

Plato and Terrestrials

The Foundations of General Schemas Theory

Kent D. Palmer, Ph.D.

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

Copyright 2005 K.D. Palmer.

All Rights Reserved. Not for distribution.

Started 05.02.14; Version 0.3; 05.02.20; gst09a03.doc

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

Morphogenesis of Meaning

After explaining the way in which microgenesis solves the problem posed by Socrates in the Cratylus and understanding the mostly incomprehensible etymologies in the Cratylus are themselves a simulation of such a microgenesis, to behooves us to go further and consider even deeper levels of unfolding beyond the appearance of the microgenetic Emergent Meta-system. In order to understand this it is wise to look at the work of Jean Petitot called Morphogenesis of Meaning¹ in which he recognizes the description of Deleuze as a good definition of Structuralism. He points us to the article by Deleuze early in his career in which he talks about how to recognize a structuralism², and it turns out that this article contains all the marks that appear in the Logic

¹ (Peter Lang 2004)

² Deleuze, G; "How do we recognize Structuralism?" in Desert Islands; (Semiotext(e), 2004); page 170; Original Publication 1972.

of Sense³ some time earlier. But in the Logic of Sense Deleuze does not mention structuralism, per se. To understand that the comprehension of structuralism was a key goal of the work of Deleuze is very important because it gives us a reference point to understand his highly cryptic writings. The later article on how to recognize a structure is like a map for us of the territory, which he explores more thoroughly earlier in more detail. The fact that Jean Petitot underwrites his description of Structuralism is very significant, because it is clear that of all the structuralists and post structuralists it is Deleuze who has thought most deeply about the laying of the foundations of structuralism. And at this point we get to consider the series of the etymologies as a whole, and the extent to which they allow for this structural motif. Previously we have applied Deleuze's description of the Structural motif to the Jubilate Agno in order to see if it fit the mad writings of this proto-romantic. That experiment⁴ was fairly successful and so I have gone on to attempt to apply the same analysis to the Four Zoas of Blake the next proto-Romantic icon, which has also worked out fairly well, but this analysis is still in work. But here we can try to apply the structural analysis to the etymologies of Socrates. We have already found a portmandeau word in his concoction of the proto-word for the moon. This leads us to wonder if perhaps the other signs of a structure are present in the etymologies of Socrates. The first thing that we should point out and the thing which is clearest in Deleuze's account is the necessity of two series. And in the etymologies we have such a pair of series, we have the words being interpreted and those appealed to as a basis of interpretation which are related on the basis of sound similarity in most cases. Each etymology makes a connection of resemblance between the word interpreted and the interpretation of that word

³ (Columbia University Press 1990); Original Publication 1969

⁴ "The Logic Of Sense In The Jubilate Agno by Christopher Smart: A Test Case for the theory of Sense of Deleuze;" See <http://archonic.net>

by another word which sounds similar but has a different meaning. So it is clear that the two series exist in the etymologies. Next we notice that the etymologies unfold in groups of words considered together which we take to be a microgenetic metamorphosis of the last group of words considered. This microgenetic series of groups provides the positional information that Deleuze demands which renders the series in some sense topological because each group of words gives us a neighborhood of meanings closely related. The means of interpretation is always varying somewhat, so there is always some novelty in the approach given to any one interpretation. The words being queried are the elements, and the difference between the meaning of these elements and the other elements appealed to with different meanings gives us the differential relations between the words interpreted and the words appealed to as a basis for interpretation. As in the word for moon only the *n* is left of the *neon* and *enon* and thus we can see that there are singularities within the words which hide chiasms that are no longer seen within the portmanteau words. Socrates also has his own esoteric words which are in his case his escape route into foreign languages which he uses when he is in a tight place and cannot easily interpret a word. So the letters can be either elements of a word, or can be seen as singularities where another structure is folded up and hidden behind the scenes in a perpetual absence as in the chiasm beyond the letter *n* in the word for moon. Deleuze also mentions the difference between differentiation and differenciation. Differenciation is the differences between the words themselves within the language. Differentiation is the unfolding of the words from the letters as fundamental elements of meaning. It is by understanding this unfolding Socrates claims that you can reconstruct the earlier meaning of words that now have a quite different meaning by tracing back to the transformations between the interpreted word to the interpreting word, i.e. instituting the difference between signifier and signified within the etymological endeavor. When we look at the letters we see that some of them are seen to be independent of all other

letters, and these seem to be the stable points around which the interpretation orbits, and these autopoietic letters which are basically the vowels provide us with the empty square that Deleuze talks about in which the two series intersect. We can also account for the difference between the levels of the real, imaginary and symbolic. What is real is the words that appear in language with their meanings. What is imaginary is the linkage between words that sound the same which we note and which we use to create etymologies. But the microgenetic etymological series is symbolic rather than imaginary. We have seen in it the unfolding of the microgenesis of projection, as one series of words is used to interpret another series of similar words. Similarity is the key here – resemblance as Foucault calls it in *The Order Of Things* which was brought back as the Platonizing influence in the Renaissance prior to the Classical age of Descartes and the Modern age. It is by allowing genetic unfolding to occur and the series of the etymologies to be formed that we get a microgenetic set of transformations and metamorphoses which tells us something about the process of projection itself, which is our subject of interest, i.e. schematization. So when Socrates takes into his alchemical lab where he does various operations on words we begin to see the symbolic field and in that field is reflected the projection process. Socrates' etymologies seem willy-nilly and mad as the *Jubilate Agno* or the *Four Zoas* of William Blake. But as we see there is a cunning to this madness in some cases which is very clear when we interpret the etymologies carefully. The cunning we have found in the various stages of the etymologies and their order which has told us something about the nature of projection in the mythopoietic era and has given us an interesting basis for considering the nature of projection in the metaphysical era which follows the mythopoietic. Once we understand the etymologies of Socrates from this viewpoint then they become much more interesting. It is more difficult to skip over them and merely talk about the problems of the *Cratylus* in general as most commentators do.

