THE JOURNEYS OF SIDDHARTHA GAUTAMA AND JESUS OF NAZARETH: EXAMPLES OF THE MYTHIC HERO'S QUEST

A Dissertation

Presented to

The Faculty of the Department of Religious Studies

University of the West

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

by

Judith L. Jensen

Spring 2014

Approved and recommended for acceptance as a dissertation in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Religious Studies

Judith L. Jensen
Candidate

February 20, 2014
Date

THE JOURNEYS OF SIDDHARTHA GAUTAMA AND JESUS OF NAZARETH: EXAMPLES OF THE MYTHIC HERO'S QUEST

APPROVED:

Jane Naomi Iwamura, Chair	February 19, 2014
Miroj Shakya, Committee Member	February 19, 2014
Danny Fisher, Committee Member	February 20, 2014

I hereby declare that this dissertation has not been submitted
as an exercise for a degree at any other institution,
and that it is entirely my own work

_____

Acknowledgements

This research project has been made possible through the advice and support of the Department of Religious Studies professors from whom I learned about the many different facets of the history and practice of Buddhism.

I would like to acknowledge Dr. Bruce Long whose interest in mythology parallels my own. Our discussions of mythology assisted in the development of the thesis for this research project.

My sincere thanks to Dr. Jane Iwamura for the time and effort she dedicated to insure the completion of this research project.

My earnest gratitude goes to Dr. Miroj Shakya for being the wonderful teacher that he is, and for his tranquil, steady support through the completion of this dissertation.

My heartfelt thanks to Dr. Danny Fisher for being willing to be included in this dissertation process thereby allowing me to complete this project.

Abstract

The Journeys of Siddhartha Gautama and Jesus of Nazareth

Examples of the Mythic Hero's Quest

Siddhartha Gautama and Jesus of Nazareth are two religious figures that have had a substantial impact on human culture. This dissertation investigates the longevity of these iconic figures by examining their religious narratives through the lens of contemporary cognitive developmental theories. This approach addresses the human tendency to perceive meaningful patterns, project those patterns onto recipient agents, and then compose narratives about the process. In addition to providing insight into what makes certain religious figures so compelling, the project also seeks to evaluate cognitive theory as a viable method of understanding religious narratives.

This study contains both explanatory and experimental components of methodology. The explanatory method examines theories of cognitive narratization, patternicity, and agenticity as functions of the human brain applied to myth making and the development of sacred narratives; explores the linguistic use of metaphor in sacred narratives; and, recounts the myth of "The Hero's Quest," that serves as a template for understanding the narratives of Siddhartha and Jesus. Experimentally, I compare and contrast the mythic hero "pattern" proposed by von Hahn, Rank, Raglan, Campbell, and Dundes to the mythic narratives of Siddhartha and Jesus to determine if they result in a "good fit." The standard of "goodness of fit" is established by the narratives conforming to the collective attributes of von Hahn, Rank, Raglan, Campbell,

and Dundes as verified by the statistical analysis of content validity and inter-rater reliability. To establish inter-rater reliability of the contemporary interpretation of the narrative passages, four volunteer raters are chosen to read selected narrative passages and complete a checklist of the primary attributes.

Analysis of the data indicates that all the hero attributes are identified in both the narratives of Siddhartha and Jesus although the reliability of the identification of the attributes in specific passages ranges from slight to almost perfect with the divergence being related to rater interpretation of specific passages and the polysemic nature of language.

Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1

Introduction to the Study

The Problem

In this, the third millennium of the Common Era, many centuries after the Buddha and Jesus Christ walked the earth; there exist millions of people who believe that one or the other, or both, of these men were "saviors" of humanity. Even in light of the massive amounts of scientific data that explain the evolutionary process; in light of the cosmological data describing the age of the universe; in light the of the neurophysiological research explicating the biological underpinnings of belief systems; people still believe in gods, miracles, heaven, and hell[1] as reported in sacred narratives, sometimes referred to as sacred myths.

Michael Shermer, a contemporary self-proclaimed skeptic, cites a Harris Poll conducted in the year 2009 as evidence that twice as many Americans believe in God than believe in evolution.[2] Shermer's explanation for this is that an individual's most deeply held beliefs are usually resistant to change through education, unless there is personal psychological readiness and a change in the larger socio-cultural zeitgeist. He holds to a theory he calls "belief-dependent realism" which he clarifies as the following:

> We form our beliefs for a variety of subjective, personal, emotional, and psychological reasons in the context of environments created by family, friends, colleagues, culture, and society at large; after forming our beliefs we then defend, justify, and rationalize them with a host of intellectual reasons, cogent arguments, and rational explanations. Beliefs come first, explanations for beliefs follow. I

1 Michael Shermer, *The Believing Brain* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 2011); Rhawn Joseph, *The Transmitter to God* (San Jose: University of California Press, 2001); Stephen Hawking and Leonard Mlodinow, *The Grand Design* (New York: Boston Books, 2010).
2 Shermer, *The Believing Brain*, 2–3.

> call this process belief-dependent realism, where our perceptions about reality are dependent on the beliefs that we hold about it. Reality exists independent of human minds, but our understanding of it depends upon the beliefs we hold at any given time.
>
> The brain is a belief engine. From sensory data flowing in through the senses the brain naturally begins to look for and find patterns, and then infuses those patterns with meaning. The first process I call *patternicity: the tendency to find meaningful patterns in both meaningful and meaningless data*. The second process I call *agenticity: the tendency to infuse patterns with meaning, intention, and agency* . . . . Our brains evolved to connect the dots of our world into meaningful patterns that explain why things happen. These meaningful patterns become beliefs, and these beliefs shape our understanding of reality.
>
> Once beliefs are formed, the brain begins to look for and find confirmatory evidence in support of those beliefs, which adds an emotional boost of further confidence in the beliefs . . . .[3]

Religious beliefs are most often inculcated in childhood. Even children who are not raised in overtly religious families acquire some religious ideas from the community in which they are reared.[4] For example most children believe that angels and/or demons exist.[5] When asked directly, children will often say that they believe in God even though they cannot describe exactly what they mean by God.

If we take an evolutionary perspective, in the history of humanity people encountered new experiences for which they had not previously developed an explanation. Some of these new experiences were wholly different from their customary day-to-day experiences. Mircea Eliade describes the "different" experiences as "hierophanies" or manifestations of the sacred as opposed to the natural or "profane" worldly day-to-day experiences.[6] According to the aforementioned theory of Shermer, humans who

---

3 Ibid., 5.
4 N.G. Waller et al., "Genetic and Environmental Influences on Religious Attitudes and Values: A Study of Twins Reared Apart and Together," *Psychological Science 1* no. 2 (1990): 138–42; Shermer, *The Believing Brain*.
5 G. Gallup and J. Castelli, *The People's Religion* (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1989).
6 Mircea Eliade, *The Sacred and the Profane*, trans. Willard R. Trask (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1987), 11.

encountered a new experience would then develop an explanation for the experience using the concepts of patternicity and agenticity. God, as an explanation for things that seem "other than profane," is the ultimate pattern and agent that explains everything from the beginning to the end of the universe and encompassing the fate of human beings as well.[7]

There are two general psychological categories of experience that cause modern human beings to feel intense anxiety; one is lack of structure and the other is lack of knowledge. My belief about the development of the concept of God, and a subsequent theology about how God operates, is that "God" acts as a container for human anxiety by providing knowledge and structure about the world and the meaning of life. After humans became conscious of themselves as "being" in the world, the consciousness that followed was of "nonbeing." Belief in a God, and the subsequent theology, became an antidote for the dread of extinction.

Many theorists advance the proposition that God is "hardwired" into the human brain but they differ as to the explanation of why they believe this to be true.[8] Some theorists believe that God implanted this biological need in humans for his own purposes while others believe that it resulted from a process of developmental evolution.[9] Shermer represents the evolutionary group when he states: "For a materialist such as myself, there

is no such thing as 'mind.' It ultimately reduces down to neurons firing and

---

7 Michael Shermer, *The Science of Good and Evil* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 2004).
8 Shermer, *The Believing Brain*; Dean Hamer, *The God Gene: How Faith Is Hardwired Intot Our Genes* (New York: Anchor, 1999); Joseph, *The Transmitter to God*; Donald E. Brown, *Human Universals* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1991); Charles Darwin, *The Descent of Man* (London: John Murray, 1871).
9 Shermer, *The Believing Brain*; Walter Burkert, *Creation of the Sacred--Tracks of Biology in Early Religions* (Cambridge: Harvard Universitiy Press, 1996); Julian Jaynes, *The Origin of Conscioiusness in the Breakdown of the Bicameral Mind.* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1971).

neurochemical transmitter substances flowing across synaptic gaps between neurons, combining in complex patterns to produce something we call mind but is actually just brain."[10]

Still other theorists take issue with the concept that belief in God is a biological substrate at all. Rather, for them it is the expression of consciousness which is not necessarily wedded to the biological brain.[11]

Wilbur asserts this position when he describes the relationship of the mind to the brain as follows:

> Notice the difference between the interior of the individual—such as the mind—and the exterior of the individual—such as the brain. The mind is known by acquaintance; the brain, by objective description. You know your own mind directly, immediately, intimately—all the thoughts and feelings and yearnings and desires that run across your awareness moment to moment. Your brain, on the other hand, even though it is "inside" your organism, is not interior in your awareness, like your mind. The brain, rather, is known in an exterior and objectifying fashion; it consists of systems such as the neocortex and neurotransmitters such as dopamine, acetylcholine, and serotonin. But you never directly experience something you identify as dopamine. . . . In fact, you cannot even see your brain unless you cut open your skull and get a mirror. But you can see your mind right now.[12]

Whatever the origin of this need to believe in God and whatever the purpose of the need, it seems clear that the majority of humans need to believe in something beyond themselves. It is also clear that the object of belief can range from a deified entity such as the Christ to a sublime experience such as Nirvana.

This particular study is not concerned with whether belief in God is only a

---

10 Shermer, *The Believing Brain*, 22–3.
11 Ken Wilbur, *A Brief History of Everything* (Boston: Shambhala, 1996); Ken Wilbur, *The Marriage of Sense and Soul* (New York: Broadway, 1998); Fred Alan Wolf, *The Spiritual Universe* (New York: Simon & Shuster, 1996); Deepak Chopra, *Quantum Healing* (New York: Bantam, 1990).
12 Wilbur, *The Marriage of Sense and Soul*, 70–1.

biological expression of an evolutionary survival mechanism or an example of the existence of supramundane consciousness. However, it is useful to borrow the concepts of patternicity and agenticity from Shermer to evaluate that subset of people who focus their belief in God on a deified entity about whom they gain knowledge through the vehicle of sacred narrative.

Need for the Study

We no longer live in a world where ideologically similar people live in groups that are minimally impacted by other philosophies due to geographic distance and limited avenues of communication. Now through media such as television and the internet, peoples' belief systems can instantaneously intrude on each other even if they are on opposite sides of the world. This often results in conflict and violence due to each group's need to defend its own beliefs. Because the shrinking world no longer affords us the comfort of living in isolated pockets of belief, we are being required to stretch our sensibilities. Some theorists would disagree with Shermer's stance that deeply held beliefs only change through education *after* the individual's psyche is ready for change. Other theorist's purport that education may in fact *produce* the psychic readiness for change in deeply held beliefs.[13] If we follow the notion that education can prepare the way for change in belief patterns, then one community understanding its own belief pattern and subsequently learning to understand the belief pattern of another community, may improve the relationships within the total human race. While education is not an all-inclusive solution, attempting to understand our own motivations and the motivations of others is a

13 Jeffrey Olen and Barry Vincent, *Applying Ethics* (Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1999); Bernard Willliams, "Ethics," in *Philosophy 1*, ed. A.C. Grayling (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998).

good place to start.

Those groups of people who focus their spiritual beliefs on a single individual whom they identify as a savior, or a model of transcendence, do so for reasons that can be understood in the context of human needs. Understanding why we attach certain attributes to particular individuals not only helps us understand our own motivations, but may also assist us in our ability to understand the perspective of others. This conviction is just one principle that guides this study.

With regard to the myth of the hero, several theorists such as von Hahn, Rank, and Raglan,[14] have applied "the pattern" to numerous mythic persons. However, not until recently has anyone since James Frazer dared to offend Christians by suggesting that the myth applies to the story of Jesus.[15] Campbell[16] has also suggested that the myth applies to Siddhartha Gautama, but there has never been a systematic attempt to compare the features of the narratives of the Buddha and the Christ to the primary attributes of the myth of the hero.

Purpose of the Study

Venerating a human being is the focus of the monotheistic religion of Christianity and of the nontheistic religion of Buddhism, which together comprise the largest number of believers on earth. Although Buddhist scriptures tell us there have been many previous Buddhas, the worship of Siddhartha Gautama has continued for twenty-five hundred

14 Johann Georg von Hahn, *Sagwissenschaftliche Studien.* (Jena: Mauke, 1876); Otto Rank, *The Myth of the Birth of the Hero* (New York: Vintage, 1959); Lord Raglan, "The Hero of Tradition," *Folklore* no. no 45 (1934): 212–31.
15 Joseph Campbell, *The Hero with a Thousand Faces* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1949); Alan Dundes, *In Quest of the Hero* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990).
16 Joseph Campbell, *Oriental Mythology* (New York: Penquin Books, 1962).

years.[17] Mythical narratives also tell us that there have been many others who were declared to be the "savior" of mankind,[18] but the worship of Jesus of Nazareth has continued for over two thousand years. In the expanse of time, very few people ever encountered the actual persons of Siddhartha or Jesus. The vast majority of "believers" have known only of Siddhartha and Jesus through the stories, the oral narratives, and finally the written texts about the lives of these two individuals. What is it about the stories of these two individuals that causes such staying power?

The purpose of this study is to determine if Siddhartha and Jesus have enjoyed longevity of worship, in part, because their stories "fit" a model of sacred narrative that resonates with the need of humans, thereby reducing anxiety about mortality.

Hypothesis

The hypothesis that guides this study is as follows:

Siddhartha Gautama has been venerated as the Buddha for twenty-five hundred years and Jesus of Nazareth has been worshipped as the Savior of mankind for two thousand years, in part, because the evolutionary developments in biology resulted in a human brain that seeks a pattern to project onto an agent; and the evolutionary developments of the mind resulted in a human psyche that produces stories about experiences, some of which culminate as "sacred narratives" about life. Siddhartha Gautama and Jesus of Nazareth are both agents that fit the pattern of the myth of the hero.

Assumptions

17 Niniam Smart, *Religions of Asia* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1993).
18 Eliade, *The Sacred and the Profane*.

For the purpose of this study the following assumptions will be made:

1. Neither Buddhism nor Christianity is totally true when truth is defined as the use of the scientific method and naturalism as a philosophy to understand reality.[19]
2. Science is a belief system.[20]
3. While scientific knowledge has external validity based on empirically collected, observable data, narrative knowing has internal validity based on subjective truthfulness, sincerity, and honesty.[21]

Limitations

Only the narratives of two prominent individuals, Siddhartha Gautama and Jesus of Nazareth are considered in this study to evaluate the similarities they exhibit in conformation to the mythic pattern of the hero.

This study is confined to the evaluation of the *sacred narratives* of Siddhartha Gautama and Jesus of Nazareth and not the historicity nor factual details of their lives. This study also does not consider other variables that influence the proliferation of Buddhism and Christianity such as each religion's ability to adapt to new cultures, or the propensity for proselytization.

This project is constructed as a preliminary study meant to inspire further questions and support the creation of research methods that include both scientific and religious hermeneutics. The limited number of raters; the variability of inter-rater reliability; rater lack of familiarity with the mythic language of the stories; personal interpretation of

19 Shermer, *The Science of Good and Evil*.
20 Marvin Minsky, *The Society of the Mind* (New York: Simon & Shuster, 1985).
21 Wilbur, *A Brief History of Everything*.

narrative descriptions; restricted religious backgrounds of raters; and the polysemic nature of language are all limitations on the scope of this research and are discussed in more detail in the final chapter of this dissertation.

Method of Study

This study contains both explanatory and experimental components of methodology. The explanatory method is used to apply Jaynes's theory of the function of cognitive narratization[22] and Shermer's theory of the function of patternicity and agenticity of the human brain to myth making;[23] to discuss the linguistic use of metaphor in sacred narratives; to apply Joseph Campbell's theory of the functions of mythology in the human psyche to the interpretation of sacred narrative;[24] and to recount the myth of "The Hero's Quest."

The experimental method is used to compare and contrast the mythic hero "pattern" established by von Hahn, Rank, Raglan, Campbell, and Dundes to the mythic narratives of Siddhartha Gautama and Jesus of Nazareth to determine if they result in a "good fit." The standard of "goodness of fit" is determined by the narratives conforming to the collective attributes (tenets identified by all five) of von Hahn, Rank, Raglan, Campbell, and Dundes as determined by the statistical analysis of content validity and inter-rater reliability. To establish inter-rater reliability of the contemporary interpretation of the narrative passages, four volunteer raters are chosen to read selected narrative passages and complete a checklist of the primary attributes. The statistical method of kappa coefficient is employed to determine the inter-rater agreement of responses.

