



**EXAMPLE OF OMNI-SEMANTIC PRAXIS
OMNISEMANTIC HEARING OF CONCEPTS**

Omnisemantism is praxis of musical perception of Language.

The musical perception of words and concepts is a practice of the ability to sink in the harmony accorded inside the Hollowness and into the depth of a particular word. Through this exercise the practitioner begins to gradually hear the Semantic Overtones of the word the way he hears other concepts and semantics. Or the other way round, this is an exercise, through which one begins to “hear” Concepts and Meanings the way he hears the “Semantic Overtones” of concept and meaning as they sound to themselves.

This musical reception of “semantic overtones” is actually realized as an enhancement of the sensual permeability, which allows more and more meanings to be perceived within a single word. These meanings are further apprehended as conceptual overtones of the word. On the basis of the musical “Overtones” (which actually determine the evolution of musical intoning), we suggest that “Semantic and Conceptual Overtones” should be called “Over-Semantics” and “Over-Concepts” or “Over-conceptuals” instead of overtones. To understand the “Musical hearing of language and meanings” it is sufficient one to recall the musical hearing of the tone intervals, in which music is referred to as “Chords – Harmonic Hearing” of intervals.

The case with the music itself is most encouraging.

The musician first hears in a single note all the “overtones” of the note interval like other note intervals, and secondly, he hears in the note interval all possible note intervals, with which the primary interval could feasibly form accords or harmonic polyphonies.

Thus both the poet and the writer hear with the “Over-semantic hearing” all the meanings within the primary meaning, with which the primary meaning could form feasible “Semantic Chords” or “Semantically-Conceptual metaphors”.

The evolution of music proves that the possibility of Chord-overtone linking of the note interval is infinite. In every single note a great musician can virtually hear all other note intervals. This means that the permeability of the hearing and intonation of musical reception has dramatically increased. As an aftermath the renowned “emancipation of the accord from the mode and the modal-tone hearing” takes place. There is no more “tonality”, “subdominant” and “dominant”, preferred and euphonic chords are no longer there.

By now all chords are preferred and there are no infeasible, forbidden or unacceptable chords for all chords sound euphonic now – which is also the beginning of the “Emancipated Music”.

My experience of a poet, playwright, musician, psychologist and conceptologist altogether has shown and proved that it is only natural for the advancement and development of Cogito and Semantics to follow the evolution of music, just as the “mental material” of assertion follows the “intonation material” of music.

Therefore, it is only natural and valid the discoveries in the venue of music and poetry to be applied to semantics and conceptology as Cogitative practices. Thus the “Emancipated music” ought to concur with the “Emancipated Semantics”. The term “Emancipated Semantics” outlines that just like the Non-euphonic chords have dissipated (as nowadays all chords are euphonic), the same way have disappeared the meaningless and erroneous assertions and

Let us harp on the same string – the pretension is to liberate the Objectivity of Cogito from the Cogitating Subject. Therefore, we pretend that one Meaning objectively hears another Meaning.

Thereby, independently from the subject, the Concept of “Truth” hears in the concept of “Existence” the concept “Eternity”.

And the concept of “Existence” hears in the concept of “Truth”: the concept of “Time”.

The example hereby is an attempt to hone the Cogitative Ear and the Semantic Ear, just like the sharpening of the Musical Ear, to guide them to the fathomless hollow of speech.

Then we could say: “what we call” Meaning is only the Acoustic effect of the Mutual hearing of Words.

The musical hearing of Words, just as the musical hearing of Notes, is the ability to simultaneously ring out the meanings – when within a single meaning many more meanings are implied. Just like in a single note could virtually be heard the rest of the notes as participants in its chords, in the same way within a single word could all the other words could be heard that form the language. Practically that means, that within a single word one is able to musically hear the entire Language. The more powerful our ability to hear is and permit the meaning within a word as many words or as the entire language, the higher the growth of our literary and poetic faculties is. The greatest poets are the ones capable of hearing the entire language within a single word. We refer to the capability to hear in just one single meaning the multitude of other meanings as “Syn-semantics” or “Omni-semantics”.

When the Notes are simultaneously heard, the Concepts should also be heard simultaneously.

Regrettably, the experience of Language in prose has always signaled a warning against the Failure and the final Collapse of the Conceptual and Semantic perception of speech while basing its skepticism and imperative ban on the argument: “The matter of Music is semantically transparent, which allows music chords to be Simultaneously construed and perceived, whereas, regrettably once again, the matter of Speech is semantically opaque, and this imperviousness proper impedes the Simultaneous Vertical Chord hearing to blend into a single perception of one Meaning, yet in this perception of the Meaning to uncover layers of sub-meanings, and layers of notions and ideas into the one initially suggested.”

