

Harold G. Coward  
University of Calgary

## “SCRIPTURE, REVELATION AND CONSCIOUSNESS IN CHRISTIANITY AND HINDUISM”

The breadth of human experience is such that throughout the ages it has expressed itself through a wide range of structures of consciousness—from poetry to rational discourse to empirical endeavour. The phrase “structure of consciousness” here refers to an internal pattern in the psyche which orders and gives meaning to one’s experience. In psychology today such “structures” are often technically referred to as “epistemic styles”.<sup>1</sup> In each period of human history one of these structures or patterns of consciousness (i.e. the poetic, the rational or the empirical) has tended to become dominant and establish itself as the philosophical presupposition or *Weltanschauung* of the age. As the philosopher Susanne Langer observes, this has the effect of culturally conditioning the general populace and even some of the educated who should know better, into an uncritical acceptance of whatever way of thinking happens to be dominant at the time. This domination by one structure of consciousness, while not totally excluding the others, does effectively limit and shape the questions one may ask. Thus, concludes Langer, each age, with its own way of seeing things, produces its own questions which in turn generate the particular academic enterprise of that era.<sup>2</sup>

1. See for example Amos Wilder’s use of “structure of consciousness” in this sense in his “Parable of the Sower”, *Semeia*, 1974, 2, p. 141. For the notion of epistemic style in contemporary cognitive psychology see Kagan, J., Moss, H.A. & Sigel, I.E., “Psychological Significance of Styles of Conceptualizations” in *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 1963, 28, 73-112; and J.R. Royce, “Epistemic Styles, Individuality, and World-View”, *Research Bulletin*, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, December 1973.

2. Susanne K. Langer, *Philosophy in a New Key* (New York: Mentor, 1948), pp. 15-16.

### I

## THE CONTEMPORARY EXPERIENCE OF CONSCIOUSNESS AND BIBLICAL REVELATION

Herbert Hahn, in his classic review of modern scholarship on the *Old Testament* shows that Langers’ contention holds true for biblical studies. “In every age exegesis has conformed to the thought form of the time...”<sup>3</sup> Hahn notes that in place of the traditional view that sacred scriptures contained a timeless revelation concerning God’s relation to the world, modern biblical scholars elaborated the view that the scriptures were really a literary record of man’s slow growth toward a deeper experience of the spiritual aspects of life.<sup>4</sup> This new approach to the Bible was a direct result of the renaissance premise that all ancient literature should be regarded as the product of human culture. Such a shift in attitude provided the philosophic basis for what came to be called “higher criticism”, and was one of the first steps toward changing the status of scripture in peoples’ experience from “divine revelation” to “human literature”. Rather than the word being a creation and gift of God as it had been held traditionally, it was now experienced as a creation of man. Although “higher criticism” was biased toward the rational and empirical structures of consciousness, it did provide many helpful correctives to the earlier traditional Christian view of the Bible. For example, it contradicted the theological contention that the *Old Testament* was nothing more than the preparation for the *New Testament*. Also, examination of the Bible as literature isolated different types and strands of writing and established a dating procedure which resulted in an understanding of the historical developments embodied in the documents. The conception of historical development in the scriptures was perhaps the chief contribution of scholars of liberal biblical criticism (e.g. J. Astruc, J.G. Eichhorn, W.M.L. De Wette and K.H. Graf). It was an insight based upon assumptions of the scientific method and evolutionary views of history that dominated thought in the latter half of the nineteenth century.<sup>5</sup> The assumptions of the scientific-evolutionary viewpoint

3. Herbert F. Hahn, *The Old Testament in Modern Research*, (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966), p. 10.

4. *Ibid.*, p. xi.

5. *Ibid.*, p. 9-10.

not only shaped the approach of the biblical scholars but also provided the mental set of the average reader (both believing and unbelieving) who knowingly or unknowingly approached the scriptures in a new way. No longer did he or she approach it as a divine revelation to be received. Now the first impulse was to ask who wrote this, when, where and in what historical circumstance. The traditional openness to receive the authoritative and powerful word of God was replaced by a critical man-centred attitude in which the scripture was approached as an object to be ordered, analyzed and put right by the exercise of man's mind. Man, not God, was the point of reference. It is not surprising that, in spite of its positive achievements, this period of biblical scholarship functioning under mainly empirical and rational structures witnessed a diminution of confidence in the scripture as divine revelation, and a loss of vitality in the believer's experience of scriptural words.

