

TOWARD A UNIVERSAL GRAMMAR

c June 1996
by Jon Klimo, Ph.D.

1. Introduction

Since I was a child, I have been preoccupied with trying to understand how the Universe operates—how, even, God “works.” It has never occurred to me that this may be the ultimate in presumption or futility. Each day I thank my innocence that my efforts are unquestionably renewed by me; or, perhaps, such is being renewed for me by the process or Being that or Whom I am trying to understand through and through in the first place; and I am also haunted by the sense that I am that Universal Being trying to understand Itself through the glass darkly of the human lens I also am.

As an essentially creative person, spending the first half of my life as a poet and visual artist, and then running a large graduate program in the arts and creativity at Rutgers University (before spending the last 14 years teaching at Rosebridge, a graduate school of professional psychology), I have felt like a tremendously constrained human version of the universal creative principle striving to understand the nature of the creative process in human terms. To the extent to which I believe that we humans are, as the old saying goes, made in the image of our Maker, I have been interested in how we may have inbuilt into us a God-given disposition to be makers even as our Maker is and does. For me, creative inspiration has always been a calling to give myself over to a creative process that empirically helps me better grasp, as a creator of the things I create, how the universal Creation stems from, and is sustained by, its Creator.

I am going to attempt to briefly set out for you a model of how I have grown to believe the Universe—the Creation, and God—the Creator, works. Since I am an ontological relativist, who believes that there are as many kinds of reality as there are kinds of reality experiencers, I am not overly attached to my own particular model, knowing that it may happen to particularly fit me alone. While I would like to think that my model might be generous enough to encompass and account for most or all other explanatory models, all I can really hope for is that my version of things might inspire you to move toward more clarity about, or a greater appreciation of, your own view of things. In this sense, the abbreviated picture, the mere taste, of a way of thinking about reality that I am going to try and convey to you in the next few pages is as much a creative work of art as it is a philosophical or theoretical/scientific treatise. By it I wish only for you to get an impressionistic sense of, a wisp of personal inspiration about, how you as a creative being may fit within the larger scheme of things and how, and even why, that larger scheme of things may operate the way it does.

Here, then, in a nutshell, is my model: *The Universe—the Creation or the Creational material—is something like an incredibly complex, inconceivably vast symbolic language system that stands with respect to the Creator aspect of the Universe—that which, and those who, use this language system. I call this system a “universal grammar.”* In the following sections, I will elaborate on this basic picture through a number of perspectives and disciplines even as I continue to repeat the one underlying theme. For those of you who are more scientific, analytical, and application oriented, by the end of this presentation you will hopefully find that my model sheds new light on some of your own interests. For example, in the final section, I will address such quantum physics concepts as collapsing the wave function and non-locality.

It also occurs to me that what I am presenting may be more of a very elaborate and extended metaphor than it is a rigorous and testable scientific model, but I think as I proceed, you may sense that even this metaphorical thinking can inspire basic understandings that in turn can lead to applications with regard to “the real world.”

2. Grammar and Semiotics

To begin with, we must lay the groundwork for my model/metaphor just described; so please bear with the following necessary primer on language and symbols so that I can then later build upon it to admittedly rather epic proportions.

On the face of it, grammar does not sound too interesting: It is usually defined as a device or procedure for generating sentences with a certain structure; and it contains internalized rules for operating on a finite set of symbols. Let’s expand this a bit by replacing the term “sentences” with “symbolic structures” in general.

Now we can imbed this concept of a grammar within the larger context of linguistics or language in general. The larger realm is usually referred to as “semiotics,” or the overall study of sign and symbol systems. As part of this, what is called the “semiotic function” means that one thing—a sign, symbol, or “signifier”—is used to mean, refer to, or evoke in the mind, another thing—that which is symbolized or “signified.” Due to our culture’s still generally dualistic or completely materialistic perspective, that which is meant, referred to, or brought to mind in the language user or in someone else reflects and sustains such dualism and materialism. We then have the grounds for a probably unresolvable ontological debate about which of the following realms of semiotics may be more real or valuable, to be paid most attention to: a.) the “inner” or prephysical realm of thoughts, desires, meaning-making dispositions, and intentions that are prerequisite to and responsible for what becomes a manifest set of formal symbols or signifiers able to be experienced; b.) the usually sensate material realm of such signifiers being used; or c.) the realm of that which is signified—that which is meant, referred to, or brought to mind in the language creator or in someone else—a realm which may lie elsewhere in a seemingly objectively-real “external” realm or may lie within an apparently subjective “inner” realm.

Semiotics is further divided into three categories: semantics, syntactics, and pragmatics. Let's briefly consider each of these, since much of what will follow is based upon this material,

First, *semantics* has to do with meaning. In verbal linguistics, there is a lexicon, which is a dictionary-type set of words and their meanings, whereby we can speak of the lexical relation between a word and its meaning. As we earlier replaced "sentences" with "symbolic structures," so we can do the same with "words" here. So, in the larger semiotic sense, we have lexical rules of correspondence between the realm of the symbolic structures, on the one hand, and the meanings they have or what they refer to, on the other.

There is an aspect akin to lexical relations, which involves the *intentionality* of the language user. In this sense, there is what we could call an intentional relation between what the user of the language intends by the language being used, on the one hand, and the language being used, on the other. This is often called "speaker's reference," or what the speaker means or is referring to by his or her language act. But there is more to it than this: We could say that there is, in addition, a relation between the causal or creational, as well as the intentional, grounds in or of the language user with regard to the language being created or used, on the one hand, and the symbolic structure of the language and its possible meaning-conveying impact, on the other.

Second, *syntactics* has to do with how symbolic structures are put together to function as the meaning making, or referring, entities that they are. That is, a grammatical language system, or a semiotic system in general, not only needs the semantical lexical relations, it also must use well-formed, intelligible arrangements of its symbolic material in order to adequately carry out its meaning conveying purpose. In linguistics, verbal sentences involve a linear, sequential syntactical structuring, which, within their grammar, operate by sets of rules for how they are generated and put together. But, as I asked that we expand our understanding of grammar and language systems beyond verbal-type "sentences" and "words," consider also syntax in an expanded sense as well: While a musical arrangement might, as a verbal structure, be basically one-dimensionally linear, a painting, sculpture, or work of architecture would possess what we could call a two or three dimensional syntax, while a work of theater, dance, film, or video would operate within a four-dimensional syntactical system. Finally, the daily perceptual lived-experience of us human beings—the world we live in—could be construed as involving a four-dimensional syntax, but now I am getting ahead of myself.

Third, *pragmatics* has to do with the users of language or semiotic systems and how and why they use these systems from out of themselves, and between and among themselves. This harkens back to the earlier notion of speaker's reference or intentional reference. When someone engages in an act of language use, where, as the saying goes, are they coming from? What do they mean by what they say? What are the grounds for their symbol system usage? What are they trying to accomplish by that particular use of language? And, most germane to the realm of pragmatics, for whom, as well as for what,

is this language being used? What is the function of the specific language act and who is involved in it? What is the larger context for its use?

Before moving on, I want to add one more component: the aesthetic. Usually, when the discipline of semiotics tries to understand how a language-type sign or symbol system operates across the three domains of semantics, syntactics, and pragmatics, there is an agreed-upon lexicon for the community of users of that semiotic system. There is a consensus with regard to the dictionary governing the lexical relations of meanings being intended and things being referred to by the symbolic materials. Further, there is a consensus among the community of users regarding the grammatical rules for how the symbolic material is syntactically put together to “spell out” its meanings, referings, and things brought to mind. And, finally, there are shared rules and understandings with regard to the pragmatic domain of what the language users mean or intend by their use of particular symbolic expressions and for whom and for what purpose the expressions are made. Within this realm of semiotic consensus and rule-boundness, a rose is a rose is a rose. That is, in normal language use, when I say “rose,” I mean or intend for you, as a fellow English user, to conceive, imagine, or remember that particular kind of flower in the real world. If I showed you a photograph of a rose, it would refer to the original rose being photographed, and, as the photographer, I might want the image to function to provide the literal truth, the veridical visual information, regarding that rose. My photograph refers to that real rose.

However, let’s expand this a little: What if I were a fine art creative photographer, not a botanist photographing a specimen? Can’t the photograph of a rose or the painting of a rose lead us to larger, impressionistic “roseness,” or even beyond into flowerlands, organicity, Nature, to Joyce Kilmer’s notion that “only God can make a tree,” or to Keat’s line, “Truth is beauty; beauty truth; that is all ye know on Earth and all ye need to know?” Can’t I use the word “rose” as a poet would, whereby I might be intending for you to enter into my own, or into your own, personal associations evoked by the word rose? These personal associations, or idiosyncratic meanings or evocations occasioned by a word, phrase, or other symbolic experience, are what is called the “connotation.” This is in contradistinction to the “denotation” of the word or other semiotic symbolic structure, which is rule-of-correspondence-bound by its lexical relation to one or more designated, consensually agreed-upon meanings, subjective imaginational or memorial experiences, or things being referred to by the word or other symbolic material.

One can see how clear-cut intelligible lines of communication can rapidly deteriorate if a semiotic system allows too much connotative usage at the expense of denotative usage. The language-based glue that holds a consensus reality together loses its hold and individuals fall prey to what the philosopher Wittgenstein termed “the problem of private language,” where people trying to talk to each other end up making sense only to themselves because the lexical, intentional, and syntactical relations involved are not sufficiently similar between the language users. The picture becomes a kind of biblical Tower of Babel, or like a ward of schizophrenics each of whose “word salad” and private-world meanings renders their inner experiences virtually unsharable.

