

A Selection of the Writings of
“The Speech-thinker”

APPLIED SCIENCE OF THE SOUL

by

Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy

Translator’s Remarks: James W. Kidd, Ph.D.

Introduction: Sandra A. Wawrytko, Ph.D.

APPLIED SCIENCE OF THE SOULD

by

Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy

Translated from the German by;
James W. Kidd, Ph.D.
University of San Francisco

1984
Golden Phoenix Press
San Francisco
California
U. S. A.

ISBN 0-910727-04-X

Translated from the German

Eugen Rosenstock-Huussy

Die Sprache des Menschengeschlechts.

Eine leibhaftige Grammatik in vier Teilen. Erster Band.

Heidelberg: Verlag Lambert Schneider 1963, S. 742-772.

Phototypography: Morgan

Printed by: The James H. Barry Co.
San Francisco

Copyright 1984
Golden Phoenix Press
San Francisco
California
U. S. A.

CONTENTS

Translator's Remarks	v
Introduction	viii
THE SCIENCE OF THE SOUL	1
THE PSYCHE	4
GRAMMER OF THE SOUL	6
THE DESTINY OF THE SOUL	14
Index: Location in the German Text	17
Selection of Recommended Texts	19

APPLIED SCIENCE OF THE SOUL

James W. Kidd, Ph. D.

Translator's Remarks

Although it has been said that: "The translator's task is to keep the meaning while changing the turn of speech. A word-for-word version is unsuitable . . ." (Opusc. XXVII, *Contra Errores Graecorum*, Introduction); The Speech-thinker might not go along with this statement. The natural bent of Rosenstock-Huessy's speech is direct. To turn it would be an injustice.

As *the first philosophical voice of "Inspired Fellowship"* Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy is most significant since my dissertation was entitled as such.¹ Rosenstock-Huessy stresses the imperative, especially in a Thou-I-Succession (*Du-Ich-Reihenfolge*), in that, the other who is before you calls you into existence by name and you find yourself already there. "The imperative, 'Lift the stone,' is a success as soon as the stone is lifted." (*Speech and Reality*, p. 168).² "Inspiration through a vocative or imperative addresses us as a *thou*, then forces us to respond as an *I*, makes us report as a *we*, and at the end a story speaks of us as *they*." Hans Rosenstock Huessy, Editor's postscript in *The Origin of Speech*, p. 128.

Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy was born in Berlin, Germany (1888) and died in Norwich, Vermont (1973). In Europe he is hailed as The Speech-thinker (*Der Sprachdenker*). Here in the United States he is referred to as a forerunner to the Peace Corps.

When reading any of Rosenstock-Huessy's major works, such as *Die Sprache des Menschengeschlechts* (which is a foundational work explicating a method based on speech) or *Out of Revolution* (a work reinterpreting history) one begins to wonder: How could such a thinker have been everywhere, seen everything and have known so much? The poet W. H. Auden clearly shows this (experienced) existential shift: "Speaking for myself, I can only say that, by listening to Rosenstock-Huessy, *I* have been changed." (foreword to *I Am an Impure Thinker*, p. viii).

Angewandte Seelenkunde was originally published in the German in 1924. This title in the English has been called "Applied Psychology" and "Applied Science of the Soul." For this presentation Applied Science of the Soul was chosen as I felt this work to be not limited to psychology.

In this work Rosenstock-Huessy utilizes old style German. So, translation is difficult. Without the expertise of a German Linguist³ to carefully investigate the meaning of the Text in the German ahead of my translation and thereby selecting the proper passages for a sound

representation of the thought, it would not have been possible to do this work. It was at this point I came to realize, what Rosenstock-Huessy already knew, the value of dialogue. I found very quickly that in doing a translation the grammar of speech is of methodological concern. Ernst Häublein's patience was un-ending. In our daily meetings he would stress: "Stay with the Text!" (the imperative) "Someday you will be glad you did a close translation."

Rosenstock-Huessy's thought has a unique resounding resonant height and depth of vigorous and dazzling insights. In a letter 14 September 1983 that I received from Professor Wawrytko she clearly explicates this resounding process: "I must confess that when I first read the text I was somewhat dismayed—I had a difficult time eliciting the meaning. The second and third readings, however, were a revelation. It is very exciting to see where Rosenstock-Huessy is going with his ideas and to place them within the context of philosophy and its present problems. The insights are there, insights that are very valuable for the discipline. The whole notion of a grammar for the soul, while initially somewhat shocking and incongruous, approaches the profound as its implications are unraveled."

I would like at this time to give my appreciation to Bernd Henninger, Lektorat, Verlag Lambert Schneider for kindly consenting the permission (19 July 1983) for publication of this work. It is a true International gesture for an elite press to grant permission to such a small American press. It seems that *in this instance thought prevailed*.

At some point in time the responsibility of any work stands or falls on someone's shoulders: I accept the responsibility for this translation.⁴ I would like to leave the reader with two statements: Rosenstock-Huessy is The Speech-thinker, this is why the words are of resounding quality. And the nature of the human being for Eugen is: "And who is man? The being which can be inspired." (*The Christian Future*, p. 116).

James W. Kidd, Ph.D.

Notes

- 1) Beyond this Rosenstock-Huessy inspired the not-yet published Text, *An Introduction to Metaphysics: Inbetweenness* (San Francisco, 1980).
- 2) See back of this work for a Selection of Recommended Texts by and relating to Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy.

- 3) On 15 April 1975 this translation was originally completed and approved by Ernst Häublein, a visiting scholar from Germany and by the Dean of Arts and Sciences 5 May 1975, Duquesne University.
- 4) I would like to thank Sunnie D. Kidd for reviewing the work.

Introduction: Rosenstock-Huessy and the Future of Philosophy

Rosenstock-Huessy's text, *Applied Science of the Soul*, instructively catalogues the errors and omissions of various academic disciplines in their dealings with a significant facet of the human being. The author reserves some of his most penetrating criticisms for philosophers, in terms of their failure to approach the soul in its fullest dimensions. In particular, the unquestioning identity of spirit and soul in common parlance is a matter of great import to Rosenstock-Huessy. Linguistic convention has shown itself "shrewder than its alleged interpreter" (p. 3), exposing the naivete of philosophers in general as well as a deep-seated gap in their knowledge claims.

Thus, it may seem dangerous to tempt fate by assigning the task of commenting on the offending text to a member of the offended group, that is, a philosopher such as myself. At the same time, a philosopher is a most appropriate source for this commentary. Only the philosopher can fully grasp the depth of the deficiencies of philosophy that have been so assiduously revealed by Rosenstock-Huessy. Who but a philosopher is in a better position to realize the consequences of these oversights in the methodology and outlook of philosophy? It is indeed the case that many in this discipline (myself among them) have held, or have come to hold, severe reservations concerning what Rosenstock-Huessy so aptly describes as "the tyranny of logic" (p. 7).

The roots of the problem may indeed reside, as Rosenstock-Huessy suggests, in "an impoverished grammar" (p. 6), as inherited from the seminal thinkers of Pre-Socratic Greece. Certainly Parmenides would be a prime suspect in the impoverishment process—Parmenides, who cleft the epistemological world into truth and opinion, logic and common sense, leaving in his wake the paradoxes of Zeno (arrows that can never reach their destination due to the logical impossibility of motion and tortoises who can never be overtaken, even by the fleet-footed Achilles). It is here that we first encounter serious attention being paid to the primacy of the logic of the I, although it flies in the very face of experience (and even *because* it does so).