The above analysis of what has happened in biblical studies is simply one example of a general cultural shift from one structure of consciousness as dominant to another. The sociologist of knowledge, P.A. Sorokin, has attempted to trace such shifts historically within the broad sweep of Western culture. He suggests that in fifth century B.C. Greek thought, the poetic or idealistic pattern of consciousness, dominated. This was replaced by sensory or empirical dominance from the third century B.C. to the fourth century A.D., while from the sixth to the end of the twelfth century A.D. the rationalism of Christianity dominated.<sup>6</sup> Whether or not one agrees with Sorokin's historical analysis, it does seem self-evident that in each age one structure or pattern of consciousness tends to dominate. And, as Theodore Roszak, Jacques Ellul and others have forcefully argued, ours is an age in which the empirical and the rational have been dominant perhaps to the detriment of poetic aspect of consciousness.<sup>7</sup>

It is the contention of this paper that a full experience of human consciousness requires a balanced openness to all aspects—the empirical, the rational and the poetic. Some contemporary psychologists have recently warned against the danger of continuing to downgrade the poetic or intuitive side of consciousness.

6. Pitirim A. Sorokin, *The Crisis of Our Age* (New York: E.P. Dutton, 1941), pp. 102-105.

7. Theodore Roszak, *Where the Wasteland Ends* (New York: Anchor Books, 1973), pp. 202-252.

The cognitive psychologists Kenneth Hammond,<sup>8</sup> Jerome Bruner,<sup>9</sup> J.W. Getzels and M. Csikszentmihalyi,<sup>10</sup> along with many others conclude that a balance between analytical and intuitive psychological processes is essential for creative achievement in both scientific and artistic endeavours. Carl Jung, although arguing for the necessity of the thinking, feeling, sensing and intuiting functions of consciousness, stresses the importance of intuition in today's culture, where from an early age, a child is rewarded and trained mainly in the development of the sensing and thinking function. In Jung's view the lack of development of the intuitive aspect of consciousness is especially serious since it is through intuitive processes that the archetypes of ultimate reality, deep within the collective unconscious, are grasped and individuated to one's own conscious experience. This is particularly true, says Jung, in the case of religious experience.<sup>11</sup> The aim of this paper is to consider the importance of the full experience of all aspects or structures of consciousness in the reception of scriptural revelation.

A helpful methodology in this regard might be to take up a completely different set of assumptions from those of our modern age, and then examine the approach to and experience of scripture which results. Bearing in mind the way in which a particular culture so subtly imposes its presuppositions or dominant aspect of consciousness, one tactic for obtaining a new viewpoint (a new and perhaps more inclusive set of dominant aspects of consciousness) is to heuristically adopt a different cultural context.<sup>12</sup> With regard to the problem here being studied, a particularly helpful viewpoint might be that of the fifth century Hindu scholar Bhartṛhari. The Hindu tradition is especially suitable for relating to the

8. K. R. Hammond, "Toward a Recovery of Rational Man", *Colorado Quarterly*, 1964, Fall, pp. 101-120.

9. J.S. Bruner, *The Process of Education* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1961), pp. 57-58.

10. J.W. Getzels and M. Csikszentmihalyi, "Scientific Creativity", *Science Journal*, September 1967, pp. 80-84.

11. C. Jung, *Psychology and Religion* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1938). See also J. Jacobi, *The Psychology of C.G. Jung*. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1958) and Ruth Monroe, *Schools of Psychoanalytic Thought* (New York: Dryden Press, 1955).

12. Of course one is never able to do this with complete objectivity. Something of one's own cultural bias always remains. But the modern discipline of religious studies is founded on the belief that with rigorous academic effort one can with some success get beyond oneself and "stand in the shoes" of the person or tradition being studied.

