The introduction was particularly touching because I was reflecting on how difficult it is to communicate what I end up studying. Sometimes people will say of my lectures-- it was wonderful but I didn't understand a word. What provokes that? What is it that establishes the difficulty of communicating with respect to what I end up studying? The difference between the two spheres, psychology and spirituality. Their points of departure are different. Medical psychology begins with the study of alienation in the form of pathology and hopes to arrive at wholeness. The movement from beginning to consummation is understood as a process. Happily there are many successes.

Spirituality begins with the study of differentiation, which is not a mark of alienation. It contemplates differentiation in a particular manner. It studies it in such a manner that a trans-relational intuition is awakened and a discovery is made of wholeness. It is called enlightenment, though no one who has undergone it would imagine himself enlightened since in a deep sense there is not a person there. Therefore there is a deep difference in the character of identity between the two.

Driving here I was thinking on the calendar day this happens to be. It is the first day of the Lenten season. It might appear there is no relation between that and the title of this discussion. There is a strict relation, however. The spirit of Lent is not peculiar to Christianity. During Lent there is a question that recurs-- how we need forgiveness for things we have done we ought not to have done, and for things we ought to have done and did not. It raises the question what is sin, not a word psychologists are fond of. In the spiritual tradition it is taken seriously. There is a distinction between the spiritual and ethical traditions, they must not be conflated. Sin is taken from the Greek word meaning missing the mark. But it doesn't tell us what the mark is. I would like to contemplate with you what that mark is and the implications from the I Ching and Gen. 2.

We generally think of sin in terms of something done against the law, e.g., the Decalogue. Jesus regarded the essence of the law was loving God with one's whole heart, mind, soul and strength, and one's neighbor as one's self. That is not nearly so clear as what is graven on stone. So, far from the concept of breaking the law, sin is missing the mark of our Origin. Our origin as ____ is timeless, a beginning that is prior not previous, our true nature. To have missed our true nature is to find oneself in a desperate state of confusion even if one is not aware of the despair. The figure is an image of our origin, Tao, equivalent in some respects to our word God:

```
                    Tao
                    / \
                 - -   ---
                /     \
              - -       ---
              ---
             /           \
           - -             ---
           - -             ---
           ---
          /                  \---
        - -                  ---
        - -                  - -
        ---
```

The Chinese would start at the bottom and build up. We'd put God at the top, that's why I drew it this way. From Tao, we move into differentiation of the feminine and masculine energy. There is a further movement that doubles it, heaven and earth in their feminine and masculine aspects. There is a further differentiation now with the three lines representing earth, humankind and heaven. These are still within the original differentiation. We have not in terms of our nature left Tao. Do you see the two lines moving from masculine to feminine? On p. 274, paragraph 10:

> "The Creative is heaven, therefore it is called the father. The Receptive is the earth, therefore it is called the mother.
>
> "In the trigram of the Arousing she seeks for the first time the power of the male and receives a son. Therefore the Arousing is called the eldest son.
>
> "In the trigram of the Gentle the male seeks for the first time the power of the female and receives a daughter. Therefore the Gentle is called the eldest daughter."

It appears we are dealing with something sequential in the temporal order. That is a mistake. Upon the same instant the female receives a son, the male receives a daughter. There is never a time when temporality separates the feminine and the masculine.

Hexagram 51, line 1b: "'Shock comes-- oh, oh!' Fear brings good fortune." There it does appear there is something in the temporal order. The word translated "fear" should be retranslated. Dread is a better translation. It contains three images, the first, *hsin*, heart/mind, is taken from a graph of the heart. It is not regarded as separable from the mind. The second image means a carpenter's square. So you have heart/mind and a carpenter's square. The image square has been unpopular for a couple of decades. The third image is sail which has the cognate meaning wind. Heart/mind, wind, carpenter's square. What do these images suggest? Wind suggests the power to go where one will. The square suggests effort toward an objective and solid workmanship toward that end. Heart/mind the emotional and intellectual center. How do you get heart/mind together with spirit and the task of building well?

From the Chinese perspective, we haven't left Tao. From the Doctrine of the Mean: Tao is that from which one cannot deviate. Anything that can be deviated from is not Tao.

Let us look at the first line of 57, the correlative line. The corresponding heart/mind stance on the part of the feminine to the dread stance on the part of the masculine is shown here. The a) text is not the sort of thing usually associated with the feminine: "In advancing and in retreating, the perseverance of a warrior furthers." We are accustomed to thinking it is the other way. Culturally we associate women with dread. The Chinese were hardly matriarchal. Look at that apparent inversion. Since each bears both these energies, we must bring together dread and the perseverance of the warrior. There is never any time out.

In Gen. 1 we begin with what is called God, Elohim, drawn from the concept of strength. In Gen 2 it is Jahweh Elohim. Elohim as Jahwehed is possessed of breath, spirit. Gen 2:7-- "and the man became a living being." We bear within us God's breath. We don't tend to think about that. We think of almighty God up there and us poor chickens down here.

