Journal of CosmoIntel
The First Scientific Journal in T-Consciousness Research

The Word's Unity of Existence

Naghmeh Rezaie[1], Mohammad Ali Taheri[2]

* Correspondence: Naghmeh Rezaie, PhD, Department of English, University of Delaware, USA
Email: Naghmehr@udel.edu

1- Naghmeh Rezaie, PhD, Department of English, University of Delaware, USA
2- Sciencefact R&D Department, Cosmointel Inc. Research Center, Ontario, Canada

Abstract

Linguists do not agree on the origin of human language or the reasons for the human species' unique possession of language faculty on the path of evolution. Any theoretical approach in cognitive science and linguistics eventually faces an impasse in its quest for the origin of language when reaching the realm of consciousness and mind which requires an accessibility beyond the physical inquiry. This article introduces Mohammad Ali Taheri's theory of consciousness, T-Consciousness, as the gateway to the origin of language in the human mind. T-Consciousness stands for the non-material and non-energetic constituent of the universe, the third fundamental element which generates both matter and energy. Taheri theorizes that human beings have detected language rather than inventing it, following the Language Software's primary activation in the human mind through an inter-T-Consciousness-level connection that extracts Fara-lingual information and adapts it into language. This study investigates Taheri's language theory in relation to Chomsky's UG theory, and offers a diversifying approach to UG theory, biolinguistics and psycholinguistics. The article introduces the Word's Unity of Existence/ *Vahdat-e Vojood-e Kalameh* and conceptualizes the Unified Body of Languages, initiating an interdisciplinary discourse to revisit cognitive science, phenomenology, hermeneutics, and intertextuality.

Key terms: T-Consciousness/ Linguistics/ UG Theory/ Language Origin/ Cognitive Science

Linguistic studies, in their interdisciplinary engagement with philosophy, socio-cultural studies, phenomenology, natural science and neuroscience, have not come up with any long-standing theories in response to fundamental questions about the origin and evolvement of human language: How did it all begin? How does it continue? How did human beings evolve to become the only species on earth in charge of the faculty of language? If it is a matter of evolution, why did the mutation that caused the formulation of language capability in the human brain not take place elsewhere and in animals?

Linguists disagree about the origin of languages. However, they agree that any hypothesis about the origin, formation, emergence, and evolution of language is just one more assumption with the same unbridgeable gaps between what we know and what we cannot know. Neither the engagements of the theory of evolution nor the advancements of neuroscience have led to a turning point in the history of our knowledge of human languages. Language theories are often described as "scenarios for the emergence of language" with a wide range of epistemological grounds, from Descartes' mind-body dualism, which attributes the mastery of languages to humans' l'âme/soul, to Saussure's reading of signs and structuralism, which scrutinizes language as a system, to Chomsky's theory of Universal Grammar, grounded in biology but looking beyond (Bouchard 4-60). Language development has often been proposed as an adaptation through natural selection, but language scholars have not come up with any justification for this mutation's uniqueness to the human species "without significant analogue in the animal world" (Chomsky, *Language and Mind* 59). Within the context of cognitive science, the question of the origin of the language has been marginalized because of the lack of evidence and objectivity. In 1866, the Society of Linguistics in Paris banned all discussions of the origin and evolution of language. Although frowned upon as "one of the strangest bans in the history of sciences" from a contemporary viewpoint (Szabolcs and Szathmáry), the 1866 ban historicized the modern era's awareness of shortcomings ahead and the inquietude over the question of the origin when brought up in humanities that are looking through the lenses of scientific theories. Although over a century and half has passed since the figurative ban of 1866, and there are numerous publications, theories, and debates available on the nature, origin, and evolution of language, the ambiguities of language's emergence and evolution are still so far beyond natural science's actual domain to the point of being routinely referred to as "mysteries" or "a concern for metaphysics" (Bouchard 60).

