

Data-fractal Interfacers	Vortextualizers	Thought- scapers	Entropyromancers
Axiomagicians	Matrix Gazers	Conceptopologists	Overcodadaists
World Crystallizers	Network Synthesizers	Vignetternalists	Reality Circumnavigators
Notion Delineators	Narrativerifiers	Eschatonaturalists	Social Ignitors

Quick disclaimer:

If you feel like you get these terms, whatever you're projecting onto them is fine, just roll with it, don't read any further. I don't want to prescribe meaning.

If you just want to read some thoughts on neurotypes and what mode of interaction with reality I associate with these terms, go ahead. Every type has a wordy esoteric description of how I got to the name, and a concise, snappy description of what someone more lexical than me associated with them.

Update: The interpretations of the axes used are described in detail on pages 7 and 8.

names and red text by Ouroborista (Aesthetician)

blue text by Timecake (Analyst)

Data-fractal Interfacers (Human Calculators)

Discern, reduce, and cohere with that of the phenomenologically accessible which affords systematization and rationing.

MOST OF THESE ARE COMBINATIONS OF AN ASPECT OF REALITY, PHYSICAL OR CONCEPTUAL, AND A WAY OF INTERACTING WITH IT. HCS PERCEIVE THE UNIVERSE AS AN INCREDIBLY COMPLEX STRUCTURE CREATED AND RECREATED BY A SET OF RULES, A FRACTAL ENDLESSLY REPEATING INWARD. THEY ARE INTERFACERS IN THE SENSE THAT THEIR DECONSTRUCTION OF A DATASET INTO THE BASIS VECTORS THAT PRODUCED IT ALLOWS FOR THE EFFICACIOUS COMMUNICATION OF SAID DATA. IN THE CASE OF SOCIAL PATTERNS, THIS IS A DECODING OF THE FIGURATIVE INTO THE PHYSICAL/FORMALIZED.

Vortextualizers (Analysts)

~~Conc~~Centralize the flow of the informing and cognizable to ~~afford~~~~afford~~ the extrication of the relevant from the irrelevant.

VORTEXTUALIZERS ARE ALSO TRANSLATORS IN A WAY, BUT LESS OCCUPIED WITH THE PURELY PHYSICAL, DEALING WITH CONCEPTS INSTEAD. WHETHER THESE CONCEPTS HAVE A BASIS WITHIN THE REAL IS OF LITTLE CONCERN SO LONG AS THEY ARE APPLICABLE TO REALITY, WHICH VORTEXTUALIZERS THROUGH THEIR DEPARTURE FROM THE REAL (READ PHYSICAL) ARE FAR MORE LIKELY TO SEE AS CHAOTIC WITH INCOMPLETE STRUCTURES. TO VORTEXTUALIZZE IS TO TRANSLATE THIS APPARENTLY ERRATIC NOISE-DATA INTO LEXEMES TO MAKE SENSE OF THE ABSURD AND SHOW THE ABSURDITY OF MAKING SENSE THE WAY A DATA-FRACTAL INTERFACER MIGHT.

Thought-scapers (Fascinators)

Attain and accumulate the slivers of ~~those~~ ~~phenomenons~~ ~~ina~~ which manifests at the far reaches of the mind.

THOUGHT-SCAPERS ARE BEST UNDERSTOOD IN OPPOSITION TO VORTEXTUALIZERS, WHO SORT OF STRUCTURE THE LATERAL MESS THAT IS THEIR PERCEPTION OF REALITY BY LEXIFIEING IT, SO THAT THE EMERGENT CONCEPTS CAN BE REINTEGRATED INTO THE WORLD AS A WHOLE BY WAY OF COMMUNICATION. THOUGHT-SCAPERS ON THE OTHER HAND SYSTEMATIZE INTERNALLY, BUILDING A KIND OF MIND-SPACE FILLED WITH COGNITION

MACHINES, WHICH THEY ALTER AND REARRANGE IN ORDER TO KEEP UP WITH THEIR OBSERVATIONS. IT'S A MULTIDIMENSIONAL ART PIECE THEY CAN LOOK AT TO UNDERSTAND AS THEY ALTER IT BY MANIPULATING THEIR COGNITIVE SURROUNDINGS. THEREFORE; LANDSCAPER-APPROACH TO THOUGHT.

