

## MONOTONOCUBISM

A thing is the unity of its faces. The presence of one face is the absence of a potential infinity of other faces. This unity is ideal. The *idea* of the thing is what monotonocubism gives you in trade for the “thing-in-itself.” The noumenal thing was perhaps a misinterpretation of this elusive ideality.

The lady from Neptune has 29 sense organs. We talk with her about a particular banana. There’s an all around sense that that particular banana is co-intended by all. The “transcendently between-us” “idea” of the banana organizes many kinds of sensory presence. A fellow from Pluto arrives with 144 sense organs. The game continues. Hence the “potential infinity” of the banana’s “faces.” In more familiar terms, these faces are “appearances” or “presentations.” But they are not re-presentations. We have done away with the banana-in-itself as Obscure Cause of sensory presence understand as secondary or unreal. The banana has its genuine being in these presentations. But presentation is always partial. One aspect or moment occludes an open infinity of other aspects. We don’t find the real artichoke by pulling off its leaves. We need only grasp them as a unity, and note that things are artichokes with an  $\infty$  of leaves.

Things, they say, appear “in time.” Time is the nothing on which entities are projected. Time is the disclosure of entities. Time is the varying manifestation of entities. Time “is” nothing, as presence is not itself present. Time and being, time and idea. To grasp the

face as thing is to grasp the absence of its other faces. The thing is also for others. The thing holds faces in reserve. Time shows only by hiding. Time is the bottleneck that can only give one face (one moment) of the thing at a “time.” A “time” of the object. The object is a logical manifold of its “times.” Time is the varying time. The varying “perspectival presence” of the present. “Perspectival presence” is presence of the aspect of the thing, taken *as* the thing transcendent.

Transcendence through ideality. The idea, as such, transcendent. Elusive. Bite the object like a false coin. You will not taste its essence. Far over shall you chase and she not there. Ideality gives transcendence. In some sense makes time possible. The recognition of time as time.

The thing is the logical synthesis of its moments. Therefore the *temporal* synthesis. Also the spatial, “interpersonal” synthesis.

Are torrents (phenomenal streams) fundamental? Are or they just more things, however important? Presence is not present. Being is not an entity. But reality needs no witness to shine. But what about the glue of “time consciousness”? The coherence of what we call streams? Personhood and memory. If the stream is a chain of situations constituted by the faces of things, what holds this chain together, convinces us to *call* it such a chain?

Shall we say that reality is not discrete? This is a continuum always-already molested by a digital ideality? How does a torrent know that it’s the *same* torrent

? It takes itself to be so. It is co-intended as one and the same. “My” “stream of experience.” Associated with a body that is also taken to be the same as the condition for the possibility of its changes.

Are monads (streams, torrents) derivable from objects ? What of the non-logical glue that melts situations into a continuum ? What of the continuity of “sensation” ? We see here why some philosophers might seek for a synonym that doesn’t subjectivize. Shall we identity the “sensory” with the “immanent” and the idea with the transcendent ? Immanent aspect of transcendent thing. Sensory face of ideal object.