

2 Cor 6 14 ff.

Do not be mismated with unbelievers. For what partnership have righteousness and iniquity? Or what fellowship has light with darkness? What accord has Christ with Belial? Or what has a believer in common with an unbeliever? What agreement has the temple of God with idols?

George Steiner, After Babel, p. 413

quoting Matthew Arnold, "St Paul and Protestantism":

Below the surface stream, shallow and light,  
of what we say we feel -- below the stream  
As light, of what we think we feel -- there flows  
with noiseless current strong, obscure and deep,  
the central stream of what we feel indeed....

Wilfred Cantwell Smith

quoted by Walter Conn, SR 5/3 75/76 p 222

"All religions are new religions, every morning. For religions do not exist in the sky somewhere, elaborated, finished, static; they exist in men's hearts."

Myth and Theology

A twofold ambiguity:

Myth (1) an ancient antiquated mistaken view of man and his world

(2) a theoretically inadequate view of man and his world

Theology (1) a high class word for religious studies

hence, an identification of theology with religion

(2) an allegedly theoretically adequate account of

(a) religion

Our usage: two apprehensions or accounts of religion or a religion

myth: theoretically inadequate account

theology: a tentative theoretically adequate account

An analogy

Eric Voegelin, The New Science of Politics, Chicago U P, 1952.

A condition of the possibility of a state, a polity, a regime  
is that it be apprehended and accepted by the vast majority of  
its members

A particular case of the more general point that there exists  
a type of meaning that is constitutive Method 76 cogn eff const comm

One is not an adult citizen of a country without some apprehension  
and acceptance of one's citizenship

One is not an adult Christian without some apprehension and  
acceptance of Christianity as one's religion

However there are many possible apprehensions

what is sufficient for one person may not be sufficient for another

what is sufficient at one time may not be sufficient at another

Hence with regard to politics Voegelin distinguished

ritual: apprehension <sup>h</sup>inherent in doing what is required

myth: theoretically inadequate apprehension

political science: theoretically adequate apprehension

Similarly with regard to a religion one can be a genuine adherent

with no more than a ritual apprehension

with a ritual and narrative but theoretically inadequate apprehension

with a theoretically adequate apprehension, a theology

### A Complication

We now come to the main point, the difference between the constitutive function of meaning and the other functions, viz., cognitive, efficient, communicative.

With regard to the latter, apprehension may be adequate or inadequate, and the only difference will be that one and the same object is apprehended, or effected, or communicated adequately or inadequately.

But with regard to constituent meaning, since the apprehension is constitutive of the object, an adequate apprehension is needed for the object to exist adequately, and an inadequate apprehension makes it inevitable that the object exists only inadequately.

So when the apprehension of the gods is mythical, the religion will be in a mythical phase, and when the apprehension of ~~the~~ God is philosophic, the religion will be in a philosophic phase, and when the religion is revealed, then the religion will be in a theological phase.

What is true of religion also is true of political arrangements: Ernst Cassirer has written on The Myth of the State; the myth is not a political theory; it is what the rank and file think the state is, and it sets the limit to what the state can be.

### Further Complications

We have been considering no more than the <sup>elementary</sup> implications of an abstraction, constituent meaning.

But there are further implications, some relevant to all cases of constituent meaning, others relevant only to the particular case of religion.

The most general implication is that constituent meaning is involved in a vicious circle: to have the object, one has to have the meaning; but acquiring the meaning comes by inspecting and understanding the object.

What is meant by a primitive tribe: one finds one, inspects its ways and manners, comes to understand why they are what they are. But the tribe needs that meaning to be what it is, to have its ways and manners, and to make them work more or less successfully. Theoretically it might

have inspected some ~~x~~ other tribe, but the first tribe could not have done so. Because of two reasons. Because it ~~ix~~ was the first tribe, there was no earlier tribe to inspect. Because it was not yet a tribe, there would be only families ~~ix~~ to do the inspecting.

Now this vicious circle is to be met by considering it to be a problem of genesis, How does constitutive meaning arise? How can it arise?

Really this is two problems. There is the problem of ontogenesis, How does the individual attain constitutive meaning? There is the problem of phylogenesis, How does the social or cultural group attain its constitutive meaning?

The solution to the former problem is familiar: it is in modern terms the process of socialization, acculturation, education by which the young are assimilated into the company of their parents and generally their elders. Again it is what Aquinas called *manuductio*, leading on by the hand.

However this solution has its complications. One can lead a horse to water but one cannot make him drink. There is a difference in pace in which socialization, acculturation, education goes forward. There is difference in the quality of the final products due to the difference in pace. There result differences in the goals set before new arrivals by the more or less successfully socialized acculturated educated parents and elders.

The phylogenetic problem is far vaster and we can barely touch on its main lines here.

There is the underpinning of emergent probability which combines classical and ~~xx~~ statistical laws to generate cumulative hierarchies of species, schemes of recurrence, ecologies (Insight IV)

Insight 211 if there is the process from intersubjectivity to primitive community (fruit-gatherers, hunters, ~~x~~ fishers) through the development of large scale agriculture to the AHC and the ancient empires of Egypt mesopotamia Crete, the Indus and Hoang-ho valleys, ~~x~~ the Incas and Mayas of south and central america.

there is the pneumatic differentiation of consciousness with the Hebrew prophets, the noetic differentiation with Greek philosophers, the modern tripartite differentiation of the noetic/

We have been considering general aspects of the problem of constitutive meaning

The radical vicious circle, the problem of genesis in the individual, the problem of the genesis of the constitutive meaning constitutive of the socio-cultural group.

We have now to turn to points that regard religion specifically.

First, we are apt to project into the ~~past~~ past distinctions that we take for granted in the present.

So we think of meaning as conceptually formulated and verbally expressed: Socrates found that the Athenians knew perfectly well what they meant by courage temperance justice but were incapable of offering satisfactory definitions

Again, we distinguish the intellectual and the affective and spontaneously we think of meaning as intellectual: but the distinction was unknown to the Hebrews who conceived truth as fidelity (keeping one's word) and doing good as doing the truth.

Again we think of religion as a distinct department of human life. But it could become a distinct department only with the emergence of priesthoods, sacred books, a separate social and cultural development of religious activity.

Again, the development of theology has emphasized the intellectual component in religion, but the fundamental component would seem to be affective: 1 Cor 13; and a free gift of God's grace Rom 5, 5; which God wishes all men to have 1 Tim 2, 3 ff.

An understanding of the relations between myth and theology presupposes that one can entertain the hypothesis

that the affective component in religion is the more important, that its mythical expression may expose it to dangers but ~~these~~ need not destroy it, that the difference in pace in which the achievements of the past are assimilated implies that symbolic apprehensions of religious concern are still necessary for a majority at the present time

on the other hand that high social and cultural development can hardly be combined in one and the same consciousness with a religious affectivity that has no more than a symbolic expression.

*C-S intelligence  
is not yet  
systematic  
defining  
intelligence*