But there is another more positive and mysterious aspect to this connotative domain of semiotics. It is called aesthetics, or the study of the aesthetic experience and the aesthetic object. While the field of aesthetics has traditionally been interested in the nature of the beautiful, it involves more than this. To have an aesthetic experience of something is not to have a practical, usual experience of it, which would be more related to the earlier idea of the dictionary-type lexical, denotative “right answer” that comes to the recipient’s mind when presented with a semiotic structure that is supposed to mean, intend, or refer to that particular something. In contrast, to have an aesthetic experience is to allow oneself to become disinterested and distanced from that lexical-relation “hard-wired” right answer of what should come to mind in the presence of that stimulus, object, event, or experience. Freed from the conditioned dictionary association, one is then free to experience the object, event, etc., more variously according to the nuances and idiosyncracies of what are called the “formal properties” of the thing being experienced aesthetically: the surface colors, shapes, textures, sounds, movements, et al. One is also opened up to the connotative stream of consciousness of imaginal, intuitive, emotional, memorial material that is evoked as a function of the formal properties and multi-valenced qualities of that which is being experienced aesthetically. A rose is not then just a rose. A chair is not then just a chair for sitting in. A sunset is not then just the summation of all the “right answer” scientific understanding of its history, composition, and of the way it presents itself literally to our perception and conception as generally dictated by a practical “real world” consensus reality. It is also what is evokes in us connotatively, emotionally, even transpersonally and transcendently. By freeing ourselves from the consensual, rule-bound, meaning-making lexical relations we would normally attribute to and derive from something, we can subjectively enter a multidimensional experiential realm by means of it. In this regard, the late authority on myth, Joseph Campbell, defined the symbolic as that which is “transparent to transcendence.” I take this to mean that one can access that which is transcendent to the symbolic material itself by way of it; one can experientially access that which transcends the denotative, lexically bound constraints of meaning by allowing oneself to experience something symbolically and aesthetically, not just in a rule-bound, consensual, and literal way.

Here is what the late Harvard philosopher Nelson Goodman wrote about the aesthetic in his Ways of Worldmaking (Hackett Pub. Co., Indianapolis, Indiana, 1978; p. 68):

There are five symptoms of the aesthetic: (1) syntactic density, where the finest differences in certain respects constitutes a difference between symbols... (2) semantic density, where symbols are provided for things distinguished by the finest differences in certain respects; (3) relative repletteness, where comparatively many aspects of a symbol are significant... (4) exemplification, where a symbol...symbolizes by serving as a sample of properties it literally or metaphorically possesses; and finally (5) multiple and complex reference, where a symbol performs several integrated and interacting referential functions, some direct and some mediated through other symbols.

3. The Universe as Symbolic Material

I have indirectly alluded to the way in which we can consider that everything in the world may be symbolic (and/or aesthetic) material; but I now need to address this concept directly. We usually think of only a small subset of the world's stimuli, objects, and events as being formally part of a semiotic system. Most of the experiential stimuli of our cultural system is meant to operate in a semiotic manner, serving the semiotic function of having one thing refer to another. We have agreed among ourselves to have a great many of the perceptual surfaces of what we experience be more than their formal sensate properties; we agree to have them function as information-conveying symbolic material that means, or refers to, something beyond itself. A stop sign means stop, not just a machine-tooled, red-painted piece of metal on a stick; but the bare side of a building standing next to a vacant lot, for example, does not necessarily mean or refer to anything beyond the literal truth of its "saying" to anyone who experiences it: "I am simply the presence, and perhaps idea, of this building; I don't mean or refer to anything beyond myself." Nonetheless, if you are an artist, poet, daydreamer, or someone in an altered state of consciousness or from some relatively alien culture, you might experience, by way of the side of that building, who knows what other experiential realms through interacting with it as a symbolic, connotative, or aesthetic presence that is "transparent to transcendence," rather than experiencing it in its usual "opaque," literal, or self-referential truth.

In this sense, a great percentage of the things we experience every day are sort of lexically bound to a very practical and worldly dictionary-like realm of meanings and associations we consensually relegate them to; and unless we disinterest, distance, and free, ourselves from such a rule-boundness of meaning, reference, and association, so as to experience such aesthetically, connotatively, in an altered state of consciousness, etc., we are bound to a predictable, closed system of opaque or rule-bound relationships with the objects, events, and experiences with which our existence presents us. But, once more, the glue that holds the consensus reality together is made out of such rule-bound, shared dictionary meaning making. This can also be seen in terms of what psychologists refer to as "reality testing," which means to stay in touch with, to stay true to, to be kept adapted and functional with respect to, the "external," "normal," locally acceptable reality. Yet it is not so much the physical, sensate surfaces—the literal or opaque and self-referential truth—of the supposedly objective reality out there that we reality test with respect to; it is with respect to the cognitive infrastructures, the very grounds out of which we semiotic functioning beings generate and interpret our languaging, that we reality test. And woe unto to a people if they do not have sufficiently similar infrastructures or shared subjective grounds from which to relate to the supposedly objective reality; for as I will soon propose, there is a deeply interpenetrating way in which these two domains—supposedly subjective and objective reality—relate to each other and, more so, how they are actually two aspects of a unified field wherein what we call objective reality is actually created by what we call subjective reality. But, again, I am getting ahead of myself.

For now, semiotic material, whether it be linear verbal, or non-verbal higher-dimensional, syntactically organized symbol systems, or whether—as I will get into in a later section—it be the surfaces of the day-to-day world of our “inner” lived experiences as symbolic material, such will be spoken of by me in terms of “text” with regard to its companion term of “author.” Thus any semiotic material is text with regard to the author or authoring ground responsible for it. So, we have, for example, the painter (as author) and his painting (as text); but, as in the traditional philosophical “argument from design,” we also have the seemingly designed universe (as text) which presupposes the existence of its designer (as author), God.

But what about the world itself as authored text? To repeat, I am asking you to stay open to the possibility that all that we experience—the perceptual domain of the whole physical universe, in addition to all of our “inner” apperceptions, mental imagery, ideation, and memories—can be understood to function semiotically, including aesthetically. Just one of many individuals who has asked us to see things this way was the Swedish scientist and mystic/psychic, Emanuel Swedenborg. After a series of paranormal, perhaps out-of-body, information-gathering episodes where he claimed to be taken by unearthly beings to experience the realms of Heaven and Hell, he wrote that he had been told that the Universe operates by means of a system of divine “correspondences.” He said that he was shown that the external reality of physical Creation stands in a kind of semiotic relation with respect to the realm of internal reality responsible for giving rise to and sustaining it. This inner realm is not so much internal to human beings—such as the realm of human subjective, intentional states—as it is internal meaning closer to Universal Source, to God, and to God’s meanings, intentions, and ways. According to Swedenborg’s heavenly informants, we then learn to understand this system of divine correspondences. We learn to read the perceptual world and the world of our everyday experiences in terms of the inbuilt correspondences they have to God’s own system. This is a kind of transcendental and transpersonal semiotics—a true Universal Grammar. This is why I am using Swedenborg as my example here, because, as you will soon see, my own model/metaphor is, in many respects, a more complex elaboration on his as well as many others’ vision. I simply wish to use my own version to shed new light on and expand a variety of scientific disciplines as well as to deepen our philosophical and spiritual understandings.

4. Generation and Comprehension and the Concept of Literacy

In addition to everything that I have said so far about language (and I will tend to use “language” to stand for semiotic systems in general just as I will tend to use the trans-verbal subsuming meanings for “author” and “text”), the terms generation and comprehension are also often used with regard to language. They, in turn, are paralleled by the more technical terms encoding and decoding. Communicative symbolic information processing involves a code, usually a “non-mimetic” one in English, where the code does not resemble what it stands for, although it can be mimetic (or resembling) in nonverbal semiotic systems. This code mediates the semiotic function; and codes can operate by means of a variety of media, from paper to canvas to airwaves to the entire

electromagnetic spectrum. The one generating a language act puts his or her meaning and intention into a code, encoding it, and then the one receiving the message must decode it, taking it out of the coded system and translating it into the meanings or experienced reference evoked by the message, thus comprehending it. Ideally, what the recipient of a message comprehends from it is congruent with the meaning or reference intended by the one who generated and sent the message. The phenomenological inner state of the language generator would be replicated as closely as possible by and in the phenomenological inner state of the recipient so that the latter would comprehend veridically; that is, the language comprehender would experience the same thing that the language generator experienced; again, ideally, the truth grounds in the comprehender would be identical to the truth grounds in the generator.

Next consider the concept of literacy. Literacy is the capacity to generate and comprehend a language. As children we learn to speak and then write in our native language (and possibly in other languages as well) as we acquire the semiotic function through language generation. We are also learning to hear with comprehension and then read with comprehension in that language. Educational literacy programs teach people to read and write once they know enough how to hear and speak with comprehension.

So far, the term literacy has been used with respect to verbal language systems with which we are most familiar. But there is, for example, the term “visual literacy,” which, in the comprehension domain, refers to the ability to be able to “read” nonverbal forms, ranging from map reading or identifying bacteria under the microscope or weather patterns, to more deeply experiencing painting, sculpture, architecture, film, or video, to appreciating and interpreting dreams or waking, self-generated mental (or even clairvoyant or telepathic) images. In the language generation domain, one can also gain visual literacy with regard to how one “speaks” or “writes” in nonverbal semiotic forms, ranging from using American sign language with the deaf, to taking photographs to making paintings. Then there is acoustical and musical literacy: the ability to learn to be able to design and generate, receive and comprehend or appreciate, non-verbal sounds. There are still other semiotic and aesthetic realms within which literacy can be acquired. The language of dance would involve acquiring both visual and musical literacy as well as what could be called kinesthetic or haptic literacy, which is the ability to be able to master both awareness and control of the neuromusculature of one’s own behaving body. One could think in terms of an affective or emotional literacy: being able to “read” one’s own or another’s emotional states; and perhaps to learn to read through such emotional states to the underlying causal grounds that gave rise to them, that is, to learn to be compassionate and empathic. And then there would be the generational aspect, whereby one could learn to express oneself emotionally.

Continue to bear in mind, in the way that I am talking, that, just as “author” is used by me to stand for any generational grounds for symbolic manifestation and conveyance and “text” can stand for any symbolic material once expressed by an author, as “read” can stand for any mode of experiencing, comprehending, or appreciating any text. These larger-sense, not necessarily verbally oriented terms will be used throughout the

remainder of this presentation. In addition, the terms “Creator” and “Creation” will be interchangeable with Author and Text.

