

Eric Ramsey, Kimberly Singleton

Mytho-Poetic Contributions to Hermeneutics and the Philosophy of Communication

Studia Philosophiae Christianae 49/4, 25-40

2013

Artykuł został opracowany do udostępnienia w internecie przez Muzeum Historii Polski w ramach prac podejmowanych na rzecz zapewnienia otwartego, powszechnego i trwałego dostępu do polskiego dorobku naukowego i kulturalnego. Artykuł jest umieszczony w kolekcji cyfrowej bazhum.muzhp.pl, gromadzącej zawartość polskich czasopism humanistycznych i społecznych.

Tekst jest udostępniony do wykorzystania w ramach dozwolonego użytku.

RAMSEY ERIC RAMSEY
Arizona State University, USA
rer@asu.edu
KIMBERLY SINGLETON
Arizona State University, USA
kimberly.singleton@marquette.edu

MYTHO-POETIC CONTRIBUTIONS TO HERMENEUTICS AND THE PHILOSOPHY OF COMMUNICATION

Abstract. This essay begins from an understanding that the study of the of the psyche today is need of something. The ideas presented here are philosophical provocations suggesting by studying the psyche from merely a calculative perspective, we overlook the dynamic flow of language as an integral part of psyches. We wish to undertake the hermeneutic study of psyches, which is to say human beings in the fullness of their being-in-the-world. Language and the psyche are everywhere intertwined, yet how do we talk about these as collective phenomenon, rather than reducing them to separate, calculative functions of the brain? From our hermeneutic perspective we suggest that alternative discourses of myth and poetry are necessary for somehow twisting away from the privileged paradigms of empirical psychology and turning instead toward language. Thus, through our re-readings of the myths, Eros and Psyche, Echo and Narcissus, we demonstrate the inherent relationship between human beings and words. This relationship, then, will be essential for clearing the way for understanding our mytho-poetic orientation toward the world, liberating us from the rigidity of paradigm while still undeniably leaving us with the (loving) struggle for a fitting response to the world.

Keywords: hermeneutics, psyche, myth, poetry, paradigm

1. Myth as a paradigm for the loving struggle. 2. Mytho-poetic beginnings. 3. Philosophy as/is psychology. 4. Repeating a small but essential part of a poet's story. 5. Again, with a twist. 6. Making Way.

1. MYTH AS A PARADIGM FOR THE LOVING STRUGGLE

*It is not a question of being original;
it is rather a question of being in good company.*

Seth Balentine Johnson

That something has already been said ought not deter those who wish to say again what bears repeating. As if we were akin to the madman in Nietzsche's famous aphorism (already an echoing of Diogenes and his lantern-lead search) we wonder how we could not as yet have heard about who we are – *viz.*, that it is our nature to be poetic and every one of our communicative acts is a poetic co-responding, a poetic answering to a calling. These responses are always from within a context shared from the start with others and from this we see how essential communication is to our being together. We are always saying what gets said from within a space where a-having-been-called-to-answer by others has first called out to us. Let's put it this way: We are poetic because we belong to words and to each other. Why has this news, which originated in our earliest myths, not gotten to us, how have we not heard what seems so central to our living well?

We are told news travels fast. However, what moves fast more often than not must shed its deepest truth to become fast moving. This means the news reaching us about who we are, if it comes to us too quickly, might well retain little of the profundity it had when it was first having its say. When it comes to wisdom, speed is one of the problems in our technologically-driven desire for instantaneous responses and immediate grasping of facts. Perhaps inspiration taken from myths might sufficiently slow us down.

In this contribution to a philosophy of communication we shall search by way of two select myths for the right words so as to search for love and to search for what our *psyches* can do together with one another. We undertake this search in a strange relationship to paradigms, which might be as necessary as we are wary of them. The popular paradigms claiming it a virtue to offer us either/or, black/white, true/false answers may momentarily satisfy many of our day-to-day prag-

matic searches, however, when more pressing and complex questions such as those we face here arise, we find satisfaction again evades us. We search for what cannot be found at the speed of light or at the click of a mouse. The loving struggle remains for us, then, an answering to the call of language that comes from poetic nearness such that we must bring to bear words that ever engage in the struggle for avoiding fast, reductive, and once-and-for-all solutions. As we shall attempt to show, the myth of Echo and Narcissus along with that of Psyche and Eros orient us toward a non-reductive approach pointing to what is always near even if it remains seldom – if ever – addressed by popular paradigms.

