

Plato and the Names of the Gods

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 04.08.20; Version 0.9; 04.09.27; gst07a09.doc

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

Eras of Projection within the Worldview

In the last chapter we discovered that there was a way of reading the genealogy of the Gods such that we could see it as model of the breakdown of the projection process itself. In other words because the mythos is pure projection it automatically models itself such that each detail of the genealogy is a moment in the breakdown of the projection process as it runs into resistance from the noumena which we see as trauma. Because the projection process does not really know anything about the noumena then all of its breakdowns are seen as internal, i.e. within the genealogy itself. There is an opposition between the gods who can only bind each other and the men who can kill each other. The genealogy of the gods talks about the projection as an autonomous virtual realm while the genealogy of the men relates to mutual murder of all different sorts, so there comes to exist many different courts in Athens for dealing with homicide. These courts correspond to the meta-levels of Being. Men came to institute these courts in order to

handle their mutual murder of each other. In the metaphysical era the laws replaced the gods as the source of authority. Laws are written by men to control men and so they are an example of self-organization. In a way they are the dual of the gods who ruled in the mythopoeitic era and communicated by signs and omens as well as oracles. The gods mutual binding is also an image of self-organization, like the threads of the weaver who uses the shuttle that Socrates mentions earlier in the Cratylus. But the self organization of the gods is different from the self-organization of the men by laws. In the laws written rules replace oracular sayings from the mouths of seers like Tiresias and the pythonesses of Delphi. Now laws constrain each other rather than the gods binding each other. The latter is man's own production which is written down. In the Athenian court the time it took for the laws to be read did not detract from the time of the speaker. Mythos instead are the sayings of the bards that are not written down, until later, as those myths are losing their force. Constant repetition stands in for the reference to the written word. In the writing is as Derrida says a play of difference. On the other hand the oral is a process and is rooted in process Being. Today's new media take us from Hyper Being of Difference into Wild Being. There is a transformation from live performance to the stasis of written words back to the animation of the virtual. The same archetypes are playing themselves out in all these realms. The totalized same negative aspects are playing themselves out called difference, absence, illusion and fiction as the background for the unity of identity, presence, truth and reality that are the signs of logo-centrism to onto-theo-logy. The Western tradition went through a long period of subservience to writing that was the basis of civilization. During that time it attempted to suppress writing as a key ontological foundation and instead it attempted to make logos the center of attention within the tradition harkening back to the mythopoeitic realm. Today, it is writing that has become the nostalgic center of attention as we move on to software programming, and various virtual media in which mimesis holds sway. As

writing as a medium underwrote the metaphysical era we are blithely wondering what is the shape of the next era of our worldview. The post-modern is still within the metaphysical. The question is what comes after the meta-physical era. Has it already come to pass and we just do not know yet, or is it still to come to pass that the metaphysical period is merely historical. We expect some emergent event but are unsure whether or not it has already occurred or not. Badiou says it must arise out of pure multiplicity, on the other hand we believe that it is instead a sign of the non-dual. Emergent events are part of break down of the projection process as it is configured in a certain era of the worldview. Does the projection process itself change from era to era? Or is the projection process itself the same from era to era? How much credence are we to give the model of the projection process that we have seen in the mythopoeitic era in the metaphysical era, and how much similarity is that to the projection process in the next era of the worldview what ever that may be. If we see the movement from static writing to software (animated writing of Hyper Being) to artificial intelligence (thinking writing of Wild Being) to the alien (incomprehensible writing of Ultra Being) as a progression, then we would expect a change in the worldview upon reaching the incomprehensible writing of alien Ultra Being. But what is after writing in all its meta-levels. This is what is hard to imagine. Imagining an Emergent event prior to its advent is by definition impossible. The voice and ear of the mythopoeitic are taken over into a virtual world of literacy and controlled by the hand and eye. Perhaps the taste and smell reigned before that during the hunter gatherer period. Heidegger¹ thought that Nietzsche initiated the new era, the era of finitude without transcendence. But this is still just a fulfillment of the Meta-physical which Heidegger says is the period of the retreat of the last gods. When all the gods are finally gone then he believes that this will be the new period. But I on the other hand believe that the final period has to do with non-duality, and think that the

revelation of the Special Systems theory heralds a different kind of fundamental shift toward an understanding of the non-duality of existence. Be that as it may, for us the question arises as to how relevant the archetypal model of the projection process is and how relevant the model of the projection process in the meta-physical era will be to the next era, what ever that may be. The point is that knowing that there is an archetypal model of the projection process where mythos describes itself autopoietically is important, and we would not know that if we had not thought through the argument of Plato's Cratylus carefully attempting to reconstruct the thirty drama lecture. In Plato there is always the 10 drama lecture, the thirty drama lecture and then there is what Plato thinks about himself which he never wrote about but which jumps like a spark from soul to soul after years of companionship. This is the transmission level of the form of spirituality practiced by Plato that he talks about in the Seventh Letter. We consider that this practice is much like Sufism, Taoism, Buddhism and other non-dual heretical practices in various traditions. Non-duality is the core of Plato's teaching beyond the words he writes on paper. That is why he can talk about models of the Special Systems throughout his works. But here we are not concentrating on the non-dual aspect of his teaching that is behind the scenes. Rather we are attempting to reconstruct the thirty drama lecture and move from the what is called in the Sophist the lesser to the greater initiation. In the lesser initiation the man of earth who only believes what he can hold in his hand learns about unseen forces, and believe that the unseen realm is all flux. In the greater initiation the Sophist who manipulates the unseen flux further learns about the stasis that is beyond the flux. Then ultimately these two initiations must be put together and we need to approximate the super-rational picture of change and changelessness at the same time as the Sophist says. Thus we achieve the non-dual picture of the hierophant who is the initiator. For instance, Oedipus at Colonus becomes the initiator of the sons of Theseus at the end of his life. Oedipus has gained inward sight and

¹ in Contributions to Philosophy: From Ereignis

through his anomaly become sacred despite his offenses due to his great suffering. The Oedipus who is the failed initiate and the pharmacon has in the end turned into the initiator of future kings. It is possible that what Oedipus sees with his inner sight is the non-duality that is the understanding of Plato's Hierophant which stands beyond both Heraclitus and Parmenides and understands the supra-rational non-duality and how to make non-nihilistic distinctions. That is what Ultra Being ultimately is . . . it is the non-nihilistic distinction between emptiness and void which vanishes when we go up to the sixth meta-level of Being where Void and Emptiness become indistinguishable and there is no impurity of Being, which we call the standing of Manifestation. Here we want to step back from that non-dual precipice and instead talk about the Thirty Dracam lecture about the stasis beyond flux where the forms live. In the mythopoietic era these are the archetypes of the gods. In the metaphysical era they are the ideas or forms or categories. And in the next era of the worldview they will be something else as yet unknown. We move from the totalization of the negative aspects of Being in the mytho-centrism of the era of speech to the unity of the positive aspects of Being in logocentrism of the era of writing. In each case there is a nostalgia for the last era which comes from the late realization of its meaning. So in the next era we will be nostalgic about writing as we find a new basis in something else beyond writing. We are getting a foretaste of what is to come with the multi-media of the web of the internet. The interactive quality of this new media which incorporates all other sorts of media is very interesting. But we are still operating as if it were mostly about writing and access to the written word of others. Multimedia applications swim in a sea of words written in HTML and XML. There are simulacra of the voice, of images, of movies, of animations, etc. But all this does not tell us about the nature of the new era which is still to come when the era is replaced by some other fascination not based on literacy. Perhaps it has something to do with Style as we see in the Weblog phenomena

where we read the thoughts of others and where everyone is working hard to establish their own distinct style. In that Nietzsche could be very prescient as he was above all else oriented toward style. Let's say for a moment that the next advent of an era of Being had to do with style. Then we would see that it is really a medley of the other modalities that related to smell-taste, speak-hear, and eye-hand. Style might break through the isolation of the sensory pairs that have supported the other eras and their articulation of Being. Style has to do with the total articulation of the entire sensory modality configuration to express a particular unique way of being. In this way being-in-the-schema comes into its own as a way of being related to a unique style, a sort of individual personal designer created lifestyle rather than the mass designer phenomena that we have in the commercial arena today. *Logos* of designers and corporations ultimately become personal *logos* of tomorrow. We get the ultimate refinement of logos as the *logos* of the individual who want to mark their own style. I don't know whether this is it or something else. But some major change will occur and suddenly the ground will shift beneath our feet and we will be in a different era of our worldview. If we did move from direct perception (smell-taste), to mythos (speak-hear), to logos/physus (eye-hand), to style composed of a medley of sensory modalities in play then the *logos* of style differentiation would be the nostalgia for the logos which is opposite the physus. Let us then using this hypothesis about Style do a thought experiment and ask has projection itself changed in this discontinuous transformational process. We need to do this because it is exactly this kind of question that needs to be answered in order to admit as evidence the archetypal model of the projection process as evidence in our court of inquiry. In hunter gatherer society we are assuming that the direct perception of taste and smell were very important because of the need to stalk game and to forage in the forests for edible foods. Once surpluses were produced in the middle east and agriculture became the norm then we entered into the mythopoietic

world of speech and hearing where the mythos was formed because there was leisure to build up the alternative world of the mythos projection. But we know from the cave paintings in France that during the hunter gatherer period there was also projection occurring in the form of shamanism. We think that most of this was totemic as Durkheim suggests but we are not sure. The point is that we can see in the cave paintings the projections of the animals being hunted that filled the world of the hunter gatherer humans. So in a way we could use the caves themselves as a model of the projection process. This has already been suggested in an earlier paper². Because the cave paintings show us the projection process in terms of animal forms and because they include the various schemas we can think of the schemas as a very stable throughout the development of human culture. But we can go further and see shamanism as a model of the projection process itself and read off the walls a model of projection itself as is done by David Lewis-Williams in The Mind in the Cave³. Then we can transition from this version of the projection process and look at the beginnings of the mythopoeitic in the agricultural societies of Mesopotamia, Egypt, and China. In that time the mythopoeitic realm which was probably nascent in the hunter gatherer period became an independent well developed intersubjective fantasy of large groups of people. With the introduction of literacy then we move into the mythopoeitic in which writing becomes the basis of another widespread virtual world of literacy based on the alphabet. Eventually this gives way to the world of style, in which the senses all participate but in which we are removed from the world which has become a simulacrum, like the stock market which has become a whole exchange system based on the imaginary value of money, stocks in companies, and commodities as a form of exchange. Step by step the virtual world pulls free of the real world itself, which is slowly

² See The Future and Past of Schemas Theory at <http://holonomic.net>

³ Thames & Hudson (2002)

more and more devalued and forgotten⁴. There is no doubt that style is a projection, we have the fashion industry, the movie industry, the commodity design industry, and other similar industries to remind us of that. There is no doubt that logo-centrism and onto-theo-logy are projections. There is no doubt that the mythos is a projection. There is no doubt that shamanism that produced the cave paintings was a projection. So all four eras so far and to come perhaps are projections varying in intensity perhaps but no less a real transference phenomena for the human being involved. But does the projection process differ in each stage? I would say it does, but that what is going on is a refinement process rather than a complete change of kind. Schematization can be found in all the eras. Schematization is a constant that runs through them. What happens is that the projection process becomes more refined as we move into the later and later eras. If this is so then we can expect to learn something interesting if we do try to line up the previous projection processes and compare them with the later projection processes. It think this is what Plato is signaling to us in his dialogue the Cratylus. In effect he is saying that we can say clever things about projection at a philosophical level, but that the mythos has more interesting things to say about it that are deeper and ultimately worth thirty dracmas. Presumably if we knew the version of the talk that was about the hunter-gather projection process it might be worth fifty dracmas or more. So my own conclusion until more evidence surfaces is that projection itself as Heidegger says is a human phenomenon and that it is the same throughout the various eras of the worldview. Whether it is the same across all the worldviews that have existed is another question that we cannot even begin to answer, not the least because many of the other worldviews have been destroyed by colonization.