Returning to the concept of literacy, now let us expand it to universal proportions by using, as an example, Swedenborg’s system. Imagine gaining the literacy to be able to understand and work with God’s own system of “correspondences;” to read through the symbolic surface properties and qualities of worldly things to access with comprehension the “interior” ground responsible for such surface material. Ultimately, by means of such a literacy, one would, by means of reading the realm of Creation, reach the Creator: “By these fruits ye shall know him.” In a sense, one would read from the fruit through to the seeds that gave rise to, were responsible for, the fruit. The cosmic semiotic function would conjoin Creator and Creation: moving us from generational source to comprehensible result, from intention to repercussion of the intention. And then there would be the more challenging part of such a literacy: to learn to be able to “speak” and “write” in such a language of divine correspondences; but as the poem says, “Only God can make a tree.” We human beings have no trouble being creators within our own cultural domain, painting the surfaces of our surroundings with the symbolic fruits of our semiotic function and then experiencing (reading) them in both rule-bound and more personal (connotative and aesthetic) ways; but there does seem to be the larger realm of Nature within which our capacities as creative, authoring beings appears much more limited.

As you will soon see, it is the purpose of my model/metaphor to address how we can understand our human being in relation to our Creator’s, our Source’s, Being by proposing that we and our Creator’s Being are one and the same, and that the culture-specific, conditioned, and constrained limitation of our semiotic literacy is evolving into ever-more congruence and eventual identity condition with the ways and working of our Creator. Metaphorically speaking, language generation could be called the domain of the author and language comprehension could be the domain of the text to be read, the symbolic material to be experienced. Thus God would be the ultimate Author of the Text of Its Creation, and we would be something like gods—made in Its own Image as makers ourselves—stemming from and embedded within Its Creation as its creations and yet also stemming from God as active creators in our own, and in Its, right, adding to the Creation our own cultural creations, adding new passages of human-type text to the body of work with which our Creator presents us.

This, then, is the essence of my model and metaphor that I want you to have at this point as we move closer to my articulation of a complete Universal Grammar, a universal semiotics and a literacy with regard to it: *Everything that exists that is capable of being experienced by any kind of experiencer, human or otherwise, is also capable of being experienced in a semiotic manner, indeed, is only able to be so experienced.* That is, there is an implied semiotic function at work throughout all that exists such that the experienceable (which we usually think of as perceptual, although it could also be mental imagery) surfaces of things operate as endlessly complexly syntactically arrayed symbolic material that is “transparent to transcendence,” negotiating for the experiencer a passage from the realm of the signifier to the realm of the signified, from surface to deep

structure, and from the realm of what has been symbolically expressed to the realm of the intentional, causal, creational grounds responsible for its expression.

Certainly things can be experienced as self-referential or “opaque,” in terms of “the cheese stands alone,” or as with the old Freudian joke, “sometimes a cigar is just a cigar.” In such cases, we are brought back to the constrained lexical relations of experiencing something totally in terms of a set of associations that come to mind in its presence that is almost exclusively made out of its practical “real world” historical, functional, contextual, literal “basics.” But we usually take for granted that in doing this we are also obeying the semiotic function. To experience certain patternings of photons reflecting off molecular surfaces, or compression waves in the air, or other mechanical or electromagnetic impressions upon one’s system, is to experience them according to some system of interpretation. We are reading their text as comprehenders of what is written on that medium and in that language. “Nature” itself—all of the non-humanly-made configurations and interactions of matter and energy, forces, particles, and fields— is only what we make of it in terms of meaning-making and what we may then make with it. If objective reality arises only from a paradoxical fecundity/void, a seething particle pair creation and annihilation stochastic ether zero point energy vacuum, if all is just materially defined states of vortical, toroidal, spinning and orbiting involuted energy in motion with respect to itself, then how do we get from that four-or-more dimensional syntactically arranged substance to a meaningful experience of it? By way of the semiotic function wherever we may take it from its syntactically arrayed symbolic surface structures to the deep “interior” n-dimensional semantical meaning spaces with which it stands in relation in our meaning-making experience of it.

What I am particularly interested in regarding this expanded idea of literacy is not how someone is able to comprehend what *someone else* means, intends, or refers to by their symbolic expression, but what one is able to comprehend regarding ones *own* symbolic expression. It is usually taken for granted that people know what they mean, what they are trying to say when they use language; but this is not necessarily the case, and especially not when non-verbal semiotic systems are at work. For example, experiencing, appreciating, contemplating, and interpreting films or televised semiotic material can be useful and fulfilling, not just with respect to what is brought to mind through the material itself, but with respect to the rest of one’s life and understandings. Another example, dream interpretation, is also a rich vein to mine, although most of us tend to ignore our dream material and instead tend to the surfaces of objective reality available to us and only then through the experiential lens of normal waking consciousness. Or, although some of us at the end of a long day, as we slowly drift off, may lie in bed trying to figure it all out in terms of what it meant to us (i.e. read it), as we slowly drift off, most of us do not, we just drift off to then awaken to face another day full of the sensate surfaces of things, caught up in the semiotic web of highly constrained meaning making. There, are, of course, we “New Age” types, who talk in perennial philosophy terms about how all of existence is like a cosmic school-house, a lesson-learning enterprise set up by transcendental agency and within which the assorted stimuli, events, experiences, and opportunities presented to us comprise what is “written” on the educational blackboard surfaces and myriad textual material of things with respect to which we must develop our

literacy and then continue to deepen our experiential understandings about how it all works and how and why we fit into it the way we do.

Within the larger pragmatics of things, I want you to think in terms of the language generation and comprehension, author and text, relation in three respects: 1.) where the generator/sender of the symbolic material is other than the individual who is receiving and attempting to comprehend it; 2.) where the individual attempting to comprehend the symbolic material is the same individual who generated it; and 3.) where the generator or causal/intentional ground for the symbolic material is attempting to be comprehended by an individual other than the generator/sender and where the generator/sender is not an anthropomorphizable individual as we know it, but instead may be the source/grounds for “Nature, as a universal grammar system of lawful rules and operations, as a transcendental intelligence, a Universal Mind, the Creator, Supreme Being responsible for all that exists: God. And recall that I earlier suggested that we consider that the human kind of being of which we are the living case may be the same Being that is such a Universal Mind, Supreme Being, God of all. In this sense, there is never a case of the comprehender of language not being the generator of it as well; it becomes merely a matter of how out of phase, or what I later call “dissociated,” an aspect of the one Universal Being, such an individual human being, may be with respect to some aspect of itself intrapsychically (such as its own unconscious), or with respect to another human being, or with respect to Nature/Creation-as-Text or with respect to the one Creator/Author of all such Creational Material.

I will talk more about this notion of the out-of-phasesness, or dissociation, of language generator from language comprehender aspect in the next section of this presentation. I will do this to set the scene for how my post-Swedenborgian model can then be brought to bear upon a variety of scientific theories and applications as well upon a variety of spiritual/metaphysical understandings and techniques.

Before leaving this topic of literacy, I would like to refer to the related modeling of the late physicist David Bohm. He is primarily known for his concept of a pure frequency trans-spatiotemporal domain, which he calls *the implicate order* (with a super-implicate order beneath or within it, in turn). This ground is responsible for what he calls all local *explicate-order-level* spatiotemporal matter-and-energy manifest realities together with all local consciousnesses which can experience such realities. This is his attempt at what I have been calling an all-encompassing post-Cartesian unified-field perspective. His implicate order is neither mental or physical, internal or external, but the grounds for both; it constitutes a kind of neutral monism from which arise all local realities, experiences and experiencers. The details of his approach involve, among other things, quantum mechanics and wave mechanics, including interferometry, holography, and Fourier mathematics. (His chief explication of this view is in his book Wholeness and the Implicate Order, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1980). At the end of his life, Bohm attempted to treat the realm of consciousness and meaning that had not been that well formulated in his earlier work. In an article entitled “Soma-Significance: A new Notion of the Relationship Between the Physical and the Mental” (Psychoscience, Vol. 1, No.1, Spring 1994), he presents a number of ideas that I think are his version of my universal

grammar. In the following excerpts of Bohm's, I will occasionally intersperse my own terms and modeling to point to some ways in which I think Bohm and I are talking about something basically very similar.

In this approach, meaning is being given a key role (*the comprehension aspect of gaining and exercising literacy—JK*)... The notion of soma-significance implies that soma (or the physical) and its significance (which is mental), are not separate in the sense that soma and psyche are generally considered to be; but they are two aspects of one overall indivisible reality.... each particular kind of significance is carried by some somatic order, arrangement, connection, and organization of distinguishable element (*the local- medium-situated and modulated, syntactically organized semiotic system—JK*)... reality has two further aspects, the subtle and the manifest, which are closely related to soma and significance... This meaning is clearly more subtle than the form itself. But in turn, such a meaning can be grasped in yet another somatic form... As the level under consideration changes, the particular content of what is somatic (or manifest) and what is significant (or subtle) therefore has also to be changing. For example, ... a level that is mainly somatic (1) may have a significance (1), which is carried into the next more subtle level of soma (2), which has a further significance (2)...each somatic configuration has a meaning, and that it is a meaning that is grasped at more subtle levels of soma... every meaning at a given level is seen actively to affect the soma at a more manifest level...This starts a “runaway” loop, in which the significance of the soma feeds back signa-somatically, to change the soma in such a way as to increase the significance yet more... It is this over-all structure of meaning...that is grasped in every experience... Meaning indicates not only the significance of something to us, but also, our intention toward it... to learn the full meaning of our intentions... is to display the intention along with its expected consequence, through the imagination and in other ways...The word display means to “unfold” (*and Bohm has long pointed out in his modeling how the explicate order of local manifest experience and the local seats of consciousness that experience the manifest are both “unfolded” out of the underlying “enfolded,” all-containing implicate order—JK*)... With the implicate order (as with meaning) the subtler levels ultimately both organize and give rise to the more manifest levels.

So, by means of the literacy of which I speak, we can explore the “subtler levels” from which our experience of the somatic realm derives and to which it can experientially lead us. What Bohm calls the “signa-somatic relationship” is what I have been describing as the mode of literacy with regard to the universal grammar whereby the significance-holding-and-creating, meaning-making, semantical/intentional, authoring grounds of consciousness—ranging from the most constrained and local creator/author up to the one Universal Creator as Author—generates and expresses with and onto the somatic/manifest aspect of Creation. In contrast, Bohm's “soma-significant relationship” is the other mode of my literacy, whereby the reading, comprehending aspect moves from the soma-as-text through to the significance realm of meanings. The first mode of literacy has to do with learning the generative and sustaining processes that are involved in the authoring of text—from what intentional, generational grounds and how. The second

mode of literacy has to do with how meaning is made by way of the semiotic function's capacity to carry consciousness from the symbolizing soma realm to the significance realm by the reading, text-comprehending process, how consciousness enters or creates for itself the realm that is the n-dimensional experiential, semantical space meant, referred to, or brought to consciousness by, the semiotic material within the universal grammar.