The origin of human language, a mystery not solved in the studies of brain or language theories, continues to be treated as a matter of "metaphysics," and metaphysics itself continues to be a super general term applied to any unreachable concepts beyond physical inquiries, both to be discarded in favor of more feasible methodologies that investigate language in social-cultural and historico-political contexts, or under the light of neuroscience developments. Nevertheless, "questions on the origin of language [continue to] relate to the fundamental question of who we are" (Bouchard 334). Noam Chomsky affirms that the basic questions about language acquisition have never received any satisfactory answers. He has been questioning "the relevance of linguistic theories of studying the origin of language" (Bouchard 6). Chomsky asserts that the answer to the question of language "matters greatly to anyone concerned with understanding our modern selves" ("What is Language?" 3). The fundamental question of "who we are" does not find a satisfactory answer in the domain of current natural science and is subsequently marginalized in the science-oriented discourse of humanities. Chomsky shares his doubts about the prospect of current studies to provide any better answers for fundamental questions: "the hard problems were not solved; rather, abandoned as science turned to its more modest post-Newtonian course […] Within the range of feasible inquiry, there is plenty of work to be done in understanding mental aspects of the world, including human language" (*On Nature* 60).

He observes that "real progress has been made in the study of the mechanisms of language" (*Language and Mind* 87), whereas not much progress has been made in our investigations of human mind: "We live […] in the age of behavioral science, not of science of mind […] Anti-mentalism in linguistics and in philosophy of language conforms to this shift of orientation" (57) Chomsky also predicts that "the essential properties of the human mind will always escape such investigation" and even cherishes such inaccessibility: "if I can be pardoned a final nonprofessional comment, I am very happy with this outcome," which shows his frustration with any given answers (101).

Linguistic theories attribute the externalization of language in human species, a "snowflake" in Chomsky's terms, to the basic need of communication, without explaining why a similar mutation never took place in any other species who also communicate: "Contrary to much mythology, other organisms appear to lack even the most rudimentary features of the human language faculty […] Thus human language appears to be a true species property and one that enters in a central way into our thought and understanding: (Chomsky, "An Interview" 331). In the absence of any concrete evidence on how or why it happened, all one may agree on is that "[human] language happened because it could" (Bouchard 337). Evolutionists support approaching language as an adaptation by natural selection but "how and why did language emerge in humans and not in other species" continues to be unsolved (Bouchard 14-17). From an evolutionary point of view, an outburst happening about 70,000 years ago in a small group, that was a mutation in one person, initiated the language: "the acquisition of the uniquely modern [human] sensibility [as] an abrupt and recent event […] crucially abetted by the invention of what is perhaps the single most remarkable [phenomenon] about our modern selves: language" is estimated to date back to the "very narrow window of 50,000 to 100,000 years ago" (Chomsky, "What is Language?" 3). Chomsky holds that the exact dates are neither clear nor a matter of concern, but the abruptness of the emergence is important, as it alludes to an "infinite power [that] evidently resides in a finite brain" (3). But does that "infinite power" exclusively reside in the brain just because scientific enquiries have not been capable of reaching beyond?

> It is an interesting question whether the functioning and evolution of human mentality can be accommodated within the framework of physical explanation, as presently conceived, or whether there are new principles, now unknown, that must be invoked, perhaps principles that emerge only at higher levels of organization that can now be submitted to psychological investigation. (Chomsky, *Language and Mind* 86)

Although Chomsky's theory of Universal Grammar (UG), "defined as the study of the conditions that must be met by the grammars of all human languages" (Chomsky, *Language and Mind* 112), continues to be one of the most influential narratives in language, it has been criticized, and even doubted as pseudoscience, because of not being falsifiable and the inaccessibility of the Language Acquisition Device (LAD) in the study of the brain, preventing it from being confirmed or disconfirmed. Chomsky responds that "to deny the existence of UG—that is, of a biological endowment underlying the capacity for language—would be to hold that it is a miracle that humans have language, but other organisms do not" (Chomsky, "What is Language" 21). There is a gap in the UG theory when approached from biology's perspective, though, which cannot be bridged by anti-mentalist approaches in linguistics. Chomsky is not conservative about "how sharply understanding declines beyond the simplest systems of nature" and the fact that any progress made in theorizing language faces an eventual impassable in facing the problem of consciousness (*On Nature* 59).

