

Plato and the Celestials

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 2005 K.D. Palmer.

All Rights Reserved. Not for distribution.

Started 05.02.05; Version 0.3; 05.12.06; gst08a03.doc

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

Introduction

We continue our exploration of the basis of Schematization as seen in Plato's Cratylus by a sudden turn to an new theory which was discussed by Victor Rosenthal¹ at the Dynamic Ontologies Conference² in Trento 2004 which I attended³ and before which I had never heard of Microgenesis as an offshoot of Gestalt theory. Fortunately there is a comprehensive book on the subject by Talis Bachmann called Microgenetic Approach to the Conscious Mind⁴. When I heard Victor Rosenthal's talk I realized that Microgenesis would solve in a preliminary way the basic problem that I was dealing with here in terms of the relation between the true or conventional names and the noumena that is expressed in terms of the noumenal variable and the phoneme variable

¹ http://www.revue-texto.net/Inedits/Rosenthal_Micro/Rosenthal_en.html

² <http://www.unitn.it/events/do/index2.htm>

³ My presentation was titled "Meta-levels of Being" which can be seen and heard at <http://holonomic.net>

⁴ John Benjamins Pub Co, Philadelphia, 2000

that has been posed by Socrates in the Cratylus dialogue. By solved I mean that microgenesis allows us to develop a comprehensive theory that bridges the divide between the noumena and the phoneme variables and gives rise to conventional experience on the basis of some sort of true names. And this theory allows us to go deeply into the theory of the schema in an unexpected way through the at least preliminary solution of this problem. Prior to Microgenesis it seemed as one could only oscillate between the conventional and the true name stances without solving the fundamental antimony between them which is the whole basis of the dialogue. It is amazing how Plato could construct such a deep dialogue that forces us to an ultimate point in our inability to comprehend the nature of the schema. And it is equally amazing that there has existed for some time a theory that solves this problem at least tentatively. But I was primed to hear what Victor Rosenthal was saying by my work here on the Cratylus with new ears because the dilemma posed by Socrates in the Cratylus had been driven home to me over and over again by my own oscillations between the stance of conventionalism and the idea that the noumena must speak for itself and give its true name, i.e. the name that magically allows us to cut through schematization to see the phenomena as it is beyond the schematization. Already the dialogue has driven us to view mythology as a reflexive account of schematization and led us to understand the projection of the Pascal Triangle of minimal information representations as an embodiment of this projection process which is not traumatized, and so to see the difference between minimal projection and overweening and hubris in projection. This allowed us to unearth the theory of projection from the mythological era and compare that with the concept of heuristics based on natural opposites which does not produce yang splendor or closed yin images, i.e. nihilistic degenerate images in the schematization process. But still there is no way in this model to get beyond the veil of schematization as such to the noumena, the fundamental dualism between the what Deleuze calls difference-in-

itself and repetition-for-itself still stands which for Sartre would be the in-itself and for-itself derived from Hegel for which Heidegger sanctioned Sartre and withdrew the name "Existentialist." Sartre went on to talk about the practico-inert and the fused group as the basis of all social institutions instead. But Deleuze wanted to save the concept of the for-itself⁵ from its demise in the Heideggerian framework which only recognizes what Heidegger calls Being-in-the-world, *dasein*, and has no category like Being-for-the-world. For Heidegger this is a derivative state called *mitsein* where *dasein* is lost in the other as inauthentic. Sartre goes on to create a fundamental theory of *mitsein* as fundamental in the fused group of Critique of Dialectical Reason. The practico-inert is the stuff that freezes whenever the social group turns away from something it has posited in the world and schematized. For Deleuze, Sartre does not go deeply enough into the nature of the practico-inert matter and realize that it is at the bottom difference-in-itself. Also for Deleuze the fused group is too conscious and does not recognize the overriding unconscious factors at play within the fused group which he explores under the rubric of repetition-for-itself. So Deleuze pushes deeper than either Heidegger or Sartre to vindicate Sartre and reintroduce the concept of the for-itself at an even deeper level that had been considered before. But all this still gives us the fundamental Cartesian split between the *cogito* and *extensia* which Heidegger was determined to eliminate, and which Merleau-Ponty also made decisive moves to attempt to eliminate. In the late Heidegger we get the call of Being which we have forgotten which is the equivalent of Socrates' true names for fundamental ontology. Here the search is for the true name of not individual ontic things but for the true name of Being. Eventually Heidegger uses the older spelling *Seyn* for *Sein* in order to attempt to get back to that true name for Being which will take us out of the

metaphysical era. Heidegger in later writings also recognizes the importance of Language and how Language is somehow the house of Being, and thus has an argument analogous to the idea of the phoneme as privileged signifier which can express the true name because that signifier needs no other signifier to augment itself, i.e. it needs no difference from itself to express itself, and is thus closer to the for-itself and shuns the in-itself of the difference from other phonemes. Thus we can look at the argument that Socrates makes in the *Cratylus* and see its reflections in our postmodern philosophies today. There is still an active debate about whether the for-itself should be there as something separate, and whether one can construct something that is prior to that split or not. Deleuze is a lone voice supporting Sartre in this issue to which most have conceded victory already to Heidegger. Merleau-Ponty has sought for a middle ground between and beyond Sartre and Heidegger with the concept of Wild Being beyond the Hyper Dialectic between Process Being and Nothingness. Derrida has claimed that ground and extended it to Ultra Being in some cases pushing the limits of our worldview towards the ultimate limit of Existence. But even at these nether reaches Deleuze wants to proclaim a difference between the in-itself and the for-itself. But even if we can get rid of this split at some meta-level of Being then the question still arises as to whether it is possible to get beyond the projections to the thing itself and find true names for things, or for Being itself. In a way this is the opposite of the for-itself argument that would privilege consciousness and it says that beyond the *being-in-the-world* of *dasein*, the things are also privileged and should have their own voice which we should hear clearly, and which language via the phonemes should transmit to us out of the core of the structural components of language. In other words Being is made up of the aspects of identity/difference, presence/absence, truth/fiction, reality/illusion, and there ought to be something beyond that, beyond even difference-in-itself, or absence-in-itself, or fiction-in-itself, or illusion-in-itself which is part of the noumena's ownmost

⁵ Making Sense of Meaning in Deleuze From Hyper and Wild Being to Ultra Being at <http://archonic.net/dlz01a03.pdf>

otherness which speaks to us though language despite our projections via the otherness of language itself. We know that according to Foucault that the one spoken to is no longer Man, the one spoken to is somehow other than ourselves as conceived though humanism, it is somehow what Deleuze wants to call repetition-for-itself rather than representation-for-itself, which is self-consciousness that defines Man. So the ~~noumena~~ is distanced from Being, perhaps into existence, the medium is distanced from itself as ~~Language~~ becomes the unconscious in Lacan (as anti-representationalism gains a foothold), and the one spoken to becomes distanced from itself as ~~Man~~ as anti-humanism gains a foothold. We end up writing the whole formula under erasure as Heidegger and Derrida teach us and soon we end up just playing language games, or we end up denying the noumena, or we end up denying even repetition-in-itself, i.e. consciousness as anti-Man. Notice that all this is similar to what we have in the difference between the nondual tradition of Buddhism and the nondual tradition of Taoism. Buddhism denies the physical world and Taoism denies that consciousness or the social is special in any way beyond nature. This is what produces the difference between emptiness and void and what introduces the difference that makes a difference which we now recognize and Ultra Being. It is the same duality projected onto the screen of nondual existence that occurs in Being at the lower meta-levels. In order to get rid of this projection of the duality onto the screen of the nondual we must go to the sixth meta-level of Being where there is no more impurities of Ultra Being, i.e. utter negative-aspect-in-itself or positive-aspect-in-itself where the meta-difference between the positive and negative is the trace of the for-itself which when we dehumanize it becomes repetition-for-itself rather than the humanized representation-for-itself Hegel, or Schopenhauer and others. For Schopenhauer the noumena within us is the Will building on the ideas of Kant which becomes in Nietzsche the Will to Power. Heidegger, Deleuze and Foucault all build on this romantic tradition that starts with Christopher Smart, the Mad

