St. Pauls Friday 6/11/71

This is the first time it's ready to go. I usually have to wait here till it warms up. In keeping with the general difference in some of our approach that we've made on Friday morning from what we've done on Tuesday night it seemed to me today that it would be helpfull if I brought your attention to possibilities of making an analysis of your hexagram and rather than do what we did on Tuesday night which would take us a little long for our Friday morning session I shall try to get you started on something that would take rather less time though not necessarily less time. I don't mean by less time I'm suggesting that it's some sort of a lick and a promise, that's the farthest from my mind . You could take equally as much time but there would be a difference in how many lines you'd looked at as to whether you did what we did on Tuesday night or what we'll do today. Now it's possible to analyze a hexagram by beginning with the first line whether the line moves ornot and changing that line into its opposite and reading the hexagram that follows upon that change and that particular line. So for instance let ls imagine that we have received #2 which is what? The receptive, we're already getting a vocabulary, isn't that marvelous. The receptive , and let us say that we wanted to study the receptive in some depth. We could begin where we ought to begin at the bottom. The I Ching is profoundly moved to help us gain a notion of what it means to grow when we grow from the bottom up. So we change that first line and if we change that first line what hexagram would we receive?

Student: 19

Anderson: No I think you better look at your chart again. This is a hexagram you know about because you've been studying it. Yes that old 24. And then you would study that first line in 24 against the first line in #2. Now if you enter the second line of the sesond hexagram in order to change it by this method you would let the first line revert to its yin character and that would make the lower trigram what?

Student: Kan

Anderson: Right it would make the lower trigram water. Now what hexagram have we? We have earth over water the Army, Isn't that what' its called in this text. Then you'd read the second line of the Army and the second line of the Receptive. Now we don't need to carry this out. I just wanted to let you have this little practice to realize how you could make a study of the receptive as such. You could just go this way all the way to the top of the sixth line. Do you have any questions about that because we're not going to do that today we'll do something else but I did want to bring this home to you so that you would have it in your notes.

Student: You only read the line that you change you don't pay any attention to the rest of the hexagram?

Anderson: Oh no, you would read the entire hexagram.

Student: With a special emphasis on that one?

Anderson: With a special emphasis on that line, mmhm.

Student: Do you read the changing hexegram progressibly? You change first the first then the second then the third - just watch it change.

Anderson: Just watch it change.

Now we come to what we'll have to attend to today. It's possible to do this also with the nuclear hexagrams. The same thing. What is our nuclear hexagram for forty-two? If we're looking where we should to begin with?

Student: May I go back a bit? If you change the bottom line of number two, how do you get forty-two? Forty-two has a different formation to it. The bottom line of number two is

Anderson: Yes, I think I understand why you're confussed. I didn't mean to imply that that's waht we were doing when I chose the second hexagram. I just chose that at random. Perhaps it wasn't entirely at random since in terms of our work we've said so much about receptivity. But I didn't mean in any way to relate that activity to forty-two. But now we are talking about forty-two.

Student; Oh I'm sorry but when I was going back and we said at the very beginning, if you change the bottome line what do you have - what hexagram do you have? Didn't we say forty?

Class: twenty-four.

Anderson: Twenty-four. Now we have twenty-four and that is our lower nuclear heagram for forty-two, Increase. We recieved Increase as the anser to our question what is the most fruitfull approach a Christian can make toward the I Ching. Everyone's clear about that? Now, what does it mean to examine the lower nuclear hexagram? It means an emphasis on subjectivity precisely because the lower trigram of the hexagram belongs to Mother Earth, the past, subjectivity, inwardness, that which lies behind rather than before, within rather than without, below rather than above. All that points to our inwardness. Now there's one exception to the rule of starting at the bottom when you look at a hexaram in so far as you must try to gather the character of the ordeal ahead of you. So the very first place you should begin to look after you have discovered what hexagram you've recieved, whether that discovery be a happy one or an unhappy one - though it should never be an unhappy one if one has learned how to rejoice in tribulations. What is it in the hexagram that one should immediately focus on? The middle which is where man is - where we are. And if we look in the middle of the hexagram we're going to establish our possition with respect to what about the middle?

Student: Where are we , where do we go from here.

Anderson: No, you have another step to take. What I'm doing this morning is introducing a little review so that when we begin to approach what we shall in some deapth you'll have all this fresh in mind.

Student: We're going to break the four lines into six - make them into six lines.

Anderson: Which four lines?

Student: The middle four lines.

Anderson: The middle four lines- two through five. And that is what hexagram? The primary nuclear hexagram which we call the - Dr. Brunnett I think you've said it - which we call the battle field. Life is a battle. It's also a journey. And it can be a fulfillment. But nothing coerces us to fullfill ourselves. And our fullfillment is contingent upon how well we fare on the journey and how well we cope with the battle field. Our battle field, we discovered, was hexagram twenty-three, Splitting Apart. And from that we discovered that the most fruitful approach to the I Ching that could be made by a Christian would involve his coping with Splitting Apart or Self Change. Now we're about ready to begin the morning's work, if you're not worn out already.

