


<p><i>Bifrons Creativity</i></p> <p>Number 2</p> <p>October 2007</p>	<p>ISSN 1755 – 4136</p>  <p>www.Bifrons.org.uk</p>
---	---

Mascirelgic – A Logomyth for a New Millennium

Patrick William Jemmer

SoCEIS Northumbria University
Pandon Building Camden Street
Newcastle upon Tyne NE2 1XE UK

Abstract

This essay begins with an investigation of the breakdown of mythologizing, and loss of myth, which accompany the ascendancy of science and technology and the retreat of magic and religion, in modern “simulacral” society, and then goes on to discuss the effects of these changes on the human psyche. It proceeds to chart the theoretical, practical and psychical relationships between the strands of the “eternal golden thread” of language – myth – magic – religion – science, and shows how these have been woven into a complex web of interactions and interdependences throughout human history. Linguistic theories of mythologizing are presented, together with conceptual blending theories of magical and religious ritual, and the relationships between these are investigated. The linguistic and psychological nature of modern, practical magical working is discussed in detail, and the need for “ecology” in this respect is emphasized. The essay sums up with a critical comparison of each of these strands and their interdependencies, and reappraises the position and relevance of religion, magic and science in modern society. The conclusion is that new understandings of the underpinning philosophies allow a “reintegration” of the strands of the web, allowing Twentyfirst Century Humanbeings to “re-mythologize” ourselves if we choose to accept the “magic gift” and so create a new “*mascirelgic*,” and develop our own personal “logomyths” of magic – religion – science with which to go forward into the future with renewed strength and insight.

Keywords

Conceptual blending, language, magic, mana, medicine, myth, neuro-linguistic programming, personal development, psycho-chaotic semiotics, religion, ritual, science, tabu.

OBSERVATION



"Nothing is – Nothing becomes – Nothing is not."

Aleister Crowley: *The Book of Lies* [1].

OBSERVATION



"Man has, as it were, discovered a new method of adapting himself to his environment. Between the receptor system and the effector system, which are to be found in all animal species, we find in man a third link which we may describe as the *symbolic system*. This new acquisition transforms the whole of human life. As compared with the other animals man lives not merely in a broader reality; he lives, so to speak, in a new *dimension* of reality."

Ernst Cassirer: *An Essay on Man* [2].

OBSERVATION



"'Magic' occurs *in the symbolic language systems* that we use. By the various language systems (linguistics, math, music, the sensory representational systems, etc.) we *construct* our realities. We weave the webs that comprise our subjective experiences. So the more clarity we have about our understandings about such maps (i.e. how we build them, how they work, what drives them, how to alter them, etc.) the more we can empower ourselves to work with that 'magic' (i.e. neuro-linguistic magic), to cast spells, to break old incantations that imprison, and to invent new spells for magic."

Michael Hall: *The Structure of Magic* [3].

OBSERVATION



"To throw off these clothes and these naked bones – to leave my emotions in the dust – to cast my mind into the darkness of space – burning my habits in the demon's fire. When this is done, falling blindly into the abyss – only then do I begin. *This is brain change willed historically known as magick ... Magick gets its bad name from the Children which it spawns: Religion, Reason, Common Sense, Science and Philosophy. They are ungrateful souls ... Meaning can only be made after you have destroyed the search for meaning itself.*"

Christopher Hyatt: *Undoing Yourself* [4].

Let us start from the realization that “We live in a world of wonder, mystery and exquisite beauty of which human beings are in integral part” [5], where “Magic is hidden in the language we speak. The webs that you can tie and untie are at your command if only you pay attention to what you already have (language) and the structure of the incantations for growth ...” [6]. We, as thinking beings, have often been led to ask throughout our history “ ... what is the nature of the holding together of diverse things in a unified beauty and the recognition of this beauty by mind? Is it not ‘magical’ in the precise sense that the blending of the different and the identical as beauty, and the aesthetic response of mind to beauty in material things, is taken as real, yet cannot be described or invoked save ‘tautegorically’ by re-presenting the beautiful effect?” [7]. However, in this Twentyfirst Century, despite millennia of striving for answers amongst these blessings, “We live in the age of the blockbuster special effects movie, the airport novel, the TV soap. These are our modern popular myths. But do these stories fulfil the same role that myths and fairytales used to, of collectively guiding us through the journey of life? Are Tom Clancy, Seinfeld and The Terminator really expressions of the collective unconscious?” [8]. It is as a result of this that “We are facing a crisis of being with each other, and being within the world. The crisis of being must lead us to certain questions: what are we doing?, and, why are we doing it?” [5]. We find that “This is a time for a re-evaluation of all our practices” [5], and have to ask therefore how can we perform such a critical evaluation. Now if we follow Leach’s dictum that “culture communicates” [9] then “To understand culture ... one seems to need models of communication” [10]. However, impeding such modelling is the fact that “Image and thought are a unity” [11] and yet “The only true description of a language is the language itself. Anything else is just a game” [12]; and that therefore “ ... our goal is to overcome the duplicity of the literary word, to transcend the tragedy of thought without the word, to comprehend the whole word” [11]. We thus find that a real problem in philosophical enquiry is “ ... the maintenance of the human/nature dualism ... this distinction can be situated within a historical era ... [and] by situating this distinction we can recognise the role that language has played in preventing us from producing a constructive critique of our practices. Whilst we focus our critique upon our relationship with the environment, with nature, with society, with culture, and with language, we will maintain a position of separation and transcendentalism which will prevent us from properly situating ourselves within the environment, within nature, within society, within culture, and within language” [5]. We as human beings are constantly assaulted with the question that “ ... if human thought is a psychic and not just a material reality, then how can it act on reality and be influenced by things? How can the subtly differing inflections of the wind affect my mood? Or a pattern of shadows, or the interplay between sea and sky? Inversely, how is it that words which do not obviously resemble things can invoke things in such a manner that things become thereby more powerfully present, even in their absence, than they are present to us ‘on their own’? Unless my consciousness is an illusion thrown up by my brain – and what could it mean that the illusion is ‘there’? – is not this two-way intercourse between matter and

mind a kind of ineffable, magical influence?" [7]. Now, "For Plato, truth and error are not only of the speculative order, but relate to virtue. He opposed myth (*mythos*) to argumentative discourse (*lógos*). Thus, while a 'tale' (the poet's word) is satisfied to delineate contingent events, 'science' (the word of the philosopher and sage) looks to reason or the cause of things" [13]. Indeed the Greeks believed that "... to imagine a law (*nómos*) written in natural phenomena, frees the spirit and gives precedence to reason (*lógos*). This was the accomplishment of the Greeks at the dawn of western thought in their formulation of the ideal of the City and knowledge based on the analysis of facts and their coherent application to theory. From this perspective, as much political as scientific, the metaphysical idea of 'nature' (*physis*) took shape as the capacity for autonomous action, being regulated and balanced by a principle of order. Also formulated was the notion of 'essence' (*ousía*) which, given its invariability, could serve as the origin of secure knowledge based on universal principles (*archaî*) accessible to the intelligence by way of a language that was itself subject to logical rules" [13]. Buehler expounds on humans' search to make meaning of this by saying that "Science can restrict the subjective qualities of myth and religion, but it cannot destroy their reality, since every human experience has a claim to reality. Cassirer gives the following example. In our scientific concepts we reduce the differences between two colors ... to a numeric difference [of wavelength]. But it is a very inadequate way of speaking if we declare number to be more real than color. What is really meant is that it is more general ... But to hypothesize number ... as the ultimate reality, the very essence and substance of things, is a metaphysical fallacy" [14]. And we are thus drawn into an intellectual trap, for "As Cassirer puts it, '... every philosopher believes he has found the mainspring and master-faculty of his own picture of human nature – Nietzsche's will to power, Freud's sexual instinct, or Marx's economic politics – with the empirical facts stretched to fit a preconceived pattern.' This leads to a strange situation in modern philosophy. Cassirer maintains that we have no real insight into the general character of human nature, despite a rich body of facts. But a wealth of facts (information) is not a wealth of thought (knowledge). How does man deal with facts, create them, and communicate? Man uses symbols to converse with himself and with the physical world. It is these symbols (language) that allows relational thought and judgment. It is this relational thought system that allows man to develop science. Science, thus, is not concerned with the 'truth of things' but the truth of propositions and judgments, i.e., the relation among symbols" [14]. At this point, we should be at pains to note that the "scientific revolution" was precipitated by "... a group of uncommonly religious men like Copernicus, Newton, Kepler, and (much later) even Darwin, who catalyzed that separation between our knowledge of nature and what we held in our hearts. All four of them either had religious careers or were contemplating such a profession. They were brilliant questioners, and they used the sharpest tools they had to search for what was holy. They had enough confidence in the reality of the sacred to be willing to look at it as deeply as humanly possible. This unflinching search led to our greatest spiritual awakening – the modern scientific revolution. It was a spiritual breakthrough, and I think that it is our failure to recognize it as such that explains so much of

the loneliness and madness in our civilization, so much of the conflict and self-hatred ... The last four centuries of disconnect between what our elders told us and what we knew was true has been costly for our civilization" [15]. And herein lies the modern trap for " ... people grow increasingly more attached to their machines, to the point at which deprivation of a phone, a computer, an electronic organizer feels much like an amputation, the severing of a natural extension of the body, [and] the [human-machine] boundary grows more ambiguous" [16] so that " ... late twentieth-century machines have made thoroughly ambiguous the difference between natural and artificial, mind and body, self-developing and externally designed, and many other distinctions that used to apply to organisms and machines. Our machines are disturbingly lively, and we ourselves are frighteningly inert" [17]. Thus " ... our civilization is completely dependent on science and high technology, yet most of us are alienated from science. We are estranged from its methods, its values, and its language. Who is the scientist in our culture? He is Dr. Faustus, Dr. Frankenstein, Dr. Strangelove. He's the maker of the Faustian bargain that is bound to end badly. Where does that come from? We've had a long period of unprecedented success in scientific discovery. We can do things that even our recent ancestors would consider magic, and yet our self-esteem as a species seems low. We hate and fear science. We fear science and we fear the scientist. A common theme of popular movies is some crazed scientist somewhere setting about ruining what is most precious to all of us" [15]. The problem is that such ruination is pernicious, and extend from the physical world to mental constructs, so that, in Horkheimer's words, "The more ideas have become automatic, instrumentalized, the less does anybody see in them thoughts with a meaning of their own. They are considered things, machines. Language has been reduced to just another tool in the gigantic apparatus of production in modern society ... [J]ustice, equality, happiness, centuries supposed to be inherent in or sanctioned by reason, have lost their intellectual roots" [18]. Thus if we cite our modern scientific Logos in its historical context, we are led naturally into the territory of mythology since " ...we can understand the hidden meaning and ground of a particular historical people as the Mythos. The Logos (discourse) of a particular historical people always conceals the Mythos. But ... there can be at least two kinds of Logos: (1) A Logos which denies its meaning and ground as the Logos or (2) a Logos which preserves and shelters its meaning and ground ... we live in an age, as in the former type of Logos, which denies its meaning and ground" [19]. In the modern age, this "denying its meaning and ground" manifests itself in the observation that "We've always loved good stories. From fairytales to Hollywood blockbusters, human society is almost be unthinkable without them. But are myths and legends just simple entertainments to pass the time? Or do they exert a powerful pull on our minds and in our lives? And are we at risk of losing this, in our contemporary world of mass marketing and homogenisation? Have stories, like sneakers, become branded?" [8]. And, if this is true, we must surely ask "How do we deny the meaning and ground, our Mythos, in our particular historical age? ... we do so by failing to recall that we are claimed by Being to take up things in a certain way ... The discourse of our particular age is dominated by the 'mathematical,' which, as Heidegger [20] points out in *Question*

Concerning Technology, is 'that "about" things which we already know. Therefore we do not first get it out of things, but, in a certain way, we bring it already with us' ... The technological character of our everyday discourse (*gerede*) doubly conceals the Mythos our age, because it denies that it is a Mythos at all. Yet, the 'enframing' of our technological epoch is itself a form of revealing and concealing; it, too, is a form of *poesis*. By claiming it holds the sole access to 'Truth,' it marginalizes other means of seeking truth as Aletheia – truth as revealing what has been concealed, the revealing-concealing advent of Being" [19]. And the problem is multiply compounded in our modern age where "Other forms of revealing-concealing which send us on our way include poetry, art, history, religion, etc., all of which find themselves in our age defending themselves and attempting to legitimate themselves in the face of science. In other words, when we understand 'Myth' in this way, we are not speaking of something that is 'false' or 'untrue,' but rather, we are speaking of that which is the meaning and ground which is taken up into language with our everyday discourse or Logos. Science is not the only means of taking up our Mythos into language – in fact ... it holds the danger of holding itself as the sole arbiter of sense-making, of revealing, of *poesis*" [19]. Humankind's dilemma under these circumstances, then, is this: how do we "comprehend the whole word" and thus "the whole world," and in so doing rediscover the "Hagia Sophia ... the 'climax of this transformation of nature, revealing the glorious character of the material world' ... a process that is and always existed. The Transfiguration [which] made visible the eternal procession between God and Sophia through man" [21]. The partial answer to this is that Humankind does, and has done so, through the arts of language, myth, magic, religion and science, for "Religion, science and art are all pictures of experience, symbolically created to give meaning to life. So thought Ernst Cassirer. [22] They were the emotion-laden, unmediated 'language' of experience, which couldn't be interrogated for a more primary intellectual meaning. And as to where they came from, the ultimate ground of their representation, one couldn't ask: that was extending everyday attitudes into areas where they didn't belong" [23]. So, in order to progress and gain insight into "the ultimate ground of representation," we need "To properly situate ourselves within the world [and to do this] we must emphasise ourselves as bodies in a worldly context and analyse our relationship with particulars within the environment, nature, society and culture of which we ourselves are integral particulars" [5]. The end-goal of this is the development of a "new science," a "joyful science, [which] enlightens and leads us to restoration of [the] brotherhood of peoples" [11]. Now you may, or may not, agree with Young, who claims that "I think we're in a golden age of storytelling and I think that there is great wisdom even in action movies. Stories tend to reflect human experience, stories that are very, very popular often reflect something quite profound about human experience. The fact that we have so many movies, so many more channels or opportunity to see films and dramas and more television, you know cable channels and all of this to choose from, I think has really led to a kind of flowering of the literary imagination" [8]. Regardless of your position on the "magic of cinema" in the modern world, you must nevertheless acknowledge its influence, and in the light of this we go on in the rest of this article to investigate the relationships between

language, magic, myth, religion and science. In doing this we always bear in mind that “To look at the work simply as a treatise on the origins of human language or even as a cosmogony is to ignore the fact that it is a poem, characterized by devices of poetic speech ... “ [11], and that thus “ ... this story reads like a novel: and [that] in any case, doesn’t the word history itself, which designates a succession of facts through time, also encapsulate the word story: a tale, a fable, an imaginary account?” [24]. And in pursuing this investigation we seek to discover “How it came about ... [that] myth could take the place of history, and feed both fiction and utopia, that fiction in the form of dogma of various kinds could take the place of science, that science could progressively dominate fiction, that history, in eliminating myth, could itself become a science, at the cost of a ruthless battle between the imaginary and the real – a battle whose outcome, even today, remains unclear ... “ [24].

First it is useful to try and understand our ancestors’ methods for “comprehending the whole word” and through this “the whole world,” whilst remembering that these were “people who were quite incapable of telling the difference between fact and belief or between knowledge and unsupported convictions” [25]. Moreover they had no understanding that “Meaning does not occur apart from, or independent of, human beings. We can’t see, hear, feel, smell, or taste ‘meaning’ in the world. It does not exist there. It exists only and solely in the functioning of a given human nervous system. Or, if we want to talk about ‘shared meanings,’ then it exists as the shared significances and associations that lots of humans experience with regard to the same referent or object” [3]. Now we must recall that “Languages exist in some kind of space, that of the known world, but equally, when the imaginary intervenes, that of an unknown and invisible world. Languages exist in time, in historical time, but equally in mythological and utopian time” [24]. We can follow this up with the observation that “To begin with in Greece, *mythos* and *logos*, narrative and reason, were synonymous – they began to be distinguished when history separated itself from false tale or rumour, ethical religion from scandalous tales about the gods, and philosophical abstraction from mythological personification” [7]. We must therefore muse on the meaning of the ancients’ mythologizing “ ... and many conflicting answers were supplied. Myth was proto-science (Comte); it was language without abstraction (Tylor); it was the deceit of metaphor (Max Müller); it was the trace of the subconscious (Freud); it was the detritus of an archaic humanity which confused subject and object (Lévy-Bruhl), or it was rather the work of a strictly rational classification and grasping of contradictions, albeit in concrete terms...” [7]. Furthermore we can now forge another link in the chain myth–language–magic–religion–science with the realization that “Mythology ... as Cassirer noted, ‘is from its very beginning potential religion,’ [and] can be understood as a function of language ... The nineteenth-century linguist Muller described mythology as a ‘disease of language’ in just this sense; language deforms thought by its inability to describe things directly. ‘Mythology is inevitable, it is natural, it is an inherent necessity of language ... [It is] the dark shadow which throws upon thought, and which can never disappear till language becomes entirely commensurate with thought, which it never

will” [26]. We could say that “Myth is the speech and the imaginings of the psyche. It is our way of experiencing ourselves from the inside out” [27]. And so in trying to make mythical meaning in the natural world “You juggle with shifts in meaning, with metonymies, metaphors, antiphrases, comparison of antonyms, ... metatheses, epentheses, and goodness knows what else. Everything is grist to your mill” [24]. In this way “Different themes and myths are born, grow, die and are sometimes reborn, in direct correlation with the changing picture man has of the world. These myths and themes will often overlap and intertwine, when not opposed by one another (the notion of contradiction is however alien to myth)” [24]. We thus realize along with Greimas [28] that the “ ... connection between signification and the real world is completely arbitrary; however, signification is in itself not arbitrary since language tends to follow structural rules. Humans are therefore caught in a system of rules and deep structures that bear no relation to the real world [29], and we can therefore understand Greimas’ struggle “ ... to find the ‘deep structure’ of all narrativity ... the formal elements in a narrative that create implicit (if not always consciously recognized) oppositions ... he wishes to find behind any ‘manifestation of narrativity’ a ‘*fundamental semantics and grammar*’ ... “ [29]. We shall return to the formal analysis of myth below. And we may well ask “So who are the privileged bearers of this utopian and mythical current of thought which develops on the fringes of science and history, but nonetheless permeates them? They are precisely the ... lunatics in love with language. That’s who they are, the sort of dreamers who have the gift of mistaking their dreams for reality” [24]. Now “A dream is a product of the unconscious, but it can also be something constructed by a conscious subject. With dreams, as with lunacy, and this is particularly apparent when it comes to language, there is no clear dividing line. One is indeed dealing with a continuum, for ‘there always exists between theory and delirium, between an empire builder and a deranged mind a degree of connivance which takes in its share of paranoia’ [30]. And more generally, without going as far as pathological excesses, is there a single linguist, a single poet, who isn’t something of a logophile, something of a sorcerer’s apprentice with language or individual languages?” [24]. So, in our desire to understand mythical language and the language of myths we are led to the understanding that “Myth blends in with a message and denies its own existence through its apparent subordination to the content of the ... signifiers. When we become aware of myth, it shifts” [31]. And “Therein lies the nature of myth when the message is read as the meaning rather than a form of communication making reference to someone else ... Myth is constituted by the form of communication. It neglects historical, socially constructed perspective and privileges a natural order of understanding” [31]. In other words, “Myth is ... a form that provides understanding derived from, but beyond denotation and connotation. The veracity of meaning is embodied in the framework of communication” [31], and we note that in all the cases mentioned above, where story and logic began to diverge “ ... the ‘critical’ turn against myth failed to reflect that it was in large part substituting the protocols of a *written* culture for those of an oral one” [7]. We can make the comparison that “In a somewhat parallel fashion, the abstract concept in philosophy concerns something delimitable and precisely repeatable,

like a passage of writing. This tends to insinuate the idea that behind the processes of nature lie regularly operating forces rather than capricious and quasi-wilful ones, as mythology often suggests" [7], although we do also recognize that "Pictures, to be sure, are more imperative than writing, [since] they impose meaning at one stroke, without analyzing or diluting it" [32]. Now in this context we find that Detienne " ... notes that in terms of written culture there is a great difference between the hieroglyphic imperial worlds of Egypt, Babylon or China and the phonetic alphabets of Greece, and, we can add, Israel. In the case of the former the graphic is linked to secrecy, elitism, centralisation and bureaucratic control. We are talking about the records office. In the case of Greece, by contrast, remarkably few public records were kept and democratic procedures remained predominantly oral. Phonetic writing was here an exoteric instrument which made news more publicly available and allowed greater ease of access to collective memory" [7]. However on closer examination we might say that " ... in this connection Detienne perhaps exaggerates the differences between oral and written cultures: in so far, as he says, that oral narration constantly obliterates older versions, it can also exhibit a bias towards the paradigmatic and atemporal, and tends gradually to distil certain stable features of a tale which survive all retellings, like Mr Punch and his club" [33]. In contrast to this " ... the moderate alphabetisation of Greece and Israel actually assisted the more syntagmatic aspect of orality: a record of earlier versions of a story or of earlier oracular predictions can serve to bring about a consciousness of non-identical repetition which swerves away from the mythical sense of a repeated static foundation towards one of an irrecuperable loss of origin which can only be saved by eschatological recovery [33]" [7]. We can extend this discussion by noting that "In *Language and Form* Cassirer wrote that language and myth began as one, originally standing 'in an indissoluble correlation with one another, from which they both emerge but gradually as independent elements ...' Language also bears within self, from its very beginning, the power of logic ... Myth develops into art and the development of written language leads eventually toward mathematics and science, although in poetry language still has its original power. 'The greatest lyric poets, for instance Hölderlin or Keats, are men in whom the mythic power of insight breaks forth again in its full intensity and objectifying power'" [34]. So we can go on say that "If we can see philosophy growing out of mythic thought in Greek history, the difficulty arises about just how we are to then distinguish philosophy from religion, as the two later coexist but are distinguished from each other. Socrates talks about the gods all the time, and it is not clear why he should not be regarded as a religious figure rather than a secular philosopher. As it happens, the relatively easy distinction between religion and philosophy in Western history occurs because of the historical accident that the religion of people like Socrates and Plato later ceased to exist. The old gods of the Greeks, Egyptian, Babylonians, Phoenicians, Romans, Celts, Germans, Slavs, etc. were later entirely replaced by one old religion, Judaism, and two new ones from the same tradition, Christianity and Islam. It is now possible to say 'religion' and mean one of those and to say 'philosophy' and simply mean 'that Greek stuff' (*falsafah* in Arabic), where the religious side of Greek thought just need not be taken seriously" [35]. The importance of

this is that “Cassirer considered all forms of intellectual activity creative. As a symbol-creating animal, human being is the product of a new mutation in life. Science, language, art, religion, mythology – they all are man-made worlds, expressing the creativity of spirit, or mind, itself. In this capacity they help us to articulate our experience and our knowledge. Symbolic forms have great creative powers but they can also be destructive ... When intellectual, ethical and artistic forces lose their strength, mythical thoughts start to emerge and pervade the whole of man's cultural and social life” [34].

