Heidegger.

[Soc.] And speech is a kind of action?
[Her.] True.
[Soc.] And will a man speak correctly who speaks as he pleases? Will not the successful speaker rather be he who speaks in the natural way of speaking, and as things ought to be spoken, and with the natural instrument? Any other mode of speaking will result in error and failure.
[Her.] I quite agree with you.
[Soc.] And is not naming a part of speaking? for in giving names men speak.
[Her.] That is true.
[Soc.] And if speaking is a sort of action and has a relation to acts, is not naming also a sort of action?
[Her.] True.
[Soc.] And we saw that actions were not relative to ourselves, but had a special nature of their own?
[Her.] Precisely.
[Soc.] Then the argument would lead us to infer that names ought to be given according to a natural process, and with a proper instrument, and not at our pleasure: in this and no other way shall we name with success.
[Her.] I agree.

Once natural action with its own essence is given then speaking and naming are lumped together under that action, which means that there should be a proper way to do speech and naming and there should be proper instruments for them as well.

[Soc.] But again, that which has to be cut has to be cut with something?
[Her.] Yes.
[Soc.] And that which has to be woven or pierced has to be woven or pierced with something?
[Her.] Certainly.
[Soc.] And that which has to be named has to be named with something?
[Her.] True.
[Soc.] What is that with which we pierce?
[Her.] An awl.
[Soc.] And with which we weave?
[Her.] A shuttle.
[Soc.] And with which we name?
[Her.] A name.
[Soc.] Very good: then a name is an instrument?
[Her.] Certainly.
[Soc.] Suppose that I ask, "What sort of instrument is a shuttle?" And you answer, "A weaving instrument."
[Her.] Well.
[Soc.] And I ask again, "What do we do when we weave?"- The answer is, that we separate or disengage the warp from the woof.
[Her.] Very true.
[Soc.] And may not a similar description be given of an awl, and of instruments in general?
[Her.] To be sure.
[Soc.] And now suppose that I ask a similar question about names: will you answer me? Regarding the name as an instrument, what do we do when we name?
[Her.] I cannot say.

We cannot help but wonder if the examples that Socrates picks (burning, cutting, piercing,

weaving) are relevant beyond merely being random examples. The examples – burning, cutting, piercing – appear to get more and more exact, as all ways of taking something away to produce an effect. They can all be performed on two and three dimensional things. But weaving is something different, it is a synthetic operation that takes one dimensional things and produces two dimensional things. Weaving has the strange quality of knots that show us the nature of self-organization, which is to say that they cause the thing to define itself in a pattern against itself. Weaving and knotting assume a narrow three dimensional leeway in which the one dimensional threads interweave to form a pattern against themselves. The weaving instrument throws the thing against itself, while the other instruments merely interact with the thing by itself and transforms it.

[Soc.] Do we not give information to one another, and distinguish things according to their natures?
[Her.] Certainly we do.

Here Socrates shows more directly where he is going with this argument. Names are ways of transferring information or communicating about the natures of things.

[Soc.] Then a name is an instrument of teaching and of distinguishing natures, as the shuttle is of distinguishing the threads of the web.
[Her.] Yes.

Thus it becomes clear that the weaving is an apropos example, because it is an example of something that distinguishes among the threads that it is using against each other in the weaving process. So we get an image of names being thrust against each other as a means of communicating the differences in the natures of the things. Patterns of woven things also give information, perhaps an abstract design, perhaps a picture, perhaps something written in letters in the weaving. So the loom gives a good example of communication of information.

[Soc.] And the shuttle is the instrument of the weaver?
[Her.] Assuredly.
[Soc.] Then the weaver will use the shuttle well- and well means like a weaver? and the teacher will use the name well- and well means like a teacher?
[Her.] Yes.

[Soc.] And when the weaver uses the shuttle, whose work will he be using well?
 [Her.] That of the carpenter.
 [Soc.] And is every man a carpenter, or the skilled only?
 [Her.] Only the skilled.
 [Soc.] And when the piercer uses the awl, whose work will he be using well?
 [Her.] That of the smith.
 [Soc.] And is every man a smith, or only the skilled?
 [Her.] The skilled only.
 [Soc.] And when the teacher uses the name, whose work will he be using?
 [Her.] There again I am puzzled.

The awl is very simple while the loom and shuttle are somewhat complicated. Making a hole with an Awl could be a reference to the meta-system, the whole full of holes that is opposite the system, in which the synthesis occurs like the synthesis of weaving. The point here is that in each case some other craftsman makes the tool used by the craftsman who does the piercing or the weaving. But it is unclear who makes the instrument of naming on this analogy.