Remember, also, that soma as text can include even the most objective-reality-type arrangement of what we think of as atoms, molecules, compounds and energy relations, and the purpose for our literacy with respect to such would be to learn to discern the rules and procedures that authoringly give rise to, and that sustain and govern the relationships among, such syntactically organized textual material. We humans are the local seats of Universal Consciousness, made in the text-generating and text-reading, meaning-making image of our Maker and Sustainer, the Consciousness of the Creator. It appears that we are meant to be endlessly confronted with soma, in all its forms and across all its levels, in order to learn to achieve full literacy, that we might one day learn how the Creator works with respect to Its own Creation, and how we as Its creators can work with Its Creation in ways in ever-more identity condition with It.

In light of what I have presented thus far about the universal grammar and the place of literacy with regard to it, please consider the following channeled passages. (As I define it in my book—Channeling: Investigations on Receiving Information from Paranormal Sources, Jeremy P. Tarcher, Inc; Los Angeles, 1987—channeling is a process whereby communication, information, guidance, or energy comes to or through someone—the channel—from some non-physically based source that is separate from the channel.) For me, all of these following channeled sources are saying what I have been trying to say with regard to the ultimate pragmatics of a universal grammar, and with regard to the transcendental literacy that I believe we are slowly developing as human beings on this planet. Some of them also speak to the limitations of our literacy that are due to this out-of-phase relation between reader and author that I just introduced. Since there is no way at present to irrefutably prove to anyone that these sources or “entities” being channeled are who they (or their channels) claim they are—beings separate from the channel, such as Swedenborg's supposed angelic guides and teachers—we can simply heuristically read these messages as variations on the theme of what I have been talking about without getting overly attached to making a case for the real existence of these sources, or for the ontological locus of their experiential perspective and the generational site of their language and meaning-making. Also note that in the following quoted passages, I have once more occasionally inserted in italics my own paraphrasing in terms of the model/metaphor I have been developing with you.

From the purported surviving spirit of Albert Einstein, communicating through the channel Paul Winter:

The concept of perfection for physical manifestation does exist in the mind of God [*the Supreme Author—JK*]; but what is actually manifested through physical substance [*as semiotic text- JK*] is less than perfect. It is moving toward perfection. The role of the scientist, with this in mind, is to try to understand [*gain literacy*

with respect to—JK] not just the physical perspective, not just the exact physical properties of substance, but the “cosmic Idea behind physical manifestation” [*the authoring, intentional, semantical, generational grounds for the creation of text—JK*]. He should try to penetrate the outer appearance and reach the core of this cosmic Idea, and then become an agent assisting in the transfer of this cosmic design from the inner realms of life to the physical plane. The role of the scientist is to aid in the manifestation of the cosmic Idea. To do this, the scientist must begin by learning as much as possible [*gaining literacy—JK*] about the physical manifestation of the Idea, but he then must go on, and seize his responsibility to aid in the evolution of the Idea physically toward perfection [*in identity condition with the Creator—JK*]. (Heaven to Earth: Einstein Returns, Robert R. Leichtman, Ariel Press, Columbus, Ohio, 1982)

The entity Seth, channeled by Jane Roberts:

In each life you are meant to check the exterior environment [*the syntactically organized symbolic surface structure material—JK*] in order to learn your inner condition [*the authoring grounds for such semiotic text—JK*]. The outer is a reflection of the inner. You are meant to understand the nature of your inner self [*via the comprehending reader aspect of your literacy—JK*], and to manifest it outward [*via the ‘speaking’/‘writing’ aspect of your literacy—JK*]. As this is done, the exterior circumstances should change for the better, as the inner self becomes aware of its own nature and capabilities. (Seth Speaks, Jane Roberts, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1972).

The human race is a stage through which various forms of consciousness travel... Before you can be allowed into systems of reality that are more expansive and open, you must first learn to handle energy and see, through physical materialization, the concrete result of thought and emotion [*the full cycle of literacy, authoring and reading one’s own creational text—JK*]. As a child forms mud pies from dirt, so you form your civilizations out of thoughts and emotions and then see what you have created.... You must be taught and trained to create responsibly. Yours is a training system for emerging consciousness. (The Seth Material, Jane Roberts, Bantam books, New York, 1970)

The entity Hilarion, channeled by Maurice B. Cooke:

Indeed, the main function and purpose of physical existence in the plane of matter is to allow the seeking spirit or soul to experience, in the *outer* world, a reflection of its own *inner* condition, and thus to come to know itself better. It is the hope of the high entities who have decreed this function of the material plane that, through this process of reflection, the soul or spirit will be induced to improve its qualities and approach more closely to the ideal [*being in identity condition with the Creator—JK*]. (Symbols, Hilarion/Maurice B. Cooke, Marcus Books, Toronto, 1979)

The entity Alexander (can’t locate channel’s name at present):

All action originates as thought. Once a given course of action is decided upon, “intent” carries the action from thought to physical manifestation. Because the

minute energy sparks weaving the physical world are themselves conscious, they are exquisitely sensitive to the “intent” of bodies of consciousness within this field of activity. They respond appropriately, by altering the strength and position of their charge upon each successive “blink” into physical existence... The key to the process is intent, intent born of consciousness. The physical system exists because the Source “intends” that it exist, and this relationship of intent-to-matter pervades all of creation... Because energy is organized according to the intent of consciousness, all forms in the physical system have been “designed” to grant expression to a particular focus or slant of consciousness. That is the Source splinters its consciousness into an infinitude of unique potentials, each of which finds expression through an appropriate physical form. (From The Alexander Journal, Issue No. 5.)

First “The Landscape Angel” and then “The Wormwood Plant”—purported nature spirit devas channeled through Findhorn channel Dorothy MacLean:

Before there is any manifestation on what you call material levels, there is first the idea in higher substance (*closer to the Creator end of the Creator-Creation spectrum of the one unified field—JK*). Man is coming to his estate as creator, is learning, as a child learns in building with toy bricks, a certain control of the higher patterns which are the seed energy of matter. He unconsciously builds in higher energy a prototype of a machine pattern, for example [*the practice of literacy with respect to the universal grammar—JK*], and because his consciousness is limited and he is concerned with part, the seed energy or deva of that machine has limitations... We, the divine energy, are there to imbue this poor creation with more of ourselves, to educate it, to coax it to its immediate purpose.

Power is everywhere [*The Creator’s Creation Ground of Being out of which all authoring of local textual semiotic material can as Creation occur—JK*], but so much of it is beyond you, because you are so beset by the limitations imposed by your selfhood. We wield that energy, that power, in vast sweeps, in concentrated nibblings, in vortices, and we wield it right, left and centre as colour, as sound, as anything you can think of. But we wield it according to pattern and for the whole [*the operations of the universal grammar—JK*]; we wield it with precision for God and to the best of our ability. It is our joy to perfect that power in service. Will you not do likewise? Why bring yourselves to nothingness by the flawed use of power? (To Hear the Angels Sing, Dorothy MacLean, Lorian Press, Elgin, Illinois, 1980.)

From a reported temporarily incarnating ascended master:

He [*humankind*] will enter into the joy of creating and he will create under the law of the Lord or Word of God. Through His Word he will find that he can move upon the all-loving and all-enfolding substance of God and bring into visibility every ideal he holds in thought. (Indian Tour Lessons On Life and Teachings of the Masters of the Far East, Baird T. Spalding, DeVorss & Co, Pubs, Marina del Rey, CA, 1948.)

Said to be from God, channeled by Joseph S. Benner:

You have been told that the Earth and all things belonging to it are but the outer manifestations of My Idea, which is now in the process of being thought into perfect expression. You have been shown that My Idea is responsible for all created things, and that It is both the Cause and the Reason for all manifestations, yourself and your brothers and sisters included, all of which have been thought into existence by Me, the One Original Thinker and Creator. For in Reality You are an Angel of Light, one of My Thought Rays, an Attribute of My Being, ensouled in Earth conditions, with no other purpose (which is no purpose at all, but a necessity of My Being) but the final complete expression of My Idea. (The Impersonal Life, Joseph S. Benner, DeVorss & Co., Pubs., Marina del Rey, CA, 1941, 1969.)

5. Literacy in light of Hegel and Cosmological Dissociation

In this section, I wish to continue to use my conceptual and metaphorical modeling to shed further light on the particular perspective that “God” was just providing through Joseph Benner in the previous quote. Earlier versions of what is to follow in this section were first published as “A Concluding Metaphor” in Chapter 8 of Channeling: Investigations on Receiving Information from Paranormal Sources (Jeremy P. Tarcher, Inc., Los Angeles, 1987) and in “Cosmological Dissociation: Toward an Understanding of How We Create Our Own Reality,” in Paranormal Research ‘89: Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Paranormal Research, June 1-4, 1989, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado (Pub.: Rocky Mountain Research Institute, Fort Collins, Colorado, 1989).

My model/metaphor for a universal grammar and semiotics is based on a post-Cartesian (post-or-trans-dualistic) unified-field approach that is essentially monist idealistic in nature, by means of which we can understand the traditional Western dualistic realms of objective and subjective reality, matter and mind, as being integrated within an all-is-consciousness, all-is-Spirit, all-is-God universal identity and nature. Although this perspective was first articulated in the Hindu vedic writings thousands of years ago, and you can recognize other aspects of my theme in the writings of Plato and Plotinus, for some reason I choose to draw especially from the writing of the 17th and 18th century German idealist philosopher G.W.F. Hegel. Hegel wrote that all-that-is is essentially “Absolute Spirit.” In its fully realized “Thesis” state, Spirit is self-consciously thoroughly aware of itself as Spirit. Yet the fundamental monist Spirit identity and substance is capable of losing consciousness of itself as being Spirit, and Spirit can become the very opaque and inanimate-seeing objects that Spirit can be conscious of even as it is not aware of itself as Spirit. So, Spirit in its subjective self-aware mode can be conscious of and interact with self-same Spirit in its objective mode as the objects and contents of consciousness, although all that exists is Spirit at heart; it is simply a matter of how self-aware Spirit is of its own true nature through any given relativistic experiential frame of reference and individualized functioning persona of itself in any of its modes.