A direct lineage seems to run through the centuries from Parmenides to the Logical Positivists. The contemporary heirs of the school of abstraction continue the search for a purity and logical sterility in philosophy, assumed to exist only within the confines of science. These restrictions have occasioned the existential fear and trembling, anguish and despair which, for some in the philosophic community, heralds the demise of metaphysics and the inherent impotence of philosophy. Prominent among this group is Martin Heidegger. In comparing Heidegger's adverse reaction to the philosopher's plight with Rosenstock-Huessy's proposed solution,

some interesting points emerge. Both look to language in their quandries and both emphasize the importance of grammar, taken in its deepest sense. Hence, there is a mutual agreement that their linguistic interests delve far beyond, and beneath, the superficiality of school grammar—what to Heidegger is a mechanized shell¹ and to Rosenstock-Huessy a mere typological “photograph” (p. 11).

Their differences are equally illuminating. Heidegger insists that philosophy can be done properly only in German and Greek, due to the inherent power and spirituality of these languages. Such a restriction is both condescending and counterproductive; to adhere to it would violate the universality Rosenstock-Huessy seeks in his Ur-speech and grammar of the soul. Consequently, it comes as no surprise to find that Heidegger deems as the focal point of human life an intense awareness of our individuality, that is, the ego, the I, the first person myopia inherited from his glorified Greek predecessors. Although Heidegger does recognize the significance of poetry, whose emotional resources Rosenstock-Huessy identifies with the Thou, Heidegger’s grammar is nonetheless toppled by the hypertrophy of the I.

Significantly, there are those of us in the present philosophic community who find the rumors of philosophy’s death both premature and greatly exaggerated. Covertly and with considerable trepidation, we discuss these concerns and reservations with like-minded colleagues, living under the ever-present threat of being denounced as heretics by our logic-tyrannized fellows. To avoid these denunciations, many of us have drifted off into other disciplines, disciplines more receptive to options beyond reason, such as religion, psychology, and a variety of Eastern philosophical traditions. It is among such non-mainstream thinkers that one begins to sense a corroboration of Rosenstock-Huessy’s criticisms, along with support for his proposed solutions, on the model of the triparte grammar of the soul. Accordingly, our discussion here would be most fruitful as a commentary to the text if we explore these options more closely.

To begin, we must demonstrate that at least some existing philosophies reflect Rosenstock-Huessy’s concerns. Many of the criticized aspects of philosophy, while admittedly rampant within the discipline, are by no means all-encompassing. They are characteristic of the dominant trend of Western thought, a trend I have designated elsewhere as “masculine.”² The alternative and option for philosophy here rests in the “feminine” perspective, which is found within the Western tradition only infrequently while it is very frequent within Eastern traditions. The very designations masculine and feminine seem to accommodate Rosenstock-Huessy’s concepts, in that they allow us to circumvent the illegitimate reductionism of orient versus occident which he justly warns us against (p. 6).

As an example of these alternatives, we can cite Benedict Spinoza's unique, and rarely appreciated, solution to the West's chronic mind/body problem (which one can almost describe as a genetic defect carried on from Plato via Descartes). Spinoza's solution, while couched in terminology familiar to Western philosophers, relies on neither idealism nor materialism exclusively, but rather encompasses, while transcending, both. For this reason, it cannot be dismissed as merely another form of the equally extremist monism also rejected by Rosenstock-Huessy. In fact, Spinoza would be the first to join him in condemning "the shortcoming of the philosopher" (p. 5) which seeks solace in an escapist polarization of doctrines. The end result of such tactics is a reification of the soul, which is found to be more comfortable than a confrontation with its complex reality.

Trends sympathetic to and resonant with both Rosenstock-Huessy and Spinoza are even more evident within the non-Western philosophies, most prominently in the centuries-long traditions of China. Thus, the *T'ai Chi* (Great Ultimate) of Yin and Yang, common heritage of all Chinese schools of thought, transcends the half-truths of dualism and monism alike, without reverting to escape mechanisms in the process. The operative terms here, roughly corresponding to the Western keynotes of idealism and materialism, are *li*, representing the forces of logic and reason, and *ch'i*, material facticity. As early as the *I Ching* these two elements and their dynamic interchange have been the subject of discussion and speculation, continuing through Confucius, Taoism, and Neo-Confucianism. The Chinese emphasis, unlike that in the West, has been on a reconciliation between abstract principle (*li*) and material force (*ch'i*), that is, between the demands of logic and concrete experience. A harmonization is assumed to be possible, without the need for a harsh Parmenidean divorce or a reduction to one of the two extremes. Consequently, the "helpless narrowmindedness between nature and spirit" (p. 3) lamented by Rosenstock-Huessy has not typified Chinese culture. On the contrary, it is a culture notable for its sensitivity to and aesthetic appreciation for nature, as reflected in its exquisite poetry and profound painting.

The most appropriate terms for characterizing Chinese philosophies, and Taoism in particular, are spirituality and creativity. The focal point of these systems is not a conditional psyche "wedged in between corporeal and spiritual influences" (p. 4), but a multi-levelled and integrated existence. The inherent element of creativity prevents us from being demoted to the status of "converter . . . the receiver of the infinite spiritual content" (p. 4), for we are co-creators with the universe, not passive conduits of its creative resources. As a result, the ever-present Western problem of free will, which Rosenstock-Huessy dismisses as abstract and empty, has no proper place in Chinese thought.

Carrying these confirmations of Rosenstock-Huessy's insights even further into his discussion, it is fascinating to delve the soul's grammar in terms of more specific elements in Chinese language and Chinese philosophies. The first point to be dealt with is the apparent lack of grammar in the Chinese language; it is an uninflected language devoid of tenses, moods, cases, etc., such as we have come to take for granted in Indo-European languages. If, as Rosenstock-Huessy asserts, the soul is the source and originator of grammar, how are we to interpret this fact? Must we assume the existence of an Eastern soul, in counterdistinction to a Western soul, each of which requires a separate discussion and separate grammar? Was Heidegger perhaps correct in touting the ascendancy of the Greek and German languages due to the higher level of soul force underlying them?

We have here a momentous challenge to Rosenstock-Huessy's basic thesis of an Ur-speech. Yet the challenge can be met, and in a way which enriches, rather than detracts from, his essential argument. At the onset we must disabuse ourselves of grammatical presuppositions, much as philosophers need to get beyond the logic-steeped "epistemological presuppositions" Rosenstock-Huessy cites as roadblocks to a proper understanding of the soul (p. 7). Indeed, it has been argued that divergences from Western standards of grammar are indicative of a greater sophistication rather than primitiveness: "it is a plausible assumption that modern, sound-prescribed, monosyllabic, uninflected Chinese, far from being a primitive, undeveloped language, represents a very advanced, extremely reduced stage, which has gone further in the track of simplification and levelling than even English."³ As in so many other instances, less is more.