Let's now go about shining the torch of reason on the origin of basic religious practices, to see how “language of creation” [36] percolates, infuses and influences the created, and thereby illuminating the intertwined prehistoric concepts of *mana* and *tabu*. To ancient man, the Demiurge that created and maintained the Universe did so through a constant e-*mana*-tion of creative force called *mana*, which was intrinsic in every person and object to a different extent [37]. Moreover this *mana* was a part of the natural construction of the world, not a “supernatural” entity or force. Howells defines *mana* as “a kind of force or power which can be in anything, and which makes that thing better in its own special qualities, such as they are, perhaps to the point of being marvelous” [38]. It “... operates behind all human activity in the world, ... a force altogether distinct from physical power which acts in all kinds of ways for good and evil and which is of the greatest advantage to possess and control” [39]. So, important chieftains, talented artisans, visionary shamans, lifegiving women and blessed children were replete with it. Natural objects such as a beautiful tree, a fruitful garden or a cunning animal were considered repositories of *mana*. Similarly, special tools, or powerful weapons, or effigies of powerful people, were imbued with much *mana*. The miraculous magic of *mana* cannot be created or destroyed, but it can be stored and released. *Mana* can be transferred by, for example, handling a *mana*-rich object or visiting a special place, and under the right circumstances this might be very beneficial. However, this could also be dangerous: if a commoner were to come into physical contact with a chieftain, then the transfer of *mana* could cause the commoner to “blow out like a fuse,” and the chieftain's *mana* to “drain off” [37]. There is an important point to be made here, since “Countless anthropologists have managed to overlook the ecological dimension of the shaman's craft, while writing at great length of the shaman's rapport with ‘supernatural’ entities. We can attribute much of this oversight to the modern, civilized assumption that the natural world is largely determinate and mechanical, and that what is experienced as mysterious, powerful, and beyond human ken must therefore be of some other, nonphysical realm above nature – ‘supernatural’” [40]. In other words, in “civilized” culture we are prone to the fallacy of denying that “ ... that which is viewed with the greatest awe and wonder by indigenous, oral cultures is ... none other than what we would call *nature* itself” [40]. For a correct understanding of magical practice we must always bear in mind that “The deeply mysterious powers and entities with whom the shaman enters into a rapport are the same forces – plants, animals, forests, and winds – that to literate, ‘civilized’ Europeans are just so much scenery, the pleasant backdrop of our more pressing human concerns” [40]. We

can, furthermore, make a link here between the realms of magic and religion, for when the shaman becomes entranced and enters “other dimensions”, “ ... we should not be so ready to interpret these dimensions as ‘supernatural,’ nor as realms entirely ‘internal’ to the personal psyche of the practitioner” [40]. The reason for this is that “ ... it is likely that the ‘inner world’ of our Western psychological experience, like the supernatural heaven of Christian belief, originated in the loss of our ancestral reciprocity with the living landscape. When the animate presences with whom we have evolved over several million years are suddenly construed as having less significance than ourselves, when the generative earth that gave birth to us is defined as a soulless or determinate object devoid of sensitivity and sentience, then that wild otherness with which human life had always been entwined must migrate, either into a supersensory heaven beyond the natural world, or else into the human skull itself – the only allowable refuge, in this world, for what is ineffable and unfathomable” [40]. In summary it is crucial to acknowledge the “ecology” of magical practice in that “It is not by sending his awareness out *beyond* the natural world that the shaman makes contact with the purveyors of life and health, nor by journeying into his personal psyche; rather it is by propelling his awareness *laterally*, outward into the depths of a landscape at once *sensuous and* psychological, this living dream that we share with the soaring hawk, the spider, and the stone silently sprouting lichens on its coarse surface” [40]. Such beliefs are becoming prevalent even in modern “technological” society, and “According to a recent religious survey, 25 percent of all Americans believe in ‘nonpersonal ... life energy but not in a personal God’ [41]. New Age practitioners commonly call such power ‘universal life energy’ ... universal energy is equated with God by New Age practitioners. This is the fundamental undergirding of New Age thinking. One New Age adherent, Rosalyn Bruyere, has said, ‘For me, the terms God and energy are interchangeable. God is all there is, and energy is all there is, and I can’t separate the two’ [42]” [43]. However there is a certain denial of “hard physical reality” in these beliefs since “Universal life energy is considered an ‘invisible, unmeasured, yet infinite energy which is the basis of all existence’ [42] ... It is unlike physical energy, whose power is derived from material sources like the sun, crude oil, or atoms” [43]. Now we can make a link between this universal energy and *mana* and its transference, for “It is not merely a *form* of energy; it is *the* energy which flows from the universe into living creatures and circulates within them in an orderly manner ... Belief in universal life energy pervades New Age medicine ... universal energy is the basis of all life ... New Age therapists assert that disease occurs when there is an imbalance or blockage in the flow of universal energy through the body” [43].

From the embracing of indwelling *mana* arose the corresponding concept of *tabu*, defined by Howells as "... an upset, or anything that caused an upset, in the proper balance of *Mana*, which of course resided in anyone" [38]. By extension, *tabu* became a prohibition on certain acts (so that a commoner should not touch a chieftain; a non-initiate was forbidden from attempting to perform magic; women were excluded from hunting; healthy individuals were prevented from becoming too close to a dead or dying person). Thus “Taboos are to *mana*

what insulation is to electricity, a protection against its power" [43]. They were considered basic moral laws, designed to preserve the natural equilibrium and flow of *mana*, and *tabu* is, as Howells says, "something forbidden not by statute but by convention" [38]. The *tabu* provided a sense of personal comfort in reaffirming the accepted natural order, providing "The reassurance which individual people can draw from an explanation which seems sound and is accepted by everyone else ... *Tabu* shows everyone the correct path to walk, and by marking out the pitfalls gives a sense of safety ... When misfortune does arrive, *Tabu* will give its believers the explanation for it and the sense of relief that comes from at least knowing the source of trouble" [38]. More importantly, however, was the societal importance: *tabu* provided goals for individuals and societies in terms of accruing *mana*, whilst at the same time setting limits on permitted actions, and providing well-defined consequences if these were transgressed. Howells describes *tabu* from an anthropological standpoint as "setting up a code of behavior the reasons for which are not only accepted by all but profoundly believed in. It is the effects of this in turn that bolster the body politic ... *Tabus* are a potent agent for society's control of itself, and it would probably not be possible to organize a community of the complexity of, say, the Polynesians, without the aid of *Tabu* or an equally powerful religious substitute. This is the sort of thing that shows religion to be a necessary social invention" [38]. Related to all this is the idea of "ritual impurity" which "... is caused by coming into contact with some forbidden object or by engaging in some prohibited activity. Dr. Via describes it as becoming involved with ' ... certain animals or foods, corpses, pagan rites, sexual processes, etc. It is like a contagion; it gets on you. It has nothing to do with motive, intention, or the disposition of the heart.' [44] The impurity is immediate and automatic" [45]. In the most ancient recorded cultures, we can conjecture that the idea of "uncleanliness" originated in the very real disgust and avoidance of physical impurity, uncleanness or just plain "dirtiness." We still feel this today: when encountering bodily secretions (such as blood, faeces, semen, urine, and so on), for example, which are seen as "contaminating." However, "According to Via, 'there is no clear theory' about why these objects or activities are considered polluting, and were believed to cause ritual impurity. Some ideas have been suggested, but none appear to cover all of the cases. He refers to the writings of ... Jacob Neusner and Mary Douglas who showed that the rules were unrelated to hygiene, dirt or aesthetics ... Phyllis Bird and Mary Douglas who have disagreed about whether they are related to the authors' '*instinctive revulsion*' towards some objects and activities ... Mary Douglas who suggests that the purity rules reveal the '*wholeness, completeness or perfection of God.*' [44]" [45]. By extension certain persons became "unclean," either by virtue of disease (as in the case of lepers), or due to other circumstances (as in the cases of menstruating women, or those whose work was with unclean substances or persons). This is still observed today in the Hindu caste system, for instance, as described in [46],[47]. These ideas ramified further to the extent that eventually certain actions or places in themselves lead to uncleanness: just to perform such an action or be present in such a place (or to be in contact with a person who has contaminated themselves in such a manner) led to "ritual impurity" – and we find that this idea is central to modern psychotherapeutic practices,

and in particular the psychic “cleansing” engendered in the triggering of the abreaction-catharsis nexus as discussed by Jemmer [48]. Now Fauconnier and Turner [49] first introduced the idea of “conceptual blending” to explain the complexities, anomalies and conditions of certain central human thought processes. Sørensen [50], went on to apply this theory to magical (and as we shall see, equivalently to religious) ritual, as elaborated below, and in terms of this blending, we can understand that “Most agents, actions, and objects will resume a position in the profane domain when the ritual is terminated, but are likely to undergo a procedure of cleansing, severing the connection to the sacred space” [50] – and the same ideas can be extended to the “mundane” and “therapeutic” spaces of the psychotherapist’s office. *Tabu* arises since “ ... certain elements, related to the sacred domain by identity connectors or permanent metonymic connections, retain this connection. These elements have a special position in the profane domain, as it is evident in examples of certain ritual objects, actions considered taboo, and most agents with more permanent connections to the sacred domain. Thus, ascription of magical agency often entails violation of domainspecific ontological assumptions, transforming for instance objects into genuine agents with a will of their own, belief-desire psychology etc” [50]. We can use this argument to understand various facets of religion and magic, so that, for example, “ ... anthropomorphism can be seen as a result of the ascription of magical agency. Moreover there is a diffusion of sacred power in the blended space – one could call it the contagious character of magical rituals. More peripheral elements projected into the ritual space from the profane space can be contaminated (positive or negative) by their sheer presence in the ritual blend” [50]. Once again, rituals were needed to cleanse and purify and we find that “In most cases, the impurity can be removed in one or more of the following ways: A ritual animal sacrifice at the temple. A ritual washing of the body. The passage of time. However, some ritual impurities are so serious that they cannot be undone. The person must be executed in order to rid the land of pollution” [45]. In terms of the mechanisms of “conceptual blending” of the “sacred” and “profane” domains, to be discussed below, we note here that “The quality and status of *Participants* often play a secondary role in the establishment of magical agency. Participants in the ritual will not be the primary wielders of direct magical agency, but their special connection to the sacred space might be a prerequisite for the magical ritual to have any effect. This is most clearly in negative examples, where magical rituals are judged as unsuccessful because of the presence of ‘non-initiates’ understood as blocking the connection to the sacred space. This is, of course, especially evident in esoteric or initiation-based group, but is also common in the widespread notions of ‘ritual cleansing’. Thus participants must bring themselves in the correct ritual state in order to promote or avoid being a hindrance to the connection to the sacred space” [50].

So, given what we have unearthed about the nature and function of language and myth, we can comprehend the dialectic of formalized religion in this way: “If history is about the fixed points of experience, mythology is about the shimmer or chimera, the fluid context surrounding and underlying those fixed points. And theology is the marriage of these two modes” [21]. This

observation leads us to ask therefore, “How can a communication theorist in a ‘society of senders’ ... [make sense of religion]? He interprets the Bible in a new way by maintaining that it was not God who created man in His image but rather that it was man who imagined God to be of his own kind and who invented the myth of the Creation solely as legitimization of this theological idea ... exactly this interpretation was put forth explicitly by Ludwig Feuerbach (1841) [51], who viewed God as a product and projection of mankind. This thought persists in modern theological considerations [52]” [10]. This is to be contrasted with the stance that “If you incline toward mysticism, you will look to spirits from other worlds, as Swedenborg did, for traces of the first language. If you consider that the same explanatory principle can account for the whole of the world’s organisation, you will find the necessary key to it in esotericism, the symbolism of numbers, the traditions of the Cabbala and the followers of Lully, and the movements of the stars” [24]. So in order to progress further and engender a *coniunctio oppositorum* from these two conflicting views [53] we must now pursue our “... long story from daub and wattle in some archaic village to a sombre chapel under the dark hills” [54] and seek out the linguistic origins and interrelationships of magic, religion and science. For whichever member of the triad of religion-magic-science we speak of, we metaphorically seek communion (one way or another) with those “Spirits in the other life [who] converse among themselves as men do on earth ... and this in their own speech, by which they express more in a minute than a man can in an hour. For their speech is the universal of all languages, being by means of ideas, the primitives of words ... This then is the speech of spirits; but the speech of angelic spirits is still more universal and perfect; and the speech of angels is more universal and perfect still. For there are three heavens: the first is where good spirits are, the second is where angelic spirits are, and the third is where angels are. The perfections thus ascend, as from exterior things to things more interior” [55]. We should note here that “While the notion of ‘spirit’ has come to have, for us in the West, a primarily anthropomorphic or human association ... the ‘spirits’ of an indigenous culture are primarily those modes of intelligence or awareness that do not possess a human form” [40], and “ ... it is not only those entities acknowledged by Western civilization as ‘alive,’ not only the other animals or the plants that speak, as spirits, to the senses of an oral culture, but also the meandering river from which those animals drink, and the torrential monsoon rains, and the stone that fits neatly into the palm of the hand” [40]. There is a close parallel here to the “scrying” of Kelly and Dee with whom the “Others” or “Angels” conversed in a language called “Enochian” [56] “ ... compiled from a book called ‘Logaeth’ (which is Angelic for ‘Speech of God’). It is a book which contains the Words of Creation which ‘God’ used to fashion the universe. ... Various letters are taken from these Divine words by the Angels to ‘compile’ new words, which They then use to cause all things to manifest in reality” [56]. Now “ ... the Angelic Language itself has never been a spoken language on this plane of existence. It is a system of vibratory formulas which the Angels use to manipulate the Yetziratic (Astral) plane. The ‘Message’ that any Angel carries is composed of these vibrational patterns – which cause various things to manifest in our realm” [56]. Thus we are led to ask “Does the magic of the metamorphosis lie in the specific words they use, the way they say the words, their

supporting non-verbal communications, or what?" [3], and we find that "In Enochian the meaning of the words, combined with the quality of the words, unite to create a pattern of sound which can cause tremendous reaction in the atmosphere. The barbaric tonal qualities of this language give it a truly magical effect which cannot be described" [56], and they produce results " ... so amazing to watch that it moves us with powerful emotions, disbelief, and utter confusion. Just as with all wizards of the ages of the earth whose knowledge was treasured and passed down from sage to sage – losing and adding pieces but retaining a basic structure – so, too, does the magic of these ... [modern] wizards also have structure" [6]. And as we progress in our knowledge of communicative magic, we find that "The planes of speech are progressively more interior and perfect as they approach the Lord who is the origin and life of all speech" [55]. Contemplation of these " ... notions implicit in Christian civilization, such as the assumption that the 'spirits' of dead persons necessarily retain their human form, or that they reside in a domain entirely beyond the material world to which our senses give us access" [40] can, and does, however, lead to contradictions and dilemmata. Swedenborg for example, comments that "It is also said, somewhat paradoxically, that these are planes of greater or lesser universality. Universality, one might object, cannot be a matter of more or less; something is either universal or it is not. Universal is not used here in an absolute sense. It refers rather to the degree to which there are certain things shared on a given plane of the spiritual world. All in one heaven share some fundamentals of thought..." [55]. This stands in stark contrast to the beliefs of " ... many indigenous, tribal peoples [who] have no such ready recourse to an immaterial realm outside earthly nature. For most oral cultures, the enveloping and sensuous Earth remains the dwelling place of both the living *and* the dead. The 'body' – human or otherwise – is not yet a mechanical object. It is a magical entity, the mind's own sensuous aspect, and at death the body's decomposition into soil, worms, and dust can only signify the gradual reintegration of one's elders and ancestors into the living landscape, from which all, too, are born" [40]. This links creatively with the shamanic notion that the "Others are purveyors of secrets, carriers of intelligence that we ourselves often need: it is these Others who can inform us of unseasonable changes in the weather, or warn us of imminent eruptions and earthquakes – who show us, when we are foraging, where we may find the best food or the best route back home. We receive from them countless gifts of food, fuel, shelter, and clothing. Yet still they remain Other to us, inhabiting their own cultures and enacting their own rituals, never wholly fathomable" [40].