The lower nuclear hexagram is going to represent, in this particular case, the subjective disposition of the Christian who's involved in this battle simply because that is what the lower nuclear hexagram stresses - ones subjective attitude towards his involvement in the middle. Now our lower nuclear hexagram is number twenty-four called Return. Since in fourty-two, from which we've derived this nuclear hexagram twenty-four, the first and second lines move, we should look at the first and second lines of twenty-four. And then we should change those, and necessarily so in this case because they do move and see what hexagrams appear when those lines change.

First of all let's take a look at the first line of twenty-four. Something that we have done before but not in so precise a way as I hope we'll do today. We're told that the return is being made from a short distance. I take it that that would suggest that the I Ching takes our question as suggesting that one is a Christian if he asks this question. That is to say one is a genuinely religeous person; not just somebody who practices a form of religion but someone who is genuinely concerned in making self change. It's possible to slip away even a short distance even when one is serious about such a thing. But we're told here that dispite slite digressions from the good being unavoidable, one must always turn back in time before going too far. This is especially important in the developement of character. And since, amoung other things,the I Ching is

manual for the developement of character. we're being put on notice as Christians upon the instant that there's some shaping up to do here with respect to how we consider the nature the nature of digression.

Obviously then the first lesson that comes to us concerning our subjectivity is to take digression seriously. Taking mistakes seriously distinguishes the professional from the amature doesn't it? You know that saying, "Amatures laugh at their mistakes, professionals take them seriously." If one professes himself a Christian he must conduct himself as a professional. And that means something else besides approaching the matter as a diletante or someone who imagines he'd like to see the scenery while he goes along for the ride. This is especially important it says in the development of character. Every faintly evil thought must be put away immediately before it goes to far and takes root in the mind. Now let's take a look in our own Bible. You have them there, don't you? And turn to Luke 13:24. This is a very remarkable text. King James reads, "Strive to enter in at the straight gate for many I say unto you will seek to enter in and shall not be able" That reminds us of another saying of Jesus that "few find the way, that the way is difficult" We often hear of conversations from time to time even cynically undertaken concerning the narrow way and there are psychological reasons for that cynicism because the narrow way as narrow has been very badly represented very often . Not simply through a light headedness on the part of people who discuss it but even worse, they just perversly relate themselves to the need for discipline. Kierkegaard wrote a little essay one of his Edifying Discourses concrening the narrow way and he said it isn't so much that the way is narrow as it is that narrowness is the way. Now of course he didn't mean what is brought foreward in our english expression a narrow minded person. He meant rather singleness of mind. Singleness of mind is the way. In this particular case twenty-fourth verse, strive to enter in at the straight gate, in the Greek the word for gate means door and it's the door of the household. The hexagram itself is a house. It has six stories, six floors. And if we are to enter upon this discipline, a discipline implied in the word approach in our question that we put before the Oracle, What is the most fruitfull approach a Christian can make, what he's asking is how do I go about entering the house of the hexagram. The hexagram can be drawn in diagram after the manner of what we call the cube of space. A cube has how many sides? Six sides, and if you draw the hexagram with respect to those sides you can learn a great deal about this house. Hexagram is then a picture of cosmos. And up is really up and down is really down and left is really left and right is really right. And it struck me very powerfully when I resd this text to notice in the Greek that the word for gate doesn't mean the gate outside somewhere into the courtyard but in this particular case the word refers to the door of the house itself. And thatis of course immediately applicable to our concern for hexagram 24 the name of which is Return. We are litterally making our way back home. And the force of my remarks up to this point leads precisely to that .

Student: Isn't it strange that it's hexagram twenty-four and verse twenty-four?

Anderson: Well It is a curious thing isn't it? (He laughs) If we look at the first line of our major hexagram, fourty-two, we're told that the time of increase doesn't endure. Which suggests that the door is not just idley blowing in the wind but the door is subject to becoming shut. That man's chances are limited. Anyone who takes existance seriously must conclude that. We don't have to worry about our essence but we do have to think much on our existence.

Now it may be that someone has a question at this very foundational point. I don't want to leave anyting - I felt there was one in the room, there it is.

Student: In changing from your original hexagram to your nuclear hexagram do you change the lines at that time. Do you carry along the line the marks that indicate a change using the same lines, for instance the six and the nine with the cross and the thing in it? Do you carry them down into your primary nuclear hexagram or do you change them when you go into your primary nuclear hexagram? The origin 1 has two changing lines - waht do you do with them?

Anderson: Right. Well the original having two changing lines would give you two changing lines in your lower nuclear hexagram too.

Student: But do you change them or do you leave them the same when you're going into the lower one?

Anderson: You'll leave them the same when you go into the loer but you'll change them in the lower won't you? No you don't make that change form the major hexagram to - no, you just carry the whole thing over.

Student: Thank you.

Anderson: Right. You're very welcome.

What is going to happen if we change the first line in Return? What hexagram do we get? Now we can begin to go a little faster. We're sent to number two aren't we? And the very first line of number two carries a specific warning with it. What does it say? What's the force of that line?

Student: Solid ice is not far off.

Anderson: Right. Here we have the precise expression of what will happen if we don't make the return from a short distance. Isn't that correct? You see how wonderfully complementary the changes are. You will always see two sides of the coin every time you consult the Book on this account. You'll see the promise on the one hand, which is given to us in the first line of return - isn't that right? - and ofcourse we much prefer promises to judgments. But it doesn't take very much stamina or character to engage fantasy concerning ones possibility. As a matter of fact it doesn't take a great deal of intelligence. One just has to have a deep yearning and then the pictures will rise of their own accord. It does however take some stamina to make a firm resolve, to make the necessary decision. The very first line of forty-two tells us that the time of increas is subject to ...

