

Stephen Priest The Rediscovery of the Soul

THE REDISCOVERY OF THE SOUL

by

Stephen Priest

Stephen Priest is a member of the Faculty of Philosophy in the University of Oxford. He is Senior Research Fellow of Blackfriars Hall, Oxford and a member of Wolfson College, Oxford and Hughes Hall, Cambridge. Stephen Priest is the author of *The British Empiricists*, *Theories of the Mind*, *Merleau-Ponty* and *The Subject in Question*. He is editor of *Hegel's Critique of Kant*, *Jean-Paul Sartre: Basic Writings* and co-editor (with Antony Flew) of *A Dictionary of Philosophy*. He has lectured widely in the United States and Europe and his writing has been translated into Dutch, Spanish, Russian, Macedonian, Japanese and Korean.

StephenPriest99@hotmail.com

Stephen Priest
Faculty of Philosophy
University of Oxford
10 Merton Street
Oxford OX1 4JJ
England UK

44+ (0)1865 426625
07816194375 (mobile)

Preface

Something about you has remained absolutely unchanged. In this book I describe what it is.

It is not possible to understand the book by only thinking about other people. You have to apply its ideas to yourself. I have sometimes written in the second person singular because use of the first person singular has the paradoxical effect of making the reader think about the author, or an anonymous other, rather than him or herself.

I deploy both phenomenological description and philosophical argument. This combination might seem odd to those who still believe in a distinction between analytical and continental philosophy.

The book is based on lectures delivered to the Faculty of Philosophy in the University of Oxford at Blackfriars Hall between 2002 and 2006. I thank Fergus Kerr and Richard Finn for providing such a stimulating environment in which to do philosophy. I am grateful to the following for useful discussion: Daniel Came, Benedikt Göcke, Michael Inwood, Grahame Lock, Alexander Norman, Terence Penelhum, Bernard Williams and Timothy Williamson.

Stephen Priest

Oxford
Hilary 2008

Contents

I	Who looks out of your eyes?	1
II	Are you out of your mind?	38
III	Are you out of this world?	65
IV	The View From Now-Here	71
V	Being and No-thing-ness	77
VI	What is it like to be dead?	103

I

Who Looks Out of Your Eyes?

You are strikingly different from anybody else. Anyone who is not you is presented as *over there*; as a living, speaking, expressive body in the world, at some distance from yourself, as an object, always *not as you* and sometimes *as not you*. As soon as you pay attention to your own existence and the appearance of others it is clear that there is a profound difference between *being oneself* and *observing anybody else*. This difference is, in principle, utterly inexplicable in empirical or naturalistic terms.

You have never seen your own face. All the faces you see are the faces of other people. It feels as though you are 'behind' your face but other people 'face' you. One's conditioned response to this is to say: But I *do* have a face. (Perhaps you touch your own cheek at this moment.) You can see it in the mirror. On one level this is *obviously* right. But the problem is not epistemological. We need to know: *How is the systematic absence of your own face from your visual experience explicable?* Why is: If someone's face is presented to me that person is not me, a truth? Of course, this is partly because 'the' eyes are positioned on the front of 'the' head. It is more fundamentally because of the *subjective* fact that the eye that sees does not see the eye that sees. It is more profoundly due to your being 'centred' on a particular human body. It is, still more profoundly, because someone is you, that is, because there is such a being as yourself. Explanations do not end here, even though scientific explanations ended with 'because 'the' eyes are located in the front of 'the' head'.

You have never seen the back of your own head. The heads you have seen are all other people's heads, not your own. Although a barely perceptible point within the secular paradigm, this, one noticed, is a startling revelation.

You are peculiarly and mysteriously centred on just one of these human bodies, the one you call your 'own' or 'me'. It is as though you are the centre of the universe. The rest of the world surrounds you as an *Umwelt*. This clear fact is forgotten at an early age when we learn anonymity and objectivity through our Aristotlelian and atheistic

socialisation, but if you *look and see*, rather than obey your conditioning, it is clear that the world is arranged panoramically all around the human being that you are. That this being is you is a mystery that points to theology. The prospects for a scientific explanation for *someone being you* are nil.

Your body is not just one body amongst others in the world. It is where you view the world from. You could not (in the normal course of things) walk around your body. You could perhaps meet someone with a body that was very much *like* yours but it would not *be* yours. This body *being* yours as opposed to just *being like* and being *just like* yours is something we need to understand to grasp what you are.

Although you are one person amongst others, you are not *just* one person amongst others. Although you are another (because you are another to another) you are not *only* another, you are yourself.

Who is looking out of your eyes? You look at, or into, other people's eyes but you look *out of* or *through* your own eyes. You have never seen your own eyes because the eye that sees cannot see the eye that sees. An eye that is only a third person eye is not an eye that sees. (An only third person eye possesses only those properties visible through an eye that is not it.)

Are you your body? Are you inside your body? It sometimes feels to me as though I could be my body. Suppose I am the same thing as my brain. My brain is in my head so that might account for the sensation I have of looking out of my head through the eye sockets (the eye sockets I never see). If I close one eye I can see one side of the end of my nose and perhaps some cheek or part of an eyebrow. But: What have you said about your brain when you have said 'I am it'? What extra information has been provided about a brain when it is said that it is *you*? What property is ascribed to the constellation of billions of atoms in empty space that is a brain which it is said to be your's. We need to know what it is for *a* brain, 'this brain', to be you. I suggest this cannot be any further physical property. It cannot be some extra atoms or some extra arrangement of atoms.

Alternatively, suppose you are your body. Then we might be able to account for the peculiar, part, and partial, perspectives you have on my own body in the following way: You are my body, so *being it is an obstacle to observing it*. Observation requires detachment, or the distance implied by the adoption of the third-person perspective. If you are the same thing as your body you can never (logically or metaphysically) be any distance from it. You may then never have the objectivity necessary to appear to yourself as an object 'over there'.

We need to know what you are saying about your body when you say 'I am it'. What does 'I am it' add to 'It exists'?

Neither of these explanations accounts for the body being your body. It does not follow from the peculiar perspectives you have on your body that you are your body or that you are it. I am peculiarly and mysteriously centred on it. We need to know what is not expressed by

'This human being exists'

that is expressed by

'This human being exists and I am this human being'.

Things appear physical to the extent that they are subjected to the third person perspective. Things appear mental or spiritual to the extent to which they are subjected to the first person (singular) perspective. If something appears physical it is perceived from the outside, by adopting the standpoint of exteriority. You might think this is wrong, for example, it is an elementary truth of science that physical objects are composed of particles and particles are composed of sub-atomic particles. I do not deny this established truth. The point is that if you think of a physical object you think of its outside. If you think of a particle, you think of it from the outside. If you think of a sub-atomic particle you think of it from the outside (even though this is paradoxical because there is no clear sense in which a sub-atomic particle has an outside). If you think of a human body you think of its outside. (If you think of its internal organs you think of *their* outsides and so on.)

In your own case, you live your body from the inside. Your body has a lived interiority that is not physical in any objective or third person sense. Inside a car or a tank I have a peculiarly subjective perspective which reveals some parts of its contingent interiority but not others. Only the exterior of the motor is visible to someone some distance from it.

We model ourselves on others. I think of myself *as another*. If you think about yourself you think of your body as one body amongst others in the world. Your body is not immediately or directly presented to you like that. You live your body from the inside out. You are inside out, or more perspicaciously from a phenomenological point of view: you are *outside-in*. Somehow you have come to

habitually think of yourself from the standpoint of exteriority: as just like everybody else. In fact, you are never presented to yourself in this way. You would have to stand outside yourself and look at yourself to appear to yourself in this way. So whatever you are, you are not physical. From earliest childhood we have been conditioned to think of ourselves as not only *like* other people but as *only* one more quasi-anonymous member of the public. This has been an essential part of our Aristotelian atheistic socialisation, of our becoming members of society.

Complex power relations constitute us as self-conscious beings, or persons. We constitute one another as mutually constituting one another. I am like another and like another to another but not another to myself, even though I think of myself as another. We are very conditioned. But, who or what is conditioned? The unconditioned is conditioned. If the layers of conditioning are peeled off, the unconditioned is disclosed.

That we fundamentally model ourselves on others is an obstacle to our knowing ourselves as we really are. We have to decondition ourselves of the habitual background thought 'I am *only* one person amongst others' in order to begin to appreciate one's own existence in more than an abstract way. Suppose you learn:

[1] A certain human being is going to die tomorrow.

but suppose you subsequently learn:

[2] *You are* that certain human being who is going to die tomorrow.

Understanding the extra information provided in [2] not already included in [1] is beginning to understand the problem of the self which has the existence of the soul as solution. You only really feel that you exist, feel it in your bones, if you are faced with your own possible non-existence. The reverse also applies. You can only understand what your own death is if you know what your own existence is. You can only understand what seems to be your own non-being if you understand your own being.

On one level it is not wrong to think of yourself as another. This is how you appear to another. On another level this is wrong. You are yourself and, in that respect, not another. Understanding that you are and what you are requires partly reversing the conditioned view of

yourself as *just* one person amongst others. Instead we adopt a subjective point of view: *the view from now-here*. This will require coming to appreciate the expansive unity of your own existence right here now, and noticing the flux of colours, shapes, sounds and thoughts flowing through. Means-to-end 'practical' thinking and the third person 'objective' perspective have to be left aside for you to just be, and notice your body just as it presents itself. My body is both subject and object; the empirical subject of my experiences, the partial empirical object of my and another's experiences.

I move by moving not by moving my body, even though my body does move when I move. If a body is mine I do not move it by moving it but by moving. I do not 'cause' my body to move, in way in which I cause objects in the external world to move. There are some actions I perform, but not by performing other actions. I move my arm by moving my arm not by causing my arm to go up.

My body is not 'an object' for me. In its Latin etymology 'object' carries the connotation of existing at some distance from oneself (ob-jectus). Your own body precisely does not have this status of existing at some distance from you (except under special conditions that are not well known in our society). If your body were an object it would be standing in front of you, observable in a third-person way, situated or locatable in your visual or tactile field, amenable to being moved by you for example picked up, or thrown, or toured. It could move away from you and disappear from your visual field. On the contrary, your body defies objective scientific exploration by you. It is always presented to your senses from the same sort of angle. It seems to have a kind of subjective permanence from your point of view. It intimately accompanies you. It is never really in front of you. Your body is in the margins of your perception. Your body is marginal to your being as you experience it.

The differences between *being you* and *observing others* are well shown in this striking asymmetry. You appear to yourself not as you appear to me. You are not as we are conditioned to think of ourselves: *just* one person amongst others. You think of yourself as something that under normal conditions is impossible; *the perception of oneself as another*. You think of yourself as another, habitually, but you are never presented to yourself like that (except in out of body experiences). The way we are conditioned to automatically *think* of ourselves is a way in which it is ordinarily impossible to *experience* ourselves. In order to realise your own existence it is necessary to pay

attention to your experience of yourself and shun your automatic third-person images of yourself.

The experience of *being you* is partly like adopting the subjective point of view of a camera. Of course a camera is a wholly physical mechanism which can be triggered to take photographs automatically, without the need for a conscious being peering down its viewfinder. The camera is like the body. Undeveloped photographs are like neurologically stored information or the contents of the unconscious. Developed photographs are thoughts brought to consciousness. The photographs are like perceptual and conceptual contents. (Although the analogy is striking, it should not be surprising given that cameras are human produces: made in our own image.) Contrast this however with the addition of the conscious perceiver looking down the viewfinder. This is like *conceiving of a person* and then *conceiving of oneself as* that person. For a person to be you is for something to be added to that person. You are a presence which views the world through your body. You are incarnate, there is an incarnation of you, but you are not your own incarnation. 'I am a camera' is false. 'I look through a camera' is true. If we mean by 'camera' 'room' then 'I am a camera' is true.

If so, you are not your body. If we could exchange bodies then we could exchange subjective centres of awareness. You would look out of my body and I would look out of your body. If this idea seems ridiculous or far fetched then bear in mind that we are thinking about this only at the start of the twenty first century. Given enough funding of computational and neurological research projects it might be possible in the future to take all the information from one person's brain and place it in another's, and *vice versa*. This might not be possible in fifty years but what about a thousand years, or a hundred thousand years? It is important not to let our ideas of possibility and impossibility be limited by our location in history. It was one of the mistakes of nineteenth and twentieth century thought to assume that one's historical situation limited one's world view.

There is nothing in science which says that we could not exchange bodies. Nothing in natural law says that I belong with this body, you with that body. It defies no law of nature to exchange bodies. Natural law does not tell us which mind goes with which body nor that I go with this body, you with that body. There is nothing in logic which tells us that we could not exchange bodies. There is no contradiction in the idea that you could view the world from my body and I could view the world from yours. We are just waiting on the

technology. It is perfectly coherent to claim you wake up viewing the world from a body that is not your own.

If we exchanged bodies, where would our thoughts go? There are two possibilities which have to be sharply distinguished. On the one hand you could have your own thoughts but in my body and I could have my own thoughts but in your body. That is relatively easy to imagine. We take our minds with us in the swap so our psychological lives are pretty much as we are now (even though they would no doubt be affected by our new bodies). The *nowness* of the soul is the explanation of personal identity over time.

On the other hand, there is a more profound possibility: Once we exchanged bodies you might have my thoughts and I might have your thoughts. In that case we would not only have swapped bodies. *We would have swapped minds.* This *seems* impossible: Who performs the exchange? If the mind goes, who is left behind to receive the new one? Surely, *I* go where my mind goes! But suppose: the set of thoughts of type occur in my subjective interiority at a set of thoughts of type occur in your subjective interiority at occur in your subjective interiority at time occur in my subjective interiority at time. We suppose that types are tagged to histories (at least) until time, so to say that a thought is a member of is to say it is causally connected to that human being I 'am' and a member of is causally connected to the human being you 'are'. After the exchange of minds, any such causal connection is either severed or maintained. If the causal connection is maintained then the mind exchange has taken place. If it is severed, all that has happened is this: *We have inexplicably begun to have thoughts like each other and not like the ones we used to have.* However, if your new thoughts come from me and mine from you, we exchange minds. Of course, normally we might exchange thoughts, but this just means you cause me to have thoughts qualitatively similar to yours but numerically distinct (because the tokens are mine). This is entailed by communication. Here, however, we take it that the stream of tokens that was yours continues as mine and *vice versa*.

What this amounts to is: *We would have swapped human beings.* This seems outrageous and nonsensical because of our naturalistic, Aristotelian, upbringing. It seems impossible, unimaginable, because *there seems nothing to swap.* At best, one is inclined to object, there could be a chaotic meshing of two minds in one body, or of two human beings.

Imagine two human beings: A and B. Each of A and B has a full psychological life and a functioning human body. Each is conscious and alert. You 'are' A and I 'am' B. You view the world from A and the front of B's body is in your visual field. I view the world from B and the front of A's body is in my visual field. You have A's thoughts, images and emotions. I have B's thoughts, images and emotions.

Now we exchange human beings. You view the world from B and the front of A's body is in your visual field. I view the world from A and the front of B's body is in my visual field. You have B's thoughts, images and emotions. I have A's thoughts, images and emotions. Suddenly, you 'are' B and I 'am' A.

Still cannot imagine it? Suppose, then, the transformation to take place gradually. From your point of view it might happen like this: You 'are' A and I 'am' B. You view the world from A and look at B. You feel your body to become increasingly B-like and, from your special perspective on it, it changes to be more and more like B's. If you glance towards B, you see B's body becoming increasingly A-like. (Meanwhile, A has the same experience in reverse.) Eventually, you feel your body to be in no way like A and in every respect like B. Suppose further, the subjective space of your own mind, your mind's ear, is increasingly filled with thoughts and images that are unfamiliar to you and the familiar one's diminish. This feeling of unfamiliarity itself wears off as the part of the mind that distinguishes the familiar from the unfamiliar becomes increasingly A-like. You have not become A, even though your body and your mind have been replaced by A's. A has not become you, even though A's body and mind have been replaced by your's. The subjective space of your own interiority has in no way changed. The transcendental field after the *epoche* is unaffected. Only its content has been exchanged.

Although it requires a greater leap of imagination to conceive than only exchanging bodies, this it is perfectly possible. Nothing in science or logic prohibits it. It would no doubt be curious. Your sensation of me-ness and your subjective point of view would be located in my body and you would have thoughts about Oxford in the south of England, visual perceptions of bicycles, English buses, tourists and students. Physically and mentally you would 'be' me, yet your subjective point of view on the world would be your own. I of course would have the body, the thoughts and experiences which were formerly yours. (If we ever have the technology to do this we will no doubt have the technology to reverse it also).

The possibility of exchanging bodies shows that we are not our bodies. The fact that you could view the world from my body and I could view the world from your body shows that we are distinct from our bodies. The fact that you could have my thoughts and I could have your thoughts shows that we are not our minds either. There are in fact three aspects to us: body, mind and spirit.

Could you exist without adopting the subjective point of view from a body? Modern western society is extremely sceptical about the possibility of disembodied existence. It does not follow from this scepticism that it is impossible or does not happen. Indeed, there seems no good reason to believe in them unless you have had one yourself. If you do have an out of body experience then there is no doubt in your mind that that is what it is. It is at least as psychologically compelling as, for example, your belief that you are reading this book now. In particular it is the sight of your own face for the first time and your ability to perceive your own body as though it were the body of another that makes it hard to disbelieve in disembodied existence once you have experience of it.

A distinction is drawn between two kinds of experience; with the body and without the body. Bodies could in principle exist exactly as they are without minds. Minds could in principle exist just as they are without bodies (despite their obvious *empirical* dependence on hardware). Human beings could exist in principle just as they are except for not being *who* they are (where this *who* has nothing to do with personality). The fact that both kinds of experience are possible means that the answer to the question Are you a body? is 'No'. You have a body. You use your body in some experiences but in other experiences do not employ the body. You already exist, in a sense, without a body. You were never your body. You were never 'in' your body. Therefore you are not identical with your body. This argument is against identifying yourself with your body. If you can exist without something then you are not that thing. If you can exist without your body, mind or human being then you are not your body, mind, or human being.

You go where it goes. You do not go where it does not go. You feel kinaesthetic sensations in it. It travels. It travels among other physical objects.

Your mind but not your body can travel instantaneously. Thought can travel without taking time to travel: be in a place at a time, be in a different place at a later time where no time elapses between those two times.

What remains numerically identical over time in a person who changes? The soul. That it is now.

Your mind and soul are invisible (at least under normal circumstances) your body visible. Visibility is only immediate detectability by the sense of sight. Visibility is overrated. The sensory field is more informative than any of its modes. Reality is not disclosed through the senses. Your body is visible but you are invisible, therefore you are not your body.

If the possibility of experience without the body shows that I am not my body then my body is something I view the world from. I can exist in my ordinary human body, the one I was born with. I can acquire a new physical body, say by exchanging bodies with somebody else. I can leave my physical body and travel without my body. I can leave my physical body and exist with no body whatsoever. It follows from this that I am not any kind of body.

I can exist away from the physical body. This away from is a pervasion of part of the physical world that is not where my body is. Clearly then, I am not a physical object. Interestingly, without the body you have subjectivity without objectivity. You retain a subjective view on the world but you cannot (usually) be detected from the third person perspective. It is apparent that the third person/first person point of view does not just concern *ways of knowing* (or what philosophers call epistemology) but *ways of being* (or what philosophers call ontology). This is apparent because what is available to a first or third person perspective can *come apart*. You can exist as as subjectivity without objectivity. A being outwardly just like you could exist as objectivity without subjectivity if it had no point of view on the world.

If it is wondered how you could have a subjective 'point of view' without eyes, or without physical location then two things need to be said. This is mysterious *with eyes* or *with physical location*. The *seeing itself* has never been explained. Secondly, your own psychological interiority has a kind a spatiality, a kind of subjective space. (I shall argue that you *pervade* the world. Indeed you pervade your body and part of the world around your body now.) Inner space is partly like the astral body and is but wholly immaterial. It has spatiality but no spatial location. Having spatial location is a necessary condition for being physical, so it is coherent to suppose that inner space is spatial but not physical. Although *is physical then x is spatial* is a truth and, indeed, necessarily *is physical then x is spatial* is a truth *is spatial then x is physical*) is false. So, *a fortiori* is

is spatial → *x is physical* is false. (If this seems implausible, compare space itself. Space is spatial but space is not spatially located).

If you exchange bodies with someone you still have a body, the other person's body. You still have a body, the body you travel from. In soul travel I still have a body, a body I left and could return to. But could you exist with no body whatsoever? Could you, for example, survive if your body was wholly destroyed?

Contrary to popular belief there is absolutely no scientific or logical reason why you should not exist disembodied. Of course there is no scientific reason to believe in disembodied existence either, but science is narrowly focused within the third person perspective. The fundamental facts are not the scientific facts.

What is it like to exist without your body? The best way to appreciate this is to imagine that your body suddenly becomes invisible. I mean your experience remains *exactly as it is now but you do not see your body*. You see this book just as it is now but now but you do not see your hands holding it, nor the ends of your arms. You see the objects in the world beyond and around the book. Downwards you see the floor or ground but not your feet nor any other part of your body. Thoughts and all other experiences, including kinaesthetic sensations, continue just as before.

It might be objected to this description of disembodied existence that it presupposes the existence of the body. After all, I have used the word 'see' and does that not presuppose eyeballs and a functioning brain? I have used the word 'downwards' and implicitly described the book as in front of you. Do not these concepts presuppose a spatial orientation and therefore embodiment?

There is nothing in this objection. The experience that we call visual experience is not divided into two channels of vision, one per eyeball. We speak, rightly and insightfully, of a visual *field*. There is nothing about the visual field that suggests that it has an eyeball as its source or origin. There is such a thing as the subject that thinks or entertains ideas but it is not a thing and is not behind its experiences.

Does seeing depend upon well functioning eyeballs connected to a living brain by the optic nerves? In a sense, the answer to this question is *completely obvious*: 'Yes'. It requires no scientific training to know this. (The knowledge is ancient.) Yet, what is the strength of this dependency? It is empirical and contingent, not metaphysical and necessary. There is an infinite number of worlds in which there is sight without eyes. It is true that is an eye connected to a living brain by the optic nerve I cannot see. It is false that is an eye connected to

a living brain by the optic nerve then I cannot see. It is not analytic that some experience does not count as seeing unless it is caused by the eyes. Your visual experience could remain just as it is if you became invisible. It could remain just as it is if your body ceased to exist. This shows that 'vision depends on the eyes' is not analytic.

In some kinds of experience consciousness of the body is lost. (The body is *not* always perceived.) The subjective space of one's own awareness remains, but the body does not feature as an object of that awareness. In some religious traditions it is concluded on this basis that your consciousness blends into the cosmic consciousness of which it is but a part. This view is not right. It overlooks the fact that if we are both meditating *your subjective centre of awareness is not my subjective centre of awareness*. Your internal emptiness is not my internal emptiness. This interiority is not that interiority. There is still you and there is still me even after the dissolution of egos and after our bodies have dissolved, and even if our thoughts and experiences have relaxed to nothing.

As your experiences come and go, something remains constant: that I have them, that they are saturated with me-ness, that they are presented in an interiority that is mine, that they are here, that they are now. These attributes are singularly necessary and collectively sufficient for the existence of the soul as you.

The human being consists of a body, spirit and mind. The mind has semantic and phenomenological properties. The spirit has spiritual properties. The human being has social properties and these are mutually dependent for what they are.

Although to the atheistic scientific materialist mind of the West this taxonomy of selves is, to put it politely, implausible, it is not exaggerated or outrageous. The natural body is that flesh and blood living body that you view the world from now. The heart is the seat of your emotions (in sudden fear 'your heart is in your mouth').

Although your Doppelgänger is exactly like you but not you, your soul is you.

The eye that sees does not see the eye that sees. The hammer that strikes does not strike the hammer that strikes. We are so conditioned in our ordinary thinking that we automatically assume that if there is vision then there must be an eye that sees. In fact this habit of thought has a twofold origin: in seeing the eyeballs of others orientated towards objects and in seeing through the eyeballs that are in fact our own. Like so many of our concepts of the human, it has an origin that is essentially partly first person singular, partly third person. The

visual field is part of an intersensory field, a subjective space in which all your thoughts and experiences occur. It is *this space* which remains intact if the body disappears. Normal everyday experience of your body occurs in this subjective space. This space is essential to what you are, in a way that the body is not. Subjective space is a substance, the body is a process. In a description of being *invisible* the body is not presupposed.

Could the brain in a vat be part of the illusion? So-called brain-in-a vat cases show that the body is *not* presupposed. If you are a brain in a vat then you are not reading a copy of Stephen Priest's *Does the soul exist?* but a mad scientist is stimulating your brain in all and only those areas which are neurologically active when you believe you are reading Priest's book (or perhaps when you are reading Priest's book). This raises the questions: How can appearance be distinguished from reality? How can virtual reality be distinguished from reality? What is the relation between my inner mental states and the external public world? We just need to push the thought experiment one stage further to say that *the brain in the vat is an illusion*.

In the ordinary brain in a vat experiment, the external world is an illusion and the brain is not perceived. Nothing physical is perceived. Nonetheless, you continue to exist in the brain in a vat scenario. Of course, the way the experiment is set up it is supposed that you are your brain, or in some way closely dependent on your brain. This is an article of materialist faith. You have never seen your own brain. Yes, *of course* it exists, but this is to invoke the third person perspective too quickly. The fundamental point is that you exist irrespective of the appearance of your brain.

If you delete the brain from the brain in a vat thought experiment you have something like an accurate description of out of body experience. Delete the brain and leave everything else. This essentially leaves us with the scenario. Everything around you could cease to exist but you could be left over.

Suppose all apparent reality is virtual reality. We need to know who or what sees or apprehends this reality. We need to know who or what is the subject, in the sense of 'that which experiences'. Without your body there would remain your current subjective space. There would still be the sensory zone in which all your thoughts and perceptions take place. You essentially are this space.

Even in normal sane circumstances, the brain does not perceive itself. Of course the brain can think about itself. You can use

your brain to think about your brain. There is no problem about that, you could be doing it right now. The problem is that the brain cannot perceive itself. This could have been otherwise, in a different world. Suppose your brain (which has a crinkly surface anyway) could frown, rather like your forehead. Then in a way the brain would be experiencing itself. (Sensation is not enough to perception so the brain would have to truly say to itself things like, yes, now I am feeling the exterior of the right cerebral sphere, using its sensitive surface membrane, and so on, while frowning.) The perceiving brain does not perceive the brain that perceives.

There is suffering caused by identifying yourself with your body. This is a deep neurosis of the West. Your body will die. You think you are your body so with perfect logic you think you will die. The body is too fat, too thin, is the wrong shape, suffers ailments and diseases and physical blows. You think this happens to *you*. In fact it only happens to your body even though it is felt in the mind.

Although you do experience your body, your body is not presented to you as one object amongst others that you could experience in the course of the world. You experience your body by *being where it is*. The body is both *Körper* and *Leib*. The eye that sees cannot see the eye that sees, not because the eyes are located on the front of the body, but because you see through them. In so far as it sees, your eye is not one object amongst others you could see in the world.

You are not just another. You are not somebody else except to somebody else. You are not another to yourself. You are only another to somebody else. These are not fundamentally facts about self-consciousness. They are facts about *being you* and facts about embodiment. Some embodiment is *your* embodiment. This makes possible the peculiar perspectives you have on just one body but not on any of the other bodies. You are yourself and somebody else at the same time: somebody else to somebody else. You can even be presented to two people, you and someone else, both these ways simultaneously. You cannot be presented in these ways to one person simultaneously. There are asymmetries between first person (singular) and third person perspectives on the body. Describe your body as it appears to you directly.

You are given to yourself subjectively and only partly objectively. Another person is presented to you objectively and only partly subjectively. Subjectivity exists because there is something it consists in to be someone. Subjectivity is partly mental and partly physical. Mentally it shows up in the undergoing of sensations and the private

having of thoughts. Physically it shows up in the perspective your body gives on the world. Other people appear to you to be physical but they also appear imbued with mentality and emotion, as purposeful, as cooperative as threatening, in an infinity of ways.

The part of your body that touches cannot touch the part of your body that touches, even though the body can touch itself. This is not simply some physical awkwardness concerning the shape of the human body or the location of its limbs. It is a consequence of a human body's being *someone's* body. You have a subjective point of view and centre of action in one body.

You ordinarily think of your body as one body amongst others. You ordinarily think of yourself as one person amongst others in the world. This however is not how you are originally or fundamentally given to yourself. It is a psychological achievement. You have to perceive other people as objects in the world and think the thought about yourself: *I am one of those*. The perception of another is recuperated or taken back and applied to your own case so that you take yourself to be one person amongst others. As the conditioning is reinforced by practical concerns and many perceptions of other people, you take yourself to be *just* one person amongst others. This conditioning submerges and conceals the profound mystery of your own existence. It masks from you the startling fact of your own existence; of some existence's being yours. It is always obvious to you that you exist as one person amongst others. What is startling and seemingly inexplicable is that you do not just exist as one person amongst others but as yourself.

