

OF THAT SAME SPACE

The Intellect's Native Access to the Higher Dimensional Register

Christopher E. Etter · Catharturgy Corpus · 2026

Abstract

Several arguments of the Catharturgy Corpus require a standpoint outside the four-dimensional prism of temporal perception — above all the dimensional reconciliation of omniscience and freedom. This paper supplies the epistemology those arguments need: an account of how a four-dimensional mind can have any warranted access to a standpoint it cannot perceive. It proceeds in four movements. First, it diagnoses an unexamined premise shared by the standing theories of temporal ontology: growing block, presentism, and the moving spotlight do not genuinely differ on what matters but each presupposes an observer undergoing the linear procession of time, disagreeing only over the ontological status of the residue that procession leaves — accumulated past, present memory-trace, or illuminated wake. None recognises the procession itself as a premise, because each is the prism of temporal perception describing itself in the only vocabulary the prism contains. Second, it argues that the higher dimensional standpoint implies a mode of apprehension we are fundamentally not equipped to perceive, so that the only possible access to it is intellectual, not perceptual — and that this non-perceptual access, far from being a weakness, is exactly what it means for a standpoint to lie beyond the perceptual prism. Third, it grounds the warrant of that intellectual access in a single claim: the intellect can conceive the higher register because the intellect is itself of that register — the supra-prismatic element of the soul, continuous with the dimensions from which it was conditioned downward, recognising its own native altitude. The Kantian wall between concept and intuition is thereby transcended rather than denied: the knower is, in part, already on the far side. Fourth, it returns the whole to catharturgy: the ascent is not the acquisition of a foreign power but the clearing of the prism's residue from a faculty that was always of the height.

Keywords: Intellect · Nous · Intuition · Temporal Ontology · Block Universe · Growing Block · Presentism · Moving Spotlight · Perpendicular Register · Kant · Divine Illumination · Like Knows Like · Catharturgy · KEP

I. The Shared and Unexamined Premise

The standing theories of temporal ontology present themselves as rivals, but on the point that matters to the Corpus's arguments they are agreed. Growing block holds that the past and present are real and accumulate while the future is not yet real, so that reality is an expanding four-dimensional whole with a leading edge. Presentism holds that only the present moment is real, the past having ceased and the future not yet begun. The moving spotlight holds that the whole of time is laid out but that an objective present slides along it, conferring nowness on each moment in turn. These appear to be three distinct metaphysics of time. They are, on inspection, three accounting conventions for one assumed process.

What each presupposes, without examining it, is an observer undergoing the linear procession of time. Growing block presumes the procession and calls its residue accumulated real past. Presentism presumes the same procession and calls its residue memory — the present trace of a past that no longer exists. The moving spotlight presumes the procession and calls its residue the illuminated-behind, the stretch the spotlight has already crossed. The disagreement among them is bookkeeping: they dispute the ontological status of the residue that the procession leaves behind it. The engine is identical in all three — a standpoint moving through time, leaving something in its wake — and they differ only over what to call, and how much reality to grant, the wake. Even the block universe, which alone among the family tries to describe time without a flowing present, specifies itself by the comparison that all times are equally real, a judgement that implies a surveyor for whom they are found alike. The flowing present that the block removes from the timeline reappears in the standpoint from which the timeline is pronounced laid-out.

The decisive observation is that none of these positions recognises the procession itself as a premise. They argue about the residue while treating the linear passage of time as the unexamined given — the medium in which the debate is conducted rather than a candidate for examination within it. This is not an oversight that more care would correct. It is structural. Each theory is the prism of temporal perception describing itself, and it describes itself in the only vocabulary the prism contains: succession, the felt present, memory, anticipation. A mode of apprehension built entirely from processional materials will produce, when it theorises, theories whose furniture is processional. The temporal-ontology debate is perception systematising its own residue, and it cannot see the procession as a premise because the procession is the very instrument with which it sees.

II. The Diagnosis: Theories Bound to the Prism

This reframes the relation between the perpendicular dimensional argument and the temporal-ontology debate. The perpendicular argument is not a fourth position about the residue, to be set beside growing block, presentism, and the moving spotlight and judged by the same criteria. It is a diagnosis of the shared and unexamined premise on which all three rest. The three residue-theories cannot dissolve the dilemmas generated by the prism — the foreknowledge dilemma chief among them — because they are made of the same temporal procession that generates those

dilemmas. One does not escape a prism-internal artefact by selecting the most refined prism-internal theory. The dilemma is dissolved only by exhibiting a standpoint that is not inside the prism, and no theory built from processional perception can exhibit one, because every such theory has the procession built into its foundations.

The perpendicular argument steps back from the debate and locates its blind spot precisely: the linear procession the three theories assume is the signature of a particular dimensional standpoint, not a property of the temporal whole as such. It is the form temporal extension takes for an observer embedded in, and traversing, the four-dimensional register. The other theories mistake the structure of their own mode of access for the structure of time itself, because they are so wholly within the prism that they do not register the prism as a feature of access at all. The block universe is the closest of the four to the truth, not because it wins the argument about the residue but because it alone gestures at de-privileging the moving present — it is the prism's best attempt to imagine its own outside while still standing inside. The perpendicular argument is what the block was reaching for and could not reach from within: the genuine outside, named as a dimensional standpoint not subject to the prism.