[Soc.] Cannot you at least say who gives us the names which we use?
 [Her.] Indeed I cannot.
 [Soc.] Does not the law seem to you to give us them?
 [Her.] Yes, I suppose so.
 [Soc.] Then the teacher, when he gives us a name, uses the work of the legislator?
 [Her.] I agree.
 [Soc.] And is every man a legislator, or the skilled only?
 [Her.] The skilled only.
 [Soc.] Then, Hermogenes, not every man is able to give a name, but only a maker of names; and this is the legislator, who of all skilled artisans in the world is the rarest.
 [Her.] True.

Socrates unveils that the maker of the name giving instrument, which is the name itself is the law giver. Notice that the name is both the object of name giving and the instrument of name giving. The name achieves a kind of indeterminacy in the course of this argument which is quite strange. But of course this is the kind of indeterminacy that exists at the third meta-level in what is called Hyper Being, called by Derrida Differance. So we are in fact continuing to walk up the meta-levels of Being. Notice that the laws exist on the second meta-level with grammar or laws of nature. The law giver himself must be at least one level up from the laws that are given. Thus we get the following picture:

Name⁵ = Source Template of Name
 Name⁴ = Expertise, Divine inspiration
 Name³ = Name Namer = Law Giver
 Name² = Naming as Instrument for a process
 Name¹ = Name as a Noun and part of speech
 Name⁰ = various names of things

Woodwork³ = Source Template of Shuttle
 Woodwork² = Expertise with carpentry tools
 Woodwork¹ = Carpenter makes Shuttles
 Woodwork⁰ = various tools

Weave³ = Source Template for Design of Web
 Weave² = Weaving as Instrument (Shuttle)
 Weave¹ = Weaving as an Art (Techne)
 Weave⁰ = various woven things

The key idea here is that we can ascend the staircase of meta-levels by following the stages of the arts and crafts as they come into Being. For instance we see various woven things around in the world. But when we put them all together into an abstract idea we get the Weaving as an art or Techne in general. But this art or techne is dependent on the instruments used in the process of weaving itself. So the art or techne is an abstraction which is frozen in time like your membership to a guild or a diploma you receive. But the process of weaving is something you do every day with the tools of the trade. Weaving as a techne exists by nature, in other words there is a way to do it proscribed by nature. But also the weaving tools are proscribed by nature that support the actions that by nature that lead to woven products. However someone must make the tools that are used in weaving. This step outside weaving to another art gives us the hint that a fundamental discontinuity has been crossed. But that other art has its own expertise of a higher order than the expertise of weaving, and finally we see that the carpenter must follow the ideal form or template in order to make the shuttle for the weaver. Now with ordinary arts the move back to the more basic craft is not a shift upward in the hierarchy of Being. But with naming going to the level of the name giver creates exactly the indeterminacy of the name and the instrument of naming that signals the presence of the

name giver that alludes to Hyper Being. The expertise is then turned into divine inspiration that alludes to Wild Being. Finally the Name giver also looks at the templates of things in order to create his naming instruments. But those templates exist at the level of Ultra Being rather than at some lower level.

See how deftly Socrates uses the two professions where one is dependent on the other to suggest in the case of names the higher levels of Being. Notice how these levels have meanings very similar to the meanings of the kinds of Being discovered by Continental Philosophy in the last century. The kinds of Being are merely dependent on the logical meta-levels applied to Being. Their nature is fixed by the worldview. Socrates knew them as do we when we rediscover them thousands of years later. The cleverness of the dialogue is the way the meta-levels of Being are suggested by these homely analogies. Hermogenes' puzzlement is called for as Socrates is forcing him up the hierarchy of meta-levels into realms of thought most people never venture into. Part of the seriousness of the dialogue is that the kinds of Being are pointed out to the careful reader. Part of the comedy is that Socrates forces Hermogenes up the ladder of the meta-levels using analogies that are inapt and inept. The analogies Socrates is using do not really work, they only provide the required result because the object is so strange, i.e. names. Not many things can become one with the instrument of their making. G. Spencer Brown in *Laws of Form* talks about the mark as being both operator and operand at the same time. Here that kind of identity is forced at the third meta-level rather than at the second. The operator and the operator maker are identified. That is a strange identity that really only dynamic information and software has. But that identity is the key to producing difference rather than merely staring over up another ladder of the same height as we do in the case of the weaver and the carpenter.

[Soc.] And how does the legislator make names? and to what does he look? Consider this in the light of the previous instances: to what does the carpenter look in making the shuttle? Does he not look to that which is naturally fitted to act as a shuttle?

[Her.] Certainly.

[Soc.] And suppose the shuttle to be broken in making, will he make another, looking to the broken one? or will he look to the form according to which he made the other?

[Her.] To the latter, I should imagine.