That something is everywhere is no guarantee we give it its due attention. As one leading the way toward happiness says to those gathered to practice yoga: “We are not breathing,” so it is said by some of those trying to think communication “we are not communicating”. Of course, both breathing and communicating are ubiquitous, but this is no statement as to the wellbeing of either. We trust, moreover, this ubiquity, this sense of habitualness is how both manage to hide themselves right here and everywhere among us and all the time. Can we, by thinking against what is normal, ubiquitous, and hidden, end at the heart of the questions philosophy came into existence to answer and see too that at the heart of living well together is a call for an excellence in communicative practice which we shall tie to *poiesis*? We can, at least, begin, and we can do so by means of pointing toward our proper relation to the nearness of language and communication and in that pointing participate in our own way in the loving struggle.

2. MYTHO-POETIC BEGINNINGS

Havoc is always wreaked in fast cures for confusion.

Adam Phillips

Let us begin our orienting by way of listening to and interpreting the first few lines from the *Dao de Jing*:

The way-making that can be told
is not the eternal way-making
The name that can be named
is not the eternal Name.

The unnamable is the eternally real.
Naming is the origin
of all particular things¹.

Here we see, reading paradigms understood as rhetorical naming, words are the origin of isolating from among the whole particular things, granting immediately no name that can come to human speech and thus no paradigm will absolutely capture or say all that might be said of the endowing event.

Against this not altogether arbitrary backdrop, we begin by offering this provocation: No calculative paradigm that claims to be exhaustive will be the way-making and/or making way to an understanding of language and communication. We shall not be deterred by the obvious claim that this formulation is but ‘the paradigm of not having a paradigm.’ We must find a way and allow ourselves to step quietly and gently around this obstacle – one raised by the tyranny of calculation itself. Indeed our happiness depends on it. If we can stay within this as yet small clearing so as to stay near, somewhere within the oblique sight of the still obscure beginning of a path that might lead us to thinking about philosophy, language, and communication, then we shall have accomplished much.

That said, nevertheless, we agree with Heidegger “(...) we cannot get by in public without rubrics (...),” so let us recall with him here a mythological word, ‘hermeneutics’, a word that falls from its mythic truth at those times when it becomes merely a method and a too rigid a paradigm that names something particular. One of the interlocutors, the someone who questions in Heidegger’s *Dialogue on Language*, reminds us that hermeneutics is connected to the god Hermes

¹ Lao-tzu, *Tao Te Ching*, transl. S. Mitchell, Harper Perennial, New York 1991, 1.

“by a playful thinking more compelling than the rigor of science” and thus is connected to those who can bring tidings because they listen to a call, because like the poets in Plato’s *Ion* they “are interpreters of the gods”². In an attempt at an Ionic madness that might bring a glimpse of our poetic natures in its wake, we too shall follow hermeneutics as rubric, one oriented toward something more exulted than the rigors of science and thus more compelling than today’s paradigms of causality. To this end we say: Myth, of all things, will keep us grounded.

Furthermore, Heidegger helps us to think further along this path if we follow his discussion of myth and *poiesis* in *What is Called Thinking?* and *The Question Concerning Technology*. In the former Heidegger asks us to remember the distinction between myth as falsehood and *logos* as truth is the result of a separation that tore asunder a more primordial relation. As Heidegger writes: “Myth means the telling word (...). *Mythos* is what has its essence in its telling – what is apparent in the unconcealedness of its appeal. The *mythos* is that appeal of foremost and radical concern to all human beings which makes man think of what appears, what is in being. *Logos* says the same; *mythos* and *logos* are not, as our current historians of philosophy claim, placed into opposition by philosophy as such”³.

