

And Man Created God



# And Man Created God

By

Shlomo Giora Shoham

**CAMBRIDGE  
SCHOLARS**  

---

P U B L I S H I N G



And Man Created God, by Shlomo Giora Shoham

This book first published 2011

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

12 Back Chapman Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2XX, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2011 by Shlomo Giora Shoham

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-4438-3302-9, ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-3302-8

To my teachers, Gershom G. Scholem, Martin M. Buber, Claude Lévi-Strauss, Pierre Legendre, and Haim Cohen, who enlightened me about the central role of religion as Man's anchor for the meaning of his life.



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements .....	ix
Foreword .....	xi
Professor Aharon Kellerman	
Introduction .....	1
Chapter One.....	49
Gnosis, Kabbala and Existentialism	
Chapter Two .....	113
The Mytho-Empiricism of the Social Character	
Chapter Three .....	135
Out of the Depths I Cried to Thee, Oh Lord	
Chapter Four .....	163
The Reflection of God in Man	
Chapter Five .....	197
Everything is Foreseen, but Permission is Given	
Chapter Six .....	261
God the Encounter with a Friend	
Chapter Seven.....	273
The Just Failures	
Chapter Eight.....	327
Conclusion: Who Goes Beyond?	
Glossary.....	351
Bibliography .....	357





## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Frances le Roux, the dedicated editor who is now working at another academic institution. This acknowledges my love and gratitude for the many years of happy collaboration. I also wish to thank Amanda Millar at CSP for her technical assistance.

The book has been published with the generous help of the Zefat Academic College.



## FOREWORD

Our college is one of interdisciplinary studies with a strong affiliation to sociology, religion and culture. *And Man Created God* is a volume that complements our ethos of learning. It is an important work elucidating a new theory of mytho-empiricism.

Our College is situated in a city distinguished by education and spiritual exploration since the 16th century. Our aim is to preserve ancient cultures in the Galilee by integrating old with new and serving as a stepping stone towards a creative and innovative society. Professor Shoham's volume reflects this too. His innovative theories combine the old and new – from Egyptian mythologies, through Kabbalistic teachings, to the modern theories on creation.

We are honored at the Zefat Academic College to have on our faculty an author of such standing as Professor Shlomo Giora Shoham. We believe that together we can be innovative and always challenging our students and readers.

—Professor Aharon Kellerman  
President, Zefat Academic College, Israel



# INTRODUCTION

L'homme est l'être qui ne connaît les autres qu'en soi, et, en disant le contrairement.

—Marcel Proust, *La Fugitive*.

Time – you know that – is diluted poison administered slowly in harmless doses.

—E. M. Remarque

This volume is a *summa summarum* of the author's ideas expressed in previous writings. The ideas and their relationship with myths, mythogenes and mytho-empiricism are concepts explained in *The Myth of Tantalus*.<sup>1</sup> We hold myths to be connecting structures between nature and culture. Mytho-empiricism is the utilization of myths as empirical anchors for physical, metaphysical, and bio-psycho-social factors of the personality and the components of the social character. The mythogenic structure is a moulded complementarity between man's participant longing and separant quests as is explained in this introduction.

In *God as a Shadow of Man*, space-time and causality were shown to be correlates of human development<sup>2</sup> which has a cybernetic relationship with both man and history.<sup>3</sup> Our model of being, as developed in *The Promethean Bridge*<sup>4</sup> envisages two vectors which serve as a basis for a multi-dime-national scaffolding: The first is “separation” and the second is “participation.”

An individual's birth initiates growth that reaches out towards the object. This is the essence of the separant vector. However, as there is no difference at pantheistic early orality between the self and its surroundings, birth and cosmogony are projected mytho-empirically – in the Kabbala this is described as the breaking of the vessels. Mytho-empiricism effects the projection onto transcendence of the myths of human and cosmic development. Towards the end of early orality a separate self is coagulated from the pantheistic chaos of early orality. Mytho-empirically it is structured as the ejection of the first couple from paradise. The pantheistic togetherness of all things gives way to the coagulation of the separate selves of later orality, and their contrary opposition to everything. The phallic snake mytho-empiricizes the sexual impulse. This sexuality has to be guiltily suppressed by man and woman; they physically cover, and

mentally sublimate, it. Adam is destined to eat bread by the sweat of his brow and Eve's life will be marked by strife and pain. The deprivational relationship of man with his objective and human environment not only generates pain, but also gives rise to man's longing to revert back to the Elysian bliss of early orality.

The next phase of separation, relates to the acquisition of norms and morality. The Freudian oedipal processes relate to the aggression that sons have against their fathers because of some unresolved incestuous tendencies that they have towards their mothers. Freud holds that only when these oedipal feelings are resolved, can the normative authority of the father be successfully ingrained in his children within the nuclear family. We supplement this theory with the Isaac Syndrome: the aggression of the father against his sons. The surrogate sacrifice that is inherent in the socialization of the young into the mesh of the social norms as ordained by the father, complements the oedipal pressures. When these two are synchronized into a more-or-less viable balance, the nuclear family becomes a viable tool for the rearing of the young in a normative system.