Each of us is acquainted with living human bodies in two kinds of way. Firstly, we each observe through the five senses the bodies of other people; the people we are not. This is 'third person' knowledge of the body. Secondly, each of us is acquainted with his or her own body in a more direct way. Knowledge of one's own body by oneself is not only by sensory observation but also by *being* that body. For example kinaesthetic experience is possible only of the body one has. This is 'first person singular' knowledge of the body.

The distinction between being having the body that one has and observing any body that one does not, depends on being someone. The phenomenology of the body depends on being someone. Phenomenology is limited because (*qua* phenomenology) it only entails descriptions, not explanations. We need to solve the metaphysical problem of why there exists the distinction between the body that has and the ones one does not and the epistemological

problem of why there exists a distinction between first person singular and third person physical ascriptions. A series of phenomenological descriptions of the differences or asymmetries between one's own body on the one hand and other people's bodies and other physical objects on the other is a posing of these problems not their solution.

The subject is not the body: not the inanimate objective mechanical body that I may observe in the external world nor even the living, moving, experiencing, whole human body that one 'is': the body, so to speak, I am co-extensive with. The body is the expression of the soul. The soul makes a body my body.

Visually, your body (in the normal course of things) presents itself to you from the same angle. Your head is invisible to you except perhaps the end of your nose and the boundaries of my eye sockets. You can see your eyes by using mirrors but the eyes you then see are the exteriors of the observed eyes of an observer, not the lived interiority of your own eyes observing. The nearer to your eyes are the regions of my body within your visual field, the less your body appears as an object. It is in a subjective space.

Your body is not metaphysically necessary for your experiences because it is not that which has them. Although you use your body to observe physical objects in the external world, you are not your body. You may observe your own body objectively in an out of body experience. To do this I do not require a second body but remain as my soul. It does not much matter whether we think of the soul leaving the body or the body moving to a different region of the soul. Your body could in principle move within your soul and turn around to face you. Then you would be confronted with your own body as an object in the interior space of the soul. Your body would be presented to you in the way that the body of another is normally presented: facing you. You would not then be aware of your body in the place you normally have your experiences. There would be an absence of body there. Then, perhaps for the first time, you could look at your body's back and look at the back of your own head. You would encounter your body as one item amongst others in the world, perhaps saturated with your own thought and emotion, otherwise like the body of another. This body would be like the body of another but would not be the body of another. You would not adopt or inhabit the subjective point of view of this body. Your mentality but not your being, not your spirituality, would be centred on this body. Crucially, *you would not need a second body to do this.*

Ordinarily, in so far as your body sees or touches the world it cannot be seen or touched by you. You move external objects by moving your body, but you move your body by moving. Out of your body, you encounter your body in objective space. Normally, you have no need to look for your body because it is already centred on you. Your body is presented to you as a subject-object. Your presence through your body as makes possible the ordinary perspectival ways in which objects appear to you. Conditioning prevents you from being aware of the space from which you view objects.

It is part of pre-reflective common sense to think of ones soul as inside one's body as the pilot in his ship. Pre-philosophically a person experiences him or herself as a whole acting person embedded in the world. He lives in a universe of experience, in a milieu which is neutral with regard to the substantial distinctions between the organism, thought and extension; he lives in a direct commerce with beings, things and his own body. The ego as a centre from which his intentions radiate, the body which carries them and the beings and things to which they are addressed are not confused: they are but three sectors of a unique field.

It seems obvious that you cannot see without eyes. Damage to the eyes causes loss or impairment of eyesight. However, the fact that the eyes do not appear within the visual field is a clue to the possibility of a kind of seeing without eyes; a kind of disembodied seeing or spiritual seeing. To appreciate this, imagine that the whole content of your visual experience is just as it is now, but with one difference: there is no visual perception of your body. Your body does not appear within your visual field. This should not be difficult to imagine because, as things are now, very little of your body is appearing to you visually: parts of your hands holding this book perhaps, parts of your legs. Suppose, instead of seeing these parts of your body you saw straight down to the floor. The book is in front of you still but not held. Your visual field is in fact like an unbounded circle, not like a cone or a searchlight beam. It is the habit of assuming you are a body confronted with a world 'in front' of you that distorts our assumptions about the visual field. This seeing without seeing your own body is perfectly imaginable. There is no incoherence in it so it is at least theoretically possible. It is logically possible. The logically possible reveals the metaphysical fissures in the world. Although eyesight without eyes is empirically or physically impossible, disembodied seeing is logically and metaphysically possible. Spiritual seeing is possible without physical eyes, indeed,

without the body. Physical objects can be seen through disembodied seeing.

Do these subjective facts about the body suggest that you are your body? Perhaps you cannot see it as an object because you are it. Being it is in the way of apprehending it. The word 'am' denotes a kind of pervasion. 'Am' captures being it, not in the sense of being identical with it, but in the sense of being where it is. You are not your body because if your body disappears you remain: $(\exists xt1) (x=I) \ \& \ (\exists xt2) (x=I) \ \& \ (\exists yt1) (y \text{ is a human body}) \ \& \ -(\exists yt2) (y \text{ is a human body}) \rightarrow -(y=I)$. The logical possibility of this is shown by the fact that your experience, except for the experience of your body, could remain the same if your body disappeared.

There is a phenomenology of disembodiment. I am then present to myself not as nothingness but as a kind of no-thing-ness. It is possible to describe one's own being as no-thing-ness even when embodied. Between the world and your experience there is no-thing-ness. Your body is thingness. The content of the world is thingness. The world is no-thing-ness, as is the visual field. The whole experiential field that you have and the world where objects and events are presented to you are the same thing, except this is not a thing. It is no-thing-ness.

Your body is not co-extensive with the world, spread across the things in the world, but you are co extensive with as much of the world as is presented to you. You are not this presented world. You are where the presented world is. You are the space against which the contents of the world occur. You are background. The events and objects of the world are foreground. To see that soul space that you are this has to be reversed. You have to see the space of the world as foreground and the objects of the world as background. This is to begin to take a spiritual view. Understanding that there is life after death does not involve postulating something extra. It requires making salient structures of your experience that are normally repressed by practical matters, by science, by dealing with others.

Although your body is composed of matter you are not composed of matter. You are where some matter is. $-[(\exists x) (x \text{ is at } P) \ \& \ (\exists y) (y \text{ is at } P) \rightarrow (x = y)]$ holds because 'is where...is' does not entail 'is', (even if it is entailed by it in the case of physical items). You *pervade* a portion of matter. $a \text{ pervades } b \rightarrow (a \text{ is at } P) \ \& \ (b \text{ is at } P) \ \& \ -(a=b)$.

Matter itself is not rightly understood as a substance. Matter is a complex constellation of events occupying a portion of space time. 'Occupying' is to be understood in terms of attraction and repulsion of

events, not as an inert and massive presence in space, like a macroscopic physical object.

Although your body is a physical object and a physical subject you are neither a physical object nor a physical subject. You pervade a physical subject-object. You are where, but not only where, a physical subject-object is. Subjectivity can be physical, even though mental subjectivity is not physical. Subjectivity is physical to the extent that matter is inhabited from the inside by the soul. The soul is inside and outside matter because it pervades matter and exceeds it. Are you an animal? The animal is alive if it has an *anima*, the soul as life bestowing.

This human being is a constellation of psycho-physical processes which you pervade.

It is logically and metaphysically possible to travel but leave your body behind. Transcendental subjectivity then pervades some part of the physical world that does not include your own body: $(\exists x t1) (x = I) \& (x \text{ is at } P) \& (\exists y t1) (y = \text{a human body}) \& (y \text{ is at } P) \& (\exists x t2) (x = I) \& (x \text{ is at } P2) \& \neg(\exists y t2) (y = \text{a human body}) \& (y \text{ is at } P2)$.

There are (at least) two kinds of imagining: imagining in the sense of fanciful non-veridical thinking and veridical imagining. Veridical imagining facilitates the disclosure of the soul. It must be unfocussed imagining: not imagining this object rather than that but imagining the expansion of what you are to be the space all around you.

It is sometimes asked: Are out of body experiences possible? *We are out of our bodies anyway*. If you think of yourself *as* your body you are already thinking of yourself from a point of view outside in. You are thinking of yourself as coinciding or not coinciding with your body, and this entails thinking of yourself as not coinciding with your body.

You are not a non-physical thing inside your body. Your body is a physical thing inside your non-physical self. You are not an object in the world. Better to think of objects in the world as 'in' you.

By leaving your body you are joining your soul. Here, 'joining your soul' means shedding the conditioning that has prevented you from noticing all along that you are your soul. It is the human being that joins the soul by realising he is soul-bearing. The soul, is a self aware *ethereal substance* which makes each soul bearing being the thing it is. It does not bestow numerical identity on the physco-physical being, that modal and metaphysical property is possessed anyway. The human being is a constellatio of pyscho-physical

external world. Although pre-reflectively this threefold distinction does exist; it is a set of substantial distinctions. What precisely is given pre-reflectively is a mind that could exist without a body or an external world, a body that could exist without a mind or an external world and an external world that could exist without a mind and a body. 'Mind', 'body' and 'external world' do denote substances where something is a substance if and only if if it exists it depends (in all senses) on nothing except for its own existence. In other words, if something is a substance there are no necessary conditions for its existence.

Your body is at the centre of the subjective space that is your soul. On the other hand, the dimensionless point that is the centre of your soul is at the centre of your body (in the heart?).

If you *imagine away* your body and your mind then you are what is left over. If you close your eyes and successfully imagine you are facing the other way then you realise how little dependence there is on your subjective space and that human being with whom you ordinarily identify yourself. If you move the world stands still. If the world moves you stand still.

You probably already know intuitively that you are not identical with your body. You do not exactly coincide with your body, but the part of you that does not coincide with your body is not a marginal or contingent part of you. It is essential to what you are. It is you.

When you breath in your body inflates, like a balloon. This expansiveness is rather like the soul. Inhalation and exhalation are metaphors for the soul. The world in the sense of the planat earth is a metaphor for the soul. If it were possible to view the outside of the soul it would look like a sphere. This isnot possible becvauese the soul has no physical outside. In thwe ordinary sense, the soul is an inside without an outside. You are not inside your body. Your body is inside you.

In sleep the body and mind partly shut down. Mind-travel is possible within the dream space disclosed through sleep. This space is not a different space from the soul that, with care, is disclosed in waking life. Waking and sleeping are events within the soul. They all fall on the content side of the soul.

A human being is a psycho-physical complex or a psycho-physical whole. It's a human being's 'being' you consists in you being centred in it as a soul. The point that is the centre of the soul is at the centre of a human being. ('Being' is placed under erasure with a 'X' because you are not quite it: I am not my body but I 'amX' my body.)

The conjunction of these two propositions seems contradictory: “‘I am my body’ is true” and “‘I am identical with my body’ is false”. ‘am’ does not mean ‘is numerically identical with’. This seems like a travesty, a falsification of ordinary language, but is not.

‘I am numerically identical with my body’ is true.

‘I am my body’ is true.

You are not identical to your body. There is always more to you than your body or your mind. When all the facts about your body, or your mind, have been specified not all the facts about you have been specified. Your body allows a point of view on the world but you are what has that point of view. ‘Point’ is right in ‘point of view’. You are a point. In a sense you are infinitely small and in a sense you are infinitely large. This is because of your spiritual nature. You are infinitely small in the sense that no matter how small you think you are you are smaller than that. You are infinitely large because no matter how large you think you are you are larger than that. You are closer to yourself than you think. You are more distant from yourself than you think. You are much closer to yourself than your body or your mind. You are yourself, but this identity entails a kind of infinity. There is no limit to the extent to which you are what you are. This is not a formal tautology but an insight into the spark of infinite inwardness. The truth is that you are the coherent combination of infinite proximity and infinite distance, of infinite smallness and infinite expansiveness. You are the infinite zone in which these oppositions are held in coherent tension. You are the inside of infinite interiority.

body

Incarnation is *being-in-flesh*, but *being-in-flesh* is only partial *being-in-flesh* so you are not wholly incarnate. You *exceed* this body, this collection of flesh and bones with blood flowing through it. You exceed even the functioning electric circuitry of ‘the’ brain with its twinkling images. You *pervade* this psycho-physical object.

In some possible incarnations I ‘am’ not the same human being. There is an infinite number of possible worlds in which I am who I am but a different human being. In your own incarnation now, one of these possible worlds has been actualised. Your existence

remains identical across possible worlds. There is no contradiction in the supposition that you occupy numerically distinct bodies in distinct possible worlds.

The concept of the physical has no application to the soul. The thesis that the soul exists is incompatible with putative theories of the mind that are theories of the body: materialism, physicalism and behaviourism. The soul exists, so those theories are false. The concept of the soul is a spiritual concept.

Although body, mind and spirit differ in nature, and each has essentially properties the other two lack, they are intimately related in life. The soul pervades the mind and the body as presence in the world. The mind is the capacity to think and have experiences of the ensouled body. The body is the vehicle of the soul and the empirical ground of the mind. Soul and mind are incarnate. One human being has three ontological dimensions.

The view that you are nothing but your thoughts, or the flux of fleeting thoughts and sensations, is false. You are not your experience. You are not a bundle of perceptions. The question we need to address is *Who owns the bundle?* Is there a bundle without an owner? The solution that the bundle ties itself together and owns itself is inadequate. It does not explain what makes a particular bundle *yours*.

You are not your thoughts. You are the subjective space where they take place. It is hopeless to think of yourself in only third person terms. You will not understand this if you persist in taking a mental bird's eye view on yourself and think of yourself as located in public space. You have to pay attention to your own subjective experience right now. There is a subjective space in which all your experiences are located. This is not me, I am not that etc. It is wrong to conclude there is no self. I am not you. You are not me. That *Rigpa* is not this *Rigpa*. The interiority of this *Rigpa* is not the interiority of that *Rigpa*. The interiority of this skylike mind is not the interiority of that skylike mind.

You are absolute interiority. The other is not *behind* their body. You are all around your body and through it. Am I behind my mind? Is this just another thought, the idea that I am behind my mind (behind myself)? Because I am not in front of myself, like another, I wrongly conclude that I am behind myself, as a subjective source of my thought and experience. In fact I am all around myself and all over myself, like a disc. The philosophy of mind is distorted by spatial

metaphor. Your soul makes some set of *Ichstrahlen* yours on bestows *Ich* on *Strahlen*.

You are not numerically identical with your mind. Whatever you are you are not your mind. Nevertheless, you exist. You are in this literal and direct sense *out of your mind*. You have the particular thoughts and sensations you have because of your brain, because of your embodiment. Our embodiment is responsible for our conditioning.

You could exchange bodies or minds with someone else. Then your thoughts and experiences are located in someone else's body and you view the world from what was their subjective point of view. We now need to ask a much more radical and unusual question. Could you exchange human beings with someone else? The question appears absolutely nonsensical within the Western scientific materialist world view. That is because that ideology or paradigm has no room for subjectivity, for the existence that is your own. To make room for subjectivity we have to stretch its language game and see how the seemingly meaningless is meaningful.

There are two ways in which you could have not been the human being you in fact are.

Someone else could have looked out of your eyes, They could be thinking your thoughts and having your experiences now. The human being who is in fact you would exist, but the subjective point of view that is yours would not exist (or would be elsewhere). You would not look out of your body, someone else would. This someone else would inhabit your body and mind.

On the other hand, you could have looked out of someone else's eyes. Then you would be thinking their thoughts and having their experiences. The human being who is in fact the other person would exist, but the subjective point of view that is theirs would not exist (or would be elsewhere). You would inhabit their body and mind.

On the first possibility, the person who in fact you are could have existed thinking just *these* thoughts, yet might not have been you. On the second possibility, someone else, say Napoleon, could have existed but you would have perceived the world from their subjective point of view. Certain kinds of essentialism are false. There is no necessity of origin.

These possibilities reveal an important truth. To say that you *are* a particular human being is not right. At least, words like 'am' and 'are' and 'is' cannot be correctly used to express identity between you and a particular human being. You are not a human being. You are very

closely associated with a human being. It is not too misleading to say that you 'inhabit' a human being, the one you view the world from. It is convenient to use 'am', and 'are' and 'is' to talk about your relation to your human being but, these expressions have a profound meaning in this personal context that does not express identity.

Mind-Body dualism usually (but not necessarily) entails the identification of myself with my mind but this is a mistake. body Matter is a set of spatio-temporal processes. Matter in the old sense of a material or stuff that occupies space time locations does not exist. Its postulation is ontologically extravagant.

You exist at least so long as you think the thought that you exist. This leaves open the possibility that you are not your mind. You exceed your mind. *is a non sequitur*, as is *is the only mind I know from the inside I. is a mind I is prima facie coherent*. However, you and your mind have distinct persistence conditions.

is a mind if and only if is a capacity to think
is a mind if and only if has a capacity to think
is a mind if and only if is a set of thoughts
is a mind if and only if is a (living, well functioning) brain
You are not identical with any thought of yours because you persist when thoughts come and go, so you exist when a particular thought does not exist, and. You are not one of your thoughts, even though 'I am' is a thought. You are not some or all of your thoughts. ['some': 'at least two' here: metaphysics not maths.] The assumption that the mind is the same being as the soul is false. It is wrong to assimilate mind and soul even though the soul can be a mind.

Your soul needs no body in order to exist. Your soul needs no thought or sensation in order to exist. You can exist when you are thinking no thoughts, having no sensations, for example in deep unconsciousness. This shows that you can exist when your mind does not exist. I am not mental. I am something rather than nothing. Therefore, I am something that is not mental.

The soul is not any kind of function or potential or activity of the body. Activity cannot be easily separated from that which acts; the cutting from the axe, when the axe cuts. (Thinking is the mental activity of the brain.) But there logically could be cutting at a distance by *fiat*. When a physical object is destroyed, its functions could ethereally post-date it. Bifurcations could continue after the axe cutting halts. As the soul is immortal, it is not an activity of the body because no activity of the body lasts for ever. The soul is contingently

related to the body. The soul has a separate existence. The soul cannot be damaged physically. The soul is the essence of what it is for someone to be. The soul is at once existential and metaphysical; existential because you are it, metaphysical because it transcends the physical world. The soul as a separate, ghostly 'occupant' of the body, is where the body is, in life is 'pre-occupied' but is neither part of the body, nor what the body is. The soul is not the form of the body, or anything else, and the body is a poor picture of the human soul. The study of the soul is first philosophy.

Both physicalism and materialism are erroneous views. Materialism cannot even in principle capture the reality of your own lived existence. Physicalism cannot explain why someone is you.

It might be objected that the reason why I can exist if my mind does not exist is that I am my body. Similarly, it might be objected that the reason why I can exist if my body does not exist is that I am my mind. However, you can exist even if both your body and your mind do not exist. It follows that you are not you mind and you are not your body.

This amounts to the same thing as saying that you are not *exactly the same thing as* a particular human being, the one you view the world from. You do view the world from a certain human being, that is what you are doing now. However, you are not numerically identical with *this human being*.

If your soul exists you exist. If your soul does not exist you do not exist: Your soul is necessary for your own existence. Your soul is enough or sufficient for your own existence. This is because you are your soul. 'You' and 'your soul' are linguistic expressions that are correctly used to refer to exactly the same being, or one thing rather than two. Of course 'you' has an ordinary empirical use to refer to a human being, the human being other people can identify in public. It also has a more profound secret reference to your soul.

You are out of your mind. You are out of your mind in every direction from your mind. You are infinitely far from your mind in every direction from your mind. You are the space all around you. This space stays the same wherever you go and however you think.

Me-ness (Ich-heit, Je-nesse) is the property of being oneself or the feeling of being oneself. It is not clear whether the feeling is of the same sort in everyone. It seems likely that the tone of mind or personality differs from person to person, but this is not what mineness is. Your soul is essentially you, but you might well have had

a different mind or personality. Mineness or me-ness is the qualitative feel of the interiority of the soul.

We are in sense lost in thought. Our attention is drawn into a thought or taken up by a thought. We 'pay' attention to the object of a thought at the 'expense' of everything else. Although useful for practical purposes, to appreciate that you are a soul it is necessary for one's attention to widen to include the whole of one's mental or experiential field. You are the space between the thoughts. You are the thoughts themselves.

It is now clear that you are not your body. You are not identical with your body. You are not constituted by your body nor dependent on it. I am closely associated with my body, at least at this time, but your body is not exactly what you are. Are you then your *mind*? Could you be exactly the same thing as these thoughts, images and emotions that pass through your consciousness, or your unconscious each day?

It is a mistake to identify yourself with your mind (although much of Western thought since entails precisely this assimilation). This is both a factual mistake and an ethical mistake. This is an ethical mistake because identifying yourself with your mind causes suffering. Thoughts are transient. If you think you are your thoughts then you conclude that you are transient. Thoughts are often tormenting (anxious, depressing, oppressive, repetitive.)

If you identify yourself with your thoughts then you have the feeling you cannot control them and so cannot control yourself.

We are *lost in thought*. We are *preoccupied*. Being lost in chains of (complete or incomplete) thought stops us experiencing and therefore being fully what we are. 'Lost in thought' is apposite.

We are *found* in experience. Western philosophy has assumed a bifurcation between metaphysics and empiricism. The truth is disclosed by empiricist metaphysics or metaphysical empiricism. Meditation, religious experience, provide this. Much thought is about the past or the future and so a distraction from the present. The point is to experience the present however and not just think about it.

Thought is narrow but the soul is wide. The talk of a 'train' of thought is apposite because thoughts are temporally ordered in a before, simultaneous with, after relation. This temporal ordering does not pertain to the soul-space in which thoughts appear and go into extinction. In the soul-space it is eternally now. Thoughts appear, last and disappear in the eternal now that is your ownmost being. In this fairly direct and literal sense you are out of your mind.

It is in fact a kind of madness, a kind of scientific madness to identify yourself with your body or your mind. Your body and your mind are tools that you possess, to think with and to move with. If you cease to identify yourself with your body and your mind you will notice that you nevertheless exist. You are the space in which body and mind occur. Normally or abnormally we are dis-integrated. By identifying yourself with the subjective space that you are you become re-integrated.

Instead of talking about consciousness it is more metaphysically perspicuous to talk of absolute interiority or spiritual interiority. Spiritual states are not mental states. Although mental states depend (contingently and empirically) on the brain, spiritual states do not depend on the brain. Spiritual states depend on the soul. Spiritual states are states of *being*. There is no third thing called consciousness over and above: conditioned thoughts and sensations produced by the brain and the soul, especially the spiritual space of the soul.

What is ordinarily understood by 'consciousness' can be divided into: mental activity of the brain including sensation, the spiritual space of the soul. Consciousness is *reduced* to thought and sensation. Consciousness is *expanded* into the inner space of the soul. Science recognises only 'reduction' in its explanations: the theory that this is *only* that. Theology needs the idea of 'expansion'.

Are you your mind? Pay attention to your mind. Ask yourself: What exactly am I saying about my mind when I say I am this mind, or this mind is mine? Nothing mental. On pain of circularity, nothing mental is sufficient for a mind being your mind.

The introspector is an intro-specter and so a specter. Billions of atoms in empty space cannot be an introspector. If you shut your eyes and pay attention to all these chaotic thoughts passing through your mind, it is clear that they are not you. You are not one of your thoughts, you are not some or all of your thoughts. You are that which 'has' your thoughts: not a *pensée* but a *Gespenst*.

Now, it is important to realise that you are not behind your thoughts. The idea that you are behind your thoughts is only a metaphorical one. It comes from the fact that the world is in front of your body. You confront the world with your body so that seems to suggest that you are behind the world. It is not wrong to think of yourself as *partly behind the scenes* in your relationship to the world, but you are not behind your thoughts. You are the whole area in which your thoughts occur. In the soul it is neither up nor down, left or right,

behind or in front. These spatial relations obtain partly through the existence of physical objects, partly through the confrontation of a living (standing) human body with physical objects.

Thoughts well up and pass away. Thoughts come and go but you persist through them so you are the same thing as your thoughts. You are the spiritual space in which these thoughts happen. That is the inside of your soul. You are unique. You are not just one of a kind. If you were cloned, any number of times, the clones would not be you, not only because of their different genesis but because of their intrinsic difference. You are the centre of the universe. It is obvious.

A non-physical being may have a subjective kind of spatio-temporality. You are looking out of your body now. Does that mean you are your body or does it mean you are inside your body, or neither? A spiritual substance may occupy (numerically) the same space as a physical substance, yet many of the propositions of physics are not true of it. Something could in principle be immaterial but have efficacy. Am I a physical object? Although an idealist can always understand why a materialist is a materialist, a materialist can hardly ever understand why an idealist is an idealist.

Once we have described phenomenological red there does not seem conceptual room to mention the sensation of phenomenological red, any more than once one has described what a pain feels like there is conceptual room to describe the sensation of it. If we describe colour or pain (only) physiologically, then clearly this conceptual room remains. Phenomenologically it is as though if the empirical world were to be annihilated consciousness would survive.

Do out of body experiences falsify the view that the brain is that which thinks? If the body were destroyed would thinking carry on? What is consciousness? Consciousness is spiritual space-time. Consciousness is an inside without an outside.

Does consciousness exist? What is subjectivity? Subjectivity is being a subject. Are there private worlds? A private world is the world as one feels it to be. It includes the world of one's own mind and includes all one's phantasies, hopes, fears, wishful thinking, daydreams. This world is very intimate to us. It is the world in which we pass our time between waking and sleep. What am I? I am spiritual space-time.

What is thinking? The question is ambiguous between 'What is it that thinks?' and 'What is it that thinking is?'. What are thoughts? Thoughts are hypotheses. Experiences are confirmations and refutations of thought-hypotheses. Rationalism is hypothetical. Empiricism is confirmatory. What is a concept? A concept is a

capacity to imagine. The capacity to imagine x, qua x, entails the ability to discriminate x's from non x's. The ability to discriminate x's from non x's does not entail having the concept of x. eg a robot sorts x's from non x's but does not have the capacity to imagine x's. Do other people have minds? What is the solution to the problem of other minds? The solution to the problem of other minds is the possibility of thinking the problem. Other minds are thinkable because there are other minds. I think what the other thinks. We think two tokens of one thought type. the problem is, how we know there are two tokens here and not one. We do not experience a whole other person. We do not experience a whole physical object. We do not experience the inside/other side of the physical object. We do not experience the interiority of the other person. These are two versions of the same problem.

What is the relation between quantum mechanics and the mind-body problem? Mental phenomena and quantum events have common properties. They both exhibit indeterminism, non-positionality, observer dependency, interiority. Could materialism be true? Suppose the physical properties of consciousness are not introspectively available. Suppose physical properties are essential to consciousness. (nec for ?).

Your earlier self and your later self are episodes in the nowness of your soul which has remained unchanging. The now that it is now is the now that it was when you were a child. The now that it is now is the now it will be when you die. The soul seems still persisting but this is not adequate to its timelessness. Its nowness has never changed. It is the passing of thought and experience through the soul which causes the belief that the soul *lasts*. This is not wholly wrong but is misleading. Something that lasts lasts in time. The soul is not an item in time. It does not last *over* time. The soul is the now, the facilitator of change in which events replace one another. An event does not happen until it is now. That soul is the now so an event does not happen until it passes through the now.

Being you is not being a body even though you have a body. It is acceptable to say that 'I am a body' so long as 'am' is not used to express straightforward identity. You view the world from a certain body. It is right either than you are your body. The full truth is that your body is in you. Your body is at the subjective centre of the world. You experience the world as distributed all around you. You experience your body as at the centre of the world. This subjective or disc shaped world is much closer to what you are than your body. This

world, without its contents, is what you are. Your body is at the centre of your world but it is one being amongst others in the world.

You are a centre, like a mathematical point but also the subjective space emanating from that point. The events and objects of the world are arranged all around the central point that you are (both *acumen* and *cuspis*) and in the subjective space that you are.

You are invisible but you can be detected by the sense of sight. The gaps between the leaves of the tree are invisible but may be detected as spaces because the leaves of the tree are visible. Similarly, you are invisible as spiritual space emanating from a point, but this structure can be detected by sight because visible things are arranged according to it. Ordinarily, you are not known to yourself. You are immediately spiritual space. You are mediately a certain body and a certain mind. The world is a clue to what you are because the world has your shape, your structure, your imprint. You contain the world as it is present to you. You pervade the world. Inner space is open but filled by the empirical world.

Is this idealism? Not really. The soul is not essentially mental and the now is not essentially mental. The now and the soul are both essentially spiritual. It is a mistake of idealism in Western and Eastern thought to assimilate the spiritual and the physical to the mental. The event being an event that is a *change* depends up in its passage through the soul. This means that something's happening is its happening through you. You are the place where the future becomes the past. You are not located at that place. You are that place. You are the becoming past of the future. This is what the present is when conceived from the point of view of content. From the point of view of pure presence there is no future and there is not past.