Growing block, presentism, and the moving spotlight do not disagree about time. They presuppose the same procession and dispute only the residue it leaves — accumulated past, present memory, illuminated wake. None sees the procession as a premise, because each is the prism describing itself in the only vocabulary the prism contains. The perpendicular argument is not a fourth theory of the residue. It is the diagnosis of the premise the other three cannot see.

III. The Supra-Perceptual Standpoint and the Necessity of Intellectual Access

The higher dimensional register implies a mode of apprehension we are fundamentally not equipped to perceive. This is not the claim that there is a view we have not yet managed to obtain, as though with better instruments or longer effort the perception of the whole worldline would come within reach. It is the stronger claim that co-presence-without-traversal is categorically unavailable to processional perception. We have no sense, no faculty of intuition, no experiential mode for apprehending temporal extension all-at-once, because every mode of perception we possess is itself extended in time and delivers its objects successively. To perceive the worldline whole, one would have to perceive without succeeding, and our perception is succession. The higher apprehension is not a perception we lack; it is not a perception at all, for us.

The consequence is exact: the only access a four-dimensional mind can have to the higher standpoint is intellectual, not perceptual. We reach it by inference, by the discipline of subtracting the temporal residue from each image that would betray it, by the analogical structure in which the higher register stands to the four-dimensional worldline as the plane stands to the line. We never reach it by seeing. And this non-perceptual character of the access, far from being the argument's weakness, is precisely what we should expect, and is the mark of its success rather than its failure. A standpoint that exceeds perception could not, by definition, be reached perceptually; it could be reached only by the faculty that is not perception. To demand perceptual access to the supra-perceptual is incoherent — it asks that the thing beyond seeing be seen. The

objection that one reaches the perpendicular standpoint only by positing it intellectually, rather than by encountering it perceptually, is therefore not an objection at all. It is a restatement of what it means for the standpoint to lie beyond the prism. The intellectual route is not a defect in the access; it is the only road there is, because perception was never built to travel it.

Here the position meets, and transcends, the Kantian wall. Kant held that space and time are the forms of our intuition — the built-in shape of how a mind like ours must perceive — and not features of things as they are in themselves; and he concluded that the intellect, conceiving beyond the bounds of intuition, generates only empty thoughts that latch onto nothing, so that the thing-in-itself is closed to us forever. The present account accepts the diagnosis and refuses the resignation. It grants that perception is bound by its forms — indeed this is the prism, stated in Kant's own terms. But it denies that all knowing is perceptual. The intellect can conceive the structure of a standpoint not bound by the forms of our intuition, and the conception need not be empty, provided it is disciplined by analogy, by subtraction, and by the internal logic of dimensional indexing. Where Kant draws a wall between us and the noumenal, the system draws a window the intellect can see through though the eye cannot. But a window onto what we do not inhabit would still leave the Kantian worry standing: why should the intellect's conception reach truth about a register it has no contact with? The answer to that worry is the burden of the next movement, and it is the keystone of the whole.

IV. The Keystone: The Intellect Is Of That Same Space

The intellect can conceive the higher register because the intellect is itself of that register. This is the claim on which the entire epistemology turns, and without it the access remains unwarranted — a faculty reaching toward an outside it has no contact with, generating concepts that might be elaborate fictions answering to nothing. With it, the gap the Kantian worry presupposes is not bridged but dissolved, for there was never an unbridged gulf with the intellect wholly on the near side of it. The intellect does not reach across an alien divide from inside the prism toward a foreign outside. It recognises — partially, dimmed and refracted by the conditions of its embodiment — a register it already participates in, because its own nature is not confined to the four-dimensional register within which it perceives.

This follows directly from the system's account of the soul. The soul is the divine spark dimensionally conditioned into the human register, continuous from its source and continuous with the registers above it at the intersection the brain constitutes. The intellect — the supernal faculties above the Ruach, the Chiah and the Neshamah, the element of the soul nearest its source — is precisely that part of the soul which is of the higher registers, conditioned downward into embodiment but never severed upward from the dimensions it descends from. Perception is the soul looking down into the body's register, bound by the forms of that register's mode of access; intellection is the soul recognising the registers it descends from, exercising the native capacity of its own higher element. This is why one faculty is prism-bound and the other is not. They are not two powers of one register straining unequally against a common limit; they are the faculties of different registers within the one soul. Intellection exceeds intuition because intuition is the faculty of the embodied register and intellection is the faculty continuous with the registers above

it.

So when the intellect conceives the perpendicular standpoint from which the worldline is apprehended whole, it is the higher-register element of the soul apprehending the structure of its own native dimension. The conception reaches its object because conceiver and object share a register. The principle is the ancient one that like is known by like: the eye, as Plotinus has it, could not behold the sun were it not itself sunlike, and the soul knows the intelligible because it is, at its summit, of the intelligible's order. It is the Neoplatonic nous, which is not a human instrument peering at the intelligible realm from outside but belongs to that realm, so that contemplation is the soul turning toward what it already is at its height. It is the illumination of the Augustinian and Bonaventuran tradition, in which the mind knows eternal truths not by abstracting them from the senses but because it is lit by, and participant in, the eternal light. The system's contribution is to give this ancient principle a dimensional form: the intellect conceives the higher space because the intellect is of the higher space, the soul's element continuous with the dimensions from which it was poured down.

