

MYSTERIOUS METAPHYSICS

Mike has been drawing attention to the essence-existence ideas of the DU, which obviously concern him more than hyparxis, time and all that. I'll be trudging on along my set hyparchic path but pause here to make some passing comments.

“What exists is always less than what might exist, but the balance is redressed by the quasi-infinite **repetition** of existence that offsets the quasi-infinite **content** of essence” p. 24

The Dramatic Universe is a stimulating treasury of ideas, at least twenty years in the making. It kept on changing and was never really completed. It should always have been regarded as a work in progress and not as a complete artefact. JGB if he were alive now might be making a blog of it!

Thus, the treatment of the triad is not consistent and what he does with Function-Being-Will does not correspond with the discussion of the ‘worlds’ based on triadic laws. For the former he brings in yet another threefold: objective, subjective and cosmic; making nine in all (3x3). The treatment of triadic ‘laws’ is actually very questionable though outstandingly brilliant.

It was Ouspensky who started the business of ‘six laws’ – as the possible combinations of three terms – and JGB was one of a group who were set to look into what they could mean. Rodney Collins had different ideas from JGB (who did not like Collins!) and JGB himself changed his mind between 1952 and the publication of the DU about certain combos. There is no logical way of getting from the formalism to intelligible meaning – one guesses or feels. At first glance, writing e.g. 2-1-3 cannot possibly say anything about the real world.

In a way the six laws are ways of coding six aspects of any event. Thus if we take term 1 as ‘higher’ and term 2 as ‘lower’ then 1-2-3 suggests ‘going down’ and 2-1-3’ suggest ‘going up’ – i.e. involution and evolution respectively. But it’s just a short hand for an already existing idea. It is very strained if one tries to follow it as a sequence. It would take a whole essay to analyse what is going on in this symbolism.

As we know, JGB was evolving what he called ‘systematics’ in the course of writing the DU but he never got beyond a certain basic stage. The principles or rules for interpreting the systems were not developed consistently. Thus, the sequential combinations he used for the triad – ABC, BAC and so on – were never reflected in any other system. There is some hint in the dyad/tetrad where he uses the equivalent of 11, 10, 01, 00. So, more or less, linear combos are only used for the triad; which reflects the history of his thought.

Going back to the worlds of will. There are no less than three ad hoc additions to the principle of the triad. The first we have addressed at least in outline. The second is his essence-existence distinction. Applied just by itself it would yield 8 variations. JGB applied it to the six laws, obviously then making 48 in all. The third intervention was to allow ‘negative triads’ which then result in 96 laws. But in fact he says that they come in pairs such that they cancel each other out. The complexity of triads is increased further when JGB says that what a given triad means is different in different worlds. There are therefore no less than **192** positive triads in this scheme. Simon Weightman and I addressed all 192 of them for the subject of language (unfortunately all our work is lost)

These are perhaps tedious technicalities but do show that the scheme is somewhat ‘cobbled’ together. What’s involved is the fusion of two different systems. The worlds of will reflect different

levels, which is a property of **being** and not of will. Dealing in linear sequences – ABC etc. – strikes me as a reflection in **function**.

The symbolism imports the essence-existence **dyad** into the **triadic** form. The archetypal form for this is the Seal of Solomon with an existential and an essential triad interlocked. Since essence is associated with value and existence with fact this **hexad** belongs to the domain of harmony. Its attribute is coalescence. In Vol III the six laws are given to the hexad, which was a major change of use. The formulation of the six laws is brilliant. They now strike me as the six aspects of every **action**.

One looks for examples of the laws but they can prove elusive. One has to see for oneself. Triadic thinking as such does not come naturally to us (we are third force blind as is said). As mentioned above, the 'laws' mean something different in different worlds. Take 2-1-3. This has many **names**.
E.g.

Concentration

Evolution

Sacrifice

Which might correspond with function, being and will by the way

A 'world' is a **context**.

Looking into what one can identify by means of the six forms in something known and experiences by one is always of value, without any regard to whether it is 'right' or not. The mental action involved is close to 2-1-3 because one has to submit the diverse content (2) to the stringencies of a form (1) to arrive at a definite meaning (3). In active thinking, one comes to know the act of holding one's mind under a question. This is meditation in the raj yoga sense.

My favourite 2-1-3 is distilling alcohol!

Compliments and best wishes for the festive season. May you be near loved ones and find rest from the horrors of the world.