Fulsome philosophizing is fascinating, but far from fully functional – and the pragmatism of producing progeny was paramount to our ancient parents. Let us look then at how the lore of language leads to learnings about love, loathing, liturgy. Malinowski postulates that "mystical, non-empirical conceptions and doctrines" [57] such as the linguistic fantasies described above would not contribute to the continuance of the group or society. In order to influence the flow of mana or cleanse from ritual impurity, ancient man used his language to invent religious ritual and prayer and "In that earlier (but long enduring) condition nature and society

formed a coherent whole, interconnected by the closest bonds. The step from participation in the totality of nature to religion involved a detaching of forces and beings into outward, inverted existences. This separation took the form of deities, and the religious practitioner, the shaman, was the first specialist” [26]. We see that “A formal religion in a complex culture provides a system of common values and concepts about the supernatural that often serves to validate and legitimize the social order; this explains why the state and religion are so often intertwined in complex cultures. In simple cultures there is no state, and thus no need for a formal religion to legitimize it ... Religious views in simple cultures tend not to be systematized into a formal set of beliefs” [58]. Now the simplest method of religious practice is “prayer” and “The existence of prayer is attested in written sources as early as 5000 years ago. Anthropologists believe that the earliest intelligent modern humans practised something that we would recognize today as prayer” [59]. We can particularize specific prayer practices thus: “Prayer is an effort to communicate with a God, or to some deity or deities, either to offer praise to the deity, to make a request of the deity, or simply to express one's thoughts and emotions to the deity. There are a variety approaches to understanding prayer: The belief that a god listens to prayer, and may or may not respond; The belief that prayer is intended to inculcate certain attitudes in the one who prays, rather than to influence a god; The belief that prayer is intended to train a person to focus on a god through philosophy and intellectual contemplation; The belief that prayer is intended to enable a person to gain a direct experience of a god; The belief that prayer is intended to affect the very fabric of reality itself” [59]. We can add to this the idea of “Proclus, [who] like Plato, did not think we could rise to the divine by theoretic contemplation alone: rather the divine itself descends to us and obscurely speaks to us in the language of myths and symbols. In consequence, even though the soul tends to lose itself by over-attention to the material realm, the cure for this can only be homeopathic: a new recognition of transcendence first of all within the material sphere under the reach of divine grace – since the soul having surrendered its superiority over the material cannot then, of itself alone recover it” [7]. We can tie all this together with “ligatures for linguistic manipulation” (whilst replacing emphatic capitalization with italicization) if we recognize that “Fittingly, there is no Indo-European root for RELIGION. Dictionaries perform the usual alchemy on Latin, whose *religio* means scrupulous piety and conscientiousness (not spiritual transcendence). *Religio* is thought to come from *religare*, to bind back – *re* plus *ligare*, to bind. This alleged ‘binding’ is never tied to the many given definitions of faith. Meanwhile, one can go to a gambling bar and brothel *religiously* – that is, with *regularity*. Piety, rather than belief, is all about scrupulous attention to ritual. The word *religion* is all about *regularity*, not belief or faith. RELIGION was so hard to trace because its Biblical origin was scrambled, a metathesis, from Resh-Gimel-Lamed, RGL, to RLG. And the semantics were about *regularity* not faith. Hebrew RiGeeYLOOS or RiGeeYLooT means ‘wont’ or ‘habit,’ one’s *regular* routine. The challenge of organized RELIGION is to not let rote rituals become routine for the *regular*, jaded spiritually-challenged masses” [60].

Now, if “religion is that which is done regularly”, then let us turn our attention to the heated debate about the relationship between myth and ritual. Smith held that “ ... it is the *action* that matters, much more than the *belief*. The ritual, therefore, must come before the myth” [61]. He wrote that “In all the antique religions, mythology takes the place of dogma ... But, strictly speaking, this mythology was no essential part of ancient religion, for it had no sacred sanction and no binding force on the worshippers... [The worshipper] was often offered a choice of the several accounts of the same thing, and, provided that he fulfilled the ritual with accuracy, no one cared what he believed about its origin. Belief in a certain series of myths was neither obligatory as a part of the true religion, nor was it supposed that, by believing, a man acquired religious merit and conciliated the favour of the gods. What was obligatory or meritorious was the exact performance of certain acts prescribed by religious tradition ... So far as the myths consist of explanation of ritual, their value is altogether secondary, and it may be affirmed with confidence that in almost every case the myth was derived from the ritual and not the ritual from the myth ... The conclusion is, that in the study of ancient religions we must begin, not with myth, but with ritual and traditional usage” [62]. Thus “Actions come first, human attempts to explain and rationalize them afterwards ... What these individuals believed (or did not believe) in was a matter of their personal choice. What they were performing or participating in was not ... The notion of the ‘personal interest’ is very important here, considering Smith’s emphasis on the social components in all religions” [61]. However, these ideas, although influential, stand in direct contrast to those of “Andrew Lang ... [who had] already profoundly influenced the study of myth with his notion that myths should be studied as some kind of a ‘primitive science.’ The idea of the essential difference between different cultures was the fatal blow to the comparative study of myths” [61]. Moreover, “The concept of the subordination of myth to ritual was already challenged in the articles for ... the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics* ... In the same project, Hartley Burr Alexander ... noted that ‘the meaning does not stop with the notion of act, it is also the attitude.’ The attitude is influenced by the belief, which is in its turn influenced by the faculty, etc. The explanation of ritual action is extremely complex, and if we attempt to understand myths primarily as something subordinate to rituals, we will not get very far” [61]. We can take this latter attitude further by quoting Malinowski [63] who “ ... believed that myths represent a ‘pragmatic charter,’ a set of rules or codes of conduct, that enable the social functions of the culture to flourish. ‘The *myth* comes into play when rite, ceremony, or a social or moral rule demands justification, warrant of antiquity, reality, and sanctity’ ... myth is ‘a reality lived’ ... ‘not symbolic, but a direct expression of its subject-matter; it is not an explanation in satisfaction of a scientific interest, but a narrative resurrection of a primeval reality’. This, of course, stood in sharp contrast to the words of Smith, since for Malinowski, myths offer justification for belief. They are again intimately associated with rituals ... but in an inverted order of importance. Even if rituals do come first, myths are necessary in order to comprehend their meaning and true function. If rituals form a reenactment of the events that are considered to have happened in another reality” [61]. An interesting development in these anthropological

investigations, are the psychological insights of Kluckhohn [64] who “... elaborated on the ‘connection between rite and myth,’ clearly recognized by the psychoanalysts like Reik and Freud, who ‘verbally agreed to Robertson Smith’s proposition that mythology was mainly a description of ritual’ ... This reference to psychoanalytical interpretations is not an accident, since Kluckhohn was very interested in various psychological explanations ... which he believed to have been neglected in prior anthropological research” [61]. He noted that “... while there are cultures that associate myths and rituals (Kluckhohn gave an example of the Christian Mass), there are clearly others (and here he drew on his extensive fieldwork experience among Navahos and Pueblos) that do not. As a matter of fact, ‘the whole question of the primacy of ceremonial or mythology is as meaningless as all the questions of “the hen or the egg” form” [61]. A different approach is provided by Leach [65], who “... did not attempt to define ritual, and from his perspective any particular definition (except one as broad as ‘a system of symbolic communication’ ... is irrelevant. What is relevant is the very specific context he provides for any situation where rituals are observed. In this approach, Leach attempted to reconcile divergent views represented by Durkheim, Mauss, and Malinowski before him. The solution, in his opinion, was a view of a *ritual* as something related to *technique* just as *sacred* is related to *profane*. They ‘do not denote types of action but aspects of almost any kind of action.’ Ritual ‘is a symbolic statement which “says” something about the individuals involved in the action’ ... ‘Myth, in my terminology, is the counterpart of ritual; myth implies ritual, ritual implies myth, they are one and the same’” [61]. Thus “For Leach, myths are only ‘one way of describing certain types of human behavior’ ... Furthermore, ‘ritual action and belief are alike to be understood as forms of symbolic statement about the social order’ ... This is possible because rituals in their cultural contexts are always patterns of symbols, and they have the same structure as the other pattern of symbols, consisting of the phrases and technical terms that the anthropologist devises in order to interpret them” [61]. We have already considered the “psychologization” of myth and this was taken further by Lévi-Strauss [66] who “... announced the coming of structuralism to the anthropological study of myth ... [and] argued that we should proceed directly from the apparent contradictions that myths pose ... Myths offer direct insights into the ways the human mind operates ... [Lévi-Strauss] considered the cognitive processes to be universal – hence, myths provide us with the key to understand how the human mind functions. Just like Frazer before him, Lévi-Strauss advocated *symbolic* approach to the study of myths” [61]. Moreover there is yet another link back to language, since “Approximately at the same time as Leach, but more clearly and much more explicitly, Lévi-Strauss recognized myths as communication. In fact, he recognized a clear connection between myths and language (since myths are expressed through language). Along the lines of the great Swiss linguist Ferdinand de Saussure, as well as Trubetzkoy, Jakobson and Hjelmslev, Lévi-Strauss recognized another system of signs that could be interpreted in a similar way as language. Since myth, just like language, is made of constitutive units, these units ‘presuppose the constituent units present in language when analyzed on other levels — namely, phonemes, morphemes, and sememes — but they,

nevertheless, differ from the latter in the same way as the latter differ among themselves; they belong to a higher and a more complex order' ... He called these units *mythemes*. It is only through the analysis of the relations of different *mythemes* (whose structure remains in the unconscious) that we can understand the meaning of a myth. Understood in this way, we can say that myth, using Saussurean terminology, should serve as a kind of an allochronic device, bridging the gap between the synchronic and diachronic perspective ... 'the myth, considered as a *thought ritual*, is submitted to a direction which is in some way natural and emerges from the analysis of ritual considered as an *acted myth*.' ... Unlike his predecessors (especially Leach), Lévi-Strauss pointed at the fact that in many cases ... there is no proof of the interrelationship between myth and ritual" [61].

Let us move on from this point to consider Barthes, who, as "mythical thoughts start to emerge and pervade the whole of man's cultural and social life" in the mid-Twentieth Century, expressed the motivation for his Project of "symbolic mythanalysis," by saying that he "... resented seeing Nature and History confused at every turn, and ... wanted to track down, in the decorative way of *what-goes-without-saying*, the ideological abuse which ... is hidden there" [32]. This was to be done by adopting a structural-linguistic approach and "... articulating the relationship between all aspects of a sign system that constructs meaning around cultural assumptions embedded in the form" [31]. In this endeavour we strive "... no longer merely to reverse (or to correct) the mythic message, putting it right side up, with denotation at the bottom and connotation at the top, nature on the surface and class interest deep down, but to change the object itself, to engender a new object, point of departure for a new science ..." [67]. We can model mythology then in the following way, following Barthes and Hjelmslev, and using a formulation presented by Gaines [68]. We posit that "there is a relation (R) between the plane of expression (E) and the plane of content (C)" [69]. Now "The denotative first order of signification can thus be represented as (E R C); the correlation of the signifier or expression (E) in relation (R) to the signified or content (C)" [31]. We then go on to realize that mythologizing leads us into a veritable hall of mirrors and we can concatenate relations to show that "At the connotative or second order of signification, the signifier or expression (E2) is constituted by the sum of E R C from the first order of signification" [69]. In this recursive fashion, "The denotative sign becomes the signifier for the connotative sign. The denotative sign system (E1 R1 C1) would be equivalent to the second order expression (E2), and the connotative level can be graphically represented as E1 R1 C1 R2 C2" [31]. And, if we choose to gloss "mythology" as "narrative reason", then the nature of the recursion just described is that "... the connotative level asserts a cultural meaning as a value added to the first order (denotative) signifier. The connotative meaning is assumed through specific cultural knowledge of the sign, and cultural knowledge is carried through the specificity of the relationship (R) between the expression and the content" [31]. Thus "The analysis of myth necessarily seeks a shift of awareness from figure to the ground, from the denotative and connotative signs to context of the form of communication" [31]. The Dialectic of Enlightenment [70] suggests that "

... when contrasted with magical/mimetic relationships to nature, mythology is as already on the path toward enlightenment. Drawing on the work of Marcel Mauss, Horkheimer and Adorno argued that magic presupposed neither a unity of nature nor a unity of the subject: deities are local and specific and the shaman must take up various cultic masks in order to imitate the objects over which mastery is to be gained ... Mythology, in contrast, represents an attempt both 'to report, to name, to say the origin' and to 'present, preserve, and explain' ... In place of the milieu-bound practices of magic, mythology requires a separation of ideas from reality that was first achieved by the reality adjusted ego ... The origins of individuality, in short, lie on this side of the line between magic and mythology" [71].

So much for the language of labels – what does this mean in terms of practical mythology? Well, "Myth builds upon the same process that composes the first and second order of signification" [31]. We could say that "It refers to an unarticulated chain of associated concepts by which members of a culture understand certain topics" [72]. Myths are therefore "the attempt to identify a basic level of cultural experience, manifested in words and deeds throughout history, and concerned principally with the articulation of the core concerns and preoccupations of their host cultures" [73], and expressed in "a logical form within speech, folklore, stories, ritual, and tradition" [31]. Myth is distinguished from connotation, in that myth appears natural or universal in its signification and thus "myths are connotations which have become dominant-hegemonic" [74]. The essential distinguishing property of myth is that it "... carries an order of cultural signification where semiotic code is perceived as fact ..." [32], "... therefore assuming a degree of power and authority" [31]. In other words, "There is an already assumed connotative meaning of the sign that seems natural from a particular context of cultural consumption. Thus, myth maintains an influential power through a quality of appearing self-evident" [31]. We thus arrive at the understanding that myth constructs a "global sign" [31] and that it does so within a system defined by Barthes as a metalanguage [31] "... because it is a second language, in which one speaks about the first" [32], and this in itself generates magical power since "Using the Meta-model empowers us to become *magicians over neuro-semantic reality*" [3]. This is because such a "... Meta-model offers us a higher level of understanding about the whole mapping-process and how to effectively manage it. You can think about the Meta-model as itself a *magic wand* by which we can catch, break, and cast spells. This underscores the realization that 'the magic' has structure. To the uninitiated it may seem that the moves (the 'sleight of mouth' maneuvers ...) of the ... magician happen 'out of the blue' and without rhyme or reason. But no. *Method does exist in the magic*. And this method the Meta-model of language makes explicit" [3]. So if we use this "magic wand" over on the symbolic language of myth, we see that "... myth can be analyzed as (E3 R3 C3) with the expression E3 being derived from the second order of signification (E1 R1 C1)(R2)(C2) in relation (R3) to the signified content (C3) of myth" [31]. More pithily, we could express this by saying that "The Connotation of the Sign becomes the Signifier of the Myth" [31]. So what, in practice, does the act of mythologizing do? We know that "Myth is the

most obvious level of signification, but distorts meaning by validating arbitrary cultural assumptions in a way similar to the denotative sign" [31], and in fact we conclude that "myth hides nothing: its function is to distort, not to make disappear" [32]. We are left with the understanding that "Myth therefore itself already demythologises, by dividing subject from object and by seeking to locate a fundamental abiding structure, identically repeated. In this way, myth is proto-science, and myth, as Adorno and Horkheimer precociously argued, unlike the non-identical repetition of the Hebrew Bible, preshadows rationalist enlightenment [70]" [7]. In anthropological terms we therefore follow the Dialectic of Enlightenment [70] in paraphrasing that "The transition from magic to myth was accompanied by a centralization of power and the development of a division between mental and manual labor. 'The lyrics of Homer and hymns of the Rig-Veda,' Horkheimer and Adorno noted, 'date from the time of territorial domination and the secure locations in which a dominant warlike race established themselves over the mass of vanquished natives' ... Following Durkheim, they argued that even the categories of subordination and superordination in logic had their basis in new forms of social domination ... Likewise, with a nod to Hegel's account of the dialectic of master and slave, they argued that the separation between subject and object is grounded on the distance of the thing that the master achieves through the mastered ... With the move beyond magical/mimetic relations to the world, language renounces the claim to be like nature and instead limits itself to the task of calculation and control" [71].

We note in passing here that "The Christian narrative is more fairy-tale than myth" [7]. The reason for this deduction is that "Initially, God confronts no primordial beast, but shapes a thing, the Creation, and then does further things with that thing. Human beings and even angels enjoy no original and independent spontaneity, but begin and remain entirely objects of the divine shaping" [7]. Moreover it was always taken for granted that "... man has a status comparable to that of a word. The biblical conception is still at work here: Christ as incarnation of God's word and humans as creatures who strive to attain this status in the imitation of Christ" [10]. Now, as the Christian mythology unfolds, we find that "Later on in this story, the plot is not propelled by the primordial and irremediable conflict of warring personal impulses as in myth: love and war, love and domesticity: Aphrodite and Ares, Aphrodite and Hestia etc. Adam and Eve do not first compete for the apple, but Eve transgresses the fairy-tale ban on eating this object, which is objectivity as such in the mode of illusion of a value-neutral control over one's fate and over life and death. Cain and Abel were not doomed to quarrel; rather Cain's murderousness had something to do with his possessive approach to the realm of things" [7]. This is followed up with "The later story of Israel [which] concerns their escape from the obsessive rule of cruelly indifferent things (idols); their construction of a more mobile thing, the Ark, which realises but does not entrap their subjective identity; the losses and regainings of this mobile thing; and finally more detailed self-identification in terms of a legal handling of things which was throughout concerned with the protection of spirit and life from the fated objectivity of regular blood-letting" [7]. This observation leads to a comment

on the nature of monotheistic religion, which “ ... concerns an ultimate unified source beyond mere numerical unity and diversity – and it is a consequence of this very plenitude at the origin that there should be multiple and diverse spiritual mediators, some of whom can only be locally understood. It is the mark of true apophatic acknowledgment of the one God that one approaches him by multiple mediation of gods, angels, daemons, spirits and fairies: claims to direct access to a hypostasised subjective will are by contrast all too likely to issue in arrogant, terroristic interventions” [7]. If we turn then to the New Testament we read “ ... as the Russian teller of fantastic tales Nikolai Leskov suggested, Christ is as much a sender and an enchanter as he is also a sent and aided hero, able to command and subordinate all objects, but under the ban of not deploying this power for the sake of his own power [75]” [7]. Thus we realize that “The language of myth is closed and self-supporting, not easily translated or transferred from one culture to another. Meaning is formed by acts of communication, and has to be recreated in those acts time and again. It is always possible to reduce religion to anthropology or social science, but such explanations give no abiding satisfaction” [76]. If we return, now, from the New Testament world of Christ, through the Dark Ages, to the Enlightenment, we find that “ ... scientific progress succeeded in relegating to the background what is commonly called ‘myth’, a term that connotes not only the sum of ancient ‘tales’ which lie at the base of culture, but also the intellectual attitude that governed mankind’s original rapport with reality. The rationalism tied to classical science stigmatized myth as ‘infra-scientific,’ hence, incapable of revealing any sort of truth. Myth was considered precisely a mystification” [13]. However, this is not the end of the story, for “In our day, thanks to developments in the natural sciences, with the modification of certain conceptions and the introduction of new ideas, the perception of myth’s value has changed. The human sciences as well have altered the contemporary notion of myth by rediscovering the importance of traditional culture. Even philosophy, which occupies itself with universal spiritual experience, has cultivated a respectful relationship with myth. All this has led to a new appreciation of the value of myth, without in any way detracting from the defense of reason before the shifting manifestations of the irrational” [13]. The problem with modern myth-makers, however, is that “ ... most of their stories are geared within the economic rationalism to sell not to actually speak to individuals or the soul, they don’t actually speak to so many people. They don’t provide enough variety and differentiation to meet the wide range of needs and feelings that we need to give form to ... [we have] become relatively impoverished because we haven’t valued, if you like, the creative lives, and the creative arts as much in our modern world as perhaps was valued in the older times. And we don’t tend to have time now to tell stories and we tend to get the standard stories you know via the television etc.” [8]. We have forgotten that “One of the things once was said about myths is that they are food for the soul and if you take the soul, you know, from its original Greek word ‘psyche’, that myths are actually ways in which we sustain. We tend to have one predominant story at present and that’s a rather impoverished one that we would call economic rationalism, that it is a mythology, it’s the contemporary mythology, but of course it’s used to explain everything one can imagine from

health care to well being, to justify wars, on it goes. Now when you have a mono-myth like this, I think it fails to capture our experience as human beings and the wisdom of the Greeks of course was that they had so many myths and therefore their stories reflect the wide range of human experiences" [8].