Student: Crossing the great water?

Anderson: No the time of increase itself does not last. It's not in the first line as such if I remember correctly but it is rather on page 162 down at the bottom. That's a good line to mark up. The time of increase does not indure therefore it must be utilized while it lasts. Now the implication in the first line is there since it says it furthers one to accomplish great deeds. When it says it furthers one to do something it's not simply a discription of what it would be pleasant to undertake. It's a commision to get on with it. If you're going to follow the advise of the oracle one must always study it as under command. And if it says it further one to accomplish great deeds, one ought to say, "Well then I'd better get going." Why? Well simply because the situation specifies wat I must do. Now don't in any way confuse this with situation ethics. That's a different notion. The situation specifies what I must do in this sense; that each situation possesses an essence, a character or its own and it must be genuinely respected for what it is. It's not there simply to be manipulated. It's not there simply to dictate. It is there rather to be met in terms of its own nature. And working out the relation between its nature and ones own nature is the primary task.

One never surrenders to the situation if he relates to this text correctly. He never ignores the situation if he relates to the text correctly. He never tries to manipulate it into something else if he relates to it correctly. Now that's of capitol importance to notice. Why doesn't he try to manipulate it into something else? Well simply because it happens to be the case that until one has changed himself nothing else will change - in principle that is. Nothing wil change of itself unless one first has changed himslef. Now appearances can be changed, certainly. You can pick up a stick and you can whittle it away to the point of nothing bent over on the end can't you? And you think to yourself, "Goodness me. Look waht I've done." I'm sure that when we were children we had that cross our mind. It gave us quite a sense of power to bring a stick to nothing. But we in no way tampered with stickness - in no way. Stickness abides whether sticks are present or not. That's the point that the oracle wants us to grasp.

The world is plastic. Certainly. But it has a nature. It does have a nature. We have a nature. The nature of the world is essentially good. Existentially it's subject to all manner of disease. But essentially it's good. The I Ching teaches that , our Bible teaches that. Our nature is also essentially good, The I Ching then is a mannal the study of which will help us undertake to bring those two natures into relationship with eachother fruitfully. That's the great emphasis it seems to me of our very firstline. And we're being told how to dispose ourselves subjectively toward the phenomenon of Self - Change in this lower nuclear hexagram. The very first admonition concerns shaping up to the need to make this return with dispach. And to make it decisively.

Now perhaps at this point it would be well to say one other ting. The I Ching always situates us before the Eternal. That's the reason why we have to make our return with dispatch. Not because we don't have very much time. Time has nothing to do with it. It's simply because the temporal is always put in checkmate by the Eternal. That's why. Now for instance in evangelical forms of Christianity one hears phrases like, "The last hour" or the"Midnight hour" or "Two minutes to twelve" and all that sort of thing. And Billy Graham talks about the "hour of decision". Isn't that right. Well a profane understanding of that which I don't mean to impute to him - don't misunderstand me - a profane understanding of that might very well occurin the audience. They might really think that it has something to do with the fact that maybe we've only got three years left before the world collapses altogether. But if you think rather than simply feel the biblical insistence on the urgency that we face in making our return than our understanding of the matter becomes altogether different. And it is simply because the eternal registers everything. Nothing is lost to it. That is to say it naver loses us, but we can lose it. That's the problem. The eternal never loses us simply because our essence endures. Ecclesiastes 3:14 makes that very plain, "Whatsoever the Lord does endures forever" Didn't He create us? Than in that power He must have made us to endure forever.

Student: Than how can we lose the eternal?

Anderson: Now I made a distinction, didn't I, between our losing the eternal and the eternal never losing us. How can we lose the eternal- by preferring the temporal above it.

Student: We have no choice, we're her in the temporal

Anderson: But the eternal is embodied in the temporal

Student: The eternal is so much greater than the temporal, how can we lose the eternal?

Anderson: I think you don't understand me , what I'm trying to say is simply this; that by existing in a certain way we can lose abiding in the abiding. Disipline is involved in learning how to abide inthe abiding. The eternal abides. We come to be and pass away with respect to our existence. We must never forget that we do come to be and pass away with respect to our existence. What is the only thing that is going to ground that existence, stabilize it if not the eternal. We must act toward that so that we never become anxious. That's why Jesus tells us cut that out. How would it be possible to cut that out unless ther were a way to abide in the abiding. That's what all the great scriptures are about, teaching us that way, that means, that method. Oh we can lose the eternal.

Student: But we can return.

Anderson: We can return if we don"t go to far.

Student: What happens if you go to far?

Anderson: We lose it. (laughter) We lose it with respect to our existence. And that's what we have , and that's all we have with respect to what?

Student: The eternal

Anderson: No. The eternal has our essence forever. So we know positively, we know the eternal conceptually by negation. For instance , look at the word immortal. It doesn't say what it is,does it, it just says what its not.

Student: Not mortal.

Anderson: Not mortal, but that doesn't tell us what it is, no.

Student: I don't know whether I hear you right.

Anderson: Oh dear! (he laughs heartily) If you did (he laughs again) I don't think I could stand it.

Student: The eternal is abiding

Anderson: Yes.