The hard problem of consciousness, brought up by Chalmers in 1990s in *Search of a Fundamental Theory* in cognitive science and philosophy to revisit the "mind-body problem," has been greeted by multidisciplinary scholars, including Chomsky, who has consistently referred to a major gap in language studies due to the persisting problem of mind and consciousness: "The mind-body problem is as baffling as it ever was. The impressive progress of the physical and cognitive sciences has not shed significant light on the question of how and why cognitive functioning is accompanied by conscious experience" (Chalmers 25). We argue that a grand theory of consciousness is on the horizon to respond to the hard problem of consciousness and bridge the gaps caused by the evasiveness of consciousness in multidisciplinary fields including cognitive science and linguistics.

This essay introduces Mohammad Ali Taheri's theory of consciousness, T-Consciousness, as the gateway to the origin of language in the human mind. T-Consciousness stands for the non-material and non-energetic constituent of the universe, the third fundamental element which generates both matter and energy. Sciencefact, an emerging field of scientific studies based on Taheri's theory, is investigating the existence of T-Consciousness through the application of T-Consciousness Fields to "living and non-living creatures including plants, animals, microorganisms, [and] material" in multidisciplinary areas including physics, chemistry, and biology (Torabi et al.). The phase-based Studies of T-Consciousness Fields in Sciencefact investigate the existence and effects of T-Consciousness in applied science (Cosmointel):

> In this theoretical framework, the universe and all its constituents are governed by a rich universal network of data and intelligence known as the Cosmic Consciousness Network (CCN) that contains the entire data and structural and functional information of all animate and inanimate systems. The CFs are the subcategories of the CCN that operate independent of time and space and are capable of implementing structural and functional modifications to the character and behavior of all components of the constituents placed in their field. […] [Taheri's theories are] setting forth the idea that energy and matter are not the only building blocks of the universe and that they are, in fact, a direct result of Consciousness as the third and most fundamental element that gives rise to and governs all forms of energy and matter. (*Taheri et al,* "Consciousness Fields" 3-5)

The existence of T-Consciousness, and the trajectory of the approval of its existence by Sciencefact interdisciplinary research results, will enable us to draw on consciousness, not as an evasive concept which is not within our grasp, but as a turning point in the humanities' discourse that extends our understanding beyond the systems of nature. T-Consciousness theory bridges the gap between what we know about the human brain and what we do not know about language acquisition. The study of the interrelation between human T-Consciousness and the Cosmic Consciousness Network (CCN) in Taheri's theory provides new explanations of the emergence of language in the human mind.

Taheri explains that the emergence of language from existence to being is a "revelation" followed by human "detection," rather than invention or innovation, and the multiplicity of languages with their internal harmonies and unison is readable as externalization of a unified source text. We conceptualize this phenomenon as "the Word's Unity of Existence." The Word's Unity of Existence/ *Vahdat-e Vojood-e Kalameh* conceptualizes a unified unmanifest, the Untextualized Text, of which every other text is inherently a transcription, or an adaptation, and each emerging language a revelation. In this theoretical narrative, the Language Software's primary activation in the human species, generally described as an unexplained mutation, correlates with human being's coming to awareness of one's

existence: the T-Consciousness surfacing as self-T-consciousness, developing language ability and self-consciousness as two unique attributes of human species on the path of evolution. This approach proposes self-identification as the primary driving force in activating language faculty in the human mind leading to externalization in the human brain.

According to Taheri's language theory, human beings have not "invented" language but have "detected" it. This detection has been based on a meta-lingual resource of information that pre-exists language. In this approach, the very first human experience of language detection, has taken place by inter-T-Consciousness-level connection set between human mind and the Cosmic Consciousness Network as information exchange, a sparkling connection in almost no-time, that extracted information as word and activated language faculty (language software predesigned in the human mind) in an individual human brain (the language hardware). The primary activation of language software marks a language software switch-on from potential to practice in an individual brain which could consequently affect and upgrade the Collective Mind of human species, turning the evolution page to language chapter. This narrative partially accords with the theory of evolution by hypothesizing the first language experience resulted by an individual mutation, but also departs from it by establishing that one individual human mind's upgrade could cause a collective language evolution in human species.

