

The ~~complex~~ ^{Triplex} a proach to reality is used by everybody who has to lead a normal life, with a goal before him, with people to work with, and with obstacles to overcome. The "myth" is his unbreakable connection with his goal, the "soul" or anima, is his personal integrity among his fellow men, the "body" is his vitality in overcoming the obstacles, called objects.

What has happened to make us neglect the three ways of grammar in which we express every bit of reality? How could it happen that "science" tried to persuade us ~~that~~ ^{that} for one moment, ~~we~~ ^{that} we could base our acquaintance with the real on our treating the world as an obstacle and object only?

The world was moving towards unity. And there was good reason to belief that any partial myth of any particular group was an obstacle in achieving the larger unity of the whole world and of all men. Not the myth, but the partial, too small myth, became an obstacle. Hence, we analysed and debunked myths wherever we could find them, being sure that all myths had to be "narrow", or superstitions, that is to say, ~~left-overs~~ ^{remnants} of a period of divided loyalties.

But when one after the other of the old myths in family, tribe, country, continent, nation, churches, scholarship, art, was debunked, the uprooted adherents of this myth were not ushered in into a new life-inspiring, goal-determining, animating myth. They were left to themselves. And they began to analyze their goals as child-behaving mothers, as working producers of material things, as playing child, as research fellows. And they asked why they should bring children into a debunked world, why they should work at maximum speed, why they should play without incentive. ^{child lies next to my horn}

In the ~~next~~ CCC camp, the educational adviser told me the following story. He had a very efficient equipment for plays and games in his Camp and he proposed to the young man to play over the weekend, to their hearts' desire. The answer he received was debunked man's answer to his own goals:

III

We won't play if you do not provide a money reward.

Any group in society, it seems, begins to ask why it should function, and asks to be bought or bribed. They are in search of the animating "animus", the heroic wind, which would ~~xxx~~ make them sure that they were moving in the right direction, toward their appointed goal. age

~~The sterility of a machine/which~~ is not aware of the law that the same thing which we manipulate (let us say an automobile which we manufacture), also must represent a value to which we gladly and proudly bow, in reverence and delight. *No car will be bought at 1000 dollars if a people ceases to take delight in cars to trailers.* And rightly so, perhaps, as long as there is danger that we might relapse into a partial, an arbitrary myth of nationalism, or professional pride.

all myths said: it is necessary. *highly we know* But only a universal myth can be necessary. But "Man" is the necessary and the eternal and everlasting myth because his unity beyond the ages and specks of land and sea over which he roams, is the goal which is necessary on the one hand, if we are to survive, and it is entrusted to ourselves *daily* if it is going to become real.

The creation of One Great Human Family is the universal myth, is the cross of reality, to which we are nailed. It is necessary as our goal, and it is indispensable as "our" goal. Every one of us can frustrate it, and does frustrate it ~~xxx~~ half of the time. *It is as much an objective as a subjective necessity. It is the project which abolishes subject and object.* There is one myth for all men: Man. But it is only the object of science, but *it also* the project of our thought towards their goal, and *it is subject* of our *to his discipline* ~~xxx~~ personal lives. This myth *provides* is animus, anima, and animal; it is the power that moves us and that we are and that we apply.

Perhaps, the machine age, at first was right in reducing everything to a comparative value in dollars and cents, and to consider the cashed money value of a house as equivalent to the incomparable value going that go with a home. Because, he lived in small towns, valleys, states, and there always was the danger

I We shall not bow to Manmade idols and man-dividing myths. Man is not man-made. We have a maker, and Man need not divide Man. Hence Man is one necessary and universal myth.

return to the very nature of the myth

X

The constant, conservative, constitutional processes are in the feminine, and a potiori or fortiori, ~~because of the women's preserving function, it is indeed intimately connected with the feminine.~~ ^{But why are countries, and trees feminine / XXXXXXXXXX in Greek ?} Because of their lasting established function of identifying distant processes in time or space as the same. Anima identifies man throughout his life and wherever he dwells. 'In nova fert animus', the animus carries the soul to a fresh start.

The animal is the incarnation, the material projection into space of the animus which carried the soul the anima to her fresh start. It is here and now. It is not necessary like the animus, nor unified and personal like the anima. "Hence the individual animal is only representative of the personality which it represents. The animal divinum, bull or calf, any totem animal, is only one out of innumerable incarnations of the anima and the spirit who called forth the creation of the cult, always is reported as infinitely more powerful, than the individual materialisation. This explains why Zeus may appear as ~~an~~ a bull, or Hera as a cow. And yet, the individual animal is not the whole Hera nor the whole Zeus. It only represents them, bodily.

The most primitive thinking and our daily speech both, use the method by which one and the same reality is approached, to use the Greek terms, as soma, psyche, ~~mythos~~ mythos. And mythos is the older word for Logos. Mythos is one new, creative name for the establishment of a permanent order. Psyche lives this order. "Soma" demonstrates its vigor and vitality.