Poet, and Blake, the Visionary Poet, and is eventually codified by Karl Wilhelm Friedrich von Schlegel who influences Coleridge and Wordsworth. It is interesting that von Schlegel is an ancestor of Nietzsche who also wrote aphoristically. All this is to say that the anti-humanistic tradition has deep roots in our own tradition and was not just an idea created recently by Deleuze and Foucault and other postmoderns. Deleuze wants to say that we are anti-humanists but that there is still something other than the merely in-itself, there is still something like the for-itself which is still anti-human and which we can go into madness or nonsense to witness. He makes the best case for this in his Logic of Sense. I have attempted to apply the aspects of structuralism elaborated in the logic of sense to the poetry of Christopher Smart in order to see if the analysis applied to Alice in Wonderland also holds up in that case with which Deleuze probably had no acquaintance but was at the origin of the romantic tradition. The analytical structure that Deleuze elsewhere calls symbolic after Lacan's use of the term, does seem to hold up very well, and is actually clarified in many respects by the Jubilate Agno of Smart⁶. An ongoing incomplete analysis of the Four Zoas by Wm Blake bears marks of the same Symbolic Structure. The breaking of the mould of Man is in part a recognition of the Lacanian Structural Symbolic underlying the construct of Man according to Deleuze and these early romantic documents show traces of this symbolic structure in a nascent form similar to that which Deleuze finds in Alice in Wonderland. The key idea is that Sense arises out of nonsense, doxa out of paradox. To make sense these symbolic structural patterns must be brought up from a level prior to the constitution of Man and it is to this Symbolic level that the anti-humanists must appeal in order to show how the construct of Man fails us. But there is little or no such analysis on the side of the noumena. Phenomenology has bracketed Kant's

⁶ The Logic Of Sense In The Jubilate Agno by Christopher Smart: A Test Case for the theory of Sense of Deleuze at <http://archonic.net/csjo1a04.pdf>

noumena and few are attempting to go back and attempt to find out what is there beyond the projections, i.e. beyond the meta-difference between positive/negative-aspects-in-itself which ultimately lead us to ultra-being and beyond that to existence proper which is seen in emptiness and void. But Socrates wants to see both sides of this equation of otherness explored fully. He wants to hear the voice of the noumena beyond the projection of Being, he wants to hear it through language at the structural level that produces the phonemes as Jacobson shows us, and he wants to hear it in the realm of the dead where Being overcomes Becoming and Persephone reigns with Hades as Dionysus. Man's limit is death as Heidegger and others points out. It is a critique that Heidegger does not deal with death except as futurity that gives authenticity. He does not deal with death as such. But death for Plato was the entry into Being from Becoming. On the other hand we can see Death at an even deeper level as the entry into Existence from Being, i.e. it is when all projection stops. And when the loved ones stop returning to the graves, but are in the graves themselves, and the names are all but forgotten on the tombstones, and we become dust, then we truly enter into emptiness or void, which is the greatest fear of Man caught up in the projections of Being, i.e. Maya. At that point we become the things themselves again and the difference between the noumena as pure in-itself and our for-itself beyond Man vanishes. If we see that is mere dissolution then that is giving up unity and totality to plurality, magma, multiplicity, etc. But if we see this as moving out of the dialectic between unity, totality, plurality and even wholeness, into a nondual realm where there is neither one nor many then there is a fundamental transform in our understanding of death. Wisdom, Gnosis or Insight are various levels of dipping into this nonduality prior to death. The Prophet Muhammad, peace be upon him, said "Die before you die." The nonduality has multiple layers of existence (wajud), manifestation (sifat), and inexplicableness (dhat). These are Standings that are beyond the Standings of the

meta-levels of Being. Death changes its meaning at the various meta-levels of Being and those Standings beyond Being. We must be ready to explore these deeper levels of meaning of death. But we will not pursue that question here. Rather we are focused here on the fact that there is a general problem of characterizing the opening prior to death within life between the animate and inanimate, conscious and nonconscious, social and nonsocial. And Socrates is pushing our face in this problematic that brings to the fore the whole problem of schematization and the question of whether we can hear the noumena beyond our projections, whether language can serve as a medium for expressing true names based on their structural or semiotic infrastructure of language that is seen in the arising of phonemes, and whether the otherness of the one who hears the things themselves speak, as a thing in itself, i.e. as a will to power (to life) is there to hear beyond the solipsism of subjectivity. As we go deeper into the Cratylus all this whole problematic comes to a head. And one interesting attempt at a solution to this problem was discovered by some of the early gestalt psychologists who eventually called the approach microgenesis. We will explore this approach and see how it deepens our appreciation of the problematic that Socrates sets up.

Microgenesis

We will not rehearse the microgenetic theory here, as the background materials already cited are excellent introductions. Rather we will talk about how the Microgenetic thesis addresses the fundamental problem at the basis of the Cratylus presented by Socrates. Microgenesis says that given a perception that it goes through metamorphoses from the first time it is apprehended after it is presented to its full presence to consciousness as a representation. These metamorphoses are very quick and we just do not notice them as stages of the congealing of the gestalt, but they are there and we can make them visible with careful observation of perception and through ingenious experiments on perception. This

school of gestalt psychology was founded in Leipzig and had minimal impact in relation to the major school of gestalt psychology that said that the gestalt appeared all at once. However, the microgenetic approach has been a smaller underground movement within the greater gestalt movement from the beginning. But since most of the texts of this group were not translated it had minimal impact except in Europe. The major proponent of this method in the United States was Werner but it was not taken up to become a school on its own. However, careful research has been done by many perceptual scientists that have confirmed the hypothesis of microgenesis many of whom were not holders of that theory overtly. Such studies attempt to get at the short time period between first presentation, then first appearance to the full appearance of the gestalt and account for the metamorphosis of the perception in that short time period. If we accept the results of this research that the perception undergoes dramatic change over the time of its congealing into a gestalt from first presentation, through first appearance until the full gestalt is present then we have to consider what this means with respect to our problem set for us by Socrates in the Cratylus. Indeed it utterly transforms the problematic to realize that gestalts do not appear all at once out of nothing, but instead appear in bursts that are very different from the final gestalt, and very different from each other over a period of time, which is very short. What we have is a discontinuous process of Becoming prior to the full Being of the Gestalt as an experience. But an even more interesting aspect of this theory is that there are germs of the final gestalt in the very first metamorphosis of the pre-gestalt. This is the key to our problem with the difference between the noumena and the ontic as such, i.e. presented beings. There is no clean break or instantaneous presentation of the full gestalt, rather there are stages of metamorphosis of the gestalt with germs of the final gestalt in the prior states of pre-presentations. So our hypothesis is that it is in the differences of the metamorphoses that the noumena speaks as phenomena that phenomenology goes back to as the things

themselves to listen to their voice. Their voice is heard in the differences between the metamorphoses. In fact there is a period between presentation of a figure and its first metamorphoses and that period is when the thing presented is a noumena. There is an actual noumenal time within the microgenetic evolution. Microgenesis posits that the stages of metamorphoses has to do with the evolution of the brain and sensory system and that older strata of evolutionary neurological strata are activated first, then later stages activate later strata. So Microgenesis is radically evolutionary seeing every perception as going through the biological structures laid down in evolution in the order of their stratification. Whether this is so is not definitively established, but it would account for the radical differences between metamorphic stages in the microgenesis process. When we think of these metamorphic stages we have no better model than that given to us in mythology, for instance in Ovid's recounting of endless tales of metamorphosis both of the gods but of humans into plants and animals at the behest of the gods. In other words we can jump from the idea of metamorphosis in perception directly to the ideas of metamorphosis in myth as an example of how the brain makes up scenarios to explain things in the world. We can see the difference between the mythopoeitic and the metaphysical in some sense as the difference between the working with the partial pre-gestalts and the full-gestalt. This gives us some poetic access to the idea of the metamorphoses which we would not have otherwise. Metamorphoses also becomes a theme in literature and culture as can be seen in The Gods Made Flesh⁷ by Leonard Barkan. So we quickly make the jump for heuristic reasons from the metamorphoses in human perception to the concept of metamorphoses in myth intrinsic to the metaphysical era. But science also knows of some physical phenomena that are also discontinuous in their evolution in this way, and the Alchemists made much of sublimation and other discontinuous processes which they

⁷ Yale, 1986

contrasted to continuous processes that appeared as operations in nature and on nature. So suddenly we have a rich repertory to draw from in considering the central problem that Socrates presents us with in the *Cratylus*. First of all we know from the perception experiments that there is a time when the perceptual functions of the body are merely processing and there is no output yet, so there is a noumenal time interval within the microgenetic process. Then there is a series of metamorphic pre-gestalts that carry with them the seeds that unfold into later pre-gestalts that although different from the earlier ones have some elements that remain throughout the transformations giving continuity even within discontinuity of the pre-gestalt flashes. Finally there is the presentation of the gestalt proper in which the figure and ground are dynamically related. And Figures are abstracted from this final presentation and backgrounds are forgotten so that the perceptions give rise to thought processes, which themselves are perhaps microgenetic, in other words the thoughts also develop by metamorphoses of which perhaps mythological thought is a stage prior to metaphysical thought that separates ratio from doxa. So it becomes clear that we have rich territory here for reinterpreting the problem set up for us by Socrates. We can see that there is something prior to the presentation which is even prior to the noumena, but that the noumena has its own span of the microgenetic evolution prior to the first pre-gestalt, then the first pre-gestalt appears and there is metamorphoses from one pre-gestalt to the other until the full gestalt appears which is the complete and clear perception which we have as Merleau-Ponty says a good grasp of. Then we use that as a basis for a completely different microgenesis of thought. However, we want to stay for the present time at the level of perception. Because we want to focus on the question that Socrates raises how it is that the phenomena as noumena can speak to us beyond our projections. Let us bracket the projection of the schemas for a second. Just taking microgenesis as it stands we can say that there is definitely a time period which is noumenal.