So what of the form and function of these regular religious rites? We learn that "The performance of rituals is an integral part of all religions. Rituals are stylized and usually repetitive acts that take place at a set time and location. They almost always involve the use of symbolic objects, words, and actions" [77]. Moreover, "Most religious rituals are performed in special places and under special conditions, such as in a dedicated temple or at a sacred spot. This is an intentional separation between the secular and the sacred. By being removed from the ordinary world, the sacred acts are enhanced for the believers – the separation makes the rituals more effective. Only allowing initiated people to participate in religious rituals also can have the same effect" [77]. These observations can be stated more formally by in Sørensen's conceptual blend terms by saying that "At a general level, religious and magical rituals involve a blended space consisting of elements projected from input spaces themselves created by elements from two general domains, a 'sacred' and a 'profane' domain, and structured by a ritual frame" [50]. The "sacred domain" is " ... a conceptual domain containing concepts, frames, idealised cognitive models, and knowledge that *by participants* are given a special status as: (1) containing a breach of ordinary ontologies, properties and/or abilities, (2) being connected to myth and narratives explaining the creation and/or the nature of the world and its relations, and (3) being interpreted as belonging to a distinct part of reality that one must perform special kinds of actions in order to interact with" [50]; and we contrast this with the "profane domain" which " ... contains concepts, frames, and idealised cognitive models that structure our knowledge of the everyday world we live in" [50]. In this context we must understand that "... the sacred domain is *not* a logical consistent system of representations, but rather a formation of coherent structures around pragmatic styles like narratives and rituals, preestablished conceptual clusters, and modes of behavioural interaction, like prespecified ritual actions. Theologies around the world might *attempt* the construction of such coherent systems, but in general peoples' religious representations are not systematised and will often contain contradictory ideas" [50]. Now following from this, "... religious concepts are based on a combination of intuitive and counter-intuitive properties, that enhances memorability and transmission, and sets them apart from other concepts ... the counterintuitive properties can carry schematic structures and thus inferential potential" [50]. The *modus operandi* of both magical and religious rituals is the "conceptual blending" between sacred and profane whereby "In general, the ritual blend is a temporary and bounded construction enabling a contact between the sacred and the profane domains. This is a banal and often reported function of all rituals" [50]. It is worthwhile stating clearly at this point the "conceptual blending equivalence" of magical and religious rituals, since "Even though the model is applied to magical rituals ... it is general and applicable to all

sorts of religious rituals" [50]. Thus "... religious concepts are used in rituals in order to create notions of ritual efficacy by connecting them to elements from the profane, everyday world by means of conceptual mapping. In magical rituals, elements of the sacred and the profane domain can interact and thereby facilitate ritual manipulation of aspects of reality otherwise beyond reach. Therefore I do not propose a rigid division between the sacred and the profane domains. Some concepts, models, and frames contain elements belonging to both domains and thus form conceptually entrenched connections between the two. In this model, ritual participants do not move into or directly manipulate a sacred space as such, but only a blended space consisting of a mixture of sacred and profane elements giving rise to an emergent structure" [50]. The point of this is that "Religious ritual reinforces the basic tenets of religion. ... Rituals are often charged with high emotions. The exalted feelings people feel during rituals provide positive reinforcement for continuing them" [77]. Let us now consider the Christian religious ritual of Sunday Church attendance, which "... usually requires the wearing of somewhat different clothing and interacting with others in a particular manner in a sacred location. At the heart of this experience is a sequence of traditional ritual acts that symbolically represent aspects of the life, teachings, and death of Jesus ... For instance, the 'partaking of the host' in the Catholic mass is a symbolic participation in the 'last supper' of Jesus and, by extension, an affirmation of the acceptance of his teachings" [77]. But this "symbolic participation" has far deeper consequences, for "... if the supreme art is liturgy, does not this art magically invoke the divine through human work? We cannot alter the divine mind by prayer or ritual, but this does not mean that they are merely convenient pedagogic instruments for self-education. Rather, as the pagan neoplatonist Iamblichus suggested, these practices 'attune' us to the divine and so as it were 'magically' channel divine power, even though God of course ultimately and entirely shapes our very invocations [78]. In this way God is allowed to retain his aseity, yet is conceived as really and truly acting through our prayers and ritual performances" [7].

Of course the form, the ritual, the liturgy, can often overtake the function it was initially designed to perform, and turn it fake, and we see that "Another major characteristic of false religion is an emphasis on form, based on an underlying belief that you can find salvation merely by participating in the right physical forms" [79]. Now to appreciate the problem of this from a religious believer's viewpoint we need to define "formal religion" formally, and one such believer writes that "My Merriam-Webster dictionary defines formal as 'relating to or involving the outward form ... rather than content ... characterized by punctilious respect for form ... rigidly ceremonious.' It then lists 'ceremonial' as a synonym. Given these definitions, I don't think it's any mystery what 'formal religion' means. It is religion that places great emphasis on adherence to strictly prescribed forms. Formal religion, in fact, is a great deal of what we *mean* by religion" [79]. Our religionist then continues that "The *Psychotherapy* supplement has some strong words about this. 'Formal religion,' it says, 'has no real place in religion' ... It goes on to call formal religion an oxymoron, suggesting that by their very nature, the words 'formal' and

'religion' do not belong together" [79]. Given our advances in science, and in its technological application, we are stimulated to ask: "Why do we humans hang on to our mythic worlds and other religious beliefs? Different answers to this question focus on different levels of the hierarchy of living systems. For example, those who follow the lead of Durkheim focus on the social system: religion holds the society together, reinforces primary social values, and provides a charter for social organization. Rappaport ... focuses on the ecological system: sacred beliefs act as governing principles for human ecology. There are other answers, including psychological ones that focus on the self or somatic system. However, there is also a general evolutionary answer" [80]. And in Marxist terms, "Language, myth, religion and art thus advanced as deeply 'political' conditions of social life, by which the artificial media of symbolic forms replaced the directly-lived quality of life before division of labor. From this point on, humanity could no longer see reality face to face; the logic of domination drew a veil over play, freedom, affluence" [26] – we will return to humanity's "veiling of reality" in the discussion of magic, meditation and trance to follow [81]. However from a formal symbolic viewpoint it is also possible to adduce evidence that "Religion is not reducible to social function ... though many seek faith because ultimately men are failures. Without sin, suffering and evil there cannot be free will. Guilt is our response to evil. We do not deduce evil from standards, but as a violation of the taboos which make possible our cultural and social life. Religion becomes meaningful in acts: ritual, prayer, mystical encounters. Meaningful is not equivalent to the empirical, to universally accessible acts of perceiving. The Eucharist is understandable to believers within the framework of an entire system of ritual symbols. Moral content is given in the very act of perceiving and understanding. As Plotinus remarked, 'God is only a name if spoken about without true virtue'" [76]. Within this framework which "... so outlined applies to all religions, to Humanism, scientific neutrality, indeed to all types of human commitment" [76], we come to appreciate the much deeper and richer understanding that "Religion is the sacralization of identity ... Whereas identity in animals is rank or territory, in humans it is more often symbolic: in terms of class, sex, attitudes to money, beauty, equality. Sacralization is an emotionally welding of an identity which, sudden or not, consolidates and stabilizes that identity: certain patterns of symbolic systems acquire a taken-for-granted, eternal quality. This identity is also crucial to societies: alienation and marginalization occur if changes in society stake out identities before the originals adapt sufficiently" [76]. And so "as if by magic" we have rapidly relocated from "daub and wattle" Demiurge-worship and the manipulation of *mana* to the regular religious practices of the "sombre chapel."

Now, when our primitive ancestors developed language as a tool to describe the world, they also inadvertently invented the ability to do "science" by empirical investigation: but it was primitive science, and they lacked the *meta*-tools to understand their magic. There is also argument today as to why and how this discovery occurred – "Whereas Vlahos felt that speech arose quite early, in relation to simple stone tools and their reproduction, Julian Jaynes has raised perhaps a more interesting question which is assumed in his contrary

opinion that language showed up much later. He asks, how it is, if humanity had had speech for a couple of million years, that there was virtually no development of technology? Jaynes's question implies a utilitarian value inhering in language, a supposed release of latent potentialities of a positive nature. But given the destructive dynamic of the division of labor ... it may be that while language and technology are indeed linked, they were both successfully resisted for thousands of generations" [26]. We can think of this simplistically as follows: "The primitive phase is the phase of thinking which follows immediately after the emergence of language and is characterized by the fact that linguistic activity has not yet become its own object. The transition to the phase of modern thinking is a metasystem transition, in which there is an emergence of linguistic activity directed to linguistic activity" [82]. However, there is a complication since "The language of primitive people is first-level language, while the language of modern people is second-level language (which specifically includes grammar and logic). But the transition to modern thinking is not simply a metasystem transition in language if we view language statically, as a certain possibility or method of activity. It includes a metasystem transition in real linguistic activity as a socially significant norm of behavior" [82]. But there's more to it than that, and "With the transition to the phase of modern thinking it is not enough to think about something: one must also ask why one thinks that way, whether there is an alternative line of thought, and what would be the consequences of these particular thoughts. Thus, modern thinking is critical thinking, while primitive thinking can be called precritical" [82]. In order for our forebears to increase their partial knowledge, widen their perspectives, and predict and influence the outcomes of their desires, a technology was required. This technology was "magic," defined as "The change in situations or events in accordance with one's will, which would, using normally accepted methods, be unchangeable" [83], although "This admittedly leaves a large area for personal interpretation" [83]. For example, in the realm of seafaring: building and handling the boat was doable; however, the sailor was at the mercy of the natural elements, which nevertheless seemed to act with some purpose, controlled by "supernatural" or "impersonal" forces. Magic became the practical method invented to control these forces which are harnessed by the will of the magician, and we could say that it involves a belief in "impersonal power to be ritually employed to achieve human purposes" [84]; that " ... the magician's intelligence is not circumscribed *within* the society – its place is at the edge, mediating *between* the human community and the larger community of beings upon which the village depends for its nourishment and sustenance" [40]. The contrast with religion is that in magical practice this "impersonal power" is "divorced from God, its true source, and understood, animistically as a power to be manipulated" [43]. Magic is characterized by its passion, use of imagery, symbolism, and association of ideas which have no empirical connection [85], and we could further state that "Magic is the use of rituals and paraphernalia to manipulate spiritual powers. By means of magic people attempt to project human control over spiritual forces" [43]. This stands in contrast to the idea of *mana* as a "natural" emanation from the Creator, and to its related ritual manipulation and the associated *tabus*, as described above. Thus "By their

rituals, trances, ecstasies, and 'journeys,' magicians ensure that the relation between human society and the larger society of beings is balanced and reciprocal, and that the village never takes more from the living land than it returns to it – not just materially, but with prayers, propitiations, and praise” [40]. The shaman is thus an “angel,” an “other,” an intermediary or messenger, “ ... the exemplary voyager in the intermediate realm between the human and the more-than-human worlds, the primary strategist and negotiator in any dealings with the Others” [40]. This therefore leads to a conflict, since “The medicine person's primary allegiance, then, is not to the human community, but to the earthly web of relations in which that community is embedded – it is from this that her or his power to alleviate human illness derives” [40]. In “civilized” society our understanding is that “Magicians, whether modern entertainers or indigenous, tribal sorcerers, work with the malleable texture of perception” [40], that they utilize “ ... methods which give the onlooker the impression of magic if he be not himself initiated or equally skilled in the mechanism” [86]. This is possible as “All that is given to consciousness is sensation. By adding a Thing to which sensations are supposed to adhere is to commit a very serious error. It hypostatizes sensation, which in the last analysis is only a process, as a subsistent attribute, and ascribes this attribute to a thing that either exists only in the complex of sensations itself, or has been simply added by thought to what has been sensed ... Where is the sweet that is attributed to the sugar? It exists only in the act of sensation ...” [86]. So we end up with the observation that “ ... the most sophisticated definition of ‘magic’ that now circulates through the American counterculture is ‘the ability or power to alter one's consciousness at will.’ There is no mention made of any *reason* for altering one's state of consciousness” [40]. And once again we are forced to return to a properly-balanced ecology, since “ ... in tribal cultures that which we call ‘magic’ takes all of its meaning from the fact that, in an indigenous and oral context, humans experience their own intelligence as simply *one* form of awareness among many others. The traditional magician cultivates an ability to shift out of his or her common state of consciousness *precisely in order to make contact with other species on their own terms*. Only by temporarily shedding the accepted perceptual logic of his or her culture can the shaman hope to enter into a rapport with the multiple nonhuman sensibilities that animate the local landscape” [40]. In other words, in “civilized” society we forgotten that “Our neuro-semantics consist of the mapping that we have coded and programmed into our body and nervous system. It makes itself known as we *react* (kinaesthetically, emotionally, and mentally) to various triggers or stimuli. *Semantic Reactions* (Korzybski's terminology) refer to such reactions that occur automatically, unconsciously, and habitually. *Semantic Responses*, by way of contrast, refer to those responses that we make consciously, thoughtfully, and by choice – a much more human way to live” [3]. By learning to remember that “Language itself, as well as all of the social filters of beliefs and ideas, powerfully affect what we can perceive and how we generate internal representations. The social constraints involve the cultural presuppositions coded in the language, the beliefs and values of the society, etc.” [3], we can learn to change our perceptions, and thus our worlds, since, after all – “If you have a magic wand – you might

as well use it" [3]. We can make a context for magic in modern society by understanding that "Despite its apparent incompatibility with current scientific thought, magic reflects deeply rooted tendencies of the human mind. The manipulation of symbols is evident not only in religion, but also in art, poetry, politics, rhetoric, and commerce. Ancient magical processes of mind are also reflected to varying degrees in common practices such as the use of mascot figures and the enshrining of photographs and even locks of hair of loved ones on a dresser or mantle. Whereas most people expect that such practices influence only their way of thinking about a particular circumstance, the magician believes that these practices affect external reality" [87]. Moreover, "From the sociological and psychological points of view, magic often provides a means of self-affirmation and empowerment for those who feel excluded by the dominant classes of a society and its educational and scientific institutions" [87].

Let us now turn our attention to the various practical approaches to "shifting out of the common state of consciousness" and "manipulating" such magical power, all of which are based on the "Theory of Correspondences" or "... hidden relationships among entities within the universe – especially between human beings and the external world. According to this view, the application of the right colors, objects, sounds, or gestures in a given context can bring about the desired result. The theory of correspondences affirms the power of thought to confer reality on products of the imagination, particularly when these thoughts are expressed through significant symbols" [87]. In *sympathetic magic*, "things act on each other at a distance ... by means of what we may conceive as a kind of invisible ether" [88]; in *contagious magic* "things which have once been in contact with each other ... continue to act on each other at a distance after the physical contact has been severed" [88]; *imitative magic* is based on the principle that "like produces like," and that any desired effect can be produced "merely by imitating it" [88] and there is also *homeopathic magic* "... or the use of small portions of a thing to represent and affect the whole" [87]. Thus "Both contagious and imitative magic are based on a common understanding of the use of symbols. Magic turns a 'symbol into an objective power – something which exists and acts on its own' [89]. While religion says that forms have no power in and of themselves, magic makes these symbols into power objects" [43], and the magician cries forth into the Void that "I have gathered forth my symbols and prepare my garnishings of the is to be, and the image of my creation lurketh as a seething basilisk awaiting his release" [83]. And the release of the mental-emotional symbol to act in the material world through the power of the magician's Will could be described by saying that "The vision shall become as reality and through the nourishment that my sacrifice giveth, the angels of the first dimension shall become the substance of the third" [83]. We might well define a magician as that individual who has cultivated "... the ability to readily slip out of the perceptual boundaries that demarcate his or her particular culture – boundaries reinforced by social customs, taboos, and, most important, the common speech or language – in order to make contact with, and learn from, the other powers in the land.

Shamanic magic is precisely this heightened receptivity to the meaningful solicitations – songs, cries, and gestures – of the larger, more-than-human field” [40]. We note at this point that "Magic falls into two categories, ritual or ceremonial, and non-ritual or manipulative. Ritual magic consists of the performance of a formal ceremony, taking place, at least in part, within the confines of an area set aside for such purposes and at a specific time. Its main function is to isolate the otherwise dissipated adrenal and other emotionally induced energy, and convert it into a dynamically transmittable force. It is purely an emotional, rather than intellectual, act. Any and all intellectual activity must take place *before* the ceremony, not during it. This type of magic is sometimes known as '*greater magic*'" [83]. We should be careful to contrast this with "Non-ritual or manipulative magic, sometimes called '*lesser magic*,' [which] consists of the wile and guile obtained through various devices and contrived situations, which when utilized, can create 'change, in accordance with one's will.' In olden times this would be called; 'fascination,' 'glamour,' or the 'evil eye'" [83]. Crowley goes on to ask: "What is a Magical Operation? It may be defined as any event in nature which is brought to pass by Will. We must not exclude potato-growing or banking from our definition. Let us take a very simple example of a Magical Act: that of a man blowing his nose ... an occurrence in the brain characterized essentially by the uniting of subject and object ... the exaltation of the mind by means of magical practices leads (as one may say, in spite of itself) to the same results as occur in straightforward Yoga " [90]. The exact mechanics of magical working are discussed in detail below.

The basic execution (or "meaningful solicitation") of " ... action-based ritual agency lies in the extensive use of spells and formulas in magical rituals" [50], demanding highly specific spoken or written language patterns, times, places, rituals and ingredients, to be effective. We should recognize along with Sørensen from the outset that "Spells are ... a special type of speech-act almost devoid of ordinary communicative function and symbolic content ... believed to establish or create a desired state of affairs by their performative power alone or by coercing supernatural powers to produce it" [50]. Performing the spell requires great concentration to exercise one's "Will" over the supernatural forces – Pederson says: "If the soul is strong then it must leave its impress on all his undertakings ... The soul is a whole saturated by power" [91]. LaVey goes on to comment on this critical feature of magical ritual, stating that "One of the most overlooked ingredients in the working of magic is the accumulation and subsequent direction of force toward an effective end" [83]. Bely expands on this and makes the link between magic and meditation, stating that "Concentration is – a pathway to meditation; meditation is not wandering of thought, but the recognition of thought as alive ..." [92], and for the magical practitioner to exercise her Will, "... understanding is not enough: we must comprehend [the spell], take it into ourselves" [11]. We here make the link with the "Enochian" language of the Angels, and its creative power, as discussed previously. Now, "Despite all non-verbalists' protests to the contrary, soaring heights of emotional ecstasy or raging pangs of anguish can be attained through verbal communication. If the magical

ceremony is to employ all sensory awareness, then the proper sounds must be invoked. It is certainly true that 'actions speak louder than words,' but words become as monuments to thoughts" [83], and a successful "working" results in the projection of subconscious symbols onto these forces in order to impress them to change, through appropriate magical language, and often with the help of magical objects [93], whose " ... properties ... clearly contradict very basic physical expectations. It [the object] understands vocal direction, it can act at distance, and it is even understood as having its own intentions ... The explicit combination of intuitive and counterintuitive properties in magical objects might be one of the reasons for the great proliferation of magical objects in all traditions and cultures" [50]. So now it's becoming to ask how will one come to be a beguiling enchanter, word-weaving spells, spelling out magic chants, exercising one's will with guile? Since, "In every act the magician's breath is regarded as the medium by which the magical force is carried. The voice – and let us remember it must be the voice of the accredited and fully instructed magician, and that his voice must correctly utter the words of an absolutely authentic spell – 'generates' the power of the magic" [94]. In other words "Language *does* play an important role in magical rituals. However, some of the features traditionally treated as special linguistic effects ... [could better be described in terms of] ... objects, ascribed magical agency by metonymic or metaphoric connections, and interpreted as either indexical extensions or iconic representations of sacred elements, besides their more or less transparent referential meaning" [50]. At this point we should bear in mind that language has life of its own and has a habit of casting a type of magical spell on our worldview without our even realizing it. In this context, we can usefully recall Adorno and Horkheimer [70] who are paraphrased as saying that "The familiar theme of the Dialectic of Enlightenment – an escape from myth that collapses back into myth and magic – is here applied to language itself. Once words are no longer seen as evoking particular experiences, and instead become neutral signs, devoid of any connection with a domain of objects, they become rote formulae, invoked like magical incantations, before a reality that has become impenetrable. Words no longer serve to 'bring objects to experience' but instead become slogans and catchwords that function like 'conditioned reflexes'" [71]. The descent of language into "magical incantation" has the effect that "The more completely language is lost in communication [Mitteilung], the more words are debased as substantial vehicles of meaning and become signs devoid of quality; the more purely and transparently words communicate what is intended, the more impenetrable they become. The demythologization of language, as an element of the total process of Enlightenment, falls back into magic. Word and content [Gehalt] were distinct, yet inseparable from one another. Concepts like melancholy, history, even life, were recognized in the word, which separated them out and preserved them" [70]. And "The absolute separation which renders the order of words superfluous and the relationship of word and object arbitrary, puts an end to the superstitious merging of word and thing. Anything in a fixed, literal sequence that goes beyond the correlation to the event is banned as unclear and as linguistic metaphysics [Wortmetaphysik]. But the result is that the word, which can now be only a sign without