The opposite personality vector, the participant vector, aims to make the phases of separation invalid and revert back to earlier steps of development. Thus Marcel Proust in his *A la Recherche du Temps Perdu* wanted to annul his detested adult life and slide back to his preadolescence, a stage where everything was permitted and condoned, especially by his beloved mother. The dissolving of the ego boundary is the goal of those who wish to return to the pantheism of early orality. This is, of course, impossible. However, surrogate reversals to early orality are longed for, or attained, by alcohol, drugs, love, and sex. The last phase of participation is the regression to nonbeing which is the nothingness that is the potential of everything. This is extant in the *drash*, the hermeneutic, of the Maggid of Meseritz on the verse from Job which asks: "But where shall wisdom be found?"<sup>5</sup> "Where" in Hebrew is also "from nothingness." Thus the great Maggid reads this verse in the affirmative and proclaims that from nothingness comes wisdom.<sup>6</sup> This mytho-empiricism is vindicated by modern astrophysics which envisages that the Big Bang, and hence cosmogony, is initiated from a singularity – a point of nothingness effected by infinite density and gravity – within a Black Hole.<sup>7</sup> The complementarity between the vectors of separation-growth and participation-decline effects the structure of both objects and life. We stress complementarity and not dialectics, as in the synthesis of dialectics the thesis and antithesis are merged and obliterated. In complementarity, each side of the duality retains its essence and interacts dialogically with the other side in a maieutic, midwifery manner.

Thus the human personality is a system-in-balance between the participant and separant core-vectors. Similarly, the social character, which is a composite portrait of a culture, has a complementarity between the active Sisyphean and the passive Tantallic vectors. In all objects situated in a closed system there is the participant entropy countered by the separant negentropy. The same holds for cosmogony: there is the separant Big Bang complemented by the participant Big Crunch.

The Mythogenic Structure is the connection between individual human beings, between subject and object, between history and transcendence, and between the artist and his creation. It is the patterns of experience and longing that are structured for bonding – whether by dialogue between men, or a dialogue between the artist and his creation.

The structuring of the mythogene is through the revelation (in synchronicity) of the inner “pure self” that is then transmitted through the diachronic interactive self, to the “other,” or to the artistic medium. Mytho-empirically, the bonding function of the mythogene is extant in Egyptian mythology. Upon his death, King Horus linked the diachronic East and synchronic Osirian West. So does the Gnostic messenger and Jesus the son of God. In Judaism, the Burning Bush is the mythogene bonding history and transcendence. The mythogene is the content of the concept underlying the phonemic label of the word, and the written or the spoken Logos.

If the dialogue between the I and the Thou is authentic, grace flows between them and effects an ontological viability. The meaningfulness of the dialogue is related to its authenticity – but for Buber, the grace within an authentic dialogue generates the universal Thou which is the transcendental God. Here, we differ. We hold that the Universal Thou is generated in the context of a group. For example, in group treatment, in public performances, and in communal prayer, there is a flow of grace if the link between the audience and the artist or the religious leader is authentic. This grace is unified as a Collective Thou, and is structured as Divinity. Mytho-empirically this is extant in Exodus when God commanded Moses to go down from Mount Sinai and sanctify the people of Israel.<sup>8</sup> In the Midrash, Rabbi Sinai recounts that when the people of Israel agreed at Mount Sinai to hear the Covenant and obey it, the angels descended and put two crowns on the heads of each person. One for agreeing to hear, the other for consenting to obey the Covenant.<sup>9</sup> This sanctification of the people of Israel in the ritual that took place on Mount Sinai, is also the basis of the peoples’ proclamation of being God’s chosen people.

Our dualistic approach to existence stems from our developmental dynamics: the pantheistic unity of early orality versus the coagulation of

the self at later orality, which makes for a confirmation of the nascent self with the plurality of objects and life forms. The uniform unity of matter after the Big Bang versus the later formation of cosmic clusters, and monotheism versus polytheism. These are not binary dichotomies, but analog gradations along a continuum where the extreme dualities are at its poles.

The basic duality of Judaic cosmogony is mytho-empirically extant in the first verse of Genesis, “In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. And the earth was without form, and void, and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.”<sup>10</sup>

The original Hebrew states that the spirit of God “hovers” over the waters. There is no direct link between the spirit and the chaos. There is a gap, a synopsis, not unlike the space between the hand of God and the finger of man in Michelangelo’s fresco of the anthropogony in the Sistine Chapel. Hence both the mytho-empiricism of the Judaic cosmogony and the anthropogony portrayed by Michelangelo may be depicted as a complementarity between the creative spirit of God and its creatures. The synapses allow a maieutic relationship between creator and the created, so that the resultant creature feels that it has created itself. Hence the cognitive knowledge of God is impossible. It is actually the Original Sin. The only dialogic experience of God’s Grace is the inner maieutic revelation, which is a free choice encounter and not that of a sacrilegious subjugation of master and servant. Indeed, the dialogic relationship between man and God cannot be with an absolute deity, but with a God whose power is curbed or even blemished. The Judaic God has already limited his omnipotence by undertaking not to flood the earth again and to mark this covenant with a rainbow.<sup>11</sup> The contract with Abraham was a virtual *Magna Carta* given to the first Patriarch and his offspring. The covenant between God and Abraham was marked by the circumcision of the Patriarch, his son Ishmael, and all the males in his household.<sup>12</sup> This gave Abraham a *locus standi* in his haggling with God over the fate of Sodom and Gomorrah, as one cannot bargain with a God whose power is unlimited and whose mandates are absolute. Likewise, Moses pleaded with God when He intended to destroy the people of Israel following their fashioning of the Golden Calf. He founded his pleas on God’s covenant with Abraham. Indeed, The Lord was appeased by Moses’ pleading and He desisted from destroying the People of Israel.