And then with the first pre-gestalt appearance then there is something shown that is not the final gestalt. This difference of the microgenetic series from the final gestalt is new information that is not included in the final gestalt completely. It is not merely a fade in, but a series of discontinuous images that are fundamentally different but which bear some resemblance to aspects of the final gestalt in some ways that we can say that there are germs of the final gestalt in the pre-gestalt series. So there is some continuity of unfolding despite difference. If we look at this from the point of view of the kinds of Being we see that the abstraction of the Figure in isolation is Pure Being. The Gestalt itself in its full tension with its background and the process of refresh of the gestalt with new material after stabilization is Process Being. The series of discontinuous pre-gestalts unfolding is Hyper being, and the germs that show propensities that drive the unfolding that remain throughout the series is a manifestation of Wild Being. The noumenal period itself is Ultra Being which differentiates emptiness and void of Existence. So the noumenal period is mostly Existence with some impurities of Being considered as externality. Microgenesis tells us that the temporal unfolding of perception is a model of the kinds of Being, it is a face of the world. Thus every perception at the microgenesis level is a face of the world. It is like the concept of virtual particles that compose spacetime below the limit of Plank's constant interval which is also a model that includes all the kinds of Being. When we produce a model that includes all the kinds of Being then we are producing a model of the faces of the world. Microgenesis is such a model. But more than that it explains how the noumena interacts with consciousness and transfers difference-in-itself to consciousness as information beyond our projections that tells us something fundamental about the world beyond our projections. In a special state we can take in this information of our total context in a Blink⁸. The noumenal appears as that which is a mixture of nondual and Ultra Being, which then

⁸ Malcom Gladwell (Little, Brown; 2005)

gets transferred to perception from the noumena as Wild Being of propensities, or tendencies, or germs, or seeds that grow through a process of metamorphoses, which maintains radical difference with some continuity of family resemblance, until it produces a gestalt that can then be abstracted into a figure without ground. We seize on the gestalt as the projection itself and forget the metamorphoses, and thus we lose the information of radical difference encoded into the metamorphic stages, but we also lose the information of radical continuity that comes from seeing how the germs are carried in the various stages of genetic unfolding of the perception. We also lose the series of activations of our own brain in the order of its evolution. We lose everything out of the face of the world except the gestalt as a finalized full picture, and its abstraction into a contextless figure. Mythic thought reminds us of metamorphoses as thought itself is produced microgenetically not only historically but in the thinking process itself. Every rational metaphysical thought or doxa has a microgenetic metamorphic precursor pre-thought series as well which mixes up ratio and doxa and in fact is made up of Sense rooted in paradox and Meaning rooted in supra-rationality instead of significance, and semantics. Since thought is later, and still has a nostalgia for the mythopoietic now that it is trapped in the metaphysical, it still considers the metamorphic presages and gives them credence from a literary or archetypal point of view. From these anachronisms at the level of thought we can connect to the possibility of similar presages at the level of perception itself and contemplate their implications. And those implications are that the problematic posed by Socrates is bridged, noumena are no longer totally outside of perception but a stage in the unfolding of perception. There is transfer of not just radical difference but radical continuity information through the metamorphic presages so we hear the voice unconsciously of the noumena in those pre-gestalts and their differences and similarities, and then we see the gestalt itself and see the glosses that rip the figure from the ground and create the

abstractions. The conventional is built up from the non-conventional noumenal presentations step by step, with the information of each step, retained if giving us information about the invisible noumena if we could only slow things down enough to see the unmasked pre-gestalts that are presages of the final gestalt and its decontextualization. But all in all we are looking at a robust process of the unfolding of a face of the world in every perception, and there is a bridge built into our evolutionary biological makeup that bridges between the noumena and the final gestalt which is a reduction of the total information that comes with the pre-gestalts and their metamorphoses. Information is surprise and metamorphoses is nothing but a series of surprises so they are heavily information laden. Most of this information about the noumena is lost to our consciousness but it impacts us unconsciously, and we process it in our other brains⁹, heart¹⁰ and the gut¹¹ as well as at the reptilian and mammalian levels of the brain if it does not register at the higher cortical levels in consciousness or even awareness as part of the social engagement system. Even at the cellular level there is constriction and expansion that is pre-nervous system reaction of life to its environment. So we have a lot of reactive and hidden processing power, hidden mostly from ourselves, which is paying attention to the rich information about the noumena that appears in the metamorphic pre-gestalts where not just radical differences appear but also radical continuities where germs of gestalts evolve through a series of pre-gestalts into final gestalts that we grasp adequately and which we de-contextualize by abstraction.

Now notice that this idea has a very important

⁹ Two halves of the Brain are each dissipative special systems that make up an autopoietic symbiotic whole.

¹⁰ Four chambered, four beats, hyper efficient basis of life which is Autopoietic based on Quaternion structure.

¹¹ Reflexive special system made up perhaps of four dissipative special systems. Processes most of the information about the environment which is unconscious.

implication for schemas theory. Schemas are all abstractions inscribed in Pure Being. So prior to each schema there is a series of metamorphoses that relate to the noumena. We talk about schemas as abstractions mostly, and this hides the point that each schema has its metamorphic modes of pre-schemas that unfold from schematic germs that ultimately are rooted in noumena. This is the important point. Microgenesis does not just happen to forms torn out of gestalts, which are themselves systems when conceptualized. Notice also that the microgenesis also happens between the perception and the conceptualization. So gestalts as perceptions become systems in conceptualization but there are probably microgenetic stages to this unfolding that are metamorphic. That means that between percept and concept there is information rich territory that is largely unexplored. This is just like the information rich territory between noumena and precept that is also ignored. And our General Schemas Theory cannot afford to throw away either the metamorphosis of the percepts or of the concepts for that is where the radical difference and radical sameness is stored that connect us to our environment viscerally, i.e. is the source of our full embodiment. This is the concept that Merleau-Ponty was also searching for when he talks about getting a maximal grip on perceptual phenomena. That getting a grip process is microgenetic. So embodiment is microgenetic. We get into contact with the noumena through our embodiment. And in that embodiment there is not just the schematization as such as concept or percept, but there is the microgenetic unfolding which is the place where Deleuze would like to find the positive/negative-aspects-in-itself which is full of surprise because it is metamorphic but has the germs of wild being embedded from the beginning that are never lost either as singularities from the environment or as propensities in the organism. Microgenesis as a theory solves problems in interpretation of both Merleau-Ponty and Deleuze at the same time as solving tentatively the problem that Socrates postulates in the Cratylus.

And this whole thing applies to language as well. Phonemes arise microgenetically in language acquisition. So the final phoneme that stands alone that Socrates thinks is the conduit for the true name, is something produced structurally as Jakobson showed so well. The phonemes are nodes in a network within a field which arise differentially in respect to each other as semiotic carriers. But phonemes evolve, and continually change as language changes. Remarkably it is children that drive this change because it is they who turn pigeon languages into Creole languages, i.e. they give grammatical structure to language, they regularize, make consistent and complexity language as they learn it in different generations of children. So this means there is a fundamental link between language and games to produce what Wittgenstein calls language games, and these two childhood specialties are both primary examples of systems. What we find is that language is structurally patterned at multiple levels. Games themselves are more flattened and more of a surface phenomena compared to language. Games are behavioral involving the whole body normally or the manipulation of pieces, while language is more to do with the entire person and especially their inward dimension, as is said when we talk about knowing the heart through the tongue. For children language comes out and is about play in many instances. So there is this close symbiotic relation between children's play and language production. But because both are structural, i.e. have patterns that are unconscious and which the participants themselves in their immersion are unaware of that determines their behavior or speech then we can see that the emergence of both play and language together must itself be microgenetic. Language and Games are embodiments of systems. Systems are the conceptualizations of Gestalts. So Language Games are the equivalent in behavior, giving insight into inward and outward coordination of behavior, of gestalts in perception, or systems in conceptualization. Behavioral microgenesis arises in games and language and we should be able to see pre-language-games and we would