Having answered at least to my own satisfaction the question of the discontinuities between the eras within the worldview and

⁴ A theme in the Matrix movie series. Those movies are almost all about style with little other substance.

their relation to the projection process, we can move on to another question already breached in the last chapter. This is the question about the relation between the letters and the gods as NTR and the noumena of the physis. In the mythopoietic we discovered these three things were fused. The key distinctions were between heaven/earth and mortal/immortal instead of between logos/physis and infinite/finite. What the fundamental dualities in the era of the hunter gatherers or might be in the next era is quite unknown. We have no choice but to concentrate on the transformation between the mythopoietic and the metaphysical for that is what we have data concerning. We don't know that we are close to the end of the metaphysical era. That is only a speculation. These eras last for thousands of years. The Hunter-gather period was at least from 35 thousand BC to 6 thousand BC. The Metaphysical era started about 400 BC and has lasted until today as far as we know. The mythopoietic era was produced by a climate shift that stabilized the planet Earth's climate about 10000 years ago making surplus agricultural production possible. On the other hand the metaphysical era was inaugurated by the creation of letter writing systems which is an internal invention of mankind. The next era will probably be brought about with the synthesis of multimedia on demand globally which is a quickly coming technological change. Style memes will run rampant and rough shod over the inhabitants of the world all turned inward looking at the mirror of cyberspace whose essential nature is the alien.

Detraumatized Model of Projection

Now in the Mythopoietic we hypothesize that there was no difference between the variable of embodiment and the phonemic variable and the gods which have their own names for both themselves and other things. But that the gods for the Egyptians were NTR and thus the basis of what we today think of as Nature or Physis. We have applied Ilm al-Raml to understanding the genealogy of the gods from the Greeks. We saw it was possible to read into Ilm al-Raml a type of Taoism through the auspices of Sidi

Ali al-Jamal. We hinted that we could understand the letters as being related to the 2^5 level heuristic with 32 tetragrams. This produced a connection to Pascal's triangle that was the embodiment variable. And we noted that the gods were like perfect numbers and that Arabic at least had a perfect number of letters. What we did not mention is that there are three vowels plus sukun in Arabic which takes us up to 32 letters, then there are the hamza, the alif-lam/lam-alif, the ta marbuta and blank which are quasi letters which would take us up to 32 letters. Vowels are represented by marks above or below the consonants which give their articulation. The quasi-letters represent anomalies. In other words it is clear that the Arabic is embedded in the form of the 32 pentagrams in spite of its being limited to 28 proper letters. All the other letter systems it is hypothesized are similarly embedded but just do not form a perfect number. Perfection is not necessary. It is merely an anomaly that is of particular interest. It is rather like the golden mean which is another similar anomaly, a natural limit toward which things tend. The golden mean beyond 16 elements would be about 26 and the golden mean within 32 elements would be about 19. Spirals unfold according to the Fibonacci series in nature. But not all plants are spiral. It is merely an optima achieved by some species and not by others. There are myriad possible alphabets. Of those quite a variety have been realized historically, but all that are not syllabaries are under the crucial structural threshold of 32 elements. Not all the structural possibilities need be realized in any one case. Arabic is just a good example because it forms a perfect number and as such represents an autopoietic formation. Our point is that at the structural level the letters need to intertransform and that intertransformation occurs at the level 2^5 . The letters are forms and so we do not normally see the structural level though the forms. The fact that structural configurations are unmarked by letters is really irrelevant because it is merely a historical development that could have been otherwise. But the realization of the nature of the structural level for the alphabets makes us realize their relation to the perfect numbers

which is a significant point. The perfect numbers are the $(n^2-n)/2$ relations between 2^n levels 2, 3, 5, 7. These relate to the first four perfect numbers 6, 28, 496, 8128. The next perfect number is much bigger 33550336. The numbers $2^n = 4$ and 6 are called super-perfect. "The first few (2, 2)-perfect numbers are 2, 4, 16, 64, 4096, 65536, 262144.⁵" Now, this difference between the 2^n being perfect or super-perfect at the low levels is very interesting. The perfect numbers are related to the series of 2^{odd} numbers after 2^2 . The super-perfect numbers are related to 2^{even} numbers after 2^2 . We cut off after 2^7 because the next perfect number is very big and they start to diverge from the super-perfect numbers. But in this low dimensional space of 2^n numbers there is this interesting anomaly of convergence of perfect and super-perfect numbers. It is unlikely that this is an accident of nature or a freak of number theory. What we are getting is a reinforcement of the pattern that if we take an odd 2^n number and we get its $(n^2-n)/2$ relations they will be perfect. So the perfection of 28 comes as the relations between the eight trigrams. Pentagrams and Septagrams are also perfect in their relations. So the eight trigrams have perfect relations which project into the pentagram structural base that again have perfect relations. This means that there is a crucial reinforcement of perfection at the level 2^5 . This perfection at the 2^5 level overflows the structural base of 2^7 which is then again perfect in its relations. It is only at the level of 2^5 that the perfection of relations does not overflow the next structural level. So when we say that there are three anomalous points at level 32, they are the overflow Fibonacci from 16 which is about 26 and the underflow Fibonacci from 32 which is about 19. And then there is the perfect number that is exactly 28. Arabic uses this underflow Fibonacci number as the number of letter forms that do not have dots. Our own modern alphabet is staged at the overflow point. Perfection occurs outside both

⁵

<http://mathworld.wolfram.com/SuperperfectNumber.html>

, See also <http://www.research.att.com/cgi-bin/access.cgi/as/njas/sequences/eisA.cgi?Anum=A0192>
79

the underflow and overflow Fibonacci points but yet does not overflow the structural base as occurs in terms of 2^5 and 2^7 relations. Perfection is odd even with the evenness of the 2^n series. Super-perfection is even in the first two instances in the 2^n series at the quadragram and hexagram levels. Thus levels 2, 4 16, 64 are yin and 8, 32, 128 are yang in as much as they generate perfection based on odd exponents. So 4 both is super-perfect and generates perfection. These levels are associated with heuristics that come from traditional sciences.

| | | |
|-------|----------------------|---|
| 2^1 | Yin/Yang | Prime, Super-perfect |
| 2^2 | Major/Minor Yin/Yang | Perfect relations within structural boundaries of 2^3 level and Super-perfect |
| 2^3 | Trigrams | Perfect relations (yang) within structural boundaries of 2^5 level |
| 2^4 | Ilm al-Raml | Super-perfect itself (yin) |
| 2^5 | Hsing / Letters | Perfect relations (yang) |
| 2^6 | I Ching | Super-perfect itself (yin) |
| 2^7 | Bei | Perfect relations (yang) |
| 2^8 | IFA | |

There are four which are super-perfect in themselves and there are four which have perfect relations. Two of those that generate perfect relations do not overflow the bounds of the next higher heuristic. One is both perfect generating and super-perfect in itself.

All of this is just to come back to the point made in the last paper that when we count the gods we find that they are perfect in their number, and thus all of their divisors sum to the whole. This is the same with the Arabic numbers. They are perfect and represent the relations between the trigrams which are the

ways that heaven and earth interpenetrate. Thus the trigrams as a model of interpenetration show us precisely what the situation was under the reign of Alalu before traumatization occurred in the succeeding generations. In other words if Uranus had managed to continue as cup bearer then things would have been different and the whole would have remained undivided. But once the whole started unfolding then the various gods that are parts of the whole are generated which as divisors fold back into the whole. The analogy for this is the Arabic letters that have the same perfect form. As an anomaly they stand out from the other letter systems. In the best of all possible worlds the gods and the letters would be the same because the gods among the Egyptians are NTR, i.e. the basis of nature. Because the system used for coding is 2^n then we get a fusion of the letters as a phonemic variable to be filled in by a name, a true name given to us by the gods themselves, i.e. from the archetypal collective unconscious, and that true name will apply to an embodiment variable of the 2^n bit coding base from Pascal's triangle, and then finally because they represent the noumena beyond the projection these same gods are aspects of NTR or nature. We see that in the Egyptian case their gods form a structure that is recognizably related to the Special Systems. But then there are infinite local gods beyond the state structure of the gods. These infinite local gods represent the noumena, that are beyond the projection that perturb it. Egyptian letters were given by the Gods and were considered the language of the gods. There were 24 letters. But these could be combined into roots not just of three letters or four like Arabic, but in combinations of one, two, three, four and five. Twenty four is exactly .75 of the structural base. It is not perfect but it is the most divisible number. The point here is only that no matter what the actual letters chose for a specific language, there are these specific points in the structural base which will tend to get exercised and the most interesting of these is where the letter system is perfect and the set of gods is perfect, because perfection is the symbol of the untraumatized projection mechanism. In other

words letter systems that are not perfect may be seen to have been subjected to trauma perhaps as well. And what we see in the structural base is that if we have an unfolding of heuristics, then the first will be the distinction between yin and yang. Then the celestial lights will unfold. They are both perfect inducing in their relations and super-perfect in themselves. Then after the celestial lights we will see the interpenetration of heaven and earth. The various trigrams that represent the separated heavens and earths as the case may be have 28 perfect relations between the segments of the interpenetration body. Ilm al-Raml represents to us the yin receptive earth that accepts the trauma. The level of the Hsing and letters represent the yang celestial cause, and this is a perfect role for the gods to play. However the Hsing also accepts the forms of the letters of which only Arabic is perfect. In as much as Arabic is perfect it represents a perfected form imposed on a structural infrastructure. When the Hsing interact with the earth of Ilm al-Raml then we get the variation of causation and the reception of causation be it from a celestial unseen cause or from a traumatization. The earth unfolds from its receptivity to give us the patterns of the I Ching. That combines the major and minor Ying/Yang lines added as extremities to the tetragrams of Ilm al-Raml. The extremities of yang splendor and closed yin are added to the receptivity of the earth. Finally with the level of the Hsing and Bei the generation of perfection in relations outruns the structural base to support it and the perfection becomes an ecstasy. The next perfect number is fairly far off and so is the next super-perfect number. The series of the two numbers diverges more and more as we continue up the number line. There are interesting things that happen where these two series interact at the base of the tree of the binary number systems. These interesting things give a unique structure to the heuristics and differentiates them between yin and yang. Perfection is something that is projected beyond the heuristic, but for a time upper level heuristics can capture the difference and support its coding. After that the projection of perfect relations becomes an

ecstasy that overflows the structural bases of the next highest binary system. Super-perfection on the other hand is something intrinsic to the binary system itself and is a second order relation with regard to the perfection of perfection. Super-perfect yin heuristics do not create yang perfected relations. But for a brief time the perfection of relations can be injected into the super-perfection of the system itself. At the level of four these two properties overlap. But then they diverge and some heuristics are super perfect and the others are perfect in their relations.

Let us think of the binary system as part of Pascal's triangle being generated from a single Pascal point. This point becomes the intersection point of two Pascal lines and then in the Pascal plain the interference between the two lines gives us the Pascal triangle that generates all 2^n binary number systems in sequence. Think of the Pascal point as the pure projection which is untrammelled. Then think about the production of the two Pascal lines and their interference as the breakup of the projection system. As we go from the Pascal point to the yin and yang binary $1 \Rightarrow 11$ then we get the difference between Uranus and Gaia being created. Within that interspace there are other numbers created that are like the children of Gaia and Uranus and the successive generations. The first thing created is the celestial lights which are major and minor yin and yang. Among the celestial lights are the Sun, Stars, Moon and Planets. There are five visible planets with the unaided eye. From the celestial lights we get the interpenetration of Heaven and Earth next. The celestial lights fall to earth and that is the interaction between Heaven and Earth. But at the trigram level we get the interpenetration of the two realms internally rather than their outward means of interaction externally. At the tetragram level we see the receptivity of the earth and its ability to absorb the trauma from the Yang Splendor and convert that into its nihilistic opposite Closed Yin. This appears as the Ilm al-Raml model we explained earlier. Then the celestial cause differentiations at the

pentagram level into the various causes represented by the letters. These unseen causes get associated with the gods. But each god has its own natural way of manifesting its efficacy. So those various efficacies can be associated with the phonemic variables that are projected onto nature. But the efficacies themselves that are recognized are seen as the NTR or nature itself. When the differentiated Yang interacts with the Yin of the receptivity of the earth then we get the formation of the nihilistic model that includes yang splendor and closed yin that models trauma instead of the action of celestial causes. But this model is only the addition of the celestial lights around the receptivity model of Ilm al-Raml. The hexagrams contain tetragrams capped by single yang splendor and closed yin lines. When we move up to Bei then we introduce another level of perfect relations generation that is an ecstasy just like that of the Hsing. After this point we lose both generation of perfection and super-perfect status and so the Heuristic series comes to an end. This is why the IFA configuration is not a true heuristic. It in fact quickly degenerates into Voodoo. Note here that the heuristics are a model of the detraumatized projection process, just as the gods are a model of its traumatization. Originally when the Gods were NTR there was no trauma but only the manifestation of the noumena of nature transparently or at least translucently. But the trauma picture turns the projection opaque. By comparing the heuristic account to the traumatized account of the gods of the Greeks, or those of the Sumerians or those of the Egyptians it is possible to see how the disturbance in the flow occurs. For instance we see it in the model of the relation of the generations of the gods to Ilm al-Raml. Comparing the Traumatized version to the non-traumatized version allows us to see the distortions that were created by self-traumatization within the projection process as it collapses.