meaning, becomes so fixed to the thing that it petrifies into a formula” [70]. The theoretical importance of such “reference without content,” and of “floating signifiers with zero symbolic value,” is taken up again in the discussion below, where the importance of the “superstitious merging of word and thing” is paramount. And this leads us on into a discussion of the modern communicative glossolalia magic [95] of Psycho-chaotic Semiotics [96], as given in depth elsewhere. What this *means* in terms of magical methodology and logos-methods is that “The relation between an object and its image is perceived in exactly the same way as between an object and its name. In general primitive thinking does not make any essential distinction between the image and the name. This is not surprising, because the image is connected with the original of the same association that the name is. The image is the name and the name is the image. All images are names of an object taken together with the object itself form a single whole something (specifically a representation created by an association). Therefore it seems obvious that when we act on a part we act by the same token on the whole, which also means on its other parts” [82]. So due to the beguiling power of language, whereby “If it were not for names, very few of us would understand anything in life, much less attach any significance to it; – and significance compels recognition, with is something *everyone* wants ...” [83] – “Verbal symbols thus become instruments of imitative magic to manipulate reality” [43]. We can now go on to reforge the link between the discourse of Creation and the Demiurge [36],[97] by calling forth “Leviathan, the great Dragon from the Watery Abyss, [who] roars forth as the surging sea, and [for whom] these invocations are his tribunals” [83]. In making this invocation, however, we realize that “The use in antiquity of divine names to coerce deities also cannot be neatly classified as either contagious or imitative [magic]; it partakes of both [forms]. It was believed that the magical use of divine names could coerce gods to do human bidding. Many therefore hid the names of their gods for fear of their misuse” [43]. A probable example of this is “ ... the meaning of the Davidic statement made to Yahweh: ‘They speak of you with evil intent; your adversaries misuse your name’ (Psalms 139:20). God gave express command that his name should not be used with malicious intent (Deuteronomy 5:11)” [43]. Moreover, “Because names were thought to hold sacred power, the Jews wrote the personal name of their God in such a way that it could not be pronounced. While the unpronounceable tetragrammaton *YHWH* was transcribed in the documents, at most times the word *donay*, ‘my Lord,’ was substituted in the readings. The personal name for God was considered too sacred to pronounce [98]” [43]. One good example of the invocation of the divine Name is “ ... the creation of a golem, turning a creature of clay into a living man through prayer and incantation, became a mystical ritual associated with great power on the part of the kabbalist who raises it. In this ritual, the kabbalist would invoke the sacred name of God, the Tetragrammaton *YHWH*, chanting elaborate and systematic permutations of the letters of the name with other letters of the Hebrew alphabet ... The legend of the golem draws heavily on the concept, often apparent in kabbalistic texts, of theurgy, or man acting on God, the ability of the actions of man to bear on God. The raising of the golem is a creation story of man become God; it is also often the story

of the failure of that presumption” [16]. In terms of modern magical working we learn that “When calling the names, all of them may be recited, or a given number of those most significant to the respective working may be chosen. Whether all or only some of the names are called, they must be taken out of the rigidly organized form in which they are listed [in manuals of practical magic] ... and arranged in a phonetically effective roster” [83]. But there is a price to be paid for this wanton utilization of godly power – it leads to dissipation and dissolution – since, in terms of the Dialectic of Enlightenment, [70] “In Vico's account of the origin of language, the gasp of surprise at the unusual becomes its name ... Hence the inability of mythology to provide any comfort for man: the names of the gods are the petrified sound of human fear ... Enlightenment is this mythic fear turned radical, pressing onward, distinguishing appearance and essence, activity and force, seeking to produce a world in which everything is repeatable and calculable. In its drive to create a world in which there is nothing to be feared, it spares no remnant of mythological thinking except for the very foundation of mythological thinking itself: the abstract fear of the collectivity ... The ‘noontime panic’ in the face of nature is replaced with a fear of social forces that can only be assuaged by that relentless effort at self-preservation that ultimately discards the ideals of enlightenment itself as just another bit of mythology” [71]. And perhaps the magical desire to keep united “appearance and essence” and “activity and force” is the best rationale for why “Magical rituals often use dead or foreign languages. Tambiah describes how Sinhalese *mantras* contain a hierarchy of languages: Sanskrit, when Hindu gods are invoked; Pali, when Buddha and Buddhist myths are referred to; Classical Sinhalese, when origin myths are narrated in the spell; and finally a polyglot mixture of several languages when the demons are addressed ... In more extreme cases, *non-sense words* or pure *gibberish* play a substantial part in magical rituals. In that case, words do not have any semantic reference for the participants (or this is ‘hidden’ or ‘forgotten’). Instead, they are believed to be a compelling force alone by their material or performative aspect, as a sign or a sound, or by their ascribed function as a communicative medium of the sacred space. Knowledge of such special words and languages enables the magician to communicate with elements belonging to this space and enable these elements to be active in the ritual space” [50]. And in a more general sense, “Linguistic anomalies have always been described as one of the distinctive marks of magical rituals. Think of *abracadabra* and *simsalabim* of the variety magician. These linguistic deformations are spread all over the linguistic register and have a very distinct effect used to mark off the ritual space from everyday communicative interaction ... language in magical rituals can profitably be understood as a blend between natural, everyday, profane language ... and idealised sacred or magical language(s) ... Cultures and even individual rituals within a culture can use different linguistic parameters in the construction of a ritual space, so, like the genetic blend, the linguistic blend should be understood as an abstract model depicting the relationship between natural and sacred language found in magical rituals” [50]. In terms of the conceptual blending mechanism described above we know that “Pictures, statues and other material objects can obtain ritual efficacy simply by virtue of a similarity-based

connection to elements in the sacred space ... This representative function, based on perceptual resemblance, points to the complex problem of material (linguistic) signs used as objects in magical rituals, e.g. as amulets and talismans" [50]. We note here however, that "Even though linguistic signs based on conventional reference are very common, purely iconic reference are often exploited in material objects used as magical talisman or amulet ... Pure linguistic reference does play a significant role in talismans and amulets by facilitating the performance of ritual action through symbolic invocation of specific agents from the sacred domain. However ... purely symbolic, conventional connections are de-emphasised in magical rituals ... In most important aspects the linguistic signs written on amulets and talismans have lost their symbolic reference. This is replaced with indexical references based on the conception of a direct connection between a given sign and its referent, in which the sign is seen as 'originating' from, or having 'power over' its referent" [50]. And here there is a link back to the original emanation of *mana* and its control through *tabu*, for we have already emphasized that "Magical rituals can contain words devoid of any meaning in the traditional symbolic sense of the term (i.e. definable by other symbols). However, this does not entail that they can be used for any possible interpretative purpose. They are bound to a discursive register (magical ritual), in which they have the semiotic function of referring to a sacred space, and thereby to a hidden potentiality of symbolic meaning" [50]. Now, in this semiotic context "The importance of reference without content points to the classical anthropological notion of 'floating signifiers' with 'zero symbolic value' proposed by Lévi-Strauss ... in his analysis of the concept of *mana* used by Mauss and Hubert in their theory of magic ... The description of linguistic blending might shed further light of some aspects of this problem" [50] by showing that " ... these words might have other, non-symbolic, 'meanings.' Iconic features present in the utterance of the word, such as tone, intonation, and stress entail a very basic ascription of meaning based on linear scales, such as positive-negative, big-small, and friendly-aggressive. Indexical features, such as the 'origin' of the word and its enunciator, will in a similar fashion entail a basic ascription of meaning by relating the word to a given conceptual domain and pragmatic situation" [50]. Even the "... words and grammar need not be deprived their referential and logical function. The expressive side of language can by itself mark ritual use of language off from everyday natural language. The *prosody* of magical spells is an important expressive marker. Spells and magical formulas are often recited in a very special manner with specific rhythm, intonation and stress. Other linguistic utterances in the ritual, not considered to be efficacious spells, also make use of a special prosody immediately marking off the ritual context from ordinary language" [50]. Furthermore, "*Iteration* and *redundancy* are common traits in linguistic utterances in magical rituals, which distinguish them from everyday natural language with its lineal structure and communicative intention. The length of many magical spells is thus totally out of proportion with the information and meaning contained in the utterance" [50].

Now, whatever the form of expression, we must turn to the psychological state of the magician in preparing for, and then in performing, her ritual. Given the intense emotional nature of the magical working, we must realize that “The invocations ... are designed to serve as proclamations of certainty, not whining apprehension. For this reason they are devoid of shallow offerings-up and hollow charities” [83], And thus even in the “Invocation employed towards the conjuration of compassion” [83] the magician must be at pains to be emotionally congruent when proclaiming the highly-charged spell containing the phrases “With the anger of anguish and the wrath of the stifled, I pour forth my voices, wrapped in rolling thunder, that you may hear!” [83] So, with this in mind we can understand the comment that “Perhaps the most noticeable shortcoming in the printed magical conjurations of the past is the lack of emotion developed upon the reciting of them” [83]. In fact, LaVey notes that “The purpose of the ritual is to FREE the magician from thoughts that would consume him, were he to dwell upon them constantly. Contemplation, daydreaming, and constant scheming burns up emotional energy that could be gathered together in a dynamically usable force; not to mention that normal productivity is severely depleted by such consuming anxiety” [83]. And this “freeing from consuming thoughts” is the reason why “Besides ordinary illocutionary speech-acts working by combining semantic and contextual features, many magical spells deliberately exploit non-sensical or archaic word-forms, almost totally devoid of any semantic and direct referential function for the individuals participating in the ritual” [50]. Thus, as discussed above, “By de-emphasising the possibility of symbolic interpretation, the words are stripped down to an identity or similarity connection to the sacred space ensuring the transfer of magical agency. This is marked by diverse iconic elements in the utterance itself, such as prosody, intonation, iteration, all elements prolific in ritual language in general” [50]. We note here that “There is of course a significant difference in the perception and understanding of such ritualised language depending on the role in the ritual filled by an individual. Some individuals will know the meaning, others will not. However, this does not change the fact that even ritual specialist often do not understand, or have only superficial understanding of the meaning of words used in ritual sequences, and I find that this tendency is strengthened in magical rituals” [50].

So much for the verbalization and vocalization involved in magical invocation. Now, as to the attainment of results by the execution of Will, as opposed to the submissive supplication of prayer, we recognize that “Since children first learn through pictures and stories, the selection of the right stories told the right way becomes *the most central concern* of philosophy – and this of course is precisely what Plato, the first real philosopher, taught from the outset” [7]. And the child learns that “... if he wishes for something hard enough, it will come true. This is meaningful. Wishing indicates desire, whereas prayer is accompanied by apprehension. Scripture has twisted desire into lust, covetousness, and greed” [83]. So the would-be magician is exhorted to “Be as a child, and do not stifle desire, lest you lose touch with the first ingredient in the performance of magic” [83]. Moreover, “Children, not knowing or caring if

they possess artistic skill or other creative talents, pursue their goals through the use of imagery of their own manufacture, whereas 'civilized' adults are much more critical of their own creative efforts" [83]. Thus we note that "The adolescent boy who takes great care in carving, on a tree, a heart containing his and his love object's initials; the little chap who sits by the hour drawing his conception of sleek automobiles; the tiny girl who rocks a scuffed and ragged doll in her arms, and thinks of it as he beautiful little baby – these capable witches and warlocks, these natural magicians, are employing the magical ingredients known as imagery, and the success of any ritual depends on it" [83]. These observations lead us to understand how " ... a 'primitive' magician can utilize a mud doll or crude drawing to successful advantage in his magical ceremonies. To *him* the image is as accurate as needs be" [83]. Nevertheless, given technology, creativity, intelligence, time and resources, the modern magician is strongly encouraged to " ... fashion whatever imagery you possibly can that will parallel in as exact a way possible the situation towards which you strive. Remember, you have five senses to utilize, so do not feel you must limit your imagery to one" [83]. She is thus exhorted to use "... graphic imagery such as drawings, paintings ... written imagery such as stories, plays, descriptions of desires and eventual outcome of same ... acting out the desire in tableau or playlet, either as yourself or portraying the role of the object of your desire (transference), using any devices necessary to intensify imagery ... any odors relative to the desired person or situation ... any sounds or background noises conducive to a strong feeling" [83]. The sole end of all these magical devices and instruments lies in " ... stimulating the emotions ... and thereby intensifying the outpouring of adrenal or bio-electrical energy ..." [83]. Now in terms of the execution of the ritual itself, there is another explicit difference between magic and religion, for in the former one knows that he actively seeks to engender "... a form of contrived ignorance in order to expand his will, whereas another [say Christian] religionist doesn't – or if he does know, he practices that form of self-deceit which forbids such recognition" [83]. During the "acting out" of a magical ritual "Anything which serves to intensify the emotions ... will contribute to its success. Any drawing, painting, sculpture, writing, photograph, article of clothing, scent, sound, music, tableau, or contrived situation that can be incorporated into the ceremony will serve the sorcerer well ... Imagery is a constant reminder, an intellect-saving device, a working substitute for the real thing. Imagery can be manipulated, set up, modified, and created, all according to the will of the magician, and the very blueprint that is created by imagery becomes the formula which leads to reality" [83]. Coupled with this "The formalised beginning and end of the ceremony acts as a dogmatic, anti-intellectual device, the purpose of which is to dissociate the activities and frame of reference of the outside world from that of the ritual chamber, where the whole will must be employed. This facet of the ceremony is *most* important to the intellectual, as he *explicitly* requires the 'decompression chamber' effects of the chants, bells, candles, and other trappings, before he can put his pure and willful desires to work for himself, in the projection and utilization of his imagery" [83]. As to whether the ritual "working" should be done alone or in concert with other likeminded individuals we find that "A magical ceremony may be

performed by oneself or in a group ... A group ritual is certainly much more of a reinforcement of faith, and an installation of power, than is a private ceremony. The massing together of persons who are dedicated to a common philosophy is bound to insure a renewal of confidence in the power of magic. The pageantry of religion is what has sustained it" [83]. In the context of group workings "It should be noticed that rituals always consist in a blend between ordinary and magical language(s). Often the spells themselves will contain both contemporary and archaic forms, and at least the practical instructions will be carried out in ordinary language. So, when participants have no or very limited access to the sacred space, it constitutes a deliberate breach with the default mechanisms normally ensuring the possible unpacking of both input spaces from the blended space" [50]. Sørensen goes on to explain that "This has an interesting effect: An input space containing the sacred language is constructed, containing words about whose reference participants have very limited knowledge, but which will be believed to contain such reference, whether or not it is potentially obtainable for participants. Secrets are not secrets if not believed to be about something, and *in principle* the sacred space can be unfolded, revealing its secrets. In this way, opaque reference to the sacred space is one of the important constituent factors in the construction of a sacred space. Strange linguistic forms used in magical rituals will not only be involved in the construction of a ritual space, but also by their implicit referential function, help constructing a sacred space about which little or nothing is known" [50].

Nonwithstanding all the paraphernalia and willpower required in the execution of a magical ritual, there is still a crucial caveat on the success of the enterprise, since "One of the magician's greatest weapons is knowing himself; his talents, abilities, physical attractions and detractors ..." [83], for "To be able to adjust one's wants to one's capabilities is a great talent, and too many people fail to realize that if they are unable to attain the maximum, 'a half a loaf can be better than none'" [83]. We can conclude (transmuting emphatic capitals to italics) that "The aspiring witch who deludes herself into thinking that a powerful enough working will *always* succeed, despite a magical imbalance, is forgetting one essential rule: *magic is like nature itself, and success in magic requires working in harmony with nature, not against it*" [83]. There is thus a critical psychological factor inherent in the practice of magic, in that "A complete knowledge and awareness of this [balance] factor is an ability few witches and warlocks ever attain. That is, simply, knowing the proper type of individual or situation to work your magic on for the easiest and best results. Knowing one's own limitations is a rather odd bit of introspection, it would seem, for a person who should be able to perform the impossible; but under many conditions it can make the difference between success and failure" [83]. LaVey comments further on the importance of the magician's Will – "It must be remembered that *it matters not whether anyone attaches any significance to your working, so long as the results of the working are in accordance with your will*. The super-logician will always explain the connection of the magical ritual to the end result as 'coincidence'" [83]. Another block to the efficacy of the magical ritual, therefore, is the state of mind of the magician since " ... too

many would-be witches and warlocks will perform a ritual, and then go about with tremendous anxiety waiting for the first sign of a successful working ... their very anxiety in waiting for the desired results only nullifies any real chance of success. Furthermore, with this attitude, it is doubtful that enough concentrated energy to even perform a proper ceremony could be stored up in the first place" [83]. Moreover, "To dwell upon or constantly complain about the situation upon which your ritual would be based only guarantees the weakening of what should be ritualistically directed force, by spreading it thin and diluting it. Once the desire has been established strongly enough to employ the forces of magic, then every attempt must be made to symbolically give vent to these wishes *in the performance of the ritual* – not before or after!" [83]. Indeed "It will be said, by some, that these instructions and procedures are nothing more than applied psychology, or scientific fact, called by 'magical' terminology – until they arrive at a passage in the text that is 'based on no known scientific finding'" [83]. We can explore the nature of the divergence of practical magic from practical science in terms of our conceptual blending if we note that "Even though magical rituals can be understood as a particular kind of instrumental action aimed to effect the surrounding world, it is obvious for everyone, both performer and observer, that it obtains this efficacy in a special way ... the process of *ritualisation* produces a displacement of agency and intentionality, and this provokes a search for another source of agency in the ritual" [50]. Thus "The ritual must contain specific elements, and most notably, certain objects, actions or person(s) *must* be present in order for the ritual to work. This might be said of all types of action, but in rituals it is not obvious how these stipulated elements are related to the purported effects, and why specific elements are represented as crucial to this effect" [50]. The reason for this is that, in conceptual blend terms, "The efficacy of the actions does not lie in their instrumental or direct perceptual effect, but in the similarity to actions ascribed the sacred space. This similarity ensures the connection between the ritual action performed and the desired effect of the action, despite their lack of perceptual or causal connections. In fact, the procedural character of such actions, devoid of direct ascription of both symbolic meaning and direct instrumental causality, is an important part of the general tendency in magical rituals to de-emphasise symbolic interpretations. These are replaced with connections transferring ritual efficacy through iconic and indexical relations" [50]. And yet again, we can make a link with the manipulation of *mana*, for the "Rituals must be enacted perfectly. If a ritual is wrongfully enacted, 'the *mana* might rebound against the person seeking its help' [99]" [43]. We can exemplify this by invoking a religious example – "Why a catholic priest must be ordained and perform a specific performative utterance in order for the Eucharist to have an effect is not obvious in the same way as a man, a stone, and a window is both causally and intentionally related in order to break the window. In magical rituals, at least one element will be invested with the *magical agency* necessary for the ritual to have any effect, and this agency is constructed by a mapping between the sacred and the profane domain" [50]. In fact, in this case, conceptual blending tells us that in the Catholic Eucharist both " ... the priest and the ritual action, including the spell, are depicted as connected to the sacred space, and therefore

invested with ritual agency. This is because both elements are deemed to be necessary in order to perform the transubstantiation of bread and wine ... The action is based on an iconic reproduction of a mythical act by Christ thus creating an identity connector to the sacred space ... and its efficacy rests in its correct performance of the ritual action as it is prescribed by the church. Thus, a deaf-dumb, but correctly ordained, priest cannot perform the consecration of bread and wine” [50]. Moreover, “A significant element of the ordination of the priest is captured in the dogma of apostolic succession, according to which the bishop ordaining the priest is directly connected all the way back to the apostles if not Jesus himself. An important part of the ordination of priests and bishops is the imposition of hands, by which a line of touch can be reconstructed from any present priest, and all the way back to the apostle. Thus, a ‘pseudo-genealogical’ lineage is formed connecting the present day priest with the sacred authority of the apostles, and this lineage is an important legitimisation of magical or ritual efficacy of the priest ... However, a more direct counterpart connection between the sacred and the profane space is also constructed. The transubstantiation of bread and wine into the flesh and blood of Christ cannot succeed without the proper intention of the priest, making him ‘the instrumental cause’ voluntarily performing the action of ‘Christ whose agent he is’” [50]. Given that all the above factors are in place, then the magical result is guaranteed, and Connelly comments on the almost “scientific” causality of result inherent in some forms of magic (as opposed to religious rite): “In some conceptions of magic, one need not really believe in it for it to work – it is seen as decidedly causal in nature – if you mix the right ingredients and say the incantations correctly, the spell will work – even if you don't believe it will” [85]. We might well ask therefore what happens when the magic fails, and the answer is given that the magician “ ... may reason that the wrong paraphernalia or medicines were used while the magical rituals were being performed. Perhaps he might determine that the rituals themselves were wrongfully employed. A contemporary parallel is the Western view of medicine. Westerners do not question the validity of medicine just because one drug fails to effect a cure. They go back to the doctor to seek another medicine which might cure the illness. Likewise, the animist does not reject magic because one type fails; he seeks a new type of magic or a new implementation of ritual using his old magic” [43]. In contrast, the religious practice of “praying” can encompass elements of adoration, communion, intervention, petition, pleading, praising, submission, thanksgiving and waiting [100]. However, a prayerful supplication may simply be refused on the whim of your god, and thus “It is no wonder that magic tends to be more formulaic and less extempore than prayer” [93].

