

# The [Psycho]Historical Dialectic of Ancient Mediterranean Philosophy through Plato's Philosophical Developments

by Aoristos Dyosphainthos

Author's Preface. The purpose of F.E.D. Vignette #12 is to present an abbreviated E.D. 'Dialectical Meta-Model Meta-Equation' for the [psycho]history -- and for the [psycho]historical dialectic -- of the progression of Ancient Mediterranean philosophies through the two philosophies espoused by Plato, his "early" and his "final" philosophies.

This 'Dialectical Meta-Model Meta-Equation' can also serve as a worked, "cook-book" example, and sample, of the application of the **NQ** dialectical algebra to summarize interconnections of, and to "solve for", the psychohistorical-dialectical 'ideo-meta-dynamics' of key episodes in the [psycho]historical progress of 'The Human Phenome'.

A Note about the On-Line Availability of Definitions of F.E.D. Key Technical Terms. Definitions of Encyclopedia Dialectica technical terms, including E.D. 'neologia', are available on-line via the following URLs --

<http://www.dialectics.org/dialectics/Glossary.html>

<https://www.point-of-departure.org/Point-Of-Departure/ClarificationsArchive/ClarificationsArchive.htm>

-- by clicking on the links associated with each such term, listed, alphabetically, on the web-pages of the links above.

Definitions of the Encyclopedia Dialectica special terms most fundamental to this vignette are linked-to below --

«arché»

<https://www.point-of-departure.org/Point-Of-Departure/ClarificationsArchive/Arche/Arche.htm>

«arithmos» and «arithmoi»

<http://point-of-departure.org/Point-Of-Departure/ClarificationsArchive/Arithmos/Arithmos.htm>

«aufheben»

<https://www.point-of-departure.org/Point-Of-Departure/ClarificationsArchive/Aufheben/Aufheben.htm>

Historical Dialectics

<http://point-of-departure.org/Point-Of-Departure/ClarificationsArchive/HistoricalDialectics/HistoricalDialectics.htm>

**NQ** dialectical arithmetic/algebra

[http://www.dialectics.org/dialectics/Correspondence\\_files/Letter17-06JUN2009.pdf](http://www.dialectics.org/dialectics/Correspondence_files/Letter17-06JUN2009.pdf)

Psychohistorical Dialectics

<http://point-of-departure.org/Point-Of-Departure/ClarificationsArchive/PsychohistoricalDialectics/PsychohistoricalDialectics.htm>

-- and we plan to expand these definitions resources as the Encyclopedia Dialectica Dictionary Project unfolds.

[Note: "'Arithmetical Quantifiers'" vs. 'Arithmetical Qualifiers'. In the phrase "3 apples", we term "3" the "arithmetical ["pure"-]quantifier", and "apples" the "'ontological'" -- or *kind* of thing -- "'qualifier'". In the phrase "3 pounds of apples", we term "pounds" the 'metrical[-unit] qualifier' -- or "'unit of measure qualifier'" -- quantified by the 3, which, together, 'quanto-qualify' the 'ontological qualifier', "apples". A key use-value of the dialectical arithmetics is to provide algorithmic, ideographical-symbolic systems for the various kinds of 'arithmetical qualifiers', both with and without the co-presence of "'arithmetical quantifiers'".].

**I. Introduction to the *Psychohistorical Dialectic of Ancient Mediterranean Philosophy*.** The historical expanse of “Ancient Mediterranean [“Occidental”] Philosophy”, up to and including both of the two major stages of the philosophies of Plato, offers a stunningly rich diversity of ‘human memetic content’ -- of *psychohistorical material*.

The task of framing a unified model, let alone a *dialectical-mathematical meta-model*, to encompass all or most of the history of this vast human-phenomic proliferation, as an *ideo-meta-genealogy*, all following from a single philosophy as *«arché»*, or starting point, via the iterated *self-reflexion*, and *self-refluxion*, of that *«arché»*, and of the *ideo-cumula* spawned by that *self-iteration*, would seem to be a daunting assignment, to say the least.

Many difficult choices face the “*psychohistorian*”, the *dialectical meta-modeler* who pursues such a task, not least of which is the choice of *«arché»* philosophy, of the *ultimate ideo-ancestor*, of all that follows it in the *psychoalgebraic representations* of the *meta-model-generated progression* of multi-category [multi-philosophy] *ideo-cumula*.

One might want to consider, as candidates *for* this *«arché»* philosophy -- i.e., for the “*kernel*” or “*seed*” of the *meta-model Seldon Function* -- the early philosophies *of* the *«arché»* of the *«kosmos»* -- e.g., the philosophy of Anaximander [moisture as *«arché»*], the philosophy of Anaximenes [air/breath-of-life as *«arché»*], and the philosophy of Pythagoras [the origin of the number sequence as *«arché»*], etc.

For the purposes of the guided *meta-model* construction exercise explicated in this vignette, we have chosen the philosophy of Herakleitos as *«arché»*, and have sought thereby to encompass, by the *connotative entailments* of its “*Triadic Seldon Function*” *self-iterata*, and via two successive such *self-iterations*, or “*negations of negations*”, of our Herakleitean *«arché»*, both the philosophy of Parmenides, and, then, also Plato’s early philosophy of the supremacy of “*The Forms*”, and, finally, Plato’s final recorded philosophy, of the supremacy of *«autokinesis»*.

The *dialectical-algebraic language* that we will employ in constructing this *dialectical meta-model* is that of the *NQ dialectical arithmetic*, the first and simplest *explicitly dialectical arithmetic* in the *dialectical progression of dialectical arithmetics* discovered by our co-founder, Karl Seldon.

**II. E.D. Standard Interpretations for the *Initial Generic Ordinal Qualifiers of the NQ Arithmetic*.** The first four, first-order-logic, Dedekind-Peano Postulates for the “*Natural*” Numbers focus on *ordinality*, *not cardinality*, viz. --

1. **1** is a “Natural Number”.
2. The *successor* of any “Natural Number” is also a “Natural Number”.
3. No two, distinct “Natural Numbers” have the same *successor*.
4. **1** is *not* the *successor* of any “Natural Number”, i.e., **1** has *no ancestor* within the “Natural Numbers”.