The first thing to consider-- differentiation within divinity. Radically, Elohim is differentiated as Jahweh. Jahweh is a breather. Contemplate breath-- it is a pulse. When we breathe out there is a point at the conclusion which is pleasant, but it doesn't last long. If it lasted a fraction of a second longer we would become alarmed. We must not think that we don't have that in common with Divinity according to the distinction here. Jahweh refers to becoming. We then as breathers too, an image for spirit, bear within us the breath of God, Jahweh. Jahweh is not a baby god born of Elohim. Where is the separation? Differentiation, yes. This is not what we've been brought up to think. Where is the separation at the level of breathing between us and God?

Oh! some would say, he must be a pantheist! This has nothing to do with labels. Whatever cognitive agony you're having, try to stop it and exercise with me a little dread. That is called stopping at the back of a thing, not trying to get in front. That is the movement of dread which has nothing to do with cowardice.

Jahweh might be interested in our becomings. He is a tricky fellow. Remember Moses? Jahweh was interested in his career. It also says Jahweh set out to kill him.

There is something about process, becoming, that requires going back to the origin Elohim. Somehow we have to get the three together of carpenter's square, wind, and heart/mind. Unless we give ourselves airs about our humanity as compared to animals-- "a living being is also what animals are called" therefore there is a great continuity "on down the line." There is no stepping out of God.

Gen 2:8: "In the east [in the front of]..." that's our first sense of something we are up against as an horizon. Yet this is supposed to be paradise. It just says Eden (delight) and garden. The word paradise originates from the Greek translation. Garden is from a word meaning to surround. He puts the Adam there. There is only the definite article in Hebrew. It refers to class or essence, so we are dealing here with human nature which is put in an enclosure which happens to be a place of delight.

2:15 is very strange because it repeats. Scripture tends to be economical. Look what happens. He took the Adam and put him in the garden, and there is something new: he is to till (cultivate) and keep (protect) it. To cultivate requires a certain attitude with respect to heart/mind, as does protecting. So far, we have heard nothing from the text about paradise. You don't work there, certainly there would be nothing to protect, and who needs warriorhood there? Obviously though he is in danger of encroachment or invasion. What could you expect from Jahweh the breather except one thing after another? Isn't that peculiar to our life? Even if we don't look for something, things come at us. We are always being confronted. This is not a story about how things wonderfully were, but about life in the present. Life as we know it can never be utopian which means no place. The Adam is not without a place. He was really put on a spot. Life can never be utopian because it is subject to enclosure, to horizoning. The enchantment of possibilities... our present surrounds us. The only thing it doesn't do is decide for us. It leaves us in a strange position. We are accustomed to think we can change things but things don't change. The only possibility of change is in my relation to myself. That's why we say the more it changes the more it stays the same. We don't believe it because some day my ship is coming home. We are placed but not outside God, ever. What does the Psalmist say? Even if I go into the depths of hell thou art there.

Look quickly at the prohibition in 2:16-17. The Hebrew brings forward an intensive, die the death. Sometimes we are so ill it is a relief to die. What if we couldn't, we were stuck with this divine breath, and had to go on breathing. Jahweh doesn't die and it is his breath we breathe. I'm not talking about an abstraction of the immortality of the soul. Every breathing instant is a crisis.

What is it to eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil? It has driven theologians crazy, let alone the laity. To eat biblically means to take something within oneself as a substance that is not one's person and convert it into one's own substance. This is supported by Isaiah talking about eating a book. What would it mean to eat good and evil in the sense of having it become my substance? Good and evil refers to valuations. When we make an estimate, evaluate, we don't like what we've just learned to be changed. It shakes our foundations (those we imagine for ourselves; we have a sure foundation, there is no getting outside of God). So the foundations we are concerned about must be those we imagine. To have taken within myself a point of view, to have made an estimation, decided that's it, never question it. If you do that you will keep on dying.

Now get to man/woman. 2: 10: I will make one as in his front. That is a relation similar to thunder : wind. It doesn't say anything about the helper being inferior. It clearly indicates a relation of parity but in front. How is he going to deal with himself here and her over there? A current question isn't it?

Then the Lord parades the creatures before human nature which doesn't label them but calls out to them an ecstatic exclamation. Then the Lord or Adam or maybe both say nothing is found as a true complement. Then we have the surgery. The Adam is put to sleep. Now our eyes are closed and we can't have the opportunity to see. It doesn't say formed from the rib but built from the rib (carpenter's square). Jahweh is doing something wierd: contrasexuality has building as its ground, human nature has dust. 2:22 into a woman not into the woman.

He is not awakened and told to go find her. We are instructed as boys to go looking. The Adam is up against being confronted by something new which wasn't asked for.