The binary systems are generated from the Pascal Triangle which is the embodiment variable. But within its structure that can be used as bit patterns for minimal coding, there

is the assignments of the symbols which is done by the projection of the phonemic variable. This phonemic variable functions at a very interesting spot in the hierarchy of the heuristics. It is a spot where the perfection of relations does not overrun the ability to be coded into the next higher level. Thus the phonemes have a structural basis that is in the level 32 binary system. Yet different letter systems only realize some part of this structural basis. But the structural basis in terms of heuristic has to do with the differentiating of the celestial causes which are then seen as the archetypal forms of the gods. The phonemic variable is projected and then later filled in with a true name from the collective unconscious as the phoneme relates to the field of already assigned phonemes that have meanings. The phonemic variable is a form that is also related to a sound. It functions both in the register of sight and sound and thus can take us into the virtual realm of literacy. When we see the phoneme as a efficacy of nature, and thus as a representative of the NTR or gods in their Egyptian form then we see how the true names can appear as if from out of nature, because the gods original source is itself the source of our concept of nature. The anomalies that appear from the noumena of nature, which are unknowable like the gods, cause the traumatization of the projection process, and its successive collapse that gives us the generations of the gods, and which is related to trauma absorption which is modeled by Ilm al-Raml. The generations of the gods differentiate the kinds of Being and also the courts of homicide. We can also see other differentiators as well such as the Roots of Being in Old English and the Caste Structure among the Indo-Europeans. Both City and Warfare in Ancient Greece also follow this structure. Slowly we see that the phonemic variable itself is the differentiated unseen cause and that it falls on the embodiment variable in the projection process. Anomalies arise that cause perturbations in the projection process that appear inwardly to that process as traumatization. But the untrammelled process appears as the structure of the heuristics that is encoded into the embodiment variable.

Reading between the heuristics as the example of the healthy projection process and the traumatization of the projection process when it runs into resistance one can get a pretty good idea of the dynamics involved. The unfolding of the heuristic binary system levels from the Pascal point and the unfolding of the Traumatized generations of the gods from Alalu are the two systems we have to compare to get a picture of the dynamics of the projection process with and without traumatization.

In mathematics we have found the primary archetype for the Traumatic collapse of the projection process in the form of the heuristics. The heuristics have to do with the production of the binary systems one step at a time in the unfolding of Pascal's triangle. This unfolding appears to have a meaning with respect to the projection process. If we consider that the projection process is a whole like a Pascal point with the standing of Ultra Being. When the projection process begins to breakdown then it splits into Yin and Yang which are the interval limits of the two Pascal Lines crossing. Yang is the unseen cause and Yin the receptivity of the Earth, so they are like Uranus and Gaia like the Pascal Point is like Alalu. Between Uranus and Gaia there are children produced and these are the lights of the heavens as Socrates suggests, the runners and also the stars. The celestial lights comprise the sun, stars, moon and planets. These represent Yang Major, Yang Minor, Yin Major and Yin Minor respectively. This is at the level of $2^2 = 4$. After that there is the model of the interpenetration of the heavens and earth. In Quran it says that there are seven heavens and seven earths. These are the trigrams where there is the Heaven trigram and the seven earth trigrams, or the Earth trigram and the seven heaven trigrams. They represent interpenetration by conjunction of the nowhere, no-when of the heavens with the somewhere, somewhen if the earth. Notice that the trigrams are formed by wrapping the Major/Minor Yin/Yang form around the Single Yin or Yang from the first generational split. This nesting is the way all the successive

generations are created with the odd wrapping around the odd and the even wrapping around the even. The trigrams are at the level of $2^3 = 8$. Both the Trigram and Bigram levels have Perfect numbers for their $(n^2-n)/2$ relations. That means all the possible divisors of relations add up to the whole number of the relations. Where the Unigram gives us the basic difference between seen and unseen, between cause and receptivity of causation, the bigram gives us the means by which the influence of the heavens reaches the earth outwardly and the trigram gives us the interpenetration of the heavens and the earths through the inward connection of the heavens between parts of the earth. Through spacetime there is an influence of the earth by the heavens through light. Through an inward dimension of the things there is direct connection between the heavens and the earth by their interpenetration. When we get to the Quadragram which is $2^4 = 16$ then we are back to the external relations between things, and we see a model in *Ilm al-Raml*, the Science of the Sands, of the impact and absorption of the celestial cause on the terrestrial receptivities of the four mothers. The mothers are the accepting the repetition of the impact of the celestial father with the earth as either even or odd. This pattern given in sixteen lines is rotated to give the pattern of the daughters producing an image of an interval. Then there is a titration as the various pairs of figures are used to calculate the next deeper level of the absorption and transformation of the impact of the cause. When the impact is abuse then it is Yang Splendor rather than the Celestial Cause, and this was the case with the story of Gaia who got Kronos to attack Uranus. Gaia asked all the brothers and their was a winnowing down to Kronos and this winnowing is represented by the titration process. Finally Kronos is self-selected and he attacks his father and then marries his sister Rhea to produce his children which he eats, until Rhea plots against him to save Zeus, who then overthrows his own Father and makes good the karmic revenge he deserves for attacking his, Kronos' father, Uranus. The stone which is the substitute for Zeus is the Closed Yin which is

the opposite of the Yang Splendor of abuse of Gaia by Uranus. The four levels of winnowing from the mothers to the result are equivalent to the four lines of the quadragram. So here we get a precedence for the structure that Wang Bi finds in the I Ching of the top and bottom lines being exceptional as Yang Splendor or Closed Yin compared to the four central lines which represent the norm. Thus the *Ilm al-Raml* can be read from the I Ching just by grouping the four hexagrams with the same central quadragram. As *Ilm al-Raml* is an image of the receptivity of the earth, so the next higher level is a model of the differentiation of the Yang cause. The earth is the tetrahedron of three dimensional space and the heaven is the pentahedron of four dimensional space. The pentagram represents the pentahedron, in which each point is articulated as either yin or yang. This gives the different possible configurations of the pentahedron. This is the Pentagram which is at $2^5 = 32$ level. It is the differentiation of the celestial cause into kinds. It represents the hypercycle that controls the autopoietic system like the Five Hsing in Acupuncture Theory. The four dimensional pentahedron relates to the icosahedron via the A^5 group. This differentiation of the celestial causes, i.e. the control structure with requisite variety to control the tetrahedral system in the third dimension is the sub-structure pattern of bits which are the basis for the letter forms. Patterns of flux and structure in the third dimension are influenced and controlled by patterns of value and signification in the imaginary fourth dimension where the design that designs and produces itself resides for the autopoietic system. The pentagram patterns wrap around the trigrams and thus contain within them the nodes of interpenetration of the heavens and the earths. The *Ilm al-Raml* quadragrams are the image of the tetrahedron which is the system in the third dimension, the minimal solid in that dimension. The Hsing pentagrams are the image of the pentahedron which is the meta-system in the fourth dimension, the minimal solid of that higher dimension. The relation between these two minimal regular polytopes in geometry ensconces the relation between

these two heuristic levels. The other geometrical regular polytopes of these dimensions are important as well. Their lattices interlock to give a complete description of the cycles seen in Acupuncture theory. The entire set of cycles work together to give a complete picture of the interaction of these two geometrical levels. We live in a four dimensional world but we experience it as three dimensional plus time and thus there is a broken symmetry in our experience of the world. But beyond that asymmetry is the symmetry of the four dimensional imaginary world within which the celestial causes operate that effect the Yin receptivities in this world with their Yang causation. A full explication of these relation would take more time than we have here. Let us leave it for now and merely note that there is a complex interlocking between the four dimensional and three dimensional levels and that this is encapsulated in the relation of Ilm al-Raml and the Hsing. One important point is that there is a mapping between the letter forms of various languages and the structural substrate of the pentagrams. Of these mappings the most significant is that which we have in Arabic which is based on the perfect number 28 which is the same number as the Greek gods. However, this perfection is not significant in itself, but rather what is significant is the relation between the letter forms and the structural substrate at the level 32. In all instances it is not the symmetry but the asymmetry that is important. In terms of language both symmetry and asymmetry need to be balanced. Different languages use up the different resources of the structural substrate differently. For instance ancient Egyptian uses it to articulate 24 letter forms, which can relate to the 24 cell polytope in the fourth dimension. The Hebrew use the structural substrate to articulate 22 letter forms which the Kabala makes much of in terms of their meaning. Arabic uses 28 letter forms but then fills out the other 4 to relate to all the 32 elements of the substrate. Arabic has the perfection that relates to the trigrams and represents the perfect relations between the combinations of heaven and earth. Also the Greek gods just happen to use this same

number of elements. So we point this possibility of mapping the perfect relations that connect the nodes of heaven and earth both to the gods and to letters. In this we hypothesize that the gods themselves can act as the phonemic variable that is projected onto the embodiment variable. Here the structural substrate at level 32 is the embodiment variable and the perfect relations between the combinations of heaven and earth is the phonemic variable. Structure and Form combine to give the sort of connection that Socrates is suggesting occurs in the true name between the phoneme and the embodied noumena which is natural because the gods as NTR in Egypt are the source of what we not call Nature. This connection between the letters and the gods which Socrates implies is the long shot in our exposition and the fact that they are both perfect seems accidental. And the fact that the languages do not connect seem damning. But the point is that Arabic, Hebrew and Ancient Egyptian are all related languages and thus letter systems, and the Egyptians believed that their letters were given to them as the Gods, and were in fact the writing of the gods themselves. So it is not far fetched to believe that they would strive to perfect the letter forms and the form of the system of the gods both independently. We are not claiming that there is any connection between the Arabic letters and the Greek gods. Rather because they are both on the from of the perfect number 28 as a system we are merely using them as a parallel development in terms of the striving for perfection. There have of course been some studies that trace the Greek names back to the semitic origins. And Black Athena by Martin Bernal is an example of such a study. But at this point we do not have to go deeply into this issue because all we are trying to do is show that there is a possible connection between the letters (of what ever language) and the gods as Socrates suggest. The perfection of the letters in Arabic and the perfection of the number of the Greek gods is merely a synchronicity that allows us to make this point as Socrates does but more succinctly. The gods and the letters are both spring out of us as human beings and are features of our

collective unconscious. We think of them as random, but then at times they can appear with a certain perfection that is uncanny in which the numerical form conveys more than we expect. It is precisely this phenomena of unexpected synchronicity that Socrates sees as the sign of a true name. If we go on from here to the next level which is the $2^6 = 64$ level of the Hexagram. This is the level of the I Ching. We now know that it is created by the Major/Minor Yin/Yang bigrams being wrapped around the Quadragrams according to Wang Bi's interpretation. This is the level of the interaction of Heaven and Earth where the full differentiation of the Heavens as celestial causes, seen as dragons, interact with the earth as the bringing together of the Heavenly Trigrams and the Earthly Trigrams in the Ho and Lo river maps. One map represents N^2 of external quality and the other represents 2^n of internal interpenetration of quality. But we can also see that the top and bottom lines of the hexagram are exceptional and that they wrap around the core of the Quadragram. This is the level where there is the 2^6 and 4^3 efficiency in which we can transform from the second to the third dimension without losing any information. Our own DNA makes use of this in order to reduce errors in RNA replication. At the core of the I Ching is the twenty source forms beyond substitution and inversion. Those twenty sources come from the relations of the five Hsing of the Pentahedron to the four elements of the Ilm al-Raml level. They are the fundamental interactions between the five celestial causes and the four terrestrial receptivities that are seen in the elements. Shaykh al-Akbar talks about this in the eleventh chapter of the Mekkan Revelations. After this there is one more level related to Bei which is a Polynesian oracular system which is at the level of $2^7 = 128$. But we can also see this in the Quran as the combination of Suras of which there are 114 and the 14 Al-Mukattat letters that are the insignias for some surahs. Although it is unknown why the 128 is split between the chapters, or suras, and the other 14 are related to the letters. But just like the I Ching is the oldest book and based on the revelation to Fu Hsi, so the Quran is the latest

revelatory book and it is interesting that they have some structural relations to each other. For instance there are a set of four characters that play the role of the Al-Mukkatat letters that appear without explanation in the Quran. After this level there is the IFA divination system from Africa which is sometimes cited as being a heuristic. But as we noted before after the 2^7 level the superperfect and perfect producing systems come to an end until we get to much higher numbers. So I believe that the 2^7 level is a natural cut off point in the series of heuristics. Our point is that these heuristics give a model of the interaction of Heaven and Earth in the breakup of the Projection system that is not traumatic. The story of the gods contains the trauma while the story of the heuristics relates to that story of extremities but gives us a version not so filled with woe. And it is interesting to compare the two versions both mythopoeitic, but one rooted in oracular devices and the other in the mythological stories of the gods. Socrates claims to be oracular in his channeling the names of the gods and others within the Cratylus so it behoves us to study these oracular systems to see if there is any relation between them and the traumatic genealogy that Socrates calls up, and so it turns out that there seems to be some relation, because the heuristics gives us the non-traumatic example of how the celestial cause interacts with the terrestrial receptivities. We can now compare the two stories and see how they intertrwine and yet are different in some areas, with the heuristics being more precise and detailed in terms of their modeling of the projection process, while the mythos is more crude and more extreme. However, finding that there exist these two stories from the mythopoeitic era that give us a theory of projection is an important ontomythological find. It allows us to compare with between the mythological theory of projection and the more abstract metaphysical theories produced by Plato and Aristotle and Kant as well as others in our later tradition. The mythopoeitic theory is more precise and gives many more details than the metaphysical version. And hopefully we can use that to our advantage in constructing our

own theory of the projection process and the role of schematization in that process.