Western Jewish and Christian traditions since it too is based and validated on the experience of a scriptural revelation (i.e. the Vedas). Bhartṛhari is interesting because he is a sophisticated philosopher, theologian, grammarian, and psychologist who, in his *Vākyapadīya* (C. 500 A.D.), carefully studies the question "How is language, especially the special language of revelation, received and understood by man?" His explanation is all the more stimulating, because like that of many contemporary thinkers, it is couched in terms of levels or structures of consciousness.

## II

### INSIGHTS FROM A HINDU APPROACH TO LANGUAGE AND REVELATION

In Bhartṛhari's view language, in its essence, is not man-made but divine.<sup>13</sup> Consciousness is so created that it has within itself the *a priori* forms or structures of language. At first hearing, this emphasis on innate language may bring to mind Chomsky's contemporary theory of innate grammatical structures.<sup>14</sup> However, on closer examination Bhartṛhari's view, although it can accommodate Chomsky, goes much further. Whereas for Chomsky the innate grammatical structures of consciousness are epistemologically neutral, Bhartṛhari's *a priori* forms provide not only the structural syntax of language but also its meaning. In Bhartṛhari's view, therefore, meaning (and structure) will not primarily expose itself through an analysis of the conventional characteristics of human culture (e.g. archaeology, anthropology, sociology, etc.). Of course such studies will not be discontinuous with the deeper meaning, since man's cultural activity is but a manifestation or outer expression of his inner consciousness. Therefore, some trace of the inner meaning will always be present at the empirical level, although necessarily in a partial and incomplete fashion due to the limitations of man's conceptual processes. But, says Bhartṛhari, to experience the full meaning inherent within consciousness, man must pass inward from the outer level of empirical manifestation,

13. *The Vākyapadīya of Bhartṛhari*, trans. by K.A. Subramania Iyer. (Poona: Deccan College, 1965).

14. N. Chomsky, *Language and Mind*. (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World Inc., 1968).

to the middle level of rational formulation and finally arrive at the intuitive level of the meaning-whole (*sphoṭa*) itself.

While the last few statements may tempt some Western readers to immediately dismiss what is being said as simply more of that same mystification for which the East is so well-known, it is interesting to observe that something which seems in many ways remarkably similar is being proposed in the West these days by the new and fashionable school of Biblical Structuralism. Writing in the new biblical criticism journal *Semeia*, Amos Wilder says:

Structural investigation...has often been compared to archaeology. Where biblical writings are at issue this operation would be a second kind of stratigraphy beyond that represented by the excavation of buried forms. Now it is a question not of exposing a succession of overlays in a historical-evolutionary dimension, but of identifying a grammar common to all such layers. Here we have an operation of decoding or looking for the "figure in the carpet" which can tell us much about the basic orientation of some human family or epoch or the ultimate logic of human consciousness itself.<sup>15</sup>

Like Bhartṛhari, Structuralism talks of levels of language with each level expressing the meaning of the whole. The inner meaning, or archetype as it is sometimes called, is deep within human consciousness and can only be imperfectly symbolized at the surface levels. This implies that to have any understanding, even at the surface levels, requires the reader or hearer to open himself to the inner meaning even though it is not yet fully perceived. As John Crossan puts it in his structural study of the parables of Jesus, "To understand a parable one must at least be 'looking in the same direction' as its creative author".<sup>16</sup> The hearer of the parables is therefore required to share (affirm) something of the frame of mind (structures of consciousness) of Jesus for only then will he be sensitive to the direction and distance of the in-

15. Amos N. Wilder, "An Experimental Journal", *Semeia*, 1, 1974, p. 10.

16. John D. Crossan, "Parable and Example in the Teaching of Jesus", *Semeia*, 1, 1974, p. 87.

ward "leap" (from the literal to the metaphorical and beyond) that the scriptural parable invites him to take.<sup>17</sup>