In fact to see the symbolic in them beyond the real and imaginary it takes some close reading and some creative interpretations in order to discover what might be the pattern discussed by Socrates at the level of the symbolic, i.e. the structural pattern within the etymologies. But the fact that all the hallmarks of structure from Deleuze's point of view are present in the etymological series is very significant. Deleuze points these out in *Alice in Wonderland*, and I have pointed them out in the *Jubilate Agno*, and have seen signs of them in the *Four Zoas* of Blake which I have not yet written about. The fact that these structural formations can be seen in these works tells us that unconscious patterns are being worked out in these works that are beyond the conscious control of the artist. But the artist sets up the conditions in which these unconscious patterns may be expressed, even though their meaning may be beyond the comprehension of the artist himself. Similar things are said about societies and their cultures by Levi Strauss. There are unconscious expressions within the cultures of societies that we may elicit and point out that they are not aware of creating. Similarly here with Socrates it is difficult to tell whether he is intending to point out the things that he points out through his use of his etymologies or whether this is merely an expression of the unconscious of Socrates. But let us think about this microgenetically. We can posit as in the *Metamorphoses* of Ovid that between the utterly unconscious and consciousness there are a series of microgenetic stages in which transformations take place. Thus there is no cut and dried line of demarcation between the two realms but instead when we unleash the expression of the unconscious we will get a series of image formations that are morphogenetic and microgenetic as we travel toward consciousness and stability. The critique that Deleuze has of Jung is that he deals almost exclusively with the imaginary realm and does not understand the symbolic. However, since Jung understands the existence of the Arche I think that this critique is not completely true, rather in his study of alchemy Jung has gone beyond the merely imaginary to the symbolic in

his uncovering of the Arche which he calls the quaternities of quaternities in *Aion*. We ourselves discover this pattern as prior to the meta⁰-dimensionality of the schemas, in a negative meta¹-dimensionality. If meta¹-dimensionality is in the unconscious then as something rises toward consciousness it will be schematized at meta⁰-dimensionality where we become aware of it as a spacetime envelope, and we will eventually categorize it when we get to the level of standings that describe the kinds of Being, existence, manifestation and the non-manifest at meta¹-dimensionality. Allowing the symbolic to manifest beyond the imaginary allows us some insight in what lies prior to the schemas, i.e. the minimal system of minimal systems (tetrahedron of tetrahedrons) which only shows up as a field of places of symbolic structural distortions, and not as things in spacetime. This field unfolds from a singularity and only shows up in the series of genetic unfolding which is microgenetic. Socrates takes us into this realm with his etymologies. The very complexity, roughness, disorganized character of the etymologies is precisely what allows the structural differentiation to be seen. We should be paying attention to the field of operations performed by Socrates as he creatively tries to find more and more ways to build his etymological webs. It is the field of operations itself, not the words, or their meanings, that shows us the structural level in operation as it undergoes the transformations of microgenesis which leads to the morphogenesis of meaning. In other words the microgenesis of form produces a morphogenesis of meaning which Petitot relates to the Catastrophe Theory of Rene Thom. Catastrophe theory is seen as the only way that the unfolding of structures can be understood fully. Meanings are discontinuous as is the microgenetic transformations of schemas. Morphogenesis of meaning allows us to map the folds in meaning which are produced by the folds in schemas undergoing microgenesis. It is a sophisticated theory worthy of consideration. But for the moment we want to go in a different direction, which is to consider what may be deeper than the symbolic, in the series it forms with the imaginary and

real.

Exploring Anti-Categories

We have mentioned several times in various contexts the categories of Peirce and Fuller contending that there are five of them: Zeroths, Firsts, Seconds, Thirds, and Fourths. However, recently on reading the article by Deleuze on the recognition of structures I realized that the Lacanian registers: Real, Imaginary, Symbolic were anti-categories of the same type. So for instance the Real is a Negative First, Imaginary a Negative Second, and the symbolic is a Negative Third. This thought was at first very disconcerting. But slowly I realized that it meant that the categories of Peirce and Fuller was incomplete as was the counter scheme of Lacanian registers. Instead we must add to these the Negative Fourth of the Generative and the Negative Fifth of the Immersive, and to the positive side we must add the Fifth of Syzygy beyond Synergy. So there are five categories on the positive side and five negative categories or registers on the negative side extending both the work of Peirce/Fuller and Lacan. Were Synergy means the over determination of a geometrical structure in higher dimension that saves points, lines and other components in the definition of more figures that inhabit the higher dimensions, Syzygy on the other hand means conjunction of elements in a pattern which are in some sense unique like singularities. So when in the etymologies we see that many words are used to define the target word that is over determination. But on the other hand the chiasm of enon and neon is an articulation that just juxtaposes the reversibility transformations and defines a surface level singularity of n which hides the deep structure of chiasm. Syzygy defines the interaction of singularities within the field that supports these singularities that appear with Catastrophe Theory. Such a seed proto-structure is not regular and not over determined, but unique and underdetermined. Deleuze is continually discussing the importance of the interaction of singularities within a topological neighborhood which is similar to what Thom describes in Catastrophe

theory. It is fairly easy to understand why we would need Syzygy beyond synergy to explain conjunctive and juxtaposed schematizations. What is much harder is to understand the registers beyond the symbolic. We call these registers beyond the symbolic the Generative and the Immersive. The Immersive Deleuze seems to have understood when he uses the terms Univocality and Immanence. The Generative Deleuze seems to have understood in his distinction between difference-in-itself and repetition-for-itself. So we can see Deleuze as pushing deeper beyond Lacan's registers in his work. The fact that Lacan's registers are anti-categories in the Peirce/Fuller sense is strange, but the idea that there are further deeper anti-categories takes us into a realm that is completely unexpected. The symbolic appears only when we have the double series of microgenetic unfoldings. The generative is what lies beyond this unfolding and generates it. For instance we recognize that the EMS is built on mirroring and is thus imaginary. We see that there is a genetic unfolding of EMS in autogenesis from the field of singularities. But the Generative is what produces the difference between the singularities within the topological field to be unfolded. The immersive is when we are within the singularities themselves, and all the rules of the topological space are undone prior to the appearance of the singularities as separable. Deleuze refers to this as Immanence and says that Spinoza is the most perfect of the immanent philosophers. On the other hand the Generative register appears with the distinction between difference-in-itself of the field and the singularities and the repetition-for-itself of the unconscious drives. We know that the people who Plato mentions in the Cratylus, the interlocutors of Socrates are real people, and so there is a reality that the dialogue is based upon. But we know the dialogue itself is imaginary, and we see that clearly in the antinomic character of the two arguments of Hermogenes and Cratylus, both of which Socrates flips on their heads. We know that the etymologies are themselves are a double series that appears to be structural so that the Dialogue reaches the level of the Symbolic or