Student: It is eternally and undiscourageably there.

Anderson: Yes.

Student: So really no matter how much we cut ourselves off, to my mind there always is the possibility of returning because the eternal is abiding and it's there and somehow or other I feel that no matter how separated we become there's alwas the possibility of coming back. We may not achieve it but if the eternal never cuts us off and is abiding and undiscourageable, I can't understand what you're saying when you say that there is no possibility of return.

Anderson: It has to do with our existential identity not our essential identity you see.

Student: I think existential identity can be boo hooed(?) by our inner identity which I don't believe ever dies. Well I don't know I may be quibbling.

Anderson: No, no, you're not quibbling. You're very much speaking to the point and it's a point that is very difficult to discuss. What I'm trying to suggest is that all the great scriptures speak with urgency. There must be a reason for that. And it has to more than a sentimental reason. It has to more than a feeling reason for that. There has to be a reason for that that is grounded in the generic traits of existence.

Student: I don't mean that everybody does return no matter what. But if there is an urgency there is also an energy of love. And it's possible but it doesn't have to be a return.

Anderson: No, no, I'm very interested in your point(the woman had wanted to cease her discusion thinking it of no value). Just let me say one thing more and then we can go on. I don't want to weary you but on the other hand I don't want to lose you to my point if I can make it. I don't mean by that that I want you necessarily to agree with me. That's not the point. The point is I would like you to understand what I'm saying.

We exist as being always on our way. The self that exists not as an essence but as an existence is subject eternally to change. It is our essence to be changing therefore when we talk about ourselves as "I", until we've come to self-unification all we're talking about is a sequence of "I"s. But it happens that it is the person that must become saved not his essence. And that's why the immediacy and urgency is brought into the foreground. What we might have been is beside the point. It can never be again. Which is a loose way of saying that potentialities that are not actualized never can be. (in answer to a comment by the woman)No they can't even be. And the reason for that is because the world is subject to change too in which they are actualized. If you grasp that you really do grasp the urgency of existence. For instance let's just take the situation today. I thought, as you might have perhaps cosidered reasonable, a good deal about what to discuss today. Now, I can only discuss one thing not two, not three, not four - one. Let us say that I chose ill instead of well. It will never be possible - ever- for me to rectify that. And my identity at that time is understood by yourselves and by me in terms precisely of how I am presently existing with you and you with me. And if a thing isn't done correctly now (snaps his fingers) it will never be done. That's the point I'm making.

Now human beings don't like to hear that. And it's not an easy thing to grasp intellectually. Believe me. If one is having difficulty with it it's no sign his I.Q. is in a diplorable state. By no means. There's nothing so difficult to grasp intellectually as the relation between essence and existence. And you know ontology just isn't everbody's cup of tea. One just has to face that. But one is not let off the hook on that account because the is such a thing as correct sentiment. And the person who is not trained nor capable of being trained in ontology - that is analysis of being - is in no sense excused simply because he does not have it within his power to behave well on the basis of correct sentiment.

Because the soul is naturally ordered to the good. Even what he does that is bad he does because he thinks it's good at the time. But that doesn't excuse him. And precisely because of that he can only be forgiven. Why would you forgive something that could be excused? Does that help?

Student: Yes. Say that again, that's wonderful. (laughter from audience and Dr. Anderson)

Dr. Anderson: Precisely because it cannot be excused, it must be forgiven. I'll paraphrase it a little and make it worse. Instead of putting it in the indicative I'll just put it in a different tense - let it shape up(?) It must be forgiven. So when Jesus said, "Father forgive them for they know not what they do." He didn't excuse them did he? He said that because what they did was inexcusable and precisely on that account had to be forgiven.

Student: How could it be forgiven?

Anderson: Well you have to take that up with God.

Well let us take a look at the second line of Twenty -four. "Return always calls for a dicision" the commentary states, "and is an act of self-mastery. It is made easier if a man is in good company. " Well that's psychologically very sound isn't it? Where ther is mutual reinforcement in the practice of the good it's of course easier. But we must not conclude that it's impossible without it. We're not coerced to the good through social good fortune and we're not coerced into evil by social misfortune. That is if we believe in the radical freedom of man. Of course if we didn't believe that then we would believe that we were the dupes of our circumstances which is of course contrary to every great Scriptureal teaching it doesn't matter waht tradition. "If he can bring himself to put aside pride and follow the example of good men, good fortune results." One of the best ways to cultivate putting aside pride is to meditate on the relation between essence and existence and realize that we are composit beings. We have a potency that requiresto be actualized - that can never be completely actualized in any one time and place. God's is. That;s why He never changes. We cahnge simply because potency and act are related to eachother in such a way that our existence suffers that privation and necessarily so - we were made that way. It takes time for us to realize our potencial. But we have a sense of that potential; we project it into all sorts of marvelous fantasies. And then of sourse the weight of yearning becomes so great that if we're not extremely vigilant we fall into impatience which is disasterous for the spiritual life.