These are phenomenological facts. Phenomenology reveals to us the given. It is shocking that the given is not usually given as the given. It is shocking that phenomenology is even necessary. The layers of mutual constitution of the human beings make it essential. Phenomenology, although the study of appearances, operates at the level of $\Gamma \ // \bullet \ ? \ \blacktriangle \ \Gamma \ \cup \ \Gamma$, the world at the level of $\sqcup \ // \ \blacktriangle \ \blacktriangledown$. The soul belongs to the world of $\Gamma \ // \bullet \ ? \ \blacktriangle \ \Gamma \ \cup \ \Gamma$, the human being to the world of $\sqcup \ // \ \blacktriangle \ \blacktriangledown$. There is belief in the existence of objects, experience of pure interiority. It is possible to intuit the soul. It is possible to *imagine oneself as a soul* and thereby veridically imagine it. In conditioned thought, imagination is 'only imaging' with the pejorative connotation that such imagining is non-veridical or not of anything real. Imagination of the soul is not imagination of nothing

but of no-thing-ness. By imagining the phenomenological space that surrounds the human being who you 'are' and identifying oneself with that space it is possible to imagine being a soul. This imagination is not any fanciful projection. Imagining being a soul in this way is a discovery. This imagining peels away the decades of conditioning to reveal the pure presence that you are. It is a comparatively short step from this for the body at the centre to disappear. If you were stooping forwards in the ordinary course of things and looking forwards you would not see any part of your own body. There are no doubt kinaesthetic sensations but suppose these are quietened by stillness. Then you are not aware of your body. Your body might as well not be there. Where? Your body might as well not exist. You have survived the disappearance of your body. In fact, your experience has remained intact but for the fact that your body is not included as an object of it. Even in ordinary conditioned experience there is only part, partial and fragmented experience of one's own body by the human being who you are. You are your-self, You are not yourself. Your self is not yourself.

Metaphysical imagination is not empirical imagination nor the transcendental imagination. Empirical imagination is imagining something empirical or imagining something empirical as though it were more or less empirical. Transcendental imagination is supplying the background assumptions to perception to render it perception of meaningful wholes, for example the hidden sides of a house to use example. The metaphysical imagination is imagination of ultimate truth. It includes within its deployment empirical tools and transcendental consequences. Imagining anything is a deployment of spatial concepts or spatial metaphors. It is instructive to imagine the soul as the sky, as though your being stretched to the sky in every direction from the human being who you 'are'. In fact your absolute interiority stretches infinitely further than the inside of the light blue dome that is only a few miles away and you are beneath your feet as much as above your head or beside yourself. You are beside yourself. You are on every side of yourself. The metaphysical imagination is transcendental in consequences because it reveals conditions for experience: metaphysical conditions for experience. The accurate imagination of the soul entails the discovery of the soul and the soul is necessary for any thought or experience being one's own.

The soul is necessary for any thought or experience being a thought or experience rather than just some neurology. The soul turns the neurological into the mental. (is this right?)

The soul is with-out the body. The soul is with-out the mind. The soul is with-out the entire psycho-physical human being. The soul is with the human being in the sense that, apart from out of body experiences and death, the human being is at the centre of its own soul. In out of body experiences the body is de-centred in the soul. In the case of death the body dissolves within the soul (along with the rest of the empirical world). The soul is out of the body in the sense of being all around it not just pervading it. The term 'out of body experience' is in a sense misleading because you were never in your body all along. You are not 'in' your body now. *With-out* captures the soul-body relation. You are out of this world.

unity

The unity, (*unit-y* but *un-it-y*) of this human being as you is the essential one-ness of the soul-space. Being someone is prior to 'being' a mind, a body or a human being even though these could in principle exist anonymously. Unless you were someone you could not be anybody. Unless we were souls we would be nothing. The existence of your own soul is necessary and sufficient for your existence. The soul is a unity that is a singularity, the ontological realisation of a number not made out of ones: $\cup // \bullet \vee _ \bullet \cup // ? \vee \times \bullet - \cup // ?$. The soul is never more or less. The soul is profound and *pro-found*.

The unity that constitutes personal identity at any one time is the unity of the soul. The soul is the self because a specific person is the person who they are by being a specific soul. The soul is *shes-pa*. The soul is a type of *skandha* called *vijnana*.

The absolute ground of ordinary consciousness is the interiority of the soul. Consciousness in this sense is distinct from the ordinary day to day experiences of the human being. It is the inner space in which they occur and which they presuppose. Ordinary mind emerges through conditioning of the mental activity of the brain which takes itself place in the inner space of my soul which is to say that psycho-physical activity is *my* activity. The soul has an earthly function to enable a human being's experience to be your experience.

unity

The unity of consciousness is the unity of the soul, but 'unity' has a different meaning in each of its two occurrences here. The unity of experience the togetherness of experiences. The unity of the soul is the oneness (*unus*) of the soul. The unity of the soul is comparable to the unity of space: its being in a certain sense unique. The unity of experience is comparable to the unity of society, the individuals qua

social members (parts) being essentially socially tied (by kinship, concepts, roles, functions).

There could be two numerically distinct but qualitatively identical bodies or minds or human beings. There could not be two numerically distinct but qualitatively identical souls. You are essentially and necessarily a singularity. The soul is the instantiation of itself.

The soul is a monad. Experience is integrated in the soul. The experience of the soul is the mono-graph of the monad. The soul is found, not in a finding by one experience amongst others, but by the background of all experience suddenly made foreground. This 'of' in 'knowledge of the soul' is knowledge *by* the soul and knowledge *about* the soul. This originary synthesis, devoid of reflection, overcomes subject-object dualism is primordial, not a fusion.

ppersonal identity

'The' human being, this psycho-physical whole, has an identity through time: a numerical identity that is retained through quantitative change. This notion of numerical identity over time has no application to the soul. The soul is timeless. The soul is an eternal now. The soul does not last over time because there is no earlier and later of the soul. The soul is the source of sense.

bbeing someone

You are your soul if you exist. You 'are' partly your body for a while, in earthly existence. This *being-something-for-a-while* betrays the contingency of embodiment. *Being-something* is contingent but *being-someone* is necessary, not in the sense that you could not not have been, but in the sense that if you are you are someone. You might not have been, but you are, so you are someone. *Being-some-one* is entailed by 'You are'. (Again, this has nothing to do with personality.) Your *partly-being* a body and a mind, or the *extent* to which you 'are' it, consists in your really *pervading* it and your being located at the centre of a body. (That is the point.) You *ex-ceed* your body. You *ex-ceed* your mind.

hhuman being

The human being comprises three parts: mind (☉ // ■ // ?, ● // ▼ ?, reason), spirit (self, *anima*) and body, (*animal*, flesh, the carnal). Each of these functions interactively with the other two as a synthetic totalisation: psycho-physical human-being. A peaceful soul is possible in a human being but this requires training or grace. With-

out the body and the mind, cleansed of sin, peace is the natural state of the soul. (There is the possibility of peace.) The logos is a plan of the universe.

The human being is made of matter ($? \bullet \aleph \subset \Gamma$), from the earth, but the soul is the spark of the divine put there by the divine. The doctrine ($\diagup \times \vee \blacksquare \cup \vee \blacktriangle \Gamma \bullet \vee$) of the soul is not 'pragmatic' in any earthly sense, even though doctrine in the sense of dogma ($\sqcup \diagup \blacksquare \cup \vee \blacktriangle \vee$). To realise is both to understand and to make real. To real-ise is to make present. When the soul is made present, disclosed for the presence it is, when background becomes foreground in a *Gestalt* switch or spiritual $\Gamma \diagup \diagup \bullet$ that reinterprets the given as presence, when formlessness is salient and content recedes, there is self-realisation in both ways.

The human being, as it lives its life, is neither entirely different, nor exactly the same, as it was the previous moment, day or year. The soul remains the same, as the process that this human being is continues. The soul is alive, $\Gamma \cup \aleph \blacktriangledown \Gamma \diagup \bullet$, has life, is $\aleph \blacktriangledown \Gamma \bullet$, not in a bio-logical sense but as the self-moving spontaneity of the now. The soul is theologically prior to this human being 'being' you. Knowledge of the soul facilitates re-member-ing yourself as: body, mind and spirit. You are a *trinity* of body, mind and spirit: a profound respect in which God has made us in his own image.

This human being has its own conditioned personality and habits. 'Personality' is per-son-ality: the Greek theatre masks were held in front of the face and spoken through: *per - sona*, sound-through. Your personality is an invisible shield you hold between yourself and the others to protect yourself from criticism, to pretend to be good, to pretend to excel. Personality is psychological technology. You are not your personality. Your personality, however appealing, is a piece of conditioned social technology. Someone experiences, but this someone is not a personality.

It is the human being that acts, but in so far as 'I' act, a certain human being is 'mine'. In life, the world is accepted into the soul because the soul calls the world into it. In death, the world is rejected. Birth is the world's acceptance of the invitation of the soul. Life is an event, not a thing. The soul feels isolated in the world because the soul is not of the world. An anonymous human being is a souless human being: someone who is not anyone. (This has nothing to do with personality.) In so far as my experiences are mine, my soul feels them so that some phenomenology is my phenomenology depends on the soul.

The soul is intuitive. The soul is the fulfillment of the human and the beginning of the next world.

An adequate theory of science entails an adequate theory of the soul.

The human being serves the soul. In conditioned thought, you identify yourself with the human being. You have never seen yourself in a mirror. You have seen your human being many times in the mirror. You have a human being in the way that you might have a vehicle. The role of the human being is to serve the soul in earthly life. It is possible to give up identifying oneself with the human being you are so closely associated with but know so little from the outside. It is possible to view this human being as a fleshy vehicle. Only the time scales are different. The strategies of the human being are made someone's by the soul.

The human being is constituted. Human beings constitute one another as mutually constituting. This constitution is not ultimately supervenient upon anything physical although many layers of psycho-physical constitution are.

The human being operates in the soul.

The human being is much more like a tree than an animal.

The spatio-temporal reality of the human being obtains in the greater spiritual space-time of the soul.

The element of your being is your soul.

From a phenomenological point of view, it is difficult to understand what it is like to be another human being: to picture their internal world. The psycho-physical human being is ordinarily an obstacle to their pervasion of the other. However, this is not logically or metaphysically impossible.

The soul is the home of the human being.

Being a human being is something that you are doing not something that you are. Being human is an activity embedded in a world of activities, not something with which you are identical.

You do not even co-incide with a certain human being.

It is a category mistake to think that the psycho-physical human being owns its own experiences because these belong to the soul.

In so far as the soul, rather than the brain or the whole person, thinks the soul is *psuche*. The question of whether the soul thinks or the whole person thinks is like the question of whether the brain thinks or the whole person. The *postulation* of the soul is specifically philosophical or theoretical. The *experience* of the soul is specifically mystical and spiritual. The enhumaned soul is *sawal*. The human

being is soul-bearing: *sawolberend*: a soul-bearing process. The human being is *saweled*, having a soul, ensouled. *Sawal* is *saul*. To expire is *sawlian*, to 'soul', to become a pure soul, to cease to be *saweled* and to be *sawal*. *Sawlung* is dying, souling. Dying is soaring.

What it would be natural to think about and associate with the body or the mind does not apply to the soul. The soul is the opposite of the body. The body is pure exteriority. The soul is pure interiority. The mind is partly like the body partly like the soul. The mind is a synthesis of internalism and externalism. One soul could pervade various thinkers.

The soul is a window onto the world. You are the inside of the world. A relative inside is not an inside but an outside. Only the spiritual has an absolute inside, an inside that is not another outside and depends on no outside, so matter has no inside. Introspection discloses the soul to itself, to its-self.

thing-in-itself

As soul *per se* you do not admit of a distinction between past and future but are pure presence. This changelessness is characteristic of being in itself. The for-itself and the in-itself coincide in the thing in itself. You are a thing in itself. The soul is a thing in itself, which entails, not a physical thing. Fundamental phenomenology looks behind the scenes. We go behind the phenomena to do very thing critical philosophy entails is impossible. We describe the things-in-themselves. In yourself you are pure nowness, purer interiority, pure space, pure youness. Devoid of phenomena you are one of the noumena. Noumena cannot be detected from the outside. You can know only one noumenon by direct acquaintance, the noumenon you are. You know it by being it

You know the *noumenon* you are by being stripped of the *phenomena* you are not. In conditioned thought we falsely identify ourselves with the phenomena, with this constellation of phenomena or that. You are a noumenon but not a nous. You have a nous. Although you are a noumenon, and can be the object of thought as such, you are only thereby depicted at a very abstract level. The interiority of the soul has to be disclosed, for example by fundamental phenomenology. It cannot be adequately theorised at a distance.

life

The soul is indispensable to life in the sense of your life, the life that only you live. The soul has no parts, life has parts, so the soul is not identical with life. You are your soul but you are not your life. You have no parts. The soul is not a perceptual phenomenon but there is

the phenomenon of the soul. The soul is given as though solipsism were true. (Why are the living the living?)

∞ ? | • | is not ● // ▽ ? . *Anima* is not *intellectus*.

The soul as 'psyche' is its mental being. The psychology of the soul is its being ∞ | • | . The soul as *anima* is its life bestowing role. The soul bestows life, not in the sense of biological or physical life, but 'my life' or 'your life'. Human-being is *animated*, is someone. The soul is therefore life in a non-reductive sense. It is not possible to exchange 'soul' for 'life' in sentences *salve veritate*. (Grass has life but no soul.) The Latin *spiritus*, like *anima* and *atman*, ex-presses the 'breath'. 'Soul' in its life bestowing mode is *nefesh*, life, or vital breath. The soul is *atman* 'breath' (*prana*) because that some breathing is my breathing, not just anonymous breathing, is because it takes place in the subjective soul-space that I am. That I can feel my breath as between freedom and determinism, in my own interiority, is a fact about my soul. (I can *choose* to breath. If I do not choose, breathing is caused to go on anyway.) 'Alive' means 'ensouled' so long as the life is someone's life. Human beings might have been as the grass.

The answer to the question 'Who lives your life?' is 'The soul'. 'Who or what is now?' 'The soul'. The view that there is no abiding self is false. The self exists, so the answer to the question 'What thinks?' is 'The soul'. Thought does not itself think, even though there is no contradiction in the idea of a world in which only thoughts, or only one thought, exist. If you remove the thought, it is not true that there is no thinker (self) to be found.

II

Are You Out of this World?

You are not nothing but *no-thing-ness*: a zone of presence. You are not nothing because you are and there is something that you are. You are no-thing-ness because what you are is not a thing and anything that is is either a thing or no-thing-ness. You are a zone of presence because the world is *presented*, *present*, and *pre-sent* through the zone of no-thing-ness that you fundamentally are. If the world were not both present and presented thought about it and perception of it would be impossible but there is both thought and perception of the world, so

the world is both present and presented. The world is pre-sent, not only chronologically, but also because the explanation of its presence transcends it: The possibility of this world is out of this world. It follows that this 'pre' of the 'pre-sent' is both transcendental and transcendent in a completion and a subversion of the critical philosophy.

The living presence that the soul is is a microcosmic synthesis of *Gegenwärtigkeit* and *Anwesenheit*.

The disclosure of this ownmost no-thing-ness is both phenomenological and theological: phenomenological because *given* irrespective of content, theological because metaphysically identical with the soul and therefore, ultimately, turning out to be a portal to God. It is possible to shed the world, through phenomenological epoche or (vel) mystical stillness, so that no-thing-ness is disclosed as the absolute interiority of the soul. This uncovering of no-thing-ness presupposes the cessation (*tanhakkhaya, nirvana*) of conditioned thinking, but there remains nevertheless (ever-more) pure consciousness or at least space (*anatta*). This metaphysical epoche, which is more thoroughgoing, pure, and transcendental, than 'pure' or 'transcendental' epoche, is a quasi-annihilation that yields *nemo homo* but not *nemo, nullus* but not *nihil*. In this absolute relaxation or *passaddhi*, the world of *rupa*, or space-time contents, is exhibited as transient: *anicca*. In the disclosure of the soul, empiricism and metaphysics coincide. There is revelation of what is: the unchanging.

You are the inside of being, not as an absence but as an interiority that is pure presence. This is the answer to Kant's question 'How is experience possible?'. The answer to Moore's question 'What is the external world external to?' is 'you'. This philosopher of common sense brings you up sharp with the uncommon sense of your own being. To do metaphysics it is necessary to discard the exclusively third-person language which misconstrues the internal world as external. (We are not talking at the level of psychology.) You are the no-thing-ness at the heart of being. Otherwise, the disclosure of being would be impossible. There is a disclosure of being so you are the no-thing-ness at the heart of being. As Sartre sees, if being were only monolithic, appearance (and *a fortiori* phenomenology) would be impossible. Appearance is possible so being is not only monolithic.

The soul is being as substance, *ousia*, not becoming, *polemos*. The soul depends on nothing natural because it is given without the world (as though it could be all there is). Naturally, it does not follow

from 'x is given as F' that x is F where 'F' stands for any empirical predicate ('commonsensically' construed). However, the soul is phenomenologically disclosed without the world (as though it could be all there is) and phenomenological disclosure is incorrigible. As the spiritual is truly approached, the distinction between appearance and reality falls away.

The soul is not empirically determinable so not mentally or physically determinable. It is not inappropriate to think of the soul as being but there being no-thing, or nothing empirical, that it is. This is not being nothing. The soul is no-thing, but it is. The soul is something but not some-thing.

Are you out of this world? The world (*mundus, rerum natura, monde, Welt,*) does not wholly include you even though you exist, and even though the world seems to include you from the third person or quasi-anonymous point of view. If you were wholly in the world experience would be impossible. Experience is possible, because there is experience, therefore you are not wholly in the world. You are partly in the world and partly out of it. If you were not partly in the world you could not be detected from the third person perspective. You can be so detected so you are partly in the world. If you were not partly out of the world you could not be you. You are you so you are partly out of the world.

You are a subject in the sense of that which has your experiences because your existentially primordial view is *the view from now-here*. Now is when your experiences happen. Here is where your experiences happen. You are who your experiences happen to. Now and here are an originary synthesis: a synthesis that admits of analysis only in the abstract and only incompletely. This incompleteness is systematic because the mutual presupposition of the here and the now is ineliminable, even at the level of metaphysics. The ontological reciprocal dependency of here and now is accurately captured by the temporal and spatial senses of the one word 'presence'. Presence is the now-here which, although not nowhere, is nowhere locatable from the third person perspective.

There is *being as* and *being-for-a-while*. Some clay exists as an object for a while, is scrambled, and exists as a different object for a while.

The human being is constituted by body and mind and soul. Modern thinkers, conditioned by materialism, have next to no knowledge of the soul.

The soul is *absolute particularly* which means it is logically impossible for there to exist anything numerically distinct but qualitatively identical to it. Absolute particularity pertains to spiritual beings: God, the soul, angels (and to numbers).

The soul is the synthesis of *being-for-itself* and *being-in-itself* in their worldly opposition so, fundamentally, you are neither subjective nor objective, but exist in a way that transcends subject object dualism. Something belongs to *being-in-itself* if and only if it is the object of thought and experience but, at least *qua* object, is not the subject of thought or experience. Something belongs to *being-for-itself* if and only if it is a subject of thought or experience and at least *qua* subject it cannot be object. The *pour soi*, *für-sich* can only be mental or spiritual. The *en-soi*, *an-sich*, cannot be mental or spiritual. The relations between *being-for-itself* and *being-in-itself* are dialectical. Any dialectical relation is at least reciprocal such that *a* depends upon *b* and *b* depends upon *a* (logically, causally, ontologically, semantically or constitutionally). Although *a* is not *b* and *b* is not *a*, *a*'s being and *a*'s being *a* depend both upon *a*'s not being *b* and *b*'s being and *b*'s being *b* depend both on *b*'s not being *a* and *a*'s being. At least: $\neg (\exists a) (Fa) \rightarrow \neg (\exists b) (Fb) \ \& \ \neg (\exists b) \rightarrow \neg (\exists a) (Fa) \ \& \ \neg (a = b)$, so: $(\exists a) (Fa) \leftrightarrow (\exists b) (Fb) \ \& \ \neg (a = b)$. Where and only where such reciprocal relations obtain, *a* and *b* are dialectical *moments* (have *moment* and so *momentum*). The ontological realisation of the mutual dependency of the *in-itself* and the *for-itself* is the inner space of the soul. *This* 'inner' is not contrasted with any worldly 'outer'.

Being-in-the-world is a not the primordial existential category. (Y)our existence (*Hiersein*), as an ensouled (*ensaweled*) human-being, is partly-in-the-world, partly-out-of-it, partly *of* the world partly not *of* it. Partly-being-in-the world is ontologically, and *a fortiori* epistemologically, primordial with regard to distinctions between mental and physical, subjective and objective which are nevertheless given in immediate experience and not products of reflection.

The soul uses the body as an instrument to perceive, travel and act in the physical world. The irreducibility of my perceiving, travelling or acting to this specific human being perceiving, travelling or acting depends upon the ontological separability of my soul from this human being. Despite the empirical dependence of 'consciousness' on 'the' brain, metaphysically, *my* perception is the presence of content, *my* travel is pervasion of numerically distinct portions of space-time at numerically distinct times, *my* acting is tele-kinesis.

The privileging of one structure of *being-in-the-world* over another depends upon emphasising or re-reading descriptions of some dependencies but not others. The anti holistic view is that each part of *being-in-the-world* is *not* an indispensable moment of the lived dialectic. There can be being without a world, and a world without (your own) being (*Hiersein*). Such a world could only contain human beings, their interpretations and *praxis* anonymously. Your own *being-in-the-world* is temporary. The three moments of *being-in-the-world*, although dialectical at the level of *world* (that is, at the level of only one of its dialectical moments) are metaphysically separable. Your ownmost *being-out-of-this-world* is permanent.

The existential structures of *pervading-the-world* are dialectical moments, so *partly-being-in-the-world* appears as a dialectically constituted whole: Its moments make it what it is. This allows *partly-being-in-the-world* to be mistaken phenomenologically for *being-in-the-world*. I pervade my body in a lived dialectic. *Partly-being-in-the-world* is the set of existential structures it is because of our living participation in it as an essential component. (Why are *the living* the living? Why is it not now a thousand years ago? Is now when it is *really* now, or just when you are?) Things are to us as they are, metaphysically, because they present themselves to us *per-spect-ivally*: through the spectre. Empirically, things are subject-matter: the content of the soul.

The metaphysical and existential revision of this phenomenology is: My being is *partly-being-in-the-world*. As Augustine and Husserl see (Latin) truth inhabits the inner man or, more accurately, there is an inner space of your ownmost being, you are only partly in the world, and not only, or even not even, in the world do you know yourself. If you know yourself you know yourself (*to be*) out of this world: ■ ● ◀ - • ? ▮ ✓ ▼ ▲ // ● ☞ The man inhabits inner truth. Anything absolutely inner is not part of the world. The soul is absolutely inner so the soul is not part of the world.

ppervasion

To the extent that the soul is in the world the soul is *where* matter is but is not matter. There is no logical or *a priori* objection to *a* being where *b* is but not being *b*: $EP1 \ xP1 \ \& \ yP1 \ \& \ -x = y$ is coherent. (Even in the case of physical objects this claim is not contradictory, so it is a contingent fact about physical objects that they occupy distinct portions of space-time.) The soul is a kind of space, a phenomenological space, and a physical object may occupy a portion

of phenomenological space. This is understandable because the concept of a physical object occupying space is familiar and space is itself phenomenological. 'Physical space' enshrines a mistake because space is necessarily not physical: does not have physical dimensions and is not composed of matter. You pervade the $\cup // ? \cup // ?$, the world is material, so matter is distributed through the soul. This shimmering presence takes place against the background soul-space which is your experiential field: *no-thing-ness*.

Ether is an inadequate heuristic if construed only in a third-person way. Being ethereal is more perspicacious, if being ethereal is *being capable of being where something else is*. For example, in the case of a dead person, they are not where their body is.

The presence of the soul as the inner space of this human being and its *pervasion* relationship to the physical body is the explanation of your own existence, the answer to: *What does your own existence consist in?*

The soul may pervade any portion of the physical universe, but by pervading that portion it does not thereby become my body. What is it that makes the pervasion of a portion of matter make that matter the soul's body?

Nor is there any contradiction in the supposition that the point that is the centre of your soul is centred on your body or any other object. The centre of the soul is like a mathematical point: a space that occupies no space: an absolute location that is infinitely small: No matter how small you take it to be it is smaller than that. The soul is infinitely proximal to your being. You infinitely are it because it is the infinite interiority of your own being. There is no limit to the extent to which you are your soul. Your self pervades yourself in inwardness.

The darkness behind your own eyes is *no-thing-ness*. As soul, you are the $\checkmark \times \sqrt{\quad} \bullet$ of the human being you 'are'.

The soul's portal to the world is only perspectival because of the human being but per-spect-ival because of your own pervading presence. Things would not be things *qua* the things we encounter in the world if they were not partly made what they are to us by our very encounter with them. That much of Augustine, Vico, Kant and Heisenberg is correct. Although necessary, this is not an empty tautology but points to the fact that, for example, a physical object being the sort of item that may present a side to us, and not a constellation of atoms, partly depends upon the micro and macroscopic organisation of our visual and tactile sense organs. There is no

front or back, up or down in the soul. These concepts are derived from embodiment and travel.

The soul working as *ensawled* in the human for the benefit of other beings, through its own microcosmic creativity, is the explanation of your own existence in the teleological and ethical sense of *Why do I exist?* To know yourself means to know your soul: to know that you are a soul and become directly acquainted with it by spiritual experience.

The soul is *scient*.

wworld

A world without souls is not impossible but would not be presented to anyone. A souless world would not be anything to anyone.

Any lifeworld is someone's lifeworld. A lifeworld is someone's lifeworld only because pervaded by inner space. There are lifeworlds, so they are pervaded by inner space. It is because the soul is in the world but not of the world that the world is a lifeworld. You are partly inserted into the world. The soul is the unreflected presupposition of the lifeworld.

Wherever in philosophy 'from the inside' is used, this is the mark of the soul. Whenever in philosophy 'external world' is used this is a mark of the soul because there is no external world without an internal world.

The soul is in-dependent of the world. The soul pervades the world but is not 'in' the world in the sense of contained in it. The soul is not an item in the world.

The world is in the soul. Concentration on the world, on content, is a distraction from realising the soul. The soul is essentially you. You are it. If it is destroyed, you are destroyed. We are so used to *this human being* we identify ourselves with it. The soul is your real identity, which is not an *id-ent-ity*.

oobjectivity

The further from you something is the more thing-like it is. The nearer something is to you the less thing-like it is. You are no-thing-ness. The world is thing-ness. You do not move your soul. You can move your body inside your soul.

Your soul is not in objective space but pervades objective space. We do not apprehend everything in objective space because our mind and body are finite. Your mental and sensory capacities are limited. If

they were not, they would apprehend everything in the infinite space that is the soul, in so far as this infinite space pervades the world, you would apprehend all the events and objects in the world. We are cognitively finite but spiritually infinite. Our finite cognition provides us with a finite amount and degree of information about the world. Spiritually, we wholly pervade the world.

There can be no 'picture' of subjectivity, no visual picture because the soul is not physical. The soul is a portion of spiritual space-time, what I am whatever else I am, an inside without an outside, pure interiority, pure individuality.

What is the relation of the body to the soul? The body is *in* the soul: located in *this* portion of spiritual space-time. The soul makes me me.

Materialism and phenomenalism, obtain at different levels of disclosure of the soul to itself. In ordinary taken for granted experience, it looks as though everything is physical. In experience of experience, or reflection on experience, it looks as though phenomenalism is true. Consciousness is one kind of filling of the interiority of the soul. Intentionality is grounded in the soul. In the cessation of experience the soul is disclosed to itself. The soul is given to it itself, as it is, as the absolute it is. World views are possible from the soul. The soul is constant, world views are variables. The world itself is presented within the soul: present and presented.

There are different kinds and degrees of objectivity. Objectivity is the presentation of something as an object over and against a subject, something as at a distance. Objective can just mean true. Objective facts are just facts. Objective truths are just truths. In this sense, something is objective if it is the case. The soul is objective in the sense that it transcends subject object dualism. It is. It makes subject object dualism by including it.

Anything with an exteriority, paradigmatically, a physical object, is quantitative but the soul is qualitative. The non-intentional experience of the soul is its emptiness. Its being-in-itself is its own disclosure to itself. This openness of the soul is not a relation.

subject object

The subjectivity of the body and the objectivity of the world of objects are dissolved in inner space. (This makes phenomenalism thinkable.)

In so far as your experience ceases to be visual, inner space is disclosed as what you are.

You are aware of being this space by being it. Inner space is therefore self-intimating in so far as its contents are not the object of attention. 'Aware' is not the right word if it implies three things: a subject of awareness, space as the object of awareness, and awareness as a relation between the two. The space is monolithic and it is disclosed precisely in so far as the tripartite structure of awareness or consciousness dissolves but consciousness remains. (Consciousness is not essentially intentional but pointless: it is the point.) In so far as consciousness entails no object or subject, consciousness is space. Consciousness is expanded to be(come) this space. Once the soul is revealed, talk of consciousness can be given up for talk of the soul.