Entropyromancers (Newtypes)

ACQUIRE, HARNESS, AND INTERNALIZE THE TEMPORARILY AND TEMPORALLY STABLE FLASHES IN THE PROCESSUAL FLUX OF THAT WHICH MAKES ITSELF APPARENT.

OKAY, I SHOULD FIRST SAY THAT THESE ARE ALL SORT OF SUPERPOWER / TYPE-AT-THEIR-BEST NAMES, AND ALSO THAT I ASSOCIATE ALL OF THE HARD RIGHT TYPES WITH FIRE, MAYBE IN PART BECAUSE THEY'RE RED, BUT IT JUST SEEMS LIKE ALL OF THEM FUCKING BURN, CONSTANTLY, WHEN OPERATING OPTIMALLY. THIS HEAT MANIFESTS IN THE ENTROPYROMANCERS ON THE LEVEL OF COMPLEX INTERACTIONS OF THE MICROSCOPIC, LIKE WITH ALL HIGH LATS. THE COGNITION OF NEWTYPES FEELS TO ME LIKE THE BURNING OF CONCEPTS, RERELEASING THE CHAOTIC GASEOUS MESS OF MOLECULE FRAGMENTS, INCREASING FIGURATIVE ENTROPY AND GIVING THEM SOMETHING THEY CAN MORE NATURALLY INTERACT WITH.

Axiomagicians (Technicians)

Manipulate the reductions afforded by the articulating agents and principles into that which conforms with the needed and necessary.

LATERALITY IS A MEASURE OF SCALE. WITH INCREASING LATERALITY AN OBJECT DISSOLVES INTO EVER MORE PART OBJECTS AND THEIR SPECIFIC INTERPLAYS. SO WHILE THE HIGH LATS LOOK AT THE COMPLETELY ATOMIZED, PURE PHYSICAL DATA IN THE CASE OF THE LEFT COLUMN, AN AXIOMAGICIAN WILL WORK FROM A BASIS OF PRAGMATIC PRESUPPOSITIONS RATHER THAN GO ENTIRELY DEEP-LEARNING. THIS MAKES THEM MORE EFFICIENT THAN THEIR MORE LATERAL COUNTERPART, BUT STILL MORE ATTUNE TO INTRICACIES THAN THE LINEAR, BEING ABLE TO MIRACULATE OFF-THE-BEATEN-PATH CONCLUSIONS DUE TO THEIR MORE COMPLEX ANALYSIS.

Matrix Gazers (Quick Witted)

Direct the insights into and of the arrayed interactions of the connectome of the layers of the perceptible out into the readily apprehensible.

MATRIX GAZERS APPLY THEMSELVES WELL TO SOCIAL INTERACTION THROUGH THEIR DECODING OF SOCIAL SYSTEMS, WHICH IS AT ONCE COLOURED BY THEIR RECOGNITION OF INCOMPLETE STRUCTURE AND THOUGHT PROCESS WHICH IS STILL EASILY VERBALIZED. MODERATE LATERALITY ALLOWS THE CONNECTION OF SEEMINGLY DISPARATE DATA-POINTS. THIS QUICK AND DIRTY ANALYSIS OF, AND REACTION TO SYSTEM-MATRICES ALLOWS MATRIX GAZERS TO APPEAR... WELL, QUICK WITTED.



Conceptopologists (Overseers)

Trace out and navigate the undulations and implicatures of the sensory manifold presented by the environment.

CONCEPTOLOGISTS' TENDENCY TOWARD IMPRESSIONISM MAKES DAY TO DAY COMMUNICATION A LOT LESS INTUITIVE FOR THESE TYPES. THEY UNDERSTAND JUST FINE, BUT THEIR CONCLUSIONS ARE TOPOLOGIZED RATHER THAN VERBALIZED. UNLIKE THOUGHT-SCAPERS, NOT EVERY DETAIL OF THEIR MIND SPACE IS ARRANGED, THIS IS MORE A COMPLEXLY TEXTURED SURFACE, THROUGH WHICH IDEAS FLOW TO THEIR CONCLUSION. COMMUNICATING THEM REQUIRES OVERCODING OF LANGUAGE, WHICH IN ADDITION TO THEIR LATERALITY MAKES THEM MORE LIKELY TO BE PERCEIVED AS DEEP THAN TO ACTUALLY BE UNDERSTOOD.