In this light we return to myth and by our interpretations attempt to set our nature into relief. This is all the more important today given the long tyranny of calculative paradigms. As Heidegger warns in *What is Called Thinking?*, the threat to our poetic and mythological nature is we shall “adhere with growing obstinacy to the trivial surface of [our] conventional nature, and acknowledge only the flatness of these flatlands as [our] proper habitation on earth”⁴. This flat habitation ignores myth at best and mocks it at worst because from this flattened perspective nothing non-factual could be true.

² M. Heidegger, *On the Way to Language*, transl. P.D. Hertz, Harper and Row, New York 1982, 29.

³ M. Heidegger, *What is Called Thinking?*, transl. J. Glenn Gray, Harper and Row, New York 1968, 10.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 57.

Indeed, it is right to say Heidegger in *The Question Concerning Technology* is under one name naming all calculative and reductive paradigms with the concept Enframing (*Gestell*). Accordingly, we understand his essay as a meditation in large part on what blocks *poiesis* from our view. This inability to see *poiesis* at our heart keeps us from understanding who we are. When he attempts to show how essential *poiesis* and truth (i.e., *aletheia*) are to our very nature Heidegger makes recourse to Diotima's lessons on love, which she shares with Socrates in Plato's *Symposium*. When Diotima reveals to Socrates, with another myth, no less, that "love's purpose is physical and mental procreation in [a beautiful] medium" she has just finished speaking of creativity and of things "coming into existence". This coming into existence she calls poetry or *poiesis*. If "every human being is both physically and mentally pregnant," as Diotima affirms, then those beings for whom it is their essence to be always already in *poiesis* have the potentiality for bearing creatively and linguistically words and discourses⁵. Moreover, we would do well to recognize that this capability to create, to build, and to make is the aim and struggle of *eros* itself. Put succinctly, we are always set to a beautiful pro-creative purpose⁶.

Myths are able to guide us toward understanding our fundamental relation with language and understanding ourselves as dwellers and doers within it. In this regard, Heidegger often points us toward the poet Hölderlin who tells us, "(...) poetically man dwells (...)". In this understanding of *poiesis* and human being, it follows that the true measure of our common existence does not show itself through one or another calculative paradigm but in the space of an in-between, as a dwelling place always measured first by poetry. Thus, the truths myths tell are revealed through the subtle nuances of language, through the ability to create with words the disclosure of our human being together, which speed reading often overlooks in its will to mere information

⁵ Plato, *Symposium*, transl. R. Waterfield, Oxford UP, New York 1994, 47.

⁶ See R.E. Ramsey, *Procreation in a Beautiful Medium: Eroticizing the Vectors of Communicative Praxis*, in: *Experiences Between Philosophy and Communication*, eds. R.E. Ramsey, D.J. Miller, SUNY Press, Albany 2003, 191–200.

exchange and absolute veracity. Perhaps a thoughtful consideration of myths, then, is necessary for helping us understand their hermeneutic possibilities. Myths will slow us down, cause us to reflect, and bring pressing questions into relief such that we might orient well our best conversations.

3. PHILOSOPHY AS/IS PSYCHOLOGY

Perhaps, in the end it is indeed charity that compels us not to forget the many stories that have been passed on to us, of which we are the heirs, at least insofar as they constitute our provenance.

Gianni Vattimo

We have been often told and it is said the study of the *psyche* belongs to empirical psychology. Yet the care of the *psyche*, the *eros* and *logos* of the *psyche*'s well-being does it not rightly belong, or at least belong as much, to philosophy? The love of wisdom that long-standing definition of philosophy first given in *Symposium* is, we suggest, the *logos* fitting to the *psyche*. To care about *psyches* one's own and one's own as necessarily related to others is first and foremost a care taken by doing philosophy. Furthermore, this philosophical care of *psyches* must be a philosophical care of communication and language because no *psyche* can show itself, can come to presencing outside of *poiesis*. Let us say, then, philosophy and psychology are in this way one. The love of wisdom is a love that discloses wisdom's benefit to our *psyches*. We love wisdom from our very souls in the hope our souls might find relief in wisdom.