The whole structure of subject object dualism exists in the soul. The soul does not exist over and against the world in the way that a human being confronts some physical objects or sees them at a distance from himself. The soul pervades the world. It pervades it in a way that produces then possibility of subjective human perspective. This is not fundamentally a perspective but rather the pervasion of part of the world but not the remainder by the soul. The soul is a substance, a sub-stance.

The essence of subjectivity is the soul. The real subjectivity of the soul does not depend on the body or the world. My own existence as subjectivity as consciousness is exactly one with my existence as a soul. If the world disappeared I would remain. The subject that I am, when correctly understood as soul, is phenomenologically and ontologically separable from my body and the world. The soul is not embodied if this means in a body. If it means, there is one body with whom you are very closely associated for some decades and are centered upon then the soul is embodied but contingently embodied. The soul is not quiet in the world. A body and a mind are infused in me by being at the centre of my soul. The relation between soul and world is mediated by the human being that you are. The ontology of the soul is the study of the being of the soul. The phenomenological ontology of the soul is the letting show itself of the being of the soul.

The soul appears subjective, but subject object dualism is a product of the soul's presence in the world and the world's presence, fulfillment. Putatively continuous perception is really discontinuous because the before/after succession of events in the soul. The true subject is thrown down, and thereby obscured, by experience. In the absence of experience the subject is no longer subjected and disclosed as the soul.

freedom

The soul is the source of the exploding spontaneity of the present. The soul is the source (spring, fountain) of meaning. The human being is *equipment*, the equipment of the soul appropriate to the physical world. *Human-being-in-the-world* has an attitude of implication, involvement or concern but falling short of being fully human is not being *ensawled*. A human being is not fully human unless someone. You are not just someone but some-one and this 'one' is absolute and ab-solved. One soul is absolutely distinct from any other: free so ab-solved.

The soul is the zone of free choice and decision making.

Choices are made within the soul. The soul is the arena of freedom.

existentialism

There is such a thing as *being* absolute interiority. From the bare fact that one soul is qualitatively distinct from another it does not follow that one of them is you. Your being a soul is the existence you feel yourself to be now, not the psycho-physical human being you feel yourself to be, but the *existence* you feel yourself to be. Your soul is co-extensive with (what you feel yourself to be) now. By 'feel yourself to be' I do not mean 'believe yourself to be' but how you are existentially, from the in-side. Existence and essence coincide in the soul. Your soul is your essence. It is what you really are or what you are essentially. The 'esse', the being of your soul, is your being. The existence of your soul is necessary and sufficient for your existence. The soul is the inside of the external world.

Existentialism is a way to the soul. In existentialism it is the soul that faces the anguish of choice, confronts death and the other, and makes commitments. The soul of existentialism's greatest angst is its non-recognition in its suffering. If the human suffers the soul does not. The soul is existential because it is what your own existence here and now consists in. Your entire world-view is centred on your own existence and this means centred on the centre of your soul. Your ethos is centred on your soul. The soul has a singular character which is yours. The phenomenology of the soul is automatically an existential phenomenology. The soul is what your own existence consists in. The soul is being-for itself. The soul is concrete human existence. Perhaps surprisingly, the most concrete, the most real, the most existentially primordial is not physical but soulful. It is only from the inauthentic standpoint of the physical world that the soul

appears not to be real. This standpoint is inauthentic because grounded in the soul it repudiates. The so called point of view of the physical world is not a point of view or is self-undermining and therefore inconsistent and inauthentic. Existentialism is not a humanism. Existentialism is a theology.

Existentialism and metaphysics coincide in the human being as a *trinity*, a tri-entity, of body (*soma, hyle*), soul (*psyche*) and spirit (*pneuma*). The spiritual seed (*sperme pneumatike*) is the *shes-pa, jiva* in *ruh* in or soul-spark, Higher Self of transpersonal psychologies, *Atman* or Buddha-nature. *Spiritual seed* returns to its source. The soul is a kind of light with the body at the centre. You are this light. The body is in the soul. If I am aware of myself as a bodily subject I am aware of myself as spatially located, but the reverse does not follow because I can be aware of myself as a spiritual substance that 'pervades' part of the physical world. The body is located in the portion of spiritual space-time that is the soul.

conditioning

The soul is normally, or in the conditioned ways of practice, lost in the world. The soul is hidden by the body and the mind. That is why there is so little understanding of the soul. The soul is hidden by sin. The soul is the opposite of the world. That is why there is so much reluctance to understand the soul. Human beings *like* the world.

Intersubjectivity constitutes human beings as mutually constituting. It is reversing this process of constitution that reveals the soul. Mutual constitution is conditioning. Exposure of the soul requires de-conditioning. Self-other and world makes each other what they are at psychological, physical and meaningful levels. Each of semantics, psychology and the physical constitutes the other two. Each of self, other and world constitutes the other two. The soul is a first-person point of view that is not contrasted with any earthly second or third. The soul is absolutely first person in an unqualified way.

Beyond the layers of conditioning of the human there is the reality of your own presence in the world. You do not completely exhibit being in the world because you are partly not of this world. You are presence in the world. A clue to this is the fact that you cannot see the back of your own head and the world is arranged before you or around you. Your pervasion of the world is a concrete and conspicuous existential fact upon which views about conditioning are based. Your pervasion of the world is real.

The soul is ordinarily hidden, which is to say, conditioned thought has no or little awareness of the soul.

The soul is *that which* is conditioned: the unconditioned in itself.

The souls are covered or concealed by the conditioning of intersubjectivity. What changes? The soul changes and remains unchanging. The subject of change does not change because it 'endures' though the change as that subject. The subject of change changes because it is that which undergoes in the sense of sustains change. The soul is the unchanging subject of change. In a sense then the soul changes and in another sense does not change.

Our thought and language, our very imaginations, are geared to understanding *thing-ness*. Things can be quantified over and so bought and sold, manipulated, fashioned to human ends. However useful for practical purposes this ingrained habit of thinking in terms of *thing-ness* is almost useless for thinking about the soul. To reveal the soul thinking has to relax its focus on the plurality of particulars and apprehend the one partícula they are all included within.

You have these thoughts and sensations *because* of the brain, because of embodiment. Our embodiment is responsible for our conditioning. This turns tables on objection that the mind depends on brain. The problem is that we are very *conditioned*. This is the reason we do not realise we are souls. The West (over the last 2-3 centuries) is the most *conditioned* culture/civilisation in history. Therefore it is the one most ignorant of the soul and immortality. You have to notice that you exist.

The journey from the scientific and ordinary commonsensical understanding of the world to seeing that there is life after death is via philosophical questions. Common sense is historically constituted and historically changing. Our Western capitalist common sense has little in common with most historical communities. If you can really feel the bite of the philosophical questions without wandering onto conditioned thought you will see that metaphysical questions can be posed within the physical world. Metaphysical questions cannot be answered only by looking inside the physical world (except in a profound and subjective sense of 'inside' that is not meant here: I am the inside of the world.) Metaphysical questions have to be answered by looking outside the physical world. (cf the famous picture of the person looking through the sky to the heavens (in Renaissance).) Scientists can make little of this, because of the third person perspective. 'Perspective' is partly epistemological access. The first person singular is general, but only one person is you.

Ego

The soul is not the ego. The empirical ego (not the transcendental ego) is my image of myself. My ego is the totality of beliefs, impressions and connotations I have about myself. One component of my world-view is my self image. From a pragmatic point of view, or for conditioned thought, a person is more or less what they take themselves to be. What you take yourself to be is taken seriously by conditioned thought and action. The ego is embedded in and sustained by world-views, social roles and economics. It is nurtured by education. However, you are not your ego. This is not to say that the depiction in your self-image of the human being that you 'are' is inaccurate. Naturally it is distorted and overly favourable. It is part of the awareness of being fallen to see through that overly favourable self image see us as we are: to face utterly our faults and inadequacies. The point is that the self image is not the self. You are not your ego. The soul is the real existential space that is you're here and now. Your self image is a constellation of dispositions, impressions and images that is exercised in your soul-space. Therefore the ego is not the soul. A constellation: experiences are like stars, they are illuminated. They are together in the 'unity of consciousness' which is the soul, as lights in the light: points of accentuated light and colour. They appear and disappear like visible stars. An experience is a comet which passes through the soul leaving a trail that fades to nothing. The soul is not a conglomerate. The human being has an egocentric viewpoint but the soul is essentially ego-centric. The soul is the centre that contains the ego.

In conditioned thought and experience the soul is *closed*. The falling away of past, future, desire, and elsewhere *dis*-closes the soul. (These are inductive subjects.) The space-like interiority of the soul is pure openness, so no closure is intrinsic or essential to it. Ending conditioning, and seeing through hope and fear, the soul is revealed. There is no *anatta* of the soul.

In the unconditioned present, the soul is re-recognized as distinct from this human being. It could have 'occupied' another.

To ordinary thinking, the existence of the physical world seems obvious, the existence of the soul an extravagant postulate or an obscure and groundless belief. There is no need to start (or end) with ordinary thinking. By doing phenomenology and disclosing the soul we can start with the spiritual substance you are. The soul can be full or empty. In life it is full and hidden from itself. At death the soul is

emptied. The soul is a *Logos*. The programs of the mind run in the soul.

becoming

Human-being is becoming, but the soul is being, so the human being in relation to the soul is *be-coming*: *becoming becoming being* or effecting the transition from becoming to being which cannot be wholly becoming and cannot be wholly being but must share in both. (Beginning, that has not already begun and is not *not yet*, is *be-coming*.) The term 'human being' should be replaced by 'human-becoming'. This is our impermanent nature and our perennial teleology. In soul realisation you become what you really are by effecting the transitions from becoming through be-coming to being; faith in the soul be-comes k(now)ledge. Faith is in the situation of *becoming*, knowledge belongs to *being*.

persons in grammar

How is the first person perspective possible? Because I am a soul.

How is the second person perspective possible? Because we are souls.

How is the third person perspective possible? Because I am a soul.

The first person singular character of the soul does not depend upon anything human. In particular it is independent of the first, second and third person natures of human beings. Human beings are first, second or third person in relation to one another. You are presented to me as one of a we or as a you or one of a you or as a he or a she. I am presented to you in the same ways. The soul is an absolute presence here. You are you absolutely. I am myself absolutely.

A person is that of which a first second and third person account is possible. By this criterion, God is a person and you are a person. The soul is a person because you are it, it is a soul descriptibly in an abstract or third person way, and it is encounterable by other souls. The soul is a person but not a physical person.

First person singular psychological ascriptions are made true by the soul, whether this is recognised by the ascriber or in the semantics of the ascription. The soul makes the first person singular perspective possible. The phenomenology of the soul describes the soul as it is.

There is not just an epistemological asymmetry between first and third person perspectives of the person but an ontological asymmetry. The soul is an intrinsically first person singular reality.

Because the soul *qua* soul is pure awareness there cannot be a theory of the soul in any ordinary, that is, third-person scientific sense.

Our ordinary conventional understanding of ourselves is not so much false as radically incomplete. It is acceptable to talk of a human being doing one thing or another as a matter of practical convenience from a third person perspective, but only subject to the qualification that ultimately we are changeless. The disclosure of being is not ultimately halted by opinion. It is a delusion useful for 'practical purposes' that you are only an-other.

Next to no understanding of the soul may be obtained from a third person point of view, which construes its subject matter as only other and as only entity-like. The soul is other than other and not an entity.

self other

No-one has ever seen anyone else, although empirically false, is metaphysically true. To really understand the other one has to bear in mind that they are a soul. Their presence to you is the presence of their soul.

science

Science assimilates two kinds of objectivity that need to be separated. In an uncontroversial epistemological sense, 'objective' means 'true' or 'the case', with the connotation: 'irrespective of any belief or perspective'. In a more controversial ontological sense, 'objective' means 'other' or 'not to do with me' or 'over there'.

Science conceives everything as objective in this second sense, as *other*, so the soul systematically escapes detection by science. For science to admit the existence of the soul would create the greatest scientific revolution so far: a synthesis of science and theology, a synthesis that is ideologically and methodologically difficult for science, one which it has hardly begun to admit. The third person perspective that emerged with science, and as essential to it since the Renaissance, requires the suspension of religion.

science

'I am a soul' is consistent with science but not entailed by the science we have at this early point in its history. Naturalism includes no knowledge of the soul it presupposes.

science

Science is made possible by the life-world which is the world of the soul's pre-scientific inner region.

science

There is no science of the soul. To admit the existence and reality of the soul would change science well beyond the point we could still call it 'science'. An important task for human knowledge is the integration of knowledge of the soul with science. The soul is the infinite emptiness in which causation happens. The world appears in the soul, the infinite lens. The soul guarantees a critique of pure naturalism because the soul is supernatural. Phenomenology can offer this supernaturalism because truly pure phenomenology is phenomenological theology.

science

There can be no science of the soul. Science depends upon replicating experiments. The investigation into the soul cannot be replicated over a plurality of souls. The soul cannot be reproduced or cloned because it is logically impossible that there should exist more than one qualitatively distinct soul. Science construes all its subject matter as wholly other. Soul is essentially self. Science only entails the existence of the physical. The soul is wholly immaterial.

The exercise of the applied sciences (□□ • × // ▲ □□ ● • ☺ ✓ • □ // • ? ▲ • ☺ ✓ •) however 'useful', is in the opposite direction to the soul. Although to scientific thought theology seems an outrageous and nonsensical set of postulates, outmoded superstition motivated by fear and wishfulfilment, in fact, the truths of science depend upon the truths of theology. Theology makes naturalism possible. The truths of science can only be true because the truths of theology are true. A human being can only be you because you are a soul. The phenomenology of the soul turns the tables on naturalism. The phenomenology of the soul grounds the natural in the super-natural, the scientific in the theological. The sentences of fundamental phenomenology are made true by the existence and nature of God and the soul.

Naturalism has no strategy for approaching the soul. Naturalism is looking in the opposite direction to the soul.

Science operates at several removes from reality. Science is the mathematical ideology of technology and takes us away from the souls that we are. The epoche shows the separation of consciousness from nature. The natural sciences have never provided the least information about consciousness.

Is Physics Fundamental? Physics is not fundamental. Theology is fundamental. The study of the soul needs to be freed from psychologism. Psychologism is appropriate to the mind. To study the

soul we need to do theology and study the findings of the world's great mystics.

III

Are you out of your mind?

consciousness

Con-scio-us-ness is *knowing-with*, not because of the truth that it is conditioned by the human world, but because the soul 'accompanies' the human being. You pervade this human being for the duration of your life's journey.

The soul is *rig-pa*, pure consciousness. The soul is equal or uniform throughout, original nature, which provides *this human being* with a life *qua* someone. The soul is the aim or *teleology* of the human being and what it is for the human to be whole, $\triangle \square \subset \square // \bullet$, to 'really be someone' (an achievement). Here, (as *Hiersein*) what is achieved, is (the disclosure of) what was the case already.

It is time to give up talking about consciousness and resume talking about the soul. Thinking about consciousness has replaced the soul over the last few hundred years. The absurdly contradictory attempts to 'reduce' consciousness to matter have failed. The 'inflation' of consciousness to the soul is the way of truth.

The soul is consciousness but, in a sense, belongs to the unconscious because typically in being conscious there is not consciousness of consciousness. In perceiving objects I am typically unaware of the totality of my experience at a moment or the phenomenological space in which they are occurring. In consciousness there is not consciousness of consciousness even though the soul is a consciousness that is transparent to itself. This consciousness of itself is the light or the opening or the space in which experience occurs. If a room is full of light then physically there is a light source but it is not necessary to appreciate the existence of the light source to see that the room is illuminated. The soul is light. The soul is not a light source within itself, the soul is pure light itself. The soul is not physical light but the pure light of consciousness. It is by being pure light that the soul is consciousness of itself. It is by being pure light that the soul does not arch back onto itself to be aware of itself. It is by being pure light that the soul contains no subject-object dualism as part of its own nature. It is the true subject but

we have to give up talking about sub-ject at this fundamental level. It is the light space in which subject-object dualism obtains but in itself it belongs to neither. In appreciating empirical (physical) light we are not typically aware of the light source. We can see that it is daylight without having to glimpse the sun. The light of the soul is pervasive. The light of the soul is a kind of no-thing-ness. By being that light you are what is usually called 'conscious of it' but, at the level of the soul, there are not three things, you, your consciousness and the soul, but only one: pure interiority which entails consciousness of itself. Rather as, if something is already a secondary quality it is redundant to talk of the sensing of it, in the case of the soul, the soul is its own pure disclosure.

An experience is not a conscious experience because of some meta experience or of it, some consciousness of consciousness in being conscious. This is possible, but it is not what an experience being conscious consists in. An experience being conscious consists in its being an experience. That is its happening in a soul. An experience turned inwards is in-experience, but there is no inner testing, no perception. Conscious experience is therefore not a kind of consciousness, not a knowing-with, not an awareness that accompanies the experience in the having of it. There is an ineliminable consciousness or awareness presupposed in phenomenology and in our self-consciousness. That which ultimately resists elimination is the soul, in theory and in practice. The whole complex of conscious and unconscious states exists in the soul. The soul is the local ground for the possibility of one's own experience. None of this is any kind of idealism, not in the mentalist sense nor in the anti-realist sense. The soul is the constant, experience the variable. The metaphor of a theatre is appropriate to the soul. The soul is a theatre in which the human being performs, a theatre in which experiences pass through. There is a pure or empty field of consciousness. The field of experience exists whether there are experiences or not. The field of experience is not nothing but no-thing-ness. The problem of how pre-reflexive consciousness can be a kind of self-consciousness is unsolved in phenomenology. The solution is that all consciousness is the soul. The soul is pure consciousness so anything passing through it is an object of consciousness and when no experience passes through it the default position is pure self-intimating light.

knowledge

Philosophical questioning leads to the soul. The soul is not a *species* or *type* and is not instantiated because it is not one example of a type. In the soul, type and particular coincide.

The soul may be investigated. The soul is not logically or necessarily hidden. It is also a contingent, and so revisable, fact that there is ignorance of one's own numerical identity with a soul, so although. The soul is contingently hidden, but under layers of conditioning. 'Under' and 'layers' are metaphors which are at once helpful and a hinderance. At first they are helpful. Later they should be thrown away. To lack knowledge of the soul is to be ignorant, $\checkmark \cup \checkmark - \sqcap \bullet ?$. Those who are acquainted with the soul are not $? \parallel \sqcup \parallel \bullet$ in the sense of 'sophists' but $? \parallel \sqcup \parallel \bullet$ in the sense of 'clever'. The transition from is from $\checkmark \cup \checkmark - \sqcap \bullet ?$ to $\blacklozenge \square \times \square \text{)(} \leftarrow \square$

Each soul is essentially the soul that it is and necessarily none of those it is not. This is not just the modal point that anything is numerically distinct from what it is not. It is the metaphysical point that any soul is intrincically qualitatively distinct from any other soul. The *you-ness* of your soul has a different tone from the *me-ness* of my soul, and this has nothing to do with conditioning so the soul has a phenomenological *tone*.
self consciousness

The soul overcomes the difference between rationalism and empiricism because there is metaphysical experience of the soul. It is possible to experience the soul because you are it. It is possible to experience being co-extensive with your soul because you are its interiority. This identity that is not an id-ent-ity is necessary for experience of being a soul. The identity is sufficient because, devoid of contents, the soul is self-intimating. This experience is not subject-object dualistic experience. It is *ex-perience*: beyond or out of empirical testing. There is no arching or over arching of the soul onto itself (even though the soul is $\checkmark \times \sqcap \bullet \textcircled{1}$). The old metaphors of vison and the world are dropped in the apprehension pure interiority by itself. The demonstration of the soul is metaphysical and meta-physical empiricism.

To gain understanding of the soul it is necessary to be brought up sharply with the fact that you exist. Your own existence is a mystery. You have never seen anyone else, only their human-being.
self consciousness

The soul is disclosed to itself in the absence of experience (which, because em-peira, is empirical). The absence of experience

leads to light or to darkness. One kind of cessation of experience leads to unconsciousness, the half consciousness of sleep, or oblivion. The other kind of absence of experience leads to the most full awakening: the clear light of the infinite emptiness of the soul disclosed to itself as it is.

The soul does not engage in cognition but cognition is in the soul. I am my soul. But the soul is not the mind. The soul is not an idea, or set of ideas, but there is an idea of the soul. The idea of the soul, or the thought of the soul, is not the soul. The soul is its own existence. The soul entails that it is.

The ideas of consciousness as a relation between subject and object, including the case where subject and object are the same because the subject is its own object and the object is its own subject, needs to be freed from spatial metaphor derived from sense, especially vision. The *image* of self consciousness is not self consciousness. The thought of self consciousness is not self consciousness. The image of the soul's disclosure to itself is not the soul's disclosure to itself but the sky-like emptiness of the soul is its own, unconditioned, disclosure to itself. There are layers of conditioning that have to be removed for the soul's self-disclosure so it is necessary to notice that you exist and see the asymmetries (of grammatical person) in that. It is necessary to question the self-not self distinction: the ways in which each of us divides what exists into two mutually exclusive and jointly exhaustive categories: the part that you are and the remainder that you are not. Experience of the soul is essentially non-*thetic*. There can be no experience of the purity of the soul without an end to ordinary experience. Nevertheless, the soul can be apprehended in ordinary experience as its background, as the eternal nowness of the now.

Each soul has to conduct its own investigation into itself. The human being is at once the tool of the investigation and an impediment to it. You are your own subject matter.

self consciousness

The soul is its own point of view on itself which is to say we have to give up talking of a point *of view* here. The soul is its own absolute interiority (it entails it).

It is not true that there cannot be an awareness of the soul. The soul is (entails) its own awareness of itself. There is a clear and distinct idea of the soul but this is not a colourful image. It is the image of infinite emptiness. You are much larger than you think. The soul is self evident. Understanding it entails perceiving its reality.

There is experience of the soul. Normally, we are lost in thought. Thinking about it is an obstacle to appreciating that you are it. The soul is being-for-itself. The soul not only bestows consciousness on its contents by being the light in which they are disclosed but the soul is a pre-reflexive consciousness of itself. The soul is utterly self-intimating. The soul is transparency to itself.

The soul is not a state of consciousness, not a thought or an experience. The deconditioned soul is self-manifest. The soul is a consciousness of itself. It entails its own awareness of itself. This cannot be accurately characterised as a subject object relation. The soul is self-intimating. It is a zone of openness in which nothing is hidden from itself. Self-consciousness is not extra to the soul but integral. It is its own transparency. At the level of the soul, being entails being its own awareness. Self-intimation is the mode of being of the soul. Awareness was always the light of the interiority of the soul. That is what empirical awareness was all along, just with empirical contents, perceptions of object, thoughts, images, sensations. Rather as colour is already a secondary quality and so has all ready been 'seen' once described phenomenologically, so the soul's awareness of itself does not exist in addition to the soul, as a contingent appendage.

The soul's awareness of itself is not dispositional and not observational. It is not dispositional because not dis-positional nor positional. It is not observational because it does not observe itself: It is at no distance from itself and it does not serve itself. The soul's awareness of itself is immediate and direct because it is the glow of its own awareness, the light of its own infinite interiority. The reason the soul is self-intimating is that it is what consciousness is. The phenomenology of the self stops inside the soul.

The soul as existing, is there for itself, even when the human being does nothing or does not exist. The soul never *directs itself* to itself. The soul never *turns on itself* in its self-intimating awareness. The soul does not, in any sense engage in inner sense or inner perception. The soul is there for itself without reflection. If the soul's self-disclosure was a kind of self-consciousness then the soul would be divided from itself: as that which is conscious and that which consciousness is of. Because the soul is spiritual space, it does not itself admit of subject object dualism. Self-consciousness presupposes subject-object dualism (even though subject and object are identical in this case), so the soul's knowledge of itself is not a kind of self-consciousness.

Inner sense or introspection that is conscious is only conscious because it takes place in the illuminated inner space of the soul. The consciousness of the human being is 'borrowed' from the soul. In a truncated sense, there could be mental events in a human being who operated anonymously, that is, without a soul. These events could be neurological, syntactical in the sense of being formally ordered, semantic in admitting of truth or falsity, and, in a dispositional sense, image-like. (The actualisation of the image-disposition as an image requires the soul.)

These truncated mental events would not occur in any phenomenological interiority, would not be private, would not occur in any now or metaphysical here of inner space. Talk of consciousness should be replaced, on the one hand, by talk of experience, thought, and their properties and, on the other hand, by talk of the soul: the here of inner space, the light of the soul, prior to inner sense or inner perception.

The soul does not engage in reflection. The soul is *illuminato* because *lumen* but never *ill*. The self is (entails) its own self-disclosure. It is the light or the space in which light or space is disclosed to itself. The soul is its own self-disclosure. The soul is consciousness of itself in the way that water is wet or the sky distant or light light. My life is lived through my soul.

To be properly self-conscious is to be aware of an extra metaphysical and immaterial being which is not identical with the human being with whom you ordinarily identify yourself.

'expanded' consciousness is possible and happens. The meta-awareness is not overarching or directed towards the object and the consciousness of it. It is the subjective site of the disclosure of act and object.

The human being's knowledge of his or her own psychological and behavioural dispositions depends upon inner psychological awareness of the stream of mental events and sensations irrespective of their objects. All these are levels of self-consciousness of the human being by the human being. None of these is yet self-consciousness in the sense of consciousness of the self.

Consciousness of the self is consciousness of the soul. Consciousness of the soul requires either *cessation* of the course of ordinary experience or the apprehension of the soul *in* the ordinary. Both are possible. Phenomenalism being true is closely like what it would be like to be dead. All the experiences are there, intact as in life, but the physical world has disappeared.

The apprehension of the soul in the ordinary requires *seeing through* one's own experience (in both senses) and not(ic)ing that: it is one's own, it is always now, it takes place in an unbo(u)nded existential inner here, it is suffused with me-ness. This constant or unchanging no-thing-ness in which all experience happens is then disclosed as such. Consciousness of this is true self consciousness or consciousness of the self.

content

Thought is experience at a distance. Perception is thought which touches its object.

A flux ontology provides an accurate description of the human condition devoid of own-ness but misses your abiding nature.

The soul is not mundane. Desires distort spiritual understanding by logically implying a commitment to past and future, but, if attention is 'paid' to the given, as opposed to what is assumed to exist, it is existentially clear that there *is* no past no future. There *is* the constantly changing present *content*, constituted by protention and retention. The presence of this content is not itself constituted so, if change ceases, the present remains. The present *qua* presence is pure presence.

Although all empirical things are in a constant state of flux, not everything is in a state of flux. You are fundamentally unchanging. There is something about you which has never changed. Thoughts and emotions, bodily cells and structures are transient. A physical object is a slow event. You, how-ever, are abiding *ab-id-ing*. A human being is a temporary phenomenon. The zone of absolute interiority that you are is an unchanging and abiding self which reveals the sense of 'I' or 'me' the, no-thing-ness where body and mind take *place*. This expresses in essence the reality of the self. It is self evident that you are a soul once the soul is revealed by de-conditioning. It is then a principle that you are a soul, a principle that may be deployed to do theology.

The soul-teaching of *atman*, not *anātman* entails that the permanent abiding self is the reality of your own existence now, is not a thing or an ent/it/y. *Die Seele* is *der Kern*. The body is a thing, even though it appears to itself as a body-subject because of the presence of the soul through it. Identifying oneself with one's body or mind or both is one of the root causes of human suffering. It is a mis-take to take one(?s)self to be *identical* with *this human being*. The emotional, social and political consequence of this misidentification is suffering.

How-ever, you are not content with content because you are space. The soul is extremely subtle. You are the opposite of a physical object. Your relation to your body is like this: One of the physical objects is outside-in. You do not quite co-incide with your body. You overlap your body. You ex-ceed your body.

The impermanence of the body and the mind is the opposite of the permanence of the soul. The impermanence of mind and body are psychologically transferred to the soul by us. This transference is caused by third person thinking. Belief in the soul is replaced by knowledge of the soul when there is direct experience of the soul. The soul unifies the mind and the body as the living human being. *Jeevatma* is not *paramatma* but caused by *Paramatman*.

We mistake physical processes for permanent objects. The real permanence is your own existence, but this is wrongly regarded as temporary. When you fear the death of your body you should transfer this feeling onto the objects you would like to possess: none of them will last forever. The 'permanent' is really transient, the 'transient' really permanent.

The soul is the context of experience. The human, the experiential and the existential, is projected into the future but the soul is now-ness, eternal unchanging presence, so it being is not *being-towards-death*. All perspective on the world is human so the soul is not pointing at anything, at least no-thing earthly.

The soul has no parts because only whole so there is no possibility of a mereology of the soul. The soul has no syntax or structure but it is nonetheless the infinite site of unlimited meaning. The nature of the soul is sky-like. There are interrelations of experiences, and between souls, but not of experiences and souls.