James J. Y. Liu notes that the grammar of the Chinese language is altered rather than absent, as compared to the more familiar Western models; it is "fluid, not architectural," or, changing the metaphor, consists of "chemical elements" used to make various compounds.⁴ As such, it is a language perfectly suited to the grammatical transformations demanded in life, the transformations which Rosenstock-Huessy identifies with the authentic life of the soul. Perhaps it is not "laziness" which inhibits those needed transformations in the West, as he suggests (p. 10), but instead the inherent deficiencies of our language, the linguistic limitations which in turn limit the scope of our world (à la Wittgenstein). Hence, we find it all the more difficult to be dynamic, to slide among the three persons of grammar, while the Chinese practice these moves quite spontaneously.

Proof of this circumstance resides in Chinese poetry. The intentional absence of pronouns in a poem allows the reader to transform the experience being recorded therein into a personal (I) experience, as well as permitting a more objective (it) interpretation, or even a projection of a second person Thou. Similarly, the non-existence of moods in the Chinese language, another key element of the soul's grammar for Rosenstock-Huessy, leaves

open all options—indicative, subjunctive, and imperative - as well as their mutual transformations. The sole limitations are imposed by our own imaginations and the context of use.

Chinese philosophies offer the same possibilities for enrichment vis-à-vis the Rosenstock-Huessy thesis as does the Chinese language. Among Chinese philosophers he would most likely find collaborators, rather than critics, of his views. If, as he argues, “Ur-grammar teaches the pervading validity of change” (p. 14), one could not find a philosophy better suited to expressing the cosmic fact of change than Taoism. Nature itself is a veritable model of eternal transformation for the Taoist: “a whirlwind does not last a whole morning./Nor does a rainstorm last a whole day./ ... If even Heaven and Earth cannot make them last long,/How much less can man?” (TTC, 23).⁵ Nor is the escapism of the abstract, criticized by Rosenstock-Huessy as an aberration rampant among philosophers possible here. The Taoist sage is a concretely grounded “answering Thou” (p. 16), in response to the summons of Tao, which takes changing nature as its own model (TTC, 25).

Within this context, grammatical stagnation is equally to be avoided. The Taoist very early recognized the dangers inherent in a monolithic I. What has been the fulcrum of Greek thought, and hence of the Western tradition of philosophy, is taken by the Taoist as a signal of decline, of estrangement from our resources of creativity in Tao. It is not the primary and inevitable perspective for human life, but the final stage of decadence. The gradual awakening of self-identity in the child is a subject for regret, not rejoicing; the Taoist ideal is, in fact, the infant who has not yet smiled (i.e., who has not yet made the I-Thou distinction necessary to evoke a response to externals) (TTC, 20).

Being given a name is no less defiling of the “true self.” For example, there is the unavoidable gap between Named Tao, the Tao which can be spoken of (and hence is merely conditional), and the ultimate Unnamed Tao, of which nothing can be said (TTC, 1). How much preferable is the state of the “fool”:

Common folks see differences and are clear-cut;
I alone make no distinctions.
I seem drifting as the sea;
Like the wind blowing about, seemingly without destination.
The multitude all have a purpose;
I alone seem to be stubborn and rustic.
I alone differ from others,
And value drawing sustenance from Mother (Tao) (TTC, 20).

Although a fool by conventional standards, the Taoist sage is at least no “fool of his ego,” the description Rosenstock-Huessy gives of those who

are circumscribed by the I (p. 14). The defiant “I am I” stance is, for the Taoist, not only superfluous, but actually counterproductive; it is not to be viewed as an accomplishment, but as a dangerous hindrance. Like the children and simple people who prefer to talk about themselves in the third person (p. 9), the Taoist sage reveals self best in talking about Tao.

Nonetheless, Rosenstock-Huessy emphasizes the necessity of all three persons to complete the grammar of the soul, including the I repudiated by the Taoist (p. 10). The Taoist might well agree, given a reinterpretation of the I as the ‘true self,’ for individual uniqueness is not being denied except insofar as it creates a misinterpretation of the reality of Tao and our relationship to it. Even more supportive here would be the Confucian whose plan of transformation extends across eight carefully outlined steps,⁶ which stretch from “the investigation of things” (the it, the other), through an ever-broadening scope of self-cultivation (the I), culminating in world peace (the evoked Thou). Yet it is stressed that “all must regard cultivation of the personal life as the root of foundation.” This is the same self-knowledge, “I knowledge,” which Rosenstock-Huessy recognizes as being “called forth through challenge” (p. 14). It is the knowledge to which Confucius “skillfully lures one on,” as his disciple Yen Hui put it; thus it is that Confucius said he would give “one corner of the subject” to the student, expecting the other three corners to be self-discovered.⁷

Further parallels are evident between Rosenstock-Huessy and Chinese thought. The network of person and moods attributed to the grammar of the soul are well-articulated in Confucian philosophy, are, in fact, its very essence. Rather than using language “to pass on something finished” (p. 11), the Confucian seeks ‘renovation’ of both self and others, i.e., an endless reaffirmation and rededication. The indicative third person of Being gives rise to the subjunctive first person of Becoming, the person in the process of cultivation. The second person imperative, characterized by transforming love, then serves as both the beginning and end point in the guise of the pervasive Five Relationships, the emotional interactions among social beings. In Confucian humanism, tradition provides the multiple voices which Rosenstock-Huessy perceives as calling forth the “destiny of the I” (p. 15), under the form of an impersonal Heaven rather than a personal God.

Apparently, then, a discrepancy exists between Chinese philosophies and Rosenstock-Huessy on the matter of the ultimate destiny of the soul. The restriction of meaning to “an answer to or as a longing after the command of the loving person” (p. 18) conflicts with the impersonal ultimate of Taoism’s Tao and Confucianism’s Will of Heaven. At the same time, however, these Chinese philosophies have avoided the pitfall, common to occultists, of reducing human beings to the merely animal level of “a cosmic being through which the streams of nature roar” (p. 18). This is possible because both the Taoist and the Confucian are called forth as a Thou, called forth by

nature in the first case and by other human beings in society in the second case. As the Confucian thinker Mencius avers, the difference between other animals and human animals is slight, arising specifically in terms of humanity's unique set of social interrelationships; therefore, it is the mark of the *chiün-tzu* (the moral ideal of the superior person) that he or she "guards the distinction carefully."⁸

Confucianism also sets forth the principle of human uniqueness through seeming identity and diversity, which Rosenstock-Huessy recommends but finds lacking in psychology: "for two souls, two groups, two people, the same outward behavior, the same response can never mean the same psychically" and conversely "Where two do different things it can mean the same" (p. 19). Thus, Confucius is not being contradictory when he dispenses different advice to different students who approach him with the same problem (Analects, XI,21), although he seems to defy logic in doing so.

Similarly, Chinese thought offers a noteworthy variation on the second person of the soul's grammar. Due to the "self-forgetting" and "world forgetting" combination in the Thou, Rosenstock-Huessy views as inevitable the end of philosophy and of philosophizing (p. 13). The need for philosophy also is extinguished in the experience of Tao, nonetheless our oneness with it, either immediately (as in Taoism) or through the mediation of social relationships (as in Confucianism) does not necessitate an extinction of individual uniqueness. Instead of employing the language of dual forgetfulness, it is more appropriate in this context to speak of a total remembering of one's true place within reality—not as a domineering I nor as a dominated it, but as a responsive Thou, co-creator of the universe. Again we see the conflict with a personal conception of God prevailing in the West.