After the destruction of the Second Temple the stature of the Judaic God is diminished as He allowed His Temple to perish. Indeed, the celebrated Mishnah about the oven of Achnai cut into segments like a



snake raises the hallachic authority of the Torah above the rule of God himself.<sup>13</sup> The Talmud also recounts that when Moses went to the upper world he found God binding crowns to the letters of the Torah.<sup>14</sup> After the expulsion of the Iberian Jews at the end of the fifteenth and beginning of the sixteenth centuries, the stature of the Judaic God who could not prevent this catastrophe was further diminished. The sixteenth-century Lurianic Kabbala depicts a God whose *magnum opus*, the creation of the world, is marked by a cosmic catastrophe – referred to as the breaking of the vessels. This cosmic catastrophe resulted in particles of Divinity being strewn into the mires of evil. Hence the role of man is to “mend” Divinity by locating these strewn particles and returning them to the blemished God. Thus man becomes God’s restorer and, in the rather striking metaphor of the Ba’al Shem Tov, God is the Shadow of Man.

Man is regarded by modern anthropological Philosophy as a necessary antecedent of the world order. The so-called Anthropic Principle ranges from the Weak to the Final.

## **The Anthropic Mediation Principle**

The term Weak Anthropic Principle sounds tautologous; perhaps it is. It states roughly that if man is present in the universe, its condition and background must have enabled his evolution. Barrow and Tipler give a more formal and precise definition of the Weak Anthropic Principle (WAP):

The observed values of all physical and cosmological quantities are not equally probable, but they take on values restricted by the requirement that there exist sites where carbon-based life can evolve and by the requirement that the universe be old enough for it to have already done so.<sup>15</sup>

The WAP is a *post facto* statement that if conditions were different (e.g., if Pauli’s exclusion principle did not exist and all fermions could cram together on one orbit around the atom’s nucleus), life as we know it would not exist. Or as Hawking rightly observes, the digestive tract from mouth to rectum would cut all animals into two if the world had two spatial dimensions instead of three.<sup>16</sup>

Finally, for life to appear, the evolutionary process needs time, billions of years. Hence, its explosive expansion from the original Big Bang would be measured by billions of light years.<sup>17</sup> The human life form, being the most elaborate psycho-physically, requires a very delicate and complex range of possibilities and structures to be formed and sustained. Even small changes in temperature, gravity and electromagnetic equilibrium

would have prevented life from forming, or destroyed it if it had already arisen.

The Strong Anthropic Principle (SAP) posits that “The universe must have those properties which allow life to develop within it at some stage in its history.”<sup>18</sup> The SAP is not probabilistic, but categorical in its teleology. It postulates the evolution of life and of man as a necessary corollary and aim, *telos*, of the creation of the world. The SAP seems to imply a theological, theosophical and even theurgical need for the creation of man. In *extremo*, the SAP is manifest in Teilhard de Chardin’s teleological doctrine, in which man is not only the irreplaceable goal of creation, but also its infallible end.<sup>19</sup> Kabbalist theurgy also entails a SAP. The whole notion of the Kabbalist *tikkun*, the human mending of a blemished God, makes man theosophically indispensable. Says Idel:

Jewish theurgical anthropology strikes utterly different chords; the problem is basically the need of the divinity for human help, or human power, in order to restore the lost *sefirotic* harmony. The focus of the Kabbalistic theurgy is God, not man; the latter is given unimaginable powers, to be used in order to repair the divine glory or the divine image; only his initiative can improve divinity. An archmagician, the theurgical Kabbalist does not need external help or grace; his way of operating – namely, the Torah – enables him to be independent; he looks not so much for salvation by the intervention of God as for God’s redemption by human intervention. The theurgical Kabbala articulates a basic feature of Jewish religion in general: because he concentrates more upon action than upon thought, the Jew is responsible for everything, including God, since his activity is crucial for the welfare of the cosmos in general. Accordingly, no speculation or faith can change the exterior reality, which must be rescued from its fallen state. The metaphor of the shadow points to the reinforcement of the theurgical trend precisely by its strong delineation of the human and the divine; only by retaining his own individuality can the theurgical Kabbalist retain his cosmic influence...

Man is therefore an extension of the divine on earth; his form and soul not only reflect the divine but also actually are divine—hence, the interdiction against killing a person. Its real meaning is not the fact, emphasized in rabbinic sources, that man is a whole world, a world in itself, but that this micro-cosmos is a divine monad. Destroying a person is tantamount to diminishing not only the divine form on earth but, as this text puts it, divine powers itself. Man is conceived as a source of energy parallel to or perhaps even essentially identical with, the divine.<sup>20</sup>

Thus, God is tantamount to the “Shadow of Man,”<sup>21</sup> because without man, God could not be theurgically “mended.”