One of the marvelous lessons in Job is simply that he refers to waiting so often. Job talks about waiting. And many of the great texts in Job use the Hebrew word for wait which implies hope. Wouldn't have to hope if potency and act were as they are in God. But then if we were also God how should we love Him? That is to say how should we have communion between two different natures? Well that is what is so marvelous and rich for ourselves that God in no way coerces us to commune with Him. And because the nature of God and our nature stant in such radical contrast, so the love can become so radical. It's not simply because we are made in His image that we are capalbe of loving Him. No, It's also because we're different. I remember hearing a popular hillbilly song the other day and it set me to thinking a lot about existence and essence. And the chap was singing to his guitar, "There's a whole lot about a woman a man don't know." And I said to myself, "That's everlastingly true. And God be praised." We seam to exist in this absurd way if we don't get hold of ourselves. We're terrified that we'll never find out all we want to about her and then the next minute we're terrified that we might exhaust her. It's just nonesense being back and forth on this razor's edge. Now of course I'm not speaking about how it is with women in their contemplation of men. I'm just talking about how it is to be a man and contemplate woman. And I certainly know it's one of the vices of my sex that we fool around with this nonesense. One minute we're avid to find out and the next minute we're scared we'll get bored if we do.

Student:(female) And visa versa.

Anderson: And I suppose that women have some of that going for them too. Perhaps with more common sense since I do think that women are usually

more commonsensical than men. Nature seems to have taken care of that thank God. But I'm not denagrating my sex when I say that. I don't mean that. There are compensations that we posses for that too.

We must be careful that we don't relate to God that way - in an on and off again fashion. On the one hand especially at certain seasons we become rather avid toward the Divine presence - like Easter maybe. Holy week is a marvelous time to reflect on that. As it gets more gruesome in the contemplation of the passion it takes a little bit to hang in there doesn't it? But of course everybody thinkd it's great when the flowers come out for the resurection(he laughs) And then after Easter well you've got a long stretch of almost nothing by comparison it seems. When you look at the Christian year it's very interesting that that stretch. Oh you have your text in the prayer book that you're supposed to be reading. You know and the cycle that you're supposed to be reading and all that. It's all there. But somehow - Why can't it always be like Easter? It can't always be like Easter or ther would never be an Easter. That doesn't mean to say that we on that account require to lose the eternal. It seems to me as we begin with the return these things are crucial. The psychological reason for insisting on making this return in a strict way is simply because no discipline is so strict as that which is required for practicing the presence of God. It really is a disipline. For instance look at second Peter. This is a marvellous correction for people who think that faith is enough. It says here in the first chapter, it says in the fourth verse a lot of things about potentiality. It says, " Whereby are given unto us exceeding great and precious promises: That by these ye might be partakers in the divine nature, " Might be, notice that, it doesn't say will be, might be. Having escaped the corruption that is in the world through lust. Now look at the fifth verse, it gets grim. In the fifth verse he says, " And beside this, giving all diligence, add to your faith " add to it virtue. And then to virtue something else. One might have thought that it was enough to have to add virtue to it. No, get a little bit of virtue and then one has knowledge and that's not enough either because then temperance and then that awfull thing patience. And then in the seventh verse it climaxes as we should expect, love. That's a very interesting list, isn't it? And it's a progressive list. Now he doesn't want to leave the matter simply on the basis of some sort of moral exhortation. He says over here in the ninth verse, " But he that lacketh these things is blindand can not see afar off, " and this is what's so awfull, " and hath forgotten that he was purged from his old sins." Now let me ask you in relation to the discussion we had earlier around the question of possibility, who's going to make him remember once he's forgotten? That essentially he could remember has nothing to do with whether there's an existensial possibility for his remembering. That's what's at stake here, and if we're Christian I think we must learn to take that seriously. God will not coerce that existensial rememberence on our part. That's why the evangelicals make all this noise about urgency, not necessarily because they've grasped what I've said, don't misunderstand me, and not necessarily because they haven't am I saying it. I don't know what they have or haven't. I'm just inclined to think not all have grasped what is behind what they say. And that wouldn't be such a terrible description of other brethern in Christ, since it's not that easy to grasp. And worse if ever grasped it's even harder to remember it. Much harder and that's why he says in the tenth verse, " Wherefore the rather brethren, give diligence to make your calling and election sure: " Ther's work at making it sure. " for if ye do these things, ye shall never fall: " If. Now in the twelfth verse, " Wherefore I will not be negligent to put you always in rememberance of these things" That is I'm going to go on reminding you and reminding you and reminding you untill I die. That's what I'm going to do. And why, why's he going to do that? Look at the fifteenth verse, " Morever I will endeavour that ye may be able after my decease to have these things always in rememberance . Not just untill I die, but I'm going to keep yapping about this so that even after I die it won't be that easy for you to forget because if you do forget than you're back to verse nine,

which means you've had it.

Student: And there won't be anybody else to remeind you.

Anderson: Because you won't want to remember.

Student: There's a nice phrase in this English Bible, "Therefore clinch God's choice(?)"

Anderson: Oh that's good. That's wonderful. Now you see it isn't because God's love is not always present, eternally available essentially. It's just that it is possible not to want to remember.

Student: Not to want God's love.

Anderson: Just not to want to. Yes. Just not want to. To want to forget is, for all practical purposes, not to want to remember. Now essencially it's not the same. But for practical perposes - we're talking about existence which is always practical. That's what's tough about the whole discipline.