This view may be somewhat difficult to grasp for many of us Westerners raised on a diet of dualism, or of physical monism wherein all is material, objective reality, and

consciousness is merely the ontologically inferior emergent epiphenomenon of live physical brains and bodies. Therefore, to help you better grasp what I am talking about, I will repeat a variation on this Hegelian theme that I used in the earlier-mentioned publications when I first found myself using the concept of dissociation.

Consider the concept of dissociation, which originated in turn-of-the-century psychology. Dissociation meant then, as it still means today, that there is some kind of disconnection, some lack of flow or continuity, with respect to one or more of the following areas: conscious awareness, cognition or information processing, and volitional control, causal efficacy or energetic coupling. The best-known example is what used to be called multiple personality disorder and now is called dissociative identity disorder. In such a case, a person, usually correlated with early childhood sexual trauma or physical abuse, appears to psychoenergetically “break apart” somewhat and generates one or more of what are called sub-, alter-, or secondary-personalities. These sub-personalities tend to be partially or totally dissociated from one another, and the host, parent personality that generated them may be to varying degrees dissociated with regard to them and they, in turn, may be to varying degrees dissociated from the parental host. This process gives rise to a bunch of relatively autonomous, self-aware personalities or identities who appear to be cut off from each other to varying degrees, cut off with regard to the aforementioned conscious awareness, cognition, information processing, volitional control, causal efficacy, et al. And there are other forms of dissociation that do not particularly involve self-generated sub-personalities, but do involve one or more of those modes of lack-of-connectedness-type dysfunction. For example, in the case of “automatic writing,” someone loses his or her sense of “ownership” of his/her own actions and lacks the sense of conscious volition and motor control as some intentional agent other than his/her conscious self appears to take over the writing hand and writes things with respect to which the person is completely cut off and unconscious.

Over the years I have chosen to expand this psychological notion of dissociation to address the realms of parapsychology, physics, parapsysics, and metaphysics. On the broadest canvas I call it “cosmological dissociation.” To understand this, return with me to my brand of Hegelian monistic idealism and consider the following simile: *The Universe, All-That-Is, or God, is something like an inconceivably vast, dissociated multiple personality as we experience It from our perspective of being Its own “cosmological sub-personalities.”* We look to It all and, with few fleeting transcendental exceptions, we tend to experience Its Many-ness, not Its Oneness; and we feel apart from It, not at one with It. That is not to say that God is self-dissociated, or experiences dissociation with respect to Itself or with respect to aspects of Itself, for I do not choose to believe that this is the case; but, rather, because we are God’s, or the Universe’s, own offspring—just as sub-personalities can be created out of the psychoenergetic material of the host, parental person—we humans happen, at this species-specific stage of our evolution, to be quite dissociated in a number of ways with respect to our Creator and Its underlying, sustaining, all-constituting Ground of Being.

The dissociation appears to operate in three basic domains for us as such cosmological sub-personality offspring of our Creator: 1.) we experience dissociation intra-psychically

with respect to aspects within our own respective individual beings; 2.) we experience dissociation inter-psychically or inter-personally with respect to other individual beings, human or otherwise, animate or inanimate, conscious or unconscious; and 3.) as Its relatively dissociated and autonomous creations and as aspects of Itself, we experience dissociation with respect to the one underlying Ground of Being—the creative cause, host, and sustainer of us all. Each of us individual human beings (and each of other kinds of beings as well) differs somewhat with regard to the kind and degree of dissociation we are the case of within and across these three domains.

For me, then, the goal of all philosophical and religio-spiritual seeking and practice, and the goal of all scientific endeavor toward understanding and technological application, is the same: It is what I call “overcoming cosmological dissociation.” To the degree to which our cosmological dissociation can be overcome within and across its three aforementioned modes, we individuals, we cosmological sub-personalities, can access and be at-one with ever more of the one underlying parental hosting Universal Ground of Being’s omniscience (i.e., consciousness and awareness, cognition, and information processing); omnipotence (i.e., causal efficacy with regard to all existing energies and modes of manifest being); omnibenevolence (i.e., pan-compassion/empathy and universal love); and omnipresence and omnitemporality. The more we overcome our cosmological dissociation, the closer we come to sharing the identity, nature, and capacities of our Creator with respect to Its and our Creation—the nearer we come to being at-one and in identity condition with God Itself.

In light of this inter-related set of definitions based on an expanded notion of dissociation, let us return to our previous thinking about a universal grammar and semiotics and about our literacy with regard to such. First of all, the more we overcome our cosmological dissociation, the greater our literacy will become with regard to the universal semiotic system; and the more we increase our literacy, the more we are overcoming our cosmological dissociation. Second, we can talk in terms of how the Supreme Creator is Author of all Creation as multi-dimensional semiotic Text, compared to us—its dissociated cosmological sub-personalities—being creator authors of various sub-texts within the one Creational Text. But doesn’t the one Author also create through its own admittedly dissociated and constrained offspring extensions of Itself as creators as well? Doesn’t the one Author write through each of us as authors in turn; for how could we exist to create anything apart from the Creative Being of our Creator? Yes, perhaps “only God can make a tree;” but couldn’t we make real living trees as well if we overcame our cosmological dissociation enough to do so? Doesn’t it lie in the realm of possibility that we could gain sufficient literacy with regard to the universal grammar semiotic system that we could learn to “speak” and “write” in the same language that our Creator does? Is this so far-fetched? I don’t think so; although how long it will take some of us individuals, and then later the less-interested, more-dissociated members of our species, to evolutionarily to do so remains to be seen.

Consider, next, a specific way in which thinking about increasing literacy with regard to the cosmological semiotic system and overcoming cosmological dissociation both come together. I spoke earlier about how there could be a condition of dissociation or out-of-

phase relation between the semantical/intentional authoring/generational ground responsible for particular syntactically arrayed symbolic/aesthetic surface structures of Creation, on the one hand, and the recipient experiencer of such semiotic action and surface structures, in the role of comprehender, reader, or decoder, on the other hand. And I asked you to consider that the author of the text being read could be the same as or different than the reader him, her, or its self, and that the author, in some cases, could also be considered as transpersonal and transcendental in nature. Now consider that, as part of our human kinds of cosmological dissociation, we could, as we experience bringing our degree of literacy to bear upon our experience of the surface structure semiotic material surrounding us (and even “within” us), be sufficiently out-of-phase and dissociated with respect to how we are the authors of the text we in turn are reading, that we are dissociated with respect to being aware of or understanding the intentional, semantical, functional-pragmatic grounds responsible for generating and sustaining the existence of the n-dimensionally syntactically arrayed semiotic text in question. That is, there could be the case where *we are* the authoring grounds for the very texts we face as readers, but where we are unaware that this is the case—that we are dissociated in this regard. This is the relation that particularly interests me. In the next to last section of this presentation, I will try to tie this situation into the current quantum physics notion of the observer collapsing the wave function as being both author of text and then experiencer (reader) of what was just authored.

Christ said, “Forgive them for they know not what they do;” and Freud had his concept of unconscious motivation; but this idea—of being the reader dissociated from oneself as authoring ground of the very text one is reading—runs much deeper than just being out of touch with “where one is coming from” in traditional psychological motivational terms. We may be directly contributing to the authoring of the texts we experience as our surrounding experiential daily lives—all stimuli, objects, and events—all that we take to be “out there” and objectively real. And who, then, is this “we” I am referring to? If we are of God, all aspects of that one Hegelian Absolute Spirit, if we are each “an Angel of Light, one of My Thought Rays, an Attribute of My Being,” in “God’s”/Benner’s terms—albeit dissociated from our maker and sustainer in the mode of Its own cosmological sub-personalities—isn’t it possible that we could learn, through enhanced literacy, to read through the surface textual material of our lived-experience to see not so much the face of God, but see and know through-and-through the originating semantical/intentional deep structure and the generational and transformation grammar that is responsible for bringing objective-seeming reality into manifestation from out of subjective-seeming reality? The more conscious the authoring is, and the more conscious the reading comprehension of text is—until the human spirit ideally eventually achieves identity condition with Universal Spirit—the greater the literacy becomes and the less cosmologically dissociated one is. Don’t we contribute to this authoring of what we experience as we overlay our own subtexts from out of our own ways of being in the world, and from our deepest beliefs, expectations, memorial psychoemotional “baggage,” and subtlest cognitive engineering wetware perceptual constructivist programs?

Yet what is the relation between Creator and Its Creation, on the one hand, and we humans and our creations within this Creation, and as creators within and as dissociated

extensions of our Creator, on the other hand? It would seem that, as we overcome our cosmological dissociation, we will blend ever more into identity condition with our Creator's will, ways, and workings and thus we will be capable of a literacy that can speak whole worlds into being in one breath that operates by means of the universal grammar that is my theme and my passion throughout. Consider, again, the purported surviving spirit of Einstein, communicating through the channel Paul Winter:

On the human level, the inner being uses physical, emotional, and mental matter to express its inner life. On the planetary level, the inner being of the planet [*a more vast, less-dissociated trans-human cosmological sub-personality working as author within the Supreme Author—JK*] uses physical, emotional, and mental matter for its evolution and manifestation. This planetary inner being exists as a vortex in subtle matter. You can think of this vortex as the intersection of this indwelling life and subtle matter existing in its primal state. As primal matter intersects with and accepts the indwelling life, or cosmic Idea, the indwelling life moves into manifestation as a being, through the vortex. This is how It becomes a planet... The Idea, which could also be called the cosmic plan of God [*the universal grammar—JK*], sounds forth the creative impulse and proceeds into matter.

I have been asking you throughout to entertain the possibility that there is only one all-encompassing Creator-to-Creation, Author-to-Text, subjective-to-objective Reality in terms of which the process and continuum post-Cartesian unified-field nature of the one Absolute Spirit lives and moves and has Its Being. More specifically, I have asked you to entertain this picture in terms of a universal grammar that is responsible for generating the semiotic text that comprises all of the objects and subjects that are able to be experienced by all of the consciousness-possessing subjective aspects of the Universal Being—all Hegelian cosmological sub-personalities of the one Absolute Spirit evolving their literacy, operating from, and gradually overcoming, their assorted kinds and degrees of cosmological dissociation, in the out-working manifestational creativity whereby all experiential worlds for those sub-personalities are made down to their finest detail.