Taheri's concept of Collective Mind/*Zehn-e Jami* explains how every evolutionary leap among species begins in an individual mind, operating in the brain, and consequently transferring to all fellow species' collective mind regardless of geographical or temporal distances or boundaries. In this view, one individual mind's detection of language has initiated humanity's discovery of language ability, and language ability's reemergence in sporadic geographical spots did not necessarily require an act of physical emigration by speaking human tribes. Although linguists discern the migration of a small group of about 2000-3000 dating back to about 50000 years ago from the corner of Africa as the only possible means of language spread around the world (*Speaking in Tongues*), the T-Consciousness theory challenges this scenario by hypothesizing the possibility of the emergence of multiple languages in different geographical spots resulted from Collective Mind evolution without necessitating the act of emigration. In this view, the Collective Mind's detection of an already activated human faculty does not necessarily require physical interactions between the species, which also explains diversity of languages after their re-emergence in tribal and geographical divisions despite common attributions and inter-lingual connections in between. According to Taheri, the proper logic of language existed in all human beings. When continents were formed, humans independently and internally shared an innate talent for language despite their dispersal on the planet so that all humans could develop common features in language such as verbs, subject, time, place, and so forth. Chomsky explains that "the systems [of languages] are cast to the same mold" (Chomsky, "An Interview" 330), which could not be an adventitious phenomenon in Taheri's view. This approach does not refute Chomsky's scenario of externalization, although it offers a new insight about it. Chomsky asserts that "there is no point in [language] if you are the only person who has this capacity, then nobody would understand it if you did. But if there are enough people who have that capacity, then you can usefully externalize it" (qtd. in Bouchard 44). The T-Consciousness interconnect justifies the externalization taking place in one human brain, and shortly after in many, in one location, and elsewhere.

Taheri's language theory bridges the gap between biolinguistics and psycholinguistic and it promises border-crossing dialogues in linguistics, phenomenology, hermeneutics, theory of intertextuality and adaptation studies (in both natural science and humanities) and offers a diversifying approach to the origin of the text as well as the origin of the language. The T-Consciousness theory initiates a dialogue with

Chomsky's theory by providing new evidence to revisit the concepts of Universal Grammar and Transformational Generative Grammar, bridge the gap in UG and TGG theories and go beyond their limits. The TGG theory's "basic idea is that knowledge of language involves a system of rules, and representations, of mental computation, linked to the motor and perceptual apparatus, and that much of this system is fixed and invariant, […] determined by our biological endowment" (Chomsky, "An Interview" 330).

Bouchard asserts that "Chomsky's ambivalence about studying the origin of language is understandable from someone who espouses the view that language depends on specific brain system with multiple elements" (Bouchard 6). In bridging the gaps between studying the brain and understanding the mind, Taheri establishes a software-oriented discourse based on his theory of Software Revolution Thinking that aims to "reexamine [the] currently one-dimensional quantitative approach to life and consider a perspective that incorporates the qualitative dimension of Consciousness as an implicit yet integral and pervasive aspect of existence" (Taheri et al, "Consciousness Fields" 2-3).

Accordingly, the innate language acquisition device (LAD) is definable as language software, grounded in mind, operating in brain, and programmable by T-Consciousness. It is notable that in Taheri's theory, mind, psyche, and body are three functionally separate spheres, and the brain is an operator of mind (a contactor) and not a generator of it. The regeneration of language requires a continuous cooperation between mind (the software), brain (the hardware), and the T-Consciousness rapport that interconnects the two via T-information. Chomsky believes that "a language can be acquired, in all of its richness and complexity, because the child basically already knows it, as part of its biological endowment" ("An interview" 330), and Taheri goes beyond the physical inquiry to theorize the "biological endowment" as mental software endowment. The fact that the software cannot be detected in the hardware of the human brain in this approach does not mean it does not exist. By introducing the Principle of T-Information Conservation,[1] Taheri conceptualizes a pre-lingual and Fara-lingual/ *Fara-zaban*[2] state of information which pre-exists any externalization of language. The conceptual icon of X Information marks the connecting principle between T-consciousness, matter, and energy, and sketches the connecting line between human mind, language, T-consciousness and thought ("The Definition of Data"). In the assembly of information/language/thought one item is not distinguishable from the other. This merging pot has caused many controversies in linguistics, by questing the existence of thought beyond the language. Taheri's principle of T-Information Conservation confirms the existence of thought apart from the language although the human mind may not have direct access to that. Thought is the information, and languages are revelators of that information. The Fara-lingual/ *Fara-zaban* is not the inner language but the information preexisting the language. Although a controversial topic in language studies, "no theory convincingly shows that linguistic thinking is required, as opposed to non-verbal thinking […] Actual percepts are impossible to communicate by language" (Bouchard 59). We argue that human beings share the basis of non-lingual state of thought before revealing and accessing it through multiplicities of languages.