Are these points of divergence indicative of a violation of the purported universality of Rosenstock-Huessy's grammar of the soul? Do they betray a Western bias in favor of an anthropomorphized conception of the ultimate and a paranoia vis-a-vis individuality as an all or nothing proposition in life? Such suggestive questions can only be posed here, without the hope of definitive answers. If valid they can serve to direct attention to areas in which this grammar must be re-evaluated and expanded in order for it to function properly.

Finally, the three "scientific problems of the soul" (p. 20) noted by Rosenstock-Huessy, and rejected by psychology, can now be tackled by philosophy through use of the resources of non-Western traditions, and Chinese thought in particular. Each of his questions can be met with a possible solution in these alternative philosophies. Thus, Rosenstock-Huessy's work can be conceived of as a veritable manifestation of the

process it discusses change through transformation along with universality amidst uniqueness. It stands as a preface to East-West dialogue in resolving the inadequacies of contemporary philosophy, as well as a road map for desired, and desirable, directions of development. It touches chords in the depths of the philosopher's "soul" as a call for and challenge to change, following Rosenstock-Huessy's own definitions of human fulfillment and self-knowledge.

Sandra A. Wawrytko
Department of Philosophy
San Diego State University

Notes

- 1) See especially Heidegger's *An Introduction to Metaphysics*.
- 2) For a fuller discussion see *The Undercurrent of Feminine Philosophy in Eastern and Western Thought* (Washington DC: University Press of America, 1981).
- 3) Bernhard Karlgren, *Philology and Ancient China* (Philadelphia: Porcupine Press, 1980, rpt. from Goteborg: Oslo Instituttet for sammenlignende kulturforskning, 1926), p. 18.
- 4) James J. Y. Liu, *The Art of Chinese Poetry* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970), p. 46.
- 5) *Tao Te Ching*, as translated by Wing-tsit Chan *A Source Book in Chinese Philosophy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963); all subsequent quotations from the *Tao Te Ching* are from this same source, listed by chapter number.
- 6) *Ta Hseüh, The Great Learning*; all quotations are taken from Chan's *Source Book*.
- 7) *Analects*, IX,10 and VII,8, translated by Arthur Waley (New York: Vintage Books, 1938).
- 8) *Mencius*, 6.19, translated by W. A. C. H. Dobson (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1963), p. 141.

THE SCIENCE OF PSYCHOLOGY

As I said, Applied Animalogy¹ offers us the same as the so-called practical psychology, i.e., instead of a field of science it is a special branch of science with a different name, viz., the science that is taught and whose techniques are practiced at today's universities. It would take too long to give a history of the subject which, as you know, is constantly confronted with the problem of animal psychology (clever Hans, Monkeys of Teneriffa). This is not necessary for we have already admitted above that, on account of the ambivalence of any carelessly given name, the namer is only partly unaware of what he is doing. Concerning the other part, the object remains in the area of the laboratory, the testing station and seminars and lectures, staying securely confined to theoretical concerns.

We are solely concerned with the conflict between the new term animantics² and the very old soul itself. It is no exaggeration when we say that someone attending a lecture on animantics does not look for reports on intelligence tests, spot checks, touch and pressure perceptions or illusions and suggestions. With these the poor fellow has the same experience as with most of the other fields: He is utterly disappointed that such indifferent things are concealed under such an attractive heading. Many may perhaps not concede this disappointment but the desire which arouses it is quite different than that which practical psychology wants to satisfy. It is a more full-blooded and vital one, a mixture of curiosity, yearning for and a reverence of, the mysteries of the soul.

In all scientific literature those mysteries are talked about solely in a negative way and only when the author defines the boundaries of his science. It is a kind of negative animantics which is similar to à la negative theology. In the latter we find that God is not as you imagine Him, while in the former we often read that the soul is similar to what we imagine it to be. This is laudable in itself. And undoubtedly today's psychology is not fundamentally concerned with the mysteries of the soul. One must move on and say positively that psychology is not at all engaged in the peculiar area of the soul but with two mainstay traits of the psychic. The two outward structures of the psychic are concerned with the corporeal and the spiritual. We find that modern psychology inquires extensively about the physical (sensory responses) and the spiritual (memory, intelligence) aspects. Impressions and imprints of the world of things and imagination are studied. This entails a dangerous consequence. The psychical becomes the mere toy of the entire interplay between corporeal and spiritual production. Some people think it belongs to the material realm while others assume it belongs to the spiritual. Still others claim it is an antenna for corporeal oscillations or content, it is the memory and associational container for ideas.

These extremely materialistic or idealistic principles of the psyche are linked and mixed in different ways by different schools. Even after 1900 a scholarly book has managed to appear that was even issued a second time, i.e., was a success that boasts of a truly professional and rigorously scientific standard abreast of current research, i.e., which may be used as a “valid piece of research.” This book has many hundreds of pages which are labeled by the following heading: “Spirit and Substance, Soul and Body.” As the terms “body” and “soul” prove, this title does not allude at all to four concepts but for the author, mind and soul are just as identical as substance and body! He sees only one contrast, between Spirit and Nature and wants to express each facet of this antithesis twice. Beyond making the contrast between the spirit-soul and the body-substance, the whole volume does not once raise the question of whether the spirit and the soul are identical. This narrow academic philosophy does not constitute a question at all!

Meanwhile, for a thousand reasons every decorporealization of the spirit, every despiritualization of the body has become utterly suspicious to us. Body and spirit are arranged in the same system in a different way; that seems to be more probable. In the altercation between Idealists and Materialists, between the “monism” of Materialists and the “dualism” of the Idealists, both sides are obviously wrong. Quite another contrast becomes essential, one of which neither philosophy nor its opponents know anything and which the philosopher naively preserves in those rigid labels “Spirit and Body, Soul and Body.” The language, which offers two words, spirit and soul, has tricked him here since it is shrewder than its alleged interpreter.

Incidentally, it would be unfair to overlook the fact that academic philosophy is already making huge concessions to this powerful process through which old problems disappear and are replaced by new ones. Under the impression of a blind alley or bankruptcy of psychological terminology, one turns towards a closeness to life as Wertheimer, Goldstein, Gelb, Koffka and Adler have recently done. Although these scholars submit the psychic to the scientific procedures from the point of view of body and spirit, they nevertheless stress that the so-called “Whole method” should be applied to the soul since it is a unique and complete procedure to which all the single procedures should be related. A real departure from the physiological-spiritual dilemma (which for 60 years has been wrongly termed by the misleading label as a psycho-psychic context or contrast) is not carried out by academic science and actually cannot be carried out according to the standpoint of this kind of research based on the dualistic university science, i.e., Idealism by any psychology specialist who thinks it a grand feat to deal with the soul only partly in terms of the “spirit.” The latest illustration of this helpless narrow-mindedness between nature and spirit is offered by Theodor Erismann whose book *The Peculiarity of the Spiritual, Inductive and Sensible Psychology* (1924) confounds, in the title and even more so in the

text, the investigation of the soul and the spirit. It is only one example among hundreds.

THE PSYCHE

When we hear about psychology, we do not think of the sensory functions nor of the spiritual gain of which the soul avails itself but of a third and special something. The classical word “psyche” does not suit this third something. Here we really need the German word for soul, just as the French speak of *âme*, the English of soul but not of *psychologie* or *psychology*. The term “psyche” implies something conditional, it describes a psychic moment or a psychic condition of the soul which can be stated in terms of the soul wedged in between corporeal and spiritual influences. For example, the medical doctor rightly speaks of the psyche of his patient. The physician approaches man from his body and sees the part of the psychic accompanying the illness. Whether the illness lasts two weeks or two years, the corporeal process is always the signal which alerts the physician to the psyche. And this corporeal process is, practically always, temporary considering the whole life span of the patient. Whatever the doctor is interested in concerning the psyche remains only a fragment.