Structural. But the question arises whether the dialogue is either Generative or Immersive. We do not know much about the signs for recognizing the Generative or the Immersive except what hints that Deleuze gives us in his writings. The Generative is pre-symbolic or pre-structural. The Immersive is even prior to that. The Generative is between Wild Being and Ultra Being, and the Immersive is between Ultra Being and Emptiness/Void. The depth Generative is opposite the surface level synergies and the depth Immersive is opposite the surface level syzygies. Suddenly we have two new registers beyond those of Lacan to explore thanks to the pioneering work of Deleuze who tried to understand the symbolic and brought us even deeper level registers (anti-categories) that underlie the symbolic or structural. This is a whole new horizon of inquiry. Each Category and each Register at a certain level are related to each other. So the First is related to the Real, the Second is related to the Imaginary, the Third is related to the Symbolic, the Fourth is related to the Generative, the Fifth is related to the Immersive. The categories are on this side of the mirror and the registers are on the other side of the mirror, if we take the analogy of Alice through the Looking Glass. The registers are like the negative dimensions of the categories. It is the categories that fill up the metaⁿ-dimensions defining thing that appear in the metaⁿ-dimensions. So whereas the metaⁿ-dimensions talk about the encompassing spacetime, the categories talk about the geometrical/logical objects that appear within that encompassing spacetime. So there is a fundamental difference between the metaⁿ-dimensions and the categories. But both have their negative counterparts. There are not just negative dimensions but negative metaⁿ-dimensions which the Arche inhabit at the first level beyond the schemas. Beyond the Arche are the 40 temporalities and the 62 states, and other more obscure negative metaⁿ-dimensional traces. The negative metaⁿ-dimensional finitudes are more temporal while the positive metaⁿ-dimensions are more spatial. Similarly we can say of the Categories/Registers that they are dual in terms

of their positive and negative characters but in a different way related to the geometrization or logical relation of the things that appear in the various dimensions, or metaⁿ-dimensions, rather than to the spacetime of the dimensions, or metaⁿ-dimensions, themselves. The Generative has to do with the folding of the topological space that creates the singularities as different from each other before the unfolding takes place, i.e. while they are still seeds. The Immersive has to do with what is beyond the even horizon of the singularity itself. From the singularity to the even horizon there is a blank spacetime when we know nothing which is like the noumena we spoke of in the microgenesis unfolding. Then there is the difference between the event horizon and the Einstein ring which is the place where the mirroring occurs around the black hole. The mirroring is imaginary. The distance between the event horizon and the Einstein ring is symbolic. Anything outside the Einstein ring it is real, while the space itself is the Zeroth. The immersive is on the other side of the singularity itself. So we can see that the Generative is equivalent to the noumenal, and the Immersive is equivalent to the inside of the singularity itself which is a set of topological folds intersecting where the normal topological rules no longer apply. Movement on the folds produces the catastrophes that Thom speaks of which Petitot believes structures semantic space based on the structures of syntactic space. Structures in the invisible realm are produced by structures in the visible realm and vice versa. But the mirroring between the semantic structures and syntactic structures is Generative, and beyond that mirroring is the Immersive. If we know that the etymologies of Socrates are Symbolic Structures then the question becomes are they Generative or Immersive as well. How far back does Socrates lead us in the Cratylus into the depths of the mirror of the categories in the registers.

What we can see is that there is a duality whose event horizon we are approaching where we switch from cosmic words to human words, just as Socratic philosophy switches from concern with physis to a concern with the virtues of

man. What is generative is the difference and similarity between the cosmic words and the human words, and what is immersive is what is beyond this difference and similarity. The immersive is the immanence in which the transcendental line is not drawn between the two partitions of sets of words. This immanence is univocative in that it does both jobs at once. In other words the creation of the world is the differentiation of God, both at the same time as supra-rational. Similarly the differentiation of the virtues of man is at the same time the differentiation of the cosmic words at the same time, in the same way. What is generative is what gives us the two double series of words. What is immersive is the realization of their immanence to each other and their univocity. One is the projection on nature beyond man, the other is the projection on man himself which creates the concept of Man. Nietzsche and Foucault challenge the concept of Man which Socrates establishes as ethical opposed to the cosmic. All distinctions are pulled into Man himself. What is structural is the unfolding of the transformations in microgenesis. What is generative is the difference and similarity (resemblance) between two transformations, i.e. the discontinuity between the plateaus. What is immersive is the two transformations laid on top of each other and considered to be in the same plateau. For instance between two syntactic trees there are mappings formed by generative rules. The discontinuity across which the map operates is what is generative. But also there is the generation of the two different trees based on the same grammar. What is Symbolic is the whole field of trees and the patterns that they involve. What is Imaginary are the trees that are complements of each other within that field. What is Real are the individual sentences that are the leaves of the trees. What is Immersive is the roots of all those trees which is the same root.

Multiverse Hypothesis

Now I will advance a radical speculative hypothesis about the relation between the

Pluriverse Schema and the extended Lacanian Registers (anti-categories) we have been discussing. That hypothesis is that the registers which are anti-categories in the Peirce/Fuller sense are in fact the depths of the supra-rationality of the pluriverse and that this depth when projected on the ontically given, highest schematizable discernable is the Multiverse which is the concrete lifeworld manifestation of Everett's physical multiple worlds hypothesis realized. In other words as we look at the extended Lacanian Registers explored by Deleuze, but not specified by Deleuze, rather specified here in all probability for the first time, are the depths of the Multiverse as they intrude and impress themselves on our Universe (which we project as the Kosmos). This is a big speculative leap, but let us consider the implications of this leap for a moment. What we are saying is that what appears within the Kosmos corresponds to our projections of the Peirce/Fuller categories of Separableness, Relation, Continuity, Synergy and Syzygy. But what appears beyond the wall of our Kosmos within the Pluriverse as supra-rational depth are the extended Lacanian registers called Real, Symbolic, Imaginary, Generative and Immersive. The registers as anti-categories reflect the Peirce Fuller Categories on the other side of the inseparable barrier between our Kosmos and what lies within the supra-rational wasteland of the unreachable pluriverse. But that unreachable wasteland of the pluriverse is mirrored back within our world as the existence of the registers organizing the Peirce/Fuller categories. When we experience and think about these registers as we encounter them within our own Kosmos we are in fact "seeing through" to the depth of the Pluriverse. Here we use the term of Hillman which he applies to archetypes which really only applies to the imaginary, or imaginal realities that appear within our soul's experience of archetypal realities. But we can apply a similar metaphor of *seeing through* to the other registers as well. By seeing through to these organizations of our kosmos by what lies beyond it in the pluriverse we bring the multiverse into our lifeworld within our universe. We use the terms

multiverse and universe for the ontic realization of the pluriverse and kosmos schemas beyond mere ontological projection.