expect there to be a noumenal behavioral period before the first appearance of a germ behavior pre-language-game, then a series of metamorphic pre-language-games, until a final maximally grasped language games appears. And in fact there are various kinds of games with different complexity, but these are all final configurations, and what we need to look for are the pre-language-games that are evidence of microgenetic evolution of behavior. This comes out in Somatic Experiencing Therapy sessions as small movements, even germ movements are seen as the key to unlocking traumatic recovery possibilities that are a natural potential of the body. This can also be seen in the Bosnak method of Dream Therapy as well as the David Grove Metaphor method. There are therapies that deal with the pre-language-games that are metamorphic precursors to fully developed adult action patterns. For the most part we miss them or ignore them when they happen as accidents, or embarrassments, or just nervous activity. But they are important for us here because Socrates bets the farm on the singularities that appear within the structural phonetic field as the basis for capturing the true names, from the seed phonemes the true names are build metamorphically. The seed phonemes are stable because they need no other phonemes to express them, they are autopoietic within the field of phonemes. This autopoiesis within the field of language is contrast to the dissipation of the order of the noumena that is different from projected or schematized order. That means that the final piece of the puzzle must be reflexive, and that piece is the ones who are listening for the voice of the things through the medium of structuralized language and games. Those selves are actually not subjects but nodes in a reflexive field, i.e. the social fused group as Sartre calls them or the pack as Cannetti calls them. When we take our eyes off the individuals bodies we see the desiring machines in the field of the socius according to Deleuze and Guattari. When we stop individualizing as is the want of our culture then we dehumanize, i.e. lose site of the Oedipal character, Man, who has four, then two then three legs. Reflexivity is inherently perspectival because we can only

reflect on ourselves if we can take the position of the other with respect to ourselves. So now we find ourselves going around the Emergent Meta-system structure, because perception-cognition moves from the seed to the monad though microgenetic stages. When we have the full monadic swarm fully articulated, then we find we move from the monad to the views via behavior, which is articulated in terms of language games and these produce the multiple viewpoints of the monads which are reflexive. But the next move from views to candidates is what is most interesting. That move is schematization. Schematization is the dual of perception-cognition. Schematization itself is always dual because it is both organizational and dimensional at the same time. And the concept must be that schematization is microgenetic, and that explains why there are multiple schemas, but it also reminds us that each of those schemas are not just the conceptualizations or perceptions of those organizations but the microgenetic stages of the evolution of those schemas as well, which are hidden from us or masked. Schematization is projected by the swarm of views and it produces candidates, i.e. possible envelopes of objects in the world. Because all Schemas are dual, i.e. two dimensions per schema and two schemas per dimension, there is an inherent possibility of cancellation between alternative schematizations at the same dimensional register. The candidates are all possible envelopments of things in the environment, these cancel out leaving just one envelopment for each thing in the environment, one schema gives way to another at the same dimensional level once the dimension has been determined, so that the possible schemas for the same dimensional envelopes is cut in half by the annihilation or cancellation of all the possible schemas. That annihilation process leaves an encapsulation which is organized around each noumena, which is the seed from which the perceptual-conceptual microgenesis cycle starts from again. Full reflexivity occurs when all the candidates are present. Views of monads by other monads by moving into each others places is a defective reflexivity. A full reflexivity

demands multiple possible representations that then cancel. When these cancel then we are back to a seed starting point where every noumena is encapsulated by a spacetime projected envelope which it rebels against producing metamorphoses in the process of moving from seed to monad which is perception or conception. Notice that Annihilation/Cancellation (one physical the other conceptual) which is the transition from candidate to seed is opposite the behavioral transition from monad to view which expresses itself in language and games. Notice that the Creativity of Perception or Cognition is opposite the schematization which is dual between organization and dimension. All four transformational processes that are metamorphic are dual. But the key here which I never understood before is that the EMS structure is microgenetic in the transition between each of its moments via each of its transformations. The transformations are not continuous but metamorphic, and each of them is intrinsically double, so each of them represents a double series in Deleuzian terms as seen in *Logic of Sense*. Metamorphoses are repetitions that do not and cannot repeat the primal event. The endpoints, i.e. monads in a swarm, views in a constellation, candidates in a slate, and seeds in a pod are representations, but the transformations that carry us around the EMS cycle are repetitions in the Deleuzian sense from Difference and Repetition. This is a real revelation to me. It completely solves the problematic posed by Socrates in the *Cratylus* bringing out the fact that the EMS structure is hidden beneath the statement of that problematic. Once we realize that Socrates has set up the problematic in such a way that a microgenetic EMS fulfills the quandary then we get a tremendous insight not just into the subtext of the dialogue but also to schematization itself. It is the dual transformation to perception and conceptualization within the EMS. Schematization balances their creativity. What creativity produces from seeds through microgenetic stages is balanced by the projection of the schemas from the viewpoints

which creates the candidates by microgenetic states. Similarly what the behavior produces in games and language is balanced and complemented by the annihilation or cancellation of the candidates into the seeds. All four representations participate in this duality between two sets of two microgenetic transforms. This duality is very powerful as are all dualities in category theory. It gives us deep insight into schematization which is our subject by putting it into context. Schematization seems to be the problem, it blocks us knowing about the noumena. But when you place it in the microgenetic EMS then you see that it has a role to play within the greater whole that Socrates is alluding to. Projection of schemas and their cancellation is necessary to encapsulate the seeds that are the noumena. Seeds have hard shells for a reason, otherwise the germs inside would be easily lost or pilfered. But these strong shells need to crack open too and allow the microgenetic growth that produces the full blown plant with its monadic leaves. Once the plant is in place within the environment then it mutually interacts behaviorally with other monads in the same environment. Ultimately by producing language games and elaborating them we get views of both the inside and outside of the other monads, and once this inside is produced then it becomes the basis for projection from inside out of the schemas which give us the differentiation of spacetime envelopes in our environment. But schematization is an all or nothing sort of affair and all possible spacetime dimensional organizations are projected. And these are the candidates of all possible things within the environment. An annihilation/cancellation process occurs and note that it is split between physical and logical, i.e. *physis* and *logos* is assumed and this corresponds to the perceptual and the conceptual in the next creative phase. Cancellation and Annihilation leaves us with just one organization for each spacetime envelope of a particular dimensionality. The other organizational schema becomes a ghost that haunts the one that is left in place. But this gives a hard shell or envelope of embodiment for the noumena, which hopefully if fertile will

give rise to a microgenetic effect producing a new round of perceptual and conceptual creativity which gives rise to emergence. Notice that in terms of plant life, flowers are what are viewed and the insects are the viewers who then pollinate as a side effect of viewing. So a symbiosis is created between the monads and the viewers of the flowers, i.e. the insects, another kind of swarm. The view moment of representation is autopoietic so we would expect it to be seen in the biological world in terms of symbiosis. It is the candidates that are fully reflexive and this is represented by the fruits. Fruits are produced to appeal to larger mammals that will scatter their seeds while eating them. Fruits are bundles of seeds that are all endless possibilities for fructification of the plant species. But only some of those seeds fall on fertile soil when scattered by the animals. They fall on that soil and are buried either in the fruit as it rots or in the ground. And this period under ground is the noumena like period in microgenesis. Then the plant unfolds by genetic stages into adulthood expressing the microgenetic stages as stages of genetic unfolding of the organism. The fully unfolded monad which is part of a swarm then engages in embodied behavior which is viewed by the others of the swarm, when different monads take each others places and view each other from different positions occupied by the other proto-reflexive behavior can appear. But acting as a constellation of viewpoints with inwardness then the possibility of group projection becomes possible, thus the fused group or pack projects beyond its dimensionality organizations of higher schemas and builds a domain, a world, a kosmos, a pluriverse, beyond the immediate environment. Schematization is the ecstasy of the *mitsein* that overflows into dimensions beyond those that can be seen, producing the difference between visible and invisible realms that Merleau-Ponty talks about, and making it necessary to make non-nihilistic distinctions. Projection is microgenetic and that results in the different conceptualizations of the organizations of the schemas, but these are based on germ schemas and their metamorphic schemas that are hidden

