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There’s this slight troublesome of a sort of this table of languages that is all English. And yet 500 words to nothing doesn’t seem to be enough to convey the meaning of the English language: from its Germanic roots to its favoritism over the Latin form, languages are all attributed to a language genome that lies within the molecular biochemistry of human evolution. Though the ignorance of English pragmatics seems to convey -- in one’s mind, that all is not universal for the English grammar.

English pragmatics reveals its horrifying nature to the English language reader and/or listener. Such that, linguistic features aren’t strenuous enough in their capacity to combine lexical sets (from the human lexicon) and semantic phrases. Whereby the least possible move, from external to internal merge, imparts human I (internal)-language computational eloquence to realize rich sentence structures -- nearly as universal as the symbolic elegance of algebraic calculations in applied mathematics, to achieve non-bijective thought processes.

The ability to not only move a lexical phrase, but to copy and delete in such a way that recursion (external merge to internal merge) becomes possible with Spec-Head and Bare Phrase structure. Word play and semantic playfulness implies syntactical forms capacity for architectural asymmetry, but without broken symmetry, contemporary human intelligence is non-realizable. And so, 500 words cannot tell the whole meaning of the human intellectual capacity. Only that computational redundancy is not a factuality of the biolinguistics framework.

The English grammar has its own formulation of semantics and lexical phrases, yet syntactical form is near universal. And so is German, Hebrew and Tibetan. But Hebrew is right-to-left, and Tibetan (and even Hebrew) is neither uppercase nor lowercase. Language means the same thing, is the natural law of linguistic form: just written or said in a different way. All languages can be expressed as the least costly translation from one language to the other, in its syntactical form, by application of the human language table: with all the rudimentary rules of grammar and syntax stipulated. English grammar reveals only that symmetry isn’t the be all and the end all of mathematical linguistics, instead it’s asymmetry that imparts the richness and fulfillness of the diversity of human language(s).

At the parametric conditions of non-cohabitation, natural language form [NLF] unveils the limitations of the English language. Where NLF implies a much more elegant and eloquent perspective on language: all languages are of logical form, but syntactical error becomes more pronounce when there are differing molecular biochemistry that lead to wider differences in parametric settings (with larger differentiation in initial conditions). Yet NLF is more rudimentary than syntactical logical form (or even of the Germanic language form): it’s an imperfect linguistic system that unlocks the imagery and imagination of a more than superior consciousness. Which is more than fluent of the mind/brain, rather than ordinarily knowledgeable of the crude syntax and word phrases of the English grammar.¹


“...a way a lone a last loved a long the riverrun, past Eve and Adam’s, from swerve of shore to bend of bay, bring us by a commodius vicus of recirculation back to Howth Castle and Environs.”