---

22 Jaynes, *The Origin of Conscioiusness in the Breakdown of the Bicameral Mind.*
23 Shermer, *The Believing Brain*.
24 Joseph Campbell, *Pathways to Bliss*, ed. David Kudler (Novato: New World Library, 2004).

Analysis of the data indicates that all the hero attributes are identified in both the narratives of Siddhartha and Jesus although the reliability of the identification of the attributes in specific passages ranges from slight to almost perfect with the divergence being related to rater interpretation of specific passages and the polysemic nature of language.

The narrative account of the life of the Siddhartha is taken from selected Pali and Sanskrit texts. The Pali texts include the following: *Sutta-vibhanga*, *Pārājika*, *Sanghādisesa*, *Pācittiya*, *Mahāvagga*, *Cullavagga*, *Dīgha-nikāya*, *Majjhima-nikāya*, *Saṃyutta-nikāya*, *Anguttara-nikāya*, *Khuddaka-pāṭha*, *Udāna*, *Itivuttaka*, *Sutta-nipāta*, *Dhammapada*, and *Theragāthā*. The Sanskrit texts include the following: *Lalitavistara Sutra*, *Buddhacarita*, and *Mahāvastu*. The narrative of the life of Jesus is taken from the synoptic gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and the canonical gospel of John as presented in the New International Version Bible.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study a mythic narrative is considered a sacred narrative which is considered a truthful account of what happened in the remote past. It is accepted on faith, taught to be believed, and is cited as authority.[25]

A hero is [one] "who ventures forth from the world of common day into a region of supernatural wonder: fabulous forces are there encountered and a decisive victory is won: the hero comes back from this mysterious adventure with the power to bestow boons on his

25 William Bascom, "The Forms of Folklore: Prose Narratives.," *Journal of American Folklore* no. no 78 (1965) 3–20.

fellow man."[26]

Cognitive narratization is story formation using integrated communication of the cerebral hemispheres via the corpus callosum and mediated by speech. It can be considered the human experience of introspection.[27]

Patternicity is the tendency of the human brain to find meaningful patterns in both meaningful and meaningless data,[28] while agenticity is the tendency of the brain to infuse patterns with meaning, intentions, and agency.[29]

The brain is the physical organ of cognition and affect. It is located in the cranial space and directs the functions of the individual's body through an interaction of neurons and neurotransmitters.

The mind is the intangible organ of the individual that feels, perceives, thinks, wills, and reasons.

Chapter Summaries

Chapter one outlines and gives an overview of the process of this research including the problem, the perceived need for the study, the purpose of the study, the hypothesis, assumptions, limitations, methods used, and definition of terms.

Chapter two is a review of the prominent functions of narrative as explained by cognitive development theory including biological attributes, language development, the function of metaphor, and the contribution of hermeneutics. This chapter also reviews the

26 Campbell, *The Hero with a Thousand Faces*.
27 Jaynes, *The Origin of Conscioiusness in the Breakdown of the Bicameral Mind.*
28 B.F. Skinner, "Superstition in the Pigeon," *Journal of Experimental Psychology* no. 38 (1948): 168–72; Kevin R. Foster and Hanna Kokko, "The Evolution of Superstitious and Superstition-Like Behaviour," *Proceedings of the Royal Society B 276* no. 1654 (2009): 31–7.
29 Daniel Dennett, *The Intentional Stance* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1987).

historical and multidisciplinary perspectives of metaphor, myth, and narrative.

Chapter three presents the explanatory and experimental methodology used in this study. The tools developed for this study include the list of hero attributes, rater checklist tool, a list of primary attribute examples, and the rater information grid.

Chapter four provides the results of the analysis and interpretation of the data gathered in this study. This chapter includes an explanation of the statistical data, content validity, and reliability data.

Chapter five is a discussion of the results of this study including an evaluation of terms found in the narratives of Siddhartha and Jesus that are considered critical to religious studies research. Also, an evaluation of the metaphor subcategories found in the narratives of Siddhartha and Jesus are evaluated.

Chapter six includes a summary of the theoretical foundation of the study; implications for the present day interpretation of the sacred narratives of Siddhartha and Jesus; rational for the combination of the empirical and interpretative methods in religious studies research; significance of the data collected; limitations of this research study; and the recommendations for further research. Conclusions about the religious significance of the evolution of cognitive functions, the resultant advent of perceived heroes, and the development of sacred narratives is presented.

The appendixes provide a list of the narrative passages used in this study. In addition, to aid in the replication of the study, the specific narrative passages with references, and the order in which the passages are presented to the raters, is included here.

Summary

Although there have been many individuals throughout the long arc of history who have been temporarily elevated as one who could "save" humanity from the woes of life and quell the fears of death, most of them have passed into history and disappeared. Two notable exceptions are Siddhartha Gautama and Jesus of Nazareth. The purpose of this study is to explore the possibility that one important reason these two individuals continue to be worshiped is because they are perceived to be corresponding agents to an essential function of the human brain identified as patternicity. Subsequent to the existence of these two individuals, sacred narratives regarding their lives evolved to fit a pattern of mythic structure that meets the basic survival need of humans to overcome the terror of nonexistence, thereby insuring the continued veneration of Siddhartha and Jesus.

Intellectual interest in the functioning of the human psyche as it relates to mythology and sacred narrative emerged in earnest in the nineteenth century and has continued into the present twenty-first century. Over this period of time, religious diversity has increased while at the same time the "space" within which humans celebrate their religious narratives and rituals has greatly decreased. We now live in a more integrated world of overlapping existence in which we find ourselves confronted with unfamiliar beliefs and practices. If we follow the notion that education can prepare the way for change, then one community understanding its own belief pattern and learning to understand the belief pattern of another community, may improve the relationships within the total human race. While education is not an all-inclusive solution, attempting to understand our own motivations and the motivations of others is a good place to start.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

Life's journey is an adventure, a quest, a veritable road-trip through the unknown terrain of life. Sacred narratives can be considered sign posts that provide direction along the path. Some would say being able to understand the sign posts is critical to arriving at the ultimate destination. To begin the process of understanding the sacred narratives of Siddhartha Gautama and Jesus of Nazareth I would like to start at a very basic level: the biological foundations of narrative that include biological theories of perception, interpretation, and consciousness. After the biological foundation is laid, I turn to the nature of language and the understanding of narrative through an evaluation of metaphor. The function of hermeneutics is considered in conjunction with a comparison of the forms of verbal and written narrative. Finally, the role of myth and narrative as sacred story is presented in preparation to assess the sacred narratives of Siddhartha Gautama and Jesus of Nazareth.

Patternicity as a Function of Cognition

Michael Shermer describes the biological narrative function as follows:

> In the cortex of our brains there is a neural network that neuroscientists call the *left-hemisphere interpreter*. It is, in a manner of speaking, the brain's storytelling apparatus that reconstructs events into a logical sequence and weaves them together into a meaningful story that makes sense. The process is especially potent when it comes to biography. . .[1]

Shermer developed a concept he calls patternicity to account for the above described

1 Shermer, *The Believing Brain*, 37.

tendency of humans to believe in narrative accounts. He tells the following story as an example of how this pattern evolved in the human brain.

> Imagine that you are a hominid walking along the savanna of an African valley three million years ago. You hear a rustle in the grass. Is it just the wind or is it a dangerous predator? Your answer could mean life or death.
>
> If you assume that the rustle in the grass is a dangerous predator but it turns out that it is just the wind, you have made what is called a *Type I error* in cognition, also known as a *false positive*, or believing something is real when it is not. That is, you have found a nonexistent pattern. You connected (A) a rustle in the grass to (B) a dangerous predator, but in this case A was not connected to B. No harm. . .
>
> If you assume that the rustle in the grass is just the wind but it turns out that it is a dangerous predator, you have made what is called a *Type II error* in cognition, also known as a *false negative*, or believing something is not real when it is. That is, you have missed a real pattern. You failed to connect (A) a rustle in the grass to (B) a dangerous predator, and in this case A was connected to B. You're lunch.[2]

Shermer maintains that being able to assess the difference between a Type I error and a Type II error is difficult to accomplish in the split-second required for survival. Subsequently, the process of natural selection took over and the default decision became one of assuming that all patterns are empirically valid because that is the survival decision. Therefore, patternicity is associational learning that causes the human brain to seek and find patterns. Numerous animal and human studies such as those on imprinting, facial recognition, and mimicry, for example, support the notion of patternicity.[3] Shermer's formula for patternicity can be represented as:

$$P = C_{TI} < C_{TII}$$

The formula states that patternicity (P) will occur whenever the cost (C) of making a Type

---

2 Ibid., 59.

3 Konrad Lorenz, *On Aggression*, trans. Marjorie Kerr Wilson (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1966); Vincent DeGardelle and Sid Kouider, "How Spatial Frequencies and Visual Awareness Interact During Face Processing," *Psychological Science* no. Nov (2009): 1–9; D.W. Pfennig, W.R. Harcombe, and K.S. Pfennig, "Frequency-Dependent Batesian Mimicry," *Nature* no. 323 (March 2001): 4–10.

I error (TI) is less than the cost (C) of making a Type II error (TII). The over-inclusion of Type I errors in the human brain works to insure the survival of the species.

Agenticity as a Function of Cognition

The second concept put forth by Shermer is the tendency of humans to exercise what he calls "agenticity" which is "the tendency to infuse patterns with meaning, intention, and agency."[4] In other words, once the human brain has found a pattern it tends to account for that pattern by constructing a narrative to explain the representative entity and the intention of the entity. That is, humans believe that something happens because someone or something causes it to happen. The University of Bristol psychologist Bruce Hood describes this tendency as follows:

> Many highly educated and intelligent individuals experience a powerful sense that there are patterns, forces, energies, and entities operating in the world. More importantly, such experiences are not substantiated by a body of reliable evidence, which is why they are supernatural and unscientific. The inclination or sense that they may be real is our supersense.[5]

In addition to the tendency of the human brain to constellate patterns and project those patterns onto agents that are infused with intension, the human brain also tends to believe that entities such as objects, animals, and people contain an essence that is particular to each entity, and that the essence can be transferred from one entity to another. The essential essence can be thought of as good or bad. Research studies that depict this concept describe the human belief that genital shaped foods offer sexual enhancement; organ recipients acquire characteristics of the organ donors; and individuals refuse to wear

4 Shermer, *The Believing Brain*, 87.
5 Bruce M. Hood, *Supersense: Why We Believe in the Unbelievable* (New York: Harper Collins, 2009), x.

clothing of people they consider to be evil.[6]

It appears, from the growing accumulation of animal and human studies, there is an identified tendency of the human brain to organize data into patterns and to imbue the patterns with identity and intention. After perceiving a pattern and projecting "agenticity" the next step that occurs in the human brain is the creation of a story or narrative about the agent and the intention. This process is called narratization.

Narratization as a Function of Cognition

Language has the ability to organize itself into a form that allows for the process of story-making. This process is a method for thinking about something. Julian Jaynes calls this organization "narratization." About this process Jaynes says,

> In consciousness, we are always seeing our vicarial selves as the main figures in the stories of our lives. Narratization is a single word for an extremely complex set of patterning abilities which have, I think, a multiple ancestry. But the thing in its larger patterning, such as lifetimes, histories, the past and future, may have been learned by dominantly left hemisphere men from a new kind of functioning in the right hemisphere. The new kind of functioning was narratization . . . .[7]

This form of thinking about something, or internally reciting a story about what is happening is what Jaynes calls narratization. This process functions to unify concepts, goals, explanations and, in short, allows us to make sense of our circumstances. The ability to perform this function is critical to the individual's state of mental health and ability to negotiate the world outside of the self. The ability to narratize a situation is a function of the secondary process of thinking. A failure of this function characterizes a

6 Hood, *Supersense: Why We Believe in the Unbelievable*.
7 Jaynes, *The Origin of Conscioiusness in the Breakdown of the Bicameral Mind.*, 63;218.

return to primary process thinking and a psychotic state.[8]

In summarizing Freud's concept of *primary process thinking*, Hall states that primary process occurs in the id of an infant. He describes the development of primary process thinking as follows:

> The perceptual system receives excitations from the sense organs and forms a mental picture of representation of the object that is being presented to the sense organs. These mental pictures are preserved as memory traces in the memory system. When the memory traces are activated, the person is said to have a memory image of the object that he originally perceived. The past is brought into the present by means of these memory images. The perception is a mental representation of an object, while the memory image is a mental representation of a perception.
>
> In the past whenever the baby was hungry it was eventually fed. During the feeding, the baby sees, tastes, smells, and feels the food, and these perceptions are stored in its memory system. Through repetition, food becomes associated with tension-reduction. Then if the baby is not fed immediately the tension of the hunger produces a memory image of food, with which it is associated. Thus there exists in the id an image of the object which is capable of reducing the tension of hunger. The process which produces a memory image of an object that is needed to reduce a tension is called the primary process.[9]

Primary process is the first mode of thinking in humans, and it can be seen from the above description that the language is in *image* form. So, the first language of human beings is pictorial, or in image, because our primary sensory mode is visual. Of course, the images are imbued with all the sensory data that occur concomitantly with the initial trace image, as Wilder Penfield discovered while performing neurosurgery. What Penfield observed was that electrical stimulation of different areas of the cortex prompted the patient to report specific pictorial images along with all the auditory, gustatory, olfactory, and tactile information that accompanied the original experience.[10] In the

---

8 Silvano Arieti, *Interpretation of Schizophrenia*, 2nd ed. (New York: Basic Books, 1974), 122–5.
9 Calvin S. Hall, *A Primer of Freudian Psychology* (New York: Mentor, 1954), 24–5.
10 Franz Alexander and Sheldon T Selesnick, *The History of Psychiatry; an Evaluation of Psychiatric*

primary process mode, these images act as metaphoric representations of the outside world. Primary process is the precursor to the later secondary process, narratization, which begins with metaphoric substitution of one word or phrase for an external unknown and graduates into internal story telling about what is happening outside of the self and how to solve problems of daily living.

Robert Scholes and Robert Kellogg describe narrative in the literary sense as "distinguished by two characteristics: the presence of a story and a story-teller."[11] A story without a story-teller is called drama and is characterized by acting out or "imitation" of actions we find in life. If this concept is applied to human mental functioning, it could be said that secondary process thinking is characterized, in part, by the presence of narratization. Narratization requires that the person is able to distinguish the "self" or story-teller from the story. Before this ability is acquired or if this ability is lost, as it is in a psychotic episode, the person is in a state of primary process thinking, cannot distinguish "self" from story, and "imitates" life through actions without being able to make sense of the actions..

To summarize, internal narratization about the events of our lives is a function of secondary thought and undergirds healthy, conscious functioning. A failure of the process of narratization characterizes a regression into primary process thinking and psychotic states. All of the above processes are functions of the human mind, and function, so far as we know, depends on structure. This leads to the next area of discussion, neuroanatomy and neurophysiology as a basis for narrative knowing.

Thought and Practice from Prehistoric Times to the Present. By Franz G. Alexander and Sheldon T. Selesnick. (New York: Harper & Row, 1966), 340.

11 Robert Scholes and Robert Kellogg, *The Nature of Narrative* (London: Oxford University Press, 1966), 4.

Neuroanatomy and Neurophysiology as a Basis for Narrative Knowing

The relationship of the function of the human mind to the structure of the brain is at the heart of one of the oldest debates in psychology, namely the nature versus nurture controversy.[12] It is not my intent to argue either position except to say that obviously without the structure of the brain there would be no functional human being, as in an anencephalic infant who is born with no telencephalon and can function only at a reflexive level.[13] However, with relation to the topic of internal narratization as an organizing principle for the language of the mind, it is fairly clear that the structure of the human brain is fundamental to the process.