The Greeks could call the army Ho stratos, (masculine), He Stratia (feminine), to strateuma (neutral). In the first case, it was looked upon as the sum of the whole manhood gathering on the commons and ready to take up arms. In the feminine gender, it was the organised, permanent army as a form of being. In the neutral gender, this same reality was wax in the hand of the general, it had become a means and an instrument of strategy.

upheld!

~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ To say body, or to say mind, or to say soul, is a method. In all three cases, we are not ~~taki~~ talking factually. The man who says body and means corpse may ^{be} said to speak about an objective fact. But the same man when talking of a living body, reduces that what he perceives, to that what the body is minus its life, growth and death, and changes. So that whatever he does through this abstraction from what he actually perceives, is violence done to the ~~bd~~ reality of which he takes up the physical end.

And the same abstractionism, of course, is true when we approach our students in class as pure minds or as dear souls and forget that they are very lazy bodies, too. However, in no moment of our dealing with a student in class, do we omit the tri-une method. We call him by his own name = soul. We appeal to his reasoning processes through which he and we take part in the unifying process of the spirit. And we do not stumble over him when we cross the room, we open the window when it is too hot; i. e. we respect his corporality.

I have not seen either materialists or idealists or realists who act otherwise. It does not seem to make the slightest difference what philosophy they hold to be true. They all and each treat me in this threefold manner, as a man whom they try to convince, (shareholder of mental processes), as a man with special idiosyncrasies and premises (soul), and as a body who can be found in a certain office at a certain hour of the day. We are all ^{any} ~~xxxx~~body, someone, and members. Just as Churchill could say: some Chicken, adding the soul to Hitler's physical victim England, we all, are "somebody" (=soul) besides being "anybody" and being "we all" (=spirit).

The old languages were built on this experience in their grammar and we live and thrive on this grammar. Animus, anima, animal, are a good example. What we call gender, is the division between the divine, animus, the soul, anima, and the animated body, animal. The whole masculine gender is the divinising gender, the Deus ex persona gender.

The feminine ^{and} anima, is the human, personal, receptacle of name and shape and life. The animal is "anybody". It still is much more than the physicist's body, it is animated. However, children are the neuters, they had neither name nor could they speak. And for both reasons, they received labels which contained no vocative forms, and which were more words to talk of them than names by which to talk to them.

The gender in language is much more flexible than modern science. It has the triune method so that the same process may be called animus, anima, animal, according to the changing interest in the phenomenon.

The gender has been the subject matter of the most subtle and involved discussion in linguistics. As long as the grammarians treated it as a purely linguistic question, it ~~was~~ impossible to understand the workings of the primitive mind as to what was called "feminine" or "masculine" or "neuter".

The neuter, this much was clear, was the form in which there was no difference made between the nominative, and the accusative, the subject and object form in speech. As you remember, William James tried to express for a long time ~~his~~ the character of reality as not admitting of this difference between subject and object.

Help now has come from investigations which turned to the social, political, and mythical aspect of speech. Sommerfeld in his study of 'Le Language et La Société', and Goldberg, in his studies of Greek and Hebrew "Mythical Thinking", saw that all language is petrified politics, ossified social behavior.

became transparent. In the light of these investigations, the "gender" ~~was~~ the character of a "genus dicendi", a way of looking at a part of reality, more than a sex distinction.

The abstract words in the Indoeuropean languages are feminine like virtus, libertas, and Goldberg traced this to the original theology. This ~~was~~ the way in which he stated the two processes in which man is involved

XIII

When he begins to speak, that is to act and to function as the member of a body politic.

Man is a voice of the tribe, and speaks for the tribe and the origin of all language is the attempt to endow the body politic with the power to be real, that is to be an eternal, unique, incarnate ~~reality~~ unity. All language describes, then, functions which are necessary, (=eternal) unique(ensouled, personal, named), incarnate(visible, audible, touchable, concrete and open to the senses.

The necessity of being at the same time, lawful, material, and personal order, gives birth to the mythical form of existence. The only way of cutting a group out of the animal existence which is "neutral", that is neither personal nor necessary, but accidental and typical, was to ascribe a specific dignity to the personal and the necessary. And Goldberg showed that the male gods and the feminine goddesses were not distinguished in the rationalistic fashion of active and passive agents. He showed that goddesses could be active and Male gods like Hades passive. The real difference in gender between Zeus, Poseidon, Hades on one end, Hera Demeter, Hestia on the other is the difference between the unique acts which the Gods achieve by which the "decisive" and incisive" step is taken to bring about the new cosmic order, and between the eternal processes which must keep this order going once it is established. The founding, creative, initiative (initiating may be a misleading term), processes are the ways of the wind, the "animus," the "spirit" and they, the ways of eruptive, decisive, events, are the ways of ^{the} ~~the~~ gender, which was given in the name of male later on, by grammarians of an antimythical epoch; it was given because all men are in this class, - except those who are not! , From the slave and infant to the papa, the later pope. there are men who are not in this gender originally because the gender is a genus, a kind of function, not a genus in the sense of sex.