Still, we have an essentially Hegelian concept apparently at work: that even though everything is one Spirit or consciousness Ground of Being (thus panpsychism by definition), that, nonetheless, some aspects of It can be experienced as passive, inanimate, non-conscious, only matter or non-intelligent energy, experienced from the frame of reference of another aspect of the same Ground of Being that deems (reads) itself as more conscious, animate, etc. than those objects of its consciousness that it is experiencing and contemplating. In this sense, from our cosmologically dissociated anthropomorphizing frame of reference, most any author aspect would consider itself more conscious and of Spirit than any text aspect; although I am suggesting that we must, relativistically, reconsider this bias.

This perspective is presented by Hegel near the end of his book The Phenomenology of Mind, where he defines the concept of what he calls “the artificer.” Taking some liberties here to tie it into my own model/metaphor, I'd say that the artificer for Hegel is any

individualized portion of the one Absolute Spirit—a portion that I would call a cosmologically dissociated aspect of the one Absolute Spirit in the form of Spirit’s own offspring cosmological sub-personality— who or which experientially, contemplatively, and above all creatively, interacts with itself and with another aspect, or with other aspects, of the one underlying Absolute Spirit that it initially takes, from its perspective of dissociation, to be less conscious and animate. But as it creatively works with what it construes as other with respect to itself, as the artist working with his materials, Spirit in the dissociated mode of the artificer, gradually awakens Spirit in both self and other. As the artist works with his clay, as the author works with his evolving text in the bootstrapping development of his literacy, seemingly more-self-aware Spirit greets what is to itself seemingly less-aware Spirit in a dialectic cycle of expanding self-consciousness, in a process of ever-increasing subjectification of once-objectified Spirit. To address why and how part of the one post-Cartesian unified field of Absolute Spirit can become so passive and inanimate as experienced by another part of Itself, or how to deal with the neo-Einsteinian relativistic play of competing frames of reference involved (e.g., what is the self-aware experience of the artist’s clay, for example—is it nearer to God than the humanly dissociated thee?), must await another day.

Consider, briefly, a few passages from Hegel’s Phenomenology of Mind in which he writes of the ways in which domains of localized consciousness within the one universal field as Absolute Spirit interact, including his concept of the “artificer.” Unfortunately, Hegel, in English translation, and even in the original German, is notoriously difficult to follow (and you may have been feeling the same way about *my* writing for that matter); but I hope that you will be able to glean from the following that my modeling throughout my presentation to you has its deep roots in Hegel’s thinking:

The separation of elements from which spirit as artificer starts—the separation of the implicit essential nature, which becomes the material it works upon, and independent self-existence, which is the aspect of self-consciousness at work—this division has become objective to spirit in its work. Its further endeavor has to be directed to cancelling and doing away with the separation of soul and body; it must strive to clothe embodied shape with soul, per se, and endow the body with soul... Spirit’s oneness with itself contains this opposition of individuality and universality... For here the activity of the artificer, which constitutes self-consciousness, comes face to face with an inner being equally self-conscious and giving itself expression. He has therein raised himself by his work up to the point where his conscious life breaks asunder, where spirit greets spirit. In this unity of self-conscious spirit with itself, so far as it is aware of being embodiment and object of its own consciousness, its blending and mingling with the unconscious state of immediate shapes of nature become purified. These monsters in form and shape, word and deed are resolved and dissolved into a shape which is spiritual—an outer which has entered into itself, an inner which expresses itself out of itself and in itself—they pass into thought, which brings forth itself, preserves the shape and form suited to thought, and is transparent existence. Spirit is Artist.

6. Collapsing the Wave Function and Non-Locality

I am haunted by how the quantum mechanical concept of “collapsing the wave function” can be accounted for by my modeling and metaphorizing. I think it sheds new light on the quantum mechanical interactive dyad of observer and observed, of attending consciousness and what is said to be the objectively real material that is being attended to at the time; it is the relation between the person as dissociated cosmological sub-personality, as cognitively-programmed intentional seat of experiencing consciousness, as Hegelian artificer, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, the object, event, or environmental other also construed as cosmological sub-personality in its more-passive, less-conscious aspect, such an aspect as experienced/read from the frame of reference of the relatively cosmologically dissociated observer/artificer.

I think that the post-Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen-gedanken-experiment, post-Bell’s-Theorem, post-Aspect-et al-empirical-experiment quantum concept, and now proven truth, of non-local correlation or connectedness (non-locality) may be able to be understood in a more clear and comprehensive manner by means of my modeling. At a very first approximation, this is due to the fact that, in a post-Cartesian (i.e., post-or-trans-dualistic) unified-field view taken to Hegelian idealist lengths and depths beyond a Bohemian implicate and super-implicate order, the omniscience, omnipotence (pan-energetic causal connectedness potential), and, especially, the omnipresence and omnitemporality of the Creator operating within Its Creation aspect, accounts for experimentally and otherways experienced non-locality as well as accounts for all manner of state-dependent psi, paranormal, and mystic experiences that transcend normal waking consciousness and the local consensus reality. All that exists is Absolute Spirit, comprising locally, or neo-Bohmian-explicately, all experiencers and all that can be experienced, all cosmological sub-personalities across all seeming conscious and unconscious/passive modes (requiring relativistic treatment—that is, from whose or which experiencing frame of reference are we speaking/authoring and reading at the time?). Therefore, no wonder that it is possible that, from any one experiential frame of reference (or shared frame), the usual constraints that obtain due to the kinds and degrees of cosmological dissociation at work may at least be transiently surpassed allowing for tastes of a less-dissociated lived-world. I hope that the remaining bare-boned beginnings that follow might provide some more food for thought regarding the context for and process of collapsing the wave function and for non-locality, to name just two of the areas to which I hope my model/metaphor may fruitfully apply.

With regard to collapsing the quantum wave function: An observation, meaning an experimental or other intervention of experiential consciousness with respect to the probability of an event represented by its quantum wave function, is hypothesized to generate for and within the experience of the observer (at least on the micro-level for now) a local explicate-order particle, aggregate of particles, or objectively real energy configuration, out of a virtual or probability field. There has been a long history of attempts to render this process analytical, mechanistic, and comprehensible; but, much in the way that Bohm had realized that he had not earlier in his work adequately dealt with the realm of what he called significance, consciousness, and meaning-making, similarly I do not believe that quantum physicists—and psychologists and neuroscientists, for that

matter— have to this day been able to come up with an adequate explanation for how the complex psychoenergetic system of the conscious observer interacts with the underlying probability field to end up with an local objectively real something or other to experience. Therefore, I would like to very briefly try my hand at this, using the modeling I have been developing for you in this presentation.

To quickly review my perspective: I have said that within the universal grammar, as it is a vast extension of local verbal grammars, there are devices or procedures for generating structured semiotic material, which are discoverable by means of acquiring a literacy with respect to that universal grammar. I have variously called the structured semiotic material: manifestation, text, soma, local objective reality (and mental-imagery-type “inner” objects of consciousness as well), as well as creation, and Creation. I have also spoken of this manifestational domain as being the artist’s material with which Absolute Spirit, in the mode of Hegel’s artificer, and in my mode of being a relatively dissociated cosmological sub-personality of the One, plays hide and seek and peek-a-boo consciousness with aspects of Itself. I have spoken about learning the rules for operating with respect to this semiotic material as we acquire an ever-increasing literacy. And I have said that all Creation is such somatic/textual material; that any level of manifest reality can be structured or modulated; that specific semiotic domains within the universal grammar can lead specific reader aspects to specific authoring, speaker’s-reference, intentional authoring grounds responsible for specific texts (or ultimately for Text in general), and can lead to specific sub-spaces within an n-dimensional semantical space, or can lead to any other region of the experientable somatic textual space, all as a function of the capacity of the semiotic function to mean, to refer to, to bring to consciousness.

In order to address the process of collapsing the wave function, I would like to draw from Michael Polanyi’s thinking about how consciousness *attends from* a certain state of affairs with respect to what it is that it is *attending to* in the form of the object or content of that consciousness . So, I will now expand on this idea. Consider a set of *attending-from* coordinates in Hilbert, or n-dimensional phase or function space, which would represent, or be the case of, the observer and his/her/its state. Then there could be a set of coordinates within that same hyperspatial gedanken-experiment “lab,” representing the *attended-to* object or event vis a vis that attending-from observer consciousness. In my modeling, both attending-from and attended-to domains occupy the same “space,” since all is Absolute Spirit, all is one all-constituting higher-dimensional consciousness field; or all, in a more stepped-down version, is a Bohmian implicate order within and from out of which are generated the explicate-order observer consciousness domains and the domains of the observed with respect to them. Therefore, the structures and events of the attending-from domain and of the attended-to domain are non-locally correlated. That is, there is not a Newtonian, causal/mechanistic, linear-type relation between the two domains of attending-from and attended-to, or with regard to the relationship among what I have been calling the domains of the author or authoring ground, the reader and the grounds from which reading occurs, and the text and all that it can refer to, mean, or bring to consciousness, due to the higher-dimensional embedding context responsible for it all.

Let us return briefly to the concept of “speaker’s reference.” Remember that speaker’s reference has to do with what a language user intends by his/her use of language in a particular situation—what he/she is intending to mean, refer to, or bring to mind in him/herself or in another by means of the language being used. For example, in the referring-to function of language, one might use the spoken or written word “dog” to refer or point to, to pick out of a universe of all possible referents, the subject or object of dog—dog-ness, or a particular dog. Any referring piece of language can be considered from either the perspective of what is called “intension” or “extension.” Intension is the realm of the word’s, or other semiotic item’s, meaning, as in lexical rule-bound, consensual, dictionary-type meaning, and it could also be extended to include the connotative and aesthetic realms of experience and intensional-type meaning that such language could evoke. In contrast, extension is the domain of existing, empirically-experientiable objects, things, or bound-variable beings out there in the “real world” that one is intending to refer to or bring to consciousness with one’s language use. So, the intension of “dog” is the meaning it brings to mind or refers to, while the extension of “dog” is a “real world” dog.