In this section I will discuss how science attempts to understand the process of narratization, and why it is essential to human functioning. To begin this discussion I would like to return to the theory of Julian Jaynes. Although there have been more recent discussions of the nature of consciousness by authors like Oliver Sacks[14] who focuses on right hemispheric lesions that result in what he calls disorders of the self, I prefer to look at Jaynes's theory in more depth because, for the purposes of this dissertation, I am not addressing the concept of consciousness in total, but rather a subset of consciousness dealing with narratization. For this reason I return to the theory of Jaynes and his innovative conceptualization of the neurological process of self-talk or what he actually calls "narratization"— the very concept that I am asserting is such an important and valid

12 Gregory A. Kimble, Norman Garmezy, and Edward Zigler, *Principles of General Psychologiy*, 5th ed. (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1980); Guy R. Lefrancois, *Psychology* (Belmont: Wadsworth, 1980).
13 Arthur C. Guyton, *Textbook of Medical Physiology*, 4th ed. (Philidelphia: W.B. Saunders, 1971); Peter M. Milner, *Physiological Psychology* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1970); Richard F Thompson, *Foundations of Physiological Psychology* (New York: Harper & Row, 1967); Philip Groves and Kurt Schlesinger, *Biological Psychology* (Dubuque: William C. Brown Company, 1979); Aleksandr Romanovich Luria, *Higher Cortical Functions in Man*, 2nd ed. (New York: Basic Books, 1966).
14 Oliver Sacks, *The Man Who Mistook His Wife for a Hat* (New York: Simon & Shuster, 1985).

way normal humans beings learn to attribute meaning to events that occur in their daily lives.

The primary thesis of Jaynes's book, The Origin of Consciousness in the Breakdown of the Bicameral Mind is that human consciousness developed over time as a function of the integration of the communication of the cerebral hemispheres via the corpus callosum and mediated by speech. He is aware of the danger of "isomorphizing between a conceptual analysis of a psychological phenomenon and its concomitant brain structure, yet this is what we cannot avoid doing."[15] His thesis is that consciousness is the human experience of introspecting.[16] It is not how humans interact with their environment, and it is not thinking. It is rather, the ability to narratize about oneself and ones' situation introspectively. Consciousness is not just a copy of experience, it is meta-cognition.[17] According to Jaynes, consciousness appeared after the acquisition of language. He describes this process:

> Consciousness becomes the metaphier full of our past experience, constantly and selectively operating on such unknowns as future actions, decisions, and partly remembered pasts, on what we are and yet may be. And it is by the generated structure of consciousness that we than understand the world.[18]

Jaynes goes on to describe the structure of consciousness being made up of several features. The first feature is *spatialization* which he describes as a mental space that we attribute to different entities about which we are thinking.[19] He gives the example of thinking about time.

---

15 Jaynes, *The Origin of Conscioiusness in the Breakdown of the Bicameral Mind.*, 102.
16 Ibid., 4.
17 Ibid., 21–47.
18 Ibid., 59.
19 Ibid., 59–60.

> If I ask you to think of the last hundred years, you may have a tendency to excerpt the matter in such a way that the succession of years is spread out, probably from left to right. But of course there is no left or right in time. There is only before and after, and these do not have any spatial properties whatever—except by analog. You cannot, absolutely cannot think of time except by spatializing it.[20]

The second feature of consciousness is *excerption* which is the process of mentally "seeing" only parts of things we are observing. We can never see the observed in totality, or in its true nature, we can only make mental excerpts of the object, that is, we can only see the object as we perceive it, never as it wholly is.[21]

The third feature of consciousness is the *analog "I."* In this process we imagine ourselves doing things, taking a trip, making decisions, all vicariously with our analog "I."[22]

Closely related to this concept is the fourth feature of consciousness, the *metaphor "me."* As we imagine ourselves doing something, we can imagine seeing out of our imagined eyes, looking at our surroundings, or we can step back and imagine seeing ourselves as part of the situation, as if from a distance.[23]

The fifth feature of consciousness is narratization. This is the process whereby we see ourselves as the main figures in the stories of our lives.[24] But it is not just the analog "I" we are narratizing, but everything else in consciousness. For example, if we see a cat in a tree we may narratize how the cat got into the tree. For example, we may narratize the story of a dog chasing the cat up the tree.

---

20 Ibid., 60.
21 Ibid., 61–2.
22 Ibid., 62–3.
23 Ibid., 63.
24 Ibid., 63–4.

The final feature of consciousness is *conciliation.* Jaynes describes this process:

> We assimilate a new stimulus into our conception or schema about it, even though it is slightly different . . . . We are putting things together into recognizable objects on the basis of the previously learned schemes we have of them . . . . What I am designating by conciliation is essentially doing in mind-space what narratization does in mind-time or spatialized time.[25]

All of the above features have been described to validate the belief that consciousness, by definition of its functions, arrived after the development of language and, therefore, is of more recent origin than previously suspected. As Jaynes says,

> If consciousness is this invention of an analog world on the basis of language, paralleling the behavioral world even as the world of mathematics parallels the world of quantities of things . . . then it follows that it is of a much more recent origin than has heretofore been supposed.[26]

While I disagree with Jaynes's limited definition of consciousness based on my belief that consciousness is more than just narratization, it was necessary to review this somewhat lengthy explanation because it provides the first step required to understand the part of his theory that pertains to the topic at hand, namely, the neurological basis of narrative knowing.

Split Brain Function and Narrative

Jaynes proposes a provocative and controversial theory to explain the functions of the left and right hemispheres of the brain with regard to language. His theory follows the traditional view of localization of function and of the split brain phenomenon, up to a point. That is, sensory information from the right side of the body travels to the left side of the brain, and vice versa. When the corpus callosum is cut the information reaching one

25 Ibid., 65.
26 Ibid., 66.

hemisphere cannot influence the other and, therefore, each side of the brain functions as a separate thinking entity with its own unique perspective of the experience of the individual.[27]

The speech areas known as Wernicke's area, Broca's area, and the supplementary motor cortex are located in the left hemisphere of most people (specifically right handed people) and are involved in language and speech. The right hemisphere seems to be better at arranging spatial patterns and is more sensitive to melodies and nonverbal information.[28] These are all traditional views of localization. Jaynes even follows the same line of reasoning as the famous non-traditional thinker, Aleksandr Luria who states,

> Unlike the classical authors, who attempted to relate each particular higher psychological "function" to a particular area of the brain and to "localize" it in particular brain structures (areas of the cortex, groups of neurons, or even single neurons), I have argued from a totally different standpoint . . . . I have always regarded a higher psychological "function" as complex *functional system*, the organization of which in the brain involves the participation of a dynamic "constellation" of collectively working parts of the brain and areas of the cortex; every part of the brain or every area of the cortex makes its own *specific contribution* to the operation of this functional system.[29]

Jaynes follows a similar non-localization theory as Luria when he explains how the language function can be located in both hemispheres:

> . . . the neurological structure necessary for language exists in the right hemisphere as well as the left. In a child, a major lesion of Wernicke's area on the left hemisphere, or of the underlying thalamus which connects it to the brainstem, produces transfer of the whole speech mechanism to the right hemisphere. A very few ambidextrous people actually do have speech on both hemispheres. Thus the

---

27 Groves and Schlesinger, *Biological Psychology*, 499.
28 R.W. Sperry and M.D. Gazzaniga, "Language Following Surgical Disconnection of the Hemispheres," in *Brain Mechanisms Underlying Speech and Language*, ed. C.H. Millikan and F.L. Karley (New York: Grune & Stratton, 1967), 108–21; R.W. Sperry, "Lateral Specialization in the Surgically Separated Hemispheres," in *The Neurosciences: Third Study Program*, ed. F.O. Schmitt and F.G. Worder (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1974), 1749–57; D. Kimura, "The Asymmetry of the Human Brain," *Scientific American* no. 228 (1973): 70–8.
29 Luria, *Higher Cortical Functions in Man*, 374–5.

> usually speechless right hemisphere can under certain conditions become a language hemisphere, just like the left.[30]

However, his rationale for this answer is a radical departure from the explanation given by Luria. Jaynes posits that the right hemisphere is a silent speech area because it is now vestigial, like the human appendix. It had some important function at an earlier stage of human development, but is now not used for that unknown purpose any longer.[31] The explanation that Jaynes gives for the now silent right hemispheric Wernicke's area follows the following line of reasoning.

In the early developmental period of humanity, human beings were not conscious (as was earlier defined by Jaynes). When early humans suffered a sufficient level of stress, with the resultant neurotransmitter imbalance, they experienced auditory hallucinations telling them what to do.[32] These hallucinations originated in the right hemispheric Wernicke's area and were experienced as external to the self because of the not yet developed function of introspective narratization.[33] To summarize this thought Jaynes says:

> . . . the speech of the gods was directly organized in what corresponds to Wernicke's area on the right hemisphere and 'spoken' or 'heard' over the anterior commissures to or by the auditory areas of the left temporal lobe. *Note how I can only express this metaphorically, personifying the right temporal lobe as a person speaking or the left temporal lobe as a person listening, both being equivalent and both literally false.*[34]

30 Jaynes, *The Origin of Conscioiusness in the Breakdown of the Bicameral Mind.*, 103.
31 Ibid., 105.
32 Ibid., 258.
33 Ibid., 106.
34 Ibid., 105.

Jaynes refers to the auditory hallucinations as "speech of the gods" because prior to understanding death, human beings treated the deceased as if they were still alive and "god-like." The dead were buried with all the implements and food needed to sustain themselves in the journey of the afterlife.[35] The living humans "remembered" the voices and words of the deceased in their own heads and since their brains were still bicameral, that is, without the understood function of narratization, they experienced their own thoughts as voices outside themselves.[36]

When Jaynes penned his theory he was just imagining how it might have been. At the time his book was written there was no way to "test" the plausibility of his hypothesis. Now, however, the technological advances of today have progressed to a point that allows us to "image" the possibilities through contemporary research.

Auditory hallucinations are a common symptom in schizophrenic patients,[37] and a source of great distress especially when the hallucinations are of recent onset or the content is negative.[38] The neurological basis of speech hallucinations continues to be poorly understood. However, recent advances in technology such as positron emission tomography, single photon emission tomography and magnetic resonance imaging have rekindled an interest in studying the underlying neurological mechanisms of action associated with speech hallucinations. This technology now allows researchers to "see" the functional processes of the brain "through imaging." This results in an interesting

35 Joseph Campbell, *The Power of Myth*, ed. Betty Sue Flowers (New York: Doubleday, 1988), 30–1.
36 Jaynes, *The Origin of Conscioiusness in the Breakdown of the Bicameral Mind.*, 161–5.
37 N.C. Andreasen and M. Flaum., "Schizophrenia: The Characteristic Symptoms.," *Schizophrenic Bulletin* no. no 17 (1991): 2749.
38 I.R.H. Falloon and R.E. Talbot, "Persistent Auditory Hallucinations: Coping Mechanisms and Implications for Management," *Psychological Medicine* no. 11 (1981): 329–39.

combination of the literal and the non-literal dimensions of life in balance.

The many hypotheses about the etiology of speech hallucinations are now being systematically studied using these new technologies. Though the results of many studies are still inconclusive, due primarily to differences in methodology, there are several recent studies that speak to the issue of "narratization" as it relates to right brain temporal lobe functioning during hallucinated speech.

In one single photon emission computerized tomography study (SPECT),

P.K.McGuire, G.M.S. Shah, and R.M. Murray found greater blood flow in Broca's area among schizophrenic patients during active illness with speech hallucinations than during a later period of time when these symptoms had remitted, indicating that this area is associated with the experience of inner speech (narratization) or verbal thoughts.[39] Though Broca's area is in the frontal lobe, it is closely related to the functioning of Wernicke's area in the temporal lobe.

Other recent research has focused on the abnormal asymmetry of temporal lobe structures in schizophrenia. One such study showed activation of the right middle temporal gyrus, one of the regions that normally responds to external speech, in a hallucinating schizophrenic patient.[40]

Another area of particular interest to researchers studying hallucinations is the planum temporale, a part of the superior temporal gyrus, which is usually larger on the left side (in non-schizophrenic people) and has an important role in language functions in

---

39 P.K. McGuire, G.M.S. Shah,, and R.M. Murray, "Increased Blood Flow in Broca's Area During Auditory Hallucinations in Schizophrenia," *Lancet* no. 342 (1993): 703–6.
40 Peter, et al Woodruff, "Auditory Hallucinations and Perception of External Speech," *Lancet* no. 346 (1995): 1035.

humans. Several studies have looked at the presence of abnormal asymmetry (larger on the right, not the left) of temporal lobe structures in schizophrenic patients with mixed findings.[41] One explanation for the mixed results was postulated by Woodruff, et.al, who thought that left-sided decrease in the volume of temporal lobe language areas would "be confined to schizophrenic patients who have a strong predisposition to auditory hallucinations." The results of this study indicated that "schizophrenia is associated with a reduced left and increased right temporal cortical response to auditory perception of speech,"[42] which is the reverse of the asymmetry in non-schizophrenic people.

The research of Michael Persinger points to the possibility that spiritual or supernatural experiences are productions of neurological structures. In his research, Persinger produces spiritual and supernatural experiences in people by subjecting their temporal lobes to electromagnetic fields simulating micro-seizures. The results indicate that temporal lobe stimulation causes people to feel a spiritual presence, have an out of body experience, or have the feeling they are in the presence of God.[43] The explanation for this reaction is similar to the one given earlier by Julian Jaynes, namely the split brain phenomenon.

Further research needs to be conducted to increase our understanding of this complex issue, but the trend appears to lean in the direction of validating some of the novel thoughts of Julian Jaynes on the subject of narratization. While still considering the subject of narratization, I would like to look at the works of Carl Jung and Walter Burkert

41 A.L. Foundas et al., "Planum Temporale Asymmetry and Language Dominance," *Neuropsychologia* no. 32 (1994): 1676.
42 Woodruff, "Auditory Hallucinations and Perception of External Speech," 1035.
43 Michael A. Persinger, *Neurophysiological Bases of God Beliefs* (New York: Praeger, 1987).

as they relate to a biological basis for narrative knowing,

Biological Organization of Narratization

Carl Jung, the Swiss physician and psychoanalyst, describes a theory about the progression of consciousness that is somewhat comparable to Jaynes's theory about the development of narratization. Jung's approach to myth and consciousness was always to place his analysis in the context of biology and natural history.[44] He illustrates the late nineteenth and early twentieth century concept of the evolution of cognition in human beings as follows:

> Primitive mentality differs from the civilized chiefly in that the conscious mind is far less developed in scope and intensity. Functions such as thinking, willing, etc., are not yet differentiated; they are pre-conscious, and in the case of thinking, for instance, this shows itself in the circumstance that the primitive does not think consciously, but that thoughts appear. The primitive cannot assert that he thinks; it is rather that 'something thinks in him.[45]

Jung goes on to explain that because the "primitive" mind has not yet evolved in consciousness, the unconscious is more ubiquitous and powerful. Similar to the mental experience of a child, the archetypal patterns, hence magic-like manifestations, of the unconscious engulf the immature consciousness and the mythic world exists as a reality as much as the material world. It is the world of the psyche. Jung points out, "the primitive mentality does not *invent* myths, it *experiences* them."[46]

Walter Burkert, a Professor of Classics and scholar of Greek religion, proposes another theory about the mythic tendency of human beings having its origin in our

---

44 C.G. Jung, *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*, ed. Aniela Jaffe, trans. Richard Winston and Winston, Clara (New York: Random House, 1961), 339.
45 C.G. Jung and C. Kerenyi, *Essays on a Science of Mythology*, trans. R.F.C. Hull (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993), 2–3.
46 Ibid., 70–81.

biological structure.[47] Though he speaks only of the subset of mythology known as "religion," I believe that some of his principles can be generalized to the larger concept of mythology proper because of his references to narrative as a complement to, and balance for, external experience.[48] In summarizing his thesis, he states, ". . . I propose the existence of biological patterns of actions, reactions, and feelings activated and elaborated through ritual practice and verbalized teachings, with anxiety playing a foremost role."[49] Burkert's point is that life is stressful. Our ancestors, human or otherwise, were subject to intense fear and anxiety about living in the world. We see the same hypervigilence in wild animals today as they live in their "kill or be killed" world. A nervous system in constant sympathetic nervous system arousal is infused with massive amounts of adrenalin with specific physiological and psychological responses. Anyone who has ever had a panic attack can cite the responses verbatim. Physically, people experience rapid heart rate, increased and shallow respirations, cold sweat, nausea, tremor, weakness, and dizziness. Psychologically, there is fear of disaster, fear of death, illusions, delusions, and sometimes hallucinations. Early humans probably lived much of their lives in this state, and Burkert's point is that religion, spirituality, and ritual were human attempts to cope with high levels of anxiety. This sounds something like Jaynes's view about stress and neurotransmitter imbalance causing early humans to experience the "voices of gods."