A further step in the symbiotic relationship between man and Creation is proposed by Wheeler, who expounded the Participant Anthropic Principle (PAP), stating, “Observers are necessary to bring the universe into being.”<sup>22</sup> This is in line with the Copenhagen interpretation of quantum mechanics, which postulates a necessary interaction between observer and observed to create matter. Wheeler, however, raises this quantum mechanical dyad to a cosmic level.

Ultimately, we have the Final Anthropic Principle (FAP), which posits, “Intelligent information-processing must come into existence in the universe, and, once it comes into existence, it will never die out.”<sup>23</sup>

We are even more extreme. We hold that consciousness and energy-matter were always there as a basic duality. What is formed (whether by chance or as an intentional act is irrelevant for our present purposes) is the Mythogenic Structure which links the consciousness and energy-matter into an ever evolving creation. Hence, the constant kaleidoscopic interaction between the primordial consciousness and energy is the mytho-empirical anchor of a self-sustaining triad: consciousness, energy and the Mythogenic Structure, linking and constantly transforming them into endless spirals of creations, transformations and evolution. Man in this model is just an ad hoc intermediate connecting structure, which might well evolve into as yet unknown and unpredictable heights or abysses depending on our value judgment. And this leads us to our crucial point. Our conception of the anthropic principle does lead to and allow for the formation of meanings, values and norms. As Barrow and Tipler rightly state:

Although the Final Anthropic Principle is a statement of physics and hence, *ipso facto*, has no ethical or moral content, it nevertheless is closely connected with moral values, for the validity of the FAP is the physical precondition for moral values to arise and to continue to exist in the universe: no moral values of any sort can exist in a lifeless cosmology. Furthermore, the FAP seems to imply a melioristic cosmos.<sup>24</sup>

Indeed, our version of the FAP enables man to imbue his objective and biological surroundings with meaning, values and norms. Our stance is that an observer need not have been created for the world to be observed. He was always there in the essence of the consciousness. The observed was also there as energy-matter. What was ever changing, transforming and developing was the linking agent between the two. The two polar components of our world are so starkly divergent in all parameters, that there could be no direct interaction between the two. Only when the first linking structure was being formed – be it by chance or intention – could the endless variation of objects, artifacts and life forms be created. The

holonic nature of our Mythogenic Structures in the Koestlerian sense make for the transformation of Mythogenic Structures into creations and vice versa, according to the hierarchy of contexts in which they interact. Thus the Mythogenic Structure, contained in the quantum measurement instrument, processes a photon as a creation. A seed, as a Mythogenic Structure, would produce a tree as a creation, and an architect's design, a Mythogenic Structure of a bridge, would produce a bridge, which is then subject to natural selection, functionality and evolution, as are the seed and the measurement instrument. To date, there seems to be no more versatile, efficient and durable synthesizer between the consciousness and energy than Homo sapiens. But this is subject to evolution, and once man is dethroned and surpassed as a meta-Mythogenic Structure, the anthropic principle would have to be renamed after this more versatile and durable connecting agent. Until this happens, the anthropic principle posits man as the most efficient meta-Mythogenic Structure, integrating the consciousness and the dimensions of space and time, through his soma and psyche. Special relativity thus becomes linked to our conception of the anthropic principle, insofar as it envisages space and time as observer anchored. Indeed, we regard space-time as engulfing the specific consciousness of ego within the context of his being a meta connecting agent. The integration of space-time and consciousness within each individual is *sui generis* and peculiar to himself. Hence, the space-time-consciousness configuration of each individual is relativistic vis-à-vis the space-time-consciousness configuration of any other individual. This is not a Kantian conception of time-space as built-in mind filters, but rather a relativistic conception of space-time as a manifestation of energy-matter containing, in a holonic manner, the universal consciousness, which like a Platonic Nous, world spirit, is reflected in each life form and artifact. Mytho-empirically, this is projected in theosophical Kabbala as the *sefirot*, being a holonic integration of Divine lights and their engulfing garments.<sup>25</sup>

If we accept Penrose's Correct Quantum Gravity theory, the act of measurement (Penrose's R) collapses the wave function into a particle *eigenstate*. Says Penrose:

As soon as a "significant" amount of space-time curvature is introduced, the rules of quantum linear superposition must fail. It is here that the complex-amplitude superpositions of potentially alternative states become replaced by probability weighted actual alternatives – and one of the alternatives indeed actually takes place.

What do I mean by a "significant" amount of curvature? I mean that the level has been reached where the measure of curvature introduced has about the scale of one graviton or more...One graviton would be the

smallest unit of curvature that would be allowed according to the quantum theory. The idea is that, as soon as this level is reached, the ordinary rules of linear superposition, according to the U procedure, become modified when applied to gravitons, and some kind of time-asymmetric “non-linear instability” sets in. Rather than having complex linear superpositions of ‘alternatives’ coexisting forever, one of the alternatives begins to win out at this stage, and the system “flops” into one alternative or the other. Perhaps the choice of alternatives is just made by chance, or perhaps there is something deeper underlying this choice. But now, reality has become one or the other. The procedure R has been effected.