In all the above discussions we have been in fact talking of an impersonal and “neutral” force, which might be used for good or ill, and “In most societies concepts of helpful magic dominate. Magic is used to cure, protect, and profit rather than to hinder, harm, and destroy [89]. Only in tension-filled, disintegrating societies does harmful magic reign supreme over helpful magic” [43]. It is interesting that “In certain traditions harmful magic is understood as the inversion of the good. The Catholic Mass is thought to bestow blessings; to the animist

the Mass said backward is considered harmful magic" [43]. And there is a great deal of mumbo-jumbo involved in this ceremonial inversion, whereby, for example, "The priest comes at night to a ruined or deserted church, peopled by owls, bats, and toads. At the first stroke of eleven he begins to mutter the mass backward, finishing at the last stroke of midnight. The host he uses is black, with three points, and instead of wine he drinks water taken from a well into which an unbaptized infant has been thrown. He makes the sign of the cross, not in the air with his right hand but on the ground, with his left foot; and so on, through a whole series of precisely inverted devotions. At the end he pronounces the name of a victim who, under the onslaught of all this evil, withers and dies" [101]. Moreover, we can even find the form of the anti-litany specified, whereby "You take a black cat ... that does not have even one white hair ... and you bind his four paws, and then you take him at midnight to a crossroads and you cry in a loud voice: O great Lucifer, Emperor of Hell, I call you and I introduce you into the body of my enemy just as I now hold prisoner this cat, and if you will bring my enemy to death, then the following night at midnight, in this same place, I will offer you this cat in sacrifice, and you will do what I command of you by the powers of the magic I now exercise according to the secret book of Saint Cyprian, in the name of all the captains of the great legions of hell, Adramelch, Alastor, and Azazel, to whom now I pray, with all their brothers ... all the chiefs of the infernal legions: *Abigor, pecca pro nobis ... Amon, miserere nobis ... Samael, libera nos a bono ... Belial eleison ... Focalor, in corruptionem meam intende ... Haborym, damnamus dominum ... Zaebos, anum meum aperies ... Leonard, asperge me spermate tuo et inquinabor*" [102]. Once again we have a blasphemous inversion of the very language of the Christian rite, when the actant cries "Abigor, sin for us ... Amon, have mercy on us ... Samael, free us from good ... Belial, have mercy ... Focalor, attend to my corruption ... Haborym, we damn the lord ... Zaebos, open my ass ... Leonard, sprinkle me with your seed and I shall be stained" [103]. However, we should exercise caution in giving full credence to the origins of such Western "Black Masses" since we find historically that "The last of the glamorous priestesses of Satan, Jeanne-Marie Bouvier (Madame Guyon) was to be overshadowed by a shrewd opportunist and callous business-woman named Catherine Deshayes, otherwise known as La Voisin. Here was an erstwhile beautician who, while dabbling in abortions and purveying the most efficient poisons to ladies desirous of eliminating unwanted husbands or lovers, found in the lurid accounts of the 'messes noir' a proverbial brainstorm. It is safe to say that 1666 was the year of the first 'commercial' black mass! In the region of St Denis, which is now called La Garenne, a great walled house was purchased by La Voisin and fitted with dispensaries, cells, laboratories, and ... a chapel. Soon it became *de rigueur* for royalty and lesser dilettantes to attend and participate ... The organized fraud perpetrated in these ceremonies has become indelibly marked in history as the 'true black mass'" [83]. Further to this, "The Satanism-for-fun-and-games fad next appeared in England in the middle of the 18th Century in the form of Sir Francis Dashwood's Order of the Medmanham Franciscans, popularly called the Hell-Fire Club. While eliminating the blood, gore, and baby-fat candles of the previous century's masses, Sir Francis managed

to conduct rituals replete with good dirty fun, and certainly provided a colorful and harmless form of psychodrama for the leading lights of the period" [83]. So we may well want to throw a pinch of salt over our left shoulder into the Devil's eye in considering the true origin of modern European Black-magical ritual. So, how *is* magically evil intention propagated? Between 1910 and 1930 Mowinckel, Hempel, and Pedersen wrote about the origin of curses as "magical practices without recourse to God" [43]. We find that "The Sioux speak about *wakan* or *wakanda*, and other North American Indians speak of *orenda*, *qube*, *manitu*, and *oki*, reflecting the belief in an impersonal power used 'to bless or to curse.' African pygmies recognize a similar power called *oudah*" [43]. Once again, the power of the spoken curse is paramount and it is noted that "Curses are verbalizations calling upon spiritual forces to harm a person. Animistic people believe in the power of words. They would give a literal interpretation to Proverbs 18:21: 'Death and life are in the power of the tongue.' The curse, then, is the activation of the power of witchcraft and a spoken element in the use of sorcery" [43]. In this sense "Both curses and oaths are related to the *mantras* because of the emphasis on the power of spoken words" [43], and we return to the magic and meaning of mantra imminently [81]. Once again, one must take care when uttering a curse, like him whom the "...words touched too deep, and awoke [in him] a fire more fierce than ... designed" [104]. Furthermore "Even the Bible recognizes this generally held perspective: 'An undeserved curse does not come to rest' (Proverbs 26:2). In fact, an undeserved curse is likely to rebound upon the invoker's own family: 'He who curses the parents of others is like him who curses his own parents' [105]" [43].

In conclusion, the triadic relationship between religion, magic and science has been summarized as follows: "Paradoxically while the secular and magical options are vastly different in their concept of spiritual power, they both are manipulative. Secularists manipulate nature; those using magic manipulate impersonal spiritual powers" [43], and "We tend to think, of course, that magic simply anticipated science because it was a false mythical attempt at prediction and control. Yet the absolute contrast between free spiritual action and response on the one hand, and 'automatic' material action and response on the other is a post-Cartesian one which fails to reckon with the given fact of transition of meaningful forms between the one realm and the other" [7]. Furthermore, "Definitions for religion and philosophy must involve similar distinctions, where the original context of all thought is mythic. Since myth does not argue, but philosophy does, a rule of thumb for religion is that it mixes in philosophic elements but always retains an authoritative link to a mythic context. The most important thing about that mythic context, however, is not always that it exerts a dogmatic authority, but that it is historical. Philosophy cannot conjure up historical particulars out of pure reason, but religion always relates its truth to historical particulars, the actual source of the religion or its received tradition. Furthermore, contrary to the earlier evolutionary schemes about human thought, it must be accepted that mythic thought, and so religion, cannot be replaced by philosophy, or by science" [35]. We can also contrast magic, religion and science

in the context of “Christianity [which] by its very nature objects to all kinds of human manipulation and calls both the secularist and the magician into a relationship with sovereign God. The three options of this drama – the magical, the secular, and the religious – are in philosophical opposition to one another; yet sometimes they are concurrently held by the same person” [43]. We concur with Connelly that religion even today could be said to contain some “magical” elements [85] but “ ... when magic is employed, humans are forcing deity to act rather than allowing deity to act through them. Magic reduces God from an enthroned Lord to a human servant” [43]. Furthermore, “While magic seeks to manipulatively control spiritual powers by human dictum, religion seeks to supplicate the powers. The religionist, realizing his own impotence, seeks through prayer and worship to gain blessings from spiritual beings. The magician uses impersonal spiritual power to control both impersonal forces and personal spiritual beings; the religionist supplicates and propitiates personal spiritual beings. While magic might be used for helpful or harmful purposes depending on the motivations of the practitioners, religion is almost always used benevolently” [43]. Malinowski further comments that “Magic is distinguished from Religion in that the latter creates values and attains ends directly, whereas magic consists of acts which have a practical utilitarian value and are effective only as a means to an end” [57]. It is true to say that “Much of ‘magical practice’ in the human past was in reality more like a ‘prudential’ mix of received formula and willed intuitive adaptation to circumstance that exceeded the prescription of rules, in just the way that ethical action did for Aristotle” [7]. This leads to the observation that magical ritual “ ... in many ways like religious liturgy ... tended to blend formulaic ‘conjuration’ with willed invocation of hidden personal powers or traces of such powers (in the ‘signatures’ of things) – these powers including the fairies, the angels, even God himself and the demons in the case of sinister magic. (Up until the 15th Century the word ‘magic’ tended often to be reserved by theologians for bad, demonic magic, but the observation and benign manipulation of occult forces, that later came to be termed ‘natural magic’ was still recognized” [7]. We must bear in mind in all of this, of course, that the example of the Catholic Eucharist “ ... illustrates the importance in recognising that magical actions are not a property of so-called primitive or preliterate people, or of people of pre-modern historical periods. The practice of ascribing magical agency to various elements can be found all over the world, in all historical periods, and in relation to all kinds of religious and political systems. Ascription of magical agency is a fundamental prerequisite for representations of efficacy in ritual, when these are not only understood as symbolic expressions, but are believed to change or uphold a state of affairs either by ritual means alone or in combination with technological action” [50]. We can extend this to a comparison of religion and science in that “ ... science is also in the field as a subject since it is related to religion – science and religion have common roots and were fused earlier in history ...” [106]. But by contrast, “Religion is that which orients and relates the *whole* of the human individual to *all* of existence – to the world ... whereas the sciences orient part of the individual and certain social functions to specific parts of existence and uses restraint in its choice of modes of discovery and confirmation. There is no restriction of the mode or object of

religious knowledge – except that in real religion *validity* is a concern. *Especially of concern* is the meaning and nature of validity” [106]. One way of reconciling these views is to accept that in fact “Religion and science are part of a movement from prehistoric time to the present. The era, from Zoroaster and the Buddha, through the Christ to Muhammad, corresponds to a rise in symbolic consciousness in religion – and in science. This made possible a split between symbol and world” [106]. We can go on from this to state that like modern science, magic is pragmatic, and has its own specialized methodologies, but, while explicable, “ ... science has always been, at one time or another, considered magic” [83], and yet “magic is never totally scientifically explicable” [83]. And again, in contrast to science, magic operates from a sympathetic principle, wherein association of unconnected ideas is prevalent. We might conjecture along with Connelly that “... Magic is like science in form, but not in function” [85] and thus as scientific knowledge waxed, magical utilization waned. However we realize that “No one knows everything, and as long as there is wonder, there will always be an apprehension of the unknown, where there are potentially dangerous forces. It is this natural fear of the unknown, a first cousin to the fascination *towards* the unknown, that impels the man of logic towards his very explanations. Obviously the man of science is motivated to discovery by his very sense of wonder. And yet, how sad that this man who calls himself logical is often the last to recognize the essence of ritual magic” [83]. Hence we might conclude that “ ... it could just be that ‘magic’, as for example practiced by the alchemists and the Cabbalists (Jewish and Christian) names a lost possibility of a just and prudential as well as spiritually-elevating interaction also with nature as well as with the human realm. Certainly, one suspects that magic already in the Middle Ages (Roger Bacon, for example), and more especially in the Renaissance era after Paracelsus, became often routinised in a way that was indeed proto-technological” [7]. LaVey, in fact, raises exactly this semantic point, commenting that “When a puppy reaches maturity is becomes a dog; when ice melts it is called water; when twelve months have been used up, we get a new calendar with the proper chronological name; when ‘magic’ becomes scientific fact we refer to it as medicine, astronomy, etc. When one name is no longer appropriate for a given thing it is only logical to change it to a new one which better fits the subject” [83]. Now we can once again reforge our triad, since “Religion itself was often thought [by early 20th Century scholars] to arise from magic ... Since these scholars thought of magic as a set of naive beliefs about how to manipulate nature, they thought that science ultimately fulfilled this promise by actually manipulating nature in the ways that magic had promised” [35]. And LaVey poses the semantic question again, asking, “Why continue to call a religion the same name when the tenets of that religion no longer fit the original one?” [83]. One approach to the divergence between “good” and “evil” manipulative technology was adopted by Tolkien who “ ... offers a very Christian fictional account of cosmic origins more in terms of fairy-tale than myth ... he links this to the focal question of ‘the two magics’ with which all his work is concerned [104]” [7]. His philosophy is that “ ... sinister magic is technology too slavishly deployed, and here he rightly indicates that we avoid noticing the fact that modernity threatens to be the triumph of

this sort of magic – since no-one, including scientists, *really* quite comprehends why the radio, the light switch, the automobile, the mobile phone and the internet can by regular formulae command the powers they do. To surrender exclusively to technology is theologically to fall in the most fundamental sense as far as human beings (not angels) are concerned – through the will to *dominate objects* and so to forge a single means of domination: ‘one ring to rule them all’ [7]. And in these circumstances, “Caught up in a mass of abstractions, our attention hypnotized by a host of human-made technologies that only reflect us back upon ourselves, it is all too easy for us to forget our carnal inherence in a more-than-human matrix of sensations and sensibilities” [40]. Tolkien contrasts this with “good magic” – “ ... the higher magic of the elves [which] is art, which constitutes the original musical beauty of the world. Where objects are approached in the mode of art, we attend to their inexhaustible values, or attempt to mould something that will charm in its own unique terms, untranslatable into a general formula of repeatable control. In this way, Tolkien offers a kind of ‘ecological’ rereading of Christian doctrine that is linked to a respect for the ‘fairy’ values immanent in nature and art” [7]. And this “ecology” and “respect for fairy values” engenders an acceptance that “To shut ourselves off from these other voices, to continue by our life-styles to condemn these other sensibilities to the oblivion of extinction, is to rob our own senses of their integrity, and to rob our minds of their coherence. We are human only in contact and conviviality with what is not human. Only in reciprocity with what is Other do we begin to heal ourselves” [40].

And so then, what of the supremacy of science in the Twentyfirst Century? Of course we *believe* it’s all to do with ratiocination, as Lévi-Strauss noted in stating that “The scientific mind does not so much provide the right answers as ask the right questions” [107]. However we also understand that “Every discovery is preceded by speculation. Man only seeks to discover what he has been able to imagine beforehand, even if he discovers something quite different. Next come the empirical findings, which powerful ideological reasons can lead people to tinker with and distort, in order to make them compatible with some pre-established theory. Pressure has to build up to breaking point before a new discovery will provide the foundation for a new theory” [24]. This leads to early humankind with “ ... imagination in full flight, with science and objective discovery hard on its heels, while fiction is often confused with science or stands in place of it” [24]. In order to escape from this confusion and “To establish its pre-eminence beyond question, science must first dispose of myth. Now myth dies hard: it isn’t enough for science to wield proof based on direct observation of phenomena: it also needs to be ratified and upheld by ideology. For as soon as an idea or a theory is raised to the status of a dogma, no fact can stand in its way” [24]. And yet “ ... it remains striking that a thinker pursuing a more hermetic and magical approach to the cosmos like Giordano Bruno seems to have far more anticipated modern physics which allows for uncertainty, mysterious action at a distance, singularities that evade the rule of general laws, the operation of unknowable forces and even the mediation of matter with subjectivity than does the finally disenchanting Newtonian tradition [108]” [7]. And in this sense, “The entire

history of ideas in general ... is nothing more than a series of confrontations between products of the imagination and facts – confrontations which are settled by ideology” [24]. But even scientists cannot agree on the true nature of their art, since “A theory is always provisional, and the world is a good deal stranger than we can intuit or even imagine” [23]. So, for example, “Zeller denied the Hegelian view that knowledge could be swooped upon from above: its construction had to be taken into account. Helmholtz equated knowledge with signs brought to our awareness through perceptions, so that lawful order preexisted in our perception, even if matter was a fundamental reality. For Mach a thing was a thought symbol, standing for a complex of sensations of a relatively fixed nature. He emphasized the need for links between theories and perceptions at every level and turn. A physical law had no more factual validity than the individual facts combined. Hertz saw the fundamental concepts of theoretical physics as patterns of possible experiences and not copies of actual experiences. Duhem regarded theories as deductive abstractions of individual laws that were characterized by mathematical elegance and simplicity” [23]. Of course this “intuitive strangeness” is due to the mythical “split between symbol and word” described above, and there is a price to pay for this split, since while it “ ... is a source of increased understanding and action, it is fragmentary when either symbol or world is regarded as complete in itself or when symbol and world are isolated from each other. A fragmentation, made possible by heightened consciousness, occurred in response to flight from fear, and quest for power: the partial success associated with increased awareness of the symbol-object relation was assumed to be absolute” [106]. So we see that in terms of the development of the intertwined ideas of religion, magic and science, then “None of the traditions really continue independently after their origin. Religion, philosophy, and even science exert influences on each other. Only theology and philosophy are shown connected below their origins because it is hard to know what to call someone like St. Thomas Aquinas, primarily a philosopher or primarily a theologian. What philosophy contains that science cannot are real questions about Being and Value. Science must assume the reality of its objects, so it cannot have a critical metaphysical attitude; nor can it make any judgments at all about value, since some principles of value must be assumed in order to judge in some predictive or experimental way the value consequences of a scientific theory. What religion contains that philosophy cannot is the actual value embodied in large interpretative structures concerning life, the world, etc.: philosophy is only descriptive and has difficulty justifying any first principles that it might identify” [35]. Moreover, it is perfectly possible to take the relativist stance that “Ancient religions did not grow out of magic, and science does not address many, or most, of the concerns that have actually been central in traditional religion and philosophy. It is possible to go to the opposite extreme and reject any evolutionary sense of the development of human thought, saying that all forms of thought, in all places and at all times, are simply different” [35]. Yes this stance too has its problems since it “ ... does not address the dynamic of real changes that take place in the same places and to the same traditions. It is not much of a leap to say that those traditions, in their later forms involve levels of sophistication above

what occurred earlier” [35]. And there is also a return from science to myth if we acknowledge along with Feyerabend that “The content classes of certain theories are incomparable in the sense that none of the usual logical relations (inclusion, exclusion, overlap) can be said to hold between them. This occurs when we compare myths with science. It also occurs in the most advanced, most general and therefore most mythological parts of science itself” [109]. In this sense “ ... science is much closer to myth than a scientific philosophy is prepared to admit. It is one of the many forms of thought that have been developed by man, and not necessarily the best. It is conspicuous, noisy, and impudent, but it is inherently superior only for those who have already decided in favour of a certain ideology, or who have accepted it without having ever examined its advantages and its limits” [109]. In fact, we can conclude that “ ... science and myth overlap in many ways, that the differences we think we perceive are often local phenomena which may turn into similarities elsewhere and that fundamental discrepancies are results of different *aims* rather than of different methods trying to reach one and the same 'rational' end (such as, for example, 'progress', or increase of content, or 'growth') 'Primitive' thinkers showed greater insight into the nature of knowledge than their 'enlightened' philosophical rivals. It is, therefore, necessary to re-examine our attitude towards myth, religion, magic, witchcraft and towards all those ideas which rationalists would like to see forever removed from the surface of the earth (without having so much as looked at them – a typical taboo reaction)” [109]. We can go on to characterize this “false myth” of science by noting that “ ... the fairy-tale is false ... There is no special method that guarantees success or makes it probable. Scientists do not solve problems because they possess a magic wand – methodology, or a theory of rationality – but because they have studied a problem for a long time, because they know the situation fairly well, because they are not too dumb (though that is rather doubtful nowadays when almost anyone can become a scientist), and because the excesses of one scientific school are almost always balanced by the excesses of some other school. (Besides, scientists only rarely solve their problems, they make lots of mistakes, and many of their solutions are quite useless.)” [109]. We can go further in our comparison as well, and say that “Basically there is hardly any difference between the process that leads to the announcement of a new scientific law and the process preceding passage of a new law in society: one informs either all citizens or those immediately concerned, one collects 'facts' and prejudices, one discusses the matter, and one finally votes. But while a democracy makes some effort to *explain* the process so that everyone can understand it, scientists either *conceal* it, or *bend* it, to make it fit their sectarian interests” [109]. However even given these facts, in today's world, “ ... *science still reigns supreme*. It reigns supreme because its practitioners are *unable to understand, and unwilling to condone*, different ideologies, because they have *the power* to enforce their wishes, and because they *use* this power ' just as their ancestors used *their* power to force Christianity on the peoples they encountered during their conquests” [109]. In the case of the success of the “religion of science,” then, “The massive dogmatism ... is not just a *fact*, it has also a most important function. *Science would be impossible without it*” [109]. We are in a position today,