In addition, Burkert, like Jaynes, identifies the importance of language development as a precursor to narrative understanding when he points out:

---

47 Burkert, *Creation of the Sacred--Tracks of Biology in Early Religions*, x.
48 Ibid., 33.
49 Ibid.

> One obvious hypothesis would be that the tale-telling program owes its existence to previous learning . . . . This, however, should lead to the emergence of quite different forms of organizing experience, and hence different patterns of tales out of different civilizations. Yet the sequence of the quest is surprisingly persistent and nearly ubiquitous through more than four millennia . . . . If we ask where such a structure of sense, such a program of actions, is derived from, the answer must evidently be: from the reality of life, nay, from biology . . . . The biological equivalent of the quest is the search for food . . . . Actions are represented by the verb, and the verbal root, the 'zero form' of the verb, in most languages . . . is the imperative; and communication by imperatives is more primitive, and more basic, than communication by statements. The deepest deep structure of a tale would, then, be a series of imperatives: 'get,' that is, 'go out, ask, find out, fight for it, take and run' . . . . The organizing principle of a tale, the soul of the plot, is found to operate at the level of biology.[50]

So, Shermer, Jaynes, and Burkert identify the importance of narrative as an organizing principle and vehicle for understanding the sometimes confusing and stressful events of life. They believe the origin of narrative is embedded in the biology of human beings. They part company, however, with regard to the function of metaphor in the language of the narrative. While Jaynes proposes that language grew and evolved through the use of metaphor, Burkert believes the function of the metaphor is to reduce and simplify language. This view is evident when he states:

> If a body of supernatural entities, communicable through language and pictures, comes to occupy a certain space in our common mental world, it is subject to the controlling functions of reduction and simplification. In the face of the constantly growing accumulation of data infiltrating personal experience, the common world must be simplified . . . . Tradition consists of condensed, systematized information. Language continually operates in this way through two of its main functions, generalization and metaphor; these are strategies to keep the sign system finite.[51]

As a final point in his book, Burkert wonders about what will evolve from the

50 Ibid., 63–4.
51 Ibid., 26.

increase in electronic communication and virtual realities. In speaking about this area, he discusses the appearance of the narrative hermeneutic with the development of writing. "Writing drastically reduced the need for interpreting signs and for recourse to paranormal experiences of ecstasy and mysticism, but it gave rise to interpretation in a new quest for making sense amidst the gaps of the evidence."[52] Burkert's point is that writing provided the foundation for the development of modernity and empirical research which decreased the need for humans to turn to soothsayers and oracles for answers to their questions. His musings about the impact of the "written" word takes the discussion of narrative to another level—how the written word changes the meaning of narrative.

Language and Understanding

The previous discussion has focused primarily on neuroanatomy and neurophysiology as the underlying basis for the development of language, the experience of speech, and the function of narrative. Now, I would like to turn to language and the understanding of narrative.

At the most basic level, narrative is an account of an event using language to communicate meaning, therefore, language is essential to narrative and requires that we look at its nature, its development, and its functions as a precursor to the interpretation and understanding of sacred narratives or mythic narratives.

Historically, philosophers have been interested in language as a source of information about humanity and the world.[53] The interest is driven by a need to learn more about how human beings relate to the world in which they live. As Martinich points

52 Ibid., 178.
53 George A. Miller, *Language and Speech* (New York: W.H. Freeman, 1981), 3.

out:

> . . . many philosophers have held that language is a reflection of reality, if one could understand the structure of language, one could understand the structure of reality . . . . For language is the expression of thought, and, if human thoughts can count as knowledge about the world, thought would seem to be a reflection of reality.[54]

Just as some philosophers believe that human thought is a reflection of the reality of the world around them, others assert that reality is not just reflected, but is actually constructed by human thought. For example, Paul Ricoeur, a twentieth century philosopher, states: "I am convinced that we must think, not behind the symbols, but starting from symbols . . . that they constitute the revealing substrate of speech which lives among men. In short, the symbol gives rise to thought"[55]

Berger and Luckmann agree with Ricoeur and state this clearly when discussing the linguistic impact of the social community:

> Everyday life is, above all, life with and by means of the language I share with [other people]. An understanding of language is thus essential for any understanding of the reality of everyday life . . . . Language is capable of becoming an objective repository of vast accumulations of meaning and experience, which it can then preserve in time and transmit to following generations . . . . Because of its capacity to transcend the "here and now," language bridges different zones within the reality of everyday life and integrates them into a meaningful whole . . . . Language is capable of "making present" a variety of objects that are spatially, temporally, and socially absent from the "here and now" . . . . Through language an entire world can be actualized at any moment.[56]

The above arguments of Ricoeur, Berger and Luckmann are consistent with the

---

54 A.P. Martinich, ed., *The Philosophy of Language* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 3–4.
55 Paul Ricoeur, "The Hermeneutics of Symbols and Philosophical Reflection: I," in *The Conflict of Interpretations: Essays in Hermeneutics*, ed. Don Ihde, trans. Denis Savage (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1981), 299.
56 Peter L Berger and Thomas Luckmann, *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1967), 37–9.

postmodern world view which holds that reality is socially constructed through language and is organized and maintained through narrative.[57] Because language is central to narrative, it is important to understand the nature of language.

The Nature of Language and Metaphor

Language can be thought of as a collection of words, and the rules for their use, that are common to people of the same community. Language is ever-growing and changing just as those who use the language are growing and changing. The philosophy of language includes three aspects of language: syntax, which is the study of the rules that govern the use of words; semantics, which is the study of the meaning of words and sentences; and pragmatics, which is the study of what speakers do with the language.[58] For the purpose of this dissertation, I look at two of the three areas: semantics and pragmatics. More specifically, I focus primarily on the nature of metaphor, because it is my belief that the pragmatic use of metaphor is the heart (to us a metaphor) of mythic narrative. As Northrop Frye explains:

> . . . myth is inseparable from another verbal phenomenon, the metaphor . . . a metaphorical statement is not so much an assertion that A is B as an annihilation of the space separating A and B . . . myth does to time what the metaphor does to space . . . the past and the future are gathered.[59]

Though Frye is clear about his understanding of metaphor, the definition and function of metaphor is an area of disagreement and open for debate among linguistic philosophers.

---

57 Gianni Vattimo, *The End of Modernity*, trans. Jon R. Snyder (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985), 130–4.
58 Cecilia M Shore, *Individual Differences on Language Development* (London: Sage, 1995), 34.
59 Northrop Frye and Robert D. Denham, *Myth and Metaphor: Selected Essays 1974-1988* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1990), 7.

In general, a metaphor is defined as a figure of speech in which a word or phrase denoting one kind of object or idea is used in place of another in order to suggest similarity between them.[60] In the philosophy of language there are two basic approaches to meaning: the semantic approach and the pragmatic approach. The semantic interpretation of metaphor says that a metaphor has no other meaning but the literal sense of the word. Donald Davidson argues this view when he states:

> . . . metaphors mean what the words, in their most literal interpretation, mean, and nothing more. The central mistake against which I shall be inveighing is the idea that a metaphor has, in addition to its literal sense of meaning, another sense or meaning. This idea is common to many who have written about metaphor.[61]

In contrast to Davidson, Max Black argues for the pragmatic approach to the understanding of metaphor. In his argument, he states,

> Davidson devotes much of his paper to attacking the view, supposedly held by contemporary theorists, that some of the words used in a metaphorical remark change their senses when so used. He says that the "central mistake" is "the idea that a metaphor has, in addition to its literal sense of meaning, another sense of meaning." I know of no theorist who claims that the words used in metaphorical remarks thereby acquire some new meaning . . . . The question to be considered, then, is not the idle one of whether the words used in a metaphorical remark astonishingly acquire some permanently new sense but rather the question whether the metaphor maker is attaching an altered sense to the words he is using in context.[62]

Paul Ricoeur seems to agree with the pragmatic approach to the meaning of metaphor in context as he explains: "More precisely, I agree [with Black] on the fundamental point: a word receives a metaphorical meaning in specific contexts, within

---

60 Martinich, *The Philosophy of Language*, 413.
61 Donald Davidson, "What Metaphors Mean," in *The Philosophy of Language*, ed. A.P. Marinich (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 415.
62 Max Black, *"How Metaphors Work: A Reply to Donald Davidson." On Metaphor.*, ed. Sheldon Sacks (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979), 187.

which it is opposed to other words taken literally."[63]

To make the understanding of metaphor a little more complex, there are also linguistic philosophers who would argue that metaphor is a semantic trick of language. For example, Agamben states:

> Insofar as the "difference" between the signifier and the signified reaches its' maximum in the emblematic form, this form constitutes the domain par excellence where a science of signs that had truly become aware of the Saussurian paradox of "double unity" might have exercised itself. Yet, even after the studies of baroque theorists, of the mythologies, and of the Romantic critics, a merely sufficient semiological analysis precisely of the emblematic form is still lacking. In the course of Western reflection on the sign, this position translates into the prejudice that there are two terms in a metaphor, one proper and the other improper, and that the movement of substitution of one for the other constitutes the metaphorical "transport."[64]

Contrary to Agamben's view is that of Paul de Man, a member of the Yale school of deconstruction, who puts forth the importance of metaphor as central to the very nature of language. Eagleton summarizes de Man's position as the following:

> . . . devoted to demonstrating that literary language constantly undermines its own meaning. Indeed de Man discovers in this operation nothing less than a new way of defining the "essence" of literature itself. All language, as de Man rightly perceives, is ineradicably metaphorical, working by tropes and figures; it is a mistake to believe that any language is literally literal.[65]

Clearly, there are many views about the function of metaphor, but if we follow along the line of reasoning that asserts that metaphor is central to language we are led to the following discussion of metaphor as the basis of language.

---

63 Paul Ricoeur, *Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences*, ed. and trans. John B Thompson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 170.
64 Giorgio Agamben, *Stanzas: Word and Phantasm in Western Culture* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993), 147.
65 Terry Eagleton, *Literary Theory: An Introduction*, 2nd ed. (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996), 126.

Metaphor as the Basis of Language

In the previous pages, I introduce myth as a narrative about an experience of some significance. It has been stated that narrative consists of language that is the articulation of human thought that actually constructs reality in the very expression of it. Language is composed of words, and words are abstractions that represent an object, concept, or idea, to name a few. Metaphor is a word or phrase denoting one kind of object or idea and is used in place of another in order to suggest similarity between them. Both the semantic and the pragmatic viewpoints about metaphor have merit and can be honestly debated, but for the purpose of this discussion I would like to follow the pragmatic viewpoint that maintains the use of metaphor is the basis of language. One proponent of this view is Julian Jaynes, who states:

> Let us speak of metaphor. The most fascinating property of language is its capacity to make metaphors. But what an understatement! For metaphor is not a mere extra trick of language, as it is so often slighted in the old schoolbooks on composition; it is the very constitutive ground of language. I am using metaphor here in its most general sense: the use of a term for one thing to describe another because of some kind of similarity between them or between their relations to other things. It is by metaphor that language grows. The common reply to the question, "what is it?" is, when the reply is difficult or the experience unique, "well, it is like—." The grand and vigorous function of metaphor is the generation of new language as it is needed, as human culture becomes more and more complex.[66]

I would call Jaynes's point of view an augmentation theory about metaphor. That is, metaphor is the foundation of language from which new language grows and expands. Northrop Frye also asserts that metaphor is the basis of all language, but his description of the process comes from a different point of view and sounds somewhat reductionist. As

66 Jaynes, *The Origin of Conscioiusness in the Breakdown of the Bicameral Mind.*, 48–9.

he describes: "My own view is that every form of speech can be reduced to metaphor, but metaphor is primary language, and metaphor cannot be reduced to another kind of language: as long as we use words at all we can never escape metaphor . . . ."[67] Though these two theorists describe the use of metaphor from different points of view, I believe they quite accurately identify the foundational position that metaphor has in the production of language.

When a metaphor becomes commonplace to the community, it becomes a label in itself and in this service increases the complexity of language and our perception of the world. To take this concept one step further, Jaynes believes:

> . . . language is an organ of perception, not simply a means of communication . . . . This is language moving out synchronically (or without reference to time) into the space of the world to describe it and perceive it more and more definitively. But language also moves in another and more important way, diachronically, or through time and behind our experiences on the basis of aptic structures in our nervous systems to create abstract concepts whose referents are not observable except in a metaphorical sense. And these too are generated by metaphor. This is indeed the nub (knob), heart, pith, kernel, core, marrow, etc. of my argument which itself is a metaphor and 'seen' only with the mind's eye . . . . Understanding a thing is to arrive at a metaphor for that thing by substituting something more familiar to us. And the feeling of familiarity is the feeling of understanding.[68]

The above explanation suggests that metaphor assists us in perceiving and making sense out of the experiences we have in the external world, and provides us with the feeling of understanding when we try to assimilate an unfamiliar experience, or discern the solution to a difficult problem. Metaphor provides us with a "way" of knowing in the same sense that Frye asserts myth provides us with a "way" of knowing—something like

---

67 Frye and Denham, *Myth and Metaphor: Selected Essays 1974-1988*, 216.
68 Jaynes, *The Origin of Conscioiusness in the Breakdown of the Bicameral Mind.*, 49–52.

an intuitive perception. As George Lakoff and Mark Johnson assert,

> . . . most people think they can get along perfectly well without metaphor. We have found, on the contrary, that metaphor is pervasive in everyday life, not just in language but in thought and action . . . . They also govern our everyday functioning, down to the most mundane details . . . . Primarily on the basis of linguistic evidence, we have found that most of our ordinary conceptual system is metaphorical in nature.[69]

In addition to emphasizing the pervasive nature of metaphor, Lakoff and Johnson enumerate many fascinating and significant qualities of metaphor that generally go unattended in discussions about metaphor. Lakoff and Johnson include in this discussion the elements of: metaphor as conceptual; metaphor as systematically highlighting; metaphor as systematically hiding; metaphor as structural; metaphor as orientational; metaphor as experiential; metaphor as culturally coherent; metaphor as ontological; metaphor as container; metaphor as personification; metaphor as metonymy; metaphor coherence versus consistency; partial structure of metaphor; grounding of metaphors; metaphors and causation; metaphor and coherent structuring of experience; simple and complex coherence; metaphor in definition and understanding; metaphoric meaning and form; metaphor as new meaning; metaphor creating similarity; metaphoric truth and action; myth of objectivism; myth of subjectivism; metaphor and experientialist synthesis; and metaphoric understanding. The following discussion will examine each of these areas in an attempt to provide a foundation for a later discussion of metaphor in religious narrative.

---

69 George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980), 3-4.

To emphasize how much metaphor influences the way people think, Lakoff and Johnson define metaphor as "conceptual." It is not just about the function of words, the process of metaphoric representation is built into the way that we think. As an illustration, they give the example of how Westerners conceptualize the metaphor "Argument is War" and the expressions that are used when describing the facets of an argument. To describe this element they give the following example:

> ARGUMENT IS WAR
> Your claims are *indefensible*.
> He *attacked every weak point* in my argument.
> His criticisms were *right on target*.
> I *demolished* his argument.
> I've never *won* an argument with him.
> You disagree? Okay, *shoot*!
> If you use that strategy, he'll *wipe you out*.
> He *shot down* all of my arguments.[70]

It is possible, Lakoff and Johnson go on to say, that another culture might think about an argument in a totally different way. For example, as if it is a dance. In which case they would speak about the process using totally different terms, depending on how they conceptualize the process. For Lakoff and Johnson metaphor is about conceptualization of cognition. They emphasize that we systematically use inference from one conceptual domain to understand another and that, they say, is the basis of metaphor.[71]

Lakoff and Johnson assert that metaphors are systematic and, therefore, the language used to talk about metaphors is systematic and allows for the study of the concept of metaphor. Subcategories of metaphor characterize what Lakoff and Johnson call "entailment" relationships between metaphors. To give an example of the

70 Ibid., 4.
71 Ibid., 246.

subcategorization concept Lakoff and Johnson present the example of "time is money." The subcategories are: time is a resource and time is valuable. To further explain Lakoff and Johnson state,

> We are adopting the practice of using the most specific metaphorical concept, in this case TIME IS MONEY, to characterize the entire system. Of the expressions listed under the TIME IS MONEY metaphor, some refer specifically to money (*spend, invest, budget, profitably, cost*), others to limited resources (*use, use up, have enough of, run out of*), and still others to valuable commodities (*have, give, lose, thank you for*). This is an example of the way in which metaphorical entailments can characterize a coherent system of metaphorical concepts and a corresponding coherent system of metaphorical expressions for those concepts.[72]

The very systematic nature of metaphor which allows for the ability to focus on one aspect of a concept also has the effect of obscuring other aspects of the metaphor that are inconsistent with that particular metaphor. One illustration of how a metaphor can highlight one aspect of a concept and hide another is given in the previously referred to example of an argument. If the focus of the argument is on the "battle quality" of winning the point then the "cooperative quality" of the mutual attempt at resolution of the problem is hidden.[73]

Some concepts are understood through the process of "metaphorical structuring." In other words, concepts can be extended beyond their literal definitions when one concept is metaphorically structured in terms of another. In addition, there are "orientational metaphors" that have to do with spatial orientation such as up or down, in or out, and front or back, to name a few. In our culture happy equals "up" and unhappy equals "down." For example, when describing that I feel good I might say, "I am feeling up today."