The soul tells us nothing about the *content* of the world in the sense that there happen to be certain objects in it rather than others. The truth of the soul is $\checkmark \subset \bullet - \sqcap \bullet \checkmark$.

The same object but not the same event may reappear within the soul. Because you pervade the world, the contents of the soul are not mere thoughts, $\aleph \bullet \subset \checkmark \bullet \sqcap \bullet \bullet \parallel \bullet \checkmark \bullet$, but physical objects. The soul *qua* soul has no content. The soul is beyond form and content. It is but there is no-thing that it is. The might of the soul is the possibility of experience. The soul is, how-ever the world is.

Ordinarily, I am not directly acquainted with the soul, only its contents. *Nirvana* is the obtaining of the soul *qua* soul without its contents. It is not this, not that, beyond being, not being and becoming. It is that emptiness which I call no-thing-ness: not nothing,

but not a thing either. The soul is like air: it is invisible but you cannot live without it. Where are you? You are everywhere. The human being cannot at the same time perform actions, have perceptual experience and at the same time be acquainted with the emptiness of the soul. However, once noticed, or realised, it is perfectly possible to be aware of the soul in one's everyday life, not as another item to be met with in experience but as the fundamental structure of one's experience; the space where it all happens.

The soul does not presuppose the existence of any thought, experience or object. What people call the 'stream of consciousness' flows through the soul. The soul provides the banks of the stream of consciousness except the soul is really like an infinite flood plain. If you think you have found the boundaries of the stream of consciousness you do not realise that there is a flood plain, a plain that itself has no banks, no boundaries.

A de-monstration of the soul is possible; a showing of the soul away from its contents. The contents of the soul detract from its purity. The soul is identical not identical. The soul is entirely clear. Anything empirical is admissible to the soul.

Experience fits in the soul. The soul is not content but is content. The soul is beyond form and content but is a zone of spiritual fulfillment. The contentment of the soul is the absence of its empirical content. Its being content is its not being content.

Events perpetually flow through the soul in the course of ordinary experience. In uncovering the ground of this flow we do not discover another flow.

The given coincides with being that which is given. There is a clue there, or a phenomenological ground, for the truth that the soul *is*, other things are perceived to be, thought to be, believed to be. If phenomenologically one pays attention to exactly what is given, that is the content of the soul. What is given just as it is given now is given in the total space of the soul. The soul is *totalising* in that it includes the totality of one's own experience. This totalising is now and here. All anyone's experience happens now and here. There is an empirical *Zeitgeist* and a metaphysical *Zeitgeist*. The empirical *Zeitgeist* is an ideology. The metaphysical *Zeitgeist* is the soul.

The soul is not abstract. But empirical content, partly being in the world, is an abstraction from the soul. Objects are only what we perceive of them, and the contents of those perceptions depend on you

The soul is a universe.

Awareness of one's body dissolves into the quasi-phenomenalism of kinaesthetic sensation. That in turn is a content of the soul field. In this way, the body disappears: from physical to phenomenism's truth, or *nirvana* to the emptiness of the soul.

Empirical particulars are with-in the particular that is the soul. The soul is obvious but not salient unless something can be salient against no background, as all one is aware of. Normally (in conditioned existence) the content of the soul is salient, the soul is background. A *Gestalt* switch is necessary to make the soul foreground and experience background, Now is foreground and fleeting experiences background, the Here foreground and the world background. The soul is the lens. *Dasein* is *Hiersein*.

There is no 'in' the mind. There is only 'in' the soul as far as mental events are concerned. Whatever is present in the soul is a phenomenon.

The soul allows the living of experiences as one's own.

The soul is a metaphysical self, extra to the human being, but not an extra *object* because the soul is not an object. The soul is not behind experience or an accompaniment to experience. The soul is where experience happens. Your soul is not hidden behind you. Your soul is much closer to you than it would seem. The soul is a pure self that exists independently of the stream of experiences although to speak of the stream of consciousness is to implicitly invoke the soul.

Experiences are chronologically ordered components of experience within the soul: mutually related contents. The soul qua soul has no components so *a fortiori* no temporal components. Although intrinsically not chronological, it is not intrinsically a-temporal because an eternal nowness.

experience

The soul and the mind can come apart, so it is a mistake to assimilate them: The soul has spiritual states, the mind mental states. In a living human being who is someone the soul has a mental mode which hides it but phenomenological description reveals the ontological dependencies: The soul is not, one-sided or many sided because the soul has no *Abschattungen*. The soul depends upon nothing empirical. Some human being's being 'you' is existentially dependent on the soul. One experience is a member of someone's experiences by happening in the same soul. Experiences are soul-events in that a particular experience being an experience depends

upon its passage through the soul. Now is when any experience happens. Now is the time it is in the soul. Any event's being an experience depends upon its happening in the subjective space of the soul. Otherwise the event would not be anything to anyone and therefore not an experience. The soul turns events into experiences. Any experience happening depends upon its happening at the time it is in the soul. The soul as it is is *suchness* and *bodhi*. (San.), *dharma nature, prajna, nirvana*. The soul is the immutable and eternal nature of your own being but *this human being* is a constellation of psycho-physical processes. The soul needs clarification, existential clarification. The mind hides the soul. The living human being is *seelenvoll*.

The ex of ex-perience is a dis-traction from the soul. The test or proof of the *peiria* of ex-perience is a confrontation with the world, with psycho-physical creation.

The soul does not face this way or that like a human being does but is what your present existence essentially consists in. The soul is concerned in the world. My soul is essentially me. The world is the con-text of the soul but not its context. The soul is sensitive, subtle, refined.

kknowledge

What people call 'the soul' is the soul. This does not mean that the soul can be anything, although it is ontologically evasive to the conditioned mind. It means reference is secured when a metaphysical word is used. Metaphysical terms cannot fail of reference no matter how partially their sense are construed or misconstrued. If someone uses 'soul' or 'here' or 'I' they refer to the soul. If someone says 'now' they refer to the presence of God. They do this *in knowledge or in ignorance*. Indexical terms are spiritual terms. The reference of indexical terms is secured by the metaphysical use, not by the imperfect empirical epistemologies of their users. The term 'soul' might vary in sense culturally or individually but this does not preclude the identification of the soul though its metaphysical aspects or spiritual roles.

There does appear a series of levels of reality, even empirically. The soul is *one-level-up* from the empirical world. If you only ever operate on one level there is no reason why one should know there are other levels. There is no con-sensus about the soul except amongst those who have knowledge of the soul. They do not disagree. The nature of soul is super-nature.

How-ever the soul is it ever is. The soul does appear to the soul, once cleansed, in a way that is truth entailing. Teachings about the soul are based on knowledge of the soul. The soul is interpreted but knowledge of it is unconditioned. It is false that there is no-soul but the soul is hard to grasp for the conditioned mind. 'Grasping' is the wrong metaphor. Only one thing amongst others can be grasped, physically or intellectually. The expansive openness of the soul is not a thing so it cannot be grasped, but it can be described phenomenologically in its *no-thing-ness*.

The soul seems esoteric but there is nothing you are better acquainted with because the soul is innate and ever present. The no-thing-ness of the soul is subtle. Even though there is no mechanics of the soul, the soul can function meta-physically as a mind without a body. The soul is just (immediately) behind the eyes but not just (only) behind the eyes. Your original nature is not just sea-like but see-like. In earthly life, your individual self, original nature, is incarnate even though devoid of components; and nothing was put together to make it. If you undergo an experience your soul undergoes that experience.

The soul is not physical but intelligible (● // • ▲ // ● not Newton). In moments or periods of sufficient de-conditioned awareness it is possible to discern the soul as a revelation.

Your original nature is irreducible to anything else. The soul has absolute clarity. The soul engages in earthly knowing using the psycho-physical human being. The soul engages in spiritual knowing by tuning away from the senses. The differences between body mind and spirit are differences of kind, not differences of degree. The compatibility of these substances in their interaction is your existence as a human being. You are the psycho-physical spiritual nexus. You are the unity of oppositions.

No third-person observation or experiment can disclose the soul. The soul is not introspected as one item amongst others but as where introspection happens. There is a psychology of the soul, not an empirical psychology, based on exteriority, but a metaphysical phenomenological psychology. Phenomenological psychology is continuous with introspection, mysticism and theology. The soul, mentor of the mind, allows mentality. There is no earlier or later of the soul, only now. The contents of the soul admit of earlier and later.

The soul does not have to be only an object of speculation because it stands in causal relations to the body and the mind. If *you* cause something to happen your soul causes it to happen. Physical objects acquired or manipulated in earthly life are not essential to our nature. We seek permanence in the impermanent and see only impermanence in the permanent. The secular view is the reverse of the truth. We need to see(k) permanence in the permanence of the *See(le)*. My identity is neither 'id' nor 'ens'. The soul is appropriate or proper because the immortal essence of the human being. The soul is the (sea)t, area, locus or space of human will, understanding, and personality. Any soul is logically distinct from any individual human body or mind and therefore logically distinct from any human being, including *this* human being from whom you view the world. The soul is what a person is in so far as a person *is* someone so your soul is what you are in so far as a human being is you. An anonymous person is a person with no soul.

It is not necessary to only believe in the soul if you have knowledge of it. That a permanent self does not exist is a mistake of modern secularism. Belief in the soul might foster the preconception that aids its disclosure. Or, belief in the soul might foster the conclusion that that preconception is 'read into' experience, so that we find what we have cognitively put there.

Even though different people attach widely differing significance to their perceptions, acquaintance with the soul is so psychologically compelling as to render it difficult to disbelieve in the soul. Acquaintance with permanence is of a qualitatively distinct ontological order from acquaintance with the transient.

Soul-understanding does not consist only in thinking this thought rather than that, having this idea rather than that but requires noticing that your experience as a constant structure. Experiences come and go, colours, sounds, shapes, smells, images, flit in and out of the experiential *field* that you are that field. Your soul is not present to you like a thing even though it is present to you because you are the subjective zone where your experiences happen. Your body walks about inside your own soul.

knowledge

You have no need to *look for* your soul because in a sense you have never come across anything else. It is already you. The soul cannot be grasped from the impersonal standpoint of science. The soul is more personal than the empirically personal, more intimate than the empirically intimate because infinitely personal and infinite.

Your soul cannot be grasped by generalization because it is more particular than the particular because infinitely particular and necessarily what it is: The soul is infinitely inside itself, the inside of infinity, infinity inside itself, infinite inwardness. Being and experience have to co-incide (co-inside), coincide and *incide*, (*inside*), for you to realize (in both senses) that you are your soul. (The inside is not a side.) Ordinary experience focuses on one content then another (hence its dis-content.). Spiritual experience is of the field of pure space against which content (which is an event) takes place, hence it is content (happy) without content (*Inhalt*). Background be-comes foreground.

kknowledge

There may obtain propositional knowledge of the soul without recognition of it *as* one's own interiority which which one has perpetual direct acquaintance (without perspective). Conditioned introspection only detects one experience or another and fails to apprehend the inner space in which they happen. The soul as a theatre (like a theatre of war, with no definite boundaries) makes spatial metaphor in the philosophy of mind applicable. The soul has a kind of spiritual or subjective spatiality which allows spatial thinking about thinking.

The soul is the zone of truth. The soul can be known by intuition, if this means: I know I am my soul but do not know how I know. My being it is necessary for my knowing that I am it.

kknowledge

The soul is at once the most familiar and the least familiar reality of your own experience. In a sense there is nothing more familiar, nothing more proximal than the you-ness of you, the space in which your experiences happen, its being now at any time you have ever experienced. In a way, no facts could be more obvious to you. No facts could be more directly and obviously presented to you than these phenomenological facts.

Yet, the soul has been forgotten by philosophy. Despite it being what you are from moment to moment, it is obfuscated by content and left for that part of us that is being-in-the-world. Although the soul is in a sense the most obvious and compelling reality, it is hard to characterise because it is no-thing-ness.

A transition is necessary from scepticism about the soul to belief in the soul to knowledge of the soul. There is knowledge of the soul by acquaintance. If there is knowledge of the soul by acquaintance there is not necessarily propositional knowledge of the soul's existence or

essence. It is possible to be directly acquainted with the soul qua soul and not realise that that is what one is acquainted with. A paradigm case of this is *nirvana* where there is acquaintance with emptiness but it is missed that this is the soul.

Knowledge of the soul is the opposite of pragmatism. Pragmatism sacrifices truth to utility. Knowledge of the soul sacrifices utility to truth. Pragmatism is an obstacle to understanding the soul. In pragmatism we are always underway towards some future goal. The disclosure of the soul requires the absolute stillness in the eternal now.

The soul is an opening that is never properly speaking closed but only filled. There is an ascent to the soul but also a descent and an expansion into every direction away from the centre point of your being.

The soul is immediate. The soul is given. The soul is known without inference. The soul is pre-given.

The soul is not an extravagant extra postulate but an ineliminable presupposition. The soul is not an esoteric hiddenness but very familiar. The soul is *too familiar* to be grasped by conditioned thinking; too near to be perceived, too proximal to be grasped. The soul is infinitely proximal. It is just not familiar as the soul.

self

The permanent personal self is your *original nature*. The self is hyper-personal, infinitely proximal to you. You are it. It is infinitely you, not contingently you. The meaning of the soul as *Seele*, *See*, sea is being spiritual ocean of infinite nothingness.

concept

It is hard to have a concept of the soul if a concept is a capacity to re-identify members of a class, because there is only one soul with which you are directly acquainted, but a concept cannot be that because we have concepts of unique things.

Also, being able to identify and re-identify *x*'s presupposes possession of the concept of *x* so is not to be explained in terms of it. (This entailment does not show that the ability to discriminate is constitutive of the concept. [?]) Concept possession as the capacity to discriminate putatively epistemologically privileges spatio-temporal criteria of individuation. These are redundant in the case of the soul. Possessing the concept of the soul is analogous to possessing the concept of *the number one*. Both are non-physical unique substances.

In some ways, the soul is like *the number zero*: It exists but *per se* is empty of content.

ssynthetic a priori

The soul is a separable immortal essence. It is not a linguistic matter that you are a soul but a metaphysical discovery. There is a history of the modal status of anything we are acquainted with. 'Water is H₂O' moved through 'meaningless', 'necessarily false', 'contingently false' and 'contingently true', to 'necessarily true' (first *a priori* then and *de dicto* then *a posteriori* and *de re*.) 'I am a soul' might well have the same future history.

ssubstance

Rather as a physical substance has been regarded as the subject of physical properties, the soul is the immaterial substance and subject of spiritual properties. Although the mind or whole human being has sensations and thoughts, desires and beliefs, and performs intentional actions, someone does these things in so far as they pervade that human being. The soul is spirit, 'spiritus', 'prana', 'breath', 'RuaCH', 'wind'; making a person who is animated by the spirit of God into a living being rather than just a computational machine. (Computers are soulless.) The soul is conceptually connected to breath because breathing is causally necessary and sufficient for the biological life of the human being and the soul is necessary for life in the sense of someone's life: your life, my life. Biological life in the human predates breathing, which begins at birth. Biological life in the human ends shortly after breathing ends. With biological death, the death of the body and those psycho-physical states which depend upon it, the soul and the human being are parted. There is thus a close association of breath and soul. Both breath and the soul are invisible. You are your soul. Therefore you are invisible. You are invisible in the way that the space behind your eyes is invisible, or space is invisible.

subject object

The ordinary subject-object distinction that constitutes the human being you are closely associated with and, on the other hand, the world of moving physical objects with which you are ordinarily confronted, a world that is 'in front' of you is dissolved within the soul. This entire opposition or *difference* of subjective psycho-physical body and objective world-over-there is enacted within your soul (and every embodied being's soul) so once apprehended as a

constellation of psycho-physical events within the soul, subject object dualism need not be assumed to be primordial.

Being and No-thing-ness

IV

iindexicality

The soul is an *indexical being*. Indexical language has a profound, true and ordinarily secret reference to the soul. The soul gives metaphysical sense to indexical language and makes possible indexical thought.

‘I am here now.’

is ambiguous between expressing an empirical proposition which fluctuates in truth value and an essentialist metaphysical proposition which takes the truth value ‘true’ so long as the referent of ‘I’ exists. Construed empirically, the proposition is true or false as the value of ‘here’ and ‘now’ changes. Construed metaphysically (although this seems preposterous to the conditioned mind) the proposition is an identity statement. There is an unchanging and metaphysical *here and now* which is ontologically distinct from empirically fluctuating times and places: the *now-here*. The now-here is nowhere empirical but it is not nowhere. The indexical view is *the view from now-here*. The *now-here* is a kind of *no-thing-ness* that is not nothingness for whose detection it is necessary to notice the respect in which it is *always now* and *always here*: Now is the time it is whatever the empirical time or clock time. Here is where you are wherever you are. These facts are not to be explained by the empirical truth that, so long as you exist you always exist at some time or another and so long as you exist, in an embodied state, you exist in some place or other. Although truths, they do not explain why any time when you are is now or any place where you are is here. Nor do they explain why the time that you are is now and the place here: Anyone can truly say that they are here now but you are not just anyone.

‘I’ is the primitive indexical and ‘now’ and ‘here’ depend upon it. In ‘I am here now’ we can anonymously vary the referents of ‘I’,

'here' and 'now'. At a metaphysical level, 'I am here now' is true of anyone but each is distinguished from the other by the qualitative difference of the referent of each use of 'I'. The now-here of the self is numerically distinct from every other but the singularity of one interiority being one's own is a fusion of qualitative and numerical difference. In your own existence, existentialism and metaphysics coincide.

The soul is a singularity, essentially unique and the one that it is. The soul makes indexical meaning possible. A computer, which is intelligent but soulless, can use language to refer to itself, to where it is, to when it is. In indexical thought the soul is (amongst) its own secret propositional content.

'I am' refers to the soul. 'I am here' refers to the soul. 'I exist now' refers to the soul. Extra information is added by the use of 'I am', not already included in 'this person is...' uttered by one person successfully referring to him or herself. The extra information is spiritual information. 'I', 'am', 'now' and 'here' each has a secret reference to the soul. There is an indexical entity. The indexical entity is the soul. Indexicality does not just pertain to linguistic expressions but the hidden subject and object of those expressions. The soul is the user and the referent of an indexical expression. The soul determines the referent of an indexical subjectively and objectively by being its secret subject and object. Indexical experiences refer to their object uniquely. If I use 'I' and you use 'I', on a public level, the first person singular pronoun has the same sense in both uses: 'I' is a word each person uses to refer only to him or herself.

It is not right that reference is guaranteed, so not right on that ground that 'I' is not a referring expression. If some of us intertwine hands, as children do, and someone says 'I am the one whose finger looks as though it is pointing at the door' there is room for error. 'I' is only *a* word each person uses only to refer to him or herself because there are others: 'me', 'myself', 'my', 'mine'. On a private and metaphysical level 'I' has a different meaning it is (successfully) used to refer and this difference in meaning is not wholly explicable by the shift in reference even though the meaning does shift with the reference. When I use 'I' I refer to the me-ness of me. When you use 'I' you refer to the me-ness of you. Our own-nesses are qualitatively distinct, not just numerically distinct. The soul is an indexical being. If you and I both say 'I am here' at one level our utterances mean the same. Metaphysically they differ in meaning. Thoughts, even of remote things, do not exceed the space of the soul. The soul is

essentially an indexical being because it is I, here and now. It has these properties essentially in the sense that it could not be a soul if it lacked any of these three existential and metaphysical characteristics. All experiences are in the last resort indexical because they happen in the here and now and are in principle reportable by sentences of first person singular grammatical form. The soul has a spiritual horizon in which indexical and non-indexical experiences occur. The soul as an indexical being is the subject of experiences. The soul can only be understood through internalism about indexical content and meaning. Indexicality is part of the soul's essence.

The soul is an essentially indexical being in relation to the world. The soul makes indexicality possible. The soul is ontologically indexical. Whenever, 'I', 'here' and 'now' are used, these are marks of the soul. There is a truth here in the ordinary phenomenological claim that in perceiving something a perceiving subject is always tacitly presupposed. This is here now is not just the claim that thinking of something is thinking of it as it would appear if you were perceiving it, but that might be by and large true (for example of physical objects). It is the claim that the soul is the lens by which the universe is given.

The essence of the soul is: me-ness, nowness, hereness and absolute interiority. These four cannot come apart. The nowness is the nowness of here. The here is the here of interiority. The interiority is your interiority, the interiority of youness. The soul is spiritual space-time.

Indexicality

If I say 'I' a secret metaphysical self-reference is made to the soul. It is not wrong that that psycho-physical whole that I 'am' is the being that acts or takes decisions but it only acts *qua me* if pervaded by the soul. If the soul acts alone, it acts spiritually, not mentally or physically. The human being is the soul's *psycho-physical equipment* for functioning in the physical world. The human being is *equipe, team*, in many senses: an empirical plurality of psycho-physical processes in functional reciprocity, an ontological unity of parts. Its unruly, physical and mental attractions pull it in incompatible directions. It is teleological. The human being is teaming with life. The unity of the team is the soul.

ii am

I am my soul means that that being that I am is not a human being but an immaterial substance. 'am' denotes the peculiar mode or

style of being that pertains uniquely to spiritual being. 'a' picks out the individuality of the soul. You are one soul amongst others and unique in being the soul you are. 'my' denotes the suffusion of interiority by you-ness. 'soul' refers to the interior now-space that is your own existence.

The I exceeds the sequence of acts of consciousness it owns. It is the phenomenological space of their possibility.

There is a Ghost in the machine. The myth of the Ghost in the Machine is true. All that is wrong with it is 'in'. I am not inside myself.

The soul is immune to misidentification by itself in its deconditioned state. The soul can be misconstrued by the human being, that is to say, by the soul in its embodied and enminded state. 'Embodied' is not adequate because the soul is enhumaned.

'I am is incorrigible' because it cannot be produced without the existence of the producer. 'I am thinking' is not incorrigible because it can be produced without thinking.

solipsism

The soul makes solipsism thinkable. The doctrine that only I exist, or only my mind exists, can be formulated only if someone is someone, for example if a human being is someone, if there is a centering of the self or subjective space. Then other people are presented as outsides or physical exteriorities. This asymmetry between first and third person perspectives on the person makes solipsism thinkable. The soul makes possible the first person singular perspective.

There could be a solipsistic soul. The soul is given to itself as though solipsism is true: the infinite interiority of a spiritual space. It is pure inwardness, pure presence in both the temporal and the spatial sense of 'present'. The content of the soul does not appear to any other soul. Token soul contents are logically private events, even though any soul content could in principle have been the content of a distinct soul.

One human being can bracket the existence of another by phenomenological $\Gamma \ // \ // \ \Gamma \bullet$ because each soul is given as though it is the only one there is.

Methodological Solipsism is the method of the phenomenology of the soul. It is me-t-hodo-logical solipsism. It is a kind of solipsism that goes to the kernale of the me. Scruinising the interiority of

consciousness for every possible time and found nothing there. This nothing is no-thing-ness.

To do phenomenology of the soul proceed as though solipsism were true.. There is a subjective field of your own awareness and only this can with certainty be known to exist. This field of phenomenological awareness is a substance. It depends upon nothing external, nothing in front of it (externalism) or below it (foundationalism).

To understand how the truth (✓ ◡ • - ▮ • ✓) of the soul *makes itself manifest* is necessary to have felt the plausibility of solipsism, if not to be terrified of its possibility. There are, indeed, things that cannot be put into words. They make themselves manifest. ✓ ◡ • - ▮ • ✓ exceeds what is not ineffable. The truth that there is in solipsism exists because the soul is a substance: The soul is given as though it could be all there is because it is a substance. Being on the way to the soul, which is to say, on the way to God. It is this aesthetic or quasi-religious dimension to persons' experience which makes itself manifest in metaphysics. It belongs to philosophy because it is one role of philosophy to express the ineffable, to make the unmanifest manifest.

simplicity

You are necessarily one, even though your brain might be bisected and even your consciousness might be bisected and your mind might be divided. It is phenomenologically and logically impossible for you to be divided in an analogous way. Of body, mind and spirit, the body is physically divisible, the mind is mentally divisible but spirit is in principle indivisible. You are in principle indivisible. Although the soul has properties, the soul has no parts. Whatever has no parts cannot be divided so the soul cannot be divided. You are your soul, so you cannot be divided. You could in principle have two bodies or two minds or be inhabited by two human beings, each of whom 'is' you. This would not be metaphysically distinct from having two arms or two hand or touching your two hands to one another, only physically distinct. Suppose, for example, you met yourself in time travel. It would be yourself whom you met but, equally, it would be you who visited. You are both visitor and visited. What would this experience be like? One is tempted to privilege one you over the other, regarding one as only object and the other as only subject, but they are both you. What is thereby true of them? Many things, at least: you look out of both pairs of eyes not just one. You see both of the people who you are, not just one. One soul views the world from two human beings. The visual field would be

like the inside of a sphere. In the spherical interiority the exteriors of both human beings are visible. You could be two human beings but you can only be one soul. If there are two souls, at most one of them is you. There are souls and they form a species 'soul'. All the souls have it in common to be numerically and qualitatively unique. Each soul possesses a property every other soul lacks. So no soul is any other soul.

Thinking in generalities is an obstacle to perceiving the subjective uniqueness, the existential lived reality of your own existence: 'I am', 'I am here' and 'I am now', as identity statements.

The empirical world is in question. The space-time world generates philosophical questions because human beings have finite minds. The empirical world is not all there is.

The human being is a window onto space-time: The soul is a portal to God. The senses allow information about the contents of space time. They are obstacles to knowing the soul. The senses are facing in the wrong direction to apprehend the soul. Understanding the soul as soul requires suspending the senses and quietening the mind. Without this, there is little real likelihood of knowing the soul exists. Because the soul is an indexical being it cannot be apprehended directly by the conditioned human being inhabiting it.

Mystical experience is experience of the soul. 'Mysticism' is a misnomer. It should be 'claritism' or 'clearism' or 'clarifism' because mystical knowledge is the clearest knowledge. Mystical knowledge is disclosure or revelation. Knowledge by acquaintance of the soul does not distance the soul from itself or divide the soul into subject and object. The soul is its own revelation. When thinking and experience fall away the soul's self-disclosure remains as pure awareness.

unity

The soul is necessarily a unit. The soul is self-realisation. The soul is where anything is real, actual, present. Re-presentation (because presentation and so presence) is in the soul. Within the soul, any experience can be disclosed as non-intentional. The bare givenness of the experience is there once its connection to the outside world is dissolved. In themselves, experiences are not (necessarily or contingently) directed at anything because the soul is objectless and in itself is empty: If the world falls away, the soul remains. Thoughts arise and subside in the soul-space irrespective of whether they have a corresponding object. An object is at some distance from the human but present within the soul. The soul is pre-positional. It is where

experiences have absolute positions, positions they do not have just in relation to one another. The soul is silent but not ineffable. Some sentences are made true or false by the soul so knowledge of the soul can be expressed in language.

ppossible worlds

The set of souls is a set of possible worlds each of which is actual at itself. All actuality is bestowed by the soul. The soul is necessary and sufficient for actuality. (Except the actuality of God.) The soul makes possible counterfactual situations because they logically depend upon the actuality. Possibilities are real, that, is exceed any imagination of them. The soul is essentially actual and not even in principle only potential. Any soul is the same soul in all possible worlds. There is transworld identity of souls.

The subject is not in question.

V

nnow

To capture the actual truth of actuality it is necessary to recognise truth as actuality.

ttime

In the human time of the human world there are predecessor and successor but not inside the soul: Now it is the time it is inside the soul. There is a *where* of the soul, not where it is but where the things in it are. The soul is not among many other things but among many souls.

The soul divides the past from the future. What is the difference between the past and the future? *You are the difference between the past and the future.* You are pure presence.

If there are desires, there are hopes and fears because desiring-that entails minimally hoping-that and desiring-not entails fearing-that. Desires distort emotionally; they dis-tract us. Desires distort semantically; in desire we are lost in thought. To dis-tort is tort. Dis-tort-ing desires are endemic in psychological life. To desire not to

desire does not solve the problem but makes it worse by iterating desire. The solution is to allow the disclosure of the infinite inner space in which desire arises and subsides. Desires are then revealed phenomenologically and ontologically as they are: psychological events appearing and disappearing in the eternal present.

The soul is essentially present so cannot in principle be future or past. The soul timelessly is. The soul never was future and never will be past. What passes through the soul admits of a past/ future distinction, not the soul itself. 'Future' means 'before actuality'. 'Past' means 'after actuality'. 'Present' means 'actual'. If an event is future it is earlier than actuality. If an event is past it is later than actuality. An event is only strictly speaking an experience when it is actual. Events happen as experiences in the now. There are past and future experiences but only in the derivative sense that they will be in the now or were I the now. The soul does not anticipate experience. There is not protention or retention by the soul. The constitution of time obtains at the level of transcendental psychology, not at the level of transcendental spirituality. At a spiritual level there is no time. The soul is the experiencing subject but, when thoroughly understood, is seen to be no more subjective than objective. Time, as change, is the passage through the soul. The soul is changeless through past present and future, through before and after, through *kalpna*.