The scientist, the scholar and the teacher also speak of the “psyche” of the individual with justification but from a different vantage point. The behavior of the corporeal parts directed the doctor to the background of the “psyche;” the observer of the psyche, however, starts from the spiritual whole of the “logos.” Considering its realm of ideas, he is astonished at the power of this paltry little individual psyche to perceive knowledge and moral and aesthetic judgments. It seems that the spiritual forces its way into the single human being. So the psyche capable of the “universal” is studied because it is strange and impressive that such a universal force, the spirit, can settle upon thousands of single individuals in the paths of tradition, education, teaching, mores and imitation, etc. For he who begins with ideas and the spiritual, the psyche is first and foremost the universal notion for the more or less powerful converter which each human being, the receiver of the infinite spiritual content, represents. On these premises it is examined in life concerning will, intelligence and emotions. It is in accordance with it that the past of the soul that looks towards the spirit is estimated according to a quick mental capacity, its timesaving capabilities, for the spirit is timeless. It is a fallacy to believe that due to increased mobility the psyche is more “spiritual.” Thus, the psyche is judged as a transaction agency of the physical. It is the receiver apparatus of the spiritual and today these two are the objects of psychology as a science.

We cannot be satisfied with this duality. Psychology does take note of a third territory of the psychic, however, it is shunned by psychology like leprosy and with good reason. Perhaps it can be said that psychology came into being directly because of the flight of the mind out of this uncanny middle region. At best, modern psychology dares to approach this field from the outside and surrounds it with a high fence like a dangerous fault line in a

territory full of mines. We are referring to the psyche of the science of the occult. Concerning these soul areas one usually refers to Max Dessoir's book *Beyond the Soul* which, in order to remain "scientific," is merely a report. One can then wash one's hands in innocence. One has not been forced to compromise. One has taken only an "objective" stand. The "beyond" simply lies "beyond" and consequently, the psyche lies "beyond" science.

This somewhat comfortable word "beyond" requires some explanation. If the occult sciences (Theosophy, Spiritualism, Astrology, etc.) are worthless to an investigation of the psyche, this does not depend on the fact that the accepted science is not complete in the problems posed. No, today's science fails in this; the occult sciences also fail in this. But it asks where one must ask. Oddly enough, its failure resides in something which also remains unsaid by its opponents. We must briefly deal with this in order to account for our objection against scientific psychology.

It is the shortcoming of the philosopher that although his egos (by dint of their reason) are divine, they are powerless shadows in the laws of the world. It is the error of the occult scientist that his soul-beings are equipped with all the world-powers and thus lose their share of divine reason. The "I's" of the philosopher are spirit-giants, the "media" of the occult scientist are world-giants. There the soul should be a rational personality throughout, here it is to be one of the most capable world-powers, which is able to conjure up worlds and make them disappear in front of our eyes. There are very old eternal ineradicable eccentricities of mankind whose rationale we view this moment: The orient and occident, yoga and philosophy, asceticism of the body and logicism of the spirit are those onesided trends into which man rushes, everyday again, in order to escape his psychic center. The orient and occident, monachism³ and higher education, Buddha and Plato tyrannize the soul. I state: The soul is not a thing.

Both errors can be traced back to the same error. They apply a wrong grammar of the soul, more precisely, an impoverished grammar.

GRAMMAR OF THE SOUL

Has the soul a grammar? Well, since the word comes out of the soul and the truest word from the very depth of the soul, since we measure the power of language upon the agitations of the soul, when

the minstrel's melody rings from within

and awakens the power of dark sounds

which rested wondrously in the heart,

so it seems that, as the spirit has logic, the soul has a "word-structure" as its internal structure and exactly that is "grammar." This analogy is not to be taken lightly but in all its comprehensible importance. The programmatic character of this treatise, therefore, cannot be other than a grammatical one! While logic and the theory of knowledge are the core of all humanities and while natural science stands and falls with mathematics, grammar is the key which opens the lock to the soul. Whoever wants to explore the soul must fathom the mystery of language. But does a mere scholar (who is not an especially gifted psychologist) or an occultist know about that? On the contrary, both shun and flee this genuine method of our knowing our soul.

The philosopher wants to get at the soul logically by means of epistemological presuppositions. In so doing he is as unmethodological concerning the soul as a scholastic of the middle ages concerning nature. All humanities today are still unproven scholastic philosophy when they touch upon questions of the soul, i.e., in the areas of law, economy, history and above all in psychology. If we want to grasp today's situation of the accepted science of the soul, we must think of natural science before mathematics and experimentation freed it from the tyranny of logic.

The occultist, the monist, etc., on the other hand, want to master the soul with just this modern method. They "approach the soul" with more or less (mostly less) modern but definitely spatial-naturalistic or astrological-mathematical calculations. These thinkers always have to "materialize" the soul. Materialization processes and experiments of the "media" are viewed as the highest revelations of the soul. This is just as perverse and precisely as indecent towards the soul as when a philosopher explains rationality as the soul's most secret miracle.

Academic psychology sees the "I" as the only fixed quantity. The "you," the "he" and "she," the "it" of things, everything else becomes remarkable only through the fact that it is psychically absorbed by this first person of its grammar, by the "I." The "non-I," the fellow-man, God or the "object" are examined by the "I."

This precept is in accord with the claim of the Greek grammarians that the “I” is the first person of the verb, letting us clearly recognize its origin from an antiquated point of view or, as Spengler would say, from an Euclidian stand point. Greek philosophy and Greek school grammar today are no longer the valid basis for such long-ranging claims. Even if in our school books the “I” is still called the first person, this does not mean that psychology can naively presuppose this incorrect counting method as a dogma. For all of our experience registers exactly the opposite of this Greek doctrine of the primacy of the “single I!”

Out of a thousand worries, impressions and influences which cover, surround and afflict it, the child gradually defines itself as an autonomous being. Its first particular ascertainment therefore is that it is not world, not mother nor father, not God but something different. The first thing that happens to the child, to every human being, is that it is addressed. It is smiled at, asked, rocked, comforted, punished, given presents and satiated. It is first a “Thou” for a powerful external being, above all for the parents. Therefore, Goethe rightfully says in *Pandora* “After all, a father is constantly a god!” This is so because he is there for the daughter before her own “I,” because he, addressing her as a “Thou,” bestows a consciousness upon her (self) by means of the “Thou.”

Realizing that we exist and mean something for others, that they want something from us, precedes the articulation of the fact that we are ourselves and what we ourselves are. The fact that we receive commands externally and are judged by others gives us self-assurance because now we perceive ourselves as something and something specific, over and against the command and the judgment. Being something other or something specific, is the basic experience of the “I.” And how many men accomplish nothing other in their lives than this dull obstinate “feeling of being different.” The sentence “I am I” pins it down. This first sentence of any ego-psychology and individual ethics, “I am I,” is the answer of the man addressed from without by his name. Similarly, many a child says “myself,” filled with self-confidence. So the individual address of man, who is a being distinguished by his proper name, precedes all the I’s-thinking-about-itself. In the Semitic language as well as in Indo-German, the shortest basic form of the verb, therefore, is the “you-form” of the imperative: go, come, listen, become. After this, man who is distinguished by his proper name in contrast to other kinds of external objects like trees, tables, stones and houses, answers with his obstinate, self-assured “I am I” which shows him that he can answer “yes” or “no” and that he can offer up resistance. The well-known stubborn negativism of many children, their “pigheadedness,” is only the practical application of the answer of the experience which lies at the bottom of the “I am I.”