---

72 Ibid., 9.
73 Ibid., 10.

Likewise, if I am feeling sad I might say, "I am feeling down today." We have all used these phrases and know exactly what they mean when we hear them because all metaphors are comprehended through our own experience.[74]

The most important cultural values will be represented by, and coherent with, the metaphorical structure of the most fundamental concepts of the culture. In order to be meaningful, the cultural values need to be expressed in a coherent system of metaphorical concepts that are used by the culture. When experiences can be identified they can be categorized and subsequently evaluated through reason. The process of reasoning about experience is assisted by the use of ontological metaphors.[75]

Ontological metaphors allow us to comprehend the experience of nonhuman objects in terms of human characteristics thereby making sense of experience in the world in human terms. Examples of this type of metaphoric use would be, "Inflation is our enemy," or "This work is killing me." Personification acts as a general category that includes numerous aspects of the human way of experiencing things.[76]

Metonymy is the process of using a metaphorical expression as a substitution for another entity to which it is related. Included in this category are the examples of one entity referring to another and a part of an entity referring to the whole. Lakoff and Johnson distinguish between metaphor and metonymy by describing their functions as follows:

> Metaphor and metonymy are different kinds of processes. Metaphor is principally a way of conceiving of one thing in terms of another, and its primary

74 Ibid., 14–9.
75 Ibid., 22–32.
76 Ibid., 33–4.

> function is understanding. Metonymy, on the other hand, has primarily a referential function, that is, it allows us to use one entity to *stand for* another. But metonymy is not merely a referential device. It also serves the function of providing understanding.[77]

We have seen that because metaphors can be described systematically in relation to the concepts that they represent, and because the systematic way metaphor is structured allows for the use of concepts from one sphere to metaphorically define concepts from another sphere, it is possible to use only partial metaphors in representation of a concept. For example, in using the metaphor "theories are buildings," one could talk about the "used parts" and the "unused parts" of a theory. An example of the "used part of the building" could be represented by the phrase, "His theory has a strong foundation." An example of the "unused part of the building" might be stated, "His theory is an empty room." Neither example gives reference to the "whole" building, only the parts.[78]

The idea of "grounding" a metaphor refers to the linking of one clearly defined concept to one that is less defined for the purpose of elaboration and understanding. Going back to the concept of "argument as war," the ability to ground the concept of argument to the concept of war allows for extending the understanding of argument. It is common for nonphysical elements to be grounded by physical elements for the purpose of elaboration. Reviewing the example of "argument is war" gives the following examples:

77 Ibid., 36.
78 Ibid., 52–5.

ARGUMENT IS WAR
Your claims are *indefensible*.
He *attacked every weak point* in my argument.
His criticisms were *right on target*.
I *demolished* his argument.
I've never *won* an argument with him.
You disagree? Okay, *shoot*!
If you use that strategy, he'll *wipe you out*.
He *shot down* all of my arguments.[79]

Here, the phrases in italics suggest concepts that remind the reader of physical objects or actions.

According to Lakoff and Johnson the concept of causation is a partly emergent and a partly metaphorical concept. Concepts can be categorized in three different ways: 1)as directly emergent; 2) as emergent metaphorical concepts based on experience; and 3) as concepts with an emergent core that is elaborated metaphorically. Generally speaking, complex concepts have been considered complex because they can be deconstructed into elemental concepts that are considered the building blocks of the complex concept. Causation is often considered an emergent or elemental concept. However, Lakoff and Johnson make the argument that causation has an emergent core that is metaphorically elaborated. They explain, "A proper understanding of causation requires that it be viewed as a cluster of other components. But the cluster forms a gestalt—a whole that we human beings find more basic that the parts."[80] The shared features of a common direct causation are:

79 Ibid., 4.
80 Ibid., 70.

> The agent has as a goal some change of state in the patient.
> The change of state is physical.
> The agent has a 'plan' for carrying out this goal.
> The plan requires the agent's use of a motor program.
> The agent is in control of that motor program.
> The agent is primarily responsible for carrying out the plan.
> The agent is the energy source (i.e., the agent is directing his energies toward the patient), and the patient is the energy goal (i.e., the change in the patient is due to an external source of energy).
> The agent touches the patient either with his body or an instrument (i.e., there is a spatiotemporal overlap between what the agent does and the change in the patient).
> The agent successfully carries out the plan.
> The change in the patient is perceptible.
> The agent monitors the change in the patient through sensory perception.
> There is a single specific agent and a single specific patient.
> The twelve properties given above characterize a prototype of causation in the following sense. They recur together over and over in action after action as we go through our daily lives. We experience them as a *gestalt*: that is, the complex of properties occurring together is more basic to our experience than their separate occurrence.[81]

The above is an example of the concept of causation based on the model of direct manipulation (like making an envelope out of a sheet of paper), which comes from human experience. Direct manipulation is a gestalt entailing properties that occur inherently together in the daily experience of performing direct manipulations.[82]

Metaphorical concepts function by partially structuring an experience in terms of another. Coherence occurs when our experience is structured in terms of gestalts. For example, a conversation is experienced as an argument when the gestalt of war fits the perceptions and actions of the conversation. Humans experience coherence when they can categorize their experience in terms of gestalts. Metaphorical coherence occurs when there are a least two metaphors defining the experience; each metaphor has a defined goal

81 Ibid., 70–1.
82 Ibid., 75.

(emphasizing one aspect of the experience); and there is partial fulfillment of each metaphoric purpose.[83]

Many concepts that are important to human beings are either abstract or not clearly defined in our experience. Concepts such as emotions, ideas, and time are difficult to grasp. Metaphor provides a way of understanding these concepts. Abstract concepts require metaphorical definition because the concepts themselves are not understood clearly enough for use in our daily lives. Lakoff and Johnson assert:

> We are proposing that the concepts that occur in metaphorical definitions are those that correspond to natural kinds of experience . . . . Similarly, we would suggest that concepts that are used in metaphorical definitions to define other concepts also correspond to natural kinds of experience . . . individual concepts are not defined in an isolated fashion, but rather in terms of their roles in natural kinds of experiences. Concepts are not defined solely in terms of inherent properties; instead, they are defined primarily in terms of interactional properties. Finally, definition is not a matter of giving some fixed set of necessary and sufficient conditions for the application of a concept; instead, concepts are defined by prototypes and by types of relations to prototypes. Rather than being rigidly defined, concepts arising from our experience are open-ended. Metaphors and hedges are systematic devices for further defining a concept and for changing its range of applicability.[84]

Metaphor gives meaning to the form of our speech. Linguistic form is conceptualized in spatial terms and specific metaphors can apply directly to the form of the sentence. Links between metaphor and the content of the sentence are not indiscriminate which causes the metaphor to precisely affect the meaning of the sentence. Therefore, according to Dwight Bolinger[85] it is not possible to paraphrase a statement because no two statements will ever be the same.

---

83 Ibid., 87–96.
84 Ibid., 118–25.
85 Dwight Bolinger, *Meaning and Form* (London: Longman's Publisher, 1977).

New metaphors can provide understanding of our experience in the same way that conventional metaphors have, namely by providing coherence in structure and illuminating certain aspects of our experience while hiding other aspects. New metaphors have the power to create new reality. One example of metaphors making new reality occurs when the Western concept of "time is money" is introduced into another culture. That introduction changes the reality of the other culture.[86]

Metaphors can create similarities. Lakoff and Johnson emphasize that we see similarities through the categories of our conceptual system and by virtue of our natural experiences. Many of the similarities that we perceive are due to the conventional metaphors that are a part of our conceptual system. New metaphors are also capable of creating similarities and they do so in the following way:

1. Conventional metaphors (orientational, ontological, and structural) are often based on correlations we perceive in our experience.

2. Conventional metaphors of the structural variety (e.g., ideas are food) may be based on similarities that arise out of orientational and ontological metaphors.

3. New metaphors are mostly structural.

4. New metaphors, by virtue of their entailments, pick out a range of experiences by highlighting, downplaying and hiding.

5. Similarities may be similarities with respect to a metaphor . . . metaphor defines a unique kind of similarity.[87]

New metaphors can define reality, and they do this through a coherent network

86 Lakoff and Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, 139–45.
87 Ibid., 147–53.

of entailments that emphasize some qualities of reality while hiding others. As Lakoff and Johnson state, "The acceptance of the metaphor, which forces us to focus *only* on those aspects of our experience that it highlights, leads us to view the entailments of the metaphor as being *true*."[88] According to Lakoff and Johnson, metaphors are conceptual in nature, they are central to the function of understanding, and they play a critical role in the construction of socio-political reality. The traditional view of metaphor is that is it a linguistic technique that cannot state truth (objective and absolute). Lakoff and Johnson do not accept the existence of objective, absolute, and unconditional truth. For them, truth is "always relative to a conceptual system that is defined in large part by metaphor."[89] Metaphors are often imposed on people by those in power—political leaders and religious leaders to name a few. The people who impose their metaphors on the culture control what is considered "true."

Lakoff and Johnson present an alternative to objective and absolute truth. They see truth as built on a particular understanding of a situation that is based on individuals as bounded entities with the capability of directly experiencing events. Individuals and objects have specific orientations with respect to the environment that produce the dimensions of experience in which we function. The dimensional categories in which we function are gestalts of experience, and an experiential gestalt typically serves as a background for understanding. Understanding a situation involves identifying elements of the situation as fitting the dimensions of the gestalt. The properties we directly experience are products of our interactions with our environment. Each category is

88 Ibid., 157.
89 Ibid., 159.

structured in terms of an example and bears resemblance to the example. They summarize these assertions by saying, ". . . there is nothing radically new in our account of truth. It includes some of the central insights of the phenomenological tradition, such as the rejection of the epistemological foundationalism, the stress on the centrality of the body in the structuring of our experience, and the importance of that structure in understanding."[90]

As evidence of the conceptual nature of metaphor in human cognition Lakoff and Johnson cite the neural theory of Srinivas Narayanan.[91] In his dissertation, Narayanan hypothesizes that conceptual metaphors develop and follow a neural pathway which includes the sensory-motor system as it intersects with higher cortical centers. The development of the primary conceptual metaphor is likened to the concept of mapping in the field of neuroscience. For example, within the visual system neurons send dendritic projections to the visual cortex. The neurons in the visual cortex form a "map" of the retinal image. At this point, the metaphor is structural. In a similar fashion, neurons throughout the body send dendritic projections to the homunculus in the motor cortex forming another "map." All of this takes place through physical links of neuronal circuits. As Lakoff and Johnson describe, "This neural learning mechanism produces a stable, conventional system of primary metaphors that tend to remain in place indefinitely within the conceptual system and are independent of language."[92]

The primary obstacle that prevents Westerners from accepting the notion that metaphor is conceptual has to do with the philosophical limitations of objectivism and

---

90 Ibid., 159–82.
91 Srinivas Narayanan, *Embodiment in Language Understanding: Sensory-Motor Representations for Metaphoric Reasoning about Event Descriptions* (Berkeley: Unpublished doctoral dissertation, 1997).
92 Lakoff and Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, 256.

subjectivism, according to Lakoff and Johnson. In Western philosophy if you are not objective (believe that there is absolute truth), you are subjective (truth is what I choose it to be). Lakoff and Johnson view these two extremes as myths in and of themselves. Lakoff and Johnson offer a third alternative, which they call experientialist. In describing the difference they say:

> The fundamental concern of the myth of objectivism is the world external to the individual. The myth rightly emphasizes the fact that there are real things, existing independently of us, which constrain both how we interact with them and how we comprehend them. Objectivism's focus on truth and factual knowledge is based on the importance of such knowledge for successful functioning in our physical and cultural environment. The myth is also motivated by a concern for fairness and impartiality in cases where that matters and can be achieved in some reasonable fashion. Experientialism departs from objectivism, however, on two fundamental issues:
>
> Is there an absolute truth? Is absolute truth necessary to meet the above concerns . . .? Experientialism answers no to both questions. Truth is always relative to understanding, which is based on a nonuniversal conceptual system . . . .
>
> According to the experientialist myth, scientific knowledge is still possible. But giving up the claim to absolute truth could make scientific practice more responsible, since there would be a general awareness that a scientific theory may hide as much as it highlights . . . .
>
> What legitimately motivates subjectivism is the awareness that meaning is always meaning *to* a person. What's meaningful to me is a matter of what has significance for me. And what is significant for me will not depend on my rational knowledge alone but on my past experiences, values, feeling, and intuitive insights . . . .
>
> The experientialist myth agrees that understanding does involve all of these elements. Its emphasis on interaction and interactional properties shows how meaning always is meaning to a person . . . .
>
> Where experientialism diverges from subjectivism is in its rejection of the Romantic idea that imaginative understanding is completely unconstrained . . . .
>
> In summary, we see the experientialist myth as capable of satisfying the real and reasonable concerns that have motivated the myths of both subjectivism and objectivism but without either the objectivist obsession with absolute truth or the subjectivist insistence that imagination is totally unrestricted.[93]

93 Ibid., 226–8.

We have seen that narrative is an account of an event using language to communicate meaning, and how the language of narrative evolves with the constructive use of metaphor which is not just linguistic, but conceptual in nature. At this point it is important to look at the use of metaphor and image within the study of religious narrative.

Metaphor in Religious Narrative

Metaphors are foundational to religious narratives and therefore of interest to scholars in the field of religious studies. David Tracy, a Catholic theologian and scholar describes religions as having "root metaphors" from which come networks and ancillary networks of metaphors. This notion seems similar to the "primary" and "complex" metaphors discussed by Lakoff and Johnson. Tracy goes on to describe the function of these metaphors when he states:

> These networks describe the enigma and promise of the human situation and prescribe certain remedies for that situation . . . the prevalent theological concern has been with the truth status of religious cognitive claims in relation to various scientific, ethical, and sometimes metaphysical theories of meaning and truth. This concern may now be recognized as a necessary but not sufficient condition for intelligent, rational, and responsible reflection upon the phenomenon of religion.[94]

The network of metaphors found in the study of religions encompasses the description of singular core concepts on one end of the continuum to the emblematic allegories, stories, and parables recited within religious narratives on the other end. As stated in the previous discussion of metaphor as a basis for language, metaphors weave together the familiar with the unfamiliar for the purpose of understanding. Metaphoric

94 David Tracy, "Metaphor and Religion: The Test Case of Christian Texts," *Critical Inquiry* 5, no. 1 (1978) :91.

function is the same in the study of religion where familiar words or concepts are used to assist humans in understanding the numinous.

Some of the terms that describe core concepts in the study of religion and are illustrations of metaphoric interpretation are: belief, body, conflict, culture, experience, gender, god, image, liberation, modernity, performance, person, rationality, relic, religious, sacrifice, territory, time, transformation, transgression, value, and writing.[95] At this point it will be valuable to consider some of these terms and how they are examples of metaphoric interpretation.

The word "belief" has evolved to become an abstract metaphor for "religion." It would not be uncommon to hear someone say, "What is your belief?" when asking, "What is your religion?" When speaking of belief Donald S. Lopez, Jr., scholar of Buddhist and Tibetan studies, states:

> The problem, then, is not whether belief exists—this is difficult to determine—but whether religion must be represented as something that derives from belief, as something with external manifestations that can ultimately be traced back to an inner assent to a cognitive proposition, as a state of mind that produces practice. As we have seen, in thirteenth-century Italy the inquisition hunted and punished heretics in the name of belief. There, even when it appears with such priority, belief is the afterthought, belatedly depicted as having existed inside someone else's head. In the nineteenth century, Colonel Olcott and other foreigners created a world religion called Buddhism in the name of belief. Its role in turning other traditions, including the Christian, into world religions remains to be investigated. A century after Colonel Olcott, we continue to speak of the "world view" of this or that religion, demonstrating that, even though we may no longer believe in God, we still believe in belief.[96]

To speak of religion in terms of belief suggests that religion is the external materialization

---

95 Mark C. Taylor, ed., *Critical Terms for Religious Studies* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998).
96 Donald S. Jr. Lopez, "Belief," in *Critical Terms for Religious Studies*, ed. Mark C. Taylor (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998), 34.

of some internal metaphoric concept we call belief and that religion then becomes the representation of that internal state.

Turning from the internal belief to the external representation, the concept of body as a metaphor has a history in many religions. In the religion of Christianity, the church is considered the "body" of Christ. In the observance of Holy Communion, the bread is called, "the body" of Christ. In different cultures, whether it is acceptable to alter the body is dependent on the cultural view of how the body is related to God. Again, in Christianity, the body is the "temple" of the Holy Spirit. As William LaFleur points out: "Part of Europe's self-identity was rooted in the supposition that Christians, unlike peoples referred to a pagans, did not disfigure or even redesign the body given by God. Medieval Europeans saw somatic alteration as a desecration of bodies thought to possess the *imago dei* or image of god."[97] In his discussion of the concept of the body within Western religious traditions, Richard Roberts, a religious studies scholar and professor at the University of Lancaster in the United Kingdom states, "The 'angelic way' of early Christians paradoxically at once devalued and reified the body."[98] Roberts goes on to assert,

> Western methodological concerns and traditions have so colored the representation of the 'bodies' of the religious 'other' that some politically aware Westerners declare the *impossibility* of this representation and some non-Westerners its *unacceptability*. All the major traditions of Christianity—Catholic, Protestant, and Orthodox—inherit a difficulty: a powerful

97 William R. LaFleur, "Body," in *Critical Terms for Religious Studies*, ed. Mark C. Taylor (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998), 40.
98 Richard H. Roberts, "Body," in *The Blackwell Companion to the Study of Religion*, ed. Robert A. Segal (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009), 216.