To think about the loving struggle let us think about and engage in an interpretation of *psyches* and words as we encounter both of them in the myth of Cupid and Psyche⁷. In this context we need two intertwined lessons from the myth of Psyche: On the one hand to understand we are neither gods nor machines, and on the other language and com-

⁷ *The Myth of Psyche and Eros*, in: *Bulfinch's Mythology*, ed. Th. Bulfinch, Doubleday, Garden City 1968, 84-94.

munication determine the destiny of each of us, perhaps even the gods. Through our reading of the myth, we acquire an understanding of the loving struggle by observing Psyche's destiny as it unfolds among the various discourses between and among gods and mortals. As we have shown in some detail elsewhere, to care for the health of the *psyche* one needs always and at the same time an understanding of philosophy and communication that acknowledges the inextricable link between words and souls⁸. We shall cleave to this relation between words and *psyches* as we turn now to read selected moments in this myth.

Psyche's destiny is, as are all destinies, determined by words. When the myth opens, it is the words in praise of her beauty from other mortals that send her destiny on its way. When these mortals compare her beauty to the beauty of Venus, we learn soon enough *psyches* are not immune to the wrath that such words of comparison bring out from the gods. The curse imposed on Psyche by the envy of Venus is that Psyche's beauty will continue to produce "flattery" that is to say many words, but these hollow words will fail to "awaken love"⁹. What a most unspeakable fate, indeed, when words are disassociated from love. The myth acknowledges this horror, as later we learn the world is filled with "mournful lamentations" when such an estrangement occurs.

Although misspoken words by mortals determine the trajectory of Psyche's relation to the gods, other kinds of words work to restore her relationship and others to harm it still more. In the beginning of Psyche's way to love are voices, voices welcoming her to a home with Cupid and becoming her "vocal attendants". The power of words are shown to linger and call from beyond, sometimes from an unseen origin. In so far as words move souls, their effect is able to inspire passion and harmony, profoundly resonating in the *psyche* of those who hear them.

If words and voices can evoke bliss and tranquility through our poetic natures, it remains the case that through that same nature, ill-

⁸ See R.E. Ramsey, *A Hybrid 'Techné' of the Soul?: Thoughts on the Relation Between Philosophy and Rhetoric in "Gorgias and Phaedrus"*, *Rhetoric Review* 17(1999)2, 247–262.

⁹ *The Myth of Psyche and Eros*, op. cit., 85.

spoken or ill-intended words can damage and send astray those who receive them. We see this demonstrated when the supposed words of counsel from her envious sisters remain with Psyche, provoking her suspicion and curiosity where soothing words of love once reigned. Psyche learns a difficult lesson when she gives in to her low curiosity; to wit, love is not allowed to guide us as long as jealousy, suspicion, and resentment are indulged.

The myth tells us that nothing, no matter how much, will be by itself sufficient for sustaining the soul without also including love. Through the course of the myth as ignorant desires injure Psyche still more and to her very heart at the loss of Cupid we come to understand Psyche requires the power of words to be healed. She is not alone in this; even the gods need words. That is to say, words inspired by love are required to intercede on behalf of the wounded love of Psyche and Cupid. Through a supplication before Jupiter, Cupid's words win favor with him and persuade Jupiter who in turn brings the case to Venus. Echoing Cupid's words, Jupiter wins the consent of Venus to reunite the lovers, and thus allowing him to summon Mercury (Grk. Hermes) to bring Psyche to the heavenly assembly. The myth tells us the gods, whose words can instigate both blessing and curse for we mortals, also must converse with one another, must attempt to persuade and make appeals to one another, and share meaningful discourse with one another about the care and maintenance of divine and mortal worlds.

In the wake of our readings of these struggles and punishments induced by the gods and made real through words, we learn this hermeneutic lesson: For gods to touch humans, for them to say something to humans, the gods must pass through *poiesis* a risk even for a god. That is to say, humans are able to 'hear' the gods because the gods come to them through words, and words can only come meaningfully to those who occupy that poetic dwelling we have called *poiesis*. For we mortals, another lesson follows: Dwelling within *poiesis* we are never all that far from the gods, no matter how god-forsaken we or our situation might seem.