Now what does this radical speculative hypothesis mean. It means that when we look at say the imaginary, i.e. doubling phenomena within our universe which is entantiomorphic then what we are seeing at the archetypal level is a reflection across a mirror surface in the depths of the multiverse between two universes. We know from string theory that there is a possibility that universes are paired and only share gravity between them. So string theory gives us a model of this possible mirroring between two universe within the multiverse that produces a bi-verse, which appears when retrojected into our universe as enantiomorphic mirroring of things, for instance our own symmetrical forms of our bodies. So what is Real is what is not mirrored. If something is mirrored ontically, then what it is embodying is a mirroring surface beyond the limits of the universe in the muliverse, between two universes, perhaps our own and another, or perhaps two other bi-verses in the multiverse. If we go on to the Symbolic Structural level which Deluze has explored the most then we see a deeper organization, which is not just that of a bi-verse, but which is a more embedded structure within the multiverse that is retrojected into the universe. When ever we see symbolic structures what we are seeing is a reading of this deep structure of the multiverse. For instance, we are positing that within the etymology of Socrates is such a deep structure which is Lacanian from the point of view of his registers. Structure is an genealogical unfolding according to Foucault and Deleuze, even Piaget sees structure that way. So we can say that there is a genealogical depth to the multiverse that appears in the universe as the genealogies of ontic creatures which genetically unfold within the universe. So as we are seeing the stages of the unfolding of organisms in their development there is a sense in which that is a seeing through a glass darkly into the deeper organization of the multiverse. Since we are creatures that unfold genetically, recapitulating

in some sense evolution we too are bearers of the markings of the symbolic. And in fact every microgenesis is indeed the activation of these more to less archaic structures and so is in fact in some sense a genealogy in action that points to the depth organization of the multiverse within our universe embodied in creatures. To take this further than Lacan goes but to other registers that the work of Deleuze hints at we can look beyond the Symbolic deep structures that embody glimpses of the ordering of the multiverse to the Generative. The Generative has to do with where the unfolding of the symbolic as singularities within a field, i.e. the catastrophe theory topology modeled by Rene Thom, comes from. The Generative is a yet deeper but even more darkly perceived order of the multiverse retrojected into the universe and embodied by creatures. We see the Generative in the in the Burgess Shale which Steven J. Gould describes in Wonderful Life⁵. We do not know why the forms of life exploded in this period. But we do know that life went through a rigorous self-selection of forms after that so that many of the body plans seen in the Burgess Shale merely vanish later. But the Burgess Shale period is the Generative origin of the later suggested structures that survive to produce evolved creatures. If they had all survived then we would have a very rich biological diversity much richer than the one we have today. But in the evolutionary process there was a weeding out of forms down two what exists today as the fundamental varieties of life that exists. The generative diversity is different from the existential evolutionary diversity, which then implies specific genetic unfoldings of the remaining lifeforms. Other lifeforms would have had different genetic unfoldings but those possible genetic histories are lost in the process of evolution itself. However, the original even greater genetic diversity of possible forms is the Generative out of which the Symbolic Structures unfold as a narrowing down of possibilities. So it is with the Multiverse, there is a deeper Generative Order beyond the Symbolic Structural order which gets

⁵ W. W. Norton & Company (September 1, 1990)

retrojected into our own universe from the multiverse, because our universe is one of the possible multiverses whose possibility is shaped by the other companion possibilities. Perhaps the Multiverse is like the Burgess Shale in terms of the production of many different sorts of Universes. Ours is just one genetically unfolded trajectory from that original and archaic diversities of possibilities. But our universe must carry with it some trace of the original ordering diversity of possibilities that all universes share, this is part of the theory of microgenesis that some germ of the origin gets carried along in the metamorphic developmental stages. So that in some sense all the possibilities of the multiverse are mirrored negatively in the existing universe. And again we would see our own embodiment as the locus of that Generative aspect of the ordering of the Multiverse as it is retrojected into our own Universe and seen in the organization of the things within the universe. The universe is a spacetime capsule among other spacetime capsules in a broader multidimensionality that string theory posits. The things within the Universe are embedded with the traces of the multiverse even to the generative level. What are the fundamental existential possibilities within our universe for existing things is in some sense the expression of the hidden order, the implicate order of the multiverse out of which the universe sprang as one possible trajectory among many other possible trajectories. The possibility of having a trajectory at all somehow embeds the trajectory producing generativity out of which the trajectory springs. And for us in terms of our own embodiments this appears in the link between the five-fold body plan and sex. There is an intimate link between our general body plan and the sex genes. Our body plan is just one of the many possible body plans that appear in the Burgess Shale. But the sexual reproduction of our body plan is intimately linked to the genes that specify sexual differentiation. Sex itself is fivefold in some sense for us. And Sex is the very activity that produces evolution as a possibility. Sex is in fact a difference at the level of modification

from a category theory point of view. There is a book which talks about how sex difference is a kind of a kind. But in fact, sex difference takes place at the fourth meta-level as a modification of a natural transformation, which is beyond a functor and an arrow in category theory. So Sex from the point of view of higher logical types as expressed in Category Theory is a very deep difference. It is not an accident that Sexual Generativity appears at the fourth categorical meta-level. For instance, the symbolic register is a representation of a natural transformation. The Imaginary register is a representation of the Functor. The Real register is a representation of the Arrow. So as we step back into the deeper orders of the Multiverse we are really stepping up the meta-levels of category theory. The Generative register produces all possible differences of which the Symbolic register genetically unfolds based on a specific evolutionary path a specific set of differences. The Symbolic differences that appear between selected differences seems greater than the modifications between all the possible Generative differences. This is because the space of Generative differences is more crowded than the space of Symbolic differences, since the space of differences is more crowded the amount of room for difference is smaller at the higher meta-level. Generative difference is tightly bound with each other, while Symbolic Structural difference is loosely bound with each other, so there is wider space for the articulation of the differences between the few binary markers that are chosen to be part of the surviving body plan out of the myriad possible body plans that are first produced. The same thing happens in the brains of children. Massive numbers of neurons are produced and interconnected and these are selected down during maturation and growth and those left form a relatively sparse matrix. Like the Burgess Shale the Tabular Rasa of the infant mind is one in which there are too many possible connections and neurons which are then selected down through learning and development. Differences between neurons and paths are slight when there are so many possibilities, but become great as the