-- defining the essence of the “*Natural Numbers*” explicitly in terms of [apparently purely-]*quantitative ordinality*. In keeping with this focus on *the ordinal*, Seldon defines the system of the *NQ dialectical arithmetic* -- the first *antithesis-system*, or *contra-system*, to the “*Natural Numbers*” *system* -- in terms of *qualitative ordinality*. The *NQ*, which he also calls the *meta-Natural meta-Numbers*, are, in their simplest, least-interpreted essence, a consecutive sequence of ‘meta-numeral’ ideograms representing the successive *qualities*, *not quantities*, of *ordinality* -- the *quality* of ‘*first-ness*’, followed by the *quality* of ‘*second-ness*’, followed by the *quality* of ‘*third-ness*’, and so on... -- satisfying the four first-order-logic *contra-Peanic*, *Qualo-Peanic* axioms:

- 1’. The *ordinal qualifier* for the *quality* of ‘*first-ness*’ is an element of the *consecuum* of generic *ordinal qualifiers*.
- 2’. The *successor* of any element of the *consecuum* of generic *ordinal qualifiers* is also an element of same.
- 3’. Any two, distinct *ordinal qualifiers* have *qualitatively unequal successors*.
- 4’. The *ordinal qualifier* for the *quality* of ‘*first-ness*’ is *«arché»*: *not* the *successor* of any element of its *consecuum*.

The symbols, or ‘*meta-numerals*’, that stand for the ‘*meta-numbers*’ of the  $\mathbf{N}^{\mathbf{Q}}$  ‘*archeonic consecuum*’ are derived, *syntactically*, in a way which represents the *semantic* ‘*self-subsumption*’, ‘*self-subordination*’, or ‘*self-demotion*’ [*dialectical, self-«aufheben» self-negation*] of the “**Natural Numbers**”. That process is the positive fruition of the *dialectical, immanent self-critique* of the “**Natural Numbers**”, which divulges the  $\mathbf{N}^{\mathbf{Q}}$  as the implicit, most extreme known opposite, “*Non-Standard Model*” of the “*Standard*”, Peano “**Natural Numbers**”. This involves the turning of ‘*generic ordinal quantifiers*’ of the “**Natural Numbers**” into the ‘*generic ordinal qualifiers*’ of the  $\mathbf{N}^{\mathbf{Q}}$  ‘*meta-Natural meta-Numbers*’. The conceptual ‘*self-subsumption*’ of the *quantitative ordinality* intended by the Dedekind-Peano Postulates surfaces the  $\mathbf{N}^{\mathbf{Q}}$  as their hitherto hidden, implicit ‘*intra-dual*’, based upon the *generic quality of ordinality*, a “‘*genericity*’” which we represent by the ‘*meta-numeralic*’ ideogram ‘ $\mathbb{Q}$ ’. That ‘*meta-numeral component*’ represents ‘*qualitative ordinality*’, or ‘*ordinal quality*’, *in general*: just ‘ $\mathbb{Q}$ ’, or, more fully expressed, just ‘ $\mathbb{Q}_{\mathbf{N}}$ ’.

To fully express, ‘*meta-numeral-y*’, or ideographically, the ‘*consecuum*’ of *specific ordinal qualities*, namely --

$\mathbf{N}^{\mathbf{Q}} \equiv \{ \text{‘first-ness’}; \text{‘second-ness’}; \text{‘third-ness’}, \text{etc.} \}$

-- we must add a second ‘*meta-numeral component*’, via “‘*subordinating*’” *specific* “**Natural Numbers**”, as *specific* ‘*ordinal quantifiers*’, to the *generic ordinal qualifier* symbol ‘ $\mathbb{Q}$ ’, by ‘*subscripting*’ those *specific* “**Natural Numbers**” to a ‘script-level’ ‘ $\mathbb{Q}$ ’ above them, yielding --

$\mathbf{N}^{\mathbf{Q}} \equiv \{ \mathbb{Q}_1, \mathbb{Q}_2, \mathbb{Q}_3, \dots \}$  [in which each ‘*meta-number*’ is an «*arithmos eidetikos*»], vs.  $\mathbf{N} \equiv \{ 1, 2, 3, \dots \}$ .

Note that this *opposition* of an arithmetical system of *purely-quantitative ordinality*, based upon the  $\mathbf{N}$ , *versus* an arithmetical system of *purely-qualitative ordinality*, based on the  $\mathbf{N}^{\mathbf{Q}}$ , is not a *radical dualism*, imagined as an *absolute, irreconcilable diremption* between an *absolute quantitative* and an *absolute qualitative*. This *opposition* is, on the contrary, a *dialectical antithesis-sum*. The  $\mathbf{N}$  *quantifiers* are still there -- still present -- in, or “‘under’”, the  $\mathbf{N}^{\mathbf{Q}}$  *qualifiers*, though *subsumed*, *subordinated*, *demoted* -- as their *subscripts* or denominators: The  $\mathbf{N}$  *quantifiers* are still “*contained*” in[side] the  $\mathbf{N}^{\mathbf{Q}}$  *qualifiers*. That is,  $\mathbf{N}^{\mathbf{Q}}$  *qualifiers* are «*aufheben*» determinate *negations / conservations / elevations* of  $\mathbf{N}$  *quantifiers*.

For this first layer of interpretation of these “*purely-qualitative*”  $\mathbf{N}^{\mathbf{Q}}$  ‘*meta-numbers*’ -- which does not yet make explicit their universal interpretability for the modeling of *dialectical progressions* -- this is all that they represent: *abstract temporality*; [*abstract chronological*] *order*; *generic* ‘*ordered-ness*’; the consecutive succession of ‘*qualitative ordinality*’; the ‘*consecuum*’ of *order quality* or of *order qualities*.

But even here, at this minimally-interpreted stage of the construction of the  $\mathbf{N}^{\mathbf{Q}}$  *dialectical arithmetic*, there is already a kind of *generic connotative entailment* at work. True, it is but a shadow, and but a ‘pre-vestigial’ harbinger, of the richness of the kind of particularity of *categorical followership* that drives forward, intuitively, the *dialectical, purely-qualitative logic* of the more concrete, more specific *dialectical-algebraic* interpretations thereof. A case in point is exemplified in the very ‘*meta-model*’ of *the dialectic of the Ancient Mediterranean Philosophies*, constructed herein.

This *generic connotative entailment* can be formulated as follows: ‘*second-ness*’ follows -- and even follows *from* -- ‘*first-ness*’; ‘*third-ness*’ follows [*from*] ‘*second-ness*’, and so on.

In the next section, the construction, by iterated interpretations layering, of the Seldonian *first dialectical arithmetic* will advance from this harbinger of ‘*connotative entailment*’ to the following, still *generic*, but at last also explicitly *dialectical*, form of ‘*connotative entailment*’ *ordinality*: *first full antithesis* follows from the *self-interaction* of [«*arché*»-]*thesis*; *first full synthesis* follows from the *mutual interaction* of *first full thesis* and *first full antithesis*, and so on.