Linguistics estimate that there are over six thousand languages and dialects in the world, with constant variations and no actual borders in between. Chomsky explains that languages and dialects gradually shift or dissolve into one other if we move from one geographical point to the other one in two neighboring states or countries. Thus, we cannot easily map the territories of languages with solid lines based on the geopolitical borders of so-called national languages: "with the rise of national states and especially national communication and national education system […] which is a pretty modern phenomenon then you get what we call national languages" (Chomsky, "The Concept of Language"). We draw on the concept of the Uni-Body/*Tan-e Vahedeh* in Taheri's theories to explain that the multiplicity of human

languages, in their recurring patterns, internal harmonies and dialogic interrelations, entails unity in the T-Consciousness level. We describe this phenomenon as the "Unified Body of Languages." In this view, any generated language can affect the whole body of languages. This approach pushes the boundaries of intertextuality and adaptation studies into a Fara-textual level by arguing that intertextuality, and adaptation in between languages, can take place even before the translation, and a given language itself is approachable as translation or adaptation of Fara-lingual/*Fara-zaban* T-information. Chomsky emphasizes that "in the technical sense of the term *evolution,* languages don't evolve at all, though they do change over time […] there has been essentially no evolution of the language capacity, at least in the roughly 50 thousand years […] and the constant historical change […] is not to be confused with evolution" (Chomsky, "Some Core Contested Concepts" 96-97). Taheri explains that human beings have gained access to more, but not necessarily all, features of language faculty embedded in mind at different stages of evolution manifested in various languages and particularities of each language. In other words, they did not have access to language faculty in full capacity from the beginning although the intrinsic capability was in full potential. This assumption resonates with Chomsky's idea of language users evolving rather than language capacity and calls for a more detailed comparative approach.

Although cultural evolutionists assert "that language itself adapts to answer environmental pressures" (Bouchard 10), in approaching language as adaptation, both transitive and intransitive modes may apply: language adapting, or language being adapted. However, the role of human agency and collective consciousness agency will vary in each model: "Under a transitive model, adapters *make* adaptations, thereby rising to the status of author ("maker") […] Under an intransitive model, it might be argued that adaptive organisms are both subject and object of the process. […] they do not make anything, not even themselves; what they do instead is *change*" (Leitch 96). The evolution of each and every language, as an "adaptive organism," interrelates with the evolvement of other languages, although it does not necessarily embody an evolutionary leap. Thus, the intransitive model of the verb adaptation tends to be more aligned with both UG theory and T-Consciousness theory, as both theories assign a secondary role to human agency in the process of universal language evolvement. Taheri's theory gives reasons for the language software's universalism after its primary switch-on/mutation by language detection (and not invention) and explains how the similar software of language faculty, once activated around 50 thousand years ago, continues to initiate evolvements without undergoing a second evolutionary leap. Hence, T-Consciousness theory recognizes the intertextuality of all languages upon their coming to being, and afterward. Comparably, beside historical circumstances, the law of entropy is involved in extinction of languages, when the text becomes inaccessible due to the extinction of a language. The Principle of T-Information Conservation maintains that the extinction of a language does not eliminate the information acquired and generated by it. Burning books has never eliminated the writing.