In a recent issue of *Semeia* Paul Ricoeur shows how parable, which is narrative form of the metaphorical process, operates to take the hearer beyond the literal to the poetic.<sup>18</sup> Metaphor proceeds from the tension produced when two words, which in terms of their empirical or literal meaning do not fit, are placed together. This is nicely illustrated by Crossan's analysis of what happened within the psyches of Jesus' hearers when he put together the words "good" and "Samaritan".<sup>19</sup> On the surface or empirical level, it looks much like the modern philosophic notion of a category mistake. Two classes which were previously far distant are suddenly brought together, but in such a way that the result is something quite different from a mere mistake. Through the tension evoked when the hearer is asked to put together the two contradictory words "good" and "Samaritan", the listener is raised from his usual structuring of consciousness to a new way of "seeing" in which the "good Samaritan" is a true language revelation of reality. It is a "truth", however, which is not retranslatable *in its fullness* into literal, empirical or rational categories. This is why it is characterized as a poetic structuring of consciousness. Ricoeur concludes that at its deepest level the language of revelation is a variety of poetic language.<sup>20</sup> In Ricoeur's view the textual levels of scriptural language simultaneously *reference forward* to an extra-linguistic reality, and *reference backward* to a speaker and the communication with an audience.<sup>21</sup> The *reference forward* is accomplished by the metaphoric processes which effectively point to or evoke a reality which cannot be fully conceptualized in literal or rational structures of consciousness. The *reference backward*, however, once the extra-linguistic referent has been made known through poetic structures, necessarily involves the use of rational and empirical processes to translate the new intuition into action in everyday life. Thus *all* structures of consciousness are necessary for the full experience of scriptural language and revelation, and indeed for the full apprehension of any ordinary language.

17. *Ibid.*, p. 86.

18. Paul Ricoeur, "The Metaphorical Process", *Semeia*, 4, 1975, pp. 75-106.

19. Crossan, *op. cit.*, p. 76.

20. Ricoeur, *op. cit.*, p. 107.

21. *Ibid.*, p. 66.

Both Bhartṛhari and contemporary Biblical Structuralism, therefore, suggest that the experience of scriptural language as being spiritually alive naturally occurs when the validating presuppositions are shifted from the surface level (empirism, rationalism, and evolutionary development) to the inner level of symbol, metaphor and, finally, to the silent understanding of the heart. Crossan concludes that the ultimate referent of the parable is above the level of the literal words and irreducible to any abstract philosophical or ethical principle. "It is", says Crossan, "servant only to the revelation that pushes forward to vision in and through it."<sup>22</sup>

The above approach to the experience of scripture imposes certain very practical requirements on lay devotees and scholars alike. (1) One's mental set must not be fixated on any empirical or rational presupposition, but be free to follow the spirit of the scripture itself through the literal and rational words to the inner insight that is being revealed. Ultimately, it may be the poetic rather than the empirical approach that is required. This does not mean that the empirical side has no function. On the contrary, it has the important function of purifying the literal and rational levels of language so that they can be effective symbolic vehicles both in revealing the extra-linguistic referent, and in putting the religious insight into practice in one's everyday life. (2) If what has been said in point one is correct, it then follows that while one's initial approach to scripture will likely be more scientific and rational, one must move quickly to a meditative study in which the hearer intends and allows himself to become caught up into the poetic level of the words themselves. It is through meditation that the deeper levels are reached and revelation becomes a living experience. (3) To allow oneself to be "caught up" requires trust, provisional trust if necessary, for otherwise one will never get beyond the empirical and rational levels. The revelation will not be experienced. If the starting point is "provisional trust", such as the Buddha counselled, then the experience of the revelation provides the verification and the trust becomes absolute rather than provisional. The affirmation of scripture as revelation and the revelation experience are reciprocal precursors of one another. Amos Wilder has recently emphasized exactly this point in his demonstration of the need for "naivete" in the experiencing of scriptural language.

22. Crossan, *op. cit.*, p. 88.

A work of art has a life of its own apart from its reporters. It remains itself and goes on testifying or celebrating, independently of its interpreters and their various versions and deformations of its communication... So it is with a parable or other literary form in Scripture. Its *telling* is ever and again to be heard naively and afresh. The deep registers or response in the hearer should not be disturbed at this level of encounter by other preoccupations.<sup>23</sup>