connections and neurons become selected down and thus fixed into a sparse pattern which contains order imposed by the environment on the infant. We posit that the same thing is true of the universe itself with respect to its creatures. The universe is generatively sparse compared to the multiverse but because of that it has a more developed and differentiated order than would appear in the multiverse out of which the universe is generated. For the universe we see that generativity in the acceleration of the dispersal of matter within the universe for instance, so called dark energy that is pouring into the universe from some unknown source, i.e. the multiverse. That acceleration of the redshift is generative of the expansion of our universe and effects everything within our universe. We see it only in its effects on the things that are getting further apart, as spacetime is created out of nothing between the things in the universe. The multiverse has a huge generative effect on the universe even today, in this appearance of dark energy out of nowhere, and it is likely that the multiverse has other commanding effects that are generative on the things within our universe as well, but we have just not recognized it yet, because the register of the generative has not been singled out and explored as yet. It is the next thing past structuralism, but we have not found our way in the so called post-structural period into the necessity of studying this even deeper register beyond structure. We are just on the shore of that Generative Register and we do not yet have a definition of it that is succinct as that which Deleuze gives for Structuralism. That is a new frontier which Deleuze begins to breach his cryptic discussion of the difference between difference-in-itself and repetition-for-itself.

If we have not yet really entered the register of the Generative then it is presumptuous to speculate that there is an even deeper register beyond the Generative, i.e. the Immersive. However, we will take that chance and posit this even deeper level of the organization of the multiverse which has itself again retrojective effects on the universe and is seen in its

creatures. We will straight off identify the immersive with what Deleuze calls immanence and the univocal. This is the core of the multiverse as we can know it through its effects on the creatures of the universe. We can think of it in this way. We live in the multiverse and our entrapment in the universe is in fact an illusion. The uncrossable boundary between universes in the multiverse is in fact illusory and we are totally immersed in the multiverse every moment and the idea that we are trapped in the universe is a fiction from the point of view of this deepest register that we can comprehend. From a category point of view this says that there is something even beyond modification at the next n-categorical level. From the point of view of the meta-levels of Being it means that Ultra Being exists. So we are immanent in the multiverse and all the transcendental differences between universes do not actually exist, and thus there is only immanence, and nothing else, and further more this immanence is univocal, in the sense that its very ordering, is the production of the multiverse as separate universes. This is a very deep conjecture about the nature of the multiverse to universe relation. In other words the universe is only a modality of the multiverse and we are really in the multiverse. In other words we are really only quantum phenomena in relativistic spacetime and there is no contradiction in that, it is a supra-rational statement. As Deutsch says in Fabric of the Universe quantum phenomena is the indicator of the many-worlds hypothesis of Everett and he posits that we will be able to compute across these multiple worlds. If this turns out to be true, and we are probably close to doing that experiment then that tells us that we are not really in a universe but a multiverse and just cannot see most of it perhaps because we can only see a few of its eleven dimensions. Note that the number of dimensions speculated on by M-brane and string theorists are the number of dimensions you need to reach the pluriverse in schemas dimensional theory. Instead of seeing the strings as either rolled up in little balls or as a greater multidimensional space in which we float, another possibility is that the unseen

dimensions are in the negative dimensions and that the surface between the positive and negative dimensions is time. In other words we are in a three dimensional space floating on seven hidden dimensions with one transitional zero dimension which is time. The seven hidden dimensions are negative dimensions. That is why we do not see them. They partake in the levels of interpenetration and are equivalent to what are called traditionally the seven heavens. For instance it is these heavens that Muhammad⁶ visits on his Mirage. The immersive view says that we are immersed in all these dimensions right now and that we are experiencing the multiverse directly in our interactions with things within this universe. The things within the universe are the face of the multiverse and that it is univocity that makes only this immanence actual for us. In other word it is our embeddedness in the multiverse that allows us to see the universe as a transcendent difference from the other universe that are generated out of the multiverse and that ultimately we never leave that immersion in the multiverse at all. This is for instance the position of Advaita Vedanta which is a sort of monism that they call Nondual because all two-ness is a fantasy. But this does not seem to recognize that the pluriverse is itself supra-rational. But when we start talking about Nirguna Brahman, i.e. the godhead, it is difficult to say that this is really a monism in the normal sense of that term. It is more as if monism is used to give entry instructions into a genuinely nondual state which takes into account the nature of ultra-being as seen in the behavior of Krishna in the Mahabharata. These are unresolved issues as to the status of the nonduality of Advaita Vedanta. But it is clear that the immersive is at least the threshold of the nondual. In other words the nondual proper as unthinkable might lie beyond the Immersive register. But the Immersive itself may partake in some degree of nonduality, but that this nonduality might not completely shun tinges of monism. Be that as it may the Immersive is the deepest register that has an order retrojected

⁶ Peace be upon him.

onto the things within the universe, and that appears to us as our ultimate embodiment, our immersion into our own bodies and this particular existential universe. In other words it is the Immersive core of the multiverse that puts us into our bodies in a particular universe. That particular universe for us is the center of the multiverse. And we need another deeper Copernican revolution to realize that our universe is just one of many, and not necessarily the center of the multiverse merely because we are instantiated and particularized within it. Rather what ever universe and body we are instantiated and particularized within is for us the center of the multiverse, and we are despite that still immanent in the multiverse and have never left it, and the partitions between universes are in fact illusory ultimately because all there is for us is immanence and through univocity the multiverse creates all the universes including our own in the same breath as it generates its own immersive ordering.

This radical speculation about the relation of the multiverse and the universe based on the extended registers of Lacan propounded obliquely by Deleuze suddenly gives us a new way to look at the relation of the schemas that define the limits between paradox and supra-rationality in terms of the measure of man, to the things within the universe itself and their immersive relation to the multiverse. This is a new perspective on our world which is truly post structural because it invites us to explore these deeper registers and our embedding in the multiverse despite our embodiment within a single universe. The immanence in the multiverse while embodied in the universe is accomplished by the idea of univocity. Where the schemas see the supra-rational the ontic embodiments posit fusion and paradox. Similarly we can expect at the other end of the spectrum that the schemas might posit paradox at the level of the facet, but that the things reveal some degree of superimposition as well as entanglement when we are talking about quantum phenomena as an ontic reality. There is a flip where the schemas posit one order that give us the limits of the divided line while the