from us conceptually. But schematization is an all or nothing affair and extra schematizations are produced because there are two possible schema organizations that can be projected at every dimensional threshold. So one must be cancelled out or annihilated based on whether they are based on logos or physus. One becomes a ghost to the other, its virtual partner ready to step in if they schematization does not fit the noumena well. But here we see that the difference between physus and logos is established and thus the non-dual between them of order is also established. And then comes into existence the chiasmic combinations of these terms i.e. the logos of the physus and the physus of the logos. One of these is logic and the other is the schemas themselves. The higher level of order is mathesis that produces the orders. So it is in cancellation/annihilation that the difference between physus and logos is established, and also the difference between logic, schema and mathesis is implied. Our culture has developed logic and mathesis but ignored schematization until the development of General Schemas Theory. Logic implies the difference between set and mass approaches to things and their associated logics. Logic also implies deviant logics and the Gremias square. Schemas become hard embodiments with the cancellation or annihilation process. So we seem to get an inherent split between body, which is the spacetime envelope in extensia and mind which is the ratio/doxa which establishes the cogito. The cogito is established by doubting everything and thus undermining the doxa and the ratio. But the cogito uses the ratio to reestablish certain doxa. It is interesting that all this dualistic way of approaching things we see in our philosophical tradition naturally falls out of the cancellation and annihilation transformation of the EMS. But once bodies have been established for everything within spacetime by the annihilation or cancellation process then what ever has been captured in a projection begins to react to that projection and that is when you get the high information exchange of the perceptual and conceptual microgenesis that creates the stable gestalts of the monads in the swarm. High information

loads are created and exchanged but then they are lost in the final gestalt presentation that appears in consciousness which will be the basis for behavior, which will lead to another projection of schemas, which will lead to another attempt to embody everything in the environment successfully. By working the EMS quickly the environment settles down into stable spacetime envelopes that do not rebel against those confinements. Here the work of Foucault on the genealogy of forms of confinement is significant. Our own systems of social confinement of each other went through a similar microgenetic process of transformations of institutions of mutual confinement. Once the noumena accept their confinements then schematization and perception merge, behavior and cancellation/annihilation of logos and physus merge and the EMS itself as an adaptive genetic algorithm becomes invisible until something changes, i.e. an emergent event occurs where the closure of some part of the world is opened up again and has to be settled then suddenly we are back into the cycle of the EMS again until the problem is sorted out and a comfortable amount of closure is produced within the openness of the clearing in Being.

This microgenetic EMS theory responds to the entire problematic that Socrates has raised in the Cratylus and it structures our understanding of the relation between the various representations within the EMS by understanding the transformations as repetitions that are essentially microgenetic. This essentially solves the paradox set up by Socrates because noumena can speak to us through microgenetic unfolding in perception. Language Games structure behavior of the monads produced by perception. This produces viewpoints which in concert can schematize with a coherent projection, and by cancellation/annihilation we get a world where everything is embodied in a single spacetime envelope, which is the starting point for the rebellion against that projection, that leads to high quality information from microgenesis in perception/conceptualization in the next round. Microgenesis of behavior in games and

language gives high quality information about the group that has the gestalt, that group eventually gets views of itself, but mostly it projects the next schematization, to try to get control of the spacetime organization again, cancellation/annihilation produces duality but also embodiment of the noumena. Duality is continually reinforced with each cycle and that is why Dualistic Views are endemic in our world. The production of the monads in the swarm balances that with the attempts to construct unities in totality that will dominate the plurality of noumenal things embodied. Views tend to concentrate on seeing wholeness, and the projection of the spacetime schema organizations that are dimensional is certainly a basis for determining wholeness. But in producing wholeness by throwing every schema we have against what is out there we over determine the things with the schemas and we need a quick way to get down to one embodiment for each thing so that is where cancellation/annihilation comes in handy as it is a quick way of voting if still very imprecise. As we collapse out of all the possible candidates into a reduced set of embodiments then we start to see how our quick and dirty embodiments rile up the things projected upon, so that they start to rebel and we start to get microgenetic movement toward a new gestalt picture. Notice how we back around the EMS cycle. It is rebellion in the ranks that have been organized, that cause new gestalts, that demand new views, that demand new possibilities, that demand a simplification which is an over simplification which is then rebelled against again, but perhaps not quite so much. The EMS is a quick and dirty way to sort out the environment quickly in a dangerous situation when you don't know anything about that environment, i.e. the worst-case survival situation. The Microgenetic EMS gives us that edge of the least effort way to sort out a dangerous situation. The problem is that we have to live with it there in peace time as well hovering in the background like a restless dragon.

Continued Commentary

We continue our commentary of the Cratylus of Plato. We have reached the stage where Socrates talks about the celestials. They are called another kind of god. And they include not just the celestials but also the elements and the times. So it is here that we enter into the point where we are discussing heaven and earth and have left the discussion of immortals. Heaven and earth, Mortals and Immortals are the elements of the Positive Fourfold of Heidegger which according to Socrates in the Gorgias are the components of the world.

It is fitting that our discussion of the Microgenesis of the EMS comes at this point because this is the point where the etymologies of Socrates most clearly exit the invisible realm pertaining to the Immortals and appear to us in the visible realm of celestials, elements, times determined by the interaction of heaven and earth. In other words this is the point where we encounter existence and leave the projections of the invisible archetypal beings that are the idealization of men, the reflection of men which goes beyond the limits of men, or where we encounter nature in its visible form. That these are considered gods of a different kind shows us that the immortals are not just considered nature spirits. They are something more and deeper than that, they are archetypal, not merely projected shadows of natural visible phenomena as was thought by early investigators such as Frazier.

[Her.] From these sort of Gods, by all means, Socrates. But why should we not discuss another kind of Gods- the sun, moon, stars, earth, aether, air, fire, water, the seasons, and the year?

[Soc.] You impose a great many tasks upon me. Still, if you wish, I will not refuse.

[Her.] You will oblige me.

[Soc.] How would you have me begin? Shall I take first of all him whom you mentioned first- the sun?

[Her.] Very good.

[Soc.] The origin of the sun will probably be clearer in the Doric form, for the Dorians call him alios, and this name is given to him because when he rises he gathers (alizoi) men together or because he is always rolling in his course (aei eilein ion) about the earth; or from aiolein, of which meaning is the same as poikillein (to variegate), because he variegates the productions of the earth.

Socrates links the sun to three words. The sun gathers men, it is always rolling in its course about the earth and it variegates the productions of the earth. For Plato of course the Sun is the sign of the Good. And there is both the inward Sun and outward Sun. The outward sun is the dynamo of life on earth while the inward sun is the source of the production of variety where each gets what it needs which is different. So when Socrates says that the sun is always rolling in his course he means the outward sun. But when he talks about variegation then he means the inward sun. But Socrates also says, between these there is a third sun which gathers men. This gathering of men is the sun which is the good of men which differentiates men from each other as they engage in their daily activities determined by the passage of the sun from night to day. Men gather to what is good in men and good for men, and knowing what is good is part of wisdom, courage, temperance and justice, i.e. virtue in men. So it is very interesting here that there is a middle meaning to the Sun articulated by Socrates. What is between the Analogy of the Sun and the Analogy of the Cave is the divided line. The divided line stands in the middle of the other two meanings of the sun as inward and outward. As a line it demarks the transition between inward and outward. It is a distinction, a non-nihilistic distinction between the inward realm and the outward realm which we must mark with the use of our doxa and our ratio. The limit of doxa is paradox which in quantum mechanics appears as entanglement. The limit of ratio is the supra-rational which appears in quantum mechanics as the superimposition of probability waves prior to observation. In other words we run into those same limits today externally in the understanding of nature. But what is even more interesting is that the schemas are limited by these same limits. Facets appear out of fusion or entanglement that is related to paradox. Pluriverse is made up of separate universes that exist simultaneously and perhaps only interact as quantum phenomena, these are unmixed separate and simultaneous states of existence to which we only have access to our own. So the

limits of the schemas are the same limits as imposed on the divided line. In the case of the schemas they are the limits of the human scale not the limits of understanding as in the case of the divided line. But we cannot deny that there is a sense in which the divided line is orthogonal to the schemas, in as much as in the divided line we see appearances, and that these appearances are tested to discover which are real and which are illusory and this is the difference between groundless and ungrounded opinion when we add in the test of truth, i.e. does the statement still correspond to its context. Notice that truth and reality come to play in relation to doxa as the chastening of doxa. Truth and Reality together are called in Arabic Haqq. Haqq is the counterbalance to doxa, opinion and appearance which allows us to discover what is illusory and fictional. Doxa concerns what appears of the physis and logos which must be distilled into what is true and real so that we are not just lost in opinions and appearances but are grounded in the earth and the celestials beyond our projections. Haqq is all about testing projections to find out whether they are substantial or rooted in the earth and celestials. Visibility or Speech is not enough because there is illusion and fiction.

In relation to doxa there is also the opposite of Haqq which is Sharia which means way or road and it comprises the aspects of presence and identity. At each point along a road something is present and what is moving along the road remains identical with itself despite change. Grounded opinion or grounded appearances are those that have a certain coherence of appearance and have a certain identity. It is the aspects of Being that appear in relation to doxa and are the measures that distinguish between grounded and groundless doxa. The aspects of Being fuse together to produce knowledge at each meta-level of Being. The grounding of doxa is that leads to knowledge of the world beyond appearances and mere opinion.