Continued Commentary

Speaking of the Gods, we now consider Socrates' etymologies related to the names of the gods. We have considered the generations of the gods and men, and it is interesting that Socrates moves from that to the question of the body and soul, and then from that to the names of the gods themselves. We assume the main purpose that Plato has is to show that Socrates is not impious. But relating the names of the gods to other words in itself calls into question those names. What we have said is that there is a suggestion that there is a mapping between gods and letters, and that the names of the gods well up from the unconscious to fill that phonemic variable with a name, which is a true name because it is related to the field of all other prior names. We make something of the fact that there is a striving for perfection in both naming and in letter formation and that there is a haunting isomorphism between the Arabic letter system and the Greek gods in that both of them are built on the system of the perfect number 28, which makes them holonomic by definition. It is this kind of perfection that Socrates calls attention to when he says that there are four letters, which are vowels in Greek that need no other letters to give them their names, these letters are autopoietic, self sufficient and autonomous. The fact that they are vowels mean that they run through all of speech adding to the articulation of the consonants. In Arabic, Hebrew and other Semitic languages for the most part the letters are consonants and the vowels are not considered letters. We posit that each letter system is a variation on the structural substrate of the 2^5 binary system. They are forms imposed on this patterning substrate. Essentially all the Semitic letter systems are related, and the Greek gods are based on Semitic prototypes so that the connection between the gods and letters is not so far fetched as it seems. Gods are the efficacies of nature and Letters are the efficacies of language or logos. In the Mythopoietic era there is reason to believe that

these two efficacies might have been conjoined so that the phonemic variable and the embodiment variable, the gods and nature as NTR were one thing rather than different things they become in the Metaphysical era. So what seems somewhat far fetched at first slowly takes on some semblance of a possibility. In the Kabalah for instance the letters are seen as the interconnection between the 10 sephera, which are like the Greek tetrakys, which represent the fundamental attributes of God. We can think that in a monotheistic religion the efficacies called the gods in polytheism would become seen as the attributes of God in a monotheistic religion. Letters are here the relations between the attributes of god rather than lining up with the god qualities themselves. This is different from the letters being the relations between the combinations of heaven and earth. Unless we have a take on what is god like Spinoza it is a very different way of understanding that occurs in the Mythopoietic era verses our own Metaphysical era. What was whole in the Mythopoietic era has become fragmented in the Metaphysical as the fundamental distinctions between heaven and earth or mortals and immortals cut cross wise the distinctions between logos and physis or between finitude and infinity. The mythos was a pure projection. Now our projections are tempered with a constraint by mathematics or the noumena that stand behind physical phenomena, even language has the constraints of logic. But the projections of the mythic era still ran into hard barriers which resulted in the traumatization that flowed as a miasma down through the generations. The traumatization is the inward collapse of the projection as it runs into the alienness of the noumena. We see those traumas as monsters and areas on the map where the monsters roam. But as we have seen this traumatization is based on the structure of the unfolding of the binary systems we call heuristics which are related to the oracles that have been developed by different cultures. By comparing the oracles and their binary substrate to the traumatization of gods and men we find the difference between the natural opposites and their

combinatorics and the nihilistic projection that is seen in the genealogy of the gods. What is new here is the realization that both of these are images of the projection system and that they have structures that relate to each other. Thus by looking between the traumatization of the projection process and the binary system (bit level) substrate seen in oracles we can get a fairly succinct picture of the the mythopoeitic theory of projection, which turns out to be more precise than the later metaphysical theories which are more abstract and less nuanced. We are interested in all the little incongruities and anomalies that appear in the traumatization image as they relate to the pure binary systems that are unfolding in the Pascal Triangle. These anomalies tell us a great deal about the understanding of the projection mechanism when read ontomythologically. The ontomythological reading says that the collapse of the projection process reveals its internal structure that we would not see in any other way. Its difference from the binary systems tells us how much difference there is between the modeling of the natural flow of opposites which are constantly turning over into each other, and the nihilistic superstructure that is expressed in terms of Yang Splendor and Closed Yin. The concept that the mythology is telling us about the infrastructure of our world projection process and articulating its structure is a striking finding if it is true. In this process in the fourth generation there is a field of gods that are created and what Socrates is going to tell us about now is that field of the gods currently in control in the last era of the mythopoeitic, just prior to the establishment of the metaphysical. It is these gods who were the last generation of the gods to reign over men, before men created laws as a means of reigning over themselves and forgot the gods. Heidegger in his Contributions to Philosophy (From Ereignis) talks of the metaphysical era as the time of the retreat of the gods. He believed that the next era would occur when the last god had fled. It was the era inaugurated by Nietzsche's claim that "God is dead." We have since gone through the transformation from polytheism to monotheism. The metaphysical era has been

according to Heidegger the time of onto-theology or what Derrida calls logocentrism. There are constant threats that this last era is over and a new era has begun. When we are looking at Plato's etymologies we are considering a time when the metaphysical era was new, instead of being old as it is now. The gods were still fresh in everyone's mind and accepted by many. When we view this etymology we are seeing someone from the metaphysical era considering the names of the gods from the mythopoeitic era. To him the rightness of their names should have been well considered by the mythopoeitic name giver. Thus the metaphysician is looking for wisdom in the relations between words that are coming out of the mythopoeitic era.

[Soc.] Shall we begin, then, with Hestia, according to custom?

[Her.] Yes, that will be very proper.

[Soc.] What may we suppose him to have meant who gave the name Hestia?

[Her.] That is another and certainly a most difficult question.

[Soc.] My dear Hermogenes, the first imposers of names must surely have been considerable persons; they were philosophers, and had a good deal to say.

[Her.] Well, and what of them?

The comedy now moves on to consider the pre-Socratics as if they were the namegivers of the gods. They are identified with the philosophy of Heraclitus who was the philosopher of flux and becoming. Many of these names will be associated with flux and processes, because this is the lower level initiation according to the Sophist, and since we are in the one dracma speech it is appropriate that the names reflect the lower initiation.

[Soc.] They are the men to whom I should attribute the imposition of names. Even in foreign names, if you analyze them, a meaning is still discernible. For example, that which we term ousia is by some called esia, and by others again osia. Now that the essence of things should be called estia, which is akin to the first of these (esia = estia), is rational enough. And there is reason in the Athenians calling that estia which participates in ousia. For in ancient times we too seem to have said esia for ousia, and this you may note to have been the idea of those who appointed that sacrifices should be first offered to estia, which was natural enough if they meant that estia was the essence of things. Those again who read osia seem to have inclined to the opinion of Heraclitus, that all things flow and nothing stands; with them the pushing principle (othoun) is the cause and ruling power of all things, and is

therefore rightly called *osia*. Enough of this, which is all that we who know nothing can affirm.

Hestia has two sources of her name, one from the lower initiation of flux and the other concerning the essences of things which is from the higher initiation with regard to Being. In Doric there is *essia*, *ôsia*. *Essia* is related to Ionian *ousia* which means "I. that which is one's own, one's substance, property; real property, immovables; II. stable being, immutable reality, hence, being in the abstract, opp. non-being; III. 2. substance, essence; 3. true nature; 4. the possession of such a nature, substantiality; 5. in the concrete, the primary real, the substratum underlying all change and process in nature; 6. in Logic, substance as the leading category; IV. fire-resisting substances; V. in Magic, a material thing by which a connexion is established between the person to be acted upon and the supernatural agent."⁶ Notice the fifth definition which is the material thing by which a link is established to perform magic, like hair. This is perhaps the archaic origin of the words meaning. Magic is pure projection. Here substance is that by which the magic achieves its connection to the person whom the magic is being directed. Then out of those substances some are fire resistant, and thus very stable. This stability is then addressed as the philosophical meaning of the term, which means that which lasts under all the various accidental changes. We call that the essence of a thing even today. It is interesting that *osia* is related to *hosia* which means, "I. divine law; II. the service or worship owed by man to God, rites, offering; 2. funeral rites, last honours paid to the dead; III. *hosias hekati* for form's sake." Here working from the peripheral to the central we see that *hosia* means for the sake of the form of things, but this becomes the form of the funeral rights of the dead, then what service man owes god, and then divine law. Marginal meanings sometimes are the root meanings of words before they are transformed. Here we find it interesting the mention of form which is a

schema. In other words we can interpret this as the fact that the schemas are given by god and they become the schematization of behavior. That behavior is most significant when related to the dead at a funeral or to the gods in service. The schematization becomes divine law when it is realized that there are just so many schemas and they are imposed on us by necessity. So if we take these meanings of *osia* and *esia* then we get a picture of the relation between the schematization in *hosia* and the thing schematized in *esia*. *Osia* is related to divine law of the gods and *esia* to the properties of things based on their material substance, i.e. that which transfers the magic of projection. *Estia* (*estin*) is related to *eimi* (also *einai*) which means to be or to exist. Hestia is of course the hearth, which is the core of the home, and by analogy the hearth goddess. The analogy seems to be that the hearth with its life giving warmth is the core of the household and thus the basis of its substance, since it is used to feed the inhabitants of the house. On the basis of the hearth the inhabitants continue to exist because they are eating the food cooked there. But the hearth is an altar to Hades, and in fact Donald Kunze notes that the ritual tells us that the wives are really married to Hades in terms of their sacred duty to keep the hearth fires burning. The hearth as we know is fire resistant rock in many cases. The hearth is seen as the door way to Hades. There is a legal restraint that binds the wife to the home as property of the male citizen. The wife gives service to the deity Hades at the hearth, and performs the role of Hestia, the one who binds the gods together. Her work is to sacrifice to the ancestors of that home. Her role is that of a form fulfilled in the household of the Bee who stores away what the man who owns the house brings home and then uses it up wisely to feed the family according to the *Oeconomics* of Xenophon. It is a strange thing that the wife is seen as ritually married to Hades. That the fireplace is seen as the gate to the underworld. Perhaps this as to do with the idea that if the food stops flowing then starvation follows. So when the fire goes out and there is no more provision then death is the outcome, and all this is just a reminder of the possibility of

⁶ Henry George Liddell, Robert Scott, A Greek-English Lexicon

death at the center of the household which is about supporting life.

Socrates says remarks on “Athenians calling that estia which participates in ousia” In other words that which has being should have substance but the connection to hestia suggests that what ever has substance has been schematized and that possessing properties and having substance goes hand in hand with schematization which is the imposition of form, for the sake of form as we get in rituals, like the rituals that women perform in their role as Hestia at the hearth of the home in their life giving role, but which is also seen as the door to the realm of Hades when that life giving role is no longer performed. This may be related to the fact that sometimes the ancestors were buried in the hearth.

But the Ousia is then associated with the pushing principle (othoun = to thrust, push, shove, force onwards or away) and the viewpoint of Heraclitus that all is flux. This is of course the leap for we have difficulty seeing why he would go from Ousia to othoun to collect the other meaning which is “thrust, push; I. mostly of human force; 2. force back in battle; 3. thrust out, banish; 4. push matters on, hurry them; 5. pushed off from land; thrust or push away from oneself, force back, esp. in battle; III. to be thrust, pushed, or forced, rush or fall violently.” The only thing that I can think of to bridge the gap is the fact that necessity pushes us to do things we would not do otherwise. Thus the push of divine law as necessity is what inaugurates the flow of change. We are forced by divine law forward into time’s flow and thus toward death or our fates. And this perhaps is where the schematization gets its association with time that is seen in Kant. If time is divine law for mortals. And if again immortals stand outside of time’s flow. Then we can see how we would be forced on or pushed into time by divine necessity. This explanation makes sense but it does not answer the fundamental question concerning Socrates leap from ousia to othoun. It is like skipping stones on the surface of the water. It is difficult to see the reasoning behind

the semantic leaps.