Luckily, however, the experience of Poetic Language in intonation has always been closer to music than to grammar, and on the other hand (from the point of view of Philosophy), the transcendental and mystic experience of Language – no mock, no regret – the transcendental and mystic experience of Language has ever ignored the ban of Prosaic experience; for the Poetic practice and the Philosophical-transcendental practice mingle into one to persuade a thinker and poet into the other way around, namely: the matter of Speech and Meaning can be semantically transparent as well, it can sound in both overtone and chord the way music matter is obviously transparent, provided that specific conditions of fundamental importance are available (these conditions are to distinguish between Poetic experience versus Prosaic experience, and the transcendental-conceptual experience, and on the other hand, versus the formal-logical experience). These conditions obey to the well-known rules of prosody, rhythm-metrics, poetic metaphor, and alliteration that are actually the semantic Leader¹ of poetic cogito, etc., in poetry; moreover, these conditions are actually the Fundament not of

“laying words and ideas in succession” (as in Prose) but rather the “Simultaneous-Vertical-quasi-chord laying of words and ideas one beneath the other” (i.e., their laying Vertically: the Verbal verticalization of the Language = the Semantic verticalization of the Language (Words) = the Conceptual verticalization of Words).

But then, you may ask: “Do not all these suggestions of yours mean a radical and irreversible Conversion, and Inversion of Language – from its Linear Lining-up and its linear Description – to the ‘Vertical Lining-up’ and ‘Vertical Description’ of Language?”

Yet, on the other hand it might mean the definition of a very simple new rule: to start writing the words not in succession in a line but in columns, a word beneath the other, in Columns like the ones of the Vertical Columns of Music Chords, shall we?

SCRAFOTZOLUS’ COUNTERPOINT

Yet, if we go deeper into your suggestions that might turn scary because we would come to realize that what you advise us is to entirely change the Hearing of Language through its drastically new Lining-up and Writing.

What you urge us to do is to begin reading words vertically rather than in a horizontal line, and start writing Words one below the other; and you only aim is at our contribution (through the Vertical Reading and the Vertical Writing) to the harmonious sound of Meanings, i.e. to a special training in the skill of hearing the music into words. In other words, what this simply means, is a readjustment from the “Non-transparent perception of Meanings” to the “Transparent perception of meanings”, or a readjustment from the “Perception of the Semantic Verbal Non-transparency” to the “Semantic Verbal Transparency”.

All rules set in advance for poetry writing, such as rhythm, alliteration, etc., aim at an unconscious approach to language, to its Verbal Semantic Transparency; so do all preconditions for a talent in philosophy, they all come to one and only disposition: “The approach to a single notion as to the blend of others”. Such a disposition is merely the ability and training of the skill to “in one notion to Hear and See other notions”, and that you might mean that all poetic and transcendental-philosophical attempts have unconsciously organized themselves to a transfer from the “Consecutive Culture” (which rules over the Prosaic Experience) to the “Instantaneous-Simultaneous Culture” ruling over the Poetic and Philosophic-transcendental and mystic experience.

For it is not a secret that each Verticalization (such as Music Notes), words’ verticalization has one and only global task: to replace the Mind Sense from its Consecutive Proceeding to its Instantaneous Simultaneous proceeding.

¹ In other words, a Poet speeds up to new meanings and a Purpose, being completely in the dark and unaware of where he is going, while in absolute trust in Alliterations: a Poet is led by Alliteration like a blind man in the stormy ocean of the material world, yet at an infallible speed not of his own but the speed of Rhythm and Language; a Poet rests for a while only at the objects of the Cogito where he is led by Alliteration and Passion incarnated in rhythm.

But then, does not that all come to the ‘Practice of Vertical Reading’ and the ‘Practice of Vertical Writing’, while both of them lead to the same purpose: to make our perception of Language easier, and make us feel closer to the perception of Language as being ‘Semantically Transparent’?

And not a lesser public secret is that the way the Consecutive regulations of languages and signs created historically the customs and culture of Semantic Non-transparency (with the contribution, of course, from the consecutive unfolding of the Linear Time and Visual Logic), so did the training in Instantaneous-Vertical-Vortex regulations of Signs and Languages create the historical customs and culture of Semantic Transparency.”

So is ostensible the fact that Language (and the Meanings implicit in it) has come to be “Semantically Non-Transparent” when Language – deprived of the simultaneity of the Poetic metrics – was lined up in Consequence.

And the other way round, while Language has been lined up and proceeding into the Instantaneous-Simultaneous, language has been heard and perceived as “Semantically transparent”.

For, it was not the Semantic Transparency of meanings one for the other” that lined up words and notions in a Consequence, and organized Language into a Linear and Consequential Order but the other way round.

“The Consecutive order and organization of the words and language” has made the meanings of the words semantically non-transparent to each other.

And vice versa, not the primordial “Semantic Transparency of Words and Meanings” lined the words vertically and in Quasi-accord Vortexes but the other way round: the millennia-old stereotype and habitual practice of Vertical Speech, Vertical Writing, and of Vertical-accord Hearing – has developed in Poets and Thinkers, as well as in musicians, the ability in one meaning to hear more than one, and the ability in one word to comprehend (within its implicit semantic meanings) other words and notions with no mutual distortion of their semantics.

[Redacted text block]

[Redacted text block]