### III. Triadic Seldon Function Interpretation of the Initial Generic $\mathbf{nQ}$ Ontological Category Qualifiers.

The generic form for the functions-family of the Seldon Functions is that of a generic cumulum symbol  $\left[ \begin{array}{c} \text{H} \\ \text{H} \\ \text{H} \end{array} \right]$  on the LHS [Left-Hand Side] of the 'dialectical meta-equation', equated to an RHS expression representing 'self-reflexive operation' of an «arché», “‘seed’”, “‘cell-form’”, or 'ultimate ancestor' ontological category symbol  $\left[ \begin{array}{c} \square \\ \square \\ \square \\ \alpha \end{array} \right]$  -- indicating its recurring 'self-reflexion' via a 'meta-exponentiated', monotonically increasing  $\left[ \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ \uparrow \\ \uparrow \end{array} \right]$  whole-number-valued “‘independent variable’”  $\left[ \mathbf{h} \right]$  -- on the RHS of the generic Seldon Function equation, viz. [with 'generic-ness' connoted by the “rectangular” motif of the symbols-set]:

$$\left[ \begin{array}{c} \text{H} \\ \text{H} \\ \text{H} \end{array} \right]_{\mathbf{h} \uparrow} = \left[ \begin{array}{c} \square \\ \square \\ \square \\ \alpha \end{array} \right]_{\mathbf{v} \uparrow}^{\mathbf{h} \uparrow}, \text{ for } \mathbf{h} \text{ in } \{0, 1, 2, 3, \dots\}.$$

If  $\mathbf{v} = 2$ , the Generic Seldon Function above is said to belong to the Dyadic Seldon Function sub-family. If  $\mathbf{v} = 3$ , the Generic Seldon Function above is said to belong to the Triadic Seldon Function sub-family. Our remarks herein are concentrated on the Triadic Seldon Functions, as the 'dialectical-mathematical meta-equation', modeling the dialectical progression of the Ancient Mediterranean Philosophies, exposted herein, is of the  $\mathbf{v} = 3$  variety.

With  $\mathbf{v} = 3$ , and selecting that special generic Triadic Seldon Function form that we reserve for an historical dialectic, or for a psychohistorical dialectic, the form of the 'meta-model meta-equation' to be constructed herein becomes, more specifically --

$$\left[ \begin{array}{c} \rangle \\ | \\ | \\ | \\ \langle \\ \tau \uparrow \end{array} \right] = \left[ \begin{array}{c} \diamond \\ \diamond \\ \diamond \\ \alpha \end{array} \right]_{\mathbf{3} \uparrow}^{\tau \uparrow}, \text{ for } \tau \text{ in } \{0, 1, 2, 3, \dots\}.$$

-- wherein the symbol  $\tau$ , replacing the more generic symbol  $\mathbf{h}$ , takes on 'temporal' connotations, representing successive historical periods, or “epochs”, and wherein, in general, the “angular” motif of the entire symbols-set used is to connote the [psycho]historical domain of 'dialectical meta-modeling'.

The Seldon Functions bring with them a further, second layer of interpretation of the  $\mathbf{nQ}$  qualifiers,  $\{ \left[ \begin{array}{c} \square \\ \square \\ \square \\ \alpha \end{array} \right]_1, \left[ \begin{array}{c} \square \\ \square \\ \square \\ \alpha \end{array} \right]_2, \left[ \begin{array}{c} \square \\ \square \\ \square \\ \alpha \end{array} \right]_3, \dots \}$ , by which they are interpreted as qualifiers that symbolize generic dialectical ontological categories, e.g., as “‘thesis’” categories, or as full or partial 'contra-thesis' categories, or as full or partial 'uni-thesis' categories.

If we assign  $\left[ \begin{array}{c} \text{E} \\ \text{E} \\ \text{E} \\ \text{E} \end{array} \right] \rightarrow$  the «arché»-thesis category,  $\left[ \begin{array}{c} \diamond \\ \diamond \\ \diamond \\ \alpha \end{array} \right]$ , to the generic  $\mathbf{nQ}$  qualifier 'meta-number',  $\left[ \begin{array}{c} \square \\ \square \\ \square \\ \alpha \end{array} \right]_1$ , as signified by ' $\left[ \begin{array}{c} \diamond \\ \diamond \\ \diamond \\ \alpha \end{array} \right] \text{E} \rightarrow \left[ \begin{array}{c} \square \\ \square \\ \square \\ \alpha \end{array} \right]_1$ ', and if we can discern that  $\left[ \begin{array}{c} \diamond \\ \diamond \\ \diamond \\ \alpha \end{array} \right]$ , and all of its successor-categories, and their cumula, as generated by its successive, cumulative, 'Seldon-functional self-operations', connote «aufheben» operators, that is, dialectical negation operators, then the Triadic Seldon Function is seen to signify, under the axioms of the system of arithmetic of the  $\mathbf{nQ}$  meta-numbers [ [http://www.dialectics.org/dialectics/Correspondence\\_files/Letter17-06JUN2009.pdf](http://www.dialectics.org/dialectics/Correspondence_files/Letter17-06JUN2009.pdf) ], a 'self-iterated', cumulative recurrence of dialectical “negations of [the] negations”.

With every [unit] increase in  $\tau$ , the Triadic Seldon Function 'formulaic recipe' calls for the triadic self-operation of the result of the previous triadic self-operation, i.e., for a negation of the negation of the result of the previous negation of the negation. Only for  $\tau = 0$  -- only for the case in which no self-operation occurs -- is the “result” a singleton [ideo-] ontological category symbol, the symbol for the «arché» [ideo-]ontological category alone, instead of that “result” taking the form of a cumulum of three or more such symbols, i.e., a “non-amalgamative sum” [cf. Musès], or «a-sumbletoi» sum [cf. Plato], of '[ideo-]ontological category' symbols, since  $3^0 = 1$ :

$$\underbrace{\rangle - | - \langle}_0 = \langle \langle \alpha \rangle \rangle^{3^0} = \langle \langle \alpha \rangle \rangle^1 = \langle \langle \alpha \rangle \rangle = \langle \alpha \rangle$$

For example, if we take epoch  $\tau = 1$ , and denote the «*arché*» ontological category simply by  $\alpha$ , for syntactical convenience, then the *Triadic Seldon Function* calls for the following, as per the  $nQ$  axioms, because  $3^1 = 3$  --

$$\underbrace{\rangle - | - \langle}_1 = \langle \alpha \rangle^{3^1} = \langle \alpha \rangle^3 = \langle \alpha \rangle \diamond \langle \alpha \rangle \diamond \langle \alpha \rangle = \alpha \diamond \beta \diamond \gamma$$

-- wherein  $\alpha$  denotes the «*arché*» category or “thesis”,  $\beta \in \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_2$  the first ‘*contra-category*’ or “antithesis”, and  $\gamma \in \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_3$  the first ‘*uni-category*’ or “synthesis”, with ‘ $\diamond$ ’ standing for a generalized addition operation, that covers the addition of *qualitatively* distinct terms, and with ‘ $\diamond$ ’ standing for a generalized multiplication operation, that covers multiplication of  $nQ$  *qualifiers*.

