

CUBOPLATONISM

1

According to Plato's "esoteric" and "unwritten" doctrine, reality is the collision or entanglement of "The One" and the "The Indefinite." I suggest that this "One" represents *idea or category in general*. Its complement, the "Indefinite," represents *the qualitative continuum*.

In other words, The One is *constituting ideality*. The Indefinite is "sensory material" which is given *form* or *forms* by The One.

Plato takes the *entanglement or collision* to be fundamental. The two principles of idea and quality are not given or primary but merely the *result* of theoretical analysis. This is *Plato's* hylomorphism.

2

This is offered as a minimal, *demystified* Platonism. The famous forms are just ideas properly understood as *between* subjects and, indeed, involved in their constitution *as* subjects.

I suggest that *the myth of consciousness* has obscured Plato's otherwise plausible insight. The *pre-supposition* that the subject is a *container* of sensations and ideas encourages a mystified reading of these forms or ideas as otherworldly. They are instead an *explication* of reality even at its most mundane.

It is our own two-substance superstition that obscures Plato's meaning.

The "One" calls attention to ideas as *unities*. A particular entity has an identity which is always a boundary. The entity is this and not that. What an idea unites, in the case of an empirical object, is of course its "qualitative" or "sensory" presence. In other words, *things are manifolds of what are therefore their appearances*.¹

3

Plato, read this way, is explicative rather than speculative. Husserl imperfectly reactivates Plato. Derrida doesn't subvert Plato but presents his unwritten doctrine.

Husserl's use of "consciousness" was perhaps an obstacle. But he grasps that consciousness was consciousness *of*. Heidegger takes this transcendence to the limit, until the emptied subject is world from perspective. Existence, as time, is disclosure or unveiling, the ever imperfect presence of the present.

All things are *between* being and non-being. "Perfect" being is *ideal*. Absolute non-being is just as ideal. All things manifest a tension between these two poles, just as all real numbers are *between* $-\infty$ and $+\infty$, without ever *being* either.

¹I might be accused of bending Plato toward ontocubism, but I see things differently. I realized very recently that I finally *understood* Platonism. Or I found *an* interpretation of Plato that seems plausible. I was helped by Derrida's reflections on the signifier and the signified in *Of Grammatology*.

Derrida writes that *the sign and divinity have the same place and time of birth.*

The divine sign is that in the human which is beyond the human. The realm of the sign is the realm of the deathless and ideal. The mortal “philosopher” *identifies* with a relatively immortal gnosis enabled by such signs. Those without signs die the death of mere animals.

The signified is “spirit.” The signifier is “flesh.” There is no *pure* signified. This signified is always entangled in the “matter” that is necessary for signification. There are no angels without wet wings.

From the moment that there is meaning there are nothing but signs.

Knowledge of reality is possible because *objects too* are signs. This is obscured by the alienated myth of consciousness. The objects between us are ideas between us, with both “spirit” (idea) and “flesh” (the sensory.) Indeed, the words we speak are the “prototypes” of such objects, distilling their essence, enclosing it in the diaphanous flesh of phonemes.

This phonemic flesh is translucent but never transparent. Objects and those special objects known as concepts are given only in flashes, moments, aspects.

6

Before Derrida, Plato gave us Hauntology, which is to say reality haunted by the ideal. The river discussed by Heraclitus is haunted by its own identity.