Consequently we see that earthly *psyches* cannot be equated with the gods, but we do not learn their truth when we pursue the opposite extreme, *viz.*, regarding *psyches* as nothing more than what one finds in any reductive or calculative paradigm. *Psyche* names what it means to dwell and dwelling names what it means to be in *poiesis*. For the well-being of all of us, then, let us believe love pleads the cause of the soul where dwelling among words is the condition for the possibility of hermeneutics. So too, let us take care because voices carry and words carry on continuing to have consequences beyond their initial saying.

4. REPEATING A SMALL BUT ESSENTIAL PART OF A POET'S STORY

To speak of a first word is a contradiction in itself.

Hans-Georg Gadamer

The poet to whom we shall now direct an ear so as to be shown another mythical way toward the nearness of *poiesis* is Ovid. Ovid tells us in Book III of the *Metamorphoses* about a nymph, resounding Echo she is called. Although the tradition has seemingly been more interested in Narcissus with whom Echo shares this myth, we suggest (*pace* Freud), it is Echo whom we find (as) appealing because it is she who discloses to us our appropriated nature. Thus, this is for us not just any story. To the contrary, in one small part of this poem we might catch a glimmering reflection of ourselves – we would be wise to believe in the veracity of these poetic thoughts because we are here shown who we are.

But then who are we in this regard? To start, the poet tells us we are: “resounding Echo (...) whose speech [is] strange;/ for when she heard the words of others she could not keep silent, yet she could not be the first to speak”¹⁰. In the confines of Ovid’s story he is forced to mistake Echo’s speech as strange, yet it turns out he may have known much more than he knew. If Echo’s speech is strange, we suggest, it is not in that it says again or only says what it has just heard, but strange

¹⁰ Ovid, *The Metamorphoses*, transl. A. Mandelbaum, Harcourt Press, New York 1993.

because so few if any of us listen well enough to be properly oriented to our corresponding natures. Furthermore, what the poet calls Echo's "punishment", as we shall see, is understood by us rather as a favoring that borders on the concept of grace.

After Echo sees Narcissus for the first time (one "when just born was already worthy of much love"), Ovid traces her longing and says of her and in doing so further delineates the exceptional design of the human condition: "But she cannot begin to speak: her nature forbids this;/ and so she waits for what her state permits:/ to catch the sounds that she can then give back in her own voice"¹¹. As Echo speaks only what has been uttered, in a similar manner, tradition indicates our always already having been exposed to others, to words, to meanings, and understood together to the orientation they embody. We gather understanding in light of tradition informing our present circumstance, allowing us to say – in our own voice – what the past has already informed.

Perhaps Echo's so-called curse, then, is for us a favored place for exploration into the possibilities of language. Clearly the moments of creativity in echoing, were already hinted at by Diotima: "It's always creativity, after all, which is responsible for something coming into existence when it didn't exist before"¹². Even as tradition, not existing before, does not come from nothing, so echoes re-call tradition, but still not tradition as such. On the contrary, tradition can speak through echoes in a revitalizing way. However, the responsibility returns to us, not to make a foundation of or solidify any single meaning from these echoes, but to gather a meditative focus through poetic practices. It follows that this focus is neither a static reproduction of tradition nor a frantic running around in all directions, rather a creative practice of struggling between conformity and self-expression. And of this practice, Diotima might say "all artifacts are actually creations or poems and that all artisans are creators or poets"¹³. As dwellers in the poetic,

¹¹ Ibid., 92.

¹² Plato, *Symposium*, op. cit., 47.

¹³ Ibid.

then, we bear this struggle with words as creative echoes from an always-to-be re-vitalized tradition.

