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Introduction

This proposal is submitted in keeping with the key questions of the IS4IS DTMD workshop in Vienna June 3-7 2015.

More specifically it is intended as argumentation aid and one (of necessarily several) contributions to a more comprehensive description of transverbality.

Methods

development of descriptive argument
reflective and abductive use of metaphor
thought experiment and/or physical demonstration

The definition of transverbality used here was introduced by M. Varga v. Kibed and means going beyond the verbal and nonverbal in a way that encompasses both and extends them by irreducible aspects of groups of persons [...]. This extension is connected with possibilities for forming models of systems behaviour by groups of persons. Scenic methods are primary fields of application for the
concept of transverbality. [...] making use of certain perceptual abilities specific to human groups as model systems (cf. representative perception [...]). (Varga 2006)

This general concept of transverbality leads to an understanding of transverbal language with [...] groups of persons – not the single person – as primary speaker and [...] founded on representative perception. (ib.)

[R]epresentative perception [...] in the SySt approach is defined as the spontaneous appearance of differences in proprioception and perception in members of a group forming a model system [...]. (ib.)

Mentioned concepts arose from a "tractarian" recognition of the linguistic nature of specific scenic (modeling) methods (constellations), which Varga v. Kibed & Sparrer developed into systemic-structural constellations (SySt).

In reminiscence of Wittgenstein's impetus for the Tractatus as a logical-aesthetical-ethical opus, the author proposes a navigational addition to the tractarian requisites of sagen [saying] and zeigen [showing] called sich zeigen lassen [letting show].

Operationally letting show could be defined as the somatically emerging bridge of a given bottom-up-top-down oscillation.

This bridging occurs through / can be demonstrated by differentiation processes appearing as representative perceptions in person groups forming model systems, as syntactically facilitated in the systemic-structural constellations (SySt) method.

The idea of letting show is derived from empirical knowledge that with (the syntactic approach of) the SySt methodology (and its attention to somatic differentiations in the modeling process) anything – physical, abstract or even vague (a hunch, a notion) - can be modeled by person representatives, (not only [other] person systems).

As argumentation aid letting show could be used to look at the concept of embodiment (G. Lakoff & M. Johnson) as well as tacit knowledge (M. Polanyi) in a different light.

In terms of the former representative perceptions could be seen as exbodiments (of the model forming person group).

In terms of the latter the model forming person group is set in motion – so to speak - “to let 'tacit knowledge' emerge”.

In Wunsch und Wille in der Handlung bei Wittgenstein Andrej Ule (1994) explores Wittgenstein's differentiation between wish and will as intentional requisites in a never fully formulated theory of action: wish is seen as preceding action, will is seen as internal aspect of action, as it shows through action. In terms of the SySt method Varga illustrates the gap between wish and will with the bridge of the As if.
The way *letting show* is tried here, it could be seen as *non-intentional* dimension “folded into” the contingencies of action, yet syntactically “accessible” (even discreetly “operable”) by *as if* maneuvering.

It shall be explicated *how* (in the modeling method) and *why* (in regard to least intrusive or even non-violent communication [comp. M. Rosenberg]) to syntactically approach and navigate issues of values and beliefs within a given problem setting.

Two modeling formats, which lend themselves to questions of values and beliefs, shall be described more closely:

1. Varga/Sparrer's *constellation of belief polarities* adapts F. Schuon's description of the Jnana-, Bhakti- and Karma-Yogas - as categorizing aspects of any sustainable religious form – into a stabilizing paradigm, often used as *meta-SySt-format*.
2. The other is the so-called *core transformation constellation*, which deals with *defocused topics and the good intention (behind the good intention {behind the good intention {behind the good intention ....} ....} ....)....* – towards “an understanding” spanning from the *verbal* to the *preverbal*.
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