If we take ‘ $\langle \alpha \rangle \diamond \langle \alpha \rangle \diamond \langle \alpha \rangle$ ’ as connoting the associative grouping ‘ $\langle \langle \alpha \rangle \diamond \langle \langle \alpha \rangle \diamond \langle \alpha \rangle \rangle$ ’, with ‘ $\langle \alpha \rangle$ ’ denoting the category to be *dialectically negated*, and then *dialectically negated* again, and with ‘ $\langle \langle \alpha \rangle \diamond \langle \alpha \rangle \rangle$ ’ denoting the *first negation* of that category, and with ‘ $\langle \langle \alpha \rangle \diamond \langle \langle \alpha \rangle^2 \rangle$ ’ as the *next, second negation*, then we have ‘ $\langle \langle \alpha \rangle \diamond \langle \langle \alpha \rangle \diamond \langle \alpha \rangle \rangle$ ’, as a whole, connoting the *first dialectical negation of the negation*, yielding the *first triad* of “thesis  $\diamond$  antithesis  $\diamond$  synthesis”, viz. --

$$\langle \langle \alpha \rangle \diamond \langle \alpha \rangle \rangle = \langle \alpha \rangle \diamond \langle \alpha \alpha \rangle = \langle \alpha \rangle \diamond \langle \beta \rangle \equiv \alpha \diamond \beta$$

-- and --

$$\langle \alpha \rangle \diamond \langle \alpha \rangle \diamond \langle \alpha \rangle = \langle \alpha \rangle \diamond \langle \langle \alpha \rangle \diamond \langle \alpha \rangle \rangle = \langle \alpha \rangle \diamond \langle \alpha \diamond \beta \rangle = \alpha \diamond \beta \diamond \langle \beta \alpha \rangle \equiv \alpha \diamond \beta \diamond \gamma$$

-- which, in terms of the generic, minimally-interpreted  $nQ$  *arithmetics*, is a *dialectical interpretation* of the generic --

$$\begin{aligned} \underbrace{\mathbb{H}}_1 &= \llbracket \mathbb{Q}_1 \rrbracket^{3^1} = \llbracket \mathbb{Q}_1 \rrbracket^3 = \langle \mathbb{Q}_1 \rangle \diamond \langle \mathbb{Q}_1 \rangle \diamond \langle \mathbb{Q}_1 \rangle = \langle \mathbb{Q}_1 \rangle \diamond \langle \langle \mathbb{Q}_1 \rangle \diamond \langle \mathbb{Q}_1 \rangle \rangle \\ &= \langle \mathbb{Q}_1 \rangle \diamond \langle \mathbb{Q}_1 \diamond \mathbb{Q}_{1+1} \rangle = \langle \mathbb{Q}_1 \rangle \diamond \langle \mathbb{Q}_1 \diamond \mathbb{Q}_2 \rangle = \langle \langle \langle \mathbb{Q}_1 \rangle \diamond \langle \mathbb{Q}_1 \rangle \rangle \diamond \langle \langle \mathbb{Q}_1 \rangle \diamond \langle \mathbb{Q}_2 \rangle \rangle \\ &= \langle \langle \mathbb{Q}_1 \diamond \mathbb{Q}_{1+1} \rangle \diamond \langle \mathbb{Q}_2 \diamond \mathbb{Q}_{1+2} \rangle \rangle = \mathbb{Q}_1 \diamond \mathbb{Q}_2 \diamond \mathbb{Q}_3, \text{ given that } \mathbb{Q}_2 \diamond \mathbb{Q}_2 = \mathbb{Q}_2. \end{aligned}$$

The **second** iteration of this **dialectical negation of the negation**, corresponding to the consecutively **next** value of  $\tau$ , namely,  $\tau = 2$ , yields the following, ontologically-expanded **cumulum** of **ontological categories** -- a '**triad of triads**', consisting of **9** consecutive **ontological categories**:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \rangle - | - \langle_2 &= \langle \alpha \rangle^{3^2} = \langle \alpha \rangle^9 = \langle \langle \alpha \rangle^3 \rangle^3 = \langle \alpha \oplus \beta \oplus \gamma \rangle^3 \\
 &= \langle \alpha \oplus \beta \oplus \gamma \rangle \oplus \langle \alpha \oplus \beta \oplus \gamma \rangle \oplus \langle \alpha \oplus \beta \oplus \gamma \rangle \\
 &= \langle \alpha \oplus \beta \oplus \gamma \rangle \oplus \langle \langle \alpha \oplus \beta \oplus \gamma \rangle \oplus \langle \alpha \oplus \beta \oplus \gamma \rangle \rangle \\
 &= \alpha \oplus \beta \oplus \gamma \oplus \delta \oplus \epsilon \oplus \zeta \oplus \eta \oplus \theta \oplus \iota.
 \end{aligned}$$

The additional **6** ontological category-symbols above are **dialectically interpreted**, per the **E.D.** standard, as follows:

$\delta$  = **fourth ontological category**, **first partial contra-category**;

$\epsilon$  = **fifth ontological category**, **second partial contra-category**;

$\zeta$  = **sixth ontological category**, **second full contra-category**;

$\eta$  = **seventh ontological category**, **first partial uni-category**;

$\theta$  = **eighth ontological category**, **second partial uni-category**;

$\iota$  = **ninth ontological category**, **second full uni-category**.

We will not here pursue this **E.D.** standard **dialectical interpretation** of the **ontological categories** generated by the generic **Triadic Seldon Function** beyond  $\tau = 2$ , because the “‘solution’” -- or '**semantification**' -- of the category-terms generated by the '**dialectical-mathematical meta-model meta-equation**' constructed in this vignette [whose terms are generated, initially, as **algebraic unknowns**, terms of **unknown** meaning], as presented herein, does not extend beyond that **second 'self-iteration'** for that '**meta-model**'.

The '**purely-qualitative calculations**' illustrated above describe our expectations for this '**meta-model**' in terms of **generic** characterizations of the successive, consecutive **dialectical categories**.