Overcodadaists (Aestheticians)

Indwell and channel (direct through oneself and act as the conduit of) the perceptual stream into that which is evident.

OVERCODADAISTS IS FROM "OVERCODE" AND "DADAISTS", AS IN THE ART MOVEMENT. A PREOCCUPATION WITH DECODING VERSUS OVERCODING IS WHAT THE LEX-IMP SCALE REPRESENTS IN MY MIND. ALL HARD RIGHTS OVERCODE THE SHIT OUT OF THEIR IMPRESSIONS IN ORDER TO COMMUNICATE TO ANY KIND OF USEFUL EXTENT, WITH THAT ACT GROWING

HARDER AND REQUIRING MORE ARTFULNESS AS LATERALITY INCREASES. FOR AESTHETICIANS, THIS REACHES A POINT WHERE THEIR OVERCODING COULD BE DESCRIBED AS DADAIST, A MOVEMENT WHOSE ERRATIC AND MEDIUM BREAKING WORKS WERE OFTEN DESCRIBED AS REPRESENTING THE “IMPULSE OF THE CREATIVE ACT” MORE THAN ACTUALLY CONVEYING ANYTHING CONCRETE. FREEDOM CHAOS AND COLOURS, NOTHING MORE. OVERCODADAISTS DON’T OVERCODE WITH ACCEPTED SYMBOLISM ANYMORE, THEY OVERCODE WITH THE “IMPULSE TO OVERCODE” ITSELF, COMMUNICATING MAINLY THE WANT TO COMMUNICATE.

World Crystallizers (Contemplative)

Finalize and explicate the always ongoing synthesis of the current paradigm.

WORLD CRYSTALLIZERS, WHEN INTERACTING WITH A SURROUNDING THEY PERCEIVE TO BE FUNDAMENTALLY RULE DRIVEN, ARE FINE WITH SWEEPING QUITE A BIT OF NUANCE UNDER THE RUG IN THE PURSUIT OF POST-EPHEMERATIONAL TRUTH-VALUES. THERE MIGHT BE MINOR EFFECTS WHICH SKEW THE SYSTEM IN CERTAIN WAYS, BUT TO BE EFFICIENT WITHIN IT REQUIRES ONLY A MASTERY OF THE ESSENTIALS UND A RECOGNITION OF WHAT THOSE ESSENTIALS ARE. THIS FABRICATED, CRYSTALLIZED SPACE IS THEIR DOMAIN.

Network Synthesizers (Understanding)

Cohere those who are sufficiently aligned with the current paradigm into a cooperative and mutually aligned collective.

NETWORK SYNTHESIZERS AND ALL THE FAIRLY LINEAR TYPES SHARE THIS UNCONCERNEDNESS WITH THE VERY FINE DETAILS THAT THE AUTISTS IN THE TOP ROWS GET SO HUNG UP ON. MUCH LIKE MATRIX GAZERS THEY LOOK AT SOCIAL SYSTEMS WITH AN ABILITY TO ARTICULATE THEIR CONCLUSIONS, BUT UNLIKE THEM, THEIR MORE LINEAR APPROACH DRAWS THEM AWAY FROM THE META-LEVEL AND TOWARD THE PRACTICALITY OF OPTIMIZING THE INFORMATION NETWORK. SMALL CONVERSATIONAL DISCONNECTS BE DAMNED, INFORMATION EXISTS WITHIN THE SOCIAL WEB AND THEY WILL FIND WAYS TO RELAY IT BETWEEN ITS INHABITANTS.

Vignetternalists (Externalists)

Extract and emanate the discarded and neglected back into the arena of the readily apparent, often drawing the ire of those indwelling the current paradigm and the accord of those on the periphery.

A MORE IMPRESSIONIST COGNITION AND THE NEED FOR OVERCODING THAT COMES ALONG WITH IT LEADS VIGNETTERNALISTS TOWARD A DIFFERENT CONCLUSION THAN NETWORK SYNTHESIZERS. THEY TRY TO BUILD CHANNELS TO TRANSMIT THAT WHICH IS LAYERED ATOP THE VERBALIZED INFORMATION THROUGH THE SOCIAL NET: MOODS AND EMOTIONS. CONDUCTING FLOWS OF INFORMATION LEADS TO AN ACCUMULATION OF INFORMATION, WHILE THIS EXERCISE IS CIRCUITOUS WITH NO END-STATE TO BE WORKED TOWARD. IT'S TIMELESS IN THAT WAY, WITH TIME AND A CONCEPTUAL FUTURE GENERALLY EXISTING MORE ON THE LEFT SIDE OF THE CHART. LIFE FOR THE VIGNETTERNALIST IS AN ETERNAL SERIES OF VIGNETTES TO BE TRAVERSED AND MEDIATED.