The late Harvard philosopher W.V.O. Quine once made some contributions to our understanding of the concept of speaker’s reference that I would like to use. He drew a picture within which we are asked to consider the process of language, in its referring mode, as comprising a set of “ostended” point and surfaces. By this he meant that, when one uses symbolic material within the semiotic function to point to, or ostend with respect to, something, such as that doorknob over there, then a sort of dotted-line vectoral trajectory would go from the intentional grounds for the use of that language about the doorknob to its target, the point at which the language-fired pointing arrow stops—that doorknob. If I am using language to describe and refer to the fight that ended my first marriage, then one could imagine a kind of fiber-optic-bundle complex set of lines going from the author/speaker’s use-base and intentional grounds to and through the semiotic language material itself, to the target of that marriage-ending fight. There would be a set of ostended points and surfaces constituting the organized, interrelated termini-target for my speaker’s reference generational grounds. In this sense, we have a set of attending-from points and surface, of and within the language use as author/speaker, and then we have a correlated set of ostended points and surfaces that are “of and within” the attended-to objects of consciousness and language-creation. What is brought to consciousness by the language use is related to what in consciousness generated the language. Within the one all-subsuming consciousness field, the local state or sub-state of the n-dimensional inertial coordinate system that is the author is in relation to the local state or sub-state that is the text.

Thus the observer “collapses the wave function “ in the quantum sense when a particular dog, doorknob, or marriage-ending fight is picked out of the universal probability field, or from out of any of its more local, more constrained, more highly probable (to be that dog or doorknob, etc.) sub-field. The experimental observer in the formal quantum situation may not realize that he/she is author of the text that is the particles or whatever else that is realized from the collapse of the wave function he/she has just taken part in;

nonetheless, this is my perspective: that the attending-from set of points and surfaces “in” and as that observer and his/her state has a causal or at least co-constituting relationship with the set of ostended points and surfaces of the attended-to textual material so often thought to be objectively real, external and autonomous with respect to the “inner” state of the consciousness of the observer. There is one idealistic monist ground, one consciousness, within which observer and observed are both operating, from which each continuously takes, or is given, its being.

In light of how I have been using my model to try and better understand how the observer collapses the quantum wave function to generate the observed, consider the following channeled excerpts from “Seth,” communicating through Jane Roberts:

The whole cosmic structure ... was the materialization of one original thought [*The Text of Creation from Its Author, the Creator—JK*], for the thought, the basic reality, must always exist before its representation (*the semiotic relation among the one who symbolizes, the symbol, and that which is symbolized—JK*)... there are electromagnetic structures, so to speak, that are presently beyond your (scientific) instruments, units that are basic carriers of perception. These units ... are basically animations rising from consciousness. I am speaking now of the consciousness within each physical particle regardless of its size—of molecular consciousness, cellular consciousness, as well as the larger gestalts of consciousness with which you are usually familiar... These emanations rise as naturally as breath.... They combine qualities of a unit and a field... They will draw other such units to them, for example, according to the intensity of the emotional tone of the particular consciousness at any given “point” ... It is the inner self that organizes, initiates, projects, and controls the EE (electromagnetic energy) units of which we have been speaking, transforming energy into objects, into matter [*the mode of literacy involved with learning to speak and write within the universal grammar—JK*]... the EE units are the forms that basic experience takes when directed by the inner self [*the Hegelian artificer, the relatively dissociated cosmological sub-personality—JK*]... Your dreams, thoughts, and emotions are literally transformed into physical matter purposefully by this inner self. The individual inner self, then, through constant massive effort of great creative intensity, cooperates with all other inner selves [*we creator/authors through whom the one Creator/Author works—JK*] to form and maintain the physical reality that you know, so that physical reality is an offshoot or by-product [*creational text—JK*] of the highly conscious inner self [*as author—JK*]. Buildings appear to be made of rock or stone or steel. They appear fairly permanent to the physical senses. They are actually oscillating, ever-moving, highly charged gestalts of EE units (“beneath,” say, any atomic particles), organized and maintained by the collective efforts on the part of inner selves [*recall the relationship between the points and surfaces of the supposedly subjective attending-from authoring or reading grounds and the supposedly objective, speakers-reference, observer- experienced, attended-to ostended points and surfaces of the wave-function-collapsed “real world”—JK*] They (the buildings) are solidified emotions, solidified subjective states, given physical materialization. (from The Seth Material, op cit.)

We are, then, destined to develop our literacy to continually expand and deepen our understanding of the universal grammar and in doing so learn the ways of our Creator and Its Creation, and to understand our relationship as creator and created beings with regard to Creator and Creation. Each moment we are presented with text to experience as readers. I have asked you to consider, at a very first approximation, how the authoring process leads to text and how the one reading the text relates to both the authoring grounds and the ostended semantical reference domains intended by the speaker's-reference grounds. And I have talked about how our condition of being cosmologically dissociated leads us to be only-ever-so-slowly developing our literacy so that the reader aspect of our being can learn or come into phase both cognitively and energetically with, and into eventual identity condition with, the author aspect, the manifest-reality-generating-and-maintaining aspect of ourselves, of others, and of our Creator as Author and Sustainer of all Creation as Text. I believe that this sense of things is best appreciated by means of a true Post-Cartesian unified-field theory for how an attending-from set of coordinate points and surfaces within the higher-dimensional aspect of the consciousness of Absolute Spirit, construed as the experiencing observer, may be non-locally correlated with—and indeed may be one and the same as—the attended-to points and surfaces, construed as constituting the objects and events being experienced by that attending-from aspect. In light of George Berkeley's phrase "all things are ideas in the mind of God," consider that God's ideas may be our ideas and, vice versa, that our thinking is God's thinking as us. We are authors working in a relatively highly cosmologically dissociated state with respect to, yet nonetheless in the manner of, the one Author. As in the earlier passage from "God" channeled by Joseph Benner, we *are* the Author, the Creator, speaking and writing the realities we are then faced with. At the same time we are always readers, experiencing and further meaning-making with regard to what has been spoken and written by our own inner selves, by ourselves conjointly, by other non- or trans-human beings, and, ultimately, by our Creator. We are, once more, God's own cosmological sub-personalities, learning to overcome our respective cosmological dissociation until we can eventually achieve identity condition to be the case in human form of the Creator living, moving, and having our, and Its, being/Being from out of the grounds of Creatorhood working with respect to and within the one Creation.

7. An Interdisciplinary Taxonomy of Noun-Things within the Universal Grammar and Continuing to Try to Tie this Model into other Scientific Thinking

Due to length constraints, I will end this presentation with a series of fragments. Each is meant to be no more than a kind of topic sentence starting place for ways in which my model/metaphor (of a universal grammar, a developing literacy, and an overcoming of cosmological dissociation) might shed new light on some existing scientific and engineering (including biomedical/healing) understandings and approaches. Each of these could—and I promise that many will—become a separate presentation at a later date.

To begin with, what are some of the forms that the nouns of the universal grammar can take; what are some of the media within which the forms can manifest; and how might

the multi-dimensional subjective-to-objective “speaking” and “writing” part of the developing literacy work so far as being a grammar containing devices for generating and structuring syntactical systems using internalized rules for operating on and with sets of symbolic creational material? How do these generative devices operate? What are these hypothesized internalized rules for reality creation (not just for traditional language generation)?

Consider the field called “radionics.” In a nutshell, radionics, pioneered in the 1920’s by Stanford University research physician Albert Abrams, involves the art and science of anomalous or non-ordinary diagnosis and treatment with regard to plants, animals, and humans. To the extent to which it appears that the successful radionics “operator” is capable of operating at a distance from whom or what he/she is diagnosing or treating, non-locality appears to be involved, including some form(s) of paranormal cognition, informing processing and accessing, and omnipotence-tapping, and enhanced causal efficacy of a healing nature that seems able to access and command subtler energies, from pre-physical organizational/informational fields immediately responsible for the physical state up to the hypothesized levels of feeling- and thought-forms.

What so deeply connects radionics to my universal grammar is what the radionic field calls “rates,” “fundamental frequency” patterns, or “intrinsic data fields,” that every kind of individualized being in the universe is said to be the case of and energetically and/or informationally emanates apparently non-locally. In radionics there is a particular agreed-upon semiotic function in the form of lexical relations at work which join each thing, such as a fruit tree or a living human kidney, with its designated rate or symbolic counterpart, such the “witness” for the thing. Each kind of thing, from physical things to the ideas of the things, events, and subjects and the intentions and feelings with regard to them, has, or can have, its own tell-tale identity-print and voice-print (rate, fundamental frequency, or intrinsic data field), its own individualized being drawn across the stratified yet superimposed Creation and, ideally and in potential, within the unmanifest Mind-Being universal consciousness field of the Creator, and in our human consciousness as well to varying degrees of access as a function of our respective cosmological dissociation and the strategies for transiently overcoming that dissociation at least somewhat. Then the object existing in the objective-reality realm, the numerical rate or geometric or other symbolic representation of that object, the idea of the thing in the radionic operator’s consciousness, and the authoring generational ground of the thing in the trans-human and transcendental realm, are all conjoined by the semiotic function. What you do to one, in this chain of identity relations, you have access to do to it its other semiotically related aspects across ontological strata or levels of manifestation. This is so due to the underlying unified field of consciousness within which all of it is taking place, within which all semiotically related components are held together non-locally as one, are know to be thusly inter-related as different aspects in identity relation with one another even though some might be construed as “inner” and some as “outer,” such as the actual, physically existent living human heart, the word for physical human heart, a witness for or sampling from the heart, a photograph of it, the numerical radionic rate for it, the Malcolm Rae geometrical symbol card for it, whatever the operator’s idiosyncratic representational version of it might be, and, finally, God’s “version” of it within Its

omniscience, omnipresence, omnitemporality, and omnipotence (pan-energetic causal/correlating efficacy)—the ultimate multi-dimensional cosmic glue holding the whole seemingly magical post-Newtonian affair acausally together.