[Soc.] Might not that be justly called the true or ideal shuttle?

[Her.] I think so.

When the name maker looks at the ideal form of the name he is looking deeper into the heart of things than the carpenter or weaver who is looking for designs of their work. Plato does not deal with the case that the carpenter makes tools to allow him to make tools. This is another way of talking about Hyper Being. But the craftsmen are only looking at the third meta-level for their designs, while the name maker because of the strange fusion that occurs at the Hyper Being level is actually looking for his forms at the Ultra Being level, that is the level of genuine rather than artificial emergence. It is this added depth that comes with naming that allows the name maker to peer deeper into the heart of things, into the level where the emergent events occur, i.e. where the utterly new things take shape, where new templates are formed and new technologies and sciences born. It is this depth that reaches to the uttermost borders of our worldview that allows the name maker to peer into the nature of the things as permanent essences, because at that level is the level where the permanent essences come into Being.

[Soc.] And whatever shuttles are wanted, for the manufacture of garments, thin or thick, of flaxen, woollen, or other material, ought all of them to have the true form of the shuttle; and whatever is the shuttle best adapted to each kind of work, that ought to be the form which the maker produces in each case.

[Her.] Yes.

[Soc.] And the same holds of other instruments: when a man has discovered the instrument which is naturally adapted to each work, he must express this natural form, and not others which he fancies, in the material, whatever it may be, which he employs; for example, he ought to know how to put into iron the forms of awls adapted by nature to their several uses?

[Her.] Certainly.

[Soc.] And how to put into wood forms of shuttles adapted by nature to their uses?

[Her.] True.

[Soc.] For the several forms of shuttles naturally answer to the several kinds of webs; and this is true of instruments in general.

[Her.] Yes.

[Soc.] Then, as to names: ought not our legislator also to

know how to put the true natural names of each thing into sounds and syllables and to make and give all names with a view to the ideal name, if he is to be a namer in any true sense? And we must remember that different legislators will not use the same syllables. For neither does every smith, although he may be making the same instrument for the same purpose, make them all of the same iron. The form must be the same, but the material may vary, and still the instrument may be equally good of whatever iron made, whether in Hellas or in a foreign country;- there is no difference.

[Her.] Very true.

So if the ideal form appears at meta-level five in Ultra Being and the name maker wants to make a name that is also an instrument of naming which will in turn be used by the teacher and proven by the dialectician, then that occurs at meta-level three. Thus the name maker takes what is alien and incomprehensible and uses various materials that may differ from place to place to fashion this name making instrument which is also a name, and a naming. Mediating the incomprehensibility of the Ultra Being level and the Indecidability of the Hyper Being level is the Wild Being level, at which the namer gets his expertise by following the oracles that appear there by intuitions, propensities, and other pointers as to the right way to name things. What we see is that the propensities that appear in the material, its inherent differences make the differences in the names of the various languages of the name makers.

[Soc.] And the legislator, whether he be Hellene or barbarian, is not therefore to be deemed by you a worse legislator, provided he gives the true and proper form of the name in whatever syllables; this or that country makes no matter.

[Her.] Quite true.

The foreign tongue is quite important here because it points to the externality of language at the Ultra Being level which is the limits of language. The true and proper form of the name is not related to the syllables in which it is expressed. Rather we can say that the syllables form a field, and out of that field, different for different languages, a selection will be made of phonemes. At the third meta-level of Being the phonemes appear, and also the things appear each with their true nature. By imitation the name giver picks a spot in the phoneme field that corresponds to the true

nature of the thing in its field of differences. That is the true name, the corresponding points in the two fields. If the name giver does not find those corresponding points then he will have failed and that will show up in the testing by the dialectician.

[Soc.] But who then is to determine whether the proper form is given to the shuttle, whatever sort of wood may be used? The carpenter who makes, or the weaver who is to use them?

[Her.] I should say, he who is to use them, Socrates.

[Soc.] And who uses the work of the lyremaker? Will not he be the man who knows how to direct what is being done, and who will know also whether the work is being well done or not?

[Her.] Certainly.

[Soc.] And who is he?

[Her.] The player of the lyre.

[Soc.] And who will direct the shipwright?

[Her.] The pilot.

[Soc.] And who will be best able to direct the legislator in his work, and will know whether the work is well done, in this or any other country? Will not the user be the man?

[Her.] Yes.

[Soc.] And this is he who knows how to ask questions?

[Her.] Yes.

[Soc.] And how to answer them?

[Her.] Yes.

[Soc.] And him who knows how to ask and answer you would call a dialectician?

[Her.] Yes; that would be his name.