A serious problem in the above approach arises from the fact that it is really nothing more than an analysis of language and the structures of consciousness. If this is so how is the uniqueness of scripture in relation to ordinary language to be maintained? The modern Biblical Structuralists do not seem to have addressed themselves to this problem. Consequently, their analysis would seem open to the danger of reducing scripture to being no different from other human aesthetic literature. Bhartṛhari, however, does address himself to this question. Perhaps the way in which he solves it would be worthy of consideration by the Structuralists. In Chapter One, *karikas* four to eight of the *Vākyapadiya*, Bhartṛhari makes the following points. The One Brahman is "seed" or ground of all creation, including all language. As the "seed" form of all language, the absolute One is *Sabdabrahman*, the Divine Word. The first division and manifestation of the Divine Word, is its proclamation as the Vedas by the *Ṛsis*. The Vedas, therefore, are the primary and purest expression of the Divine Word, and subsequently function as the criterion for all other language. The language of the various arts and sciences which bring poetic, rational and empirical knowledge to man flow forth from the Vedas.

In Bhartṛhari's view therefore, all language, since it flows forth from the Divine Word, has revelatory capacity (general revelation). But the ordinary language of the disciplines is so fragmented by its division into the endlessly subdividing finite categories of rational speculation and empirical perception that in itself it becomes hopelessly entangled and confused. The language of the scriptures, however, is closer to the unitary wholeness of

23. Amos N. Wilder, "The Parable of the Sower: Naivete and Method in Interpretation", *Semeia*, 2, 1974, p. 135.

God. It has the very minimum of finite separation—just enough to make it verbalizable and perceptible to man. Scripture, therefore, has the highest economy, and the greatest evocative power of all language. Not surprisingly, it is often poetic form. It bears the fewest marks of man's egoistic manipulation and shows forth with power the ONE from which all speech flows forth. Scripture is, therefore, the criterion (the special revelation) against which all other language is to be judged. This is Bhartṛhari's explanation. Even if Bhartṛhari's answer is not acceptable to modern thought, it clearly raises a question of utmost importance to any traditional religion based on scriptural revelation—namely, how to safeguard the revelation language against reduction to ordinary human language.

### III

#### IMPLICATIONS FOR THE ACADEMIC STUDY OF SCRIPTURE

At the outset of this study it was observed that in every age biblical study and criticism conforms to dominant thought forms of the time. For roughly the past two centuries rational and empirical structures of consciousness have provided the dominant frame of mind for Western thought and modern biblical criticism. By treating the subject of study as a detached object to be observed, described and qualified, certain gains have been made. Today, however, the limitations inherent in these presuppositions are increasingly entering the awareness of both the scholar and the ordinary person. All around us in contemporary society there is evidence that a shift is occurring from the dominance of the empirical mode to a new structure of consciousness. Books about a Yaqui Indian named Don Juan, who teaches how to overcome materialistic looking and to "see" deeper dimensions of reality, are best-sellers and evoke an emphatic response from large numbers of students.<sup>24</sup> In contemporary religion fascination with the intuitive mysticism of the East<sup>25</sup> and a recovery of respect for contemplation within the Jewish and Christian traditions<sup>26</sup> indicate that

24. C. Casteneda, *A Separate Reality* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1971).

25. Jacob Needleman, *The New Religions* (Toronto: Pocket Books, 1972).

26. W. McNamara, *The Human Adventure: Contemplation for Everyman* (New York: Doubleday, 1974). Within the Jewish tradition one witnesses the recent popularity of Hasidism.

a shift in the dominant perspective toward the poetic is occurring. Every where courses, books and articles on yoga and meditation abound. In modern biblical studies too, the influence of this new cultural approach is evident. Structuralism, as has been shown above, argues for the inner poetic structures of language and consciousness as fundamental in the interpretation of scripture. The important implication here is that the academic scholar of scripture should be critically aware of the dominant thought forms that are being adopted as basic assumptions, and of the need to make room for *all* aspects of consciousness in his interpretative methodology.