Experience occurs in the light of the soul. This is what the consciousness of experience consists in. Protention and retention occur in the soul-space. Experiences are anticipated and remembered in a way that does not exceed the infinity of the soul-space. The being in time of experience is an obstacle to the experience of the soul. Soul investigations take time but the soul in itself is not in time. The soul is out-of-time. The soul is what one's own actuality consists in. Its being now now for you is entailed by the reality of your soul.

There is no *earlier* or later in the soul, only in its contents, only in psycho-physical creation.

The soul is im-port-ant: time passes through it. It should be obvious to you that you are between the past and the future. The assumption that you are therefore 'in' time needs to be given up. This is all there is.

The soul has no history. Its contents are history.

The soul is time-consciousness. In the nowness of the now there is no distinction between the present and the awareness of it. Instead of talking about consciousness in addition to the now we should describe the now as presence in both senses of 'present': *now* and *present to*. There is a third kind of presence. I pervade the world. I

am partly in the world. I am a presence in the world. It is wrong to say the now has a structure. Physical objects have structure (a metaphor of the machine age). The now has three essential moments. The first moment of the now is to be the present time, for it to always be the present time. The second moment of the now is for contents or objects to be presented to the now, in a quasi spatial sense. This space is a phenomenological space, the space of pure presence. The third moment of the now is your pervasion of it, your presence in the now as you-ness. This is what it means to say that the now is time consciousness.

The phenomenological way to the soul requires leaving behind the view that you as human being are 'located' in time. This view is not false. You are inserted into history 'as' a human being. At the level of transcendental and fundamental phenomenology time is constituted. In transcendental phenomenology time constitutes itself. This is still true at the fundamental level but the time in question is the time of the soul. The now constitutes time, or time constitutes itself in the now. Events pass through the now and are mutually constituting by protention and retention. The world is, in this sense, constructed (for you) by protention and retention.

The past and the future are thought to be, the present is.

ppresence

The presence of the soul does not entail its possible absence because the soul *is* presence even though the presence of the soul may be obfuscated. The mirror that you are needs to be wiped clear of thoughts and sensations. This is not a cognitive mirror or mind, it is a field of being against which or in which the events of experience occur. Your soul is permanent in a way that your body is not. Your soul is not presented to you from any angle or disclosed side by side like a physical object because devoid of *Abschattungen*. Your soul is disclosed all at once, although there is a difference between the soul as presented as the field of thoughts and experiences and the soul as presented as free of earthly contents. The empiricists are right in a way: most what is in our minds comes from the world through the senses: layers of conditioned thought and experience that have to be suspended or cleaned off for your soul to be disclosed to you as what you are: as what you have been all along.

ppermanence

The permanence of your soul is a *natural* permanence because nothing physical or mental could destroy or in any way damage it. Your soul is not in front of you. Your soul is not presented to you as an object of perception or thought but is the spatial structure of your experience. If the totality of your experience seems to be *content*, that invites the question Content of what?. Your soul is the container for the whole content of your experience: an inside without an outside. Objects and events of experience are mutually related within the soul field so your experience presupposes the soul in so far as it is a unity or your experience.

‘Continuity’ is not an adequate term for the timelessness of the soul because it pertains to a relatively unchanging process. Although the empirical world is in flux, some processes remain the same for some of the time (otherwise, the empirical world would be wholly unintelligible.)

phenomenology

The soul has a horizon (both *Horizont* and *Gesichtskreis*) which can be detected inwardly by a metaphysical $\ulcorner \diagup \diagup \diagup \cdot$, but not in principle from the standpoint of exteriority. The $\ulcorner \diagup \diagup \diagup \cdot$ is the disclosure of the soul to itself, even though this metaphysical revelation is not apparent to a phenomenology of consciousness. Time stands still inside the soul. Most of the contents of the soul are in time. The soul admits of a noesis noema distinction without intentionality in which it is not directed towards its contents but is opened as the transcendental field in which are. The soul is the *site* of phenomenological disclosure. The matter or $\cdot \searrow \ulcorner$ appearing within the soul (*subject matter*) is the opposite of external $\cdot \searrow \ulcorner$. What is matter? A mass of space-time events, not a kind of material: it is not as though matter is matter- like so matter cannot be understood on the model of physical objects. Physics applies to entities and processes available, in principle, within the soul. There is no physics of the soul. The soul is not a thing even though individuated. The soul is the opposite of a thing. A think is pure exteriority. The soul is pure interiority. There is a mathematics of the soul. My soul is essentially one and indivisible. Each soul is numerically distinct from each other soul. The soul is defined by absolute interiority. It is an inside without an outside. This absolute inwardness disitnguishes any soul from any other without demarcation, without any line or interface between one and another. Philosophy is the love of wisdom so may be philosophy in this true underlying sense by an understanding of the soul.

There is a possible use of imagination as a tool, not to imagine physical objects, but to discover the expansive emptiness that is the soul. One of the people is inside-out, or outside-in and that is you. You inhabit a psycho-physical interiority because your soul is centred on a human being who has a first person singular perspective on the world by the fact of your soul being centred on it. The soul is the *no-thing-ness-inside-being*. There is experience of objects, sensations, changes and the *no-thing-ness* in which these take place. Metaphysically, it is not possible to go anywhere because your body and your mind can travel but you cannot. The soul is still. It is not possible to divide the soul. The soul is indivisible.

Critical philosophy cannot access the soul because it is turned away from the soul. There is a true and underlying phenomenology which makes all psychology possible: The world seems to be, the soul is so the soul admits of no appearance reality distinction. It is pure emptiness so it can only disclose itself and then only as it is. Talk of *emptiness*, of self or consciousness, knowingly or not, is description of the infinite interiority of the soul. The soul is come what may. Human beings are turned away from the soul because of their embodiment, because of the physical dimensions which crowd the soul, because of bad ethics. Phenomenology is a way to theology and profound (fundamental) phenomenology is on the way to theology. The right philosophical method is metaphysics and metaphysics points to theology. True phenomenology is not constrained by critical philosophy but is truly metaphysics: the transcendental is the transcendent.

There is a descriptive phenomenology of the soul. The psychological and the epistemological have to be reread as on the way to theology, or as proto-theology. Investigations into the soul have to be, in the end, theological because philosophical questions have theological answers. There is expression in the soul because meaning is enacted in the soul. The soul is not a universal but the most particular of particulars as *an* inside. The soul is formless or formlessness so, *a fortiori*, not the 'form' of the body, or of anything else.

There is an onto-theology of the soul because being and nothingness coincide in the *no-thing-ness* of the soul. Their true synthesis is not becoming or being-there or even being determinate but *no-thing-ness*: being without being a thing.

The soul is subtle, refined. The soul cannot be modified. There is a transcendental phenomenology of the soul in which the

transcendental and the transcendent coincide and the ruling philosophical catastrophe of their separation eschewed. They coincide in theology. Phenomenological theology is path-breaking. The theological is necessary for the empirical, so the empirical is sufficient for the theological. The soul is necessary for experience so experience is sufficient for the soul. There is no experience without the phenomenological space in which it occurs, the transcendental field disclosed by the $\ulcorner \diagup \diagdown \urcorner \bullet$. The transcendental field is a simple substance, a phenomenological space which lacks the properties of physical space: a private absolute space. In the $\ulcorner \diagup \diagdown \urcorner \bullet$, existential assumptions about the external world are bracketed or put in parentheses. What is the external world external to? The soul.

Transcendental Phenomenology can overcome the crisis in human understanding if and only if it becomes theological. There is extraordinary experience when it is realised that it is the soul that this experience is experience of. Ordinary experience entails experience of the soul but not as one item amongst others and not *as* the soul, not knowingly.

The difference between what is inside and outside the soul is what is inside appears phenomenologically, what is outside does not. This 'phenomenology' is truly part of pure metaphysics in both a narrow and a wide sense: it brackets the world but opens up the infinity of spiritual space. The soul can in principle be known to exist by purely intellectual means but metaphysical phenomenology systematises understanding usually available only to people who try to lead a religious life and some mystics, both of whom have knowledge of the soul. It is not a finite object of thought both because it infinitely exceeds any thought about it and because it is primordial with regard to any distinction between subject and object. It is a theorem of phenomenology that the soul is *dis-covered*.

Since phenomenological description reveals absolute interiority, it is a kind of presuppositional metaphysics, not the extravagant postulation of an unjustifiably 'extra' but the revelation of an irremovable foundation because the actual and possible intuitive fulfillments of the soul are presented states of the world. Transcendental phenomenology unwittingly stumbled upon the soul in the epoche describing the interiority of the transcendental field without realising that this is describing the inside of the soul.

The philosophy of the soul is me-t-hodo-logical phenomenology. The soul is not posed by the phenomenological *epoché* but uncovered. The dynamic method does not apply to the soul. The eidetic reduction

reveals the essential core of the soul. The centre is the threshold. Unwittingly this expresses the metaphysical truth that the soul is the human being's threshold to God. The soul is the transcendental-phenomenological condition for there being a world for you. The method of phenomenology introduces the soul, leads the human inwardly to the soul. Your inwardness is not inside you but you are at the centre of your inwardness. You are the centre of your inwardness. You are all around you. Your inward awareness is your inwardness. Husserl's method of *epoché* or "bracketing" needs radicalization as the methodological description proper to an indexical being. The soul is inherently first person singular so the soul is a first-person-singularity. The soul is not a point of view but a zone in which a point of view and its objects are possible. In fundamental phenomenology, or proto-theological phenomenology, the soul is described *exactly as is experienced*. From a first-person-singular point of view, one cannot but be presented with the soul as it is. There actually is the soul that one is. It is impossible that there should be a hallucination of the soul because the soul is not in any way image-like. From the first-person-singular point of view, there is no difference between the soul being what it is and the soul appearing to be what it is. There is no veridical/non-veridical distinction to be drawn in the case of experience of the soul by itself. The human being perceives by the soul. The 'per' or 'through' of the soul is a grasping of what appears. That which can be suspended by the epoche admits of an appearance/reality distinction. The soul admits of no appearance/reality distinction so cannot be bracketed by the epoche. The existence of the soul cannot be bracketed, nor its essence. The essence of the soul implies its essence. Its being is a necessary part of its being what it is. In any phenomenological description the soul is covertly or overtly referred to. The soul is the proper object of pure phenomenology. The existence of the soul is self-evident. The bracketing of the world leaves the soul untouched. If the psycho-physical universe were annihilated, the souls would remain. The phenomenological description of a given soul is of a particular interiority. The phenomenological specification of its inside does not depend upon concepts of the mental or the physical. The correctness of any existential claim about the soul depends in the end on dropping mental and spatial metaphor which belongs to conditioned thinking. The soul is the unconditioned. The soul is concerned with the world. The soul is about the human being. The *epoché* must lose its focus to disclose the soul. I under-line terms to show that they are to be taken in their

metaphysical sense disclosed by the *epoche*: I, now, here. (I adopt this device in reaction to cautionary placing metaphysical concepts *under erasure*, as though anything metaphysical should have a health warning on it.) The soul does not depend on the existence of a represented or unrepresented object in the external world. The external world is external to the soul, so depends on the soul qua external world. The soul is independent of the world vertically and horizontally. Vertically, there is no world below on which it rests. Horizontally, it is not essentially related to objects of perception or thought. The soul belongs to the extra-mental world. Metaphysical introspection discloses the soul. The soul is actually you. There is a metaphysical epoche which discloses the soul. This is distinct from the phenomenological epoche, but its findings are taken in a new way. The metaphysical epoche discloses the transcendental field of subjectivity as the soul itself. The soul is its interiority. The soul is its own inwardness. That is to say, the soul is essentially interiority. The disclosure of the soul requires not just the suspension of all objects of experience but the suspension of experience. The metaphysical epoche is the putting in parenthesis of thought and experience in order to expose their possibility. The possibility of thought and experience is the interiority of the soul, the transcendental field in which they take place. There is a sharp conceptual distinction between the transcendental and the transcendent but no ontological distinction. The transcendent is the metaphysical, that which putatively pertains to a non-spatio-temporal reality inaccessible to experience. There is transcendent knowledge. 'transcendental' to mean 'necessary for experience' or 'non empirical conditions for experience. *The transcendental is the transcendent*. The distinction does hold at the level of sense or intension but not at the level of reference of extension. Extensionally, the transcendental is the transcendent. It is a catastrophic flaw of philosophy, which subsequent thought has inherited, to divorce the metaphysical from the necessary conditions for the empirical. Metaphysical reality is not an extravagant extra postulate. Metaphysical reality is necessary for the world as we know it. The fundamental conditions for experience are metaphysical conditions. should be rewritten. The most useful task in studies in the meantime is writing against. Intentionality falls before the epoche. From Phenomenology to metaphysics. On the one hand, fundamental phenomenology leaves the soul intact. The natural attitude is bracketted. The attitude is bracketted. This allows the un-covering of

the metaphysical. Existence is disclosed as existence. In metaphysical phenomenology it is uncovered that you *have* a human being.

Imagination is a route to the soul because by imagining the soul the soul can be discovered. This imagining cannot take the form of imag-ing and object but has to be a skywards growth. The Metaphor works like this: sky is all around you, not just above you. The soul is the site of the imagination. Imagination of the soul is not phantasy. Eidetic imagination in metaphysical phenomenology replaces eidetic variation in phenomenology. Metaphysical imagination is not mere imagination. When the soul is imagined accurately no-thing-ness is imagined, a kind of space is imagined: infinite empty space from the inside that has the quality of you-ness. The soul is non-conceptual. It is given as it is without the impregnation of concepts. It is not perceptually construed one way or another in its presence to itself. It is on the other hand open to the human being to construe it as anything or nothing. The soul is a datum but not a sense-datum.

The ultimate reduction of the subject is to the soul but, paradoxically, this is the subject's greatest expansion. Eidetic reduction is re-duction, it leads back to the soul. The soul is imaginative space, not imaginary space, not a space that is imagined but a space in which the imagination operates. Thinking and experience are the same, or fused, in the expanded awareness without focus revelatory of the soul. The soul presents itself to itself as though it were the only soul, the only 'one', and as though it were all there is. Therefore an eidetic reduction, an isolation of the essence of the soul derived from imaginative variation on multiple examples is a not a possible method for disclosing the essence of the soul. The phenomenology of the soul cannot be repeated by a soul so, in another sense, there can be no science of the soul. Rather, the soul is shown through eidetic inevitability: the impossibility of being conceivably otherwise without contradiction. The world can be regarded as appearance for the heuristic purpose of disclosing the soul to itself: an agnosticism about real life. Your soul is an arbitrarily chosen soul so, in a logical rather than an inductive sense, counts as typical because if properties of the soul that a soul could not lack are disclosed, these are properties of any soul.

We have expectations of how the soul could appear. These expectations are obstacles to the *letting be* of the soul. Objects present themselves in certain ways so we accept the soul to present one aspect rather than another. In the case of the soul there is no mode of presentation, only pure presence. You can tour a physical object but not a soul. Even if you walk around a living human being you

have not thereby toured that human being's soul. The soul includes your tour. Souls overlap. The soul cannot be observed. We have beliefs about the soul, mainly derived from observing the empirical world and making conjectures.

There are many ways to the soul. This is the way of phenomenology. The epistemological dilemma is whether to look outward or to look inward. Periods in the history of philosophy can be defined by whether they look inward or outward. The phenomenology of the soul looks inwards.

Methodologically, the subject is not in question.

The description of the soul overcomes the difference between pure and existential phenomenology because the transcendental field is the lived reality of your own existence consists in. Paradoxically to both in their separation, the transcendental field is your own being in the world. The epoche is possible because of transcendence, the natural attitude is yours because of immanence. There is a fundamental ontology of the soul that is in no way psychologistic, a pure grammar of the soul which is utterly first person singular and captures what 'I am' expresses but 'this is' lacks even when both sentences are used to refer to the same human being. Being a soul is not only consistent with operating in the world 'as' a certain human being, it is entailed by it. The soul is a demarcation between what is and what is not your self because what is is actual but other passes through the inner space of the soul as an event constellation, physical objects being event-like, not being as permanent as they seem. At the level of phenomenalism they appear event-like so here, in *Hiersein*: paradoxically (against belief) but not paradoxically (consistently) appearance is reality. At the quantum level they are event like. Only at the ordinary macroscopic medium sized level, impregnated with belief and practice, are they thing-like.

Part of the phenomenological method is to suspend preconceptions. Preconceptions which imply the soul is an object or which amounts to the same thing, which construe it from the outside are misleading. The soul has no outside. The soul has no exteriority. The being of a physical object is its exteriority so it can be rightly construed as an object. The epoche cannot be applied to the now or the here. Here and now survive the epoche. metaphysically, even though any empirical here and now does not even survive the Husserlian epoche. Similarly, I as soul survive the fall of the transcendental ego before the metaphysical epoche. I am the local of the *epoché* that makes it possible. I am a singularity. There is a transition

from future to past which passes though the soul that you are. The soul is not a relation but includes the nexus of phenomenological relations. The soul is something but not some thing.

The soul belongs to deep phenomenology, empiricism to surface phenomenology. Transcendental phenomenology leaves empiricism behind and is on the way to deep phenomenology. Fundamental phenomenology is the phenomenology of the spiritual world. It is possible to see the phenomenology of the spiritual world in the empirical world after doing deep or fundamental phenomenology. It is necessary to view one's experience as a whole, realise that that whole is the unchanging space in all your experiences take place and realise that you are that space.

Transcendental phenomenology becomes truly transcendental when fundamental. Transcendental phenomenology discovers necessary conditions. Fundamental phenomenology discovers necessary conditions for necessary conditions. Theological phenomenology is truly transcendental in discovering necessary conditions that have no necessary conditions.

In the natural attitude there is virtually no awareness of the soul despite knowledge of the existence of the soul and belief and disbelief in the soul. The findings of fundamental phenomenology can be used to change the natural attitude (which includes both what is historically perennial and historically changing) through a revolution: an awareness of the soul in the course of ordinary living. A huge qualitative shift would be necessary from the unreflected and unconscious thought-habit 'I am this human being' to 'I have this human being', from 'This physical object attracts me', 'This repels' to 'I am where it happens'. To see that one is a soul, and deploy this insight in the natural attitude, it is necessary to *see the eternal in the present*: see the present in the present, the unchanging through the changing, seeing that it is always now no matter what time it is and no matter how time changes or times change. If phenomenology is the study of consciousness and consciousness is the soul then phenomenology is the study of the soul. Because of the referential opacity of 'is a study of...' this inference might not seem to go through. But all the referential opacity obstructs is the necessity of knowingly studying consciousness qua the soul in studying consciousness. Much can be learned about the soul and its contents by doing non-fundamental phenomenology and then construing its conclusions where appropriate as fundamental.

Phenomenology is the study of appearance as opposed to reality but in *fundamental phenomenology* appearance and reality coincide. Appearance and reality coincide in phenomenology because reality is reduced to its appearance. The appearance is the reality or the reality is only the appearance of reality. In fundamental phenomenology it is the other way around. Appearance is studied but because the findings are self-intimating, because the subject matter does not admit of an appearance-reality distinction the reality is the appearance. In conventional phenomenology in studying appearance reality is only appearance. In fundamental phenomenology, appearance is reality. Reality is uncovered. Where ordinary phenomenology describes the structures of consciousness as presented to the subject after the epoché, or in the world in existential phenomenology, fundamental ontology entails descriptions of the no-thing-ness of the soul. The notion no-thing-ness needs to be substituted for the notion of structure. Structures pertain to physical objects. No-thing-ness pertains to the soul. All phenomenology is conducted from a methodologically first person singular standpoint.

Although intentionality is the essence of consciousness according to phenomenology the soul does not exhibit intentionality. The soul is consciousness, when thoroughly understood, so it looks as though the central doctrine of phenomenology is not right. This would be a misunderstanding. Intentionality does characterise the various acts of judgement and experience that normally go under the heading of 'consciousness', and as there are kinds of experience without intentionality, moods, pains for example. The soul is fundamental consciousness. The soul is the consciousness in which ordinary intentional acts of consciousness are possible. The soul is identical with the *transcendental field* although it is not understood as the soul.

The phenomenology of the soul is the description of no-thing-ness from a first person singular perspective. The soul is not directed toward anything empirical. If it is directed towards anything it is only directed towards God. This however is a spiritual direction of the soul not a physical direction or a mental, i.e. intentional, direction. There is an intentionality of the physical: a hammer directed at a nail, a football directed at a goal, a plant turning toward the light. Teleology is the intentionality of the nature. Teleology is the intentionality of the physical.

At the level of fundamental phenomenology all spatial metaphor is inadequate. One of the main obstacles to the gaining of spiritual

knowledge is the inappropriateness of spatial metaphor. Our language is geared to making intelligible the world of objects in space-time. The soul is not of or about any object even though it is filled by conditioned content in its 'embodied' state.

The phenomenology of the soul yields a spiritual ontology of the soul directly because the soul admits of no appearance reality distinction. The soul is not quite presented as existence, but it is the only existence you have ever been directly acquainted with. Experience is the colouring in of the no-thing-ness of the soul. The *tabula rasa* is the emptiness of the soul, the emptiness of *nirvana*. You are always already enlightened. Clearing of conditioned experience uncovers the enlightenment that is already. The enlightenment of the soul is the light of the soul. The phenomenology of the soul yields an epistemology of the soul because it is knowledge of the soul by the soul by acquaintance. You know it by being it.

Fundamental phenomenology is a synthesis of transcendental phenomenology and fundamental ontology. Phenomenology is about what it is like to be someone.

Phenomenology uncovers the soul. The soul is a phenomenological discovery.

The phenomenology of the soul is letting the soul show itself. The soul is the ground of your being because fundamentally it is your being. Your soul is what your being you consists in.

Fundamental phenomenology cannot be done as *phenomenology of types*. Fundamental phenomenology is all about particularity. You are the particular being that you are, not one of a type.

Transcendental and existential phenomenology entail pure descriptions of lived experience but fundamental phenomenology entails pure descriptions of the lived experience: the purity of the soul. The purity of the soul is ontological, not just methodological. The soul has no empirical context.

To do fundamental phenomenology it is necessary to become aware of your own soul. This means seeing the world afresh. It means the world striking you as though solipsism could be true; as though you are the world. Instead of taking it for granted that you are a human being who supervenes on the physical world, the starting point has to be quasi-sceptical.

Once the soul is uncovered it is the starting point for subsequent philosophy. This would be to give philosophy a theological rather than a naturalistic foundation.

Metaphysical phenomenology shows how phenomena are constituted in the pure soul. Transcendental consciousness, as described, is the soul even though phenomenology did not realise the full import of his subject matter. Although fundamental phenomenology taxonomies and descriptions remain largely valid there is a literal and drastic sense in which phenomenology does not know what it is talking about: the soul. It is possible to speak the truth about something of which you are ignorant. Such is the case with phenomenology. It did not realise that his subject matter is theological.

The phenomenology of the soul cannot be done as a straightforward study of phenomena. The no-thing-ness of the soul is more ethereal than its ethereal phenomena so resists characterisation as phenomenon. *Die Seele ist der Raum*.

Describing the soul is like describing air or light or space. Phenomenon admits of a plural and is possibly contrasted with reality. The soul is reality and although ontologically plural does not admit of a phenomenological plural. The soul is the possibility of the phenomenon. The soul is the light that makes the appearance an appearance.

Fundamental phenomenology leaves on one side the natural world and everything that depends on it. If the universe were to be suddenly annihilated the subject matter of fundamental phenomenology would remain intact.

By bracketing the human being, the soul is uncovered. Who or what does the bracketing? Who or what turns its attention to this act of consciousness or that. This transcendental phenomenology is not practiced through the exercise of one cognitive function rather than another. After epoché the transcendental field of consciousness is exposed. Because that is the soul it is its own light. It is the site that lays open the structures of consciousness. It needs no further acts of consciousness to observe them. There is nothing attended by the soul, only laying bare.

The transition from transcendental phenomenology to metaphysical or fundamental phenomenology is through stages. The phenomenological epoché is applied and the world of the natural attitude is suspended. The various acts of consciousness are revealed with their noetic structure and noematic content. At this point, they are not classified into types or subjected to eidetic variation. They are regarded as divorced from their objects and described or contemplated in their bare particularity for their own sake. In this arising and

subsiding of token experiences it is revealed that certain aspects remain the same. As experiences come and go, structured by protention and retention, it remains always abidingly now. It is always the space of here. It is the same interiority, the same suffusion of me-ness. The body and the rest of the empirical human being were suspended by the first transcendental epoché. This second metaphysical epoché suspends the mind and its contents (to allow content in the mind for the moment).

There is a phenomenology of disembodied existence. Even the transcendental epoché shows the logical and phenomenological possibility of disembodied existence. One's experience remains exactly intact as it is now except one's own body does not appear as an item within that experience. This phenomenology is intrinsically consistent, so disembodied existence is logically possible. The bare fact of imagining something is not sufficient for its possibility because the imagining might contain concealed contradictions. The consistent imagining of something does show its logical possibility.

The soul is a proper subject matter (mater) of philosophy. The human being that you are is the property of the soul. You belong properly to your soul. Your current ontology is belonging to your soul. We long to be what we really are. Fundamental phenomenology is letting that which shows itself be itself as soul. Fundamental phenomenology allows us the room (space) to be what we are. To the soul itself!

spaces

Truths about the soul are synthetic *a priori*, some necessary, some contingent. That I am here is a necessary truth. That I am now is a necessary truth. (tense logic)

It is not analytic that I am my soul but nonetheless necessary and *a priori*. It is an essential law that it is always now inside the soul. The proposition expressed by the sentence 'I am my soul' is a necessary, synthetic identity statement.

VI

Why are We Here?

space sky

Although the soul is incorporeal, it is not only an incorporeal *occupant* of the human being you are. You do not end where your body ends. The soul is *oric*. The soul is sky-like but includes the human being. The human being is a pool built in the middle of the ocean. You are the ocean. The pool is *this human being* you call 'yourself'. Your soul is the sea (*See, Seele*) and your being is at the centre of its *no-thing-ness*.

sspace

You are an inside without an outside. The soul is an inside without an outside; the inside of the rest of the universe. You are not inside you looking out. You are all around you with you at the centre. The soul is spherical. You only ever see it from the inside however. Do not think of the soul-sphere ball from the outside. That leads nowhere. Be the soul-sphere from the inside: interiority. The interior of the soul is decorated with the colours of day. The interior of the soul is full of the emptiness of night. You need to turn yourself inside out to uncover self-nature. The soul is the *agara* and the ? ♡ ■ // ✕ ♡ : the home of the human being and the market or transaction place for dealings with the world. The soul is the *alaya*-consciousness, the storehouse of everything true of you: the zone of *nirvana*. The soul is simple.

sspace

Although your soul has never left you and you never leave your soul, your soul is not situated. Your soul is not an idea so your soul is not you idea of your soul. It is directly available to you as // ● ▲ // ? .

Features of the soul can be be read off space. The soul, which exists at all but not only the same time as its experiences, is the background to the *Gestalt* switches which make up the foreground. The soul is logical space: a space of reasons and possibilities.

sspace

There is ordinary empirical spatial awareness. There is the theory of space-time in physics and the description of space as a conditon of possible experience. The space that is the soul is idntical with the phenomenological space described. It is not physical space but physical space. Physical space is the totality of spatial relations between physical objects or physical processes. The space of the soul pervades the space of space-time. The time of the soul, now, pervades the time of space-time, the time of physical and psycho-physical processes. Now-tonian space is spiritual space. What appears to the human subject as Newtonian space is the space of one's own soul. Newton, an unwitting absolute idealist, thinks of space and time as the

sensoria of God. Your own soul is a private space even though infinite. Souls are numerically distinct and from a plurality of spaces. There is only one public space time with which we are directly acquainted (even though there exists an infinity of possible worlds and within them an infinity of possible space-times). Newtonian space-time as presented to you is your own soul. What you mistakenly think of as space is your own soul. The internal horizon of the soul is infinite.

We are familiar with the ordinary idea of the universe as a set of physical objects including the psycho-physical human beings within it. We are familiar with this universe being in space, or being in space-time as a certain whole. To understand the existence of the soul it is a useful heuristic to conceive one's own experience in the same way. The universe is the set of experiences that are yours. The soul is the space or subjective space-time in which they occur as a certain whole. One's own existence is a microcosm of a universe.

Now, phenomenologically we have not here described two things, the universe and one's own holistic experience of it even if ontologically these are two. In particular, in conceiving space as a container of the universe nothing distinct from one's own soul was thereby conceived. Indeed, in conceiving the universe as a whole independently of one's own experience of it it was not conceived independently one's experience of it.