The next section addresses the heart of this '**meta-model**' -- the **specific** meanings of the **generic dialectical categories** as applied to the **special** case of **the psychohistorical dialectic of the Ancient Mediterranean Philosophies**.

**IV. E.D. Solution for the 'Meta-Model Meta-Equation' of our Dialectic of Ancient Philosophy.** We have selected, as the «arché» of the universe of discourse of *Ancient Mediterranean Philosophy*, the philosophy of Herakleitos [circa 540-475 B.C.E.], and we denote that philosophy, in the 'meta-model' thereof, constructed in this section, by the symbol  $\underline{H}$ , or  $\mathbb{H}$ ,  $\mathbb{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_1$ .

The few fragments of Herakleitos's writings that survived the last Dark Ages indicate that he held a view of reality as a flowing continuum/universal flux, characterized by *constant change*, a 'uni-category' of "constancy" &/vs. "change":

"Everything changes and nothing remains still ... and ... you cannot step twice into the same stream.";

"We both step and do not step in the same rivers. We are and are not." ;

"All things are an interchange for fire, and fire for all things, just like goods for gold and gold for goods.";

"We must know that war is common to all and strife is justice, and that all things come into being through strife necessarily.";

[Diogenes Laërtius interpreting]: "All things come into being by *conflict of opposites*, and the sum of things flows like a stream.";

"There is a harmony in *the bending back*, as in the case of the bow and the lyre." [*Emphasis added* by A.D.]

"Fire" serves as metaphor, in Herakleitos's philosophy, for the *primal substance*, or «arché», of the «kosmos»; the *ultimate origin* of all other things.

Our *next* step, then, is to *dialectically negate* this  $\underline{H}$ , using  $\underline{H}$  itself as the *dialectical negation operation* for itself --

$$\langle\langle \underline{H} \rangle\rangle \diamond \langle\langle \underline{H} \rangle\rangle = \mathbb{H} \diamond \mathbb{HH} = \mathbb{H} \diamond \mathbb{?} \equiv \underline{H} \diamond \mathbb{?}$$

-- and to inquire, then, as to what might be an apt historical, *Ancient Mediterranean* meaning, for the algorithmically-generated new symbol  $\mathbb{HH}$  as to what might have been the new, historical, philosophical, 'ideo-ontological category'; the *new kind* of philosophical ideas, of philosophical 'psychohistorical material' -- that irrupted from out of this *immanent, self-confrontation* -- this *self-critique* -- of  $\underline{H}$  or  $\mathbb{H}$  by  $\underline{H}$  or  $\mathbb{H}$ . I.e., our next task is to "solve for"  $\mathbb{HH}$

What we find, as our best candidate for the historical/philosophical meaning of our "'algebraic unknown'",  $\mathbb{HH}$  is the later emerged 'contra-philosophy' -- 'contra-Herakleitean philosophy' -- of Parmenides, denoted herein by  $\underline{P}$  or  $\mathbb{P}$ .

The philosophy of Parmenides [515-450 B.C.E.], as determined from surviving accounts of his views, is one of a claimed eternal changelessness of reality -- a "reality" in which change is only a human delusion:

"There is one story left, one road: that *it is*. And on this road there are very many *signs* that *being* is *uncreated* and *imperishable*, whole, unique, *unwavering*, and complete." [*Emphasis added* by A.D.]

*Parmenideanism* is a kind of *absolutist 'meta-monad-ization'* of *Heraclitean* diversity and flux: a single «monad» of "being" posited *not* as the «aufheben» of the vast multiplicity of «monads» of *diversity/flux*, but claimed to be their *absolute obliteration*, as "falsity", in a singular "truth" of *absolute "being"*.

Our solution to the  $\langle\langle \underline{H} \rangle\rangle \diamond \langle\langle \underline{H} \rangle\rangle$  part of  $\langle\langle \underline{H} \rangle\rangle^3 = \langle\langle \underline{H} \rangle\rangle \diamond \langle\langle \underline{H} \rangle\rangle \diamond \langle\langle \underline{H} \rangle\rangle$  is thus  $\mathbb{HH} = \mathbb{P}$   
 $\equiv \underline{P}$ ,  $\mathbb{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_2$ . But what of the rest of  $\langle\langle \underline{H} \rangle\rangle \diamond \langle\langle \underline{H} \rangle\rangle \diamond \langle\langle \underline{H} \rangle\rangle$ ; what of  $\langle\langle \underline{H} \rangle\rangle \diamond \langle\langle \underline{H} \rangle\rangle \diamond \langle\langle \underline{H} \rangle\rangle = \underline{H} \diamond \langle\langle \underline{H} \rangle\rangle \diamond \underline{P}$ ? What historic *meme* of the *Ancient Occidental 'Human Phenome'* corresponds to  $\mathbb{PH}$ ,  $\mathbb{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_3$ ?

What we find, as our best candidate for the historical/philosophical meaning of our “**algebraic unknown**”,  $\uparrow$ PH is the later emerged ‘**uni-philosophy**’ of Plato, the philosophy of the transcendental «Eide», also denoted herein by E or  $\uparrow$ E.

The earlier philosophy of Plato, as determined from his extensive written remains, is one combining the opposing philosophies of Parmenides and Herakleitos into a Parmenidean-dominant “**complex unity**” [cf. Hegel], or “**dialectical synthesis**”, positing a ruling, transcendental, eternally changeless and “true” reality -- the reality of the «Eide» or «Idea» -- “**above**”, and controlling, a subordinate, truth-falsifying, illusional realm of human sensuous experience “**below**”.

This Platonian “**complex unity**”,  $\uparrow$ PH is **not** a simple welding-together of a Parmenidean realm, P, “atop” a Herakleitean one, H. Their ‘**unifying complex**’ features a **middle realm**, mediating and bridging the Parmenidean realm “**above**” this “**median**”, and/with the Herakleitean realm “**below**” that “**median**”.

