

## CHAT NOTES - August 3, 2014

from caroline sherwood to Everyone:

I'm not clear on the use of the word 'symbol' in this context. I can see how pen and hand are manifestations of TSK, but not symbols. I can sense their complete interdependence but don't know if this is the same as being a symbolic interplay of T-S-K.

from David Filippone to Everyone:

I became aware of the physical objects... my hand (my body-mind), and my iPhone in my hand. But I also was aware of my ideas of identification of both subject and object. The symbols were spacious, accompanying a more substantial felt substance of both. Then I tried to turn on the phone, exercising control, using intent and an act of will.

from Ron to Everyone:

I seemed to imagine watching the subject object interplay from the point of view of a mirror reflecting their movements.

from klaus noldes to Everyone:

seemed that subject and object were reflecting a knowing quality to each other

from Bruce to Everyone:

In reflecting on subject and object as symbol, I may have looked more at them as 'signs,' because I encountered each as what the other points to or is 'for' -- here, hand (as subject) is 'for' all things graspable and touchable and in fact could be seen as having evolved (as a mode of sensitivity and contact, not as an object) in relation to 'objects'. In seeing subject and object as symbols for the interplay of T-S-K, this became especially clear when I introduced action. Subject and Object became incomplete in relation to the dynamic interaction of T-S-K in the opening and closing of the glasses case I held in my hand.

from Micahel G to Everyone:

I noticed that the objective realm defines what I long for (elements in short supply), resent (elements too much in my face), so that the self's subjective responses might be symbols of the availability of reaction0provoking arisings in the objective realm. Conversely, the objective realm seems to respond to what the subjective self is interested in finding outside itself.

from Ron to Everyone:

Sounds very Heideggarian Bruce

from Bruce to Everyone:

Yes, that's nice -- and helps to see 'hand,' for instance, very neatly as subject-object affordance.

from Karin Tommack to Everyone:

Focusing on the sense of touching the actions of naming (pen, paper, hand...) and pointing forth and back seem to take place more slowly. There is a sense of wondering...

from Micahel G to Everyone:

We have to know the parents very well to ask an even more fundamental question: is the baby healthy, all limbs present?

from klaus noldes to Everyone:

how about the baby feeling drawn to look at the face of others and not first to the feet or hands or something else. is that part of a inborn logos?

from Ron to Everyone:

I think that is evolutionary too

from Micahel G to Everyone:

Does the logos expand when we become able to see more knowledge, or are we then seeing more of a logos that was already expressing more knowledge than we were able to apprehend?