Space

The soul is extended but not physical. Being extended is not sufficient for being physical, even though being physical is sufficient for being extended. The soul is the inside of its own extension. 'soul' originates the Anglo-Saxon *sawol*. 'Sawol' has a Germanic etymological root from which 'sea' is derived. The Old German word 'se(u)la' means: *belonging to the sea*. The soul is *sea-like*. The soul is not *only inside* the human being like a pilot in a ship, because the soul is *all around* the human being like a sea: a sea with an infinitely receding horizon. The human is like a ship on the sea, the human being is in the centre of the soul-sea.

The here of the soul is a space but not in the sense of 'interval'. The soul is *l'espace* and *l'espacement*, not *écartement* or *intervalle*. The soul is a free space or clearing without boundaries.

The soul is the site of disclosure of apparent being. The soul's content coincides with what appears to be the case. The soul provides the horizon of available being.

The integration of experiences as one's own and *a fortiori* as someone's, is their occurrence in soul space. Semantic and logical relations, and phenomenological affinities obtain between thoughts in numerically distinct minds, so none of these is sufficient for a mental event's occurrence on one mind rather than another. That is only explicable through the concept of soul. Relations between events in the same soul are thereby real and not only formal.

The soul is inner space, a Newtonian container, that contains acts of thinking. In life, content and meaning fill the soul. Doing phenomenological theology entails ascribing properties to the soul. Experiences are event-like but the soul is a substance. 'Soul', a singular not a general term, a nominal term whose meaning is part of the subject-matter of pure phenomenological language, or pure metaphysical language: language *in the widest sense*, so far as reference is concerned. The soul distinguishes you as you, a certain human being as yours. The sense of 'soul' is given by its definition. The meaning of 'soul' is its sense and reference. Talk of the soul is not nonsense.

space

The neutral *milieu* is the soul. The soul is a 'place' (*lieu*). Here is a place. The world is a place. An empirical place has both an interior and an exterior but the soul has only an interior. The world has only an interior. In *partly-being-in-the-world* the subject is in the world, contingently in the world, but there is something or somewhere the world, this totality, is in because although the world is the *empirical* totality of what is it is grounded in the totality of what reality is: metaphysically grounded by being somewhere in spiritual space. This metaphysical is at once metaphysical.

In any heuristics, there is something directly and literally in common between the explaining and the explained. The soul is space but not physical space, the soul is spiritual space. Physical space is only the set of spatial relations between physical objects. The soul is the space where everything is, the space that is ordinarily taken to be physical space. The soul is timeless in the sense of lacking any chronology but is space-time in being the now-here of your own being.

Sensations arise and subside in the space in which they occur, the eternal presence. My soul is pure in the sense that it is not its contents even though it is where its contents are. The contents of the soul attend so the soul is foundational with regard to its contents *qua* contents but, conversely, the soul does not depend on its contents,

epistemologically or ontologically. The soul is the site of their disclosure, including the disclosure of their being, but not idealistically the site of their being. The soul is prior to its contents, logically prior, so the study of the soul is first philosophy. The contents of the soul continue but the soul abides.

The soul is not an abstract object but does have non-physical features: absolute interiority, inner space,nowness, me-ness. Souls share these properties, or their token equivalents, but no soul is directly available to any other precisely because the soul is an absolute interiority. Any absolute interiority is only available to itself because appearance is appearance to and appearance to is appearance to another and being an empirical other depends upon being or having an exteriority.

The soul is pure, like logic or numbers and meaning is the possibility of imagination inside the soul. The soul is an infinite zone of infinite possibilities.

hhere

The soul is not 'there' the soul is 'here' but this 'here' does not denote anything empirical. The soul is a transcendental condition for experience, not a postulate or an object of theory. The soul is an existentialist discovery. There are variations in the soul but not variations of the soul. There is a return to the soul, historically and in the individual.

ssurface

A surface is an outside with no inside. The soul is an inside with no outside. The soul is the opposite of a surface. A surface is pure exteriority: exteriority with no trace of an inside. The soul is pure interiority: interiority with no trace of an outside. Phenomenologically, in the empirical world we are presented with surfaces. Metaphysically, in the $\Gamma \parallel \parallel \Gamma \cdot \Gamma$ we I am presented with the soul. Phenomenology, as a kind of fundamental philosophy, is the disclosure of the soul that allows philosophy as the study of the soul. The psychology of the soul is impossible from an empirical standpoint. Intentionality misses the soul.

iiinfinity

Ideas of the soul are useless if ideas of something bounded, useful if they are ideas of the sky, of space, of infinite emptiness.

Stephen Priest The Rediscovery of the Soul

The soul stays. The soul is transcendental. The phenomenological description of time, or time-consciousness, is the description of the nowness inside the soul. The soul is fundamental. Intersubjectivity conditions what you share with others. If we strip away the contributions of intersubjectivity there lies revealed what pertains to you, to you uniquely. We are very conditioned, but *something* is conditioned. You are the unconditioned. The human being is conditioned, so you are not identical with a certain human being. The horizon of the singularity that is the soul makes empirical thought possible. The soul exceeds the empirical because the time of the soul is eternal, the empirical transient.

ssap

Sentences about the soul and the propositions they express are synthetic *a priori*, necessary or contingent.

iinvisible

I am invisible. You are invisible. The visible is wholly and only other. The soul is invisible. The soul is for itself, not in itself.

‘No one has ever seen anyone else.’ is empirically false but metaphysically true.

iin itself ffor itself

The soul prevents the world being massive, opaque, dense, by being the light at the centre of being. You are the *Lichtung*, that is; not being, but the disclosure of being in the soul-space. You are at once a mathematical point and infinite space. Positions in the soul are absolute. *Die Seele is das Wesen. Die Seele explains Dasein by being Hiersein.*

uuniversal and particular

The soul is its own universal. The soul is an absolute singularity. The soul is a synthesis of the universal and the particular. The soul is the only one of a type: you. You and I as you and I do not form a type. You and I are qualitatively distinct, internally and essentially distinct. The identity of indiscernibles applies to souls. Two souls are of the same type qua souls but necessarily distinct as who they re. Any particular soul is absolutely that particular. A soul cannot be instantiated multiply in reality. The soul is an absolute

particular, not a universal because each soul instantiates itself uniquely.

The soul is the same. The soul is essentially *le même*, both as *self* and as *the same*. The soul is never *l'autre*, even though there exists the soul of the other; the other's self. The soul is *propre*. The soul is my-same or what my identity consists in. The human being is an I-deal: a compromise between the soul and the world. The human being is also an ideal. You have never perceived yourself in your entirety. You have never perceived anyone else in their entirety. You can in principle perceive your own soul in its entirety.

The soul does not represent itself in self knowledge. The soul's self-disclosure is *presentation without re-presentation*.

Ordinarily, the soul is obscured by experience, by *an-aesthetics* but not by an aesthetics. The aesthetic is a transition from the first level towards the third. Music is a high art because its embodiment is remote. The truly aesthetic requires the wearing off of an-aesthetics: Without an-aesthetic there can be an aesthetic.

Apparent states of affairs are also states of the soul. The soul accommodates the mind. The soul does not know itself by observation, by observing itself. There is no master and slave dialectic of soul and soul. The soul is not its own object or its own subject. The soul's self-disclosure to itself is the emptiness of pure awareness.

A theory of content could be a theory of physical content, mental content or spiritual content.

The soul is neither ideal or material. The soul is near to pure being. The soul remains constant while experience changes: content differs but the soul abides. I function in so far as a human being is *saweled*; ensouled by me.

self consciousness

Attention is focused within one experience. Apprehension of the soul requires attention to relax or broaden to disclose the wide site of all experience. If one consciously pays attention to something that attention is 'taken' or 'paid' or 'absorbed' by that object. It is taken away from the soul, the price paid is ignorance of the soul. Absorption by the object precludes freedom to see the soul. Attention to thoughts, sensations or physical objects are equally distractions from the soul. Experience does not have to turn back on itself in order to

Stephen Priest The Rediscovery of the Soul

apprehend a subject that is never object. The real subject is not really logically subjective. The real subject is the soul.

horizon

The horizon is the inner phenomenological limit of the soul. Any given indexical experience is indexed to the soul. Accordingly, all actual or potential experiences occur within that horizon.

infinite

The disclosure of the soul shows it as not circumscribed and so does not fall under any empirical concept.

matter

In the end, the inside of the soul and the inside of matter co-incide in one's own existence and so are more similar than at first appears. They appear opposites because one is an inside and one is an outside. The soul is the opposite of a physical object

The soul is silent it is Ch'an-Ting or Dhyana-Samadhi. The silence of the soul is a kind of silence that is not contrasted with sound.

You are already a soul so the process of finding it is one of revelation or disclosure. Clouding the soul by absorption in the transient is *duskṛta*, sin. The empty soul is the soul discovered in *nirvana* but paradigmatically not under the name 'soul'. The emptiness of *nirvana* is the interiority of the soul. *Nirvana* is the disclosure and so discovery of the soul without, in most cases, the realisation that it is the soul that is discovered. The soul has uniformity or a kind of symmetry in every direction.

individuality

Experience 'happens' in the sense that it 'takes' place. Experience 'takes place' in the soul. The soul is that place. Normally we think of a place as a part or region of space but souls are radically distinct from one another. All the souls do not together form one soul. It is our individuality which is the hardest thing to explain about us. This individuality is preserved at a metaphysical level. The individuality of myself survives the metaphysical epoché. The human

being does not even survive the phenomenological epoche. Wishes are irrelevant to the soul.

If two souls are numerically distinct then it follows that they are qualitatively distinct. The reason for this is that you are indivisible. You are the indivisible source of your own experiences. It is not possible for you to exist in the plural. The soul is a specific soul.

If you were cloned, even millions of times, to say you were one of a type would be to miss the essential point about you: You are *this very one*. You are a you-ness which cannot be replicated simultaneously, only consecutively. Fundamental phenomenology describes this particularity.

mine-ness

The soul has a character which must not be confused with personality. This character is yours. The character of my soul is qualitatively distinct from the character of yours. Personality is empirical and conditioned. The character of the soul is metaphysical, spiritual and unconditioned. Personality is per-son-ality, from the sound of the voice through the ancient Greek mask. The same sound through the face resonates in the soul. Sound is heard in my soul and in your soul. Sound can be heard in both souls at once.

third person

The soul cannot be adequately thought from a third person perspective. The soul has to be experienced from the inside. In ascribing properties to the soul the soul is conceived of as at a distance.

memory

Remembering the soul is not re-remembering because the soul has no parts. The soul is a zone of certainty and necessity, like mathematics.

speech and writing

To describe is to de-scribe, to write away from, because all writing about the soul is writing ab-out. All writing about the soul is writing as though there were a distance from the soul but there is no distance from the soul. Speech is heard in the soul. Your own speech resonates in the presence of the soul. Your performance is within your own soul. Your performance is through your own soul. De-scription is

writing away, but that is essential because this writing away is writing a way.

representation

The soul is essentially characterised by objectlessness. Re-presentations of the soul are spatially metaphorical. The presence in re-presentation is the presence of the soul but that is not really something that is being repeated, but something that is (being). The soul is under-stood. If the soul were represented it would in a sense be present more than one but it is the same soul, the same now, that is present in any putative representation. The representations can be empirically then and now or, token repetitions of one representation type. The same nowness, hereness and I-ness of the soul is presented each time where this does *not* mean numerically distinct contents of the same type presented over time. The now that is presented at this empirical time is exactly the same now in every sense as the now that was presented last time. It is not just like it. It is it. Strictly speaking, there is no repetition of a re-presentation here but a re-presentation of a presence or presentation. (A repetition of a presentation would be something at one remove from what was originally presented.) The soul is an ordinary being.

present

It is a prejudice that the present is determined by the past. The present is an exploding spontaneity. The soul is a well or a source in which thought and experience comes into the now.

hyle

The soul is the unknown object x in phenomenology.

The soul contains athetic or positing character but does not possess this in itself. Its quality is ethereal. The soul is not sensual. The soul is not matter or $\bullet \in \square$. Nevertheless, the soul does underlie perceptual experience. The soul is an ethereal container for $\bullet \in \square$ including sense impressions. The soul is not ambiguous. The soul is disclosed as a whole once de-void of content. Sense impressions or $\bullet \in \square$ remain constant in the perception of a visually ambiguous object. In the presence of the soul to itself there is no hyle to demand alternative interpretations. The soul is empty of fulfilled like intuition but is not intuition.

The soul is the underlying possibility of *hyle* because *hyle* is not present and the soul is pure presence. Nothing can be anything to

Stephen Priest The Rediscovery of the Soul

anybody unless it is something to the soul. The soul is *the me*. The soul is the mould in which sense contents are formed.

Introspecter

You are a ghost pervading a body. The soul is *Seele*. *Die Seele* is *der Geist, der Odem, das Gespenst*.

me-ness

Although the soul has no color, $\square \times \triangle \cup \nabla \blacktriangle \blacktriangledown$, it has tone: $\sqcup - \text{///} \text{C} \text{C} \text{///} \bullet$. The $\sqcup - \text{///} \text{C} \text{C} \text{///} \bullet$ of the soul is the you-ness of you. Your $\sqcup - \text{///} \text{C} \text{C} \text{///} \bullet$ is qualitatively similar no-one else('s).

introspection

What is missed in Introspection: space, me-ness, interiority, nowness.

infinity

The infinity of the soul is a qualitative infinity not a quantitative infinity. A physical object has an infinite number of properties. It could be viewed from an infinite number of points of view, if only because for any two points of view there is a point of view between that point of view. A physical object can nevertheless be *thought* as a whole. The infinity of the soul is not an infinity of properties or subjective points of view on it. The soul has no empirical boundary ($\text{///} \square \times \nabla ?$).

This is not an enumerated infinity, not the infinity of standing between two mirrors but the infinity of endless interiority: the unboundedness of the interiority of being: a *qualitative* not a *quantitative* infinity.

The soul has no finite margin but an infinite inner cusp where experience ends. The horizon of the soul is much wider than any physical horizon.

sameness and difference

The world is defined by difference but the soul is absolute sameness. The soul is the sameness that makes possible the diversity of difference. As emptiness the soul contains no difference within itself. The soul cannot be observed.

one

You are not some-body but you are some-one. This one-ness is what you are. The soul is the self. The soul is basic.

constant

To do non-metaphysical phenomenology it is necessary to focus on one experience rather than another. To do fundamental phenomenology it is necessary to relax focus and *pan-out* over all one's changing experience in the now. This *panning-out* is the apprehension or appreciation of one's changing experience as a whole in the now. It is necessary to *describe that which is constant* in the course of one's own experiences.

It might seem at first as though the constant lasts but the constant is *utterly unchanging*. The constant, although it is, is devoid of all time except *nowness*. The constant does not have duration. Duration is implied by, for example, the bare fact of aging, not deterioration, but the bare fact of being older than it was. Aging implies changing because if something is older than it was then it has changed. The pure presence of the soul is not like that. The now that is now is the same now that existed years ago which is to say it neither lasts to changes.

abiding

It is not necessary to have an experience of an experience at the same time as having that experience in order to characterise the soul. By being the soul, by abiding, it is possible to describe the passing experiences as they are. You are not so much abiding as the abiding. This abiding which is your true nature is realised by a transition *from thing-ness* to *no-thing-ness*. You are the *ab-id-ing it-self*: the abiding itself. Abiding here is not the same as lasting, but *the unchanging*: the (back)ground against which all your experiences happen or pass by. It is appreciation of the token or particular experiences that pass by which allows description of their background: as the gaps between the leaves on a tree make possible to perception of space. Souls are not assemblages (//■ ∪ //•).

enlightenment

The soul is the source of *en-light-enment*. (The thinking of the *Aufklärung* is an obstacle to nirvana) Realising the soul is becoming enlightened. Becoming is not right here because you are always already enlightened. Realising the soul is realising enlightenment. Realising means making apparent here, so in the soul the difference between phenomenology and metaphysical is

overcome. The way to the soul is by staying still. We hold onto old views dogmatically, as though we had thought them up for ourselves. To discover the soul, look and see.

To realise the soul it is necessary to abandon our conditioned beliefs and pay attention to the immediate contents of our experience and then the now-space they constantly occur in. If one can be 'all here now' all conditioning is revealed as only transient content and that which is constant in experience revealed. The realisation of the soul is a transformation in being, a disclosure.

Perhaps surprisingly, you are not yourself. You are your self.

pphilosophy of mind

The soul is invoked by the philosophies of mind that seek to surpress it. The ghost in the machine haunts the atheistic and materialist philosophies that seek to deny it. The soul is hidden in the margins of philosophy of mind but will appear in the clear light of day.

ttranscendental ego

To be aware of oneself is to be aware of one self. To be aware of one is to be aware of one. The transcental ego is the soul. What is construed as the transcendental ego has all and only the properties of the soul. The self is a substance. The self is virtually transcendent and transcendental. The soul is not ineffable but ordinary language has to be stretched beyond its conditioned meanings to describe it.

sself and other

The soul is not socially constructed. The human being is soul-bearing: *sawolberend*: A soul-bearing *process*. The human being is *saweled*, having a soul: *ensouled*. There could be a psycho-physical human being who was no-one.

VII

What is it like to be Dead?

The hereafter is the *here-after*. No illness can damage the soul, even though illness might disrupt this human being's experiences, it knowledge, including from the inside. To do theology: show that God is necessary for the world. It follows that the world is sufficient for God.

At the moment of death the soul in a sense ‘leaves’ the body, but it is more accurate to say that the body and the mind collapse and dissolve at the centre of the soul. You remain as the pure inner space of nowness. You are already a soul. You have never been anything else. The corpse is *seelenlos*, not just *gefühllos*.

The true goal of existence is the reuniting of the soul with God. One soul can in principle, or by grace of God, transfer from one human being to another. The identity of the soul is necessary and sufficient for personal identity. The identity of the human being is not the identity of the soul. Rebirth and reincarnation are logically possible. Rebirth, not just reincarnation, presupposes the existence of the soul. The next life is your life because you pervade it.

The ontological argument for the existence of God is like *cogito ergo sum*.

By the grace of God, psycho-physical life might be resumed through resurrection. Re-incarnation is logically possible and so within the power of God. However, the human being does not continue at death. The soul is permanent in a special sense. It does not so much ‘continue’ at death as *remain*. When you are dead, it is still now. When you are dead, you are still very much you even though the thinks you though you were have dissolved. When you are dead, the absolute interiority of your soul-space still exists. The soul might, by the grace of God, receive phenomena as content again.

The soul cannot disintegrate in death because dis-integration is dissolution of parts and the soul has no parts. The empirical conditioned mind disintegrates at death because it is a set of psychological processes sustained by the brain. With the disintegration of the brain, conditioned, empirical psychology ceases. The human being is impermanent, absolute interiority permanent. Because the empirical mind ceases at death, it is not possible to experience your own death empirically or ordinarily. To put it intuitively: the part of you that might experience your own death dies, so it cannot be deployed by you to experience your own death. To die consciously requires special training. However, the infinite peace of the soul is the overwhelming new experience which begins as the body is shed and the chatter of the conditioned mind ceases. You exist in death.

Understanding that you are a soul enables you to make sense of your temporary stay on earth, or other planets, as a preparation for, by the grace of God, meeting God.

God is one level up from the soul.

In death, when mind and body disintegrate the peace of the soul is disclosed to the dying as their true being. Even if the death involves mental and physical pain, as the body is shed, the peace of the soul radiates. This peace of the soul is disclosed irrespective of whether the disintegrating mind believes it has a soul. It is our true nature.

Because the soul is not the mind or the body, understanding why there is life after death is not the same problem as the mind-body problem.

Reincarnation is a logical possibility. (Theologically: Reincarnation is within the power of God because everything is within the power of God.) Embodiment is possible because you are a soul, not because you are a mind. For a body to be your body is for the soul that you are to be centred in it.

The souls of the unborn are (perpetually) created by God and placed in the embryo at or soon after the moment of conception.

The dead's souls have departed. The human being has died at the centre of the soul's inner space so their souls have only a spiritual existence. The living are ensouled.

The soul does not have various origins but one origin in God. God is pure spirit: infinite subjectivity. God made us in his own image, as fragments of pure spirit, as atoms of pure spirit, as soul atoms. The soul is an atom. This is synthetic a priori.

If someone says 'God' they refer to God. They do this *in knowledge or in ignorance*.

Only God can destroy us.

In death, the human form is shed like a shell, an empty shell. What is absent from this shell that is the corpse? The presence of the person: the presence of the soul. The spirituality that radiates from their body, through their eyes in life is gone. This spirituality, this radiance that we see in the living but not in the discarded shell is the light of the soul. It is not true then that souls are absolutely invisible. If one is sufficiently attentive sensitive or attuned it is possible to see the soul of the other. The presence of the other in ordinary life might be intimidating, or endearing or otherwise.

God and the soul are the true subject matter of philosophical study. The soul never sleeps even though the surface empirical mind of the human being partly and partially closes down in sleep. The soul is spiritually active and God reveals revelations to the soul. The natural state of the soul is spiritual joy. There are glimpses of the soul before knowledge of the soul.

It is false that the soul has no life apart from the body. The body retires from the soul. The human being collapses at the centre of the soul in death.

The main obstacle to the soul's returning to the body is the decaying state of the body. There is nothing intrinsic to the soul, or even to the soul's relation to the body or mind that prevents the soul returning. The corpse is not the right sort of vehicle to receive the soul as its body. The soul with-stands the destruction of the body. God is the teacher of the soul but the soul is partly embedded in the world. The soul is a person. It is less correct to say the human being is the person. The person is the presence pervading what we normally call the 'person'.

The body dis-integrates when parted from the soul. The body does not 'die' because, except in a minimal and mechanical biological sense, the body was never alive.

Similarly, the empirical mind that depends on the brain disintegrates at death but the mind too was never alive except in the minimal semantic and computational sense. The mind's mental life was its pervasion by the soul, your presence as its interiority. The interiority of mental life is lent to the mind by the soul. The interiority of the mind is really the interiority of the soul. God allows for logos to prevail.

The soul has a spiritual function: to journey closer to God. The soul only fully appears to itself, other souls and God. The soul cannot be separated into parts or cut. If God creates a soul he creates *ex nihilo*. If God destroys a soul, he does not break it into parts. It has no parts. If God destroys a soul he annihilates it into nothingness. No-thing-ness is then nothingness. The soul is sustained by God after death, in spiritual states and in resurrection. The soul, has the ability to meet God by the grace of God.

When the body leaves the soul, the soul understands itself properly (*rightly* and *ownly*) for the first time.

We can talk about time here in the earthly sense of the time of dying on earth. However, *dying is the transition from time to timelessness*. Dying is in the most literal and drastic sense running out of time or being out of time.

The immortal soul is ascendent, but expands in every direction from this dying human. There is a revealing of the soul. In death you realise the soul space that you have been all along. The dissolution of the mind and the body allow the sky- nature of the soul to be

re(v)eal(ed). The soul is like the light of the sun which has been obscured by the clouds.

From the fact that the soul continues to exist after the physical death of the human being it does not follow logically that it is immortal. It is immortal because naturally indestructible. From the fact that it is immortal it does follow that it survives the bodily death of the human being.

The finite consciousness of the soul is related to God as the supreme consciousness. The supreme consciousness is termed God. The *jeevatma* soul is life bestowing in human beings. Atman has individuality despite being held in Parmatma. At every stage the soul maintains a oneness beyond all differences. The lesser oneness of the created soul is bestowed by the grace of the infinite oneness of God.

The soul is a sign of the presence of God. The soul is an epiphany. The soul is your own existence, so your own existence is a sign of the presence of God. Only God could have made anything you. The creation of the soul, and its being caused to pervade the body by God, is the explanation of your own existence in the causal sense of Why do I exist? The soul belongs to a higher reality than the body and mind, but God is infinitely exalted above the soul.

The soul belongs to the realm of truth. The soul, after its separation from the body, will continue its moral progress until it attains the presence of God. The soul is a kind of presence and God is ultimate infinite presence. The attainment of the presence of God is therefore a fusion of two presences. It appears that the soul disappears into God but the soul is held by God. It appears that the soul has dissolved in God but the individuality of the soul is preserved by God. Union with God, Being-in-God is the teleology and the theology of the soul.

Life is itself a hidden or revealed theology. The tacitly or unacknowledged goal of all souls is union with God, even the soul of the atheist and the worst sinner. Understanding God as the goal of the soul helps progress towards God. The soul is in a state of bliss once cleansed of sin.

A state of sin is a condition which only the grace of God can alter or expunge. By the grace of God the soul will endure as long as the Kingdom of God: forever. The soul has sovereignty over the human being. A human life is the dominion of the soul: your body and your mind are your own. Your power endures as long as your soul endures.

The soul is in state of nearness to God. The soul in hell is in a state of distance from God. Each follows causally from sin or redemption. The soul is the individual you are. Efforts to live a spiritual life bring the soul nearer to God. Lack of spiritual life is distance from God. To develop spiritually is to move closer to God. What is this 'closeness'? It is not any kind of physical proximity. As a heuristic, consider two physical objects that are close. Subtract the physical objects but imagine the closeness left over. This is a kind of non-physical closeness. Of course, the closeness of the object has gone, but the closeness remains as an abstract universal. This non physical universal closeness is an inadequate pointer, but a pointer, to the closeness of the soul to God. Like everything earthly, it falls short of Being-With-God.

There is Being-with-God on earth but this is hidden by mind body and sin. The individual soul has existence prior to life on earth, timelessly in God.

The soul's spiritual desire is always towards God and away from the material world. The natural desire of the body and the mind is towards the physical world. The soul is created by God in preparation for entry into this physical life. During that period, the soul acquires the physical faculties (eyes, limbs,) necessary for physical existence in the physical world. The physical world is like a another womb where the soul is steeled for departure to the spiritual world. Our time on earth is therefore a period of preparation during which we s(h)oul(d) acquire the spiritual development necessary for life in the next world.

The crucial difference between heaven and earth is that heaven is perfect, earth imperfect. Spiritual development is voluntary. Spiritual development in the physical world depends closely on a conscious individual effort of will.

The soul is part of creation but part of spiritual creation, not psycho-physical creation.

The body and mind dissolve in death but the soul cannot dissolve so has not dissolved after death. The soul is invincible and so survives the transition to the resurrected person. 'Transition to' is ontologically misleading. The soul remains unchanging and God builds the resurrected human being into the soul by creating a spiritually perfect body. Heaven is a space. Heaven is a spiritual space not spatially related to the space of empirical space-time.

It is logically possible, and within the power of god, to subject the same soul to repeated births. (There is nothing that is logically

impossible but the concept is useful because there might *seem* to be a possibility: a surface possibility.) The soul is the subtle-mind which is present in incarnation.

Within the soul, any empirical or supernatural content is in principle possible or within the power of God to bestow.

If some resurrection is your resurrection and if God equips you with a spiritually perfect body then your soul successively occupies two numerically distinct bodies.

The soul has a spiritual function in enabling you to grow in spirituality, to meet God and be in God in the kind of being called Being-in-God. In Being-in-God individuality is retained.

The soul does not have a body between earthly life and resurrection. The soul wanders unless guided by God; unless guided by God to guide itself.

Metaphysical phenomenology uncovers the soul. Metaphysical phenomenology has two parts: the Phenomenology of the Soul and the Phenomenology of God. The phenomenology of God is largely possible only after death but it is conducted by the soul.

Earthly existence is not much like a dream because of the compelling reality of physical objects. Earthly existence is not a dream because because of the reality of physical objects.

The resurrected person is not just continuous with the earthly person but identical with it. Continuity of awareness is guaranteed by identity of the soul. Identity entails continuity but continuity does not entail identity. In earthly incarnation the psycho-physical human being is continuous over time. Its spatio-temporal continuity is necessary and sufficient for its continuity but not its identity. Its identity persists despite the logical possibility of gaps in its spatio-temporal continuity, despite the theoretical possibility of an intermittent existence. The human being continues. The soul remains unchanging. Incarnation is the occurrence of a set of space-time processes in the Now.

There is intersubjectivity because souls are mutually pervading. One soul can be where another soul is without being it. One physical object can be where another physical object is without being it.

Spiritual progress is achieved by being granted by the Grace of God. Spiritual enlightenment is achieved by individual effort and the grace of God. Spiritual states

Although the soul is not any kind of activity it engages in spiritual activity. The soul makes the living body more than just biologically alive. The soul is in a spiritual state. The states of the soul

are both potential and actual but the soul itself is only actual. The soul may be defined as pure actuality. The body and mind have an earthly function: to serve and aid fellow beings. The potential for irrational activity constitutes part of the essence of a human being, but not a soul. The works of the soul are through the body or the mind or through itself. Ethical work is spiritual. *Die Seele* is not *das Innenleben*. *Die Seele* makes possible *das Innenleben*.

It is not wrong but inadequate to say that the self 'persists' or 'endures' after death. The soul *remains* after death. It is still now in and after death. Death is one more process and transition, like the transitions in life but this time a transition that ends one human life. It is false that the soul perishes at death.

Physical and mental events are perishable. It is in their nature to be transient. Physical objects do not appear event like but that is their true ontology. Macroscopically, a physical object has a beginning a duration and an end and changes during its existence. At the micro level a physical object has an event like sub-atomic composition. Minds are mental processes unified by their internal semantic and logical relations, inside the soul. God made a human being you when he pervaded some biological matter with your soul.