Note that, according to this idea, the procedure R occurs spontaneously in an entirely objective way, independent of any human intervention. The idea is that the “one-graviton” level should lie comfortably between the “quantum level”, of atoms, molecules, etc., where the linear rules (U) of ordinary quantum theory hold good for the ‘classical level’ of our everyday experiences.<sup>26</sup>

In our terms, the space-time curvature of general relativity engulfs the Mythogenic Structure, with its contained consciousness, and creates the eigenstate of a particle. In this manner our conception of the anthropic principle receives a relativistic anchor both on the classical and quantum levels.

We cannot and do not wish to delve into the biological and evolutionary implications of the anthropic principle, which relate to the bio-structural and environmental parameters of the organism. However, we will concern ourselves with the fact that man is the most efficient viable mediator and integrator of the consciousness and energy-matter (until the processes of evolution dethrone him), because of his freedom of choice and cognitive intentionality, which lends meaning and value to his creative endeavours.

We hold that all life forms possess varying degrees of freedom of choice. When an amoeba “chooses” to move in one direction rather than another, its decision is indeterministic. When a *bromeliacae* seeds “decides” to fasten themselves on to a dead piece of wood, although barren and devoid of nourishment, it is an indeterministic decision with far-reaching evolutionary effects. They must develop the capacity to absorb food or become extinct. There is a crucial difference between the Buberian I-It artifacts, from quantum measuring instruments to computers with “canned” consciousness and no freedom of the will, and the consciousness, embedded in all life forms which do have freedom of choice. Man has the most elaborate freedom of choice. He may choose to develop his creative potential following authentic experiences of revelation, thereby lending his own life meaning and imbuing his

surroundings with meaning. On the other hand, he may choose not to develop his potential, and be drawn into cycles of inauthenticity and alienation. An example is Gauguin who chose to remain within the cozy, stifling bosom of fashionable, bourgeois *tous Paris*. Such freedom of choice, and its resultant inner and outer meaningfulness, may lend evolutionary viability to our conception of the anthropic principle. Man, as the meta-Mythogenic Structure linking the consciousness and energy-matter, need not change his external environment in order to achieve optimal viability. He may achieve better results by transforming the meaning of his surroundings and adapting them to changing inner or outer situations and processes. Thus man's ability to adapt and adjust meanings, values, and norms enhances his evolutionary viability as the meta-integrator between the consciousness and energy-matter.

Mytho-empirically such evaluation and normalization is already seen in Genesis, where it is written, "And out of the ground the Lord God formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air; and brought them unto Adam to see what he would call them: and whatsoever Adam called every living creature, that was the name thereof. And Adam gave names to all cattle, and to the fowl of the air, and to every beast of the field..."<sup>27</sup> This is in line with our mytho-empirical conception of God as the projection of man's inner consciousness, which is normatively neutral. Hence man, the anthropic integrator, is the name-giver, the Logos-endower, capable of lending meaning and value to his surroundings. We hold that this name giving is an attempt by man, as the meta-mediator, to bridge between the consciousness and energy-matter. Man may imbue his surroundings with meanings and values by creativity, by trying to mold objects and others in his own image. He does this by implanting his consciousness on a canvas that will be transmitted to generations of viewers. Or, he can maieutically transmit his innovations to his students or colleagues. To communicate effectively, the processes of creativity must be authentic; then the Mythogenic Structure carries the message and imbues the objective and living surroundings with meanings and values. But these are Ego's own meanings and values as conceived by him, and implanted onto his surroundings in a manner unique to himself. This stems from the fact that each individual reflects his consciousness through his unique bio-psycho-social configuration. The uniqueness of the creator is thus paired with the uniqueness of the creation. Hence, according to Sumerian mytho-empirical sources, man was created, *inter alia*, to imitate the Gods in further creating and preserving the system-in-balance of the cosmos.<sup>28</sup> Man the creator thus becomes God.

The central issue of man's existence is, therefore, his relationship with transcendence which, in religious existentialism, is linked with revelation and in our context, as a precursor to creativity.

The mythogene is conceived and structured by revelation with the synchronic inner self of the creator. The mythogene, being a complementarity between experience and longing as structured by revelation, is a condition precedent to authentic creativity. Our yearning for the impossible is the fuel which propels us for both the mythogene structuring revelation, and its embedding in the creative medium.

As we are ever-craving for what we are not and for what we do not have, we are living in an inauthentic time. The separant vector aims for the future and the participant vector longs for the past. When dominated by these two vectors man does not exist in the present and his time is therefore a nonentity, false and inauthentic. If his quests and longings inherent in his core personality vectors cannot be fulfilled there is an inevitable and constant rift between man's aspirations, expectations and his perceived reality. Hence man is ever confronted with the absurd. This dual impasse of inauthenticity and the absurd makes the myths of Sisyphus and Tantalus so central to the human condition that we can rightly consider them meta-myths. The initial inauthenticity of man's existence in the world and his inevitable experience of the absurd constitute man's existential impasse from which creativity and revelation are able to extricate him. Creativity is thus the *modus vivendi* of Sisyphus with his stone-burden and revelation is the means with which Tantalus can go on living within his predicament. Man thus starts as an initial failure, yet through his ability to sublimate his unrealized quests into creativity and revelation he is able to transform his initial impasse into authentic experience and existence.