This, then, is our nature and as such the nature we must embrace if we are to prepare for a turning toward our happiness that is, if we are to get a handle on our lives and our living well in relations with one another. We are Echo, but also a bit of Narcissus, as we are not the ultimate initiators of our own discourses either originally or derivatively. Also we are echoes because the tradition has its hold on us, indeed we are in thrall to it. In this way history, tradition, and the having been are like Narcissus the tradition must love itself, that is its nature. It tries to get in touch with itself, but it cannot do this alone. On this understanding, Narcissus needed Echo's love, but did not know it. Thus, a withering away awaits those going it alone, who need the other's love but do not know it, a little bit sad those who want only the same – the mere reflection and repetition of what is or has been. Thus we need to be a bit like Narcissus, yet a Narcissus awakened by the other.

Understanding our need for others' love, we can focus our concern on this: the tradition needs us as listeners and echoes of it. "In her own voice" for us here, today, must mean something such as: A voice marked in this history, in this epoch, in the face of this set of constraints. Yet we must, somehow, find ways to make this repeating something other than a mere repetition. As if this task of unique repetition were not pressing enough, in addition and more fundamental, we are Echo in the former sense of *poiesis* articulated above, a sense more primordial and essential to language itself and thus to our well being and the possibility of a future. Just as Echo's repetitions caused new meaning to emerge in the world, so we must take care to repeat the tradition with an inflection that causes something other to pass into circulation, some other fragment to be joined to the loving struggle we did not begin nor which we can we bring to a close.

5. AGAIN, WITH A TWIST

Everywhere I go, I find a poet has been there before me.

Sigmund Freud

Repeating in the genius that is his own voice, Heidegger seems in poetic measure to echo Ovid, a poet whom he does not name directly in his essay, when he writes: “[The Way-making] movement delivers Saying to speech. Saying keeps the way open along which speaking, as listening, catches from Saying what is to be said, and raises what it thus has caught and received into the sounding word”¹⁴.

We are then, at heart, in essence, and “before” anything else for both poet and philosopher (an) echo. To begin a philosophy of communication with the popular claim we are the “animal with speech” must, we believe, be first and always to say we are echoes – we are an answering and a responding to the yielding event of appropriation (*Ereignis*): “In our speaking, as listening to language, we say again the Saying we have heard”¹⁵.

We suspect this echo will not sound pleasing to the more literal minded among us or at best it will initially have an unsettling effect. It is more than likely to have a sense of rubbing us the wrong way and making us ill at ease, even if it claims to be lovingly directed to our happiness. After all, the accusers will say, are we not the masters of speaking, the ones who already know better than others how to do things with words, are we not already the ones who know how to be successful rhetors? Admitting freely there is no way to the other without some self-love, we might be better off overcoming an over-wrought, all-too-humanist self-love because in this type of self-love we are turning away and moving away from listening to the call to respond, turning toward that place where self-love leads to losing one’s self.

Our listening before speaking will not be easy given the way things are. The first thing, if not the only thing, we are likely to hear is the clamor-

¹⁴ M. Heidegger, *On the Way to Language*, op. cit., 131.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 124.

ing exchange of information because the way of understanding language and communication is today commandeered by enframing and calculative thinking, which attempts to order everything that is, while simultaneously speeding up all it has captured and reduced. Rather than being in touch with our echoing nature, related to our listening in the proper way, and assuming our favored place as the poetic benefit of language, we instead find we have mistaken ourselves as having dominion over language and communication. Each new conquest takes us farther from ourselves and increases the distance from what is near. In this way communication is lost or at least is in hiding (we have lost sight of it and in its place has grown disciplines). Moreover, many practices of the disciplines participate in the very hiding of our poor relation to our ground in *poiesis*. Furthermore, these practices do so most adeptly and secretively when they are at their most public and most rewarded. Hiding from ourselves is best accomplished when doing the work we all would deem necessary. This increases the difficulty of our task as it also makes it more necessary.

We find that it is never quite enough just to say what you want. How shall we share, then, the loving struggle when the paradox of our searching is this: We are required to pursue with care and deliberation what we have already been granted and left to safeguard, yet has escaped us and often leads us far from what is somehow always near?