To strive overtly for union with God might engender a battle between good and evil within the aspirant soul. A surer strategy is to let sin fall away from one's life. Then, by the grace of God, the soul and God are disclosed.

The empirical will perishes at death because it is the will of a finite human being. The metaphysical will of the soul survives. What people call communication is a rehearsal for direct after death communication between disembodied souls.

At some metaphysical time, ordained by God in the eternal Now, there will be resurrection by the grace of God. The hereafter is the here-after.

The relation between Father, Son and Holy Spirit is identity-in-difference.

As a person dies, their body and mind dissolve. When the soul is judged by God it is consigned to hell or raised to heaven.

God can know the entire content of the soul, everything that has passed through it, including all right and wrong. Re-pentence of sin and trust in God is necessary for salvation. The soul is capable of eternal life. Although the soul is naturally indestructible, the soul is not guaranteed eternal life except by the grace of God. It is within the power of God to annihilate souls so if they persist, that is granted by

Him. Being-in-God is the eternal fellowship of God. Without repentance of sin, the soul suffers the separation from God that is hell.

Beginning

There is no gradual coming-to-be of the soul, no ■□●□?•? that is temporal in *itself* taking time. If a soul comes to be it begins instantaneously, so any ■□●□?•? of the soul is a ■□●□?•? of time: a part of creation that is a microcosm (∩•□×// ∩//? ∩//?) of creation.

Salvation is salvation of the soul. The human being is selfish but the soul, as the real self, is selfless in the sense of without ego and because the ego is yet another set of accretions in inner space, within but without the soul. The human being is without merit unless his or her efforts are directed to the work of God. The soul after death is judged by God. The only explanation of the soul is a theological explanation.

Philosophy of religion is the use of theology to answer philosophical questions. ('Does God exist?' is a philosophical question, not a theological question.)

Medium

The soul is a *medium* both in the sense of a route to spiritual real(i)ty and in the sense of 'air' or 'water'. The soul is living water. The soul is interpreted: *asked for between* God and the physical world. The soul is a portal to God.

The existence of the soul is a necessary condition for the truth of Christianity. It is the soul that accounts for your own existence after death and before resurrection. On any view that I am not my soul Purgatory must be less painful: I do not go to Purgatory, only my soul. I am my soul. The foetus is an awaiting being. God pervades the foetus with a soul. A being that is born does not have the option not to die.

In resurrection the soul possesses a continuity of personal identity dependent on and entailed by the existence of the soul. The fact that the soul persists in resurrection entails that consciousness in the sense of absolute interiority persists. It is the soul which guarantees that some resurrection is your own resurrection. God could in principle create any number of bodies and minds qualitatively identical to

your body and mind and thereby 'resurrect' any number of human being's qualitatively identical to yours. By pervading one of these with your soul God thereby resurrects you. Your soul is qualitatively distinct from any other soul. By resurrecting you God causes your soul to be present in and centred on the resurrected human being. Soul leaves him meaning that he has stopped breathing and his fate for any future existence rests solely with God who they believe has the power to re-create the whole person and restore their existence. This is in line with their belief that represents the grave and the possibility of eternal death for unbelievers rather than eternal torment.

In death, it is less accurate to say that the soul leaves the body than the body leaves the soul. The body collapses but the soul remains still. The physical world dissolves but the soul remains absolute interiority.

There are three levels of intersubjectivity. After death there is intersubjectivity of souls. Souls communicate by mutual pervasion. After death there is no conditioning of one soul by another. There is no categorial imposition. The situation is the same in earthy life, when you and I communicate our souls communicated but because on earth we 'are' human-being we condition each other by our interaction. I have never seen you. You have never seen me. We have only ever seen each others' human beings. Being human beings is an obstacle to our communication.

From the third person point of view of surviving spectators, it is not misleading to say the soul has left the body. They are still confronted with the body, which is now still (more still than any body, or anybody, could be in life).

Do we die consciously? When you die, the human being dies so the part of you which would be aware of dying dies and so you do not experience your own death in any ordinary sense. There is not an experience of death because death is not an experience. Death is the end of experience. The soul survives death and soul states can be experiences of death. In this sense, you become what you really are for the first time. The body and mind fall away and you are disclosed to yourself as the soul you are.

The soul does not 'sleep' between the time of death, and resurrection. It is a set of spiritual states. The soul is present in the body in life, absent from the body in death. Absent from God in life, in the presence of God in death.

At the moment of death the soul immediately makes the transition from temporal to timeless existence. This is slightly misleading,

because the soul was always timeless, even in life. The unchanging being that you are is an eternal now. The soul becomes fully present at the end of time: at the end of the time of your life. After death, the soul does not experience any time passing. The soul, if clouded with sin, is purged or cleansed before being worthy of the presence of God. Phenomenalism, the empiricist theory of perception, is the doctrine that to talk about physical objects is equivalent to talking about actual and possible sense experiences. More precisely, it is the thesis that any set of sentences about physical objects may be translated into a set of sentences about sense contents without loss of meaning. It follows that claims about physical objects are logically equivalent to claims about sense contents: $(\exists x) (x \text{ is a physical object}) \leftrightarrow (\exists y) (y = \Sigma: \text{sense contents } \{1 \dots n\})$. If this translation project is possible then the public may be rewritten as the private, the external as the internal, the physical as the mental. If the translation is only possible in the direction physical to mental, then the physical is reducible to the mental but the mental is not reducible to the physical. Now, one kind of disembodied existence is like the truth of phenomenalism. The world is phenomenologically reduced to one's experience in it. Phenomenalists and phenomenologists insist their views are not to be confused with one another and are in fact profoundly opposed. In philosophy this is paradoxically a sign that they are saying the same thing.

It is given, in one sense by God, in another to itself. The soul does not engage in *creation*. There is an onto-theology of the soul. The human being is fallen. Is the soul fallen? The human being is inauthentic but the soul is authentic. Existential inauthenticity is fallenness. Bad faith is fallenness.

In death, you are what is left over when the human being dies. In death, the empirical mind ceases and the body starts to disintegrate. The present remains. The present abides. In the dead of the other it is their presence to you through their body that is absent.

When you lose your life your life is what you lose.

It is wrong that phenomenalism is an impossible doctrine because it presupposes a private language but there is no private language. Phenomenalism entails that the public language can be translated into a private language which is not private in any strong sense of 'private'. For example, it is a language anyone could in principle understand. Phenomenalism is a route from the public physical world to the subjective space of the soul.

Preparing for death is preparing for the end of time. 'The present' is one definition of the soul. When you die it is still now.

Genetic metaphysical phenomenology locates the origin of experience in the spontaneity of the soul and, ultimately, in God. It is the presence of the soul in the world which produces what we ordinarily call 'experience'. The world is a case as well as God because God has given creation its own autonomy.

The soul in a sense is inner person, not in the sense of 'inside the human being' but the human being's interiority. The soul is that by which a human being is made in the image of God.

See soul, with Biblical meaning that animals and people are souls, that souls are not immortal, but die; soul means the person; life as a person, etc.

'Soul' signifies the *spiritual principle*. Each person's soul is created by God at the same time as the physical body. The soul is the person himself or herself. The soul is eternal. In the resurrection the soul is granted an eternal spiritual body, that is, a body that is substantial without being material. After the death of the earthly body, the person becomes immediately conscious in timelessness.

In earthly life, the *sawol* is a *gast* and agast. The *sawol* as *gast* is a *gyst*. Because the soul survives bodily death and the soul is the conscious self, the conscious self survives bodily death.

There is an intermediate state, after death but before resurrection. Rachel's death in Genesis 35:18 entails her soul's (Hebrew) departure. When Elijah prays in for the return of a widow's boy to life, he entreats,

'O LORD my God, I pray you, let this child's *nephesh* come into him again.' 1 Kings 17:21

In death *nephesh* or 'soul' is separated from the body. Life cannot be restored unless *nephesh* is restored.

Life can return if and only if the soul returns.

Christ says to the repentant thief on the cross:

'I say to you, today you will be with me in paradise.'

Luke 23:43

If we understand that 'What makes a day today?' as a profound metaphysical problem, we can understand Christ as providing the

theological answer. God makes a day today. A day is today if it passes through the eternal now and the eternal now is the presence of God. Heaven exists now, not only or primarily in the future. Heaven is part of creation, so the eternal now of God has been bestowed on Heaven as its nowness. This very day, the thief will be with Christ in Paradise. As their bodies die, they are already in heaven. The scriptures can be argued for philosophically. The answers to philosophical questions are to be found in scripture. They express the truth that is hidden by the empirical world yet makes that world possible.

In death the human body dissolves into dust. The soul-space or spiritual seed unites and is real-ised in God. The soul proper is the bearer of spiritual states, the human being the carrier of psychological functions and personality, emotion, memory, rational faculties, imagination. The soul sur-vives, over-lives or lives beyond life. The emptiness of the soul is the fullness of its spirual being. The emptiness of consciousness in nirvana, nibbana, is the interiority of the soul. Nirvana is beyond being and nothigness because it is the no-thing-nes of the soul.

We see here a profound, hidden but true dimension to the Christian doctrine of the Holy Trinity. Reality is body mind and spirit, that is, Pos, information, God. Human reality is a part of reality. Humanity is the microcosm. Reality is the macrocosm (a manifestation of that reality). Humanity is a trinity. The Universe is a trinity. Information can be the message: God as Christ.

The earthly function of the soul is to make a human being someone. The divine function of the soul is to make the meeting with God possible. Only a being that by grace is permitted to have a quasi-spiritual nature is capable of meeting God.

The soul is between heaven and earth and in both places. The soul is therefore in the world but not of the world. In time, the soul is subject to psycho-physical processes. In resurrection the soul receives spiritual flesh. *Neshamah* goes to the source and *ruach* is, undestructed and indestructible, but unredeemed, relegated to a lower world. General resurrection occurs only after the end of time when transfigured souls who have acquired spiritual flesh finally re-unite with God in final salvation.

However, on a spiritual or metaphysical level, subject- object dualism has not been abolished. Although the soul is an inside without an outside, this means it is an inside without a physical outside. It has

an absolute exteriority or an other-sided-ness that, when thoroughly understood, will turn out to be God. Subject-object dualism therefore exists on the spiritual plane because you, as a finite soul, are not God and God, as the infinite spirit, is not you.

The soul is sea and sky. The implications of the soul are immortality and destiny after death. We cannot destroy ourselves. That is not in our power. Transcendental idealism should be replaced by transcendental theism. God is the ultimate non-empirical ground for the possibility of experience.

In a sense the living human being is pervaded by soul, *plein d'âme*, but the soul is emptiness, so in life, the soul is *plein de monde*. It is interesting that we fear death. We have no idea what our existence consists in or why we are here. Why then should we fear our own non-existence or our absence from 'here'. The answer is that death looks so bad from the standpoint of exteriority. Third person death is the destruction of the body.

The soul that you are is between ordinary finitude and the infinity of God. It is infinite in that it has no outside. It is infinite in having the eternal now as its interior time. It is infinite in having an infinite interiority as its here or space. The infinity of God is however greater than the infinity of the soul. The idea of different sizes of infinity is coherent. There are more numbers than odd numbers. There are more numbers than even numbers, even though each of these number series is infinite. The sum of odd and even numbers is infinite but greater than the sum of even numbers that is infinite and greater than the sum of odd numbers that is infinite. There are different sizes of infinity or different infinities. The infinity of God is greater than the infinity of your own soul. The soul is still. In this sense, at death, less changes than you might think. At death you abide. You remain. The soul is from the other side. Because you are in-side you are already on the other side. To acknowledge the soul is to obtain knowledge of the soul. The existence of an immortal soul is your being. This cannot be grasped by thinking of yourself as another (as we habitually do). Your awareness of what you really are is immediate, both in the sense of 'now' and in the sense of 'not mediated (by thought).

If by the soul *microcosm* of God, then we could understand this as a kind of pantheism (the doctrine that God is everywhere). Use this terminology, but this does not mean he was not a pantheist. Philosophy is split between the critique of pure reason and the ineffability of God and the postulate of the soul. God and the soul

need to be made objects of knowledge. could be used, in spite of to do metaphysical. Noumena, things-in-themselves, God, the soul: these are the conditions for experience.

What I s(h)oul(d) do is conducive to a spiritual life. There is no polarity of the soul.

The Other of the soul is God. The phenomenologist needs to become a metaphysician to do fundamental phenomenology. By putting all existential assumptions ab-out world and experience of it into parenthesis, the soul is r(ev)ea(l)ed. The soul is realised in both a metaphysical and an epistemological sense. The soul is realised in the sense that the human being realises that he or or she is a soul. The soul is real-ised in the sense that the disclosure of its reality is more real than the empirical world. There are degrees of reality. God is more real than the soul. The soul is more real than the world. Degrees of reality depend upon purity of being. God is pure infinite being. The soul is pure infinite being, but the infinity of the soul is less than the infinity of God. The soul is de-pendent on nothing except God. To speak of the soul is to speak of something essentially related to God: a part of creation.

God entails his existence because being is the being of God. Theological phenomenology is logically independent of metaphysical phenomenology: God does not have to create. Whether there is a world or not, the soul exists. If the psycho-physical world were destroyed, souls would remain.

Theological phenomenology describes the possibility of the soul: the reality of God. Fundamental phenomenology integrates philosophy with theology. Theology provides the answers to fundamental philosophical questions. Science rests on philosophical foundations. Philosophy rests on theological foundations. Fundamental phenomenology is therefore a contribution to the reconciliation of theology with science, faith with reason, truth with pragmatics.

How could the present moment be destroyed? How could eternal stillness be destroyed? How could absolute interiority be decomposed into parts? It has not parts? The inteiority of the soul is ethereal: ether-real. There is a soul irrespective of whether there are objects.

In a dying person, they are are still presetn. That presence in the dying other is the unchanging soul, the you-ness of them. In dying something goes from the other. Something is absent which was

present in life. It is the subjectivity of the other that cleaves the body. It is the presence of the other as soul, as the themness of them that is no longer present thought their face.

There are three essential dimensions to the human being: body, mind and spirit: body mind and soul. Triplism is true. The human being is the holy trinity in microcosm. The holy trinity is body mind and spirit writ large as ultimate reality.

Possibility is the infinite power of God. It is within the power of God to make any number of souls but in making a soul like yours he is making you. The solution to the terror of solipsism is the existence of God.

There is an objective spatio-temporal reality created by God. Fundamental phenomenology explains how these constitutions are possible.

The soul is light. The soul is a fragment of the nature that pertains to heaven. The soul is heavenly, not earthly, so our being is not quite being-in-the-world. The soul is an unchanging reality, body and mind perpetually changing appearances. Learning about objectivity, no matter how acute will never teach subjectivity. Psychological and physical understanding will never teach spirituality.

Although the soul cannot be empirically damaged in the way that a body or a mind can, and so the soul is independent of any mental or physical illness, the soul can be *ethically* damaged. Ethical damage is a set-back. If a soul is sick it is ethically sick from contamination by the body or the mind. The soul is a person. The person shows signs of being a soul by exuding *own-ness*. Weakness of the soul is ethical weakness caused by weakness of the mind and body. The soul is concealed from itself by the hindrances that interpose themselves between the soul and the body and the soul and the mind. Although the soul itself remains unaffected by any bodily illnesses and ailments, the soul suffers. If *this human being* suffers, I suffer. Beliefs are saturated with hopes and fears so they are be-liefs, as you would lie or otherwise.

The beginning of the soul is the beginning of your own existence. You exist fully and wholly when your soul begins to exist. You do not exist any more when you are placed around and through a body and develop a mind. Your body and mind are *there-for you* but therefore not you, and not therefore you.

The mode of the human being is being-toward death but the soul is already in immortality. At death, the soul sheds the human being. The human being dissolves in the soul into nothingness. The human

being dissolves in no-thing-ness into nothingness but you survive as the no-thing-ness you were all along.

The soul is a medium both in the sense of the phenomenological space in which all your thought and action occurs and in the spiritual sense. The soul is a medium between the human being that you 'are' and God and other souls.

spiritual states

Spiritual states of the soul do not correspond to any mental or physical events. There is no hallucination in or by or of the soul. First-person psychological descriptions are not sufficient to capture the spirituality of the soul. But descriptions of someone's experience as theirs entails the existence of their soul. Externalism is false of the soul. Externalism has no application to the spiritual states of the soul.

'Here' is a spiritual word, as are 'now' and 'I'. Being in space is being in spiritual space. The spiritual is not 'over there'. The spiritual world pervades the empirical world. The spiritual world is all-here-now. Being all here now in one's own authenticity is being as a spiritual being. Being present is being spiritual. You are an epiphany: an appearance of the soul in the empirical world.

The soul is the light in the phenomenon. There is no psychology of the soul so there is no descriptive psychology of the soul. The description of the soul is the description of a spiritual reality. The soul is a glimpse of spiritual reality. The soul is an epiphany but has to be understood as such. What appears is not just sensory data or qualia, patterns of sensation but the no-thing-ness in which they occur.

The 'inter' in intersubjectivity is not really a between between souls, it is a spiritual overlap. The sound exists in both souls. The semantics exists in both souls. What you hear is what I hear. What you understand is identical with what I understand. This is what communication entails. Communication between souls is spiritual communication. Explaining ordinary communication between human beings faces philosophical problems. Spiritual experience between souls is empathic experience. It takes place in the eternal now. There are no third person criteria for the attribution of spiritual states to the soul by other souls. One soul intuitively understands another directly. In ordinary conditioned communication there is such a thing as the moment or point or phenomenological place of understanding, where transmission is received 'consciously'. This is the pervasion of one soul by another, a meeting of spiritual states. Two spiritual states, when

they meet, fuse like two drops of water. Or, one spiritual state of one soul can be deposited in another soul and obtain there as a state of the second soul. This is how spiritual communication takes place: directly by intuition with no physical intermediary. There is something common to all human modes of communication, through writing, speech, looking, hearing and so on. What there is in common to all forms of communication is the meeting of two souls, mutual pervasion and the deposition of a state. If one person understands another's communication then the receiver is caused to be in a state qualitatively similar to the state of the transmitting person. This much is common to spiritual communication between souls and mental communication between human beings. Understanding another soul without communication is imagining being that soul, imagining what it is like from the inside to be that soul. The soul is a *persistence* but a persistence without duration, an absolute ☺ ∨ × ▲ ▭ × • ∨ .

God is the hidden primordial absolute who makes possible the first-person point of the soul but God is ordinarily not apparent. It is half way between the subjectivity and objectivity of the empirical world and the absolute nature of God. God has made us in his own image. By grace, God has bestowed a fragment of the absolute on the human in the form of a spiritual soul. Intersubjectivity depends on the soul. The souls are the subjects between which there is intersubjectivity. The souls qua souls are not intersubjectively constituted but made by God. Heaven is the home of the soul. In or between pure souls there is no left or right or up and down.

The ☺ ▭ // ▭ // ? was originary in creation. God is the light of the earth.

Intentionality does not characterise the directedness of the soul toward God. Being-in-God. The soul is not related to God by virtue of its content because it has no content. The soul is closer to God though having no content, by dying, and by being cleansed of sin. Once deconditioned the ethical route to God is open. Route is an inadequate term because as St. Augustine says God was holding your soul all along. There is in the end an outside of the soul. God is all around your soul. Although your soul is infinite it is surrounded by the infinitely greater infinity of God. The 'route' to God is an ethical route.

The spiritual context of the soul is God and the other souls. Because we are made in God's image, the eternity of the soul is a microcosmic likeness, ▭ • ☺ ◀ ● , of God. There can be no physical

□ • ☺ ◀ ● of God because God is pure subjectivity without objectivity and only the physical can be depicted (*pictus*) physically.

God is the widest condition for the possibility of experience, after that, the soul. The soul is the enduring self but absolutely enduring, so we have to give up talking about enduring here. The human being is a psycho-physical space-time process. Your being one is your soul centering on one and pervading the world.

The soul is metaphysically private. Its interiority is disclosed only to itself and God. Your own existence is a reconciliation of God and nature, theology and science. Both theology and science apply to you: you are created by God and your human being can be studied by science. You are a portal from science to God. The soul has a vision of God.

God is the foundation. The soul is you *per se*. You are a synthesis of being for itself and being in itself. You are being for itself because as soul you are consciousness, an opening onto the world and a portal to God. You are being in itself because as soul you are what you are independently of your relations to anything else except God.

The soul is a monad, *essentially* one. The soul is simple. The soul is a substance. Several souls taken together are incapable of fusion or synthesis into a single soul. There is no such thing as a compound soul. Souls enter into communicative relations by being where each other are. Because the soul is simple it has no parts so it cannot be destroyed by dissolution into parts. Because the soul is a substance it depends upon nothing but God. Because the soul is a substance it could continue to exist if everything else did not exist except God. If the world were destroyed the souls would remain. Nothing natural could destroy the soul. Souls although unbounded have extension, infinite inner extension. A soul has no shape so a soul, like a number is something with size but not shape. A soul is indivisible. The soul is a spiritual atom. The soul is the element of your own life. Souls do not begin by any natural cause. Natural objects begin by the coming together of their parts. The soul has no parts so cannot originate in this way. Natural living objects are capable of physical growth. The soul is not physical so is not capable of physical growth, so the soul is not a natural living thing. It is not living by the biological criteria for life. Souls do not depend upon one another for their existence so one could exist without the others.

communication

There is a system of souls that are interconnected by mutual pervasion. We are much closer to one another than we realise, much closer than the distances between our bodies would suggest. The kind of philosophy that comes nearest to disclosing the nature of the souls as a set of skies is phenomenology. In phenomenology you approach your own soul. There are *manifestations* of the soul but they are subtle. Foreexample: In death the presence of the other is absent, the soul is not present *through* the other human.

ccommunication

Communication between disembodied souls is much easier than communication between souls inhabited by human beings. You inhabit your own soul. You dwell in your own soul. This is an obstacle to your knowing your soul as such. The soul places no constraints upon the human being. After the metaphysical *epoché* the inquirer cannot but assume the attitude of metaphysical phenomenology.

Empathy is possible, or successful, only if you are a soul and the object of empathy is a soul. Of courzsse ordinarily, or in conditoned reality, the other dis not construed as a soul. Unknwingly, when empathy is successful the other is a soul.

Analysis and synthesis

There is no analysis or synthesis of the soul because only that which has parts admits of analytis or synthesis (in ontology or semantics). There is an infinite number of possible worlds in which more than one soul is where just one human being is, so that both souls adopt the subjective point of view of that human being. Indeed, there is not limit to the number of souls that could inhabit a human being. Would they know of one another's presence? In the most immediate and direct way. Souls communicate with one another by being directly acquainted with one another's spiritual states. The obstacle that was the psycho-physical human being has been removed. There is mutual transparency. It follows that the afterlife is a disturbingly honest place.

The soul is logically private.

Empathy is the means by which one soul can understand another in the physical world. Souls are not intersubjectivly constituted, even though the human being is constituted in a quasi-Hegelian way. The soul is a synthesis of subjectivity and objectivity, but an *originary synthesis*, a primordial synthesis that makes this difference possible.

Others are expressive beings because their souls are present(ed) through their living bodies. The soul (*Seele*) can see.

Pprivacy.

Some experiences belong to the same soul if and only they occur in the same single soul space. If souls overlap, could the same experience occur in more than one soul space? It could only be an experience in one soul space because absolute interiority cannot disclose the same experience to another. It could exist in another soul space as a bare event, or as an object of experience. Such an object of experience is not an experience to the other.

It is the soul that accounts for the privacy of mind. The mind is not inherently private without the soul, even in it tokens. Its being in a soul that is its being sealed in absolute interiority. In this sense another cannot have my pains. Can another eat for me? Can another eat for that human being? Physical states and processes in this sense are just as inalienable as mental states.

The soul has self-intimating epistemic access to its own experience. It knows what it is by being what it is.

Ways of speaking and thinking about the soul succeed in reference even if they are in adequate in sense. 'My (soul)' meant by the speaker refers to his or her own soul.

Life after death is not a *time after this time*. Life after death is the revelation of this present time *as* eternity.

Souls can only begin by creation and end by annihilation which means that only God can make or destroy souls. The soul cannot alter in itself so it cannot be altered in itself by anything else. The soul cannot be dis-placed. The soul has attributes: here, now, I and interiority. The soul is with-out the human being. The only difference between one soul and another is myness, ousness etc. Souls are not subject to empirical change, except in their content. Souls are subject to spiritual change by God. The possible worlds in the mind of god are chiliocosm: infinite in number. The soul is the *citta* or heart.

We are insufficiently aware of our own existence. To see that you are a soul and that there is life after death you have to become much more aware of your own existence than you are now.

The human being is concerned with the world but this should be concern with God, or concern for the world mediated by the relation with God. Knowledge of the soul is *wisdom*, not just knowledge, $\text{?} \parallel \perp \bullet \checkmark$ not just $\Gamma \parallel \bullet \text{?} \blacktriangle \bullet \cup \bullet$. To the conditioned mind, this $\text{?} \parallel \perp \bullet \checkmark$ seems only sophistry.

Philosophical theories of the soul are answers to philosophical questions. A theology of the soul describes the relation of the soul to God. Understanding the soul requires a sensitivity to the lived reality

of your own existence. Practicality requires a concern with the transient. Ironically, we see(k) permanence in the transient and see only transience in the permanent. Mistakenly we *prefer* the transient. In this we do not know what we do. We mis-take the transient for the permanent. Souls understand one another by pervading one another after death: by being where one another are. The soul has a beginning but no end. As an odd and perhaps unaplatable consequence, you cannot cease to exist. You survive the death of your human being.

It is possible to gain parts of the world. It is of infinitely more significance worth and value to realise one's own soul. The soul can be lost, ethically, or lost epistemologically because we are ignorant of it, or lost ontologically because it is in the power of God to destroy it. The intrinsic states of the soul are spiritual states. The extrinsic or relational states of the soul are mental and physical. Ultimately the soul has a spiritual relation to God. Re-birth is rebirth of the soul. The human being is a constellation of psycho-physical events which cohere in life and dissolve in death. Body, mind and spirit are the elements of the human person. At death the soul loses content and is trans-formed.

The soul can suffer. The removal of suffering requires the living of a spiritual life. It does not follow that the spiritual life is sufficient for the end of suffering, only that it is necessary. The Grace of God is also necessary, and is bestowed by the absolute free will of God, but is more likely to be bestowed on those who live a spiritual life because they are moving closer to God. They are more *proximal* to God. Proximality is spiritual nearness. The soul remains to be reborn. The soul is dependent on nothing except God.

The soul is an absolute interiority because it is an inside without an outside but this needs qualifying. The soul has no physical or empirical outside. The soul has a spiritual exteriority. The infinity of the soul is a lesser infinity than the infinity of God. There are different sizes of infinity. To draw an analogy, the number of number is greater than the number of odd numbers even though both numbers are infinity. The infinity of the soul and the infinity of God are not the infinities of the number series. They are not ordered sequences. Nonetheless, they admit of degrees of greatness or orders of size. The soul is included in God, not as a part, but as a created interiority. In death, the spiritual infinity of God might be disclosed.

Incarnation *per se* is not an obstacle to spiritual. Your original nature is what God placed in your mother's womb. Your original nature is what survives the death of this human being. development,

both because an incarnate being may pray and lead an ethical life and because resurrected beings might, by the grace of God, enjoy the beatific vision. However, if the soul is ruled by the body, or ruled by the mind, this is an obstacle to spiritual growth. The soul is clouded over. A certain freeing of the soul from the mind and the body is conducive to proximity to God. The body and the mind are tools for the doing of God's work in the world. If they are misused, spiritual progress is hindered. The purification of the soul is a necessary part of spiritual advance.

The soul in itself or after death is the true *anuttara-samayak-sambodhi*: the enlightened space beyond body and mind. original nature. The soul is a well but also well, in the sense of good and in the sense of subject to no empirical disease. There is no dis-ease in the soul. The way to the soul is any way a-way from the centre.

The criteria for being a soul are: *I-ness*, *now-ness* and *here-ness*: *Ich-heit*, *Jetzt-heit* and *Hier-heit*; *Je-nesse* (the original *jeunesse* that allows empirical *jeunesse* to begin), *maintenant-esse* (the original *being* which allows you to be *maintained*), and *ici-esse*: the true or original *being-here*. *Maintenant* is the hand (*main*) of God: *Now-ness* (*maintenant-esse*), the eternal presence in which he is holding (*tenant*) your soul. You are God's tenant: everything you see belongs to God. In doing philosophy, look and see. Here the *voie* is through *voir* (if you can hear the *voix*) and thereby allows the transition from *voir* to *voir ici*, from *voir ici* to *voici* to from *voici* to *ici-esse*. *I-ness* is *I-hood*. The soul is the *hood* of the human being: the *cowl* of the monk, the opening onto heaven but also onto the world that is contingently thereby closed. Only what can be open can be closed.