It seems that our programmer, whoever he is, or whatever it is – God, chance, evolution or the Devil – programmed us to yearn to achieve goals that can never be achieved, to yearn, to be different than we are at a given time and place; and to not cherish the present, but to long either for earlier developmental phases and for non-being in the past or for the away-and-beyond in the future. Our non-realizable core personality quests control us the way the lure in front of the racing bitch controls the dog-races. Our programmer intends apparently to see how our Sisyphean quests (which cannot be fulfilled) and our impossible Tantallic longings can be sublimated dialectically into creativity and revelation.

The basic goal of our programming seems also to be that our sublimatory endeavours would be as varied as possible through the infinite combinations and permutations of the dialectical interplay with the endless

varieties of forms and contents of objects and life forms. Finally our programmer has ordained our unfulfillable quests to transcend ourselves and our being. This longing for transcendence makes us realize, however vicariously and indirectly, that we are moved and motivated transcendently and that ultimately life and creation is not “our ball game” but our programmer’s match.

A separant mytho-empirical anchor for the primacy of the quest is apparent in the Pandora myth. When all the catastrophes were thrown on earth only Hope the unquenchable quest, remained to prod the exploits of the Sisyphian man.

A participant mytho-empirical anchor may be denoted as the Moses syndrome. Moses was left longing for The Promised Land, which he never entered. Yet, his unrealized quest was the guiding spirit of Israel. Thus the longing for Zion by the Jews in the Diaspora was based, for thousands of years, on their unrealized yearning for the Promised Land.

The idea of the Messiah is also based on an unrealized quest. The Jewish Messiah has not yet come and one waits for Him every day. The Christian Messiah, a crucified failed Messiah, who sacrificed himself for humanity while moaning *Eli Eli lama shabaktani* – My God, My God, why have you forsaken me? – was a success precisely because He failed. A Messiah on the cross lamenting His desertion by God perpetuates the yearning for the Second Coming.

Quests and yearnings which are mostly unrealizable were inherent in the thinking of some prominent philosophers. Kant postulated that what we should call the separant quest for a sequential order in our surroundings underlies our constant quest for causal relationships. We may even add our own interpretation of some of Kant’s basic postulates: man cannot grasp logically boundlessness and timelessness because of the separant pressures against reverting back to non-being and the *extasis* from spatio-temporality. *Per contra*, man ever seeks first causes as a projection of his participant longing to revert back to his Edenic pre-differentiation in early orality. Lessing is known for his statement that there is no truth, only an endless search for it, and Emerson described himself as “an endless seeker, with no past at my back.”<sup>29</sup> Heidegger claims that authentic being can be effected only by anticipation and Sartre, states that human existence is determined by what it is not. However, our reliance on Sisyphian quests and Tantallic longings is more basic because for us the dialectics between these separant quests and participant longings constitutes not only the scaffolding for our core personality but also the transcendental *Ding-an-Sich* – the thin in itself.



Man is therefore moved, motivated, and prodded by identification and complementarity with the ideal archetypes of his quests and longings of his core vectors. The separant type may be thus very impressed by the ideal hero in sagas and movies but tends to evade the actual crippled war hero in a veteran's hospital. He might be fired with empathy by a movie on Van Gogh or by an idealized biography of Gustav Mahler, but will fight tooth and nail against an innovator who may be in competition with him. In like manner the participant also shuns the present and longs nostalgically for the past – “the good old days” *in illo tempore*. Proust longs to revert back to his childhood and to the graces of his young mother, whereas Steinbeck re-enacts the story of the lost paradise. Nostalgia stems from the Greek words for “return home” and “pain.” The participant is ever moved by the sweet bitter pangs of longing to revert back to earlier developmental phases and to non-being.

Both the separant and the participant need to sustain their quests and their longings in order for them to be creative and revelatory. We have seen that both creativity and revelation are dynamic processes sustained by Sisyphean aims and Tantallic longings which should not be fulfilled. If they are, our yearnings die and with them, our potentiality for authentic being through creativity and revelation. The impasse of unfulfilled aims and the inevitable absurd rift between our expectations and reality is transformed from a curse to a blessing. Moreover the dialectics between our unfulfillable Sisyphean quests and Tantallic longings are our prime movers; without them we are nothing. Therefore when William Golding describes the quests of a builder to pierce a hole in the sky with the spire of a cathedral in *The Spire*, he depicts the essence of Sisyphean aspirations and the core of the builder's being. Freud's “oceanic feelings,” which he described in relation to religiosity, were given a secondary –almost peripheral role. However, it is far more central than he thought. It is the expression of the participant core longing to reunite with the totality of pantheism of pre-differentiated early orality. The feeling of grandeur swelling in one's chest while listening to Beethoven's *Eroica* and the melting into the totality of unity while deep in prayer are not just incidental or peripheral processes. They are all there is. They are the things-in-themselves.

As the goals of neither Sisyphean nor Tantallic core vectors can be achieved, the only epistemic reality in existence is the dialectic interaction between the Sisyphean non-realizable separant quests and the equally impossible Tantallic, participant longing. Because the Sisyphean quest faces the future and the Tantallic longing aims at the past, man is in the absurd impasse of being without a present and of being within inauthentic

time. Therefore, creativity and revelation are meant to extricate man from this absurd and inauthentic impasse. Those who cannot be creative and revelatory also try to escape their absurd and oppressive reality by entertainment, fantasy, or daydreaming – passive activities which feed their yearnings. The dialectics of our yearnings provides the fuel and energy by which ego emerges from an inauthentic slumber and interacts creatively, or in a revelatory manner, with objective and human surroundings. Moreover, as the dialectics between the Sisyphean quests and Tantallic longings constitute the epistemic process underlying apparent reality, it is the prime mover of life and creation. Without the dialectics of yearning both ego and his surroundings are dead and non-existent.