> metaphorical *imaginaire* of 'the body' that coexists with the negation of contingent bodies.[99]

The treatment of the concept of "body" within the Judeo-Christian tradition has been expressed in divergent and conflicted ways. The body metaphorically represented the image of God on one hand and the distasteful sin filled baggage of humanity on the other hand. A similar bifurcation of metaphor about the concept of body occurred in traditional China according to LaFleur who reports:

> Eunuchism in traditional China provides an instructive case of how significant bodily modification may occur within a society that insists upon the religious import of its opposite, that is, on strict acceptance and non-alteration of the body. Confucianism disclosed its religious dimension in its insistence that dead ancestors were de facto deities and that their descendants' filial piety was expressed in a total acceptance of their own bodies, which were given them as somatic inheritances. This entailed that any intentional alteration of it—tattooing, piercing, and so on—constituted a violation of religious duty and placed the all-important beneficence of a dead but still involved ancestor's favor in jeopardy.[100]

Clearly, the concept of body is a mixed metaphor encompassing both good and bad qualities within a religious framework.

Progressing from the notion of the body as a metaphor for a likeness of God, we arrive at the word that depicts this likeness: image. Defining what this word means and how it is applied in a religious context is a difficult task. According to Margaret Miles description:

> As a critical term in religious studies, 'image' is singularly difficult to define, even if the discussion is confined . . . to the Christian and post-Christian West. . . . In historical Christianity, image was seen as dependent (in varying degrees) on its original. Its primary use was in describing humanity's relationship to God through Christ. In twentieth-century media culture, however, the meaning

99 Ibid., 220.
100 LaFleur, "Body," 39.

> and value of image have altered dramatically. The media image often stands alone, without a referent, reflecting nothing but its creator's imagination.[101]

Image, of course, does arise from imagination that spawns intuition and personally significant experience. However, to hark back to the previous discussion of Lakoff and Johnson, unbridled imagination results in losing touch with reality, unfairness, bias, and self-indulgence. Therefore, religious images have focused on providing a sort of grounding for the intuition. This function is perhaps one of the things that makes the definition of image difficult. It has many facets and a variety of functions.

Moving from the concept of the image of God to the concept of God itself, provides an opportunity to examine examples of the concept of God as described in both human and figurative ways. God can be described in an anthropomorphic manner using the metaphors of lord, king, father, and shepherd. Or, the concept of God can be referred to in very abstract ways: being, the most high, the first, the last, love, and the source, to name just a few examples. The concept itself is very complex, as Francis Fiorenza and Gordon Kaufman state:

> The term . . . is one of the most complex and difficult in the English language. 'God' is a word rich with layers and dimensions of meaning. It is full of problems and difficulties—for religious believers as well as unbelievers—and is susceptible to many sorts of interpretations . . . . 'God' is a term used to name the ultimate reality, value, and meaning for humans more often than any other in the language, but one that has also been employed frequently in thoroughly dehumanizing ways.[102]

Invoking the name of God occurs in many different ways depending on the

---

101 Margaret R. Miles, "Image," in *Critical Terms for Religious Studies*, ed. Mark C. Taylor (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998), 166.
102 Francis Schussler Fiorenza and Gordon D. Kaufman, "God," in *Critical Terms for Religious Studies*, ed. Mark C. Taylor (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998), 136–7.

circumstances. It may be used in a plea for help or in demeaning curse dependent upon how the experience of the user and the conceptualization of the metaphor.

Performance is another religious concept that is subject to metaphorical usage in a religious context. In discussing the use of this concept Catherine Bell, a religious studies scholar and professor at the Santa Clara University of California, points out that an evolution in the field of religious studies has resulted in a change from using this word as Ricoeur proposed, that is, as a text metaphor, to an analytic focus she considers to be truer to the nature of human activity. Bell believes that departing from the old textual metaphor, and including new multidisciplinary methodologies, has improved the conversation by the use of diversity.[103] In discussing the evolution of the concept Bell states:

> The terminology of performance harbors some basic ambiguity. The oldest meaning of the noun denotes the accomplishment or execution of a specified action, most notably a command or a promise. Similarly, performance has also come to mean the enactment of a script or score, as in a theatrical play or musical recital. More recent uses, however, emphasize a type of event in which the very activity of the agent or artist is the most critical dimension and not the completion of the action. With this repertoire of meanings, religious studies uses the language of performance to stress the execution of a preexisting script for activity (as in conducting a traditional church service) or the explicitly unscripted dimensions of an activity in process (as in the spirit or quality of the service).[104]

Transitioning from the "action" of performance to the "place" of territory the notion of "mapping" becomes an example of the use of metaphor, and a core religious concept, that involves the concept of place. The idea advanced here is that myths and rituals play an important role in negotiating the unknown territory of the spiritual domain.

---

103 Catherine Bell, "Performance," in *Critical Terms for Religious Studies*, ed. Mark C. Taylor (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998), 207.
104 Ibid., 205–6.

According to Sam Gill, a religious studies scholar from Colorado,

> Advancing this metaphor, as maps are used by travelers to negotiate some territory or are constructed by cartographers to chart the significance of a territory from some perspective, so too function the myths and rituals that play major roles in religious traditions. As there are endless ways to map a territory and to use maps to negotiate a territory, there are endless ways to perform rites and apply myths in the effort to construct meaning in life.[105]

In this example, metaphoric narratives can be considered "road maps" for the spiritual journey of life and hopefully aid in finding the desired destination.

Traveling the spiritual journey sometimes exacts a cost from the devotee. The cost is often experienced in the form of sacrifice. Sacrifice is yet another concept found in religious narratives that serves as a metaphoric illustration. As just one example, the religion of Judaism has extensive descriptions and categories of sacrifice within its rituals and laws. The offering of a slain animal in atonement for sin is a central type of sacrifice and metaphor (the *hatta'at* offering). Robbins clarifies this type of ritual metaphor by explaining,

> The sacrificer lays his hand on the offering, thus identifying it with himself. The idea behind this practice was explained by the medieval commentator Nachmanides in his commentary on Lev. 1:9 as follows: the sinner's life is forfeit to God, but by a gracious provision, he is permitted to substitute an animal victim in his place.[106]

In virtually every religion there is the concept of sacrifice which involves either voluntarily or involuntarily giving up something as a metaphorical act representing something else. It is exactly this notion of sacrifice that figures prominently in the religion of Christianity

---

105 Sam Gill, "Territory," in *Critical Terms for Religious Studies*, ed. Mark C. Taylor (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998), 307.
106 Jill Robbins, "Sacrifice," in *Critical Terms for Religious Studies*, ed. Mark C. Taylor (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998), 285.

when Christ becomes the metaphoric sacrifice for the sin of mankind by becoming the "blood of the lamb that saves the world."

In discussing the metaphor of sacrifice, Robbins highlights the impossibility of sacrifice:

> When Abraham is ready to put to death his one and only son, the unique, and to give that death to God, sacrifice can no longer be understood in terms of substitution, because it concerns precisely that which is unsubstitutable. Sacrifice, as an aneconomic phenomenon, necessarily takes place and becomes legible in a domain that we call the impossible. This is the sense in which it can be understood as an ordeal that exposes community to its necessary disappearance. Sacrifice is also impossible in ethical terms, insofar as it is abhorrent . . . . Finally, that sacrifice is impossible does not mean that it has not always already occurred . . . . This tension is apparent . . . .[107]

The metaphor of sacrifice is a difficult one to incorporate with the other more positive and frequently invoked metaphors of religious practice. Yet, it is a central concept in the majority of religions. One way to integrate this metaphor is with the assistance of the next metaphor to be discussed, that of transformation.

The final metaphor to be considered in this discussion is transformation. Transformation connotes a metamorphosis, or a change, and the emergence of something new. Often, a sacrifice of sorts is required for a transformation to take place. This change can be considered a termination, or final change. However, it can also be considered a dynamic process that continues over time. As Lawrence suggests:

> . . . the power of internal transformation, not once and for all, not a do-or-die conversion but rather a rigorous, persistent opening from within to the creative potential of a divine source that resists exclusive identification with any name or nation: common to all religions, it can never become the sole possession of one except as its antithesis. It will always remain both collective and individual, surrendering neither to the tyranny of apparatchiks nor to the romanticism of sky

107 Ibid., 296.

> gazers nor to the doomism of the apocalypticists. That perhaps is the final hope for transformation as a cultural/religious/spiritual category in the next millennium, whether it be the third on a Christian calendar or the fifth on a Chinese calendar.[108]

I prefer to think of the metaphor of the spiritual journey as a dynamic process that includes all the facets of the metaphors of belief, body, image, God, performance, territory, and sacrifice leading to the ongoing transformation. Sacred narratives play a central role in transformation by functioning as containers and disseminators of the metaphors we live by.

Now, the question is, "How is the narrative to be understood or interpreted?" For this task we must turn to the theory of hermeneutics named for the Greek patron of orators and literature, the Olympian God, Hermes, from whom we receive the ability to evaluate the nature of the narrative and ultimately human intention.

The Function of Hermeneutics

Hermeneutics is the theory of the operations that occur in an attempt to understand and interpret a narrative. As Ricoeur points out, "Hermeneutics is thus the route to philosophical reflection, to reflection premised on the assumption that by following the indication of symbolic meaning one will arrive at a deeper understanding of human existence."[109]

According to Paul Ricoeur, the central problem of hermeneutics is the opposition between explanation and understanding. One difficulty encountered in the attempt to interpret a narrative is that language is naturally polysemic. That is, words have multiple

---

108 Bruce B. Lawrence, "Transformation," in *Critical Terms for Religious Studies*, ed. Mark C. Taylor (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998), 346.
109 Ricoeur, *Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences*, 6.

meanings and therefore require a context to effect an adequate interpretation. As Ricoeur says, the use of context requires discernment between interlocutors, or the parties engaged in the dialogue. The most elementary work of interpretation is to produce a relatively univocal discourse with polysemic words, and to identify this intention of univocity in the reception of messages.

In a verbal exchange of narrative, those involved in the dialogue are present to each other and the context of the surroundings and circumstances of the exchange. Therefore, as Ricoeur states, "the *ideal* sense of what is said turns towards the *real* reference, towards that 'about which' we speak . . . . This is no longer the case when the text takes the place of speech. The movement of reference towards the act of showing is intercepted, at the same time as dialogue is interrupted by the text."[110] In a verbal exchange, when someone is recounting a story to another, the context allows for questions and responses, clarifications, and elucidation. However, the function of interpreting and understanding a narrative takes a different course when the narrative is written as in the case of historical narratives such as the sacred narratives considered in this dissertation.[111]

Written Narrative: Another Story

Just as the brain has an effect on the process of narratization, the reverse is also true; narratization has an effect on the brain. Robert Ornstein, an American psychologist and researcher, emphasizes that learning to read and write a language at a young age influences the way the hemispheres work. In a process similar to the exercise of muscle fibers which causes new fibers to grow, practicing cognitive functions causes new growth

110 Ibid., 148.
111 Ibid., 145–64.

of neuronal pathways.[112] So, the progression is reciprocal.

Up to this point we discussed the notion that humans became conscious when they learned to use language to mentally narratize their lives. This process followed the acquisition of language and the use of external speech for communication among members of a community. Throughout most of history human beings communicated orally, sharing important information from one person to another, or one group to another, through telling stories, narratives, and chronicling events. But, somewhere along the line the narratives became "trapped" in little black marks like the ones I am now putting on this page, and this entrapment changed the way the human brain functions. The move from oral narrative to written narrative had sweeping consequences for society. As Marshall McLuhan, a Canadian philosopher and scholar, describes in his story about Prince Modupe, a young West African who encountered the written word:

> The one crowded space in Father Perry's was his bookshelves. I gradually came to understand that the marks on the pages were trapped words. Anyone could learn to decipher the symbols and turn the trapped words loose again into speech. The ink of the print trapped the thoughts; they could no more get away than a doomboo could get out of a pit. When the full realization of what this meant flooded over me, I experienced the same thrill and amazement as when I had my first glimpse of the bright lights of Konakry. I shivered with the intensity of my desire to learn to do this wondrous thing myself.[113]

When the spoken word was transposed into writing, the world changed in ways that had far reaching implications for the future of humanity in general, and more specifically, women. Leonard Shlain, an American physician and writer, presents some provocative thoughts on this subject in his book, The Alphabet versus the Goddess -- The Conflict

112 Robert E. Ornstein, *The Right Mind* (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1997), 40.
113 Marshall McLuhan, *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964), 84.

between Word and Image. In his book, Shlain advances the notion that the birth of the alphabet spells out death for image as an ordained messenger of meaning. As he introduces his readers to the hypothesis of his book he states:

> . . . I was struck by the thought that the demise of the Goddess, the plunge in women's status, and the advent of harsh patriarchy and misogyny occurred around the time that people were learning how to read and write. Perhaps there was something in the way people acquired this new skill that changed the brain's actual structure. We know that in the developing brain of a child, differing kinds of learning will strengthen some neuronal pathways and weaken others.
>
> Extrapolating the experience of an individual to a culture, I hypothesized that when a critical mass of people within a society acquire literacy, especially alphabet literacy, left hemispheric modes of thought are reinforced at the expense of right hemispheric ones, which manifests as a decline in the status of images, women's rights, and goddess worship.[114]

Most neurologists and neuropsychologists would agree that the function of the brain is neither completely holistic, nor localized. As explained earlier in this discussion, it appears that the brain functions in both ways, with localized specificity in certain functions and holistically in other functions. However, there are some universally recognized functional differences between the left and right hemispheres of the brain, the coordination of which are mediated by the corpus callosum as previously discussed. In addition, certain functions of the brain are decussated or crossed over, so the left side of the brain affects the right side of the body and vice versa. Most people are right handed and therefore are left brain dominant. Those people who are left handed or ambidextrous usually have mixed brain dominance.[115]

---

114 Leonard Shlain, *The Alphabet Versus the Goddess -- The Conflict Between Word and Image* (New York: Penquin Books, 1998), viii.
115 Guyton, *Textbook of Medical Physiology*, 724–6.

Generally speaking, the left brain is concerned with volition and action and communicates with the world through speech. It performs functions of analysis, logic, abstraction, numerical computations and other linear, detail focused tasks. On the other hand, so to speak, the right brain is generally nonverbal and sees the gestalt. It integrates feelings, is image oriented, and responds to melody.[116] Shlain points out that the right brain does make a contribution to the left brain function of language. And, how does it do that? Through the use of metaphor, described in the following passage:

> When people find it necessary to express in words an inner experience such as a dream, an emotion, or a complex feeling-state, they resort to a special form of speech called metaphor that is the right brain's unique contribution to the left brain's language capability . . . . Metaphors beget poetry and myth, and are essential to the parables of religion and the wisdom of folktales.[117]

The right brain is the first to develop in the fetus and is phylogenetically older, yet by some twist of fate, just as the younger twin Jacob supplanted the birthright of his older twin Esau, the left brain has stolen the inheritance of the right through the invention of alphabetic writing.

The earliest forms of writing were image based. Both cuneiform and hieroglyphic writing were iconic, though hieroglyphic writing was a more complex method of writing.[118] These forms of writing were difficult to transcribe and understand because of the multiplicity of meanings and combinations. Some historians credit the Egyptians with inventing the alphabet because some believe they invented the principle. However, Slain points out that the oldest alphabet recorded to date was discovered in the

---

116 Groves and Schlesinger, *Biological Psychology*, 78–93.
117 Shlain, *The Alphabet Versus the Goddess -- The Conflict Between Word and Image*, 20.
118 J.M. Roberts, *History of the World* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 49–53.

Sinai desert, and this leads him to hypothesize that the Hebrews were the first to use an alphabet, the invention of which reconfigured the world.[119] In discussing this dramatic change Shlain states:

> Aside from the obvious benefits that derived from their ease of use, alphabets produced a subtle change in cognition that redirected human thinking. For sophisticated neurolinguistic reasons the early practitioners could not have known, alphabets reinforced only half of the dual strategy that humans had evolved to survive. As we have seen, this strategy had three components: left brain/right brain, cone/rod, and right hand/left hand. Each tripartite half of this duality perceived and reacted to the world in a different way; a unified response emerged only when both complementary halves were used. All forms of writing increase the left brain's dominance over the right.[120]

Shlain goes on to point out that the cultures which took advantage of this tool glorified monotheism, organized their societies by "Rule of Law", instituted democracy, elevated individualism, invented money, wrote drama and poetry, and the list goes on. However, these same cultures also abused nature, glorified war, perfected imperialism, and had deep rooted sexist attitudes resulting in misogyny.[121] He asserts that the alphabet made it possible to categorize data and systematize knowledge, thereby laying the foundation for empirical science and the age of modernity with all its problems.