Magisterial Plato scholar Jacob Klein describes this Platonian ‘**unifying complex**’ in the following terms --

“...While the **numbers** [«arithmoi»; assemblages of **units** — A.D.] with which the arithmetician deals, the **arithmoi mathematikoi** or **monadikoi** [abstract, generic, idealized, **qualitatively-identical**, **homogeneous** “monads” or [ideal[ized], abstract **qualitative units** — A.D.] are capable of being counted up, i.e., **added**, so that, for instance, eight **monads** [eight ‘**ideo-monads**’; eight **abstract** ideal[ized]-**units**, **unities**, or **idea-a-toms** — A.D.] and ten **monads** make precisely eighteen **monads** together, the **assemblages of eide** [of ‘mental **seeings**’ or mental **visions**; of **ultimate ancestor** “«**ιδεας**» — A.D.], the “**arithmoi eidetikoi**” [assemblages, ensembles, “sets”, or [sub-]totalities of **qualitatively different**, or **heterogeneous**, **ideas** or «**eide**» — A.D.], cannot enter into any “community” with one another [i.e., are ‘**non-reductive**’, “**nonlinear**”, “**non-superpositioning**”, “**non-additive**”, **non-addable**’, or “**non-amalgamative**” / «**qsumbletoi**» — A.D.]”

“Their **monads** are all of **different kind** [i.e., are ‘**categorially**’, **ontologically**, **qualitatively unequal** — A.D.] and can be brought “together” only “partially”, namely only insofar as they happen to **belong** to one and the same **assemblage**, whereas insofar as they are “entirely bounded off” from one another...they are incapable of being thrown together, **in-comparable** [incapable of being **counted** as replications of the same quality of **unit[y]**, of the same **qualitative unit**, or «**monad**»]; incomparable **quantitatively** — A.D.] ...”

“The **monads** which constitute an “**eidetic number**”, i.e., **an assemblage of ideas**, are nothing but a conjunction of **eide** which **belong together**.”

“They **belong together** because they belong to one and the same **eidōs** [singular form of «**eide**»]: **one particular** ‘**internal / interior seeing**’, **vision**, or «**idea**» — A.D.] of a **higher order**, namely a “class” or **genos** [akin to, and ancestor to, the grouping of multiple **species** under a single **genus** in classical biological “taxonomics” or “systematics” — A.D.]”

“But all will together be able to “partake” in this **genos** (as for instance, “**human being**”, “**horse**”, “**dog**”, etc., partake in “**animal**”) **without partitioning** it among the (**finitely**) many **eide** and **without losing their indivisible unity only if the genos itself exhibits the mode of being of an arithmos** [singular form of «**arithmoi**»: a single **assemblage**, or “**multitude**”, of **units** / «**monads**» — A.D.]”

“Only the **arithmos** structure with its special **koinon** [“community” or “commonality” — A.D.] character is able to guarantee the essential traits of the community of **eide** demanded by **dialectic**: the indivisibility [**a-tom-icity** or **un-cut-ability** — A.D.] of the single “**monads**” which form the **arithmos assemblage**, the limitedness of this **assemblage of monads** as expressed in the joining of many **monads** into one **assemblage**, i.e., into one **idea**, and the **untouchable integrity** of this **higher idea** as well. What the single **eide** have “in common” is theirs only **in their community** and is not something which is to be found “beside” and “outside”...them. ...”

“The unity and determinacy of the **arithmos assemblage** is here rooted in the **content** of the **idea**..., that **content** which the **logos** [word; rational speech; ratio — A.D.] reaches in its characteristic activity of uncovering foundations “**analytically**”.

“A special kind of [all-of-**one-kind**, generic-units-based — A.D.] **number** of a particular nature is not needed in **this realm**, as it was among the **dianoetic numbers** [the «**arithmoi monadikoi**» — A.D.]..., to provide a foundation for this **unity**. In fact, it is impossible that any kinds of **number** [«**arithmoi**» — A.D.] corresponding to those of the **dianoetic realm** [the realm of ‘**dia-noesis**’ or of ‘**dianoia**’, i.e., of ‘**pre-sub-dialectical**’ thinking — A.D.] should exist **here**, since each **eidetic number** is, by virtue of its **eidetic character** [«**eide**»-character or «**idea**»-nature — A.D.], **unique in kind** [i.e., **qualitatively unique** / distinct / **heterogeneous** in comparison to other «**eide**» — A.D.], just as each of its “**monads**” has not only **unity** but also **uniqueness**. For each **idea** is characterized by being always the same and simply **singular** [∴ **additively idempotent**, and ∴ also ‘**unquantifiable**’, as per the axioms of the  $\mathbb{N}^Q$  «**arithmêtikê**» — A.D.] in contrast to the unlimitedly many **homogeneous monads** of the **realm of mathematical number**, which can be rearranged as often as desired into **definite numbers**. ...”

“The “**pure**” **mathematical monads** are, to be sure, **differentiated from the single objects of sense** by being **outside of change and time**, but they are **not different** in this sense — that they occur in **multitudes and are of the same kind** (Aristotle, **Metaphysics** B 6, 1002 b 15 ff.: [Mathematical objects] differ not at all in being **many** and of the **same kind**...), whereas each **eidōs** is, by contrast, **unreproducible** [hence **modelable by idempotent addition**, or ‘**non-addability**’, and ‘**non-quantifiability**’ — A.D.] and **truly one** (**Metaphysics** A 6, 987 b 15 ff.: “**Mathematical objects** differ from **objects of sense** in being everlasting and unchanged, from **the eide**, on the other hand, in being **many** and **alike**, while **an eidōs** is **each by itself one only**”...)”

“In consequence, as Aristotle reports (e.g., *Metaphysics* A 6, 987b 14 ff. and N 3, 1090b 35 f.), there are *three kinds of arithmoi*: (1) the *arithmos eidetikos* — *idea-number*, (2) the *arithmos aisthetos* — *sensible number*, (3) and “between”...these, the *arithmos mathematikos* or *monadikos* — *mathematical* and *monadic number*, which shares with the *first* its “purity” and “changelessness” [here Aristotle reflects only the *early*, more ‘*Parmenidean*’, Plato, not the later, «*Autokinesis*» Plato — A.D.] and with the *second* [the *third* in hierarchical order] its *manyness* and reproducibility.

“Here the “*aesthetic*” [“*sensible*”, i.e., ‘sense-able’, or *sensuous* — A.D.] *number* represents nothing but *the things themselves* which happen to be present for *aisthesis* [for *sense perception* — A.D.] in this number.”

“The *mathematical numbers* form *an independent domain of objects of study* [an *independent «mathesis»* in their own right — A.D.] which the *dianoia* [the faculty of *pre-/sub-dialectical thinking*’ — A.D.] reaches by noting that its own activity finds its exemplary fulfillment in “*reckoning* [i.e., *account-giving*] and *counting*” ...”

“The *eidetic number*, finally, indicates the *mode of being of the noeton* [that which exists “for” thought; that which thought “beholds”; the object of thought; the *idea[I]-object* — A.D.] as such — it defines the *eidōs ontologically* as a being which has *multiple relations to other eide in accordance with their particular nature* [i.e., in accord with their *content* — A.D.] and which is nevertheless in itself altogether *indivisible*.”