The “inspiration” for creativity and the sudden “enlightenment” of revelation are the conscious and cognitive awareness of the otherwise clandestine dialectics of yearnings. This is seen when Archimedes saw his ideas falling into place and emitted a shout of “eureka!” For Proust the taste of a Madeleine cookie triggered his longings for a lost childhood resulting in an odyssey of twelve volumes on a quest for past graces embalmed in the suspended animation of memory. Balzac makes Gobseque, the old miser, sink into a lethargic slumber in front of the fireplace, yet his young quest was fuelled by his vigorous visions of grandeur, success, and power reflected in the same fire. In a similar vein, a revelatory experience may be triggered by the smell of trees after the rain, by the glimmer of colour from the stained glass in a cathedral, or by the refraction of heat from a prickly flower in the desert. Suddenly the inner “pure” self feels itself revealed and exposed to transcendence.

Once the Mythogenic Structure has been formed the bonding processes of creativity are initiated. The creator seeks the appropriate medium of creativity in which to embed the newly formed mythogene.

## **Creativity**

The participant component of creativity is inherent in its revelatory aspect shining forth from the inner self. This discovery that sprouts from the inner core of the self, as denoted by Heidegger<sup>30</sup>, may be projected onto the object or the other and make them shine forth with a sudden disclosure of meaning, worth or enlightenment. This revelatory moment makes one feel that everything falls into place, that obscurity gives way to clarity. This is a moment which does not lend itself to easy analysis and definition. Yet it is distinctly felt by every creator; it makes the inventor shout “eureka,” the musician feel a spine-tingling elation, and the director sense that the actor delivered his lines well. This revelatory feeling that

interacts dialectically through the mythogene with the object-bound creative process is specific and unique to each creator. The feeling itself, and the contents of the revelation, cannot be effectively transmitted to others. However, the fact of its experience and the resultant mythogene is imprinted in the creation and is, therefore, manifest to an observer. Indeed the creator, having experienced a revelation and embedded the mythogene in his creation, provides his work with the element of authenticity that it would otherwise lack. The inauthentic musicians, writers, and artists cater to the whims of the generalized other and produce ready-made goods for quick consumption and shallow thrills. Without the revelatory component a creation is flat. Without a spark of the inner self of the creator infused in it as a mythogene, the creation is inauthentic. A mytho-empirical light is shed on this by Lurianic Kabbala where the world of mere doing is the world of flat matter, whereas the world of creation involves inspirational exposure to angels.<sup>31</sup>

Creativity is the expression of a unique personality. In order to be authentic, the creation has to include some participant dynamics of ego's inner self and is, therefore, as specific to ego as are its fingerprints. Creations are rendered inauthentic by imitation, the servile acceptance of the directives of the other, or the dictates of totalitarian regimes. Discipleship can also render a creation inauthentic, unless the master-teacher serves as a maieutic (midwife) catalyst to his pupils' talents. In the latter case, the teacher helps the creative potential of the pupil grow and flower, and not stifle through authoritarian impositions.

As the creative potential of each individual is unique to himself, the mode, medium, and contents of each individual's creativity has an optimum specific to himself. If a certain individual has heeded the call to authenticity and embarked on his search for rebellious creative expression, he still has to find the suitable mode and medium for his specific psycho-social configuration. This may be accomplished by intuition or trial and error. He may also fail to find it even if he arduously searches for the means of expression suitable for him. Doubts, soul searching, and uncertainties may plague the artist even if he has found a mode of creative expression. Also the optimum medium of creativity for any given person may change with time and place. Some people may also not be aware that they have found their optimal mode of creative expression and let Maeterlinck's "blue-bird" fly away from their own porch.

These are some reasons that explain why most people feel that they haven't found their optimal modes and media of creative expression that are suitable for what they hold to be their talents and artistic potentials. Many others who have found their forms and media of creative expression

are still not satisfied with them and are always searching for new methods, modes and sites of creativity. Here again the search for the “right” mode of creative expression is part of the never-ending Sisyphean dynamics of ego’s creative involvement with his objective and human surroundings. This search in itself may be one expression of man’s authentic existence.