Next in order after Hestia we ought to consider Rhea and Cronos, although the name of Cronos has been already discussed. But I dare say that I am talking great nonsense. [Her.] Why, Socrates?

It could be these leaps of faith that Socrates is demanding of his listeners that causes him to say that he is talking great nonsense, or in another translation he says, “But enough of this, considering that we know nothing.” However, as structuralists it must be the discontinuities that interest us. It is those discontinuities that provide the structuring of the conceptual space that Socrates is helping us navigate. The discontinuities are challenging the continuous nature of the semantic space. Here Socrates is telling us that these etymologies are far fetched, yet we can look at them and see whether they carry significant meaning. In the case of the leap from ousia to othoun there is only the idea of necessity of divine law that we can grasp as straws to connect the two but that gives a connection between schematization and time which is quite unexpected. So we will accept it provisionally.

[Soc.] My good friend, I have discovered a hive of wisdom.

[Her.] Of what nature?

[Soc.] Well, rather ridiculous, and yet plausible.

[Her.] How plausible?

[Soc.] I fancy to myself Heraclitus repeating wise traditions of antiquity as old as the days of Cronos and Rhea, and of which Homer also spoke.

[Her.] How do you mean?

[Soc.] Heraclitus is supposed to say that all things are in motion and nothing at rest; he compares them to the stream of a river, and says that you cannot go into the same water twice.

[Her.] That is true.

[Soc.] Well, then, how can we avoid inferring that he who gave the names of Cronos and Rhea to the ancestors of the Gods, agreed pretty much in the doctrine of Heraclitus? Is the giving of the names of streams to both of them purely accidental? Compare the line in which Homer, and, as I believe, Hesiod also, tells of Ocean, the origin of Gods, and mother Tethys. And again, Orpheus says, that The fair river of Ocean was the first to marry, and he espoused his sister Tethys, who was his mother’s daughter. You see that this is a remarkable coincidence, and all in the direction of Heraclitus.

[Her.] I think that there is something in what you say, Socrates; but I do not understand the meaning of the name Tethys.

[Soc.] Well, that is almost self-explained, being only the name of a spring, a little disguised; for that which is

strained and filtered (diattomenon, ethoumenon) may be likened to a spring, and the name Tethys⁷ is made up of these two words.

[Her.] The idea is ingenious, Socrates.

Socrates moves from talking about Cronos and Rhea to one of the other couples that are children of Uranus and Gaia. They are Oceanus and Tethys. Oceanus is clearly a stream and is supposed to be the stream surrounding the world. Because this Titan is called a stream it reminds Socrates of the doctrine of Heraclitus and tries to say by this association that this doctrine was established by those who named these titans. He makes up a connection between the name Tethys and the spring so that it complements the clear connection of Oceanus to the stream. “diatt-aô = sift, riddle” and “êth-eô = -sift, strain; filtered through; lets it trickle out.” Now let us think about this analogy that Socrates is presenting to us. We have seen that it is divine law that creates the necessity that traps mortals in time and thus thrusts of pushes them into time. But that time is seen as a stream that flows though us even when we are not moving. This is the stream that goes around the world, the ever moving Ocean the boundary of the world. But he is married to Tethys who Socrates claims also has the name of a stream. But he creates that name by combining two words, one for sifting and riddles, and the other for “sift, strain; filtered through; lets it trickle out” Can we imagine that the force of time causes a sifting that is also a riddling which is a straining and filtering which eventually allows something to trickle out. At the end of the dialogue Socrates mentions the cracked pot or the man with the runny nose to suggest imperfect objects. It is precisely this sort of straining that we can imagine is the purpose of the schemata. There are ten schemata that I know of at this time. Everything is forced through that strainer of these schemata. They are forced through by the flow of time. But there is also a riddle there in

⁷ (Têthus). The daughter of Uranus and Gaea, and wife of Oceanus, by whom she became the mother of the Oceanides and of the numerous river-gods (Theog. 136, 337). See Perseus Classical database on web. <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu>

the schemata and that is why there are only ten, why they are caught up in dimensionality, and how do they relate to time. Socrates seems to be suggesting that they are related to time as the predetermined schemas that everything is forced through on its way into existence. The kinds of things only appear after things have been forced through this filter of the schemas. What is beyond the schemas is a riddle. We think that they may be the arche but it is hard to know since everything we see is trapped in the schematization mold. This is just a guess as to the meaning of Socrates etymology but so far his fabrications seem to apply to the problem of the schematization in unexpected ways.

[Soc.] To be sure. But what comes next?- of Zeus we have spoken.

[Her.] Yes.

[Soc.] Then let us next take his two brothers, Poseidon and Pluto, whether the latter is called by that or by his other name.

[Her.] By all means.

[Soc.] Poseidon is Posidesmos, the chain of the feet; the original inventor of the name had been stopped by the watery element in his walks, and not allowed to go on, and therefore he called the ruler of this element Poseidon; the e was probably inserted as an ornament. Yet, perhaps, not so; but the name may have been originally written with a double l and not with an s, meaning that the God knew many things (Polla eidos). And perhaps also he being the shaker of the earth, has been named from shaking (seiein), and then p and d have been added.

Poseidon is the only Greek god of Indo-European origin. Poseidon was given the rulership of the sea. In many ways he is one of the most interesting of the Greek gods because of his Indo-European roots to do with his connection to Horses. His connection with the sea in Greece is a late addition probably. Socrates has jumped from a brother and sister of Kronos to the two brothers of Zeus. Zeus gave the sky and surface of the earth to himself and to his two brothers what was in the sea and under the earth. These are the two invisible realms. Socrates associates self binding with Poseidon and other binding with Hades. He creates the myth that we are bound to Hades by desire rather than constraints because that is the strongest binding, and it is so pleasant in the grips of Hades that no one ever wants to come back. Of course, we bury the dead in the earth. But also those sailors that are lost are

sunk into the sea. So both are places where we are bound to travel and never return. This binding is seen as related to the feet in Poseidon, because we can swim with out hands that are still above the water when we are out of our depth in the water and the water causes the feet to be constrained in the swimming process. Plato also says that he thinks the god knows many things. There is a seeming diversity under the sea that the realm under the ground seems to lack. The point is that both the sea and under the earth stands for the cut off point beyond which we cannot see and that is where the arche lies, i.e. that a priori organization of the archetypes prior to schematization. The name Pluto suggests that riches lie below the earth. And we know that the riches of sunken ships are at the bottom of the sea. Oceanus is connected to Posiedon and perhaps Tethys is connected to the land since she is a spring. It is unclear why Socrates would move from one generation to the next like this but it could be something to do with the recognition of the limits of schematization.

Pluto gives wealth (Ploutos), and his name means the giver of wealth, which comes out of the earth beneath. People in general appear to imagine that the term Hades is connected with the invisible (aeides) and so they are led by their fears to call the God Pluto instead.

[Her.] And what is the true derivation?

[Soc.] In spite of the mistakes which are made about the power of this deity, and the foolish fears which people have of him, such as the fear of always being with him after death, and of the soul denuded of the body going to him, my belief is that all is quite consistent, and that the office and name of the God really correspond.

[Her.] Why, how is that?

[Soc.] I will tell you my own opinion; but first, I should like to ask you which chain does any animal feel to be the stronger? and which confines him more to the same spot,- desire or necessity?

[Her.] Desire, Socrates, is stronger far.

[Soc.] And do you not think that many a one would escape from Hades, if he did not bind those who depart to him by the strongest of chains?

[Her.] Assuredly they would.

[Soc.] And if by the greatest of chains, then by some desire, as I should certainly infer, and not by necessity?

[Her.] That is clear.

[Soc.] And there are many desires?

[Her.] Yes.

[Soc.] And therefore by the greatest desire, if the chain is to be the greatest?

[Her.] Yes.

[Soc.] And is any desire stronger than the thought that you will be made better by associating with another?

[Her.] Certainly not.

[Soc.] And is not that the reason, Hermogenes, why no one, who has been to him, is willing to come back to us? Even the Sirens, like all the rest of the world, have been

laid under his spells. Such a charm, as I imagine, is the God able to infuse into his words. And, according to this view, he is the perfect and accomplished Sophist, and the great benefactor of the inhabitants of the other world; and even to us who are upon earth he sends from below exceeding blessings. For he has much more than he wants down there; wherefore he is called Pluto (or the rich). Note also, that he will have nothing to do with men while they are in the body, but only when the soul is liberated from the desires and evils of the body. Now there is a great deal of philosophy and reflection in that; for in their liberated state he can bind them with the desire of virtue, but while they are flustered and maddened by the body, not even father Cronos himself would suffice to keep them with him in his own far-famed chains.

[Her.] There is a deal of truth in what you say.

[Soc.] Yes, Hermogenes, and the legislator called him Hades, not from the unseen (aeides)- far otherwise, but from his knowledge (eidenai) of all noble things.

If Poseidon is the knower of many things then Hades is the keeper of knowledge of noble things. It is his riches of knowledge that keep those who join him bound to him. Socrates says it is not because of his relation to the invisible but to knowledge that he is difficult to leave. It is his riches in knowledge that binds us to him after our deaths. However, have we thought out how knowledge itself is invisible and also the most permanent of things in our experience. If we associate Hades with invisibility and knowledge then we know him already when ever we refer to our knowledge for where is it? It appears out of no where when we need it, and is no where to be found when it is not needed. Yet it is very stable. Try to get rid of something you know. Our knowledge is the most stable part of our experience. This is why it gets associated with Being, because Being means persistence. One way to think about ontology is that Being is merely persistence of knowledge. That conflates epistemology and ontology which is not normally done. But if knowledge is not Being then what is? That is why Heidegger talks about Being in terms of intelligibility, essentially begging the question between knowledge and Being. But let us think again about the relation between the three brothers, Zeus, Poseidon and Hades. We can see Zeus and Hades as duals of each other. Zeus is the storm god, and thus is impermanent and related to becoming, while we see here that Hades is permanent and related to knowledge. There is nothing more permanent than death. Death is the realm where the soul is separate from the

body, and thus has left the world of impermanence. And we can see Poseidon as the non-dual between these duals. Poseidon relates to the Sea which is mass like. If Zeus rules over the visible and the impermanent and Hades rules over the invisible and permanent, both of which relate to set like objects, then when we move to the non-dual before and between them then we might expect a switch to something mass-like. Before we said that the difference between esia and osia had to do with the difference between substance and divine law which causes time to flow. As time flowed it caused the things to be filtered and sifted which worked as a riddle. But at the Titan level there is a difference between the overall flow and the spring that sifts and filtered what flows. This is like the difference between Kronos who is associated normally with time and Rhea (Rheo to flow, run, stream, gush). It is as if Kronos and Rhea are reversed with respect to Oceanus and Tethys. Oceanus and Rhea are more alike and Kronos and Tethys are more alike. Be that as it may, it is clear that we are moving at the level of the Titans from opposites both supporting flow to the Olympian level where there is a three fold structure where permanence and impermanence OR invisibility and visibility are distinguished. And also the non-dual as a mass-like different sort of thing than the set-like things are distinguished. These are the regions of the worldview and are associated with the three possible algebras ($xy=0$, $yx=xy$, $yx=-xy$). Jung talks about this three way division using the example of Christ, Lucifer, and Mecurius. In this case Christ would be like Hades, Lucifer like Zeus and Mecurius like Poseidon. The regions are generated by the production of nihilism within the worldview. The duals are the nihilistic extreme artificial opposites that appear to be in conflict. The non-dual is the secret backdoor connection between the nihilistic duals, it is this connection which supports the extreme duals, but it is also what is left when the duals collapse and meaning is sucked out of the world. The classical example is Achilles when he realizes that Agamemnon is no better than Pairs when he steals Briseis just like Paris stole

Helen. The Western worldview is based on this process of producing nihilistic opposites letting them play out in conflict until it is realized that the nihilistic opposites are really the same as each other. This sucks the meaning out of the world, but it also makes one appreciate the non-dual because it is the difference between the twoness of the opposites and their discovered oneness. Nihilism passes through a moment of non-duality as the opposites collapse from many to one. That moment of non-duality is where Poseidon lives. It is a moment of a mass-like between two set like states, i.e. a set with two elements and a set with one element. The sea is the secret connection between the invisible and knowledgeable and permanent realm of Hades and the visible and impermanent and ignorant realm of Zeus. And that makes sense because Zeus is Baal, the god of covetousness, and storm gods which are inconstant, but contain much intense lightening and deep darkness combined, i.e. nihilistic opposites. As Plato's stranger in the Sophist says what we really want is change and changelessness at the same time. That means we want the supra-rational non-dual not the alternatives of flux and stasis. We want the hierophants position not the position of the Lesser or Greater Initiates. So thinking about it more deeply we can see that Socrates is actually telling us something significant here. He is saying that the division between Oceanus and Tethys is opposite that of Cronos and Rhea. Both suggest that there is flow, but they also suggest that there is time or filtering or riddling that is different from that flow somehow. And that this binary division moves into a trinary division which is the root of nihilism production in the worldview. In that level the difference between time or filtering and flow gets translated into the difference between Zeus and Hades, and the non-dual unfolds from the two duals. Permanance and Impermanance, Visiblity and Invisiblity, Mixture and Separation, all the duals are suggested. And it is suggested that the moment of mass-like quality between these opposites is what solves their duality. If you lose your set-like state for a moment and go into a mass-like state then you overcome the

limitations of sets that must be one or many. A mass is not built of unities but is rather a totality both one and many at the same time. Plato is always pointing at this non-dual alternative.