It is only at the third stage then that the objects of the world, the third persons, of the “he,” the “she,” the “it,” are discovered. Although they are given names by man they give him no answer and thus he cannot be addressed by them. It is significant that children and simple people prefer to talk about themselves in the “third” person unless they are made stubborn by an address and thrown back onto their own ego. A child will say of himself: “John has gone by train,” “John is tired.” On the other hand a command leads to and compels a “yes” or “no” both of these words seem to be mere “interjections,” in reality they are the expressions of the truly divine “I-personality,” the basis of the almighty power with which we are endowed. To say “yes” or “no” means to create and resist, to suffer and to make others suffer. God speaks “yes” and “no” and we speak it as the sons of God. But precisely the immature human being does not always go straight through life with the almighty “I-figure.” As in Spitteler’s “Imago” the hero often dismisses his “Konrad,” so he dismisses his “I” into the world of things, becomes submerged in the world and allows himself to be shocked and called back out of the world of his Adam by a new call. This single human being, however, goes to the other extreme most of the time, he reverts to the first person because he regards its personality as the only way of “personal” life. The grammar of the soul, however, needs all three persons, for in divine moments, the soul must allow itself to be addressed as an “I,” in contemplative moments as an “it,” in waking up and falling asleep as a “you.” The soul changes from the “it” to the “I” and vice versa. In these transformations it often twists itself. Its laziness seeks to avoid these transformations. But here, the essential point for us is this: Every change in the life of the soul appears as a modification of its grammatical figure, just as every alteration appears in its mathematical form.

What we have said of persons also applies to the moods: indicative, subjunctive, imperative. As persons are manifestations of their souls in their different aspects, so also those moods are coordinated to them as the most important manifestations of these moments. The ordinary grammar lists everything: I sing, you sing, he sings, that I would sing, that he would sing, I shall sing, he shall sing, we should sing and so it goes in every tense and in every mood, in the active and in the passive voice, through the singular and plural, as if everything could be exchanged indefinitely. The fine tables in the school books seem to be deficient because they lack a first person singular imperative. On the other hand, the grammar of the soul distinguishes primary and secondary relations between persons and moods. It also differentiates axioms from mere developments and derivations which bring them close together and establish a network between them. But this fully developed network can only be understood as the surface filling between the profound basic eruptions and expressions of the formative power of the soul. School grammar with its lists of conjugations photographs the surface area, the proximity of the phenomenal world which is embodied

in language. The streams of speech which originally break open in the soul are something other than their utilization in the daily lives of men.

All conventional philosophy of language deals only with the utilization of the Ur-speech. Everyday life utilizes the original psychical achievement for its own end. Thus, it will create the language of communication, practical speech which becomes a means and a tool. The tradesman above all handles language as something stored and preserved, something finished, something current and as small change. The more novel his wares the more typical and intriguing are his words in order to inspire trust. But what kind of philosophy is it to regard this utilization and exploitation (stamping) of gold bullions of soul manifestations as “the being of language.” This superficial philosophy regards the artistic network of a practical drain system as the being of language which breaks open in man. Thus, it confuses linguistic competence with the urge to speak. Whatever man has to do he is competent to do. Common man in us can only do what others have had to do. But where the necessity of speaking touches man, he no longer takes language just as a means to be understandable but is deeply stirred because things themselves want to become clear to him, because man wants to make himself understood or because God wants to become audible. Notice the difference: To make oneself understandable is the desire in us who are “human men.” Man the fox, man the wolf and man the snake in man, which were already distinguished from the human being by Cyprianus, these want to make themselves merely understandable, to order something “from the waiter that is on the menu,” to purchase “goods,” to elaborate upon “conventional” social compliments. They want to pass on something finished. The human being, however, whose original linguistic material wants to render him understandable finds a song of love or hate, of weakness or strength, of anxiety or joy.

The melody again, it seems, is nothing other than the shaping of the “I-form” to the vibration of the subjunctive and optative moods. Here the will swings free as the splendid name of “volunteer” indicates. “Voluntative” would be the right term for these manners of speaking if the thinkers had not added the controversy about the freedom of will. About volunteers and their good intentions we all know. We experience ourselves as volunteers! About the freedom of God we also know. About the abstract freedom of our will we know nothing. On the other hand, animals, plants and materials outside ourselves are pacified just like the fox or wolf in us, as soon as they become understandable to us or more exactly, when they become understandable to the man in us.

That language of the mind which today is passed off as the original speech is thus the linguistic form in which the world of things enters us. When we “move in the world,” when we want to act like men of the world, we should not and must not deny the old concepts of things. For man speaks

with the world not as with his equals. To name things in the world with their proper names is the most extraordinary thing the man in each of us can do. The old saying, that the world goes down, when man once says the full truth in the world, is not exaggerated. Indeed the world, as the world of things, of conventional third persons, always collapses when a man takes it as human. And the man who does that takes possession of himself since he remains only temporarily capable of the Ur-speech, since he also belongs to the surface world. He dares to humanize a piece of the world. When he takes himself contemplatively or theoretically, however, he speaks about himself as “Konrad,” as a piece of the world in the third person like Carl Spitteler’s hero.

For the purification of the Ur-grammar there is a connection between the indicative and the third person. Whatever is tamed by the indicative, is released calmly into the world. The indicative describes and tells of resting, past, finished and existing things. Since or as far as all philosophy was world-wisdom, its first and everlasting question had to become that of being. Being and existence are truly the essence of the indicative in all its varieties in which “something” can be predicated about the world. Out of this spiritual stream of taming discipline arise the subjunctive, optative, voluntative and the strength and power of the “I” and its legislative magnificence. The subjunctive is the swelling of song, the marching song of becoming and of all those who are becoming. “O that I had a thousand tongues.” “If I were once the Lord.” From sacred seriousness to the joke, it is always the vibration of the “I” which brings forth the conjunctive. Thus, where philosophy wants to become the consciousness of the “I” it speaks about will and becoming instead of there-being. The philosophy which idolizes man is called Idealism, for it lives on the freedom of intentionality. Freedom is, however, the most precise term for the subjunctive of all becoming which does not yet want to obey the law of there-being, which does not conceive of itself as a thing of the world but as divine, as an Idealist.

Self-forgetting, i.e., without freedom for itself, without wish or will, is love. “And if I chose Him it was without any choice.” It is no less oblivious of the world. “If I only have you, if you are only mine.” “Why do I ask for heaven and earth?” To the spirit which gives birth to the speech of love, what remains afterwards, other than “you,” from mating-call to responsible command! Love does not dally like a flirt which plays tricks in the illusion of superficial speech. Love transforms. It implores and bids. So the “you” is really discovered almost in love’s transformations of the imperative. If next to a philosophy of “world view” and next to a philosophy of “self-consciousness,” there were a philosophy of the “neighboring you,” philosophers would have found their way out of the indicative of world laws and the subjunctives of the freedoms of the will to a complete grammar long ago. But there is no philosophy like this, it cannot exist. Although the philosophers have been either self-forgetting or world forgetting, they have

never at one time been both, never merely Samaritans of thought. When they become that, they cease philosophizing. On this rests the greatest of the last works of the last great German Idealist-philosopher, Hermann Cohens, which speaks from the you of belief: It ceases to be a philosophy!

