

D 0120

Feb. 4, Theo 143

①

1. Sec. 2 needs fill-in  
on the last part of Feb. 2 lecture:  
various ways in wh.  
the new control of mg. is discussed.
2. We saw Monday  
that from the perspective  
of the two major thinkers  
from whom I am working,  
Lorenz and Jung,  
we may speak of  
three cultural epochs,  
three stages of meaning,  
in the course of the evolution of consciousness  
in the West: myth, realism, and interiority.

Other thinkers join them  
in pointing that we stand  
today  
at the beginning of something  
radically new  
in history,  
a new stage of meaning  
in terms of the differentiation,  
integration,  
and self-appropriation  
of human interiority.

The 1<sup>st</sup> fruits of this effort  
are revealed in our map or  
grid of consciousness, wh. is a  
synthesis of Lorenz and Jung.

I withheld judgment Monday  
on evaluating the emergence of  
the realistic stage from the mythic  
because the issue is very complicated.  
But it is necessary to talk more of it  
before entering into a discussion of the  
stage emerging before us.

Feb. 4, Theo 143

(2)

3. First, then, while I used Greece  
as a paradigm for the emergence of the second stage of meaning,  
Karl Jaspers,  
the first thinker, to my knowledge,  
to speak in this way of what happened at this period in time,  
indicates that the phenomenon cannot be restricted to Greece.

In Greece,  
it took the form of the replacement of myth  
as an understanding of the world  
or mediation of the world by meaning,  
with philosophy and science.

But at the same period of time,  
we find at least the following  
somewhat analogous phenomena  
in other parts of the world:

- a. In Israel, we have the rise of propheticism  
and then of the Wisdom literature.

Insofar as we can date  
the writings of the Hebrew Bible,  
it is possible to discover  
a major change in Israelite es  
with these two phenomena.

Many OT scholars  
have called  
what arose in Israel through  
the preaching  
& writing of the prophets  
an ethical monotheism.

It seems clear that prior to the prophets,  
the Hebrews were polytheists.

Yahweh was one god among many.

He was the most powerful of gods.

and the record of his power is recorded especially in Exodus.

Feb. 4, Theo. 143

5

Whenever the Israelites prevailed in battle,  
it was because Yahweh  
had defeated the other gods.

Each separate people had its own god or gods.

Israel's god was the god of Abraham, Isaac, & Jacob,  
and this was how he announced himself to Moses,  
thus establishing a continuity with their past religious history.

But the gods of the other peoples  
also existed,  
even if they were ineffective against Yahweh.

We find here  
a tendency of all mythic consciousness  
that is frustrated by the kinds of questions  
raised by the emergence of realistic consciousness:

the projection

of experiences whose meaning is interior  
upon what is exterior,  
spatial,  
and specific.

An extreme eg. is in Shintoism's 800,000 gods.

The prophets in Israel represent a breakthrough  
beyond this tendency  
in their affirmation that there is no other God  
but Yahweh.

The clearest example of this new understanding  
is in the writings of  
2<sup>nd</sup> - Isaiah,  
writing for the people in exile,  
and discovering that Cyrus the Persian  
was an instrument and servant  
of Yahweh's providence,  
even tho he did not know Yahweh as such.

Feb. 4, Theo 143

(7)

Connected with this monotheism  
is the realization that the drama  
is not going on between the gods,  
as for mythic consciousness,  
where human life is a matter of  
getting in touch with  
and re-enacting through ritual  
the cosmological drama in the other world.

No, the only drama  
was here,  
in human history,  
and worship of Yahweh  
was action in history.

What Yahweh wanted,  
said the prophets, one and all,  
was not ritual and sacrifice,  
but justice, mercy, and love among men.  
That was religion,  
and there was no religion without it.  
Religion was action in history,  
not reenactment of actions in heaven.

(Eliade)  
Cosmos & History,  
mythic & realistic cs  
contrasted.

4. This transposition of the home of ultimate meaning  
to history  
and of ultimate religious significance  
to justice,  
gave rise to the question that is central  
in the Wisdom literature:

The fact of the suffering of the just individual.

Two new factors are important here:

an emerging acknowledgment of the individual as responsible

Feb. 4, Thu 143

⑤

for himself  
and not as subsumed by a collective group,  
as previously,  
where the only individuals who are important  
are what Neumann calls the Great Individuals  
(e.g. Moses and the King)

-- through whom the rest of the people  
received their identity, and who really had no  
identity of their own,  
but were representatives  
of the collective mind.

Another characteristic of mythic es.

Now, and esp. with the end of the  
kingship as a central institution in Israel,  
the individuality of each person  
became important,  
and it was not the king who justified the people  
but the justice of the individual  
that justified the individual.

But did it?

At first, prosperity  
was taken as a sign of God's blessing  
upon the just.

Until it became incapable  
that it doesn't always work that way.

The just man often suffers unjustly,  
and the wicked man prospers.

What was it, then, to be justified?

The Book of Job attempts to answer the question, and we

Feb. 4, Thu. 1943

⑥

have the mind of Wisdom literature.

Wisdom literature is concerned with

the here & now,  
with everyday life  
in its everydayness  
its cares, joys, and sorrows.

Religion is here, if it is anywhere,  
not in ritual primarily,  
but in life,  
of which ritual is a reflection  
& celebration.

5. Jaspers finds  
at least two other instances  
of the emergence of realistic es  
from mythic es  
besides Greece & Israel:  
the appearance of the Buddha in India,  
and of Lao-Tzu  
and Confucius in China.

Most  
analogous,  
not to the science,  
or Hebrew propheticism,  
but to wisdom  
literature.

In either case,

the concern again is with life in this world,  
and with the problem of the suffering of the individual,  
which assumes a centrality not previously accorded it.

Then J. refers to this period (800-200 B.C.E.)

as an axis in human history. Lonergan summarizes:

"According to Jaspers, there is an axis on which the whole of human history turns; that axis lies between the years 800 and 200 B.C.; during that period in Greece, in Israel, in Persia, in India, in China, man became of age; he set aside the dreams and fancies of childhood; he began to face the world as perhaps it is." DM, 258.

Feb. 4, Theo 143

⑦

6. What is going on here? How are we to evaluate it?

I wish to focus here  
on the realistic stage of meaning  
as it appeared in Greece,  
and this for two reasons:

first,

I believe the other manifestations  
involve

a change in two differentiations of es  
that were already present, even if  
common sense confused w. one  
another:

✓ the religious,

whereas in Greece

the new stage

also involves the development  
of a new differentiation of es:

the systematic or theoretical. Prometheus.

(For L.,

there are 6 differentiations of es or realms of meaning:  
common sense (mythic or realistic),

theory,

art,

interiority,

scholarship,

transcendence.

In some blend or other, c.s., art, & transcendence  
have always been given, even if not differentiated  
one from the other. Theory emerged w. the Greeks,  
scholarship w. modern historical & literary studies,  
& interiority w. modern depth. Theory, moreover,  
has undergone a major change from the times w. rise of modern  
(science)



Feb. 4, Theo 143

⑧

Second, this new diff'm of cs  
has had a profound effect on our cultural sit'm,  
insofar as culture is an expression of cs.

Moreover,

we can evaluate this phenomenon best  
if we understand what happened to meaning  
in each of its 4 different functions:

cognitive  
effective  
constitutive  
communicative

---