Student: This is a personal statememt but it's strange that tis week I have had and was aware of the very experience you're just talking about in that Monday I was aware and in touch, I think, with my inner light and Thursday I happened to read something or something crossed my mind and I realized that between Tuesday and Wednesday, in that time I had comepletely forgotten . And I got a knew piano on Tuesday and I was very joyous - it's something I've wanted for years and I was so happy. And Wednesday I had so many errands and both of those days I had simply lost touch. And Thursday I was fortunately reminded that I had forgotten and it was with a pang of "Oh dear." It really is all still there after all. ~~You~~ We kind of like to be ~~kind of~~ totally involved with our outer life.

Anderson: But you see whereas it is essentially the case that it was all still there after all, existentially that's not the case. In so far as your relation to that instument was existentially impaired, your existenc leaked away.

Student: During Tuesday and Wednesday you mean?

Anderson: Yes. And you can't get that back. It will be eternally the case that that has leaked away. Right? Now as for Tuesday and Wednesday, that will never be available to fill up your essence with. Essence is just like a cup. It's a form. And it has to be filled up with existence. And if we're to believe Scripture it has to be filled up with right existence through right action. Which is only one not many. And why only one? Well simply because you can only do one thing at one time in one place in one way with one person towards one end at the time and place, if it's right. Well if you don't believe that then just fire a gun at a target and see what happens. There's only one way to do it if you're going to hit the target. You don't get any more than one. And it gets rougher if it's a moving target. And it gets worse if you're distracted or prone to distraction by others being present. And maybe you picked a moving target and there's also a wind. And after you pull that triger - as you just said, what do you do? You say, "Oh, I think I aimed wrong." Does the barrel somehow swallow back the bullet at that point so that you can fire again? Nor does the tiger wait until you have a second chance? He's there. And if you don't hit him the first time...

Student: But there'll be other times.

Anderson: But not other yous.

Student: But what about another bullet?

Anderson: One mustn't get lost in possibility. That's the point I'm making.

Student: I was remeinded while you were talking of the target that one of the ways of translating sin is to ~~hit~~ miss the mark(?)

Anderson: Yes, but it would be better to say willfully missed the mark. Sin is not the mistake. Much worse. It's very bad to think of it simply as missing the mark because it collapses mistake and sin. And people who sin badly get a lot ofcomfort out of that because they can say, "Well it's only a mistake." And people who've made a mistake and haven't sinned - there's no end of agony because they think they've sinned and all they've done is just make a mistake. There's such a thing as being babes in Christ too isn't there? But there's also such a thing as reaching age where at such age it's time to put away childish

and start growing up. And when you start growing up you start not forgetting Tuesdays and Wednesdays. That's hard! I mean it really is hard. It really is - to do that. When Jesus said, "My yoke is easy, the burden is light." He didn't mean us to forget that He said that the Way is narrow and few there be that find it and strive to enter it." Strive. In the Greek that word means agonize. That's waht it means. His yoke is easy simply because if it is borne in good spirit the power will always be available in sufficiency to bear it. That's what's easy about it. That is there's nothing frusterating about it as a yoke. But He never said that the bearing of it - the activity of bearing as such - was not an arduous discipline. Otherwise what would the striving be? Any persuit of exellence always involves the harder. But that's almost quoting word for word Aristotle. Greeks were pretty hard headed about that. By contrast we are frightfully maudlin and sentimental people as a culture. Chinese and Indians and Greek's grasp of the difference between essence and existence is very hard nose. And it seems to me that in that respect they can teach us much. And we needn't fear what we're being taught because it in no way contradicts our own Scripture. Our own Scripture teaches the very same thing.

So we rejoice in tribulations not because we're masocists but simply because every tribulation gives us an opportunity to strive and through striving grow toward exellence. Growing in grace is a discipline. It's tough. That's why, "Few there be that find it." Not because not many want it - goodness me! St. Paul mentioned to Timothy didn't he that there are people walking around constantly wanting to be taught and yet incapable of learning anything. That's even true in the academy. In purely secular learning people are registering for course and on that account showing some desire, so one would think. And it often times is the case that they want to but- so disposed are they toward their work that they are incapable of being taught. Which means they're ineducable.

Now the first line then of our concern in this hexagram is getting ourselves shaped up to the place where we can indeed begin to become taught. And that moment when you remember Tuesday and Wednesday with a pang was a very precious moment - profoundly precoius moment because you lived hard for that moment and that ment that everything else around you for that moment wore a different face frome what it did while you were sleeping in forgettfullness. That's what it means to die spiritually - to forget. So the preacher in Ecclesiastes says, "Remember thy Creator in the days of thy youth." And of course we always say, "Well goodness me that's a bit premature isn't it? It's only when we get on that we start thinking about such things. That's natural. Well the preacher hasn't any interest in what's natural. He soesn't have any interest in what's unatural either. He's just interested in virtue which is neither according to nature nor opposed to it - something else. And if the young man remembers his Creator he'll have practice won't he while young so that when he gets old by that time he'll be habituated to what is correct in making his aim. And on that account he'll have few if any forgotten Tuesdays and Wednesdays.

Now I just want to notice something with you quickly with respect to waht the I Ching calls perserverence because this should climax our study this morning. Perserverence, we're told, means consistency in doing what is right. Consistency in doing what is right is the way our great book defines it for us. Consistency in doing what is right is perseverence. Now, if we look at the Twenty-forth hexagram and the second line we're told in the last sentence of the commentary that we must follow the example of good men. Which is to say we must subordinate ourselves to the good man. Now if we change the second line what happens to it? What hexagram would we have then? We'd have earth over

Student: Lake

Anderson: Which would give us?