“The *Platonic theory* of the *arithmoi eidetikoi* is known to us in these terms *only from the Aristotelian polemic against it* (cf., above all, *Metaphysics* M 6-9)...”

[Jacob Klein, *Greek Mathematical Thought and the Origin of Algebra*, Dover [NY: 1968], pp. 89-91, *italic, bold, underline, and color emphasis added by A.D.*]

William Riese describes the *final known phase* of Plato’s two systems of *dialectical* philosophy as follows, whose bifurcation is signaled in Platonic dialogue known as *The Parmenides*:

“The dialogues of the Socratic period provide that view of the world usually associated with Plato.”

“The period of transition and criticism, and the final synthesis, are *little noted* ...”

“The *Parmenides* can be taken as signaling the change. In this dialogue Socrates is unable to defend his Doctrine of *Ideas* [i.e., of the «*Eiḗde*», herein denoted by **E** -- A.D.]. ...”

“Where the *Republic* and *Phaedo* stressed the *unchanging nature of the soul*, the emphasis in the *Phaedrus* is exactly reversed. In this dialogue, the *soul* is the principle of *self-motion* [in Greek, «*Auto-kinesis*» -- A.D.], and we are told that the *soul* is always in *motion*, and what is always in *motion* is *immortal*. The difference now between *spirit* and *matter* is *not changelessness* in contrast with *change*, but *self-motion*, the essence of the *soul*, in contrast with *derived motion*.”

“The emphasis on *self-motion* is continued even in the *Laws*, Plato’s *final* dialogue.”

[William L. Riese, *Dictionary of Religion and Philosophy: Eastern and Western Thought*, Humanities Press, Inc. [New Jersey: 1980], pp. 442-443 [*italic, bold, underline, and color emphasis added by A.D.*]

By a *dynamical mathematical “model”* is usually meant an ideographical, ““algebraic””, analytical analogue of a target reality, one that describes the *quantitative* variation, through time, of some metrics of the *model* constituents, within a *fixed* universe of such constituents, a *fixed “ontology”*, with such constituents constituting the presumptive “ontological commitments” of that *model*. Herein, by the term-phrase ‘*[meta-dynamical] meta-model*’, we mean an ‘*ontologically-dynamical*’, *multi-ontological-epochs-spanning and -bridging, equational* analogue of a target reality which, relative to a *given* epoch of the *self-development* of that reality, treated as being its *present* epoch, *reconstructs* the *ontology* of its *past* epochs, and also ‘*pre-constructs*’, or “predicts”, the *ontology* of its *future* epochs. By a ‘*meta-equation*’ we mean a ‘*super-equation*’, i.e., an *equation* ‘of *second* degree’, made up out of a heterogeneous multiplicity of *equations* ‘of *first* degree’; a ‘*super-equation*’ «*monad*» or *unit* which is a ‘*meta-«monad»*’, or ‘*meta-unit*’, made up out of a multiplicity, a *sub-«arithmos»*, of *equation-«monads»*, or of “mere” *equation-units*, as its *internalized [sub-]«monads»*.

Thus, ‘*the generic dialectical meta-equation*’, or ‘*equation of the second qualo-fractal scale*’ --

$$\rangle\text{---}|-\langle_{\tau} = \langle \langle \alpha \rangle \rangle^{\tau}$$

-- is made up out of the following multiplicity/sequence of “mere” *equations*, ‘*equations of the first qualo-fractal scale*’, one *qualitatively-distinct*[ive] *equation* for each distinct value of  $\tau$ :



**V. Suggestions for Reader Exploration.** The following further explorations of the ‘*psychohistorical-dialectical domain*’ addressed in this vignette -- the domain of *Ancient Occidental Philosophies* -- via the tools of the **Q** *dialectical ideography*, are recommended to our readers:

1. Try your hand at “solving for” the five terms, generated by the ‘*meta-model*’ herein presented, that we left “unsolved” in our explication of that ‘*meta-model*’, viz.,  $\begin{matrix} \diamond \\ \text{EH} \end{matrix} \text{E} \rightarrow \begin{matrix} \square \\ 4 \end{matrix}$ , and  $\begin{matrix} \diamond \\ \text{EP} \end{matrix} \text{E} \rightarrow \begin{matrix} \square \\ 5 \end{matrix}$ , as well as  $\begin{matrix} \diamond \\ \text{AH} \end{matrix} \text{E} \rightarrow \begin{matrix} \square \\ 7 \end{matrix}$ , and  $\begin{matrix} \diamond \\ \text{AP} \end{matrix} \text{E} \rightarrow \begin{matrix} \square \\ 8 \end{matrix}$ , and  $\begin{matrix} \diamond \\ \text{APH} \end{matrix} \equiv \begin{matrix} \diamond \\ \text{AE} \end{matrix} \text{E} \rightarrow \begin{matrix} \square \\ 9 \end{matrix}$ .

**Hint:** ‘Categorograms’ of the form, e.g.,  $\begin{matrix} \diamond \\ \text{YX} \end{matrix}$  are standardly interpreted, per the *Encyclopedia Dialectica* canon, as connoting the process/‘processor’ that produces the *conversion* of some **X** «*monads*» into **Y** «*monads*» -- or into «*monads*» which are *hybrids* of the **X** and the **Y** «*monads*»; of the *assimilation* of some of the **X**s by **Y**s; of the *appropriation* of some **X**s by **Y**s; of the *adjustment* of the existence of the **X**s to the existence of the **Y**s, or of the critique of **X** by the **Y**, the *critical review* and *evaluation* of the merits and demerits of the **X** kind of ideas from the perspective of the **Y** kind of ideas, the *correction* of the **X** kind of ideas by means of the **Y** kind, and the *theory of error* of the **X** kind of ideas from the point-of-view of the **Y** kind. In particular --

- $\begin{matrix} \diamond \\ \text{EH} \end{matrix}$  connotes the results of critique of the **Heraclitean** philosophy in light of the “Socratic” philosophy of the «*Eidē*»;
- $\begin{matrix} \diamond \\ \text{EP} \end{matrix}$  connotes the results of critique of the **Parmenidean** philosophy in light of the “Socratic” philosophy of the «*Eidē*»;
- $\begin{matrix} \diamond \\ \text{AH} \end{matrix}$  connotes the results of critique of the **Heraclitean** philosophy in light of the Platonic philosophy of «*Autokinesis*»;
- $\begin{matrix} \diamond \\ \text{AP} \end{matrix}$  connotes the results of critique of the **Parmenidean** philosophy in light of the Platonic philosophy of «*Autokinesis*»;
- $\begin{matrix} \diamond \\ \text{AE} \end{matrix}$  connotes the results of critique of the “Socratic”, «*Eidē*» philosophy in light of the Platonic philosophy of «*Autokinesis*».