The last offshoot and vagabond of this impoverished existence then, had to be activism which uncalled takes victorious action at the wrong time on principle, i.e., when the “I,” pleases. The species of military politicians, purposeful busibodies, flat bosomed female communists, arises from this spiritual climate. The tranquility of the soul is unknown to these people.

This activist species of military and civilian intellectuals as Ludendorff or Kurt Hiller (and they belong together!) is least unaware of the accurate correspondence between the individual being, the group and the people and the fact that all these arrive at peace only through change and transformation. The activist, the eternally purposeful man, is perhaps personally no superman but has peace in his soul. He imagines, however, that the nation as a whole reaches peace by ways different from the individual. Ur-grammar teaches the pervading validity of change.

For the human soul must come into being long before it can adopt the first-personality of the “I.” Even then, this ego power of divine-like purposefulness remains only an Ur-element along with the two others. The man who does not remain capable of living in the second and third person is a fool of his ego, not a god or a hero. Such a group of people is an igniting torch, a warrior band, an army but not a people. For the people are called “a people” because of the capability to change because it never solidifies in the first person.

The “I” does not separate itself but is separated by the voices from outside. Thus, this process of separation is the process of life itself. The relationship between the call of the soul via the appeal to its proper name and its answer via the “I” remains the same through all the steps of life. All self knowledge, “I” knowledge, is called forth through challenge, through a certain feeling of being struck which challenges the “I” in a concrete way. The childhood gods, mother and father or whoever, dwindle and their places may be taken by the wealth of spiritual heritage, the examples of the heroes, the cloud of witnesses and poets, the imperative may burst forth from an unforeseen source. It is always the imperative that forces the soul to come forth and develops its potential in the direction of both the corporeal and the spiritual.

Through each step of life the Thou-I-Succession⁴ of the soul remains fixed. This cannot be obscured by the period of youth and the coming of age. Between the ages of 20 to 30, man often breaks with the gods of his youth and emancipates himself from the opinions of his home and the skies of

childhood collapse. But the place, which palpably governs the child's soul, occupied by parents, teachers and the God with a white beard, is not taken by emptiness. On the contrary now the human being really learns to listen to the voices which do not issue from a visible mouth. The voices of politics (i.e., of time) of the people, of faith, of philosophy, of love become audible in him as inward voices and urge him through their call to adopt a new, self-chosen position in his life and vocation. The destiny of man, the destiny of the "I," is a result of these unperceptible voices and woe unto him if, in this period of transformation, he cannot separate the voice of God from that of his tempters. Certainly the godlike power of the "I" manifests itself here and the youth almost breaks under this feeling of his mission and urge towards the infinite. But he does not become a man before he allows the last stage of his growth to again be transformed i.e., his first person, when he again obeys and suffers! Not before this first hour does his whole human being begin to live, the human being that next to this "I" also comprises his "Thou" and "Id" again and that changes and alters between them.

Thus, for Descartes' tenet: "Cogito, Ergo Sum" (I think, therefore I am) which implies only the logical aspect of "I am I" of "A = A" we have to substitute the following grammatical sentence in animantics: God has called me, therefore I am. I am given a proper name, therefore I am.⁵ The unpretentious statement concerning my there-being is the most inspired and pure answer, which I can oppose to being addressed by name. While every opposition to a given command, a single request from without opposes only a piece of myself to this request, the answer reads: You call me, I am here, cleansed from all details, free from all chance. This answer contains all single conceivable answers. Therefore, this has always been regarded as the greatest answer, being equally removed from mere thinking as from bare defiance, as the answer which, as everyone knows, our Adam would not give after his creation because he was defiant or afraid. But now to "abstract" is a welcome foreign word for the event of this escape, of this "withdrawal." Only recently an intelligent man has diagnosed philosophy as a fear of the world and of death. Indeed, all abstractions evade the concrete situation of here and now, they dodge the responsibility of the answer: I am this and there. Matthias Claudius alters our principle somewhat but his emphasis too elevates the "I am" beautifully to the principle of consciousness which the answering soul gains if it ventures to live in the second person:

I thank God and I am pleased like
 the child at the Christmas presentation,
 that I am, am! (And that I have you, a
 beautiful human face!).

Only in thanking and reflecting upon God does the job about one's own existence develop into this our unsurpassable doubling of the "I am." So we see: The soul is to represent man's answer to God; it can be distorted into an answer to whatever gods and idols. Incidentally, even the most barbaric idolatry of an "Ismus" worshipper keeps the soul more alive than sheer deafness. Some kind of life in the second person is better than none at all. "The Man shall obey, the Woman shall serve" (Goethe). The living creature is animated as an answering "Thou," that answers his living God; only the dying, the departed being, is that completed "I" with which today's science deals according to the classical model. Consequently, the "soul" in the psychological sense, which departs from the "I," is deceased and lifeless! The fact that psychology, although it starts from a soul-thing, i.e., something dead or at best with an athlete of reason, can produce some ostensible achievement in its research and its experiments is due to the corruptness of our nature. For a great number of us have successfully avoided our own animation, i.e., there are many whose anima forces have never awakened or soon died. We all have a piece of dead "Id" and deceased "I" in us. And it is precisely this remnant of the soul upon which psychologists unleash their experiments. They use our deformity, our transgression, our animal being and our deadness as their point of departure. They perform a Sisyphean labor upon the soul's corpse. Fortunately, the human being is not quite so abandoned by God that it could not again turn into the child of God of the Thou.

Now we are able to conclude the first draft of a grammar of the soul and define what grammar means in German: It is the doctrine of Gestalt-change. Modification, transformation and changes of tense make up its contents. School grammar knows something about vowel mutation and vowel gradation but the Ur-grammar talks about Gestalt-changes!

Stating these premises, i.e., from the fundamental, more precisely from the Ur-doctrine of the Gestalt-changes, school grammar again wins our admiration. Indeed it is an enormous achievement that human beings can wield all persons of "I love, you love, he loves" and that, in the course of time, each human being has even internalized these transformations of the persons, tenses and moods. This is just as enormous and just as misleading as that every human being can pray, feel, sing, command and obey, that today everybody can learn to think, reckon and make poetry. The most primitive grammar just like the highest degree of "civilization" already contains the entire miracle of being human. Human beings have received "this and that" from a few Ur-creators and often only seem to wield "that like this."

THE DESTINY OF THE SOUL

So this argument has been carried as far as to show that both the occult and psychological sciences fall prey to the same Greek error, i.e., that the “I” or “it” is thought to rank above the “Thou,” while in fact it constitutes the answer to and the longing after the “Thou” and can supply meaningful knowledge only as an answer to or a longing after the command of the loving person.