Although individuals each have their unique mode of creative expression, their personality cannot be equated, compared or related to their creation. This is because man’s creation is the dialectical involvement of the goals of his personality core vectors with objects and life forms. The disjunctures between the personality of the creator and his creation relate first of all to the process of authentic creativity which is kindled by the unattainable goals of man’s core vectors. These are the dreams, longings, passions, visions and ideals which are projected, ingrained and imbued onto an object or event. But the actual existing human being, who is also the creator, is bound to be different in most aspects from the images, ideals, and goals of his personality core vectors. Also the final creation, being the dialectical product of the projected quests of ego’s core vectors as creatively involved with an object or an event, is also inevitably different from both the goals of the personality vectors and the initial object with which they were involved. Hence people who meet an artist and are disappointed because “he is so different from his art” should realize that there is an inevitable rift between man and his creation. This rift is necessary to generate the dialectical strain which, in turn, partially spurs the process of creativity itself. In a similar vein, people who lament what seems to them an incomprehensible antinomy that Richard Wagner created a colossal *chef d’oeuvre* of genius like *The Ring of the Niebelungen*, have succumbed to the fallacy of confounding the creator with his creation. Strindberg intuitively sensed this and made Voltaire voice the dictum that his life’s work is in the public domain, to be appreciated or condemned by God and man. The morals and the appearance of the old mule (meaning himself) are utterly irrelevant.

## Life in the Desert

In the preface to *The Myth of Sisyphus*, Camus invites us “to live and to create in the very midst of the desert.”<sup>32</sup> This is precisely what his protagonists, Dr. Rieux and Grand, tried to do within the abyss of the plague. One tries to cure people, begins to write a novel, and plants a rose bush in the middle of the swamp. He doesn’t know the ultimate purpose of the exercise, nor does he have any decisive influence on the course of events. Yet he clings to the life raft of creativity as the only safeguard

against the slump of inauthenticity in the anaesthetizing bosom of the generalized other. Thus Grand starts his novel all over again while hoping to complete it “when all this (the plague) is over.” He immerses himself in writing and rewriting its opening sentences while feeling within himself that the plague is not going to be over and his chances to come out of it are non-existent. Hence seeking creativity within the plague is transcendental because it generates an internal force field which is projected onto the creator’s surroundings and lends a measure of meaning to his involvement with it. Indeed, without creativity man’s race in a cut-throat society of achievers is like “weasels biting each other in a hole,” or worms sliding, slithering, and slashing one another in a heap of excrement. This premise could lend a novel hue to Nietzsche’s dictum that art has been given to man so that he does not die of the truth – that is, of the numbing reality of the Camusean plague.

We project our core personality cravings, quests, and longings which are not realizable onto our creation which extricates us out of the plague while we are still in it. These projections imbue the creative processes with a halo of fulfillment. Without them a violin sonata would be the scratching of horse-tail on dried cat-gut. We, therefore, appreciate the creativity and love the art which is most able to accept and absorb the projections of our personality core yearnings and lift us out of our Sisyphean drudgeries. However, the unrealizability of the goals of the personality core vectors is transferred also to their projections of creativity. The authentic creator is never complacent or content with his creation. He is forever searching for new modes of creative expression because there is nothing that kills creativity more than the feeling of the creator that he has “made it.”

There is a Zen tale of an artist who asked a Zen sage how he will know that the butterfly he painted is perfect. The sage answered that when the painter thinks that his work is complete he should gaze at the water and he would know. When the artist thought that the butterfly he painted was perfect he glanced at the water and saw his own face, which looked old and decrepit. The moral is that once the artist feels that he has achieved his goal, he has either lost his creative potency, or slumped into the complacency of inauthenticity.

As creativity is the sublimated expression of the goals of the personality core vectors it manifests itself along the separant-participant continuum. At the one extreme we have the participant creativity which aims to melt away back into the totality of non-being. The separant creative extremity, on the other hand, wants to impose its sweeping images of aesthetics and its engulfing dreams of dominion on its surroundings and, if possible, on the whole world. However, the nature of a continuum

is such that the components at each pole interact with their opposite polar components in a way that is dependent on each one's position on the continuum. If the Sisyphean creative process is to be authentic, the Tantallic revelatory element must be present in varying forms. Also, man may project his creativity onto transcendence to serve a dual purpose. First, he may feel with Berdyaev that "Man's creative work is the fulfillment of the Creator's secret will."<sup>33</sup> The creator may thus feel that he has been programmed by God to create and that in his creativity he fulfils the purpose of his being-in-the-world. Second, by being creative, man may feel that he imitates the initial act of creation itself, and thus partakes in the reflected creative omnipotence of Divinity. By being creative, Sisyphus works himself up into a rebellion against his own metaphysical projections so that he can lift himself out of his existential impasse and achieve an authentic and meaningful involvement with his rock-burden.

### **Sisyphean and Tantallic Creation**

When engaged in authentic creativity one is truly absorbed in the process and not in the end product. The chances are, therefore, that while being involved in creativity ego feels the dialectical energy flowing out to mould, engulf, or reach the core of the object. This may give a sense of elation and a feeling that he is engaged in his *magnum opus*. Yet after its completion the creator may suffer post-creation depression stemming from a sense of emptiness or deflation. This may be related to a cathartic flow of energy from the interacting personality core vectors due to the process of creativity. However, after a while the quest of the aims of these core vectors is renewed and the dialectical strain between them recharges the creative energy reservoir which leads to another cycle of creativity. This again asserts the essentially Sisyphean nature of the creative process. However, the Tantallic revelatory component of creativity lends it the depth of uniqueness and the imprint of the creator's personality. This may be illustrated by the conversation between Arthur Rubinstein and Picasso. The pianist asked the painter: "Why are you sitting day after day in front of the same fence and painting it?" The painter answered, "It is not the same fence, it changes every minute." The revelatory insights are projected onto the object and change it constantly.