therefore, where “ ... while an American can now choose the religion he likes, he is still not permitted to demand that his children learn magic rather than science at school. There is a separation between state and church, there is no separation between state and science. And yet science has no greater authority than any other form of life. Its aims are certainly not more important than are the aims that guide the lives in a religious community or in a tribe that is united by a myth. At any rate, they have no business restricting the lives, the thoughts, the education of the members of a free society where everyone should have a chance to make up his own mind and to live in accordance with the social beliefs he finds most acceptable” [109]. There is thus a deep consequence of this understanding about the ideology of science, since “ ... as the accepting and rejecting of ideologies should be left to the individual it follows that the separation of state and *church* must be supplemented by the separation of state and *science*, that most recent, most aggressive, and most dogmatic religious institution. Such a separation may be our only chance to achieve a humanity we are capable of, but have never fully realised” [109]. So is there any possibility of “scientizing religion” or “religionizing science” to the benefit of both? – and the answer might be that “ ... the separation of science and non-science is not only artificial but also detrimental to the advancement of knowledge. If we want to understand nature, if we want to master our physical surroundings, then we must use *all ideas*, all methods, and not just a small selection of them. The assertion, however, that there is no knowledge outside science – *extra scientiam nulla salus* – is nothing but another and most convenient fairy-tale” [109]. We can put forward much evidence for this statement, for example the fact that “Primitive tribes have more detailed classifications of animals and plants than contemporary scientific zoology and botany, they know remedies whose effectiveness astounds physicians (while the pharmaceutical industry already smells here a new source of income), they have means of influencing their fellow men which science for a long time regarded as non-existent (Voodoo), they solve difficult problems in ways which are still not quite understood (building of the pyramids; Polynesian travels), there existed a highly developed and internationally known astronomy in the old Stone Age, this astronomy was factually adequate *as well as* emotionally satisfying, *it solved both physical and social problems* (one cannot say the same about modern astronomy) and it was tested in very simple and ingenious ways (stone observatories in England and in the South Pacific; astronomical schools in Polynesia ... There was the domestication of animals, the invention of rotating agriculture, new types of plants were bred and kept pure by careful avoidance of cross fertilisation, we have chemical inventions ... “ [109]. Moreover “primitive” science (or is that “magic”?) was naturally open to the spiritual and artistic, and “ ... we have a most amazing art that can compare with the best achievements of the present. True, there were no collective excursions to the moon, but single individuals, disregarding great dangers to their soul and their sanity, rose from sphere to sphere until they finally faced God himself in all His splendour while others changed into animals and back into humans again. At all times man approached his surroundings with wide open senses and a fertile intelligence, at all times he made incredible

discoveries, at all times we can learn from his ideas” [109]. And in this reconciliation of religion and science we are led to embrace the fact that “At base, the world may certainly be infinitely complex and random (the reductionist nightmare), but it also and ineluctably produces higher-order features. To explain the process, Cohen and Stewart coined the terms simplicity (a process whereby a system of rules can engender simple features) and complicity (a coming together of features that enlarges the space of the possible, where the patterns created cannot be deduced from the features of the components.) [110] Scientists therefore conceive generalized models (features) and test them against instances (serviceable approximations), but neither features nor instances are arbitrary figments of our imagination. Both arise inescapably (the mathematical proof is still awaited) from the way the world actually operates, and we recognize them because our brains/minds are also congruent with such processes. We therefore, they speculate, share a dynamic with the world that is both comforting and awe-inspiring, being at one with its warp and weft in a way that Spinoza would have recognized” [23]. And in our modern age we can even find a reunification of science and myth, for “In the course of the 20th century such thinking was taken up again with the intention of founding the mathematical sciences on logic. It was soon clear that this all-embracing project was unrealizable, as demonstrated in the rigorous, logical form of Gödel’s celebrated theorem. Scientific reasoning cannot be ‘self-founding’: it bases itself on that which partially evades reason, on intuitions or postulates. Contemporaneous attempts to reach a ‘theory of everything’ are vain” [13]. And so the eternal circle closes on itself, sealed with the fact that” These considerations allow us to affirm that an all-encompassing and universal discourse, as that which is found in myth, is not at all extraneous to scientific knowledge. Notwithstanding the difference existing between scientific and mythological discourse, it cannot be denied that myth may even have had a fundamental role in the development of scientific thought. Hence, myth is rehabilitated on the epistemological plain. Scientific creativity, for example, is not reduced to pure rationality; if it were, it would surely be impoverished. Certainly the exigencies of verification and testing are essential in every scientific procedure, but these activities serve as a control and are, in some sense, secondary. The creativity of the spirit is not exhausted in the rigorous, expository course of a demonstration” [13]. And so we can summarize the distinctions discussed above by recognizing that “ ... if science carves nature at joints of real importance, it still has enormous difficulties in answering simple philosophic questions – the reality of quarks, the nature of scientific laws, and so forth. Moreover, it deals with the morally neutral, and with abstractions amenable only to advanced mathematics. Nonetheless, science is distinctive in two respects. Broad agreement does exist as to how theories should be tested, refined and refuted. And science is much more objective and comprehensive” [23]. Nevertheless, “The classical ideal that rejected myth as a perverse fruit of the imagination, considered as an evil power, proved to be too naïve. A more profound knowledge of matter has shown that philosophical ideas which in certain epochs were able to explain the various modes of rationality became insufficient: determinism could not describe the relations and the

interrelations between the ultimate components of nature, and the notion of a 'clear and distinct idea' ... came to be set aside" [13]. There is definitely a mystical dimension even to the "physical" world in which we live and "According to a famous expression, 'reality is veiled'. It comes to be known little by little, and the more we know it, the more we recognize that we are enfolded in mystery. This perspective highlights the precarious character of many of the things we know and invites us to consider that the ideal of a transparent scientific language, an ideal that permeates classical science, remains utopian, since reality is much richer than our representations, and whatever new knowledge we acquire always poses even more difficult questions" [13]. And so we *must* seek " ... a science that has dropped such totalitarian pretensions [and which] is no longer independent and self-contained, and ... [which] can be taught in many different combinations (myth and modern cosmology might be one such combination)" [109]. And the new practitioner *must* be prepared to " ... study the major ideologies as *historical phenomena*, he will study science as a historical phenomenon and not as the one and only sensible way of approaching a problem. He will study it together with other fairy-tales such as the myths of 'primitive' societies so that he has the information needed for arriving at a free decision ... It is only *after* such a hardening procedure that he will be called upon to make up his mind on the issue rationalism-irrationalism, science-myth, science-religion, and so on. His decision in favour of science – assuming he chooses science – will then be much more 'rational' than any decision in favour of science is today" [109]. We can thus come to the conclusion that "We are objects, beings in physical space, subject to the same causal laws as other biological organisms. But we are also subjects, capable of thought, speech, self-expression and imagination. All life is mortal but only humans contemplate their mortality. All genes produce other genes, but not all yield creatures capable of love, Shakespeare's sonnets or the Song of Songs" [111]. Thus "The current argument between 'religion' and 'science' is deeply unnecessary. It involves a caricature of religion and a parody of science. It is structured around a set of absurd oppositions, between science and superstition, reason and revelation, knowledge and wishful thinking, as if scientists and religious believers were incapable of realising the limits of their respective domains. We need both: science to tell us how the world is, religion (and philosophy) to tell us how it ought to be" [111]. And so we are once again brought to remember the "exhortation to harmony" that "Religion and science are like the two hemispheres of the brain, one analytical, the other integrative, one speaking prose, the other poetry. Religion without science is blind to the workings of the world. Science without religion is deaf to the music of creation" [111].

Thus we once again confirm that language, which enabled and hastened the "split between symbol and world," precipitated the development of mythology, religion, magic, and science. And as a result of this split, we have seen that "Psychologizing cannot be brought to rest in science or philosophy. It is satisfied only by its own movement of seeing through, during which it (a) interiorizes, moving from data to personification, (b) justifies itself, even hinting at a deeper hidden god, (c) provides a narrative, told in metaphors, (d) uses ideas as eyes of

the soul. Literalism or monotheism of meaning is the greatest enemy today, and we should remember that definitions outside science, mathematics and logic are elusive things. Enigma provokes understanding. Myths make concrete particulars into universals” [76]. We have demonstrated the way in which “enigma provokes understanding” particularly in the context of magic and religion by describing “ ... the construction of a ritual space by conceptual blending. In this light, a magical ritual is a blended space consisting of elements from both a profane and a sacred domain ... The first, and most important [feature], is the ascription of magical agency necessary in order to infuse any efficacy into the ritual action ... Further ... linguistic blending between a sacred language and a profane, natural language is active both in the construction of a ritual space, and, by virtue of the default referential function of all language, in the construction of a symbolic underdetermined sacred space” [50]. We have moved on from the language of magic to show that “There is first the era of myth, in which a form of scientific thought can gradually be seen to emerge ... an era ... dominated by religious dogma” [24]. And now as science becomes sufficiently well established we note that “ ... this is perhaps the beginning of a new cycle. But are we free from fantasy for all that?” [24]. We realize that in this new age where “Fiction at a last broke away from science, myth from history” [24], “ ... many persons in search of spiritual self-understanding are enrolling for workshops and courses in ‘shamanic’ methods of personal discovery and revelation. Meanwhile psychotherapists and some physicians have begun to specialize in ‘shamanic healing techniques.’ ‘Shamanism’ has come, thus, to denote an alternative form of therapy; the emphasis, among these new practitioners of popular shamanism, is on personal insight and curing” [40]. Nevertheless, it is certainly true that the “ ... pathologies are authentic, and we do not need to reduce them to medical complaints or exaggerate them as spiritual suffering. In antiquity it was thought that the god constellated in the illness was the one who could take the illness away. Today that god is the professional analyst who ‘creates’ the illness by naming it, locking patient and therapist into endless power and erotic struggles in sadomasochistic therapy. Within each affliction is a complex, and within the complex is an archetype, which in turn refers to a god. Such gods, as in Greek tragedy, force themselves symptomatically into awareness as some force within ourselves” [76]. The conclusion of this is cloaked in religious terms since “Pathology therefore is the single vision, the reduction of the polytheistic consciousness to a monotheistic one, to the identification with one and the suppression or ignorance of the others. But just as pathological experiences give us an indelible sense of the soul, so there is psychological acuity and richness of culture in periods of historical decay, as individually in neurosis and depression” [76]. However we must be extremely careful to remember at all times that “Neuro-semantic ‘magic’ lies hidden in our words, language, and symbol systems. This ‘magic’ bridges the gulf between the external world and our experience on the inside of the world. Since we do not deal with the world directly, but only through neurological and linguistic transforms of the world – *everything depends upon our maps*. Wave a magic wand over the maps so that we change our abstractions (generalizations) of the world, then we delete different things, notice different

things, create different distortions – and presto, we enter into a new and different world” [3]. So herein lies “... *the secret* then to the *magical* powers and interventions of all therapeutic wizards – somehow, in some way, by various techniques, models, parables, myths, etc. – *they effect a change in one’s neuro-linguistic maps*. And, given that we *operate* in the world and on the world via our maps – when we change the map, we experience the ‘magic’ of a changes life. This results in changed thinking-feeling, changed behaviours, changed skills, and changed perceptions. The spell of the changed map transforms our internal world into another world. Suddenly, like Dorothy we open the door and realize that ‘we are no longer in Kansas” [3]. And so we are truly able to “... re-envisage and re-imagine the immanent enchantments of the divine creation which appropriately witnesses to the transcendent One through a polytheistic profusion of created enigmas” [7]. And we can add to this that “All these myths are at the same time the fruit of an historical reconstruction, a manifestation of the unexpressed desire to seek a perfection realized in history. It appears evident, then, that the strict separation between science and myth, in place from the moment the intellectual climate was dominated by rationalism, is in fact illusory. There exists a complementarity between science and the founding ancient narratives. What is necessary now is a work of discernment” [13]. We wrap up this section with an observation from a recent news article on medical studies which reflects the need for such “complementarity,” where the author comments: “One thing that always fascinates me ... is how reductionist, how mechanical, how sciencey and medical we like our stories about the body to be. This week a major new study was published on acupuncture ... There was no statistically significant difference between proper, genuine ancient wisdom acupuncture, and fake, ‘bung a needle in, anywhere you fancy, with a bit of theatrical ceremony’ acupuncture. There are three possible explanations for this finding. One is that sticking needles in your body anywhere at random helps back pain due to some physiological mechanism. The second is that theatrical ceremony, reassurance, the thought of someone doing something useful, and a chat with someone nice helps back pain. (The third option is ‘a bit of both’)” [112]. The author concludes that “[T]he placebo effect is not about a sugar pill, it’s about the cultural meaning of a treatment, and our expectations: we know from research that two sugar pills are more effective than one, that a salt water injection is better for pain than a sugar pill, that colour and packaging have a beneficial effect, and so on. Interestingly, there has even been a trial on patients with arm pain specifically comparing a placebo pill against a placebo ritual involving a sham medical device, modelled on acupuncture, which found that the elaborate ritual was more effective than the simple sugar pill” [112]. Thus we find that magic is everywhere and that “‘Placebo’ is not a unitary phenomenon, there is not ‘one type of placebo’ ... We don’t like stories and solutions like that for our health problems ... It is a brave doctor who dares to bring up psychosocial issues for any complaint when a patient has been consistently told it is biomedical by every newspaper, every magazine, and every quack in town” [112], and yet this is clearly a crucial factor in effecting medical “magic.” And discernment in the application of this modern magic is of course critical, for simply “Mimicking

the indigenous shaman's curative methods without knowledge of his or her relation to the wider natural community cannot ... do anything more than trade certain symptoms for others, or shift the focus of disease from place to place within the human community. For the source of stress lies in the relation between the human community and the living land that sustains it" [40] – and we could add “and within and between individuals in the community” – and in this sense, a balanced scientific ecology is paramount.

So from all this we conclude that “All human consciousness can be regarded as mythic, but myths vary widely in their compass and persuasiveness” [76], and that “ ...the identity of the self is so much a function of the nonidentical, of the dissociated, unarticulated myths, that self-identity must be derived from them” [70]. Now today “Even technological objects are invested with mythical power: the computer, for instance, owns these powers when it presents its results. Daily life bears continual witness to this dynamic. Also, scientific language produces myths, and does so under its veil of being the font of the truth, even when it does not tell the truth. Truth, to be such, must not confine itself to listening to only one source of knowledge, because it cannot be other than symphonic” [13]. Thus we might well ask: “Why do we separate the scientific, which is just a way of searching for truth, from what we hold sacred, which are those truths that inspire love and awe? Science is nothing more than a never-ending search for truth. What could be more profoundly sacred than that? I'm sure most of what we all hold dearest and cherish most, believing at this very moment, will be revealed at some future time to be merely a product of our age and our history and our understanding of reality. So here's this process, this way, this mechanism for finding bits of reality. No single bit is sacred. But the search is” [15]. And particularly in the modern age “ ... herein lies the real psychological power of stories. We can think of our lives as Hero's Journeys writ small. When we experience a story or a myth we are, in a sense, experiencing our own stories. The struggles and the challenges of the hero figure are also our own struggles and challenges that can require the very same heroic courage as the great figures from mythology demonstrated. And in this sense, we follow the same pattern or journey of the hero Joseph Campbell described” [8]. Indeed, “Jung also believed that each person has a myth that they're living in their life and they didn't make the myth up – there's a myth going on in each life but we are not the authors. The myths are the authors, they are making up, they are creating us. If you knew what kind of mythic story you were living you could live it well” [8]. In this sense, “ ... myths are the dreams of the people and dreams are the myth of the individual. And that's the link that they both are imaginative language but dreams tend to be the daily myth that we're engaging in which every now and then of course overlaps with a major myth. So one has to approach both dreams ... fairytales and myths with an imaginative metaphorical way of thinking rather than a logical way of thinking. They produce images of feelings we have and of course that's the direct link to fairytales and myths, they also speak in an imaginative language of feelings that we have” [8]. And thus to return to the start of this whole discussion of logos-myths, we feel that the most appropriate “ ... alternative to denying our Mythos with our discourse is to view our discourse or Logos as a sanctuary for the

Mythos. The Logos can be understood as that which *preserves* the Mythos as we tarry about in our everyday lives, doing and making. In this case, we can understand our discourse as the 'common sense' of a historical people which shelters and preserves the '*sensus communis*.' The 'common sense' serves the purpose of being a container which preserves the '*sensus communis*' so that it can be retrieved. Through the retrieval of the '*sensus communis*,' the community is reoriented through the transformation of the everydayness of 'common sense' through a ritual recovery" [19]. In this way, "Through ritual, a culture allows for an opening in the 'at-homeness' of everydayness through an existential transformation of everydayness by which 'common sense' becomes 'uncanny' and in which the '*sensus communis*' may shine forth as the latent meaning and ground" [19]. In terms of our lifestories in a modern age, then, "Science, taken in its widest sense, also produces certain works that are born from the purely imaginary, works that we call 'science fiction'. Science fiction novels have an important role in the structuring of the imaginary ... [numerous authors] today know how to utilize the paradoxes of the new physics to heighten the contrast with common sense and lead the spirit beyond the immediate. In these novels we rediscover the fundamental structure of myth ... We find there the determination of a territory in very simple geometric form (circle, square, or pyramid), or more complex form (labyrinth), where a universal drama unfolds in which benign and evil powers confront each other" [13]. And even in sci-fi we can read a heroic journey for the modern age, for "There follows a chain of events in which heroes pass through initial trials that suppose a certain amount of know-how to dominate space and time. In this context, the sacralization of numbers indicates a return to the Cabala and the recognition of the esoteric. These rules are presented today as a source of truth, but this is pure illusion since their 'sacredness' refers to the truth only in an indirect way, in the measure in which these numerical relations were used to express the profundity of the soul and the mysteries of the unconscious" [13]. And since " ... in many ways the individual, the person who acts rationally and individually, is himself a mythical creation" [76], and "The new tellers of fairy-tales to children and adults open out just this real horizon" [7], let us finish by linking the language of science with the magic of creation in the following "new fairy tale," and "Suppose the automobile existed only to serve as metaphor of creation? And we mustn't confine ourselves to the exterior, or to the surface reality of the dashboard; we must learn to see what only the Maker sees, what lies beneath. What lies beneath and what lies above. It is the Tree of the Sefirot ... But let's pursue the dialectic of the tree. At the summit is the engine, Omnia Movens, of which more later: this is the Creative Source. The engine communicates its creative energy to the two front or higher wheels: the Wheel of Intelligence and the Wheel of Knowledge ... The supreme engine lives by an alternation of intake and exhaust. A complex, divine respiration, a cycle initially based on two units called cylinders (an obvious geometrical archetype), which then generate a third, and finally gaze upon one another in mutual love and bring forth the glory of a fourth ... And lo, the glory of the Big Bang: combustion, expansion. A spark flies, the mixture of fuel flares and blazes, and this the handbook calls the active phase of the cycle. And woe, woe if in the mixture of fuel the Shells intrude, the qelippot, drops of impure matter like water or Coca-Cola.

Then expansion does not take place or occurs in abortive starts ... In any case, after expansion, behold the great divine release, the exhaust." [113]. In conclusion, we acknowledge that " ... in the end, if the whole of the cosmos has a point, or is its own point, the rituals of play and dance come closer to reality than the solemnities of work, skills, targets and means, so beloved of our current masters" [7] – As above, so below [114] – And so, "For tomorrow, I'll prepare a mystical interpretation of the phone book" [113], since " ... what ever man does, he converses with himself, rather than with nature, god, or the universe" [14]. And if we were to ask "Has Hollywood bought the rights to the collective unconscious?" [8], we could answer with a heroic "No!" – *if* we accept, and act on the understanding, that "Not to have a story is in fact not to be human, that one's disconnected from one's actual being. So we have to in some ways continue to re-mythologise ourselves, that is, we have to continue to stay in touch with our imaginative life and begin to construct if you like and renew the stories that we've had of who we are" [8] – "For it is when our metaphors obtain to a reality greater than lived reality that myths, monsters, and madness are born" [16]. And in learning to "re-mythologize ourselves" we must each learn that the whole struggle is about " ... language on the boundaries, language about language, about 'access to the power to signify' [17]" [16], and that in this way we can each become a "Lingwiz'd of Is" – " ... a writer and a rewriter, a reshaper, an appropriator, a refigurer ... [using] language 'self-consciously spliced' ... [eschewing] 'an original language before violation'" [16], to create an unfolding, enfolding logo-myth "in which everything is always that which it is only because it becomes that which it is not" [70]. We will thus be able to use our Psycho-chaotic, and Neuro-linguistic, tools to change core beliefs and values from those indoctrinated by the prevailing religious or scientific ideologies of our society, and fill the resulting "vacuum of choice" with empowering personal logo-myths which lead to true psychic freedom and power [115]. And this is the true creative nature of modern language, myth, magic, religion and science, melding to form a holistic unity, a "mascirelgic" for the new Millennium.