On the other hand there is the opposite of doxa that is ratio. Ratio concerns the use of nonduals beyond the duals of physis and logos, for

instance the nondual of order. Geometry concerns representable intelligibles that exhibit a certain inherent order. But representable intelligibles are distinguished from non-representable intelligibles. For instance order and right are representable intelligibles, the right amount can be represented as the golden mean, order can be represented by geometry. On the other hand non-representable intelligibles are things like fate and good, which cannot be captured by concepts but only indicated. Deeper nonduals cannot be represented. Ratio deals with the nonduals and distinguishes those that can be represented and those that cannot. The door over the academy of Plato says that no one who does not know geometry should enter, because the whole point of Plato's teaching is to lead us to deal with non-representable intelligibles rather than merely representable ones. Of course, the flip side of the representation is the repetition as repetition and representation are duals of each other as Deleuze has said. There is not just the sun of the good but there is the Sol Nigra, the midnight sun which is black as it is known in Alchemy. Ratio is attunement to the nonduals by the intellect. In the Republic Plato attempts to teach the twin brothers to attune to the inward Good and to the inward of Fate. Fate is represented by the rainbow in the Myth of Er. If the sun gives light, the supra-rational aspect is that this light contains a rainbow spectrum when shot through a prism. The light is both white and colored at the same time. Supra-rationality governs the nonduals oriented to by the ratio. On the other hand it is paradox or fusion that governs the doxa. The doxa deals with the changeable aspects of life and attempts to convert them into knowledge, which is itself a nondual. But ratio on the other hand deals with the vision of the nonduals and its reapplication to representation and repetition. So the ratio transforms from the nondual into the dualistic, while the doxa transforms from the dualistic to the nondual. So we should see the divided line as two transformations going in opposite directions. One applies the sources of Plato to the world through repetition and representation of the non-repeatable and non-

representable. The other attempts to build knowledge by applying the aspects of Being to things. The center point of doxa is void (odd zero -- nil masses of space) and the center point of ratio is emptiness (even zero -- null sets of time). The center point between doxa and ratio is manifestation (sifat) which is a deeper Standing beyond existence. The deepest standing is non-manifest (dhat) which is called nirguna Brahman or the godhead by Meister Eckhart.

All of this says that at each schematic level the two transformations from nondual to dual or dual to nondual can occur. It is these transformations that govern the microgenesis of the schemas themselves. But the schemas as a spectrum of dimensional organizations is also bounded by the same bounds as the divided line, despite that discontinuous set of schemas being orthogonal to the divided line itself which governs the microgenetic unfolding of the schemas at each level. So there is a space opened up there between the two limits in three directions, one the direction toward nonduality in relation to duality. The other in the direction of difference between the schemas as dimensional organizations. There is another direction which is the articulation of the meta-levels of Being of each schema. Notice that when we looked at the hierarchy of schemas, standings, aspects, regions, duals, trinity of ones in the Metaphysics of Emergence studies we found that these finitudes were differentiated as metaⁿ-dimensions and related to fibered rational knots as a series. Knots relate to self-organizations by self-differing self-interaction. Fibered means embedded in their context. Rational means that the knots are produced by algebraic manipulations or actions of horizontal or vertical twists of cords. So this three dimensional space we have found corresponds to the lower levels of the hierarchy of metaⁿ-dimensions. This is to say that the zeroth level of dimensions which are infinite have a finite set of associated schemas. The first level of meta¹-dimensions which are infinite have a finite set of standings. The second level of meta²-dimensions which are infinite have a

finite set of aspects that are dealt with by doxa. The third level of meta³-dimension has the three regions that delineate the relation between the duals and the nondual dealt with by the ratio. There are transforms between representation and repetition as we saw in the EMS structure. But there is on the other hand the structural arising of the mirroring of the EMS from singularities that Deleuze talks about in the Logic of Sense and his article on how to recognize structures. The EMS exists at the Imaginary level of Lacan because it is engaged in mirroring. The EMS itself arises out of the structural symbolic level of Lacan from a topology of singularities. Where there is microgenetic arising in the transformations of repetition between representational moments in the EMS within the Imaginary register, there is also microgenetic arising of the whole EMS from the singularities that represent the Symbolic Structural register called autogenesis. Schematization takes place within the EMS as one of its transformations. The EMS arises from the symbolic structural to inhabit the imaginary in Lacanian terms. Archetypes are at the imaginary register and their interrelations are governed by symbolic structures. So the immortals are imaginary in opposition to the real register of finite mortals. Each metaⁿ-dimension has a finite and infinite aspect. The ratio only becomes necessary once the nondual third position becomes possible beyond the duals that are set up prior to its arising. The duals arise first and the nonduals are defined in terms of the duals. The level of the duals relate to the dual source forms like small and large. For Plato the duals that are related to source forms are always separate, like hot and cold, or wet and dry. These separate duals are supra-rational in relation to each other. After that there is mixture, and with mixture comes nihilism, and conflict and contradiction and ultimately paradox. For instance difference and sameness are core source forms for Plato. To those are added source forms like unity which we get from the next metaⁿ-dimension which is the first of the trinity of ones. Oneness is disunified because there is totality, unity, and uniqueness, which together point toward

wholeness. This is of course the source of the trinity in the Western tradition, which appears in the story of Odin was High, Higher, Highest at the same time. We of course see it also in Christian Theology. So we posit that the space opened up which we thought was perhaps three dimensional is actually the space of metaⁿ-dimensionality. There are infinite metaⁿ-dimensions. But fibered rational knots as the basis of self organization as a sub-set of all knots gives us a finite number of metaⁿ-dimensions that are inhabited by humans as our sphere of finitude, and which is transgressed by the gods who know the higher metaⁿ-dimensions beyond our world. Knowing that the divided line operates between the level of the aspects and the level of the regions gives us a perspective on the entire sequence within which Plato is operating. And what we see is that the standings exist below the divided line and the schemas themselves exist below that. But above the divided line is the level of supra-rational duals of forms and the trinity of ones. So the divided line is actually in the middle: 10, 7, 4, 3, 2, 1³. This of finite metaⁿ-dimensional expressions is schemas, standings, aspects, regions, duals, and trinity. The divided line deals with aspects and regions that separate duality from nonduals within the worldview. The nondual region is the secret connection between the extreme nihilistic opposites that come into conflict and are yang splendor and closed yin. Supra-rational duals do not generate nihilistic opposites. It is interesting that within the worldview there is a distinction between the supra-rational disconnected duals and the trinity of ones. Trinity as we know leads to paradox. So at the root of the finite expressions of the worldview is the difference between supra-rationality and paradox where paradox is more basic. Past the three ones, or trinity, is of course zero, or void which is infinitely deep in terms of metaⁿ-dimensional levels. That void is by definition nondual. That means that nonduality issues into the three ones or trinity as hierarchy of expressions, and then this turns into supra-rational duality. When those supra-rational duals such as Yin and Yang, Major and Minor, generate Yang Splendor and Closed Yin

then you have the interacting duals which must have the nondual backdoor articulated as nonduality is suppressed. The ratio relates the nonduals to the conflicting nihilistic duals by translating them into representations and repetitions. Doxa relates to the aspects and uses them to discriminate grounded from ungrounded opinion and appearances. Then you get the standings that include meta-levels of Being, Existence, Manifestation and non-manifestation. Finally you have the schemas themselves which form an emergent discontinuous spectrum but that spectrum is still governed as doxa by the limits of paradox and supra-rationality. All the levels of metaⁿ-dimensions are governed by those limits set up at the first two levels of the differentiation of the finite expressions within the infinite metaⁿ-dimensional levels. These recurring limits of supra-rationality and paradox at each level are ultimate within our worldview. Within that worldview it is the nonduals like the good and fate that gathers men, but also representational nonduals like right and order gather men. This gathering takes place between the limits of the outward sun and the inward sun, between the sun of doxa and the sun of ratio. The divided line marks the non-nihilistic distinction between these inward and outward realms. It is the circle of ambiguity on the kleinian bottle. That divided line in its own division gives us insight into the deeper standings of the nonduals which is manifestation beyond emptiness and void. Where the nondual itself does not stretch out there is the non-manifest which is the deepest standing. The divided line itself is in the middle between the lower (schema, and standing) and higher (duals and trinity) finite metaⁿ-dimensional expressions.

[Her.] But what is selene (the moon)?

[Soc.] That name is rather unfortunate for Anaxagoras.

[Her.] How so?

[Soc.] The word seems to forestall his recent discovery, that the moon receives her light from the sun.

[Her.] Why do you say so?