In addition to the above general observation some specific implications are suggested by the comparison of Bhartṛhari's language theory with modern Biblical Structuralism. Both talk in terms of levels or structures of language and reality—an approach which may offer theoretical and practical advantages for the academic study of scripture. Bhartṛhari is more specific than the Structuralists. He finds language to be operating on three levels, each of which is important and necessary.<sup>27</sup> On the lowest level there are the empirical manifestations of letters, words and sentences in either spoken or written form (*vaikhari vāk*). The task of scholarship at the empirical level is to work diligently to insure that the written forms of the scripture do not suffer from any obscuration or distortion as a result of either faulty transmission by the tradition or sloppy usage by the people. For Bhartṛhari this keeping of the spoken and written language pure requires careful attention to detail and constant vigilance on the part of scholars. It is the first step which sets the stage allowing for the development of the next two levels. Although it is lowest in the academic hierarchical study and experience of scripture, it has real importance. Without it the subsequent steps cannot be actualized—loss of the scripture would be disastrous. Scripture could not be replaced by other human language for it is the norm for all language. The purity of the empirical language is equally important since it is through the empirical that the deeper levels are experienced. Distortions and errors at this level act as a serious obstacle to the deeper experience of the revelation. In the terminology of modern biblical studies, Bhartṛhari's *vaikhari vāk* would seem to correspond with “lower criticism”.

27. *Vākyaśāstra*, *op. cit.*, I:142 with the *vṛtti*.

Clear and correct presentation of the scriptural words evokes the second level of language which Bhartṛhari calls *madhyamā vāk*. It is the level of conceptual thought which comes between the spoken word and the inner intuition. At this second level the scholar has the important task of using his reason to remove misconceptions and biases (as for example, a cultural presupposition such as empiricism) which may be blocking the experience of the revelation. In modern biblical scholarship this would correspond with the important task of “higher criticism”.

The faithful presentation of the scriptural words and the careful exercise of reason to remove man-made obstacles clears the way to the full experience of the revelation at the highest level which Bhartṛhari aptly calls *paśyanti vāk*. It is true inner “seeing” of the Divine Word itself. At this level the finite separation of the revelation into spoken words and inner thoughts are transcended so that the revelation is experienced in its true unity and fullness. It is the experience of that to which word symbols point and to which the metaphorical tension of the parable directs us. At this level we are, if we will naively trust, “caught up” through the medium of the words but taken beyond them to communion with the Divine. To understand and experience this third level is the goal, the purpose towards which all the scholarship of the lower levels is directed.

These three levels or structures of language should not be thought of as rigid hierarchies. It is not that you only move to level two after having perfected level one and so on. Rather the movement is one of oscillation. It is much like Ricoeur's notion of the *reference forward* and *reference backward* in one's experience of scripture. The point is well illustrated in Amos Wilder's life experience. He reports that at age fourteen, in a rural Sunday School class taught by a village housewife, he heard the six verses of the parable of the sower as a dynamic revelation. Wilder observes that “the revelatory power of the parable was no doubt related to the fresh sensibility of childhood, but the experience has always remained with me as one of my earliest memories of the power of the Scripture and of language generally”.<sup>28</sup> After this level three experience of communion with God through the poetic structures of consciousness, what did Wilder do with the rest of his life?

28. Amos N. Wilder, “The Parable of the Sower”, *op. cit.*, p. 136.

He did not rest withdrawn in mystic bliss, as some modern biblical scholars might be quick to suggest. Instead he returned to the empirical and rational structures of consciousness possessing a deeper insight with which to remove more obstacles and impurities thus allowing for an even deeper experience of the poetic. Wilder devoted his life to the rigorous academic study of the scripture, but never losing touch with poetic structures of consciousness and the reality to which they point. Indeed the findings of the Biblical Structuralists and Bhartṛhari suggest that a firm foundation in the poetic intuitive or metaphorical experience of the world frees one to clearly follow the spirit of the scripture itself out through the literal and rational levels and back to the inner insight that is being revealed. As Bhartṛhari might put it, the *ṛsi* or purified saint should also be the most rigorous empiricist and the clearest rationalist.<sup>29</sup>

This same oscillation between the various levels and structures of consciousness is found in Carl Jung's view of symbol formation<sup>30</sup> when applied to scriptural language. Scripture has symbolic power when it represents the inexpressible in an unsurpassable way. As symbols of the divine, scriptural words are alive when they have subjective meaning for the hearer; without subjective meaning they are simply signs—like the literal words of linguistically fixated biblical scholars. Subjective meaning or intuition occurs when in an attitude of trust and meditation, the externally sensed word of scripture is taken deeply inwards to the level of the collective unconscious. There it points to and resonates positively with the God archetype.<sup>31</sup> Then, however, the movement reverses itself so that the archetype can be intuitively individuated and raised from the collective unconscious to the structures of rational and empirical expression. This is the creative activity that is uniquely undertaken by each individual psyche, each individual hearer of the word. Psychologically it has the effect of both making present the divine, and integrating one's personality into a mature

29. *Fākyapadīya*, *op. cit.*, I:11-13.