[Her.] Very good; and what do we say of Demeter, and Here, and Apollo, and Athene, and Hephaestus, and Ares, and the other deities?

Next six deities are considered. The world has been opened out to express its variety. Many different gods are now mentioned. But they all exist within the framework of the three regions of the world that has now been produced.

[Soc.] Demeter is e didousa meter, who gives food like a mother;

Demeter and Persephone are the goddesses who deal with the realm of Hades in the Mysteries at Eleusis. Persephone as kore is kidnapped by Hades and taken to the underworld. Demeter searches, discovers where her daughter has been taken and demands her return, only getting half of her wish. Demeter is the goddess of Corn and it is precisely this corn that Demeter stops growing in order to prevent Hades from keeping her daughter. She blackmails the gods to get her daughter back by stopping the growth of all plants. So this is her strategy for dealing with the outrage of Hades against herself and her daughter.

Here is the lovely one (erate)- for Zeus, according to tradition, loved and married her; possibly also the name may have been given when the legislator was thinking of the heavens, and may be only a disguise of the air (aer), putting the end in the place of the beginning. You will recognize the truth of this if you repeat the letters of Here several times over.

Hera on the other hand is the wife of Zeus. If Zeus is a thunderstorm then his wife being the Air makes sense.

People dread the name of Pherephatta as they dread the name of Apollo- and with as little reason; the fear, if I am not mistaken, only arises from their ignorance of the nature of names. But they go changing the name into Phersephone, and they are terrified at this; whereas the new name means only that the Goddess is wise (sophe); for seeing that all things in the world are in motion (pheromenon), that principle which embraces and touches and is able to follow them, is wisdom. And therefore the Goddess may be truly called Pherepapha (Pherepapha), or some name like it, because she touches that which is

(tou pheromenon ephaptomene), herein showing her wisdom.

Notice that Persephone is associated with flux even though Hades is associated with permanence of knowledge.

And Hades, who is wise, consorts with her, because she is wise. They alter her name into Pherephatta now-a-days, because the present generation care for euphony more than truth.

Another translation . . .

"[404d] for since things are in motion (pheromena), that which grasps (ephaptomenon) and touches (epaphôn) and is able to follow them is wisdom. Pherepapha, or something of that sort, would therefore be the correct name of the goddess, because she is wise and touches that which is in motion (epaphê tou pheromenou)--and this is the reason why Hades, who is wise, consorts with her, because she is wise--but people have altered her name, attaching more importance to euphony than to truth, and they call her Pherephatta."

Pheromena (pherô) = I. bear or carry a load; II. bear, convey, with collat. notion of motion; III. endure, suffer; IV. bring, fetch; V. bring forth, produce, whether of the earth or of trees; VI. carry off or away

Ephaptomenon (ephapt-ô)= bind on or to, having fixed it as his doom, what should I gain by undoing or by making fast, is or was hung over one, fixed as one's fate or doom, partake of food, 1. lay hold of, touch, claim as one's property, generally, lay violent hands upon, 2. lay hold of or reach with the mind, attain to, 3. apply oneself to, 4. possessing a certain degree of beauty, 5. follow, come next, III. Pass., to be kindled: hence, blush.

epaphôn (epa^ph-ê) = touch, touching, handling, 2. severe handling, punishment, 3. touch, contact, 4. Geom., point of contact, II. the sense of touch, III. external claim.

Persephone was carried away, bound and touched by Hades. So it is ironic that Socrates uses these words to describe the relation to things that are followed and grasped what is in motion with understanding. Persephone is seen somehow as the intelligibility of moving things from the point of view of static knowledge. This is a key point in the question about Schemas. They are static, but objects are flowing through them to become perceptions

in space and time which are organized by them. Intelligibility is the grasping of things that flow into our experience, but from that we build up knowledge. No one knows how that works. How do we get the persistence of knowledge out of ephemeral experience. Only the combination of knowledge and experience is wisdom. Socrates is calling both Hades and Persephone wise. Some how he sees them as combining this work of following and grasping experience and turning it into knowledge. It is very clever to use the Hades/Persephone pair in this way. Hera is lovely air, Demeter is the growth of grains above the earth. But her daughter Kore is stolen to be the bride of Hades and to have this wisdom, which is the basis of the mysteries. Persephone represents innocence and experience. She is the bride who is married to Hades and keeps the altar in the household at the fire place. Demeter brings the grains that are cooked. Persephone is the cook. Half the year Persephone goes through the door to the underworld and becomes the Queen of the dead. At this door way there is the grasping of ideas, thoughts out of experience of perception and transformation of them into knowledge which is persistent. The twisting of the myth to represent this moment by Socrates is very suggesting and interesting but I am not sure we can understand it completely. This is part of the mystery that the Stranger talks about in the Sophist which we must become initiated into. Socrates is suggesting that we need that initiation, to understand the invisible flux of fire, and the invisible stasis of Being before we can go to the non-dual position of change and changelessness in the unseen together, without conflict, which is the non-dual alternative.

What is wonderful about these suggestions of the theory is that with just a few words the mythology itself suggests the details of the theory. We can think of Persephone as the thing which is entering the realm of Being. Socrates makes Being the realm of the dead because in Being everything is static. We are going from the visible and impermanent to the invisible and permanent. So now the whole story of Kore/Persephone is transformed into the story of anything that goes from opinion

and appearance into knowledge, i.e. the realm of persistent Being, i.e. from the realm of Zeus to Hades. And this is precisely the realm of the Eleusian Mysteries, which we do not understand, it is the best kept secret of the ancient world. But the Eleusian mysteries revolve around Demeter and Persephone and somehow give a vision of the next life which gives the initiates solace. But it is this metaphor around which many of Plato's references to stages of philosophical initiation revolve. So in some sense in this etymology we are running into the bedrock of Plato's philosophy which sees the levels of Being in terms of the Initiation process with the zeroth level being the Men of Earth who are uninitiated. Then there comes those initiated into the lesser mysteries who are those who know about the invisible but believe that it is all flux like Heraclitus who is now associated with the one dracma level. Then there are those initiated into the greater mystery who know that there are invisibles that are static like knowledge. This level is associated with the thirty dracma lecture which we are having to try to reconstruct. Finally there is the Hierophant himself who leads and makes up the initiations who knows about non-duality, i.e. change and changelessness at the same time. Persephone is just a girl playing in a field of flowers when she is abducted by Hades, everyone turns away and allows that to happen among the gods. Demeter starts looking for her daughter and has a hard time finding anyone who knew what happened to her daughter. Eventually she discovers the truth and demands her daughter back. This demand is acceded to because she refuses to allow anything to grow until her demand is met. But Persephone has eaten of a pomegranate while in the realm of Hades and so cannot leave completely. Thus she has to spend half of her time with Hades and the other half she can spend with Demeter. This is the explanation for the seasons, when Persephone comes back out of Hades then there is spring and summer and when she returns there is fall and winter. So Socrates is suggesting that there is a circulation between the realm of Being and the realm of Becoming. He is suggesting that the

appearance or opinion is kidnapped and taken away and thus there is the bearing away, the binding and the touching of the appearances or perceptions and that this is the wisdom of Persephone who has gone to Hades and returned. The wisdom of Knowledge of Being of Hades is contrast with the wisdom of intelligibility of Becoming of Persephone. Persephone continually rotates between the two realms, i.e. the realm of Zeus and the realm of Hades. She has the wisdom of that transition from perception, opinion, and appearance into knowledge and back again. Plato specifically says that when something transitions into the invisible realm there is a carrying away, a binding, and touching of the things in the process of movement from one realm to another. The carrying away is connected with movement and is associated with bringing forth. The binding may mean to “lay hold of, touch, claim as one's property, generally, lay violent hands upon.” One gets the impression that it means to follow along with and then to seize and then to touch or grasp. We use the term grasping for understanding. And we use the term knowledge for sexual relations. So there is an erotic component to the absorption of the perception, appearance or opinion into the invisible realm of knowledge. There is the association of rape with the apprehension of appearances and the production of knowledge from perceptions. Notice however that binding plays a role between the carrying away and the touching. Binding is how the gods inhibit each other. We can imagine that the three steps are separated by the kinds of Being:

- Ultra – flowers in the field
 - Kore (meta-system)
- Wild – unexpected traumatic violence
 - Carrying-off (reflexive)
- Hyper – possibilities cut-off
 - Binding (autopoietic)
- Process– visible and impermanent
 - Touching (dissipative)
- Pure – invisible and permanent
 - Persephone (system)
- Ultra – eats fruit

Notice how this conflicts with the idea that this is a bodiless realm. Touching is the transition into the realm of knowledge. And we would say that is true of carnal knowledge. Persephone as Queen of the dead is a Kali like character. She is portrayed as a stern mistress in the underworld. And all this is complicated by the fact that there are hints in the mythology that it is Dionysus that is her consort there. In other words because Dionysus is the only god to experience death, being torn apart by the Titans when he was young, that there is a connection between Hades and Dionysus. Dionysus tastes death and returns from the land of the dead. Dionysus is associated with wildness. Kore is first carried away by that wildness, before she is bound, which must be done because she is a goddess and she cannot be killed. Once bound she is touched by Hades, and this is the rape. But the key is that she could leave as long as she had not eaten anything in the realm of the dead. But she accidentally ate of the pomegranate. Notice its red color and the fact that the seeds are all a jumble within its form. It is a strange unordered fruit with regard to the cells it contains. She probably ate a whole fruit. But that eating was what bound her to the invisible and permanent realm. Notice that she saw the flowers in the field and then when she enters the underworld she eats the fruit. The fruit contains seeds that fructify, and the fructification leads to new plants with leaves, and this then leads to the flowering again in the next cycle of the seasons. What we have here is an Emergent Meta-system Cycle. It goes from seed to leaves to flowers to fruit. What is not mentioned is that when Persephone comes back to the upper world she does so through the seeds and the leaves of the plants, just as she entered the underworld by way of the flowers and the fruits. Once we realize that we are talking about an Emergent Meta-system then we can bring in Special Systems Theory to support our interpretation of the mystery. It is said by some that what the initiates saw was an ear of corn. This suggests that the idea was that after death there was life because the seeds fructified and that led to abundance as with the corn which yields many times the original seed

with one plant grown from a single seed. Notice now that the touching is dissipative, this suggests that the knowledge level is continually growing. The binding is autopoietic which suggests that the knotting is a self-organization. The carrying off is reflexive because all the gods turned away to allow the abduction to happen. There is a collusion in the abduction which is reflexive. Kore is exploring her environment and goes too far astray looking at the beautiful flowers when Hades erupts from the underworld in his chariot. Hades grabs the Kore and brings her into his chariot. There he binds her as they are moving toward the underworld. What is interesting about this story is that it relates the realm of the Platonic forms to the collective unconscious which is preserved in our imaginations as the underworld. One god binding another is the way that the gods self-organize forming knot patterns. Once the Kore is bound then Hades touches her. This intimate contact is the key to transforming experience into knowledge, sexual knowing, and then the combination of knowledge and experience yields wisdom as Socrates says. But the association of touching with dissipation suggests that the realm of knowledge is always growing. We know the realm of Hades is always growing because it is being filled with the dead. What is interesting about this interpretation is that we can see that given Special Systems Theory two touches is a binding, and two bindings is a carrying away. A carrying away is four touchings. This is the chariot. Probably it is driven by four horses. In Merleau-Ponty's terms touch-touching is a chiasm of reversibility. Reflexivity then is a chiasm of chiasms.

