

Session 9, Week 3, January 25
WIR 117-120; DTS 9-18
DTS Ex. 7 & 8

Orientation for Week 3

Last week we started our close reading of the Space Section of *Dynamics*. We looked at how Rinpoche gradually introduces the idea that space itself could be transformed, and what the significance of this 'space transformation' might be. As I pointed out, this discussion takes place on the level of theory, but it is theory of the highest order: the theory (the Greek word 'theoria' is related to 'seeing') that shows us reality. In our usual theory, space is nothing at all, and substance is what matters. But if substance proves to be inseparable from 'nothing at all', then space as the nothing of substance could come alive (to use Soudi's description).

There are various ways to speak of these possibilities. In the phone call I tried naming some of them so that we had a sense of what is at stake: miracles, alchemy, healing, love. (Caroline asked about the etymology of 'alchemy', but the question turns out to be complicated. See <https://www.princeton.edu/~achaney/tmve/wiki100k/docs/Alchemy.html>.) But alchemy is about transmuting one substance to another; here we are talking about an alchemy that transforms substance into space and space into something as yet unknown. There are a handful of references to alchemy in the TSK books: Here is the one that seems most related to where we are going:

Bound to conventional patterns as we are bound to the chemistry of the air we breathe, we give descriptions based on what 'field patternings' make available to be known. Yet knowledge can transform this chemistry; through a kind of alchemy it can invite Time to manifest in a 'new' way. KTS 113

Chapter 2 of DTS starts with another extended image: the box that holds all substantial entities, a box that eventually is flattened. Referring back to Chapter 1, it asks in a new way whether undermining substance also undermines our usual understanding of space. It goes on to take the discussion of 'substance' to a more subtle level. Let us accept the claim of substance to be substance, it says, but let us investigate just what is actually being claimed.

The discussion unfolds in terms of names and labels, a topic we already looked at when we discussed defining boundaries in last week's phone call. As several of you anticipated in the phone call, it seems we cannot get too far into the notion of substance without also invoking the activity of mind or consciousness, of the one who knows and names.

Yet perhaps there is a 'more substantial substance', not framed by our concerns and presuppositions. To raise this question, the chapter shifts to considering reality as a whole. You are soon back to considering questions of meaning. Is this move inevitable: are other alternatives being discarded too quickly?

Following this thread, we arrive at the field communiqué (Compare the reference to 'field patternings' in the quote from KTS above.) But you might want to review carefully: how did we get to the field communiqué from our starting point in space? Did we let go of the realm of space and substance as somehow 'thing-like' too quickly? Are space and mind truly this inseparable?