Student: Nineteen.

Anderson: Nineteen. Which happens to be concerned with what? What's nineteen all about? Approach. But the approach is subject to misfortune it says in the eighth month. Is that right? Which means that vigilence is mandatory if we're to make it. Notice waht it says in the commentary in the last three lines under the judgement. On page 79. "If we meet evil before it becomes reality,-

before it is even begun to stir - we can master it." What is the way toward achieving that? Well in practical terms the way toward achieving it is simply to be already habituated in the good. Because if one is habituated in the good his sensitivity towards evil is increased enormously. Now in the theoretical order we could discuss all sorts of things about how to become habituated in the good but we're concerned with perserverence now - the concept of perseverenc. And that's what I want to bring home. We are to place ourselves under the example of good men. That's generic - good men and women. We are to place ourselves under good example. And to place ourselves under good example if we mean sincerly what we say by example is to be doing it all the time. Because if the example were not consistent it wouldn't be good. And if we placed ourselves under the discipline of a good example, we place ourselves under the discipline of a consistent example don't we? Which means we must be consistently emmulating what is consistently good; therefore perseverence. And perseverence means consistently doing what is right.

Now I want to note with you in our own Bibles, First John, the third chapter. And we'll see some very interesting things. We'll also se a mistranslation. And those linguists amoung you will enjoy this no doubt. First John:3 and lets look at the sixth verse. "Whosoever abideth in him simmeth not: whosoever sinneth hath not seen him, neither known him." Now literally in the Greek because we have here a present active participle - present active articular participle - it reads, "The one who keeps on abiding in Him" that is in God"doesn't keep on sinning." Do you see the difference now in emphasis? When it's seen this way it's seen as concerned in a present activity rather than a puntiliar event. That is the text is concerned in an ongoingness in which you just can't have any Tuesdays and Wednesdays dropping out. I'm terribly greatful to you for that story. I hope you don't think I'm working it to death.(he laughs) It means then to be on our way in the right way, in the right manner. And the Apostle says quite clearly that the one who keeps on abiding literally doesn't keep on sinning. Now that's not the mistranslation. Even though it's unfortunate that in our English text we don't have the idiomatic possibility of bringing over the Greek participle without making it sound a little awkward. No, if it had read as I translated it literally the "one who keeps on abiding just doesn't keep on sinning" well certainly for litergical reasons one would hardly want to bring that forward cuase it doesn't have the grace and majesty that is present in the language as we presently read it. But for a student it's of capitol importance that he see that distinction. It makes all the difference. And if one thinks that makes all the difference let's look at the next. It's getting grim.

In the ninth verse it says, "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin." Now that would seem to imply that he can't commit sin. But if that were the correct understanding of the Greek then it would have been in and Aorist active infinitive. But it's not. It's in a present active infinitive. And because it's in the present active infinitive it makes the point again of ongoingness and consequently what is it saying? Now take your time. If you can reach this answer on your own without my telling you - I'll tell you if you can't - but if you can then you won't easily forget. The problem is this: Is it saying that one can't commit sin or is the emphasis somewhaere else?

Student: (something about he's not doing sin)

Anderson; Right. He's not doing sin. It doesn't say that he cannot commit sin. That is to say his free possibility of doing wrong is never taken away from him. But on the other hand while he is continually performing Right Action he is not continually subject to sinning - to doing sinning. Literally he can't keep it up. That is as for sinning he can't keep it up. Not because he can't sin but rather because while he is doing Rgiht Action he can't keep up sinning. Now you see the tremendous emphasis that places on the need for right habituation. And it also implies that in right habituation there is marvelous reinforcement; that the more one grows in grace the surer his foundation. Which is to say the more one grows in grace the deeper and stronger tap-root in the eternal which he has an existential relation to. His tap-root essentially is not in question. But what

good does that do us? Essence doesn't cook our food for us, doesn't eat it, doesn't go to school for us, doesn't learn Greek for us. No. That's the important thing. It doesn't practice the piano for us does it? No. But if we become habituated with respect to our existence in this ongoingness in our growing in grace, well as with our upper nuclear hexagram we become like a tree on the mountain - not subject to being blown over by every wind of doctrine.

So, we're saying that if he perseveres in performing Right Action, he cannot at the same time persevere in performing wrong action. And in verse seven where he says, "Little children, let no man deceive you: he that doeth righteousness is righteous, even as he is righteous." Even as God is righteous. That's a very sahrp and profound statement. But the word there is of course emphasixing the existence of the person in relation of the existence of God. Not the essence of the persn in relation to the essence of God. But it is possible apparently to exist in righteousness as God exists in it - perportioned of course to our nature. It seems to me that ought to be taken very seriously especially in our time you know when the distinction between good and evil is very blurred and people get kicks out of making it more blurred. Just love to talk about how grey things are. Well believe me you can't get any more black and white in an approach to these things than St. John both in his gospel and his Epistle - if he wrote the Epistle. So waht he's saying is simply then, in verse seven, that he who keeps on doing the righteousness is righteous. That's what the Greek says literally because it's a linear, present active participle that's in there. Because he keeps on doing righteousness then that's why he is righteous. Because he wants to. Because he keeps on doing ti he is not because his heart is in the right place as we say. No, no, but because he shapes up in the practical order in every respect. That it happens to be by grace that he shapes up Saint John would never argue, would he? You could say of course that's true but since when did grace coerce him to do it. Did grace force him to shape up? No grace empowerde him if he would. If he would. I brought that to you because it does seem to me to bring foreward to us a relationship between the I Ching and our own Bible with respect to the great concept perseverence. And makes available to you the possibility of , I trust, a very very rich study if you undertake the study of the great scripture the I Ching.