[Soc.] The two words selas (brightness) and phos (light) have much the same meaning?

[Her.] Yes.

[Soc.] This light about the moon is always new (neon) and always old (enon), if the disciples of Anaxagoras say truly. For the sun in his revolution always adds new light, and there is the old light of the previous month.

[Her.] Very true.

[Soc.] The moon is not unfrequently called selanaia.

[Her.] True.

[Soc.] And as she has a light which is always old and always new (enon neon aei) she may very properly have the name selaenoneoaeia; and this when hammered into shape becomes selanaia.

[Her.] A real dithyrambic sort of name that, Socrates.

This brief interpretation carries a lot of meaning packed into a small fragment of text. Notice how the text here is broken up into fragments as each word is mentioned in its group. We are engaged in a kind of microgeneiss as we travel through the etymologies. Interpreters avoid this rough terrain because everything seems so arbitrary, so surprising. But we know that with each set of words and their bizarre interpretations we are getting a high degree of information, information about the noumena, from the very seeming disorganization and surprising nature of the interpretations. It is as if each word were some hint of the noumena, and each interpretation is what the mind makes of that which it does not understand. And all the strangeness and the successive stages of grouped words interpreted etymologically seems like the various metamorphoses as the noumena enters consciousness. We will see that we are about to finish with the cosmological etymologies and soon enter the realm of the words about man himself. But first we must make our way though the celestials and terrestrials. And the moon is the next word that comes up paired with the sun which we just considered. Sun and Moon are representatives of course of Yang Major and Yin Major, or alchemically of the Masculine and Feminine principles. These are fundamental principles of nature. Perhaps the most fundamental. And we learned in our interpretation of the sun that there was some nonduality seen in the alternative etymologies presented between the inward and outward aspects of the sun. That middle nondual term is that which gathers men, between the outward aspect that is always rolling and the inward aspect that is the source of variety. Now when we turn from the sun which is a masculine or Yang Major principle to the Yin or feminine principle of the Moon,

then we find something very interesting. Socrates mentions a discovery of Anaxagoras refuted. A discovery refuted means that the noumena has spoken back to us through the dark glass of our experiments and we have learned something beyond our schemas that we have projected on the phenomena. Anaxagoras evidently is credited with the discovery that the light of the moon comes from the sun. In modern physics we know that is true. This is a very fundamental discovery in physics which is normally not mentioned. Anaxagoras¹² was an Athenian Physicist, i.e. of the pre-Socratics that studied physus rather than man which was the innovation of Socrates. Anaxagoras was tried and put into prison for saying that the Sun was not a God. He came up with a completely physical explanation for the creation of the solar system based on the concept of the vortex. He understood the mechanism of the eclipses between the Sun and the Moon. But he postulated that it was not just the Earth that caused the lunar eclipse but also other bodies between the earth and the moon which contributed to it. These other bodies that we recognize now as non-existent, can be seen metaphorically as analogous to the stages of metamorphosis in microgenesis. He may have postulated them because of the oddity of the exact fit between the earth disc and the moon disc which makes a perfect overlapping between the shadow of the earth and the disc size of the moon. This perfection which we now find to be a fact might have been seen as a too good to be true and he might have postulated other dark bodies in order to make up the difference and create that perfection of overlapping. However, it is that overlapping that gives us the phenomena of the corona during the solar eclipse, i.e. the possibility of seeing the sun's atmosphere when the sun's disc is blotted out, which has proved so useful scientifically. This is also the point of the refutation of Socrates as well. He takes the solar corona to be evidence that the moon has its own light and that it does not merely take its

¹² <http://www-groups.dcs.st-and.ac.uk/~history/Mathematicians/Anaxagoras.html>

light from the sun¹³. This is the first meaning of his saying that that the moon has both old and new light. The corona can be seen as the old light, the light of the moon itself, which after the solar eclipse is added to with new light from the sun which is taken away by the lunar eclipse. A key point here is that Anaxagoras saw the Sun as a hot rock, and thus had no idea that it might be plasma with an atmosphere that went beyond its surface through the production of solar flares. So the corona was not necessarily associated with the sun during the solar eclipse but instead with the moon. The refutation in this case is a false refutation because we know both that the light comes from the sun to the moon and that the corona belongs to the sun and not the moon. We know that the sun is not a hot rock but in fact a plasma with an atmosphere. In one case we are talking about a lunar eclipse and in the other case we are talking about a solar eclipse. Just like Venus was seen as two different bodies in ancient times, one the morning star and the other the evening star, so here we have two different eclipses that are conflated in the etymological understanding of Socrates of the phenomena described by Anaxagoras. This conflation goes beyond what Anaxagoras theorized and attempts to point out an anomaly, which is the corona during the solar eclipse which must be from the moon if the sun is merely a hot rock. So this is really no refutation at all in actuality merely confusion in the etymological account of the effects of two different eclipses. But what we see Socrates doing is using the etymology to point out an anomaly that would refute the theory of Anaxagoras. This is the fundamental way that science works even today, and it is by pointing out the anomalies that our theories of physical phenomena change. It is the attempt to explain the anomalies that lead to our ability to get outside our projections and see things in the phenomena we would not see otherwise, due to the overwhelming nature of the projection process itself. It is precisely this point that we

¹³ Sedley, David, *Plato's Cratylus* (Cambridge 2003) page 106

want to concentrate on because it is through the anomalies and their exploration that we learn about the noumena what we would not know otherwise. Socrates is making a double point, that there is an anomaly, and that the ancients understood this anomaly from the ancient times and built the understanding of the phenomena into the language. Unfortunately from our point of view this anomaly is easily resolved by understanding that the sun is not a hot rock, but a plasma body with an atmosphere and that the corona belongs to the sun and not the moon. But the fact that the anomaly is misunderstood by Socrates does not negate the fact that he is thinking in terms of raising anomalies against theories. But he is also thinking in terms of the ancients already having the solution to this anomaly and that it is embedded in language.

But let us look more carefully at the situation because even though the surface argument is wrong¹⁴, we can see that Socrates has the right idea about physical science which Anaxagoras is involved in and it is via anomalies that all scientific progress is made, and this progress is made by listening to the phenomena over our projections of theory onto the phenomena. But also Socrates wants us to understand that the ancients understood the anomaly better than the physical scientist whose theory does not account for the fact that the moon at times seems to have its own light. But perhaps there is a deeper level on which the argument of Socrates against Anaxagoras makes more sense. Because from our own point of view we are talking about the projections themselves and at this stage of the unfolding of the etymologies we are dealing with celestials rather than terrestrials or the time that is produced by their interaction. So if we take the etymology of Socrates from the viewpoint of the discussion of projection then we see that there is an interesting difference between the nonduality of the sun and the nonduality of the moon. The moon is called bright and Socrates says that brightness and light have the same meaning. Then he goes on to talk about the old and new

¹⁴ At least according to Sedley's interpretation.

light of the moon which normally talks about the waxing and waning of the moon during the month. The new light is that which leads up to the full moon and the old light is that which leads from the full moon to the dark of the moon. Here we interpret this line . . .

[Soc.] The two words *selas* (brightness) and *phos* (light) have much the same meaning?

. . . to be ironic. In other words brightness and light are not the same. One is a physical phenomena (*phos*) and the other is an appearance derived from a physical phenomena (*selas*). So perhaps what Socrates is really saying is that what negates Anaxagoras theory is that the moon is not just a physical phenomenon but something more, something that is the opposite of the Sun as Masculine principle. If the Sun stands for the lighting of the clearing of Being signified by the Heaven, Earth, Mortals and Immortals, then the moon must signify the negative fourfold of Chaos, Night, Covering, and Abyss which is the manifestation of the Feminine principle, i.e. everything that is outside the clearing-in-being. Now if this is so then we see that the very different silvery light of the moon represents the four phases of the negative fourfold. Abyss is obviously the darkness of the moon. When the moon is full then we are moon struck and Chaos reigns. Covering is the phase of the moon in which the light increases because the sun is covering the moon with its own light. Night is the time of the fading of the light of the moon from full moon to the darkening of the moon. So we can see that the negative fourfold can be mapped very well onto the flux of the moon. And we must remember that the them of these etymologies is flux. The flux of the sun is its running in circles. The flux of the moon is its darkening and lightening as it manifests the various features of the negative fourfold.

[Soc.] This light about the moon is always new (*neon*) and always old (*enon*), if the disciples of Anaxagoras say truly. For the sun in his revolution always adds new light, and there is the old light of the previous month.

Our interpretation is bolstered by the fact that the text says that the sun's revolution adds new

light while the old light remains from the previous month. In other words there is the concept that the sun casts its light on the moon and that light takes some time to fade. There is a casting onto the moon until the moon is full and then there is the fading of that casting and then the new casting of light comes adding to what was cast before.