X10

Gender/ ~~does~~ for nouns ~~is~~ the same what modes do to the verb. Compare animus, anima, animal, to the active, the middle voice, the passiv. The neuter preferentially will be treated as the thing acted upon, and placed in the passive state of the object. Hence, it never acquired a distinction between ~~passive~~ nominative and accusative, ~~ix~~ we speak improperly of a "subject in a passive construction. Rome was built by Romulus is a sentence in which Romulus is the actor, the author, and Rome is the object of his action. In a true passive, the "subject" is called subject ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ by analogy only.

When our soul and her states enter into the picture, the middle voice, ~~ix~~ is used, ^{medium}, in which our entanglement, our interest in the act goes beyond our being functioning as the author of this act. We are not only causing the act, in the middle voice, but are staking our being in this act beyond the mere fulfilment of a function in the world. ~~ix~~ The act means something in our life; The act, in other words, is ensouled.

The animus, the spirit who does things, is the active former and shaper of things, and the active is the ~~active~~ form of the verb which corresponds to the masculine gender.

The Grammar of Reality is still and again available in the three experiences of man that he may consider himself as the deus ex persona, the agent who creates the world, the child who is told as the creature, and the wife who is asked to preserve and to uphold that what has been instituted.

The most striking expression of these lines of force on which we move as on a magnetic field, is found in the fact that we whether we like it or not, always are either people talked to (you, my reader, are in this position, of a listening and addressed audience), or a speaker and writer, or finally a topic and object talked "about". We are when we speak apt to say I, and to write our ego very large. However, when you listen, you allow me to call upon you as my "yous". And you yourself when you are "all ear", are forgetting your quality as egos for the time being, and become receptacles for the thought which I conduct into you as a middle man.

XV

Our personal pronouns all describe a political situation in society, a function in the conversation of mankind. With relation to speech, these two attitudes are available: You can speak yourself and say: I say, I think, I believe.

You may listen to me who addresses you: you folks, you my friends, you my opponents, you, my students, you, my judges, you my examiners, you, my enemies. And in all these cases, you are the speaker's "Second Persons".

Finally, you may be the thing of whom the world talks, the 'it', the 'he', the "she" of whom people speak because and when ~~xxx~~ you are not in the room. You then become a "third" person, and not even a person, but an object. Hence, in such treatment in absentia, our objectionable and objective qualities usually are hashed out and analyzed. Analysis will always speak of man as though he were absent and a mere object, a third person, an 'it'.

An appeal, a personal appeal can only be made to you by people who have the right to tell you straight to your face what you should do, what they ask you to do. The commander of an army must give orders and all his men are waiting to be told. The whole structure of an army is built on this relation. And an army which does not obey orders, ceases to be an army.

The commander himself when he reports and has to take the responsibility, will have to say: I made the mistake. I blundered, or I did it, and I ordered it.

XVI

Gender, Modes, persons, all tell the same story.

And in our own lives, we live this story. As children we begin not as I's but as our mother's thou and you, as her baby, son, and she knows and uses our name in all possible variations long before we know it or understand it. From her, we learn who we are. The stage of the second person precedes the stage of the first and third person, in the life story of the individual.

Only when we protest and break away from our filial position, do we begin to take up the new position: And I say to you. It is we always take up in reacting against the orders which, without our new word, would prevail. The I turns against the tradition which has reached him through all the authorities which were at work before he came into his own of an ego. From the Ego, the world learns who we are. Tradition told us who we were. Now we tell them what we think of them.

The imperative in any language is the pure act of the verb, in commands, the language reaches down to the deepest relation between people, and this deepest layer is an appeal to the Second Person in you. This layer is buried today by the veneer of the ego which in evolution, comes so much later.

We are yours long before we are I's. And people who are required to stand up as Egos without having been trained to obey and to listen and to hear, those people become 'its', masses, and are neither yours nor I's. Liberalism, Freedom, Independence of persons today depends on improving the processes of personal, individual 'youness'. The Messrs of the Ego will lose out to the Its, if they do not lign up with the powers which deserve to be listened to. The lack of listening makes modern man so unstable. The strain on his ego is too much.

Imperatives precede indicatives subjectives, a long shot, in a healthy society. If you do not make the children obey, they will be childish for the rest of their lives, yearning for dependence and for somebody who can control them, some spellbinder.

Ogden's view:

language as tool

I too, have apparently used and advocated the "use" of the native language. But ~~to have~~ the preparation of a phrase book and vocabulary... has always been my first step - as most obvious one and more linguistic knowledge has followed. But I have never cared to think of this as a linguistic accomplishment, even in a limited degree. The reason for this may lie in my aversion to the idea of language as a "tool", seeing that it is just as integral, formative and expressive an element in a culture as the social organization, religion or economics with which it is interrelated. And although fieldworkers do use the native language as a means of gathering facts, yet all of us from time to time suddenly find a door, as though swinging on a verbal hinge, opened to the thought and belief, to the "inner life" as well as to other customs of the people we are investigating; we then realize that we are not using the language as a tool - rather it is "using" us, acting upon us just as other forms of behavior do."

///
The American
Anthropologist N.S. 43 (1941)
p. 89

A.P. Ellis, Sydney Univ. of Sydney