30. Jung's theory of symbol formation is concisely described by Ruth Monroe, *Schools of Psychoanalytic Thought*. (New York: Dryden Press, 1955). pp. 549ff.

31. Carl Jung, *Psychology and Religion*. (New Haven: Yale University Press 1938), p. 73.

"self". As Jung puts it, "religion is the fruit and the culmination of the completeness of life, that is, of a life which contains both sides". The integrated oscillation, involving all the structures of consciousness, results in deep intuitive awareness, rigorous analytical knowledge and effective empirical action.

In this process the special status of the revealed word is safeguarded if one allows that it and only it can authoritatively unlock and completely individuate the divine archetype in one's experience. Here one is reminded of the experience of Augustine who sensed that he had the name of God inherently within his memory (on the tip of his tongue, as it were), but could only individuate or know it for himself when the external presentation of the scriptural revelation of Christ fit perfectly with the unconscious memory (archetype) prompting a flash of intuitive recognition.

#### IV

#### CONCLUSION

This paper has examined the importance and necessity of giving full attention to the wide range of structures of consciousness in the academic study of language and revelation. The strong but subtle bias in favour of the dominant mode of the age was noted and its effect upon modern biblical criticism recognized. To counter the modern predisposition toward empirical and rational approaches, the viewpoint of the fifth century A.D. Hindu Bhartṛhari was adopted and analyzed with reference to the experience of language and scriptural revelation. The major finding was that the intuitive or poetic aspect of consciousness is essential for any full experience of language generally, and for the special revelation of scripture. Whereas modern biblical criticism, under the domination of empirical and rational structures of consciousness, often reveals only human things—by whom a passage was written, at what date, under what social and political circumstance and in what linguistic form—Bhartṛhari teaches that the revealed words are to be meditated upon with reference not only to the literal text (*vaikhari vāk*) and rational understanding (*madhyamā vāk*), but with openness to the poetic vision within (*paśyanti vāk*). The new Western school of Biblical Structuralism was found to share some ideas with Bhartṛhari—especially in the interpretation of parables by Crossan and Ricoeur. There was a common emphasis

on the need to go beyond the literal words through symbolic or metaphorical forms of poetic consciousness to the divine reality, which can be evoked but not encapsulated in uttered language.

Certain practical implications were noted of importance for both lay devotees and academic scholars: (1) One must be liberated (not fixated empirically, rationally or poetically) to follow the spirit of the scripture itself through all levels of language experience; (2) Therefore, one must be open not only to analytical but also to meditative-intuitive study in which the hearer allows himself to be caught up into the poetic experience of the words; (3) To be "caught up" requires trust, Buddha's provisional trust at least, or, as Amos Wilder puts it, a need for naivete in the hearing of scripture; (4) The open experience of the fullness of language in all its levels is one of spiralling oscillation rather than linear movement in a single direction. A clearer poetic experience of the word frees and motivates one to a more rigorous rational and empirical refining of scriptural text, which in turn lays the foundation for a fresh insight. Carl Jung's analysis of the psychological process of symbol formation was found to be consistent with the above explanation.

A significant and apparently unsolved problem for modern biblical scholarship (including the Structuralists) is the question of how to safeguard the authority and special revelation status of scripture in the Jewish and Christian traditions. Since scripture is being analyzed as ordinary language, albeit powerful poetic language on occasion, it is in danger of being reduced to the merely human level—that of general revelation only. Being within the Hindu tradition, which is also based on a special scriptural revelation (the Vedas), Bhartrhari had to face this same problem. His solution was to see the scriptural language of the Vedas as the absolute criterion against which all other language, scientific, rational and so on must be validated. While this solution opens the door to the danger of a spiritual reductionism, it may be a helpful corrective to the opposite movement of much modern scholarship.