ontic phenomena give us the opposite set of limits, and this is what is confusing to us when we try to understand how the ontic and ontological, the noumena and the schemas interact. Deleuze would say that this strange flip is part of the nature of the immanence and the univocity of that immanence, because ultimately the schemas cannot escape embodiment in bodies in universes in spite of their immanence in the multiverse. But when we take our measure as men we flip the limits and in some way take the limits at the ontological level in exactly the opposite way we take the limits at the ontic level. This complementarity between ontic and ontological is for Deleuze the nature of sense, and we go beyond that to say that in as much as the next non-existent register is the nondual, that meaning wells up from even beyond the Immersive register. If we understand the registers then we will not get confused about what the nondual might be beyond these registers that are in some sense comprehensible in spite of their depth. The nondual as anti-monism as well is non-comprehensible in a very radical way, and is the ultimate nature of the supra-rationality of the ontological pluriverse beyond the paradoxicality and fusion of the ontic multiverse. At the other end of the spectrum we get the fusion of the facets, for instance in the quarks, but that appears as juxtaposed with superimposition in quantum phenomena. When we take the measure we reverse the limits between ourselves as projectors and the things we project on, i.e. the noumena beyond our projections, i.e. what exists embodied in this universe. And perhaps this is merely the sign that the Logos/Physis duality is imaginary itself because ultimately it is only a sign of the flipping of the limits of the divided line. Of course, the appearance of the nondual of order is the appearance of the structural symbolic that is a deeper order than the distinction between the duals of Physis and Logos. What is designated as real in our worldview is what appears within the realms of the dualities, i.e. what is being fought over by the dualities. When we talk about the generative we can see that it is the threefold relation between the duals

and the nondual that lays out the field in which the nonduals can separate from each other while still being bound internally with each other though order. The immersive on the other hand is the fact that these differences are illusory and that we are always in all three realms at once. Beyond the immersive is the nondual itself which is the unthinkable beyond what our worldview provides as thinkable within the three realms. The ontic/ontological difference plays itself out across the divide of the physis and logos, but this first distinction is not the same as the second. So there is some ambiguity, some difference between the two terms such that a Symbolic series is produced and the differences do not merely remain Imaginary. But the way that we see these distinctions and their relations in terms of the Generative, i.e. how they are connected to all possible distinctions that could give rise to all possible worldviews, and how beyond that we are immersed still in an archaic state prior to the generation of that original variety despite being in this particular worldview, is difficult to say at this point.

Commentary Continued

In the last section of the commentary we dealt with the Celestials and in this section we will deal with the Terrestrials.

[Her.] What do you say of pur (fire) and udor (water)?

[Soc.] I am at a loss how to explain pur; either the muse of Euthyphro has deserted me, or there is some very great difficulty in the word. Please, however, to note the contrivance which I adopt whenever I am in a difficulty of this sort.

[Her.] What is it?

[Soc.] I will tell you; but I should like to know first whether you can tell me what is the meaning of the pur?

[Her.] Indeed I cannot.

[Soc.] Shall I tell you what I suspect to be the true explanation of this and several other words?— My belief is that they are of foreign origin. For the Hellenes, especially those who were under the dominion of the barbarians, often borrowed from them.

[Her.] What is the inference?

[Soc.] Why, you know that any one who seeks to demonstrate the fitness of these names according to the Hellenic language, and not according to the language from which the words are derived, is rather likely to be at fault.

[Her.] Yes, certainly.

[Soc.] Well then, consider whether this pur is not foreign; for the word is not easily brought into relation with the Hellenic tongue, and the Phrygians may be observed to have the

same word slightly changed, just as they have udor (water) and kunes (dogs), and many other words.

[Her.] That is true.

[Soc.] Any violent interpretations of the words should be avoided; for something to say about them may easily be found. And thus I get rid of pur and udor.

Socrates wishes to discard the words for fire and water because they are foreign, i.e. related to the Phrygian language, i.e. the Trojan language, reputedly the language of Tantalus himself, as well as Midus (of the Golden Touch) and Gordius (of the Gordian Knot). It is very interesting that Socrates would want to designate fire and water as elements foreign, i.e. non-Greek, but in fact related to the ancient enemy the Trojans. Of course, Heraclitus said that everything was fire, and he also said you could not step into the same river twice. So the philosophy of Heraclitus revolves around these two elements. But labeling the terms fire and water foreign undercuts the concept of Epidocles that they are fundamental elements. How could they be coeval if they are from different languages?

Aer (air), Hermogenes, may be explained as the element which raises (airei) things from the earth, or as ever flowing (aei pei), or because the flux of the air is wind, and the poets call the winds "air-blasts," (aetai); he who uses the term may mean, so to speak, air-flux (aetorroun), in the sense of wind-flux (pneumatorroun); and because this moving wind may be expressed by either term he employs the word air (aer = aetes rheo). Aither (aether) I should interpret as aeitheer; this may be correctly said, because this element is always running in a flux about the air (aei thei peri tou aera ron). The meaning of the word ge (earth) comes out better when in the form of gaia, for the earth may be truly called "mother" (gaia, genneteira), as in the language of Homer (Od. ix. 118; xiii. 160) gegaasi means gegennesthai.

Air and Earth on the other hand are native to the Greeks. Air and Aether are both related to flowing of the wind. Air is in fact what raises things from the earth. Earth itself is the mother and he traces this usage back to Homer. Of course this reminds us of the Phusus and the Logos which is not just the physical thing or the thought but the growth and development of these things. Thus we can think of the Air as that which brings things either in physus or logos out of the earth through their growth. In their arising things participate in the flux of the wind which blows them about like Odysseus on

the Sea. But the concept of all things being Water of Thales or all things at root being Fire of Heraclitus is seen as fundamentally foreign with no support in the Greek language.

[Her.] Good.

[Soc.] What shall we take next?

[Her.] There are orai (the seasons), and the two names of the year, eniautos and etos.

[Soc.] The orai should be spelt in the old Attic way, if you desire to know the probable truth about them; they are rightly called the orai because they divide (orizousin) the summers and winters and winds and the fruits of the earth.

Things arise within their seasons. The seasons divide the summers and winters, and the winds and fruits of the earth. Notice how the times of year and the Air and Earth are divided while the other elements of Fire and Water are left out. Socrates is beginning to tell us something very fundamental here about the nature of the physus and logos, i.e. that they both arise from the earth, and experience the flux of the winds of change throughout the seasons of the year that circle about. Time and the primordial elements of Wind and Earth are the key to understanding the nature of physus and logos, and Fire and Water are excluded.

The words eniautos⁷ and etos⁸ appear to be the same⁹, - "that which brings to light the plants and growths of the earth in their turn, and passes them in review within itself (en eauto exetazei¹⁰): this is broken up into two words, eniautos from

⁷ Solar Year

⁸ Lunar Year

⁹ The civil year (etos) was similarly dissociated from the natural year (eniautos). It was the tenure term of an official or priest, roughly corresponding to the lunar year, or to six months; it gave his name to his time period. In Athens, for instance, the year began on Hecatombaion 1, roughly midsummer, when the new archon entered his office, and the year was designated by his name; ...