Reality Circumnavigators (Impressionists)

Realize (both bring clearly to mind and make real) the passage of and to the ever-withdrawing and transcendent (escaping the bounds of the paradigm) aspects of reality.

REALITY CIRCUMNAVIGATORS LIVE IN THE MOMENT WITH TIME SEIZING TO EXIST ENTIRELY, THERE IS RATHER A SPACE OF IMPRESSIONS FOR THEM TO EXPLORE. THEIR ANALYSIS LOOKS AT SUFFICIENTLY LARGE OBJECTS FOR THEM TO ACTUALLY GET SOMEWHERE ON THAT QUEST, AGAIN, UNLIKE THE AUTISTS WHO FEEL THE NEED TO DISSECT EVERYTHING FURTHER. COMMUNICATION REQUIRES IMMENSE OVERCODING AND ARTISTRY, BUT THEIR ACTIONS ARE A DECENT MEDIUM FOR DOING SO IF ALL ELSE FAILS.

Notion Delineators (Bookkeepers)

Enshrine, inscribe, and adjudicate which beliefs & ideas (notions, enacted or otherwise) are within the current paradigm and which are not.

WELCOME TO THE REALM OF GET-SHIT-DONE. REALITY IS STILL PHYSICAL, AND IT STILL HAS RULES, BUT IT'S RARE THAT THOSE ACTUALLY HAVE TO BE

INVOKED. FOR THE MOST PART THERE'S SITUATIONS AND PROBABLE OUTCOMES. WHICH OUTCOME IS PROBABLE DEPENDS ON THE SPACE AND SO NOTION DELINEATORS CARVE THE WORLD, SOCIAL AND PHYSICAL, UP INTO SPACES, IN WHICH ONE RULE HOLDS TRUE WITH RUTHLESS EFFICIENCY. ARE THOSE RULES THE RESULTS OF THE INTERPLAY OF COMPLEX SYSTEMS? SURE, BUT DOES IT MATTER?

Narrativerifiers (Level Headed)

Synthesize and render the enaction of the accounts of that deemed to be relevant, thus disseminating the current paradigm throughout the mimetic connectome.

NARRATIVERIFIERS, THROUGH PERCEIVING THE UNIVERSE AS A UNIFIED STREAM OF CAUSALITY, WHICH IS HOWEVER NOT PURELY PHYSICAL BUT CONTAINS A BIT OF THE FIGURATIVE, A CONTIGUOUS STORY TOLD ABOUT REALITY BY PEOPLE, ARE LIKELY TO THINK IN TERMS OF NARRATIVES. AS LEXICALS, THEIR PRIMARY GOAL IS THE DISCERNING OF TRUTH VALUES FROM THAT NARRATIVE, WHILE THEIR RECOGNITION OF IT'S FIGURATIVE ASPECTS ALLOWS THEM TO ACT AS LEVEL HEADED REASONABLE PEOPLE.

Eschatonaturalists (Clearsighted)

Uncover (=apocalypse->eschaton) and bring to light that which does not fit through their disengagement from the rigors of the current paradigm.

ESCHATONATURALISTS DON'T HOLD THE SOCIAL NARRATIVE TO THE STANDARD OF THE REAL, BUT RATHER HOLD REALITY TO THE STANDARD OF A NARRATIVIZED IDEAL. THERE IS A SIMPLE, END-TIMES STATE, WITH ALL OVERRIDING COMPLEXITIES BEING FLUFF WHICH WILL EVENTUALLY COLLAPSE, SO THERE'S REALLY NO REASON TO PAY ANY MIND TO IT. THE LEXICAL OVERREALIFICATION OF A WORLD OF FLOWS AND INTENSITIES IS SEEN AS CORRUPTION AND A CHORE.