Well, scientific psychology is rooted in the same basic error. Even in science the separation of the “I” is regarded as a free act or an “established fact” of this “I.” Accordingly, it obscures the real difference between the necessary separation of the “I” in the course of life as a whole and the sin of intentional egotism; thus it denies the boundaries between health and sickness. That this omission in scientific works strikes one as less terrible than in occultist teachings involves a relatively unimportant reason: It puts the “I” under a glass cover and in that way escapes the danger of its world-pervading satanism. Only because it does not dare to carry out its error but stops at the “I” and deprives the “I” of its validity as a carrier of a proper name by freezing it artificially into a number of “I’s” without distinct shapes.

This validity, however, the human being demands, for only through a proper name man becomes a carrier of his own soul and of a particular destiny. In the meantime he runs to the occultists who recognize the integration of human beings into the world, as we call it. For them, the human being is a cosmic being through which the streams of nature roar but they do not view him as a being who is addressed. The un-addressed “human being,” however, does not manage to become a human being. He remains what he is without this calling, just a being, an animal. Thus, the boundary between white and black magic runs between human and sub-human occultism. Occult sciences regard the human being as an animal, a plant, a piece of matter, a conductor of energy, a reflected image of the course of the planets and the sun and a telluric phenomenon.

Therefore, it is not at all true that the occult sciences aim at the “subconscious being” or the “beyond” or an otherwise inexpressible soul. In order not to dirty itself, psychology unjustly hides behind such assertions. The occult sciences deal with the psyche as a carrier of a peculiar destiny; scientific psychology, on the other hand, in studying bodily or spiritual soul-functions, deals with the conception of the soul of the normal human being, i.e., of an individual among many others. Here the contrast stands out and it can be fruitful. Concerning the superstition of astrology, spiritualism, hand oracle and theosophy, we deal with a definite single “psyche” and she and she alone will experience misfortune, be subject to a transmigration of souls or act under the influence of Mars and Jupiter. The occult sciences are

consequently the pseudo-sciences which rush into territories which psychology painstakingly avoids: The unique destiny of the single unique soul.

Psychology is right to reject the means of knowledge of these secret sciences but it has no better means of knowledge than the same! Psychologists do not even take the trouble to say whether or not each human being has a soul and if so what that means. Should it do so, it would then adopt as an axiom the tenet (which it today violates constantly) that for two souls, two groups, two people, the same outward behavior, the same response can never mean the same psychically! Wherever two people do the same it turns out not to be the same. From this we arrive at the important reverse statement which is also of consequence to international relationships. Where two do different things it can mean the same!

Psychology will be overtaken by perverted knowledge and superstition, as is happening today, as long as it cannot muster the courage to inquire about the destiny of the single soul. Thus, it acts as if this psychic value had not long existed with infallible certainty. Every verse, picture, proverb and singing girl of eighteen years bears witness to what psychology refuses to know.

Even if Idealistic psychology justly refuses to place the soul under nature's concepts of rigid experimental laws, is the soul not rooted in the life-giving matrix of the created world before it receives its calling?

On the other hand, if Empirical Psychology justly refuses to attribute to the soul the liberties of an unlimited spiritual being, does this mean there is no history of the soul's fulfillment towards its salvation?

If psychology has to refuse to determine the psychic from corporeal forms, does this mean that the soul has no ability to communicate in the corporeal?

*The microcosm of the soul is a parable of creation.
The nature of the soul attains fulfillment as a history of life.
The language of the soul transforms the world.⁶*

These three themes, whether one formulates them as questions or sentences, contain the scientific problems of the soul in the ecumenical sense of this word. They are not discussed today because psychology fancies that it is bound to become unscientific by discussing them. But for normal people, a whole psychology is no animantics if it does not answer three questions:

(1) How can the superstition of a transmigration through jackel, pig or lotus blossom be replaced with a doctrine of a history and a self-completing course of life?

(2) How can the superstition of numerical interlinkage of the human being, a mere number combination transformed into matter or the starry world, be replaced with a doctrine through which the single little human or the great human or the human species is glorified into the quintessence of all cosmic powers and into a microcosm?

(3) How can the superstition of the hand or head and rules and writing laws be replaced with a doctrine which traces the creative power of the soul, its manifestation and gesture, through which the prison house separating the individual from the individual can be destroyed?

Translator's Notes

- 1) Although Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy speaks of Applied Science of the Soul, the translator felt that within this treatise the term Animalogy would further the directness of the depth of the intended meaning.
- 2) Rather than saying the new meaning of Science, the term animantics displays the dynamics of the soul which Rosenstock-Huessy intended.
- 3) Monachism is correct here as Rosenstock-Huessy utilizes the word *Mönchtum*.
- 4) See Translator's Remarks (p. i.), for Rosenstock-Huessy "Du-lch-Reihenfolge" is significant since it is the other that calls one into being.
- 5) Not only is Rosenstock-Huessy attending to the argument "I think . . ." is an abstraction of "I am thinking of something" but it is, again beyond this, the other that calls me to be.
- 6) These three themes have been placed in the italics for emphasis.

Index: Location in the German Text

- 1) this section continuous—742-745—begin 742
- 2) 742
- 3) 743
- 4) 744
- 5) end 745
- 6) this section continuous—745-747—begin 745
- 7) 746
- 8) bottom 746
- 9) end 747
- 10) bottom paragraph—begin 751
- 11) first line next paragraph
- 12) end 752—(10, 11 and 12, summary of occult section)
- 13) this section continuous—752-760—begin 752
- 14) 753
- 15) bottom line 753
- 16) 754
- 17) 755
- 18) 756-758
- 19) top of page 758
- 20) 758
- 21) 759
- 22) end 760

- 23) this section continuous—764-768—begin 764
- 24) 765
- 25) 765
- 26) middle 766-768
- 27) 768
- 28) end 768
- 29) begin 768—bottom paragraph
- 30) end 768
- 31) middle 769—begin
- 32) top 770
- 33) end—middle 770
- 34) this section continuous—770-772—begin bottom 770
- 35) 771
- 36) top 772
- 37) end—bottom 772

Selection of Recommended Texts

In the German by Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy

Ja und Nein 1969.

Die Sprache des Menschengeschlechts, I, 1963.

Die Sprache des Menschengeschlechts, II, 1964.

Die Umwandlung, 1968.

(Heidelberg: Verlag Lambert Schneider).

Soziologie, I, 1956.

Soziologie, II, 1958.

(Stuttgart: Kohlhammer).

In the English by Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy

The Christian Future (New York: Harper and row, 1966). Previous copyright 1946.

I Am an Impure Thinker, 1970.

The Multiformity of Man, 1973. Previous editions copyright 1936 and 1948.

The Origin of Speech, 1981.

Out of Revolution, 1969. Original copyright in 1938 by Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy.

Speech and Reality, 1970.

The above 6 texts and numerous lecture discs are available from Argo Books.

(Norwich: Argo Books).

In the English relating to Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy

Harold Stahmer, "*Speak That I May See Thee!*" (New York: Macmillan, 1968), pp. 106-147. See Chapter 3 on Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy: "Speech Is Hierarchical and Determines Social Unity."

Clinton Gardner, *Letters to The Third Millennium* (Norwich: Argo Books, 1981).

PHILOSOPHY/PSYCHOLOGY/LANGUAGE

In Honor of
Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy

THE CROSS

Quadrilateral
intersection
of truth
illuminating
each other one.

The Writing Caruso

Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy

APPLIE SCIENCE OF THE SOUL

Golden Phoenix Press

ISBN 0-910727-04-X