

Appearance and Reality

Since no mythic thinker is aware of his mythic thinking, no one presents myth qua myth. So it is that myth does not come unto the light that its works be manifested by the light; it works in the dark, secretly, tortuously; the condition of its success and efficacy is that it remain undetected.

Again, since philosophy is the antithesis to myth, the most fundamental duty of the philosopher is to scrutinize his own thinking, to expel from it any ~~any~~ mythic influence, to erect walls and towers against its incursions. But to perform that critical task it is well to know myth not only in its roots but also in its branches; and as we have found a root in a mythic epistemology, so now we have to consider its two principal branches.

~~A mythic epistemology implies a mythic psychology and a mythic ontology.~~

Since epistemology relates knowledge to reality, a mythic epistemology implies both a mythic psychology and a mythic ontology. Mythic epistemology places the essence of transcendent, objective, <sup>ocular</sup> valid knowledge within the confines of <sup>ocular</sup> ~~ocular~~ vision. Mythic psychology works out a theory of knowledge in conformity with the requirements of mythic epistemology. Mythic ontology works out an account of reality in conformity with mythic epistemology and psychology. Such is the full mythic thesis.

But besides the mythic thesis there is also the mythic antithesis. It discovers that mythic psychology is, in fact, false. This discovery leads to a transformation of mythic epistemology; what before was an assertion, now becomes a

is to be discerned the very possibility of any knowledge, any transcendence, any validity, any objectivity whatever.

It is to be noted that the conclusion is like its premiss. The mythic identification of symbol and symbolized is ~~an~~ not rational. But there is the same exclusion of rationality in the ~~xxxxx~~ epistemological conclusion. For ocular vision is neither intelligent nor rational. According to mythic epistemology, the essence of transcendence, validity, objectivity, knowledge lies within the confines of ocular vision. It follows that the essence of transcendence, validity, objectivity, knowledge excludes intelligence and rationality. Intelligence qua intelligence and rationality qua rationality must be not transcendent but immanent, not valid but invalid, not objective but subjective, not knowledge but non-knowledge. Why? Because ocular vision <sup>which</sup> is neither intelligent nor rational, has been given the exclusive monopoly of transcendence

regulative hypothesis. The essence of transcendent knowledge still remains to be discerned in ocular vision; but that essence pertains, not to human knowledge as mythic psychology supposes, but ~~to~~ to a merely hypothetical knowledge that we do not possess. Finally, with mythic psychology rejected and mythic epistemology reduced to a mere hypothesis, mythic ontology cannot but be illusory: it talks about the things themselves that we ~~we~~ would know if we did know but, in fact, cannot know.

While an epistemology and a psychology have no effect whatever on the reality of things, they do exert a ~~not~~ notable influence on ontology, i. e., on our account of the reality of things. So a ~~mythic~~ mythic epistemology and psychology imply a mythic ontology. <sup>I</sup>~~ts~~ basic characteristics claim our attention.

For mythic ontology being is the reality of the given. It has been said, it is true~~x~~, that being is what we see. Still, for being to be, it does not have to be seen. Things do not come into existence as Jack or Jill turns to look at them; they already are; they are already out there waiting to be seen. In so far as one says that they are "waiting to be seen," one refers to ~~things~~ things as related to our powers of seeing

Ideology gives technical and systematic expression to the non-rationality of man as animal, the prerationality of the child, and the irrationality of the mythic view of transcendent knowledge. So it is that from an ideological premise there can be deduced conclusions characteristic of materialism, intuitive realism, and idealism.

For if the real is identified with what is known by animals, it is to be identified with what is to be known by sense. Neither intelligence nor rationality can be constitutive of knowledge of rationality. The real, then, must be the sensible, and the sensible must be the real. The conclusion is characteristic of ~~some~~ materialist, empiricist, positivist, and similar philosophies.

The implications of the mythic view of transcendent knowledge are more complex, for that view can be taken either (1) as an account of what our intellectual knowledge is, or (2) as an account of what knowledge would be if we were to know.

On the first alternative, one establishes the truth of ~~realism in general, e.g., the existence of an external world~~ realism in general and then proceeds to argue from the existence of valid intellectual knowledge to the existence of intellectual intuition. We have valid intellectual knowledge of universals, therefore we must see universals; if we did not see them, then our knowledge could not be transcendent. Further, we have valid intellectual knowledge of principles; therefore we must see the nexus between universals; if we did not see it, then we would not be really knowing principles. Further, we have valid intellectual knowledge of substance, causality, truth; therefore we must see substance, causality, truth; if we did not see them, then our thinking and affirming them would have to be purely immanent, for the ~~x~~ essence of transcendent knowledge lies in seeing.