Ken Wilbur, a twentieth-century biochemist and philosopher, takes issue with Shlain's notion that modernity is responsible for all the present day human and environmental ills of the world. He asserts that modernity or what he calls the "rational-industrial epoch" provided humanity with advances and freedoms such as

---

119 Shlain, *The Alphabet Versus the Goddess -- The Conflict Between Word and Image*, 70.
120 Ibid., 66.
121 Ibid.

independence for women and elimination of slavery, changes that never would have been realized in the mythic-agrarian societies. He maintains that all epochs prior to the rational-industrial epoch were stuck in certain divisions of labor and suppression of both sexes, as well as the environment. The communities of the previous epochs destroyed the earth through ignorance just as we of the rational epoch destroyed the environment.

Unfortunately, the growth and expansion that occurred during the rational epoch produced a greater magnitude of destruction because of the larger scope of technological influence. The paradox embedded in the industrial age is that although it produced the largest scale environmental destruction, the technology also provides the methods for "seeing" and potentially reversing the destructive patterns. The solution springs from the same source as the problem.[122]

Wilbur also maintains that those who would idealize the previous epochs, and long to return to earlier stages, are guilty of tunnel vision. They focus only on what they interpret as the positive values of the previous age, without acknowledging that there was an equally negative counterbalance inherent in each epoch.123 To this extent Wilbur would disagree with Shlain, who points primarily to the negative aspects of modernity and idealizes earlier epochs, especially the mythic, image-laden goddess eras.

Shlain's writing is both fascinating and distressing because his argument has some face validity. The reality is that women are as left brain indoctrinated as are men, even though

122 Wilbur, *A Brief History of Everything*, 55–6.

123 Wilbur, *A Brief History of Everything 54*.

women have a higher percentage of neuronal fibers in the corpus callosum[124] which would theoretically allow for greater communication and balance of the hemispheres, changing thousands of years of acculturated human habit patterns is not easy. For example, in championing a feminist transformation of present day androcentric theology, Rita Gross calls for women's experiences to be recovered and taken seriously. Without realizing the embedded left brain imperative, she asserts that when that is done, "a new naming of reality begins to occur."[125] But, the change will have to be even more radical than her prescription, because "naming" is a left brain function, an emphasis of word over image, and the first instruction the imageless Yahweh gives to Adam in the book of Genesis.

Shlain ends his treatise on a positive note, stating that he thinks the transition into the age of postmodernity will bring an increased balance to our culture through "image bombardment" because of the invention of television and the proliferation of the personal computer which requires both hands and both hemispheres for writing.[126]

Although, as the future unfolds we may encounter an increased cooperation of the cerebral hemispheres, humans will undoubtedly still be writing discursive tomes about a variety of subjects. And, there are those who believe that the act of producing a written text, as opposed to a verbal account, changes the way the narrative is interpreted.

---

124 Sandra F. Witelson, "Hand and Sex Differences in the Isthmus and Anterior Commissure of the Human Corpus Callosum," *Brain* no. 112 (1989): 799–835.
125 Rita Gross, *Feminism and Religion* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1996), 198.
126 Shlain, *The Alphabet Versus the Goddess -- The Conflict Between Word and Image*, 430–2.

Hermeneutics of the Written Text

Returning to the subject of hermeneutics, Paul Ricoeur is one notable theorist who, in his discussion of hermeneutics, places emphasis on the difference between oral narrative and written text. He describes a text as a work of discourse with the emphasis on *work*. "To say that a text is a work is to say that it is a structured totality which cannot be reduced to the sentences whereof it is composed. Such a totality is produced in accordance with a series of rules which define its literary genre . . ."[127]

Earlier it was noted that Ricoeur described the fundamental problem in the history of hermeneutics as that of the opposition between explanation and understanding. Explanation was a model of intelligibility taken from the natural sciences and applied to the historical disciplines. The concept of interpretation is a derivative of understanding and fundamental to human sciences. It has functioned, in part, to distinguish the natural sciences from the human sciences. Traditionally, the natural scientist *explains* events and the historian *interprets* events.

In Ricoeur's opinion a text is any discourse fixed by writing. He believes that writing adds nothing to speech, it takes the place of speech, and it allows the content to be preserved for the future. He does point out that writing and reading are not the same as having a dialogue because there is no communication between writing and reading. In speech the context is meaningful, and this is not true when text takes the place of speech. When text takes the place of speech, there is no longer a speaker and the proximity of the speaking subject to his own speech is replaced by a complex relation of the author to the

127 Ricoeur, *Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences*, 13.

text. The distancing of the author from the text poses the problem of distinction between explanation and interpretation that arises at the time of reading the text. Explanation and understanding confront each other in the action of reading.

Previous to Ricoeur, philosophers proposed that you could either explain a narrative as a natural scientist would, or you could interpret a narrative as a historian would, but you could not do both. Ricoeur's work revised this notion. The aim of his theory of hermeneutics was to develop an approach that would espouse a complementary and reciprocal relationship between explanation of a text and interpretation of a text. For Ricoeur understanding the mental life of another, through the signs of language, provides the basis for understanding and interpretation. To this end Ricoeur developed what he called the hermeneutical arc. About this concept he says:

> If . . . we regard structural analysis as a stage . . . between a naïve and a critical interpretation, between a surface and a depth interpretation, then it seems possible to situate explanation and interpretation along a unique hermeneutical arc and to integrate the opposed attitudes of explanation and understanding within an overall conception of reading as the recovery of meaning.[128]

For Ricoeur interpretation addresses the relationship between two individuals aiming at the reproduction of what he calls "lived experiences." Finally, as a statement in opposition to structuralism in linguistics, Ricoeur states that we can treat the text as if it is world-less and author-less and *explain* the text in terms of its internal structure or, we can restore the text to a living communication and *interpret* the text.

To summarize, this discussion has centered on the relationship between the functioning of the brain and the process of narratization. Consciousness was defined as

128 Ibid., 161.

the functional employment of internal narratization to give structure and meaning to external events that are unique or stressful in some way. Several theories explaining how the process of narratization evolved and its impact on humanity have been discussed. The implications of external, written narratization as opposed to internal and external verbal narratization have been explored including some theories about how narratives can be understood through explanation or interpretation. Over the decades, this topic has been considered by scholars from a variety of disciplines. The following discussion will touch on some of the most prominent theorists who discuss myth as narrative.

Myth as Narrative: A Multi-disciplinary Historical Perspective

According to Alan Dundes, a folklorist from the University of California at Berkeley, myth is a sacred narrative that explains ". . . how the world and man came to be in their present form"[129] The imperative word "sacred" is used to differentiate myth from other types of narrative such as legends and folktales that are usually secular and fictitious. In Greek, the word mythos means story and a sacred story suggests that all religions incorporate myths into their belief systems. As Dundes states, ". . . myth may constitute the highest form of truth, albeit in metaphorical guise."[130]

One of the difficulties of studying myth is the problem of definition. It is like the proverbial blind men trying to describe the elephant but each only describing the part of the elephant he is touching. Myth, as it turns out, is somewhat like the elephant. It can be described in many different ways and, depending on one's perspective, it can have

129 Alan Dundes, *Sacred Narrative: Readings in the Theory of Myth* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), 1.
130 Ibid.

different functions.

G. S. Kirk, a Greek scholar and Professor at Cambridge University, argues against what he calls a "universal" theory of mythology, citing numerous scholars of mythology who have fallen into what he describes as poor methodological approaches to the understanding of myth. He sees myth as " a diverse phenomenon that is likely to have different motives and applications even within a single society—let alone in different cultures and at different periods."[131]

An interest in the study of narratives took on serious intent in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries when, at that time, myths were seen as primitive man's attempt at understanding nature and the world in which he lived. The "Enlightenment" theory purported that Western religions, as well as, civilized societies went through an evolution in social formation, including a change in mythic-religious formation, which followed a course from fetishism to polytheism to monotheism. Many individual theorists took up the challenge of trying to understand the "mythic" thinking of primitive people. Others, notably Claude Levi-Stauss, a twentieth-century French anthropologist, focused on demonstrating that the primitive mind is no less capable of intellectual thought than the modern one, except perhaps in variable degrees.[132]

Myth resides within the purview of many different disciplines in addition to that of the obvious: mythology and folklore. The continuum of mythology seekers extended from the German philologist, Adalbert Kuhn (1812-1881) to Wilhelm Mannhardt

131 G.S. Kirk, "On Defining Myths," *Phronesis: A Journal for Ancient Philosophy* no. 1 (1973): 63.
132 Claude Levi-Strauss, *Structural Anthropology*, trans. Monique Layton (New York: Basic Books, 1974), 146–65.

(1831-1880) who championed folklore as mythology; from the linguist Max Müller (1823-1900) to the comparative mythologist and nineteenth-century anthropologist, James Frazer (1854-1941) whose work The Golden Bough a Study in Magic and Religion is still read by those interested in learning about the early approaches to mythology. Theorists from the disciplines of anthropology, theological and biblical studies, literature, sociology, history, psychology, and linguistics, to name a few, have their own perspectives on the definition and function of myth. For the purpose of this study, which focuses on "sacred" narrative, only relevant theories from the disciplines of anthropology, psychology, and biblical studies will be considered.

Anthropological Perspective

In addition to reading and compiling data on myths, the aforementioned James Frazer, comments on biblical stories, though not from the perspective of theology. As an "armchair" anthropologist he followed the Enlightenment theory of myth and used a comparative method to evaluate the Genesis account of the fall of man. He concluded that the Genesis story was related to a universal death myth which he compared to an African myth he called "the perverted message" and an American Indian myth he called "the story of the cast skin." Frazer's work is a large compilation of ethnographic data drawn from vast references. His work has been criticized, however, because of a tendency to take facts out of their cultural contexts and to make interpretations from the culturally "stripped" perspective of the libraries from which he conducted his research.[133]

133 Sir James G. Frazer, *Folklore in the Old Testament* (Cambridge: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1923), 45–77.

Another theorist from the field of anthropology, Bronislaw Malinowski, although influenced by James Frazer, took a totally different approach to gathering data about myth. Rather, he followed the lead of Franz Boas (1940), also an anthropologist interested in myth, who went into the communities of the native people of the American Pacific Northwest to collect data himself. Malinowski followed suit by living among the people he studied, collecting data, and developing his theory of how myth functions in a living society. He is considered one of the founders of the functionalist school of mythology and was emphatically opposed to the notion that myth is symbolic. For Malinowski, myth functions to strengthen tradition and reflects culture. As he states: "Studied alive, myth, as we shall see, is not symbolic but a direct expression of its subject matter."[134] His denial of mythic symbolism caused many debates among mythologists of the various schools of thought who absolutely believed myths to be symbolic.

In opposition to the functionalist approach to understanding myth, is the theory of Claude Levi-Strauss and his theory of structuralism. For Levi-Strauss, the important aspect of myth is its structure. His school of thought is concerned with understanding the "binary oppositions" and the meaning of the narrative structure. His method of understanding myth involves a kind of diagraming the mythic structure to identify the kinship and relational structure of the narrative. For example, Levi-Strauss would analyze the descriptions in the myth to determine geographic schemas, cosmological schemas, integrating schemas, sociological schemas, techno-economic schemas, and then work for a global integration of the schemas discovered. Although there is understanding of the

134 Bronislaw Malinowski, "The Role of Myth in Life," *Psyche* no. 24 (1926): 29–39.

social context derived from this method, the process is primarily linguistic and diagrammatic.[135]

William Bascom, an anthropologist from the University of California at Berkeley, chooses to separate what he calls "prose narratives" into three distinct types: myth, legend and folktale. He distinguishes the types of narratives based on seven characteristics he has outlined (See Table 1). Bascom believes that a narrative can be investigated on the basis of the points he outlines, and that a narrative cannot be categorized without reference to *all* the categories. He is careful to point out that the designation of "fact or fiction" relates only to "the beliefs of those who tell and hear these tales and not to our beliefs, to historical or scientific fact, or to any ultimate judgment of truth or falsehood."[136] Bascom also points out that a narrative can go through a metamorphosis. It may begin as a legend which is generally thought of as a historical tale, in other words, a factual story but without any substantiation. An example of this type of narrative is the tales of King Arthur. With repetition over time, a narrative might change into a myth as it takes on a sacred quality. A myth, being more a traditional story, attempts to explain the origin of something and often deals with mysterious or supernatural events. It often has significance for a particular cultural tradition. Or, the story may be viewed as a folktale, that is, a collection of fictional stories about people and animals that is instructional for coping with day to day life. The story may be considered a folktale by one culture, a legend by a second culture, and a myth by a third culture depending on the

135 Levi-Strauss, *Structural Anthropology*, 146–65.

136 Bascom, "The Forms of Folklore: Prose Narratives.," 7–8.

evolution of the culture and the education level of the citizens. The fact that another community of people view the story in a different way usually does not impact the way any other particular community views the story. Each community will have its own perspective and interpretation that is not clouded by what others may think.

Of Bascom's three categories of tales, the myth and the legend both can represent sacred stories that provide the community with collective values and understanding. Of the three categories, only the folktale is considered purely secular. Folktales that transform into "fairy tales" generally provide the function of teaching cultural lessons. The most common function is that of socializing children, or metaphorically telling children the consequences of not following the family rules or the social mores. The punishment given to the characters in the fairy tale is meant to be instructive. Table 1 outlines the way Bascom differentiates between myth, legend, and folktale based on several categories including the type of opening (is it conventional); the time of day the story is usually told; how the community views the story as fact or fiction; the setting described within the story; the attitude of the community toward the story; and the principal characters in the story line. Using these attributes, Bascom makes distinctions between the nature of the story and the purpose of the story.

Table 1. Formal Features of Prose Narratives

1. Formal Features (Form of prose narrative)	Prose Narratives Myth	Legend	Folktale
2. Conventional Opening	None	None	Usually
3. Told after dark	No	No	Usually
4. Belief	Fact	Fact	Fiction
5. Setting	Some time and some place	Some time and some place	Timeless Placeless
a. Time	Remote past	Recent past	Any time
b. Place	Earlier or Other world	World as it is today	Any place
6. Attitude	Sacred	Sacred or Secular	Secular
7. Principal Character	Non-human	Human	Human or Non-human

Source: Bascom, William. "The Forms of Folklore: Prose Narratives." *Journal of American Folklore* 78 (1965), 3-20.

Psychological Perspective

The question arises, why are stories so important to humans? And, why sacred stories in particular? Barry Lopez, an award winning American author, explains this phenomenon through the Native American story called "Crow and Weasel." He tells us:

> I would ask you to remember only this one thing, said Badger. The stories people tell have a way of taking care of them. If stories come to you, care for them, and learn to give them away, where they are needed. Sometimes a person needs story more than food to stay alive. This is why we put these stories in each other's memory. This is how people care for themselves.[137]

Stories can become our sacred myths and through them the psyche is nourished and cared for. While a myth is frequently represented as a lie or a false tale, many theorists believe this notion to be a misconception of the true function of myth.

C.G. Jung, the founder of depth psychology, felt that myth is the answer for the urgent need of modern humanity to begin the process of tending to the "long-forgotten soul of man."[138] This is a theme shared by both Jung and Joseph Campbell, one of the most recognized mythologists of our time who exemplified both religious and psychological proclivities. Jung and Campbell independently and collectively approach the subject of myth and symbolism from a perspective that seeks to respect the purpose of religious imagination without deifying it. As Richard A. Underwood, Scholar and Professor of Religious Studies at the University of North Carolina/Charlotte, states:

137 Barry Lopez, *Crow and Weasel* (San Francisco: North Point, 1990), 48.
138 Jung, *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*, 333.