Another radionics pioneer, the late Britisher Malcolm Rae, drew a distinction between God-given naturally occurring things and their rates and those which human beings have created and the rates that can be used semiotically to represent them. The purpose of radionic treatment is for the operator, using ceremonialized assorted apparatus and procedures such as “stroke pads,” dials, gauges, et al, to help the operator find resonance with targeted diagnoses and treatments, and then to intentionally and semiotically bring together and superimpose within a trans-physical domain: 1.) things which are out-of-phase with respect to healthy structure and function, such as a diseased condition of a plant, animal, or person (for the person, usually due to the humanly-created authoring seed-grounds for such awry fruits), and 2.) the rate, fundamental frequency, or intrinsic data field representing—or being the literal, essential case of—something that has been resonantly tuned to to be the treatment for the aforementioned condition; or to bring to bear the generational, organizational, and sustaining patterns of God-given healthy and self-fulfilling structure and function. This process is carried out in order to return the out-of-phase manifestation to as close to identity condition as it can have on its respective level of existence with the ideal intended by the operator, and, ultimately with the God-given ideal, the most cosmologically *undissociated* idea in the mind of God. I can think of no other human enterprise at present that seems more closely aligned with my notion of a universal grammar and a developing literacy than this field known as radionics. Although I cannot go into radionics and its relationship to my modeling any further here, I look forward to elaborating more on this in future work.

To continue: What does it mean to say that the whole Universe is like, or literally *is*, a vast, living language system of one Universal Being and Consciousness in operation? One way to look at this is in terms of verbal language systems with which we are most familiar. I would once more remind you, however, that in my model/metaphor, components such as “word” and “sentence” are to be extended into “real world” objective reality and higher-dimensional semiotic forms and syntactical arrangements and that their traditional grapheme and phoneme presences on paper or airwave media can also be extended to include anything and everything manifestable in the universe: matter and energy, fermion or boson wavyicles, forces, fields, and subtle energies right down to those comprising thoughts, beliefs, desires, and intentions. In addition, we need to remember that, within the semiotic function, taken to universal proportions, any syntactical organization of any medium-modulating symbolic material can take the attending consciousness of any authoring or reading cosmological sub-personality, as a function of its level of literacy, to any other location and arrangement made out of any other components of the Creator or Its Creation (both aspects, once more, comprising the one post-Cartesian unified-field of Hegelian Absolute Spirit ultimately self-conscious of Itself as such).

So, consider verbal language as an example. We know that the grammar of a verbal language system uses internalized rules and algorithms to operate on and with semiotic

material to generate words, phrases, and sentences. Let's first think about nouns and verbs. Verbs represent, or in my model/metaphor *are*, the in-motion vectoral language for things in changing relation; they are like sails—hamiltonians of fermionic material in syntactical arrangement—blown by energy in its radiant and kinetic changing and shape-shifting modes. Also at a first approximation, nouns could be thought of as comprising all of the things in Creation, energy in its potential form, or as the M aspect of Einstein's $E=MC^2$ equivalence and conversion equation. Also, nouns can be things in the sense of relatively invariant, bound-variable expressions or constants writ like standing-wave Chladni or Jenny patterns upon other levels of the semiotic Creational textual material available to work with one's developing literacy, such as what I could call initial generational "intention-forms" and what others have called thought-forms or feeling-forms, as in the sense of "thoughts are things," and of how we, as homo faber, reify from creator grounds into manifest creation in the sense of Edgar Cayce saying "mind is builder of the real." In this respect, I have always loved the British philosopher George Berkeley's phrase, "All things are ideas in the mind of God;" and I would also here have you consider the reverse: that all ideas in the mind of God become things in our lived-worlds. This notion, of course, has its roots in Plato and Plotinus as well as in the later philosophical idealists.

So, in the hands of the authoring subject-mode, the reifying or object-making process within the universal grammar generates all possible noun-things that can be experienced by any consciousness-possessing cosmological sub-personality; and, while it may seem extreme to think this way, all object-type noun-things could be construed as cosmological sub-personalities as well—they are just seen as possessing less or no consciousness, at least as experienced and read from the frame of reference of apparently (i.e., apparent to themselves) subject-type consciousness-possessing cosmological sub-personalities.

So, although I cannot go any further into it right here, you can begin to consider the physics, parapsysics, and post-Cartesian unified-field n-dimensional (yet idealistic monist) ways of further elaborating on the objective-reality sense of relatively invariant, inertial-system, bound-variable, mattered-together *nouns-stuff*, together with all its adjectivally elaborated and individualized properties and fine-tunings, and *verbs*, with their kinetic energy, motion, and changing of relations with respect to the noun-stuff, together with their adverbally elaborated and finely differentiated aspects. So we begin to see how lived-worlds are articulated, and how the devices, procedures, and rules of the universal grammar work with the noun-and-verb stuff of manifest Creation; and we begin to see how those worlds get articulated into being and sustained by those experiencing them, by studying the relation of author and reader to text.

And then we have all of the other functioning parts of a language system beyond just nouns, verbs, and modifiers. Just imagine how the full-blown sense of a trans-verbal semiotic system, a tremendous reality-creating-and-sustaining universal grammar, could account for how the whole world we experience moment-to-moment is something like a spoken language, a text, and how we are then haunted by how that spoken text got into being to be experienced in the first place. As just one small example of the finely articulated micro-realm of the building blocks of our nouns and verbs, consider how pre-

physical things, such as quantum potentials, magnetic vector potentials, pilot waves, creation operators, and other related physics concepts, are used to try to explain how particles come into being and are moved around within the explicate-order realm of objective reality and are guided in their specific behaviors as arrays of harmonic field oscillators are constantly modulated, as particle-pair pair creation and annihilation oscillates the wavicles into and out of the “Dirac sea,” so that they live and move and have their constantly reiterated beings from out of, and always with respect to, the probability field represented by the quantum wave potential, the stochastic ether zero-point energy vacuum, the implicate order, or other languaged versions of that multi-dimensional superposed Creator/Creation-grounds responsible for the localized experiential realm in which we operate as created creators, as authoring particle-pair creators and annihilators, as quantum potential wielders, and as readers within the phenomenology of the results.

The concept of verbal graphemes and phonemes can be carried from mechanical acoustical and material form into electromagnetic and subtle energy media, across all octaves of the one universal ether as the Creator’s Creation textual material with which to creatively work. Using intentionally generatable etheric-forms, feeling-forms and thought-forms in standing and kinetic, scalar and vectoral patternings of the nearest-prephysical, astral, and mental planes, there are sacred technologies and magical/magickal rules, rituals, ceremonies, and procedures for engineering along the continuum from Creator Authoring Source to textual Creation, available within the Theosophical and related (Alice Bailey, Rosecrucian, Anthroposophic, et al) occult and esoteric mystery school and perennial philosophy literature. And as we continue to develop our literacy within the universal grammar and to continue to overcome our cosmological dissociation, our religio-spiritual, scientific/technological, magic(k)al, and healing endeavors will appear to flow together and integrate at ever higher and inner levels in closer alignment with Absolute Spirit Source coming to self-consciousness with regard to Itself in all that It is and does.

We can think about the syntactical manifestations of semiotic utterances as standing and moving aggregate wave forms within and across octaves of the one Creation substance aspect of and for the one Creator; Chladni and Jenny two and three dimensional (and higher, n-dimensional) and superimposed vibratory standing wave patterns; Fourier transform “devices for generating” and “internalized rules for operating” between simple componential and complex wave systems; neo-Bohmian devices and rules for generating/deriving local unfolded spatio-temporal matter-and-energy explicate-order systems, including localized consciousness, out of the underlying pure frequency domain enfolded implicate order, and the super-implicate-order underlying it; intention-programmed and driven creation operators responsible for generating and sustaining all cosmological sub-personalities, comprised of superimposed ontological strata (from Creatorhood to Creation) of the one Absolute Spirit, sub-personalities to us both possessing consciousness and not, both animate and inanimate “Nature.”

Consider the notion of variable, infinite, self-evoked plastic excitability patternings of aspects of Creation by variable, infinite aspects of the Creator. Think of Hegel’s artificer

as intentional localized self-excitation bootstrapping vivification of the denser-level adjacent cooperative passive-mode universal substance by its more active mode within the one all-as-Spirit reality.

Consider engineerable interdimensional and cross-octave harmonic resonance and entrainment relations between different-media-modulating basal signature inertial system identity patterns in linear and non-linear relations, tracked through projective geometries, group and lie algebras, reflection spaces, self-correcting error codes, and fiber-bundle group Minkowski-frame world-line loci of fermionic Pauli-exclusion-principle space-demanding, and more-free, radiant, writ-in-light bosonic (tachyonic, “Spiritonic”), syntactically structured articulated systems within and across dimensions and octave ranges of Creation and into and from out of the trans-super-implicate-order, trans-frequency domain of God’s omniscient, omnipotent, and omnibenevolent all-possible void bosom of infinite fecundity.

From Creator to Creation within the one Universal Being of Absolute Spirit, across all of Its self-generated and sustained modes of qualification, differentiation, and density worked with in the Hegelian artificer creator hands of all of its self-made cosmological sup-personalities all evolving to dissolve their respective states of cosmological dissociation back to Absolute Spirit, there is the universal grammar that, from endlessly different kinds and degrees of consciousness and intention, utilizes n-dimensionally situated spinnors, twistors, fluxons, localized flow structures, vortical, plasmoid, toroidal, universal Creational substance endlessly and infinitely moving on and with respect to itself in the one glorious cosmological incestuous intercourse that gives rise to the progeny of all that is and ever could be.

Raw textual material available to the authoring and reading disposition, made from not only fermions and bosons but also from creative programs for assembly that use post-Cartesian, post-grand-unified-theory supersymmetry-breaking, with consciousness now as superposed on and responsible for the objects of consciousness; post-Cartesian unified-field post-super-string programs for generating/activating/exciting, syntactically spatio-temporally “spelling out” and inertially sustaining, resonant modes of self-vibrant basal reiteratable utterance-substructurings of the Ground of Being Creational Substance that is the passive-aspect of Absolute Spirit, by the active-principal Creator aspect of the one Absolute Spirit as the ultimate Author engaged in the ultimate practice of literacy that we, Its cosmological sub-personalities, are also using, as makers made in and out of Its making image and likeness, working to overcome our cosmological dissociation in order to return to identity condition with It. And Its universal love is the homeward-bound, transcendent “strange attractor” for us all.