References

- [1] Crowley, A (1986) *The Book of Lies*. Newburyport MA: Weiser.
- [2] Cassirer, E (1962) *An Essay on Man: An Introduction to a Philosophy of Human Culture*. New Haven CT: Yale University Press.
- [3] Hall, L M (1998) *The Secrets of Magic*. Carmarthen UK: Crown House Publishing Limited.
- [4] Hyatt, C S (2002) *Undoing Yourself with Energized Meditation and Other Devices*. Tempe AZ: New Falcon Publications.
- [5] Rogers, K (1996) Lancaster University: On-Line Philosophy Resources from the Institute of Environment Philosophy and Public Policy: Archive of Student Work: Environmental Politics Since the Death of God. URL: <http://www.lancs.ac.uk/depts/philosophy/awaymave/onlineresources/studentwork.htm> [Accessed 26 September 2007].
- [6] Bandler, R and Grinder, J (1975) *The Structure of Magic I. A Book about Language and Therapy*. Palo Alto CA: Science and Behavior Books; Grinder, J. and Bandler, R. (1976) *The Structure of Magic II. A Book about Communication and Change*. Palo Alto CA: Science and Behavior Books.
- [7] Milbank, J (2007) *Fictioning Things: Gift and Narrative*: John Milbank: University of Nottingham. URL: http://www.theologyphilosophycentre.co.uk/papers/Milbank_FictioningThings.doc [Accessed 14 March 2007].
- [8] All in the Mind with Natasha Mitchell: *The Magic of Myth: Storytelling and the Psyche*: Sunday 7 September 2003. URL: <http://www.abc.net.au/rn/science/mind/s936388.htm> [Accessed 29 September 2007].
- [9] Leach, E R (1976) *Culture and Communication: The Logic by which Symbols are Connected*. Cambridge UK: Cambridge University Press.
- [10] Posner, R (1995); Pankow, C (editor) *Indexicality: Humans as Signs: Iconic and Indexical: Papers from the Symposium 'Indexikala Tecken,' Göteborg, November 1995*:

SSKKII Report 9604: pp. 97 – 117; URL:
<http://www.sskkii.gu.se/publications/Documents/html/Indexikality/> [Accessed 24 June 2005].

[11] Beyer, Jr, T (1995) Andrej Bely's Glossolalija: A Berlin Glossolalia. *Europa Orientalis* XIV, 2, pp. 7 – 25.

[12] Gethin, A (1990) *Antilinguistics: A Critical Assessment of Modern Linguistic Theory and Practice*. Oxford UK: Intellect.

[13] Maldamé, J-M (2007); Nicolosi, C (translator); Tanzella-Nitti, G, Larrey, P and Strumia, A (editors) *INTERS: Interdisciplinary Encyclopedia of Religion and Science: Myth*. URL: <http://www.disf.org/en/Voci/88.asp> [Accessed 29 September 2007].

[14] Buehler, L K (1999) *Reviews of Books by Ernest Cassirer: 29 May 1999: An Essay on Man*. URL: <http://www.whatislife.com/reviews/cassirer.htm> [Accessed 28 September 2007].

[15] Druyan, A (2003) *Committee for Skeptical Enquiry: Anne Druyan Talks About: Science, Religion, Wonder, Awe ... and Carl Sagan*. URL: <http://www.csicop.org/si/2003-11/ann-druyan.html> [Accessed 30 September 2007].

[16] Ake, S E (2007) *Metanexus Institute: The Global Spiral: Abigail S Kluchin: The Cyborg and the Golem: Part 1 of 2*. URL: <http://www.metanexus.net/Magazine/tabid/68/id/8123/Default.aspx> [Accessed 30 September 2007].

[17] Haraway, D (1991) *A Cyborg Manifesto: Science, Technology, and Socialist-Feminism in the Late Twentieth Century*, in *Simians, Cyborgs and Women The Reinvention of Nature* pp.149 – 181. New York NY: Routledge.

[18] Horkheimer, M (1947) *Eclipse of Reason*. New York NY: Oxford University Press.

[19] Robbins, B D (2001) *Mythos and Logos: Myth and Metaphor*. URL: <http://www.mythosandlogos.com/mythandmetaphor.html> [Accessed 29 September 2007].

[20] Heidegger, M (1977); Lovitt, W (translator); Farrell Krell, D (editor) *Basic Writings: The Question Concerning Technology*. New York NY: Harper and Row.

[21] Herzog, S and Moore, P (1978) *Man, Woman, and Priesthood*. London UK: SPCK.

- [22] Itzkoff, S (1971) Ernst Cassirer: Scientific Knowledge and the Concept of Man. Paris FRA: University of Notre Dame.
- [23] Holcombe, C J (2007) The Myth of Science. URL: <http://www.textetc.com/theory/myth-of-science.html> [Accessed 28 September 2007].
- [24] Yaguello, M (1991); Slater, C (translator) Lunatic Lovers of Language: Imaginary Languages and their Inventors. London UK: Athlone.
- [25] Schievella, P S (1997). Critical Thinking. URL: <http://www2.sunysuffolk.edu/schievp/file05.html> [Accessed 15 June 2005].
- [26] Zerzan, J (2005) Language: Origin and Meaning. URL: <http://www.primitivism.com/language.htm> [Accessed 09 June 2005].
- [27] Singer, J (1977) Androgyny: Towards a New Theory of Sexuality. London UK: Routledge and Keegan Paul.
- [28] Greimas, A J (1990); Perron, P and Collins, F H (translators) Narrative Semiotics and Cognitive Discourses. London UK: Continuum International Publishing.
- [29] Felluga, D (2007) Introductory Guide to Critical Theory: Modules on Greimas: I On Plotting. URL: <http://www.cla.purdue.edu/English/theory/narratology/modules/greimasplot.html> [Accessed 3 October 2007].
- [30] Roudinesco, E (1982) La Bataille de Cent Ans: Histoire de La Psychoanalyse en France. Paris FRA: Ramsay.
- [31] Gaines, E (2002) Semiotic Analysis of Myth: A Proposal for an Applied Methodology. The American Journal of Semiotics (Summer 2001). 17 (2) pp. 311-327.
- [32] Barthes, R (1972); Lavers A (translator) Mythologies. New York NY: Hill and Wang.
- [33] Milbank, J (1997) The Word Made Strange – Theology, Language, Culture: Pleonasm, Speech and Writing. Oxford UK: Blackwell.
- [34] Books and Writers (2003) Ernst Cassirer (1874 – 1945). URL: <http://www.kirjasto.sci.fi/cassir.htm> [Accessed 3 October 2007].

- [35] Ross, K L (2002). Myth, Religion and Philosophy. URL: <http://www.friesian.com/myth.htm> [Accessed 3 October 2007].
- [36] Jemmer, P (2007) 'Lingua Creationis' and the Creative Nature of Language. The Hypnotherapy Journal. Autumn 2007 pp 25 – 31.
- [37] Connelly, M J (1996) Longview Community College: Philosophy of Religion Course Notes: Mana, Taboo and Witchcraft: William Howells. URL: <http://www.kcmetro.cc.mo.us/longview/socsci/philosophy/religion/mana.htm> [Accessed 13 May 2005].
- [38] Howells, W (1948) The Heathens: Primitive Man and His Religions. Bakersfield CA: Doubleday.
- [39] Codrington, R H (1891). The Melanesians. Oxford UK: Clarendon Press.
- [40] Abram, D (1997). Spell of the Sensuous: Perception and Language in a More than Human World. Colchester UK: Vintage; Primitivism: The Ecology of Magic. URL: <http://www.primitivism.com/ecology-magic.htm> [Accessed 13 July 2007].
- [41] Padilla, R C (1989) Missions in the 1990s: View II. International Bulletin of Missionary Research 13 (October). pp 149-152.
- [42] Reisser, P C, Reisser, T K and Weldon, J (1987) New Age Medicine. Downers Grove IL: InterVarsity.
- [43] Van Rheenen, G (2003) Communicating Christ amongst Folk Religionists: Kingdom Missionary in Satan's Nest. Chapter 9 Impersonal Spiritual Forces. URL: <http://www.missiology.org/folkreligion/chapter9.htm> [Accessed 13 May 2005].
- [44] Via, D O and Gagnon, R A J (2003) Homosexuality and the Bible: Two Views. Minneapolis MN: Fortress Press.
- [45] Robinson, B A (2003) Ontario Consultants on Religious Tolerance: Types of Sin, as Defined by the Mosaic Code in the Hebrew Scriptures (aka Old Testament). URL: <http://www.religioustolerance.org/sinhebrs.htm> [Accessed 27 May 2005].
- [46] Ross, K L (2005) The Caste System and the Stages of Life in Hinduism. URL: <http://www.friesian.com/caste.htm> [Accessed 27 April 2005].

- [47] Sharma, S C (2001) Hindu Caste System and Hinduism: Vedic Vocations (Hindu Castes) Were Not Related to Heredity (Birth). URL: http://www.geocities.com/lamberdar/_caste.html [Accessed 27 April 2005].
- [48] Jemmer, P (2006) Abreaction-Catharsis: Stirring Dull Roots with Spring Rain. *The European Journal of Clinical Hypnosis*. Issue 5, Volume 6, pp 26 – 36.
- [49] Fauconnier, G and Turner, M (2003) *The Way We Think: Conceptual Blending and the Mind's Hidden Complexities*. New York NY: Basic Books.
- [50] Sørensen, J (2007) 4. Magical Rituals and Conceptual Blending. URL: <http://cogsci.ucsd.edu/~faucon/253/sorensen.4.pdf> [Accessed 14 March 2007]. Sørensen, J. (2006) *A Cognitive Theory of Magic*. Lanham MD: Altamira.
- [51] Feuerbach, L A (1841) *Das Wesen des Christentums*. Leipzig GER: Wigand.
- [52] Barth, K (1928) *Die Theologie und die Kirche (Gesammelte Vorträge: volume 2)*: Ludwig Feuerbach. Berlin GER: Kaiser.
- [53] Jung, C G (1958); Hull, R F C (translator) *Collected Works: Volume 11 (Answer to Job)*. Bullington Series XX. New York NY: Pantheon.
- [54] Tolkien, J R R (1963) *O'Donnell Lectures: 'English and Welsh,' Angles and Britons*. Cardiff UK: University of Wales Press.
- [55] Swedenborg, E (1749 – 1756) *Arcana Coelestia: Heavenly Secrets Contained in the Holy Scriptures or Word of God Unfolded Beginning with the Book of Genesis together with Wonderful Things Seen in the World of Spirits and in the Heaven of Angels*. London UK.
- [56] Leitch, A (1998) *On the Origins of the Enochian Language*. URL: <http://members.aol.com/AJRoberti/enorg.html> [Accessed 3 October 2007].
- [57] Malinowski, B (1954) *Magic, Science and Religion*. Garden City NY: Doubleday.
- [58] Toye, D L (2004) *World History Connected: The Emergence of Complex Societies: A Comparative Approach*. URL: <http://worldhistoryconnected.press.uiuc.edu/1.2/toye.html> [Accessed 27 May 2005].
- [59] Prayer. URL: <http://www.recipeland.com/encyclopaedia/index.php/Prayer> [Accessed 16 May 2005].

[60] Mozeson, I (2004) Edenics: The First Language. Article Number 4: Animal Names From Eden. URL: <http://www.homestead.com/edenics/> [Accessed 18 May 2005].

[61] University of the Witwatersrand: Department of Social Anthropology: Ritual and Power: Lecture on Myth Section 2. 31 August 2001. URL: http://www.gape.org/sasa/myth/myth_lecture2.htm [Accessed 29 September 2007].

[62] Smith, W R (1914) Lectures on the Religion of the Semites. First Series: The Fundamental Institutions. New edition, revised throughout by the author. London UK: Adam and Charles Black.

[63] Malinowski, B (1926) Myth in Primitive Psychology. New York NY: W W Norton and Company.

[64] Kluckhohn, C (1942) Myths and Rituals: A General Theory. Cambridge MA: Harvard Theological Review.

[65] Leach, E R (1970) Political Systems of Highland Burma: A Study of Kachin Social Structure. London School of Economics Monographs in Social Anthropology Number 44. London UK: University of London Athlone Press.

[66] Lévi-Strauss, C (1963); Jacobson, C and Grundfest Schoepf, B (translators) Structural Anthropology: The Structural Study of Myth. New York NY: Basic Books.

[67] Barthes, R (1982); Sontag, S (editor). A Barthes Reader: Mythology Today. New York NY: Hill and Wang.

[68] Gaines, E (1996) Media Construction of Cultural Identity and Myth: A Semiotic Analysis of *The Simpsons*. The Second Annual Conference on Applied Communications for The Institute for Research and Community Services. University of Pennsylvania, Edinboro. 28 September 1996.

[69] Barthes, R (1978); Lavers, A and Smith, C (translators). Elements of Semiology. New York NY: Hill and Wang.

[70] Horkheimer, M and Adorno, T (1972); Cumming, J (translator) Dialectic of Enlightenment. New York NY: Herder and Herder.

[71] Schmidt, J (1998) New School for Social Research: Language, Mythology, and Enlightenment: Historical Notes on Horkheimer and Adorno's Dialectic of Enlightenment. URL: <http://www.encyclopedia.com/doc/1G1-54098120.html> [Accessed 30 September 2007].

[72] O'Sullivan, T, Hartley, J, Saunders, D, Montgomery, M and Fiske, J (1994) *Key Concepts in Communications and Cultural Studies*. New York NY: Routledge.

[73] Silverstone, R (1988); Adler, R P (editor). *Understanding Television: Essays on Television as a Social and Cultural Force: Television Myth and Culture*. New York NY: Praeger.

[74] Heck, M C (1980); Hall, S, Hobson, D, Lowe, A and Willis, P (editors) *Culture, Media, Language: The Ideological Nature of Media Messages*. London UK: Hutchinson.

[75] Leskov, N (1974) *The Enchanted Wanderer and Other Tales: The Enchanted Wanderer*. Moscow RUS: Progress Press.

[76] Holcombe, C J (2007) *Religious Perspectives on Art*. URL: <http://www.textetc.com/theory/religious-perspectives.html> [Accessed 29 September 2007].

[77] O'Neil, D (2002) *Overview of Religion*. URL: http://anthro.palomar.edu/religion/rel_1.htm [Accessed 27 May 2005].

[78] Iamblichus (2003); Clarke, E (translator) *On the Mysteries*. Atlanta GA: Society of Biblical Literature.

[79] Perry, R (2004) *The Circle of Atonement: Should There Be Course Churches?* URL: <http://www.circleofa.com/articles/Coursechurches.htm> [Accessed 27 May 2005].

[80] Dow, J W (1986) *The Shaman's Touch: Otomí Indian Symbolic Healing*. Salt Lake City UT: University of Utah Press.

[81] Jemmer, P (2008) *From the Profane to the Religious: Language, Lies and Magic in Hypnotic Trance*. To appear in *Bifrons Creativity*. Number 8 April 2008; URL: <http://www.Bifrons.org.uk> [Accessed 5 October 2007].

[82] Turchin, V F (1977); Frenzt, B (translator) *The Phenomenon of Science: A Cybernetic Approach to Human Evolution*. New York NY: Columbia University Press.

[83] LaVey, A S (1969) *The Satanic Bible*. New York NY: Avon.

[84] Lenning, L G (1980) *Blessing in Mosque and Mission*. Pasadena CA: William Carey Library.

[85] Connelly, M J (1996) Longview Community College: Philosophy of Religion Course Notes: Magic, Ritual and Symbolism: Bronislaw Malinowski. URL: <http://www.kcmetro.cc.mo.us/longview/socsci/philosophy/religion/magic.htm> [Accessed 12 May 2005].

[86] Vaihinger, H (1924); Ogden, C K (translator) A System of the Theoretical, Practical, and Religious Fictions of Mankind: The Philosophy of 'As If'. New York NY: Harcourt Brace.

[87] Ellwood, R S (2007) Encarta Online Encyclopedia: Magic (Sorcery). URL: [http://encarta.msn.com/encyclopedia_761578842/Magic_\(sorcery\).html](http://encarta.msn.com/encyclopedia_761578842/Magic_(sorcery).html) [Accessed 29 September 2007].

[88] Frazer, J G (1922) Magic and Religion. New York NY. Macmillan Company.

[89] Shorter, A (1985) Jesus and the Witchdoctor. New York NY: Orbis Books.

[90] Crowley, A (1911, 1912, 1929). Magick: Book IV (Liber ABA). Part I. London: Wieland and Co; Part 2. London: Wieland and Co; Part 3 (Magick in Theory and Practice). Paris: Lecram Press.

[91] Pederson, J (1926) Israel: Its Life and Culture. London UK: Oxford University Press.

[92] Bely, A (1922) Glossalolija: Poema o Zvuke. Berlin, GER: Hermann and Company (Typographie: Epoque); Beyer Jr, T R (translator) (2001) Glossolalia: A Poem about Sound. URL: <http://community.middlebury.edu/~beyer/gl/glossenglish/glosseng.html> [Accessed 5 February 2005].

[93] Magic: Paranormal. URL: http://www.campusprogram.com/reference/en/wikipedia/m/ma/magic__paranormal_.html [Accessed 7 April 2005].

[94] Malinowski, B (1935) An Ethnographic Theory of the Magical Word: Coral Gardens and Their Magic: Volume 2. London UK: Allen and Urwin.

[95] Jemmer, P (2007) Glossolalia and Neuro-linguistic Programming as the 'Other Tongue'. European Journal of Clinical Hypnosis. Volume 7, Issue 3, pp 22 – 33.

[96] Jemmer, P (2007) 'De Tractatu Magicarum Linguarum' – On Dealing with the Magical Spells (of Psycho-chaotic Semiotics). European Journal of Clinical Hypnosis. Volume 7, Issue 4 (in press).

- [97] Jemmer, P (2007) 'Nomen Omen' – Language and the Nature of Names. The Hypnotherapy Journal Winter 2007 (in press).
- [98] Douglas, J D (editor) (1962) The New Bible Dictionary. Grand Rapids MI: Erdmans.
- [99] Tippett, A R (1967) Solomon Islands Christianity. New York NY: Friendship Press.
- [100] The Definitive Guide to Dhaman Sanskrit Mantra. URL: <http://www.users.totalise.co.uk/~anu/sanskrit.html> [Accessed April 2005].
- [101] Howells, W (1986) The Heathens. Salem WI: Sheffield Publishing Company.
- [102] Eco, U (1994); Weaver, W (translator) The Name of the Rose: Including the Author's Postscript. Fort Washington PA: Harvest Books.
- [103] Haft, A J, White, J G and White, R J (1999) The Key to 'The Name of the Rose' Including Translations of All non-English Passages. Ann Arbor MI: University of Michigan Press.
- [104] Tolkien, J R R (1979) The Silmarillion. London UK: Unwin Paperbacks.
- [105] Westermarck, E (1933) Pagan Survivals in Mohammedan Civilisation. London UK: Macmillan and Co.
- [106] Mitra, A (1994) The Role of Magic and Religion. Anil Mitra PhD: Copyright 1994: updated May 2003. URL: <http://horizons-2000.org/7.%20Archive/EDA/Magic%20and%20Religion/Magic%20and%20Religion.html> [Accessed 01 June 2005].
- [107] Lévi-Strauss, C (1983) The Raw and the Cooked. Chicago IL: University Of Chicago Press.
- [108] Bruno, G (1998); Blackwell, R J (translator) Cause, Principle and Unity. Cambridge UK: Cambridge University Press; Gatti, H (1999) Giordano Bruno and Renaissance Science. Ithaca NY: Cornell University Press.
- [109] Feyerabend, P K (1989) Against Method. New York NY: Verso Books.
- [110] Cohen, J and Stewart, I (1994) The Collapse of Chaos: Discovering Simplicity in a Complex World. London UK: Penguin.

[111] Sacks, J (2007) The Times: Register: Faith: Credo: Religion and Science are Twin Beacons of Humanity. Saturday 6 October 2007.

[112] Goldacre, B (2007) Bad Science: Medicalisation – Don't Take It Lying Down. The Guardian: Saturday 29 September 2007. URL: <http://www.badscience.net/?p=542#more-542> [Accessed 29 September 2007].

[113] Eco, U (1989); Weaver, W (translator). Foucault's Pendulum. San Diego CA: Harcourt.

[114] The Mystica: As Above, So Below. URL: http://www.themystica.com/mystica/articles/a/below_above.html [Accessed 27 May 2005].

[115] Jemmer, P (2006) Beliefs, Values and the Vacuum of Choice. European Journal of Clinical Hypnosis. Issue 4, Volume 6, pp 16 – 21.