We could say that we have come some distance in answering the question that was put to the Oracle, " What is the most fruitfull approach that a Christian can make toward the I Ching " We've learned that the fruitfullness of the approach depends first of all upon the preparedness to make self change and to remain always persevering in the making of self change so that he is able to make passage from glory to glory. Which of course is altogether proper to his nature being composite of potency and act. Well I think perhaps that this is where to put a period and I hope that you wont be to distressed that I talked so long. But I wanted to bring this to issue and we did have a long and for me a most delightfull conversation about essence and existence. If you have any questions please feel free to raise them. Yes our colleague with the piano left.

Student: Had she been consciously aware of the you know like the she had gotten the new piano in the joy and everything would have been, she would not have lost the essence. She was so delighted in the piano that she forgot. Had she remembered then the dilight of the piano could have been drawn into it.

Anderson: It would be better to say that had she been always remembering. That's a difference between a punctiliar reference and the reference in participle. It's interesting in grammar that the participle represents an infinite mode as different from the indicative which is strictly temporal. And it's interesting that we have a word participle that is spelled p-a-r-t in the beginning. To be part of. It's a most difficult concept to handle philosophically. Well participle's not that easy for grammarians either since in languages like Greek and Sanskrit it's so extraordinarily rich. And it's possible to say things in the New Testament for that reason because much of the literary coinet - the literary popular Greek tongue of the time is embodied in our New Testament and the participle was made a great deal of use of at that time. Much use was made of it. And that's why I said to you before, it makes all the difference in the

world whether if we read "cannot commit sin" as seen in the Aorist tense or in the different form of the participle which refers to ongoingness; not a punctiliar event which is essentially timeless. No, we didn't refer to the timelessness, we refered to the participation of time but in the eternal when we notice this form of the participle. And we're responsible for that part in the eternal which is exclusively ours. So one could begin to meditate on how does one, in all humility, undertake the part of the eternal in his own life? And if he does that he stands himself completely on his head with respect to his relationship to everything around him.

Student: Can we almost reduce that down in everyday language to:Act as though you are and you will be - isn't that ongoing? If you're practicing what you hoped would become, you do become that - kind ,gentle, or loving, or whatever.

Anderson: I was just reminded while you were speaking of a very marvelous statement by Kierkegaard in Fear and Trembling. He was very impressed with St. Paul's counsel: Work out your salvation with fear and trembling. Where he says, "It's a great thing to have given up the temporal for the eternal. It's a far greater thing to have returned to the temporal after having given it up." So what he means is: Fine, it's a great thing to become so deeply aware of eternity that you undertake a work of resignation and withdraw from busy work and hustle and bustle and establish yourself contemplatively by the negation of these things that come and pass away. But then he says it's even greater, geat as that other was, it's even greater to return to the order of coming to be and passing away after having given it up. Because now, after having truly given it up and having known what that has meant, it is possible to return to everyday affairs but now live within them taking the part of the eternal. And that would mean just what you said, practicing the ongoingness of abiding in the Abiding with a capitol A. Keeping on doing which is a very, very different thing from doing this and then that and then that and then that. Which is how most people live. They live a sequential existent not an Abiding one.

Now I don't mean to say that one can ever get out of the sequential. certainly not. For instance we're going to go out of this room shortly, I expect. And that means that we came in and we went out. But if we are taking the part of the eternal then we're not moved because we came in and we're not moved because we've gone out. It is the same whether we are in or out though the duties in and out differ. And when I say it's the same I don't mean in the sense that one is practicing some sort of chill indiference to things. On the contrary it's only when one takes the part of the eternal in the temporal that he's able to affirm the temporal for what it is. Yes, as some of my students say, "getting it together". But of course there isn't anything we can get together in our own strenght. But it is however required of us that we dispose ourselves in such a way toward the eternal that the getting it together is done for us. The self-rule is up to us. The self-actualization is done for us. Nothing easier than self-actualization though we hear an awful lot of stuff about that today as though it's a task to become self-actualized. That's nonesense, there's no task in it. We're actualizing all the time anyway. Waht kind of nonesense is that anyway. We must be always actualized. There's no way out of it. But we don't on that account require to be self-ruling. If we are self-ruling however, the self-actualization which has intrinsic value will occur inevitably. No finite creature has the power to self-actualize himself. Can't create itself, can't bring itself off. And that's why some very brilliante and remarkable psychologists who write today have failed to see that distinction simply because the weight of their concern is on something for which they should have no concern because there's nothing essentially can be done about it, namely self-actualization. But if one is self-ruling self-actualization takes care of itself.

Well I must thank you very much. I've enjoyed this Friday class in a very differnt way from the way I did on the Tuesday night. There's something rather intimate about this class. It's a very warm class. I've just - I suppose I'd say it has warmed the cockles of my heart. Good-bye.