<http://www.britannica.com/eb/article?tocId=60213&query=year%20brood&ct=eb>

¹⁰ **exetazô**

I. to examine well or closely, inquire into, scrutinise, review, Theogn., attic

2. of troops, to inspect, review, Thuc., etc.:-- generally, to pass in review, enumerate, Dem.

II. to examine or question a person closely, Hdt., Soph., etc.

en eauto¹¹, and etos from etazei, just as the original name of

III. to estimate, compare, ti pros ti one thing by or with another, id=Soph.

IV. to prove by testing, of gold, id=Soph.:--in Pass. with part., exetazetai parôn he is proved to have been present, Plat.; exetazesthai philos (sc. ôn) Eur.; c. gen., tôn echthrôn exetazesthai to be found in the number of the enemies, Dem.

2. to present oneself, appear, id=Dem.

eautotês, êtos, hê,

A. ¹¹ h self-hood, Procl.Theol.Plat.5.37.

en 1 prep2 3 prep4 5 prep6 7 prep8

Perseus. in, among. c. dat.

Lat. in. PREP. WITH DAT.:

I. OF PLACE

1. in, en nêsôi, en Troiêi, etc., Hom., etc.:--elliptic, en Alkinooio (sc. oikôi Od.; ein Aïdao II.; en paidotribou at the school of the training master, Ar.

2. in, upon, en ouresi Hom., etc.

3. in the number of, amongst, en Danaois, etc., Hom.; and with Verbs of ruling, archein, anassen in pollois to be first or lord among many, i. e. over them, id=Hom.; cf. ho, to B. III. 3.

4. in one's hands, within one's reach or power, Lat. penes, Hom., etc.; en soi gar esmen Soph.; en tôi theôi to telos ên Dem.

5. in respect of, en gêrai in point of age, Soph.

6. when en is used with Verbs of motion, where we use the prep. into, the construction is called pregnant, piptein en koniêisi to fall [to the dust and lie] in it; oionon echeuen en depaï Od., etc.

II. OF THE STATE, CONDITION, POSITION, in which one is:

1. of outward circumstances, en polemôi, etc., Hom.; en logois einai to be engaged in oratory, Plat.; hoi en tois pragmasi ministers of state, Thuc.; hoi en telei the magistrates, id=Thuc.

2. of inward states, of feeling, etc., en philotêti II.; en phobôi einai to be in fear, en aischunêi, etc.; also, en orgêi echein tina to make him the object of one's anger, Thuc.; en aitiai echein tina to blame him, Hdt.

3. often with a neut. adj., en brachei bracheôs, Soph.; en tachei tacheôs, id=Soph.; en elaphrôi poieisthai Hdt.; en isôi isôs, Thuc.

III. OF THE INSTRUMENT, MEANS or MANNER, in or with, en puri prêsai II.; en ophthalmois or en ommasin horan have the object in one's eye, Lat. in oculis, Hom.; en litais by prayers, en dolôi by deceit, Aesch., etc.

Zeus was divided into Zena and Dia¹²; and the whole proposition means that his power of reviewing from within is one, but has two names, two words etos and eniautos being thus formed out of a single proposition.

The two words for year, standing for lunar and solar years appear to be the same. They are of course the two series which remain different through a discrepancy in the cosmic clockwork which was inexplicable in ancient times based on models of the cosmos based on circles. The year brings the light of the moon and the sun which shows us the growth of the plants and other growths of the earth like animals, and here is the key phrase which it "passes them in review within itself." This self review is broken up into two parts one related to the self and the other related to review. The solar year relates to

IV. OF TIME, in, in the course of, hôrêi en eiarinêi II.; en hêmèrai, en nukti Hdt., attic; en hôi (sc. chronôi, while, Hdt.:-- en tais spondais in the time of the truce, Xen.

2. in, within, en etesi pentêkonta Thuc.; en trisi mêsi Xen.

B. WITHOUT CASE, AS ADVERB, in the phrase en de . . . :

1. and therein, Hom.

2. and among them, II.

3. and besides, moreover, Hom., Soph.

C. IN COMPOS.:

1. with Verbs, the prep. retains its sense of being in or at a place, etc., c. dat., or foll. by eis or en.

2. with Adjs., it qualifies, as in empikros, rather better; or expresses the possession of a quality, as in enaimos, with blood in it, emphônos with a voice.

II. en becomes em- before the labials b m p ph ps; eg- before the gutturals g k x ch; el- before l; and in a few words er- before r.

¹² for some call him Zena, and use the one half, and others who use the other half call him Dia; the two together signify the nature of the God, and the business of a name, as we were saying, is to express the nature. For there is none who is more the author of life to us and to all, than the lord and king of all. Wherefore we are right in calling him Zena and Dia, which are one name, although divided, meaning the God through whom all creatures always have life (di on zen aei pasi tois zosin uparchei).

<http://66.102.7.104/search?q=cache:1Czx09jRXSwJ:www.stenudd.com/myth/greek/plato.htm+zena+dia+zeus&hl=en&client=firefox-a>

the in-the-self and the lunar year relates to the review process. Then, Socrates brings up the etymology of Zeus again as the god who gives life, and how the name of Zeus was split and so are the lunar and solar years. In other words there is a fundamental duality within Zeus as signified by his names, and that duality appears as the duality of the solar and lunar years that brings the lights of the sun and moon which we explored in the last chapter. What Socrates seems to be saying here is that Epidocles is wrong when he says that there are four elements. Rather two of these elements are foreign and not Greek, just as the other half of those who fought the Trojan war were not Greeks. Rather only Earth and Air are Greek and that they relate to the unfolding of the physus and logos as growths from the earth. That growth needs time and we see that time as the seasons. But the seasons appear within a double cycle, of lunar and solar years, that bring together the two celestials and also create two series that are slightly out of sync with each other. But this out of sync quality is intrinsic because the growth of living things out of the earth is reviewed within itself by the physus and logos themselves, and the split between the in-itself and the review is like the split in Zeus into the living and the godly as he is the god who supports life.