Here we finally hear that it is the dialectician that will test the products of the name giver. Here we move from the carpenter and weaver to the shipwright-pilot and the lyremaker-lyreplayer. The shipwright-pilot is apropos because we are being guided though the rough seas of nihilism to make non-nihilistic distinctions. The lyremaker-lyreplayer is apropos because the result is harmonious. The dialectician produces the categorizations by which the various things are distinguished and given their proper places in our conceptual frameworks. Strangely as we have said dialectical categorization is higher than Reason and is the realm of intelligibility beyond computability. Thus these skills are arts that cannot be reduced to mechanization. Pilots guide themselves by the stars in the sky while the lyreplayers guide themselves by their own inner harmonies that come from the mathematics of music. Both of these are images of those who can avoid the nihilism, and Socrates would like for his law givers and name makers to also avoid the nihilism. But

they fail to do so for the most part, as they immerse themselves in the flux of things and underline that rather than the stasis or the non-dual realm between the two.

[Soc.] Then the work of the carpenter is to make a rudder, and the pilot has to direct him, if the rudder is to be well made.

[Her.] True.

[Soc.] And the work of the legislator is to give names, and the dialectician must be his director if the names are to be rightly given?

[Her.] That is true.

[Soc.] Then, Hermogenes, I should say that this giving of names can be no such light matter as you fancy, or the work of light or chance persons; and Cratylus is right in saying that things have names by nature, and that not every man is an artificer of names, but he only who looks to the name which each thing by nature has, and is able to express the true forms of things in letters and syllables.

So here is the summary of the first argument which affirms the position of Cratylus. It is the dialectician that guides the name giver to produce imitations of the true form of the thing in letters and syllables. In the process Socrates has introduced all the meta-levels of Being by his sleigh use of analogies that are unworkable. The special nature of information or software is not mentioned that breaks the analogies, but also allows us to drive deeper into the meta-levels of Being. It is a depth we need if we are to create a full resonance between logos and physus. By affirming Cratylus Socrates is saying that the physus and logos do interact and do give a true picture of the physus beyond our projections on it. Our point is that ultimately this is made possible by the schemas. But in the process Socrates has opened up the entire realm between the two duals as a problematic for exploration. And he has left open the possibility of their interaction such that we can find out something about the physus beyond our projections of logos. In fact, Socrates has affirmed that this possibility is realized by certain law and name givers although we know that they are very rare. Perhaps Solon, Plato's ancestor was one of those rare individuals.

[Her.] I cannot answer you, Socrates; but I find a difficulty in changing my opinion all in a moment, and I think that I should be more readily persuaded, if you would show me what this is which you term the natural fitness of names.

[Soc.] My good Hermogenes, I have none to show. Was I not telling you just now (but you have forgotten), that I knew nothing, and proposing to share the enquiry with

you? But now that you and I have talked over the matter, a step has been gained; for we have discovered that names have by nature a truth, and that not every man knows how to give a thing a name.

Giving a true name is tantamount to making a non-nihilistic distinction.

[Her.] Very good.

[Soc.] And what is the nature of this truth or correctness of names? That, if you care to know, is the next question.

[Her.] Certainly, I care to know.

[Soc.] Then reflect.

[Her.] How shall I reflect?

This is an important point, because Socrates sends Hermogeneus inside himself for the answer to his question, and then immediately defines that as asking sophists the answer, as a joke.

[Soc.] The true way is to have the assistance of those who know, and you must pay them well both in money and in thanks; these are the Sophists, of whom your brother, Callias, has- rather dearly- bought the reputation of wisdom. But you have not yet come into your inheritance, and therefore you had better go to him, and beg and entreat him to tell you what he has learnt from Protagoras about the fitness of names.

[Her.] But how inconsistent should I be, if, whilst repudiating Protagoras and his Truth, I were to attach any value to what he and his book affirm!

We have rejected Protagoras because we have opened up the meta-levels of Being. Hermogenes cannot go back now to the sophists having seen the realm of Being. Thus he entreats Socrates to show him the way. Now at this point a whole series of etymologies are put forward, both in seriousness and jest. Many of them show that the ancient name givers thought that flux was at the basis of everything. Cratylus takes this very seriously and finds it convincing. Rather than going through all of these etymological exercises we will refer the reader to the works of the commentators especially those of Sallis and Sedley who bring out the comedy and the seriousness of these etymologies respectively. Our main point has been made that Socrates opens up the meta-levels of Being in considering the relations between physus and logos. We advance our articulation of that interface in our hypothesis concerning the abstract and chiasmic relations between the meta-levels of Physus and Logos. At this point the specificity of the answer of Plato is not as

important as the fact that the interface between Physis has been opened up and that we can see in that interface the place of the advent of the schema as a concept within our tradition. Plato continually circles back to that interface as he develops his theory of forms.