Suddenly we have a fairly deep theory about what is happening on the boundary of the visible and the invisible between Becoming and Being. We can see that it is an Emergent Meta-system. That means that we can now look at the transition back and forth in terms of not just the kinds of Being but also the Special Systems themselves. Notice that every element of the myth supports this interpretation. But Socrates has given us the key stages by which

the Kore turns into Persephone. He says that Persephone is related to sophos, i.e. knowledge. She like Dionysus has a knowledge of death. But her knowledge of death is not by experiencing death, but by being abducted by death. Socrates says that people are bound in Hades by desire not by constraint. Constraints are not effective enough to keep everyone from escaping. So he is suggesting that desire is intimately connected to death, because at its heart desire is for permanence, not fleeting experiences. Because we are impermanent that is why we desire permanence and invent immortals as our counterpart. We want most of all to be the immortals we imagine and produce as a mythos. So we are projecting the immortals whose names we are looking at in the way that they are named by men. But that of course is telling us something about the projection process itself. One of the things is that the projection process washes up on the sea of invisible permanence, i.e. Pure Being. We see that it transitions through the kinds of Being as it approaches pure Being. Plato wants to associate Pure Being with knowledge and thinks of Epistemology and Ontology as merged. As we move back and forth from the realm of Pure Being and the realm of perception, opinion and appearances then we pass through the other kinds of Being. Within that there is a passage through the Special Systems layers as well. But this is really a move from the realm of Being of Zeus to that of Hades. But Zeus is a storm god, like a thunderstorm with dark clouds and lightning which is the appearance of the nihilistic opposites in conflict within the Air of Hera. So we get the picture that the realm of Zeus has a different status than that of Hades. Zeus can change the entire atmosphere within the world of appearance, opinion and appearance. But Hades on the other hand gives the source and final resting place of all the living beings that appear. Poseidon's realm on the other hand has to do with the Mass-like quality of the world, as if it were a huge ocean and we but creatures swimming in it as the fish swim in the sea. Poseidon's is the non-dual realm that is between and before the separation of the

realms of Hades and Zeus. Poseidon's realm has depth like that of Hades. But it is filled with animals as well, and not merely shades and eidolons. Notice that if we follow Democritus, of atomic fame, then everything communicates by eidolons like the inhabitants of the realm of the dead. Plato's forms become those eidolons in this model that uses the underworld as the analogy for the transcendental realm of ideas and forms. Persephone is embodied as a goddess within the underworld. But the humans are merely eidolons without bodies. They need the blood of sacrifices to become manifest as more than just ghostly shapes and to regain their wits. The unembodied humans are merely images. Thus the soul is merely an image of the living being that can speak within the realm of the dead but normally they do not speak anything but gibberish as they have gone crazy under the pressure of the ultimate trauma, death. Isn't it interesting that we leave the realm of appearances, opinions, and perceptions to enter the realm of knowledge, but that realm contains disembodied images itself, and that for humans embodiment going out of the realm of knowledge back into the realm of appearances, opinions and perceptions. We cannot live here in Hades, we need to eat and who ever eats from the food of Hades must stay here. Knowledge is an alien environment for us. Wisdom which combines knowledge and experience are rare. But Hades and Persephone have that wisdom, and it is based on the carnal knowledge that comes from their touching, i.e. the relation between the realm of perception, opinion and appearance connecting with the realm of Being as Knowledge. We desire knowledge but it is a fatal desire, and we cannot embody it while alive. Between Being and Becoming is the realm of Poseidon who has the mass-like state that is opposite the set-like states of Zeus and Hades. At the boundary of the interface between the realms of Zeus and Hades we run into the meniscus of Poseidon's mass like realm. Touching is the most basic sense. We touch everything through our bodies and continuously we are touching as a background to all other sensation. The totality of our touching sensation is very mass-

like compared to the other senses that are more set-like. So I think that there is a reason that touch is used to talk about the transition into Hades. The point of entry for the goddess is by touching but for us it is only if we lose our ability to touch with our entire bodies when we die.

There is the other name, Apollo, which, as I was saying, is generally supposed to have some terrible signification. Have you remarked this fact?

[Her.] To be sure I have, and what you say is true.

[Soc.] But the name, in my opinion, is really most expressive of the power of the God.

[Her.] How so?

[Soc.] I will endeavour to explain, for I do not believe that any single name could have been better adapted to express the attributes of the God, embracing and in a manner signifying all four of them, - music, and prophecy, and medicine, and archery.

[Her.] That must be a strange name, and I should like to hear the explanation.

[Soc.] Say rather an harmonious name, as becometh the God of Harmony. In the first place, the purgations and purifications which doctors and diviners use, and their fumigations with drugs magical or medicinal, as well as their washings and lustral sprinklings, have all one and the same object, which is to make a man pure both in body and soul.

[Her.] Very true.

[Soc.] And is not Apollo the purifier, and the washer, and the absolver from all impurities?

[Her.] Very true.

[Soc.] Then in reference to his ablutions and absolutions, as being the physician who orders them, he may be rightly called Apolouon (purifier); or in respect of his powers of divination, and his truth and sincerity, which is the same as truth, he may be most fitly called Apos, from aplous (sincere), as in the Thessalian dialect, for all the Thessalians call him Apos; also he is Ballon (always shooting), because he is a master archer who never misses; or again, the name may refer to his musical attributes, and then, as in akolouthos, and akoitis, and in many other words the a is supposed to mean "together," so the meaning of the name Apollo will be "moving together," whether in the poles of heaven as they are called, or in the harmony of song, which is termed concord, because he moves all together by an harmonious power, as astronomers and musicians ingeniously declare. And he is the God who presides over harmony, and makes all things move together, both among Gods and among men. And as in the words akolouthos and akoitis the a is substituted for an o, so the name Apollon is equivalent to omopolon; only the second l is added in order to avoid the ill-omened sound of destruction (apolon). Now the suspicion of this destructive power still haunts the minds of some who do not consider the true value of the name, which, as I was saying just now, has reference to all the powers of the God, who is the single one, the everdarting, the purifier, the mover together (aplous, aei Ballon, apolouon, omopolon).

An anonymous essay⁸ makes the important point that there is a structural relation between the stealing of Persephone by Hades from Demeter and the stealing of the cattle by Hermes from Apollo, and the subsequent journeys of Demeter and Apollo to regain what they had stolen. Socrates seems to be alluding to this structural relation between Hermes and Apollo in the next section because they are the book ends⁹ to his etymologies of the rest of the gods. We have established that the relation between Persephone/Demeter and Hades as abductor as relates to wisdom and the ideas as timeless is an important contribution of the last section of the dialogue. Now we get a structural inversion with the mention of Cattle/Apollo and Hermes as thief. These cattle are probably the same ones that the shipmates of Odysseus eat as there is a confluence between Helios and Apollo. There is also a parallelism between Apollo and Zeus as one kills the Python and the other kills the Typhoon, both dragons or monsters that represent existence. In one case what is stolen is the means of the gods fertility, as in the case of Helen among women, and in the other case it is the means of agricultural fertility in the form of golden cattle. Objects of exchange are subject to theft. Marriage in Indo-European society is modeled on abduction, and the abduction of Persephone is the mythic kernel of this ritual. The cattle of the sun divides the ordered ritual year into 360 days under Mitra. In Indo-European culture the other five days are given over to chaos under Varuna. So the kidnap of Persephone is keyed into the fertility and revenge cycle which occurs during the lawless days that make up the liminal period at the end of the year. The kidnap of Persephone is the inversion of the normalcy of marriage during the period of order of the ritual year. Hades claims fertility raising up from the liminal underworld to make his claim. Hermes claims the cattle of Apollo thus subverting the order of the upper world of daylight. Apollo must journey to restore that order. This

⁸ The Division of Honors and Journeying Among the Gods at
<http://www.essayworld.com/essays/religion/403.shtml>

⁹ except for mention of Pan

overturning may be related to the difference between pure reason and practical reason as trickery or Metis. Hermes is the trickster and messenger. If we consider Apollo (Athena) [Lucifer] and Dionysus (Artemis) [Christ] as opposites then Hermes stands as the Mercurial non-dual between them¹⁰. The Hymn to Hermes says that . . .

"...also that he only should be the appointed messenger to Hades, who, though he takes no gift, shall give him no mean prize."¹¹

So just as Helios/Apollo was the one who told Demeter what happened to the Kore after Hecate warned her of what happened, so it was Hermes who went down at the behest of Zeus in to the underworld to retrieve Persephone. The prize in the quote above is Persephone her self which he led out of the underworld, but who eventually had to return for half the year because of the pomegranate seed she ate. So Apollo sees the vanishing of the Kore and Hermes helps the re-emergence of Persephone. Thus we see that the structurally related myth intervenes at key points in the more basic myth of Persephone. Knowledge and wisdom that appears from Hades as the realm of Death and from Persephone as she enters and leaves, seems to be related to the difference between logos as reason exemplified by Apollo and mythos as a form of trickery that is metis exemplified by Hermes. Reason as the sun observes everything from afar and can report on the anomaly of Hades appearance in the earth to abduct the Kore. Hermes who has metis sent by Zeus goes down into the underworld but the trickster is out tricked by Hades who gives Persephone the Pomegranate seeds to eat. So from the structural unfolding of the difference between static and dynamic wisdom we get the difference unfolding between logos and metis. It is of course Odysseus who exemplifies Metis better than any other human. Hermes gives Apollo the lyre, and thus is responsible for the attribute of music being attributed to Apollo.

¹⁰ See Jung on Mercurius in relation to Christ and Lucifer
¹¹

<http://sunsite.berkeley.edu/OMACL/Hesiod/hymns.html>

This Socrates says is related to things moving together, as we play music together in ensemble. This comes from the friendship of Apollo and Hermes that unfolded from the cattle stealing incident. Hermes as a baby steals and eats Apollo's cattle but Apollo gives Hermes his cattle for the lyre, but he keeps prophecy for himself except that dispensed by the fates. Socrates relates medicine to purification, archery to shooting, music to moving together, and prophecy to truth and sincerity. Apollo claims all prophecy to himself and denies it to Hermes except what comes through the fates. It is by prophecy that Apollo sees through the ruses of Hermes the child. His bow is always there as a threat behind the scenes. Medicine is not mentioned in the Hymn but is related to purification and purgation. The telling of the truth by Hermes under the eye of Zeus is a kind of purgation for his crimes. The way that Apollo comes directly to Hermes the child and the old man gives him straight away to Apollo can be seen to exemplify the straight shooting of Apollo who comes directly to his goal of finding out who stole his cattle. If we were to stretch a point we could see that logos itself fills these roles. Logos contains an order within itself called logic which allows the parts of speech to move together to form an argumentative dance. Logos aims at the target that is named out in the world and hopes to hit the mark in its rhetorical modes of relating to the noumena. To the extent that names are true then they are divined as oracles and exemplify what lies beyond our ability to know for sure what the noumena might actually be. And the noumena itself is a medicine for us in as much as it is a curative for our over projection which when not curbed leads to excess and sickness of trauma. Trauma is the collapse from within that shows us the nature of the projection process but does not necessarily allow us to see beyond that process to the noumena itself.

Hermes on the other hand is related by Socrates to language and contrivance. Hermes represents the mythos, or speech pulled free from truth, reality, identity and presence. Hermes represents metis or tricky practical

wisdom (street wiseness). So while Apollo as Helios the sun sees the Kore vanish it is Persephone who is brought out of the underworld by Hermes. In the first case Zeus turns aside and does not interfere but does not condone either, but in the second case there is a direct order to bring Persephone out of the underworld, but she can only come out half of the time because she has the seeds of the food of the dead within her. When she appears the plants fructify producing the vegetation of the spring and summer until she must return in to the underworld in the fall. This neither... nor on the one side and the both...and on the other remind us of the tetralemma. Zeus neither condones nor discourages the abduction. Persephone must live both above and below the surface of the earth. Through the both and neither of the tetralemma, the included middle, of para-consistency and para-completeness that Persephone moves between this world of life and the world of death. Reason sees the ideas as present unities within the realm of death while the Mythos by Metis sees the absent totalities of the archetypes that arise back out of the underworld. In the mythopoietic realm it is not logos and physis as a dichotomy that is in question but the difference between logos and mythos, or pure reason and practical reason as metis. Logos is not yet contrasted with the physis through the non-dual of nomos. Deriving the true names has to do with the prophecy of Apollo and his oracles but also to do with the trickery of Hermes and his ability to act as messenger to the underworld. Apollo sets out the duals and Hermes explores the non-duals behind and between them. Hermes deals with what is impure, i.e. the realm of the dead. Yet he is the one who helps the pharamcon like he helps Odysseus. The medicine of Apollo as a pharacon is both poison and medicine. Apollo is the wolfgod, the god of the initiation, of the liminal spaces not just a god of light and reason. There is a darkside to both light and reason and Apollo is the god of that darkside as well. Apollo has the bow and Hermes has the staff. Hermes has his own music which is that of the flute. But he can only access prophecy via the fates as do men.