[Soc.] The moon is not unfrequently called *selanaia*.

[Her.] True.

[Soc.] And as she has a light which is always old and always new (*enon neon aei*) she may very properly have the name *selaeoneoaeia*; and this when hammered into shape becomes *selanaia*.

Socrates then does something quite strange in that he builds an imaginary word that contains brightness, old, new, always (*sela-hen-neo-aei-a*)¹⁵ and that word which Deleuze calls a portmanteau word in Logic of Sense is then reduced to the normal word for the moon which is seen as "bright always" with only the *n* remaining to signify the old and new aspects that were elided. *Enon* and *neon* reduce to *n*. The point here should be that there is a chiasm between old and new that stands between brightness and always. *Eon* and *neon* arise from the chiasmic reversal of *en* and *ne*. This chiasm that is embedded in the portmanteau words and then elided to appear only as *n*, is a very important description of nonduality. At the level of Wild Being there is the chiasmus that Merleau-Ponty talks about. Reversibility is the closest we can get to nonduality without falling into nonduality. Reversibility shows the minimal difference in meaning that comes from chiasmic words such as feeling-thought and thought-feeling or sensory-intuition or intuitive-sensation. But instead here we have a reversibility of the letters which is true to the emphasis that Socrates gives to the letters. So the moon is as close to the nondual as you can get without falling into the nondual. It is at the point of minimal movement of reversibility. It is substitution and reversibility that takes us into the nondual. So with the name of the moon we see a hidden reversibility that only is marked by an *n* in the word. The word as it stands is

¹⁵ Sedley page 106

brightness always hiding the flux of the old and new that indicate the passage of time. This brightness is the reflective brightness as opposed to the productive brightness of the sun which overwhelms you with its rays. For the most part we see the moon at night if it is visible, but sometimes the moon is seen during the day. Clearly the moon, earth and sun interact with eclipses. And it is these interactions that Anaxagoras is trying to understand as a physicist would concentrating on the phenomena itself. But instead Socrates here is talking about the Sun and Moon as part of the projection process that yields masculine and feminine parts to that process. The Masculine part throws out the Positive Fourfold and it is the sun that lights up that fourfold. The feminine part is related to the negative fourfold and it is more like the rebound where the phenomena protests the dominant projection and exercises its own prerogatives to negate some of the projection producing anomalies. It is these anomalies that cause us to discover new and thus transform what we knew before into the old. Thus it is emergence itself that tells us most about the phenomena by invoking novelty and displacing what is old as ways of looking at things. There is the brightness of the full projection of the Sun onto the moon during the full moon thus covering it with light. And there is the abyss of not knowing anything about the noumena which the moon signifies during its darkening. Between these are the microgenetic phase transitions between light and dark which tells us something about the noumena, beyond the projection process, and beyond merely the unknowable. It is from these intermediary stages associated with covering and night that we can learn the most about the noumena through microgenetic transformations. The nondual sun gathers men who go out in the daylight to make their living out of the house and confront the variety of the good things in the world. But within the household the women of Greece are imprisoned weaving and occasionally carrying water as all myth tells us were the only archetypal activities of the Greek women. It is in this hidden sphere of the household where women dwell that the

changeability of things are kept at bay within the darkness of that interior. That changeability is noted by the betrayal of so many Greek women in myth of their fathers and husbands which made men suspicious of them. The feminine principle ends up representing the noumena and the masculine principle ends up representing the phenomena within the clearing in Being and the structure of that clearing as the positive fourfold. The fact of the menses of the women and the fact that they were related to the moon in their cycle only confirms this concept.

[Her.] A real dithyrambic¹⁶ sort of name that, Socrates.

Socrates interlocutor notes that the portmanteau word that reflects chiasm is a pretty wild interpretation. But the term is also suggestive of Dionysus, the one who leads the women out of their houses into the wilderness to become Maenads and to consort with satyrs. In other words the freeing of women from their household prisons in Greece is like the freeing of the noumena from the projections. When we say always bright we are suppressing internal flux, but that flux is chiasmic because it is so close to the nondual at the level of Wild Being which is the wilderness in which the Maenads roam following Dionysus and ripping live animals and even their own children and husbands apart as they are caught up in the wild animal aspects of themselves while under the influence of mind altering substances. We met the Satyrs before in our interpretation where Socrates likens them with the anamorphs which are both rough and smooth at the same time. On the other hand the sun is clearly marked as differing in its inward and outward aspects and the dividing line between those that allow it to be seen as supra-rational. This hint at the presence of Dionysus marks the

¹⁶ dith-y-ramb (P) Pronunciation Key (dth-rm, -rmb) n.

1. A frenzied, impassioned choric hymn and dance of ancient Greece in honor of Dionysus.

2. An irregular poetic expression suggestive of the ancient Greek dithyramb.

3. A wildly enthusiastic speech or piece of writing.
<http://dictionary.reference.com/search?q=dithyrambic>

transition from the celestial to the terrestrial.

In the celestial realm are two principles masculine and feminine that we see everywhere in Alchemy and elsewhere symbolized. They are the representatives of the Major Yang and Major Yin of the celestial lights in the Chinese tradition which is different from the Minor Yin and Yang of planets and stars.

But what do you say of the month and the stars?

[Soc.] Meis (month) is called from meiousthai (to lessen), because suffering diminution; the name of astra (stars) seems to be derived from astrape, which is an improvement on anastrophe, signifying the upsetting of the eyes (anastrephein opa).

Socrates first mentions the month and then the stars. He has already dealt with the planets. Of course the month is related to the moon. The moon marks out the year into months. It does not quite fit into the solar year, there is an eleven day discrepancy so that the lunar months revolve around the solar year. That is what is meant by the suffering of diminution. Unlike the perfection of the relative size of the disc of the moon and that of the sun when there is a solar eclipse, there is an imperfection in the relation of the length of the solar year and the length of the lunar year.

When we look at the stars in the sky, there is an upsetting of the eyes because there is so many of them. Such diversity, such multitudes, such difference. Most of the celestials are easy to see and stable in our sight but the stars are difficult to see. It is as if the celestials are stages in our perception. The sun is too bright so that if we look at it directly it blinds us, yet it illuminates our world. The moon is also bright but very changeable in its appearance waxing and waning. The planets are roaming around the astrological signs sometimes even moving in retrograde and difficult to predict in their appearance. The stars are too many to see properly except for those that are very bright. The Sun and Stars are Yang because they give off light. The Moon and Planets are Yin because they reflect light. Sun and stars represent the limits of perception one due to blindness and the other due to confusion of the

senses by multiplicity out of control. The moon and the Planets are Yin and represent the inner reaches of the senses, we can see that the moon is like the ratio and the planets are like the doxa. The moon has been associated with intellect in for instance Islamic culture because it is seen as reflecting the light of God in the heart. If we think about it we can see here a representation of the divided line. The Sun of the Good is the limit of the line toward supra-rationality. The Stars are the limit of the line toward paradox as they represent opinions and appearances where perceptions are stretched to their limits. When the senses are confused we can enter into paradox when confusion turns to fusion. So the moon then might be seen as the representable intelligible and the planets seen as the grounded opinions. The planets have irregular motions but those motions can be predicted with a good theory of celestial mechanics. Physics has been hard at work on this problem since Anaxagoras who had the first basic insights into the relation of the Sun to the Moon. But others went on to attempt to understand the planets motion within the celestial sphere which were not fully understood until Newton. But all the great names in physics were associated with this problem prior to the publication of the Principia. On the other hand the moon is associated with the representational intellect where the representations are seen as images of the nondual within duality. Of course, geometry is seen as the greatest example of representable intelligibles. If we stare at the non-duals too long we are blinded and the Sun of the Good becomes the midnight sun Sol Nigra. If we stare at the stars too long we get lost in their multitudes and see patterns that are mere projections like the constellations which are related to the gods and heroes and serve as the canvas for mythologizing. If we reason then we must know that the intellect with its faculties are changeable in themselves and not constant, for instance we need sleep, food, and other diversions. The flux of the moon represents our finitude. If we look for grounded opinion, such as that which would be able to predict the course of the planets and rise above astrology into astronomy then we need to

understand with Hume that there is no law that keeps the planets on course, but that they are a phenomenal if regular process which could stop at any time, and we cannot rely completely on their keeping to that course even though they have always done so in the past because they are still phenomenal events based in physus. It is only when we move to representable intelligibles that we begin to have something that is stable such as geometrical proofs, yet that stability is less than the nonduals themselves which are constants in human life such as order, right, good, fate, source, and root. That constancy that we get with knowledge and wisdom as we approach those nonduals is what gathers men together.