This etymology is not something we might have expected. We might have expected Socrates to support Epidocles and his identification of the four elements. But rather we see that the elements of Thales and Heraclitus are seen as foreign to the Greek Earth and the Greek Wind. And the Wind of flux brings us growth out of the native soil which is the mother. And surprisingly this growth that brings to light the plants and other goods of the earth, is reviewed in itself, which is to say that it is seen in itself by itself through the influence of the two celestials which appear to us as two ways to count the year that is divided into seasons. It gives the impression that the growth of things as physus or logos is so that the things can know themselves, that brings back the idea of G.H. Mead that it takes time for something to

Be what it is, and that time it takes is what is needed for the phenomena to know itself. Of course, we can say with Heidegger that it is the purpose of Dasein for nature to know itself, that there is a special Being within nature by which it knows itself, and so man is implicated in that witnessing of nature within itself, because man is within nature and serves as a reviewer or witness of nature. However, it is not clear whether Socrates intends to include man in the formula of the internal witnessing of growth that is mentioned here.

[Her.] Indeed, Socrates, you make surprising progress.

[Soc.] I am run away with.

[Her.] Very true.

[Soc.] But am not yet at my utmost speed.

Socrates with the consideration of terrestrials both foreign and domestic, and how the celestials effect earth by setting the lengths of the year that belong together as the two names of Zeus belong together, turns a corner and begins now to consider man and his virtues. We move from the cosmic etymologies to the humanist etymologies. It is interesting that Tantalus is considered foreign or Phrygian who we started off with as our first human hero in the tragic unfolding of the genealogy that was first in the cosmic series of etymologies. In a sense by banishing Fire and Water to foreign tongues Socrates has come full cycle and undercut his own etymological project because the first human hero after the gods that he mentions is foreign. We expect this type of Irony from Socrates in which he paints a cosmic picture of unfolding of the gods, heroes, and other cosmic players and then brings attention to the foreignness of those heroes at the end making us wonder whether the series applies to us at all. Midus, the Lydians, Gordius of the Gordian Knot, Troy are all the near foreigners between Persia and themselves. It is interesting that Thales and Anaximander and other pre-Socratic who initiated physics were from the mainland of Turkey which was this area. So Socrates could be disavowing Physics as an approach by labeling Fire and Water as elements as foreign. And it is with disavowal he proceeds to begin to enter into the

realm of the etymologies relating to man and virtues of men. So Socrates is in fact drawing a line between the Pre-Socratic physical philosophers and the Socratic ideal of attempting to understand man.

But notice that he moves at the tip over point from the celestials to the terrestrials, and the terrestrials are seen as related to physus and logos. And physus and logos is related to a witnessing or review in itself of the things that grow in the light of the clearing in Being, which we could understand as Dasein which reviews the growth pattern brought on by the light of the seasons as it rolls through the doubled series of the year in lunar or solar months and weeks. The difference between the two types of year that are so out of kilter, with their difference, is built on the difference in Zeus himself between his divinity and his support of life. Of course, this definition of Zeus makes him a Zoa in Blake's sense, in fact Zeus is Baal the god of Covetousness which would be Orc in the Four Zoas. Urizen awakes and comes to sit beside Orc and he has his books of iron read to him. Orc is tied to the tree of mystery with roots that go into the center of the earth. Orc is Blake's image of Christ and Urizen is Lucifer. It is not a flattering picture of the Christian Avatar of God, and so it is clear why Blake did not try to publish the Four Zoas in his life. The Four Zoas is a story of the unfolding of the Zoas as the various forms of God in the Bible prior to creation, rather than the unfolding of things after creation. Reading back into Socrates he is saying that the doubleness of the Zoas is what leads to the doubleness of the year which then gives us the seasons, which in turn give us the difference between wind and earth which is the basis for the growth of things either in the physus or the logos. Blake captures this doubleness in the relation between the Zoas and their Emanations, and then between these and their Specters and Shadows. The four figurations of the four Zoas give us a picture of the Arche. And what I realized is that the divided line of the Republic is just one of four divided lines that appear as the differentiation of the four Zoas, so the four divided lines are a

picture of the Arche. But we have lost sight of three of these divided lines and we only get a picture of the one formed by Urizen in The Republic which like the Four Zoas is a narrative about what happens when the mind is split from the body. In a sense Blake is telling us the same cautionary tale that Plato has already told us in the Republic.

It takes time, a lunar year and a solar year for the witnessing of growth that appears out of the earth within the light of the day and night produced by the sun and moon. That growth is seen as the unfolding of physus and logos as natural phenomena which is reviewed and witnessed from within. We interpret that witnessing and review from within itself to be Dasein, but we could also think of it as something other than dasein intrinsic to the noumena themselves. But if we interpret the witnessing as being the province of man part of nature within nature witnessing nature, then we find a reason that Socrates moves his etymological investigation to looking at the words related to the virtues of man.

We can see man as nature in relation to nature, i.e. as the Gordian knot, in which the self-interference and self-folding onto itself is the means of witnessing of the self by the self and its self-organization. But we can also see nature as controlling nature as Bolos says, and we know that it is the Lydians that invent money traditionally which is a means of control of things by extracting value from them and placing it in something that is easily exchanged. So man as the market animal is the means of nature controlling nature which eventually leads to the global economy which is outside the control of man himself in spite of the fact that it represents the collective control of resources by men. We can see that nature produces nature as Bolos said in the unfolding of the physus in growth, and in the unfolding of the thoughts, speeches and written works in logos. And that production is like the touch of Midus who washed his golden touch into the river and thus made the river full of gold. The midus touch of nature is that everything that nature touches

becomes more nature. And we can see that nature also delights nature as Bolos has said. But that delight may be merely a tantalizing desire as we see in the punishment of Tantalus. Tantalus did not know how to interact with the gods. He mixed up human food with the food of the gods or tried to feed his children to the gods and for this he was punished with the nature of the world which is *dunya*, *dukha*, and *maya*. But he is the first man in Socrates genealogy. Finally we can say that nature contains nature, and this is what makes it a meta-system. Thus Troy contains the Trojan Horse which puts the Achaean army within the walls of Troy by the *metis* of Odysseus. These are the steps of the Special System that relate to Alchemy, and we can see that these are the foreign myths associated with the Phrygians. The Phrygian myths are all pictures of the special systems at the various levels of emergence. The foreignness that Socrates calls up as otherness has a resonance with the special systems in a strange way which is hard to understand. But what we must understand from this is that the model of the duality of *physis* and *logos* and the model of the witnessing in the clearing created by the difference between lunar and solar years and their seasons stands somehow opposite the otherness of the Alchemical to which the rejected words of fire and water belong. Socrates marks the Phrygians as otherness but that brings to mind their associated myths, and we find that those myths remind us of Bolos and the Special Systems as well as the frames of self-relation and self-containment of nature by nature.