Social Ignitors (Pure Instinct)

Embody, enact, and demonstrate the necessary incompleteness of the current paradigm through their unfacilitated attunement to the world, thus precipitating the ever-necessary shift of the paradigm.

SOCIAL IGNITORS ACT BASED ON WHAT FEELS RIGHT IN THE MOMENT WITHOUT REGARD FOR SOCIETAL PERCEPTION. THEY ALSO USUALLY ASPIRE TO SOME SORT OF IDEAL, WHOSE EXACT NATURE WOULD BE ENTIRELY LOST IN OVERCODING. THEY ARE SOCIAL IGNITORS, BECAUSE LIKE ALL IMPRESSIONISTS, THEY BURN, AND ALSO BECAUSE THEIR LACK OF CONSTRAINT AND PASSION FOR SOME INCOMMUNICABLE GOAL AT THE HORIZON TENDS TO INSPIRE THOSE AROUND THEM.

Okay, that sure was a lot of fucking word vomit, and I really would prefer if you just vibed with these cool ass terms and whatever they imply to you, but I try to be inclusive toward lexies, so if anyone got anything out of the boring normal words, which now outnumber the sick neologisms to a worrying extent, that's a plus in my book.

Long overdue update, since I finally feel like I can put a thing into words. A piece of feedback I've frequently gotten is that the type descriptions themselves feel right, but that my approach to the axes isn't clear. Time to remedy this:

Lin-Lot Axis

Laterality is a measure of scale, a dichotomy of the complete and the completely atomized. It is not a measure of intelligence by way of being able to consider the massive whole of something. They are both perfectly capable but their approaches are different.

Here's an example: A thought is an object, and not just any particular thought but the whole construct of them. Everything you consider at one time is part of the same complex topology, since you are able to connect them and find links. You are able to synthesize thoughts only because they were one all along. It's Trixi's idea of laterality causing the entirety of your life to be part of every consideration. The key objection I have is that your whole life will always be part of your thought, no matter how linear you are. Your life shaped your mind after all, but a linear person will approach the vast polydimensional thought object from a distance, with the surface presenting the pertinent facing them. This is the macro-approach, the

thing as whole. They can of course zoom in to consider the details should they become relevant, but only as aspects and perspectives of a whole, not as true part-objects haphazardly clustered.

Laterals consider the microscopic. What appears as multiple/branching/diffuse trains of thought is the consideration of the whole object not as one, through a synthesized confluence of perspectives, but as all of its atoms and their interplay. The whole emerges incidentally as the outline of all the thoughts once a meta is established. Here zooming out is of course also possible but the whole cannot be seen as an absolute topology, but as a swarm. Sort of a thing in itself, yes, but you can still see the individual pieces moving and it is very hard to look at the whole and consider its borders.

Lex-Imp Axis

I used to describe the tendency of impressionists to be one of "overcoding", and while I think that's the more correct term, the idea is more easily understood by just juxtaposing a focus on decoding with one on encoding.

What does focus mean: not that they are good at it, but that it is the more involved process for them. The thing that emerges more prominently as a general facet of their cognition itself.

We can conceive of the (capital w) World and all conceptomic idea-objects as polydimensional, intricately structured shapes and hyper shapes. Topologies. An impressionist thinker will interact with this perceived reality unmediated, shaping and entangling these shapes directly in their contemplation of them, while the communicative act manifests as the projection of topological space onto the lesser dimensional space of singular objects. Disentangled Topologisms, lexemes, words etc.

The quality of the encoding is almost not neurotype-dependent and more a function of practice and effort. Decoding is not usually necessary for normal cognition on the imp-side of the spectrum and thus not a process they typically consider. Since communicative acts are abundant in the day to day, impressionists will have a deep connection to the encoding function though.

Lexicals think and reason not with the direct conceptomic object but with the lexemes that are derived disentangled topologisms within the object's image. The communicative act is thus a relatively frictionless transfer into another medium which does not typically involve encoding.

To arrive at the lexemic single objects requires a decoding of reality itself which directly follows perception though. An aspect of the World is capable of consideration only after it has been broken down into speech-like disentangled topologisms that can be rearranged during the course of contemplation and

reasoning. The decoding function thus permeates their thought, being its natural and inevitable first step. Quality of decoding is again not based on neurotype but practice and effort.

The lex-imp axis describes the relative prominence of encoding and decoding processes within one's thought.