Taheri's theories reinvestigate the origin of the language and also offer alternative approaches to the future of human languages in the age of deep learning algorithms and big data. For future research, we suggest using Taheri's theories to revisit AI language, the controversial topic which is bringing new doubts and shadows to previously established knowledge of human faculties, including language. Now that "the tantalizing problems that language has always posed for those who are puzzled and intrigued by the mysteries of human intelligence" (Chomsky, "The Current Scene" 595), are being augmented by the mysteries of Artificial Intelligence, it is time for demystification and some crystallizing answers in order to proceed. Taheri's definition of intelligence challenges the established discourse, and Artificial Intelligence is more suitably defined as Artificial Brain or Wisdom/*Aql*. According to Taheri's Theory of

Intelligence in *Psymentology*, an alternative field founded by Taheri which offers a "supraholistic approach the study of mind (mento) and psyche (psychology) […] Intelligence is the ability to create and bring about new information in various fields; Wisdom/ *Aql* […] is the ability to apply, make use of, and utilize […] while Memory is the ability to store and recall information" (Taheri et al., "A Comparison" 74-79). This theoretical distinction between intelligence and *Aql* offers a diversifying approach to the brain-like process of AI-generated languages, and the expectations of creativity and intelligence associated with that. Chomsky reminds us that in "many respects, we have not made the first approach to a real answer to the classical problems. For example, the central problems relating to the creative aspect of language use remain as inaccessible as they have always been" (Chomsky, *Language and Mind* 58). Thus, the puzzlement or excitement about AI creativity in language does not solve the mystery of creativity in language at first place. The studies that aim to unravel the mysteries of natural human language by decoding the brain-like process of AI language show that the brain-like computation of language heavily "depends on the algorithm's ability to predict the missing words" in the context (Caucheteux and King 134). Taheri explains that AI brain-like language develops as mimesis rather than creation, and it will continue to lack human creativity. It is expected "that a concern for language will remain central to the study of human nature, as it has been in the past" (Chomsky, *Language and Mind* 58), whereas there will be new questions about the distinction of human languages from human-like languages, human mind, and brain-like systems to deal with. As serious new concerns are being raised about human conditions in the age of AI, addressed by Taheri as the era of Modern Slavery ("Proposed Principles"), the study of the origin of human language will also contextualize the connection between human languages, human thought and human freedom by "proceeding from the detailed investigation of language and its use to a deeper and more specific understanding of the human mind", human capacities, human conditions, and exploring "human need for freedom from the external constraints of repressive authority" (Chomsky, "Language and Freedom" 96). The word's unity of existence originates the word's freedom of existence.

Although natural sciences are still way behind offering answers to many fundamental questions about the origin and existence that require enquiries and accessibility beyond the physical (that involves either matter, or energy, and in humanities fields the text), the current scientific discourse frequently equates metaphysics with non-scientific and thus nonreliable concepts beyond the scholarly world's actual responsibilities or concerns to keep a safe distance from it. "It would be entirely irrational to argue that certain phenomena and certain problems do not exist, merely because they lie beyond the scope of scientific inquiry" Chomsky admits (*Language and Mind* xv).The history of human knowledge has repeatedly proven that a matter of metaphysics during centuries, can become a matter of physics in the future, and the boundary in between the physics and metaphysics is a conceptual one, two relatively defined binary zones divided up by understandings and mysteries of the given age. Expectedly, one next border-crossing act of enlightenment is going to push the boundaries, re-merging the realms of physics and metaphysics, and redrawing the fine line in between. In the third decade of the third millennium, "the hard problem of consciousness" and the question of origin are among the gatekeepers at this divisionary border, and the theory of T-Consciousness is the border-crossing one:

> How Unification might take place, or whether it can be achieved by human intelligence or even in principle, we will not know until we know […] For the present, the study of language and other human mental faculties is proceeding much as chemistry did, seeking to establish a rich body of doctrine, with an eye to eventual unification but without any clear idea of how this might take place. (Chomsky, *On Nature* 56)

Chomsky maintains a pessimistic view on the established scientific discourse's capability to provide an answer to the fundamental questions of language: "Surely the classical questions of language and mind receive no final solution, or even the hint of a final solution, from the work that is being actively pursued today" (*Language and Mind* 87). Even a "hint" of solution may require a departure from the habitual margins of current scientific prospects. Chomsky's call for "an eventual unification" is echoed in the prospects of Taheri's concept of Supra-Holism/*Fara-Kol-Negari* that perpetuates Interuniversal consciousness about consciousness (*Human Worldview*). The T-Consciousness theory responds to this call for unification, inviting a dawn of the new age of knowledge.