With the help of the hints above, can you identify specific, named or described doctrines of Plato, together with citations of passages in Plato’s Dialogues, which correspond with some or all of these five terms? For example, Plato criticizes the philosophy of Herakleitos, from the perspective of the “Socratic” philosophy of the «*Eidē*», in the following terms: “...how can that be a real thing which is never in the same state? ... for at the moment that the observer approaches, then they become other and of another nature, so that you cannot get any further in knowing their nature or state ... but if that which knows and that which is known exist ever ... then I do not think they can resemble a process or flux....”, in the dialogue *Cratylus*, in its paragraph **439**, section **e** through paragraph **440**, sections **a-b**. [E. Hamilton, H. Cairns, editors, *The Collected Dialogues of Plato, including the Letters*, Princeton University Press [Princeton: **1989**]. pp. **473-474**].

2. See if, by exploring other candidate «*arché*» for a *Triadic Seldon Function* ‘*meta-model*’ of this domain, you can construct a ‘*meta-model*’ which encompasses, e.g., the earlier philosophies of Thales [**640-546** B.C.E.], and of Anaximander [**610-547** B.C.E.], Anaximenes [**588-524** B.C.E.], and/or Pythagoras [**570-500** B.C.E.], as well as later philosophies, of Herakleitos [**540-475** B.C.E.], Parmenides [**515-450** B.C.E.], Democritus [**460-370** B.C.E.], Plato [**428-348** B.C.E.], and even of Aristotle [**384-322** B.C.E.], in a single *Triadic Seldon Function* ‘*dialectical meta-model meta-equation*’.
3. Determine whether or not you do better with a *Dyadic Seldon Function* ‘*meta-model*’, in covering a fuller range of the [psycho]history of *Ancient Mediterranean Philosophy*, than with the *Triadic Seldon Function* ‘*meta-model*’ that you constructed for/in step **2** above.

Links to definitions of additional *Encyclopedia Dialectica* special terms deployed in the discourse above --

«*arithmos aisthetos*»

<http://point-of-departure.org/Point-Of-Departure/ClarificationsArchive/ArithmosAisthetos/ArithmosAisthetos.htm>

«*arithmos eidetikos*»

<http://point-of-departure.org/Point-Of-Departure/ClarificationsArchive/ArithmosEidetikos/ArithmosEidetikos.htm>

«*arithmos monadikos*»

<http://point-of-departure.org/Point-Of-Departure/ClarificationsArchive/ArithmosMonadikos/ArithmosMonadikos.htm>

«*autokinesis*»

<http://point-of-departure.org/Point-Of-Departure/ClarificationsArchive/Autokinesis/Autokinesis.htm>

*categorial*

<http://point-of-departure.org/Point-Of-Departure/ClarificationsArchive/Categorial/Categorial.htm>

*category*

<http://point-of-departure.org/Point-Of-Departure/ClarificationsArchive/Category/Category.htm>

‘*cumulum*’

<http://point-of-departure.org/Point-Of-Departure/ClarificationsArchive/Cumulum/Cumulum.htm>

*dialectical categorial progression*

<http://point-of-departure.org/Point-Of-Departure/ClarificationsArchive/CategorialProgression/CategorialProgression.htm>

*dynamics*

[http://www.dialectics.org/dialectics/Glossary\\_files/F.E.D.\\_Definitions.DYNAMICS\\_vs.\\_%27META-DYNAMICS%27,19DEC2012\\_1.jpg](http://www.dialectics.org/dialectics/Glossary_files/F.E.D._Definitions.DYNAMICS_vs._%27META-DYNAMICS%27,19DEC2012_1.jpg)

‘‘*eventity*’’

<https://www.point-of-departure.org/Point-Of-Departure/ClarificationsArchive/Eventity/Eventity.htm>

*The Human Phenome*

<http://point-of-departure.org/Point-Of-Departure/ClarificationsArchive/PsychoHistory/PsychoHistory.htm>

*immanent*

<http://point-of-departure.org/Point-Of-Departure/ClarificationsArchive/Immanent/Immanent.htm>

*immanent critique*

<http://point-of-departure.org/Point-Of-Departure/ClarificationsArchive/ImmanentCritique/ImmanentCritique.htm>

*meta-dynamics*

[http://www.dialectics.org/dialectics/Glossary\\_files/F.E.D.\\_Definitions.DYNAMICS\\_vs.\\_%27META-DYNAMICS%27,19DEC2012\\_1.jpg](http://www.dialectics.org/dialectics/Glossary_files/F.E.D._Definitions.DYNAMICS_vs._%27META-DYNAMICS%27,19DEC2012_1.jpg)

*meta-genealogy*

<http://point-of-departure.org/Point-Of-Departure/ClarificationsArchive/MetaGenealogy/MetaGenealogy.htm>

«*monad*»

<https://www.point-of-departure.org/Point-Of-Departure/ClarificationsArchive/Monad/Monad.htm>

*ontological category*

<http://point-of-departure.org/Point-Of-Departure/ClarificationsArchive/CategoryOntological/CategoryOntological.htm>

*ontology*

<https://www.point-of-departure.org/Point-Of-Departure/ClarificationsArchive/Ontology/Ontology.htm>

*ontology-dynamics*

<http://point-of-departure.org/Point-Of-Departure/ClarificationsArchive/OntologyDynamics/OntologyDynamics.htm>

*psychohistory*

<http://point-of-departure.org/Point-Of-Departure/ClarificationsArchive/PsychoHistory/PsychoHistory.htm>

*qualo-fractal*

<http://point-of-departure.org/Point-Of-Departure/ClarificationsArchive/QualoFractal/QualoFractal.htm>

*qualo-Peanic*

<http://point-of-departure.org/Point-Of-Departure/ClarificationsArchive/QualoPeanicity/QualoPeanicity.htm>

*Seldon Functions*

<http://point-of-departure.org/Point-Of-Departure/ClarificationsArchive/SeldonFunctions/SeldonFunctions.htm>

‘*self-meta-monad-ization*’ or ‘*self-meta-individual-ization*’ or ‘*self-meta-holon-ization*’

<http://point-of-departure.org/Point-Of-Departure/ClarificationsArchive/Meta/Meta.htm>

<http://point-of-departure.org/Point-Of-Departure/ClarificationsArchive/MetaMonadization/MetaMonadization.htm>