23: Ishah is taken out of Ish. That isn't what happened: She was built out of the Adam, she was brought to the Adam not to the Ish. Ish means man in contradistinction to the word meaning woman. Etymologically Ishah is not the feminine of Ish, therefore it is nothing derivative. It comes from the root meaning soft as Ish means strong (the gentle : the arousing). The Adam makes a profound mistake. What is the basis of this error on the part of human nature [Adam]? The Adam is not man as opposed to woman. He is ok until he names her for the wrong reason. At the moment he sees her, contrasexuality breaks out in the consciousness of human nature. Where's the dread on his part? Hasn't he jumped beyond where he hasn't begun? You might say, culturally speaking, the rest is history, not just in our culture.

There is something interesting in 2:24: (no article) Ish cleaves to his Ishah. Not once does the word woman have an article in chapter 2. She doesn't get one until she collides with the serpent, then she becomes elevated. The distinction between human nature with the article, man and woman and the relation between man and woman is disordered from the outset, not by Jahweh-- possibilities don't decide. In every present situation there is a freedom for us no different from God's. That's disturbing. Possibility cannot actualize itself. The possibility for human nature is actualized in relation to environmental conditions that face us. There is no such thing as self actualization. There is such a thing as decision. There is a little dread in the room now. The dread is our only hope of waking up, the first step in self awakening is to hold in the gap between possibility and actuality. Why shouldn't the event in chapter 3 have occurred given this mistake? In chapter 2, 3, 4, never once is she recorded as having spoken to the man. They don't talk to each other. When he goes on with his expostulation, she doesn't say a word. What I'm suggesting is that is the point of the fall-- not at the point of breaking the law. Who can stop at the back of a thing?

Who can stand still on the spot before the enchantment of that possibility? Suppose that soon I have to make a decision. It is my attitude which will decide. Decision is only an embodiment of attitude. If I exercise the humility I should, decision will come naturally. Everything happens. Haven't you had that feeling when stuck in the midst of a disaster, the intuition that in spite of yourself, everything happens? That is a moment of truth. Then we go back to thinking we are the doers.

I haven't discussed contrasexuality in terms or medical psychology, a rather more easily communicated assignment. The Friends of Jung are ardent students of it. Spirituality is supposed to have been around since time out of mind. Unfortunately thinking on it has not remained consonant with the level of the literatures. If I were to misrepresent Jung, what would happen to me? It is easy though to misrepresent spiritual literatures. In thinking on what I was going to say, I went through the Hebrew a word at a time, counting all the definite articles. You have to wait on the text. There is no where to get, aren't we in God? There is everywhere to get lost. Imagine-- we're not lost essentially but we think we are! Or worse, we think we're saved. Who has a letter from God? Joan of Arc was asked by her tormentors if she were in a state of grace. I pray God if I'm not he'll put me there and if I am he'll keep me there. Her tormentors couldn't do anything.

In encouraging us to study this, we are attempting to move up a notch. So in contemplating the relation of ourselves to ourselves (I and me, I and thou, I and we'all) we can become gradually unconfused, so we don't think the feminine is a species unto itself but everything within the present to stop at the back of it with dread lest I give myself airs that decision is radically mine, that the work is mine. It is a question of attitude, a way of looking at things. Let us say mythically since the mistake was made we have had a confused eye. Have you ever seen a hawk with a confused eye? Even when mistreated they don't get confused eyes. How is it we have such confused eyes so terribly early on? I'm reminded of the way Meister Eckhart ended his sermons, he would simply say, our eyes might become unconfused, may God help us all!

Questions

There's one thing that remains to be said...

Ques: I want to know what was the mistake.

I described the mistake in strange language. I left it at stopping at the back of a thing. I'll translate for you. It seems mean, nobody is going to hear it except those who come back from the break. The mistake in spiritual literatures is called self identification. The Adam identified himself with Ishah and insofar did not allow her to exist in her own right and wounded his own existence in doing so. Why should she answer? Who was there to speak to? He had collapsed himself into her. It is interesting -- what we regard as the wholeness felt in romantic love.

Ques: Couldn't she have said he was wrong?

No because given what he did there was no one left to talk to. Dreadful. Ever since then, men have been saying "just like a woman" etc. How could it be otherwise? They mean just like a nothing, just like no meaning at all.

Ques: That's how we miss the mark?

Yes.

Ques: And the same with her?

No, there was nothing to answer back to. Her mistake occurs in the second chapter.

Ques: Did the first necessitate the second?

No, though you could say what she did was natural, yet that is not inevitable since possibilities don't decide anything. Though it is natural, i.e., given with our own nature to put ourselves on, to take something for real (our projection) for what is really real, to mistake as in the Hindu tradition the distinction between the snake and the rope. A great Indian sage once said that the refusal to see the snake in the rope is the condition for seeing the rope. She could have refused to see the fruit the way she saw it, through her projection upon it. She does the same thing he did, only the circumstances are different. What is possible to our nature isn't inevitable.

This should be studied in relation to the distinction between two different perspectives, medical psychology and spirituality. There is a point at which the two no longer understand enlightenment in the same way. It is well to understand that so we can be free of doing injustice to either. Jung felt the tension deeply and tried to bring them together. There is a point at which they diverge. No amount of trying to get them together will succeed.

Ques: Tell me again why you introduced the Tao.

Non-dual perspective.