Works Cited

Bouchard, Denis. *The Nature and Origin of Language.* Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2013.

Caucheteux, Charlotte, and Jean-Rémi King. "Brains and Algorithms Partially Converge in Natural Language Processing." *Communications Biology; Commun Biol*, vol. 5, no. 1, 2022, pp. 134-134, doi:10.1038/s42003-022-03036-1.

Chalmers, David J. *The Conscious Mind: In Search of a Fundamental Theory.* Oxford University Press, New York, 1996.

Chomsky, Noam. "The Concept of Language." YouTube, uploaded by UW Video Mar 12, 2014, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hdUbIlwHRkY

---. "The Current Scene in Linguistics: Present Directions." *College English*, vol. 27, no. 8, 1966, pp. 587–95. JSTOR, https://doi.org/10.2307/374695. Accessed 11 July 2023.

---. "An Interview with Noam Chomsky." *The Reading Teacher*, vol. 48, no. 4, 1994, pp. 328-333.

---. "Language and Freedom." *Resonance: Journal of Science Education*, vol. 4, no. 3, 1999, pp. 86-104.

---. *Language and Mind*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2006.

---. *On Nature and Language*. Edited by Adriana Belletti, and Luigi Rizzi. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002.

---. "Some Core Contested Concepts." *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, vol. 44, no. 1, 2015, pp. 91-104.

---. "What is Language?" *What Kind of Creatures Are We?* Columbia University Press, 2016. pp. 1-26.

Leitch, Thomas. "To Adapt or to Adapt to? Consequences of Approaching Film Adaptation Transitively." *Studia Filmoznawcze*, no. 30, 2009, pp. 91-103.

Rezaie, Naghmeh. "Fara or Meta? A Prefix for a Worldview." Modern Language Association Annual Convention. San Francisco, 06 January 2023. Conference Presentation.

Speaking in Tongues: The History of Language. Directed by Christene Browne, Films for the Humanities & Sciences, 2007.

Szabolcs Számadó, and Eörs Szathmáry. "Language Evolution." *PLoS Biology*, vol. 2, no. 10, 2004.

Taheri, M. A., et al. "A Comparison of the Definition of Intelligence in Psychology and Psymentology". *Journal of Cosmointel*, vol. 1, no. 5, 2022, pp. 74-79.

Taheri, M. A., et al. "Consciousness Fields According to Taheri: Experimental Investigation of the Function and Implication of Consciousness." SSRN, 2020, http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3753649.

Taheri, M. A. *Cosmointel*, 2020, https://cosmointel.com/.

---. "The Definition of Data and Information." *Taheriacademy*, T-Consciousness Lessons 82, 2022, https://taheriacademy.com/

---. *Human Worldview*. Interuniversal Press. 2017.

---. "Proposed Principles for the Universal Declaration of Human Rights." *Mataheri*, 3 May 2023, https://mataheri.com/.

---. *Psymentology*. Interuniversal Press. 2011.

Torabi, Sara, et al. "Alleviative Effects of Faradarmani Consciousness Field on Triticum Aestivum L. Under Salinity Stress." F1000 Research, vol. 9, 2023, doi:10.12688/f1000research.25247.4.

[1] Taheri's theory of information (T-information) is expansive and essential to any further study of T-Consciousness Theory. Taheri sets difference between data (rough information) and information, and qualitative and quantitative information. In this view, information is the connector between T-consciousness, matter, and energy. Any information is aligned with memory which foregrounds Taheri's theory of Particle's Mind. In this theory, the information in the particle equals the whole information ("The Definition of Data").

[2] The prefix Fara (meaning beyond, above, or meta) plays an unprecedented role in the School of *Erfan Keyhani Halgheh*, founded by Mohammad Ali Taheri, as several coined compound nouns using Fara as a prefix have been introduced in Taheri's terminology (such as *Fara-darmani* which stands for an alternative medicine based on T-Consciousness Fields' connect and *Fara-kol-negari* that presents a supraholistic approach to philosophy, theology and natural science). We select to use the prefix fara instead of meta for Fara-lingual. In a parallel study we have argued that the "border-crossing encounter between Meta and Fara, and the worldviews perpetuated by them, is going to be an epoch-making one" (Rezaie).