6. MAKING WAY

*But suppose we question this basic presupposition.
Perhaps the goods that are circulating in our social practices
are never strictly one's own.*

Calvin O. Schrag

Let us be bold – but here our courage toward the loving struggle has nothing to do with anything willfully heroic – rather our boldness is born of a wakeful and radical responsiveness, an open listening to the very mytho-poetic ground of who and how we are. Let us go, then, to the end of Heidegger's *The Way to Language* where we find unconcealed the be-

ginning of a therapeutic; a ground cleared and uncovered by the rigorous showing that has preceded it. There we find an injunction, a call to let the noisy seductions of all enframing paradigms fall away, a call to let them be, a call to check our curiosities about them even as we shall need them yet at another time. An offer to make a little preparation for our future happiness is proffered: “We might perhaps prepare a little for the change in our relation to language. [Perhaps] this experience might awaken: All reflective thinking is poetic, and all poetry [in turn] is a kind of thinking. These two belong together by virtue of that Saying which has already bespoken itself to what is unspoken because it is thought as thanks”¹⁶.

If we seek the essence and ground of our poetic selves as communicative beings, then a philosophy of communication shall be required to drop every calculative paradigm of mere cause and effect (again, even if we shall no doubt need them at another time) and turn toward a mytho-poetic orientation embodying our proper relation to our corresponding nature in *poiesis*. Without such a turning and orientation we shall remain too far from ourselves and from one another, too far from our proper relation to the appropriating event, too far from the ground whence a genuine challenge to the disaster might show forth.

As beings such as Echo, whose nature is to be ever listening for the chance to say something, it is as if we have been given over to our nature by we know not what. And yet here we are: Our *psyches* have been set aside, that is *favored* for this our proper purpose, by the appropriating event as we learn from myth. Unlike the mythical Echo this is not a curse or “defect, however, but rather an advantage by which we are favored with a special realm”¹⁷. This realm, toward which Heidegger gestures, is the realm where we “dwell as *mortals*”. Faith and testimony, then, about which we can say nothing here other than to mark their equally essential nature, are fundamental to the study of our vulnerable relation to the ground and essence of language and communication. It is our favored nature to have been set aside in *poiesis*, to be appropriated by language. We wonder if we are able to be grateful that we are echoes who must listen before speaking.

¹⁶ Ibid., 136.

¹⁷ Ibid., 134.

This mytho-poetic orientation, if not a strict paradigm, is, in any event, the fragile “along which” we shall have to ponder if our happiness and the loving struggle undertaken as doing philosophy of communication is our honest concern. This orientation is neither an enframing paradigm nor even perhaps a *modus*: “But the melodic mode, the song which says something in its singing”¹⁸.

So a curative melody makes its way near and means to awaken us – “come, come” it says again and again, somehow you’ll have heard, “*poiesis* awaits” – belonging, resounding, orienting. In making possible the loving struggle, it says again but not altogether merely to repeat: “Let’s meet”.

REFERENCES

Heidegger M., *On the Way to Language*, transl. P.D. Hertz, Harper and Row, New York 1982.

Heidegger M., *What is Called Thinking?*, transl. J. Glenn Gray, Harper and Row, New York 1968.

Lao-tzu, *Tao Te Ching*, transl. S. Mitchell, Harper Perennial, New York 1991.

Ovid, *The Metamorphoses*, transl. A. Mandelbaum, Harcourt Press, New York 1993.

Plato, *Symposium*, transl. Robin Waterfield, Oxford UP, New York 1994.

Ramsey R.E., *A Hybrid ‘Technê’ of the Soul?: Thoughts on the Relation Between Philosophy and Rhetoric in “Gorgias and Phaedrus”*, *Rhetoric Review* 17(1999)2, 247–262.

Ramsey R.E., *Procreation in a Beautiful Medium: Eroticizing the Vectors of Communicative Praxis*, in: *Experiences Between Philosophy and Communication*, eds. R.E. Ramsey, D.J. Miller, SUNY Press, Albany 2003, 191–200.

The Myth of Psyche and Eros, in: *Bulfinch’s Mythology*, ed. Th. Bulfinch, Doubleday, Garden City 1968, 84–94.

¹⁸ Ibid., 135.