This answers the Kantian worry at its root and completes the reply to the charge of smuggling. The worry was that conception without intuition latches onto nothing; the charge was that one reaches the higher standpoint only by positing it from inside the prism. Both presuppose that the conceiving intellect is wholly inside the prism, on the near side of an unbridged gap, reaching toward an outside it has no contact with. But the intellect is not wholly inside the prism. The positing of the perpendicular register is not done by a prism-bound instrument straining beyond its bounds; it is done by the supra-prismatic element of the soul exercising its native capacity to recognise its own register. There is no gap to smuggle across, and no empty reaching toward an uncontacted outside, because the knower was never entirely on the near side to begin with. The reason we can think past four-dimensional time is that the thinking thing is not, at its root, a four-dimensional thing. To conceive what cannot be perceived is the soul recognising its own altitude.

The intellect conceives the higher register because the intellect is of it. Perception is the soul looking down into the body's register; intellection is the soul recognising the registers it descends from. The conception reaches its object because conceiver and object share a register — like known by like, the sunlike eye beholding the sun. There is no gap to smuggle across, because the knower was never wholly on the near side. To think past the prism is the soul remembering its own height.

V. The Return: Catharturgy as the Clearing of the Faculty

If the intellect's capacity to conceive the higher registers is the soul recognising its own source, then this epistemology folds directly back into the active work of purification that is the system's name. The cathartic ascent is not, on this account, the acquisition of a foreign power — not the building of a new faculty capable of reaching what the soul could not previously reach. It is the cultivation and the clearing of a faculty that was always of the height. The intellect that conceives the perpendicular register is the soul's native higher element, and what obscures its exercise is the prism's residue — the processional, perceptual habit that drags every conception back inside the

four-dimensional order and mispictures the timeless as frozen, surveyed, already-laid-out, scanned by a higher gaze. The cathartic work is the subtraction of that residue from a faculty whose nature is to recognise its own dimension once the residue is cleared.

This is why the disciplines of the Corpus that bear on the higher registers — the subtraction of temporal imagery, the practice of conceiving without picturing, the orientation of attention along the ontological axis toward its ground — are not merely intellectual exercises but the first motions of the return. To conceive what cannot be perceived is the soul beginning to recognise the source from which it was conditioned downward; and to clear the prism's residue from that conceiving is to clear the faculty by which the soul ascends. The ascent and the conception are the same motion viewed from two sides: the soul turning toward its own height is the intellect conceiving the register it is of, and the intellect conceiving the register it is of is the soul turning toward its own height. The perpendicular dimensional arguments are therefore not a detour from the cathartic project into abstract metaphysics. They are the cathartic project conducted in the register of the intellect — the soul's highest element exercising, and by exercising clearing, its native capacity to recognise the source from which all things, itself among them, were poured forth, and to which the active work of purification is the return.

The whole arc is therefore one motion. Perception is bound to the prism because it is the faculty of the embodied register. The standing theories of time inherit the prism because they are perception systematising its own residue. The higher standpoint cannot be reached perceptually, only intellectually. Intellection can reach it, not by a power to exceed its own nature, but because intellection is the faculty of the higher register, the soul's element continuous with the dimensions from which it was conditioned downward. And the clearing of that faculty from the prism's residue is the cathartic ascent itself — the soul recognising, and by recognising returning toward, the height that was always its own. To conceive what cannot be perceived is the first step of the return; the soul thinks past the prism because the soul is, at its root, of the space beyond it.

The ascent is not the gaining of a foreign power but the clearing of a faculty always of the height. To conceive the higher register is the soul recognising its source; to clear the prism's residue from that conceiving is to clear the faculty by which the soul returns. The perpendicular arguments are the cathartic project conducted in the register of the intellect — the soul's highest element exercising, and by exercising clearing, its native capacity to recognise the source from which it was poured forth. To think past the prism is the first step home.

References and Related Papers

Etter, Christopher E. *Omniscience and Freedom: The Dimensional Reconciliation; Seeing Outside the Prism*. Catharturgy Corpus, 2026.

Etter, Christopher E. *Kenotic Effluent Panapotheism: The System Stated; The Structure of the Human Soul; The Perpendicular Axes*. Catharturgy Corpus, 2026.

Plotinus. *The Enneads*, I.6 and elsewhere (the sunlike eye; the soul of the order of the intelligible;

nous).

Augustine. On the Teacher; and the tradition of divine illumination continued in Bonaventure, The Journey of the Mind to God.

Kant, Immanuel. Critique of Pure Reason (the forms of intuition; the limits of concepts without intuition; the noumenal).

On the principle that like is known by like, from Empedocles through the Platonic and Neoplatonic tradition.

Christopher E. Etter | Catharturgy Corpus | 2026