This is an example of structural metamorphosis of the mythos which Socrates is using to point us to a deeper understanding of the unfolding of the projection process from the dead realm of ideas and archetypes into the world. Apollo and Hermes are the access points for the entry and exit of Persephone. The fourfold nature of Apollo is very important because it points toward the minimal system. Reason discerns the minimal system, i.e. the gods fundamental fourfoldness. The minimal system appears on the background of the meta-system. The meta-system is the deeper ground beyond the ground of the system that allows us to see the figure. Our intention shoots straight when we pick out the form, or system on the various deeper and deeper backgrounds defined by the schemas. In the system or at any schematic level the lower level schemas belong together and move together within the greater schema. We must purify our view of the world to see the things of the world within schematic frames. And to the extent that things fit or do not fit into the schemas we project as archers then we develop a prophecy as to what lies beyond our projections as noumena. In some sense Apollo is the personification of the projection as it appears in the world using the ideas and archetypes from the realm of the dead. But to the extent we pull away and get lost in the pure projection of language then we enter the realm of Hermes who brings back strange artifacts from the realm of the dead which surprise us like the pomegranate whose seeds are disordered inherently.

The name of the Muses and of music would seem to be derived from their making philosophical enquiries (mosthai);

The fates and the muses are sisters and Socrates would have the muses be philosophers who dwell on the implications of fate.

and Leto is called by this name, because she is such a gentle Goddess, and so willing (ethelemon) to grant our requests; or her name may be Letho, as she is often called by strangers- they seem to imply by it her amiability, and her smooth and easy-going way of behaving.

Leto is the mother of Apollo and Artemis.

Apollo and Artemis are opposites complementing Dionysus and Athena. Her etymology is all together euphemistic.

Artemis is named from her healthy (artemes), well-ordered nature, and because of her love of virginity, perhaps because she is a proficient in virtue (arete), and perhaps also as hating intercourse of the sexes (ton aroton miseasa). He who gave the Goddess her name may have had any or all of these reasons.

Artemis is the sister of Apollo and is more like Dionysus as Athena is like Apollo. She is the wild woman who is never domesticated. Here connection to nature gives her heal and a well ordered nature, but she is virgin, i.e. unknown in the carnal and epistemological senses, yet she is also related to arte, which is rta, the Right or excellence. She is as close as we get to a view of the untrammelled physis. Thus the relation between Artemis and Apollo is the relation between Physis and Logos.

[Her.] What is the meaning of Dionysus and Aphrodite?

[Soc.] Son of Hipponicus, you ask a solemn question; there is a serious and also a facetious explanation of both these names; the serious explanation is not to be had from me, but there is no objection to your hearing the facetious one; for the Gods too love a joke. Dionysos is simply didous oion (giver of wine), as he might be called in fun,- and oinos is properly oionous, because wine makes those who drink, think (oiesthai) that they have a mind (noun) when they have none.

Dionysus is not treated seriously out of respect. Merely his connection to Wine is brought up. But wine is cultivated so we see in him nature as agriculture. The wine causes men to have no minds. So in this sense he is opposite of Apollo who is logos and reason, i.e. mindfulness itself. He is akin to Artemis but opposite of Athena who is born out of the head of Zeus rather than his thigh. One is a woman who wears armor and leads warriors and the other is a man who spends his time with women in the wilderness who have gone mad. Dionysus when treated seriously is related to Hades because he is the god who tasted death. He is seen as having a relation to Persephone in his form of the bringer of death to those who do not accept him. His followers have no mind like the wraths and eidolons of hades realm. Because Dionysus visited Hades as a child he is the double of the child that Demeter tried to give immortality but whom she killed instead when the mother barged in

on her as she roasted him.

The derivation of Aphrodite, born of the foam (aphoros), may be fairly accepted on the authority of Hesiod.

Socrates spends no time on Aphrodite but appeals quickly to tradition.

[Her.] Still there remains Athene, whom you, Socrates, as an Athenian, will surely not forget; there are also Hephaestus and Ares.

[Soc.] I am not likely to forget them.

[Her.] No, indeed.

[Soc.] There is no difficulty in explaining the other appellation of Athene.

[Her.] What other appellation?

[Soc.] We call her Pallas.

[Her.] To be sure.

[Soc.] And we cannot be wrong in supposing that this is derived from armed dances. For the elevation of oneself or anything else above the earth, or by the use of the hands, we call shaking (pallein), or dancing.

[Her.] That is quite true.

[Soc.] Then that is the explanation of the name Pallas?

[Her.] Yes; but what do you say of the other name?

[Soc.] Athene?

[Her.] Yes.

[Soc.] That is a graver matter, and there, my friend, the modern interpreters of Homer may, I think, assist in explaining the view of the ancients. For most of these in their explanations of the poet, assert that he meant by Athene "mind" (nous) and "intelligence" (dianoia), and the maker of names appears to have had a singular notion about her; and indeed calls her by a still higher title, "divine intelligence" (Thou noesis), as though he would say: This is she who has the mind of God (Theonoa);- using a as a dialectical variety e, and taking away i and s. Perhaps, however, the name Theonoe may mean "she who knows divine things" (Theia noousa) better than others. Nor shall we be far wrong in supposing that the author of it wished to identify this Goddess with moral intelligence (en ethei noesin), and therefore gave her the name ethonoe; which, however, either he or his successors have altered into what they thought a nicer form, and called her Athene.

Athena who is the complement of Apollo and the opposite of Dionysus and the contradictory of Artemis is related to armed dancing first then to divine intelligence especially moral intelligence. This because she sprung from the head of Zeus fully armed. She is said to lead the troops to battle and there are reports of sightings of the goddess by troops as they went into battle. But she seems to be associated with the dancing of the troops before battle, which is then related to communal dancing of the polis itself. So while Apollo is related to logos and order of reason so Athena is related to order of action. Dionysus is related to disorder of both mind and action. Artemis is related to natural action. Athena acts as mentor to Odysseus, while Dionysus as the Suitors

guards Penelope back home.

[Her.] But what do you say of Hephaestus?

[Soc.] Speak you of the princely lord of light (Phaeos istora)?

[Her.] Surely.

[Soc.] Ephaistos is Phaistos, and has added the e by attraction; that is obvious to anybody.

[Her.] That is very probable, until some more probable notion gets into your head.

Euphemistic etymology.

[Soc.] To prevent that, you had better ask what is the derivation of Ares.

[Her.] What is Ares?

[Soc.] Ares may be called, if you will, from his manhood (arren) and manliness, or if you please, from his hard and unchangeable nature, which is the meaning of arratos: the latter is a derivation in every way appropriate to the God of war.

[Her.] Very true.

Obvious etymology.

[Soc.] And now, by the Gods, let us have no more of the Gods, for I am afraid of them; ask about anything but them, and thou shalt see how the steeds of Euthyphro can prance.

Socrates has been rushing through the gods looking for closure. None of the other Etymologies have brought out anything structural other than the complementarities between Athena, Artemis, Dionysus and Apollo. Finally he reaches the end where the opposite of Apollo appears in Hermes which closes off the rush through the other gods mostly with euphemistic etymologies that do not allude to their myths.

[Her.] Only one more God! I should like to know about Hermes, of whom I am said not to be a true son. Let us make him out, and then I shall know whether there is any meaning in what Cratylus says.

[Soc.] I should imagine that the name Hermes has to do with speech, and signifies that he is the interpreter (ermeneus), or messenger, or thief, or liar, or bargainer; all that sort of thing has a great deal to do with language; as I was telling you the word eirein is expressive of the use of speech, and there is an often-recurring Homeric word emesato, which means "he contrived"- out of these two words, eirein and mesasthai, the legislator formed the name of the God who invented language and speech; and we may imagine him dictating to us the use of this name: "O my friends," says he to us, "seeing that he is the contriver of tales or speeches, you may rightly call him Eirhemes." And this has been improved by us, as we think, into Hermes.

Iris also appears to have been called from the verb "to tell" (eirein), because she was a messenger.

[Her.] Then I am very sure that Cratylus was quite right in saying that I was no true son of Hermes (Ermogenes), for I am not a good hand at speeches.

Here is a key point where Hermogenes admits that his name really is wrong from him as Cratylus has said. This is the turning point in the dialogue which will soon consider turning the argument of Cratylus upside down.

[Soc.] There is also reason, my friend, in Pan being the double-formed son of Hermes.

[Her.] How do you make that out?

[Soc.] You are aware that speech signifies all things (pan), and is always turning them round and round, and has two forms, true and false?

[Her.] Certainly.

[Soc.] Is not the truth that is in him the smooth or sacred form which dwells above among the Gods, whereas falsehood dwells among men below, and is rough like the goat of tragedy; for tales and falsehoods have generally to do with the tragic or goatish life, and tragedy is the place of them?

[Her.] Very true.

[Soc.] Then surely Pan, who is the declarer of all things (pan) and the perpetual mover (aei polon) of all things, is rightly called aipolos (goat-herd), he being the two-formed son of Hermes, smooth in his upper part, and rough and goatlike in his lower regions. And, as the son of Hermes, he is speech or the brother of speech, and that brother should be like brother is no marvel. But, as I was saying, my dear Hermogenes, let us get away from the Gods.

Socrates ends with the Satyr like god Pan child of Hermes who is most like himself. He then connects himself to the journey of Hermes to the underworld and back out again. Pan declares all things, which could be sophisticated if it were not truths, realities, identities and presences he was declaring in his speech. He is the perpetual mover of all things and thus related not just to speech but movement, thus to both logos and physis. Like the satyr Pan is rough below and smooth above and thus like logos and physis is made up of two natures that are fused in the same living being as all men are. Pan is the brother of speech. It is interesting that Socrates ends with and connects himself to thereby Pan and not Apollo. He is connecting us with the one who goes to the underworld and is thus made both smooth and rough at the same time, rather than just the one who sees the abduction from the heights of the sun which is the outward form of the Good. Rather we need to see the inward form of the Good in the underworld, the

midnight sun, sol nigra. By bringing the midnight sun into the world and realizing that it is the same as the sun of Apollo/Helios then we are realizing non-duality which goes beyond the division between life/ death and upperworld/ underworld and conscious/ unconscious.

Socrates wants to flee the Gods and their possible wrath, showing he is pious. But his exploration of the names of the gods has shown us that there is wisdom in the mythology which is reflexive, i.e. is an image of the structure of the projection process itself. Structural relations between the metamorphoses of the mythology tell us about the unfolding of the projection process. Thus Socrates allows the mythology and the names of the gods to speak for him. The myth carries the weight of the argument and he merely refers to it with side glances and signs in order to make his point that the names of the gods really do carry a wisdom, a wisdom about the projection process itself as it collapses within under trauma and as it metamorphoses structurally creating important dichotomies such as that between Persephone and Hades or Apollo and Hermes, or between the fourfold of nihilism which is Apollo/ Artemis// Dionysus/ Athena.

Socrates relates himself to the satyr Pan and claims that Pan can talk of all things, which is the sign of the Sophist. He relates the turning around of Pan with his smooth and rough parts as the relation of the aspects of Being, true and false. The sophists say all speeches are true, all points of view are true. Socrates things that a non-nihilistic distinction can be made between these and the other aspects of Being. But also Pan is related to Becoming because he moves all things, and thus is related to the endless flux. But Pan is super-rational because Pan embodies these differences all at the same time. Pan is an Anamorph. But also Pan is said to have died. I.e. been an image of the last God who the sailor heard tell that the great god Pan was dead on his voyage. So Pan like Dionysus tastes death. But there is no resurrection for Pan. His death is a sign of the death of all the

gods. As Heidegger says in the metaphysical era all the gods are fleeing and we are waiting for the passing of the last god which when it happens will be announced like the death of Pan. Pan means all. Pan is totality. From it we get Pantheism, the religion of Spinoza in which creation itself becomes God. Pan is the god of the Deists. In Pan Nature becomes god. The Gods return to being NTR which was the name of the gods for the Egyptians. When nature as a god dies then materialism is the result and we enter into the Mirror of Production¹².

¹² See Baudrillard