> My fundamental assumption . . . is that both Jung and Campbell participate in the long history of religious studies in its more general nature. . . These two thinkers are involved insofar as part of the task of the academic study of religion is to help provide a degree of rational comprehension of how and why religious phenomena have played so vast a role in the affairs of humankind.[139]

Jung set the stage for Campbell's description of the hero-journey motif when he wrote his famous essay on "The Stages of Life" which emphasizes what Jung called the principle of "enantiodromia," or the turnaround of values that occurs during mid-life in human beings. During the first half of life the individual is concerned with developing ego mastery. The expression of energy and the focus is outward. According to Jung, when an individual reaches the mid-point of life, there occurs a turning inward. The person becomes more aware of mortality and more thoughtful about the meaning of life. As Jung states:

> A human being would certainly not grow to be seventy or eighty years old if this longevity had no meaning for the species. The afternoon of human life must also have a significance of its own and cannot be merely a pitiful appendage to life's morning. The significance of the morning undoubtedly lies in the development of the individual, our entrenchment in the outer world, the propagation of our kind, and the care of our children. This is the obvious purpose of nature. But when this purpose has been attained—and more than attained—shall the earning of money, the extension of conquests, and the expansion of life go steadily on beyond the bounds of all reason and sense? Whoever carries over into the afternoon the law of the morning, or the natural aim, must pay for it with damage to his soul, just as surely as a growing youth who tries to carry over his childish egoism into adult life must pay for this mistake with social failure.[140]

For both Jung and Campbell, mythic imagination is not the only way, but it is one

---

139 Richard A. Underwood, "Living by Myth: Joseph Campbell, C.G. Jung, and the Religious Life-Journey," in *Paths to the Power of Myth Joseph Campbell and the Study of Religion*, ed. Daniel C. Noel (New York: Crossroads Press, 1990), 13–4.

140 C.G. Jung, *The Spirit in Man, Art, and Literature*, trans. R.F.C. Hull, vol. 15 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1971), 17–8.

centrally important way that humans find meaning in life. It can also be asserted that it is a *primary* way. Joseph Campbell presents this view when he responds to the question of how our imaginations are to be nourished, now that the scientific methods of modernity have attempted to strip the earth of its mystery. In response Campbell says, ". . . there is a point of wisdom beyond the conflicts of illusion and truth by which lives can be put back together again."[141] For Campbell, finding a new synthesis of the scientific and the mythic is the "prime question of the time." For people who develop without having acquired a meaningful narrative about their lives, or for whom the narrative has become ineffectual (such as the lack of satisfaction found in today's churches), finding meaning and reason to live becomes more difficult. Studies have shown that lack of religious affiliation and lack of belief in a sacred narrative is a significant factor in suicidal behavior.[142] Human beings need meaning and purpose to survive.

Historically, people who formed a group, society, or a culture created meaningful stories that seemed to bind and sustain them. However, in postmodern Western culture, a shift has occurred away from one binding communal narrative to a proliferation of "personal" narratives or sacred myths by which individuals seek meaning in life. This is partly due to the contemporary ease of travel from country to country, and the combination of people from various cultures living together in the same geographic location. But, it is

141 Campbell, *The Power of Myth*, xix.
142 S. Stack, "The Effect of Religious Commitment on Suicide: A Cross National Analysis," *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* no. 24 (1983): 362–74; S. Stack and D Lester, "The Effect of Religion on Suicidal Ideation," *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology* no. 26 (1991): 168–70; K.D. Breault, "Suicide in America: A Test of Durkheim's Theory of Religious Family Integration 1933-1980," *American Journal of Sociology* no. no 92 (n.d.): 628–56; Kanita Dervic et al., "Religious Affiliation and Suicide Attempt," *American Journal of Psychiatry* no. 161 (2004): 2303–8.

also a result of what has been called the "demythologizing" effect of the scientific era.[143]

While many theorists hold to the belief that following a mythic narrative can provide a solution to individual and societal problems, James Hillman, an American archetypal psychologist, has a different view of the function of myth.

> Despite their graphic description of action and detail, myths resist being interpreted into practical life. They are not allegories of applied psychology, solutions to personal problems. This is the old moralistic fallacy about them, now become the therapeutic fallacy, telling us which step to take and what to do next, where the hero went wrong and had to pay the consequences, as if this practical guidance were what is meant by 'living ones' myth.' Living ones' myth doesn't mean simply living *one* myth. It means that one lives *myth*; it means *mythical living*. As I am many persons, so I am enacting pieces of various myths. . . . Myths do not tell us how. They simply give the invisible background which starts us imagining, questioning, going deeper.[144]

Joseph Campbell seems to disagree with Hillman. Campbell declares his belief that myth *is* instructive to our personal lives when he states:

> Myths primarily are for fundamental instruction in these matters. Our society today is not giving us adequate mythic instruction of this kind, and so young people are finding it difficult to get their act together. I have a theory that, if you can find out where a person is blocked, it should be possible to find a mythological counterpart for that particular threshold problem.[145]

Campbell further emphasizes that, "the images of myth are reflections of the spiritual potentialities of every one of us. Through contemplating these, we evoke their powers in our own lives."[146]

---

143 Sophia Heller, *The Absence of Myth* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2006), 65–7.
144 James Hillman, *A Blue Fire*, ed. Thomas Moore (New York: Harper Collins, 1989), 158.
145 Campbell, *The Power of Myth*, 175–6.
146 Ibid., 258.
146 Ibid.

Biblical Studies Perspective

From a theological perspective myth is considered to function as a "sacred" narrative. The stories about Siddhartha and Jesus are narratives that have staying power, and have found their place in the world for over two thousand years. Discussions about the place of sacred narrative and mythology within the discipline of religious studies abound.

Lauri Honko, Professor of Comparative Religions at the University of Turku in Finland, offers a descriptive definition of myth that is neither as abstract as the German philosopher, Ernst Cassirer (1946), who generalizes myth as the function of "primitive consciousness" nor as narrow as the biblical scholar, Theodor Gaster (1954), who views myth as being completely tied to ritual. Honko favors a definition based on four principles: form, content, function, and context. In describing these principles he states,

> In terms of its form a myth is a narrative which provides a verbal account of what is known of sacred origins . . . in general, myths contain information about decisive, creative events in the beginning of time . . . myths function as examples, as models . . . [and] the context of myth is, in normal cases, ritual, a pattern of behavior which has been sanctioned by usage.[147]

J. W. Rogerson, who also represents a theological perspective, outlines the eighteenth and nineteenth century approaches to myth by cataloging the attitudes toward myth into four classifications: myth as a lack of rationality; myth as an aspect of creative imagination; myth as a social device; myth as a facet of history.[148]

---

147 Lauri Honko, "The Problem of Defining Myth," in *Sacred Narrative Readings in the Theory of Myth*, ed. Alan Dundes (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), 49–51.
148 J.W. Rogerson, "Slippery Words: Myth," *Expository Times* no. 90 (September 1978): 10–14.

The Enlightenment theory of myth is an example of Rogerson's first classification. This theory proposes that myth arose due to a lack of human understanding of scientific causes for natural events, or the lack of rational understanding of natural events. Due to this lack of understanding, people interpreted the actions of animals and inanimate objects anthropomorphically, and developed their own stories to explain the events. This theory is foundational to the earlier discussion of the theory of the biological nature of myth as seen in patternicity, agenticity, and narratization.

The Romantic view, in opposition to the Enlightenment theory, is an example of Rogerson's second classification. This theory deems myth to be an expression of the deeply creative imagination of humanity, or a source of inspiration. This theory is the bedrock of the work of Carl Jung on the symbols of the psyche[149] and Lionel Corbett's view in *The Religious Function of the Psyche*.[150]

Rogerson's third classification emphasizes the connection between myth and ritual. As an English scholar of comparative religions, S. H. Hooke's theory of myth and ritual falls into this category and asserts that myth serves a social role by exemplifying values and standards.[151]

And finally, Rogerson sees the fourth classification of myth as an adjunct to history in that it provides pictorial or symbolic explanations for historical facts. Ultimately,

149 C.G. Jung, *The Portable Jung*, ed. Joseph Campbell, trans. R.F.C. Hull (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993).

150 Lionell Corbett, *The Religious Function of the Psyche* (New York: Routledge, 1996).
151 S. H. Hooke, *Middle Eastern Mythology* (New York: Penquin Books, 1996), 11.

Rogerson urges caution when trying to understand myth and states, "If we read a statement such as 'the real meaning or purpose of myth is . . .' we should be on guard. In the present state of our knowledge there is no such thing as the real meaning or purpose of myth . . . and we may well discover insights that will assist biblical interpretation."[152]

Another theorist with a theological viewpoint is Mircea Eliade, a scholar of mythological themes and religion at the University of Chicago. His interest was primarily in patterns of myth, but he was also interested in the myth-ritual connection and the Jungian concept of universal archetypal symbols. Eliade, like Joseph Campbell, maintains there is not only a correlation between myth and contemporary life, but myths contain critical patterns to be followed in everyday living. For Eliade, myths are alive and essentially symbolic.[153]

Pierre Brunel, Professor of Comparative Literature at Paris-Sorbonne University, tells us, in *The Companion to Literary Myths, Heroes and Archetypes*, that there are three essential functions of myth: to narrate, explain, and reveal.[154] Many prominent Biblical studies scholars concur with Brunel about these essential functions. For example, William Doty, a Biblical scholar and retired Professor Emeritus of Religion at the University of Alabama, discusses the narrative function of myth in the following way:

---

152 Rogerson, "Slippery Words: Myth," 14.
153 Mircea Eliade, *Myths, Rites, Symbols*, ed. Wendell C. Beane and William G. Doty, vol. 2 (New York: Harper & Row, 1975), 342–3.
154 Pierre Brunel, *Companion to Literary Myths, Heroes and Archetypes* (New York: Routledge, 1995), x–xii.

> Narrative provides a mode of ordering significant events, that is, a plot . . . of experienced or ideal existence. Myths are the narrative fictions whose plots read first at the level of their own stories and then as projections of imminent transcendent meanings. Such plots mirror human potentialities, experiences with natural and cultural phenomena, and recognition of regular interactions between them. Myths thus provide possible materializations for otherwise inchoate or unrecognized instantiations, names for the possible.[155]

From this point of view myths are stories about something important that has happened on both a human and a transcendent level. As Paul Brockelman, Professor of Philosophy and Religious Studies at the University of New Hampshire, so eloquently describes it:

> Mythology . . . then, discloses a human awareness of a transcendental reality beyond this world but reflected in it . . . . It is through mythology (including its varying forms of historical revelation and philosophical perspective) that such interpretive visions of what life is for are made available to us. Rather than factual error, then, myth in this context means the narrative disclosure of an interpretive understanding of what life is about . . . .[156]

Stories also give humanity an understanding of how our perceptions of the world and reality have developed. That is, myth explains. Mircea Eliade describes this function of myth in his discussion of sacred time:

> . . . the myth describes the various and sometimes dramatic irruptions of the sacred into the world. . . . It is the irruption of the sacred into the world . . . that establishes the world as a reality. Every myth shows how a reality came into existence, whether it be the total reality, the cosmos, or only a fragment–an island, a species of plant, a human institution.[157]

As we have seen, according to some theorists, myth provides an account for how

---

155 William G. Doty, *Mythography: The Study of Myths and Rituals* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1986), 16.
156 Paul Brockelman, *The Inside Story A Narrative Approach to Religious Understanding and Truth.* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992), 24;103.
157 Eliade, *Myths, Rites, Symbols*, 2:97.

something came about. As Brockelman asserts, myth and mythic thinking are important to human beings because myth, rather than being what is commonly thought of as a lie or false tale, actually provides the narrative disclosure needed to embrace the ultimate meaning of life. He is very clear about his belief that narrative is *the* basic method of understanding for human beings.[158] The great religious leaders of the world, for example The Buddha and The Christ, knew the value of narrative. That they explained the human condition through the telling of stories would seem to confirm that they were aware of the power of narrative understanding. Brockelman goes on to point out:

> This discovery and display of the sacred level of being in mythology is . . . the first step in the long process whereby human beings came to orient their lives in the light of an interpretation (hermeneutic) of the meaning of being. Human beings don't just exist; they exist and act in the light of some ultimate sense of what it means to be.[159]

When a narrative account resonates with the individual or collective psyche, enlightenment or revelation is experienced; myth reveals, as Eliade notes,

> To tell how things came into existence is to explain them and at the same time indirectly to answer another question: Why did they come into existence? The why is always implied in the how–for the simple reason that to tell how a thing was born is to reveal an irruption of the sacred into the world, and the sacred is the ultimate cause of all real existence.[160]

The story reveals not only how something happened, but in telling how something happened, it tells why it happened. The question of why something happens often preoccupies human thought. For Eliade, myth gives a response to the "why" question.

---

158 Brockelman, *The Inside Story A Narrative Approach to Religious Understanding and Truth.*, 26.
159 Ibid., 25.
160 Eliade, *The Sacred and the Profane*, 97.

While many theorists agree with Brunel's aforementioned three functions of myth, there are those who would disagree with his assertion that myth explains the how or why of an occurrence.

In her introduction to The Long Journey Home, Christine Downing, Scholar of Mythology and Professor Emeritus of Religious at San Diego State University, disagrees with the notion that myth answers questions. She proposes that myth takes us *deeper* into the questions of "how" and "why" rather than providing answers. Accordingly, Downing emphasizes,

> I have long been fascinated by the sacred myths and rituals of initiation through which women and men of the ancient world were helped to discover and become themselves. I have long believed that remembering and reimagining these traditions might help us do likewise. Like James Hillman, I believe that although myths don't tell us how, they help us to question, imagine, go deeper. Myths help us to enter the complexity of our situations more deeply, with more love of the perplexities themselves and of those caught up in them.[161]

Does myth narrate, explain, and reveal the meaning of life or does it increase life's mystery by exposing hidden complexities? Clearly, there is not one *literal* answer to that which is *mythical*.

Joseph Campbell's View of Myth

Not only are there many theories about what myth does, there are also many theories about the meaning of myth. One description presented by Roland Barthes, Professor of Sociology at the College de France, proclaims, "Myth is a type of speech. Of course, it is not any type: Language needs special conditions in order to become myth . . .

161 Christine Downing, *The Long Journey Home: Re-Visioning the Myth of Demeter and Persephone for Our Time* (Boston: Shambhala, 1994), 1.

but, what must be firmly established at the start is that myth is a system of communication, that it is a message."[162] Joseph Campbell elaborates on this basic definition in his discussion of the historical development of mythology when he states:

> The comparative study of the mythologies of the world compels us to view the cultural history of mankind as a unit; for we find that such themes as the Fire-theft, Deluge, Land of the Dead, Virgin Birth, and Resurrected Hero have a worldwide distribution, appearing everywhere in new combinations, while remaining, like the elements of a kaleidoscope, only a few and always the same. Furthermore, whereas in tales told for entertainment such mythical themes are taken lightly—obviously in a spirit of play—they appear also in religious contexts, where they are accepted not only as factually true but even as revelations of the verities to which the culture is a living witness and from which it derives both its spiritual authority and its temporal power.[163]

Paraphrasing Campbell's definition, one could say that myth may be defined as a collective belief that is accepted by the community and used to direct social interaction. Sometimes the etiology of a socially significant myth may be found in the dream of an individual member of the society, as in the example of Black Elk who was given a dream about the fate of his people. The dream was a message to be used to guide and direct the actions of the community.

All cultures and societies have myths and stories that have been passed down from generation to generation. Different communities of people seek to discuss and apprehend their own conceptualization and connection with the Great Spirit, the life force, the universal energy, the specific god and goddesses, the entities of nature, etc. So, we share our dreams, our stories, our myths with one another, furthering the universal connection.

---

162 Roland Barthes, *Mythologies*, trans. Anette Lavers (New York: The Noonday Press, 1993), 109.
163 Joseph Campbell, *The Mythic Dimension: Selected Essays 1959-1987*, ed. Antony Van Couvering (San Francisco: Harper, 1997), 10.

Although theorists disagree as to whether myth provides answers or simply unearths more questions, most will agree that going deeper into the experience of life through mythic narrative takes us down into understanding—a vertical descent into the depths of a certain kind of knowing that somehow makes sense, even if one believes the "why" and "how" questions are not answered. The narrative descent is accompanied by a form of security similar to that which can be seen on the famous stele of Hammurabi receiving wisdom from Marduk. In the sculpture, Hammurabi is pictured intently listening as he is positioned just below (under-standing) Marduk.[164] The security that accompanies narrative understanding manifests in a perception of being mentored by the wisdom of the ages; a feeling of being admitted to some secret primordial experience that, while it may result in painful understanding, produces a perception of centered wellbeing. We have all experienced this kind of understanding and though we may not have been able to explain the internal perception to someone else, the experience of the interpretive knowing can be profound. It is as if a light suddenly goes on and you realize that though you have seen this thing a hundred times before, you have always viewed it in the dark and now, in the light, you really see it for the first time. This is how myth works. It always has been, and always will be there, but in the background, in the shadows, waiting for the right moment of illumination. As Carl Kerenyi, Hungarian scholar and pioneer in the study of mythology, points out:

164 Richard Aldrington and Delano Ames, trans., *Larousse Encyclopedia of Mythology* (New York: Barnes & Noble, 1994), 61.

> It is the same with the happenings in mythology. They form the ground or foundation of the world, since everything rests on them . . . everything individual and particular goes back . . . while they remain ageless, inexhaustible, invincible in timeless primordiality, in a past that proves imperishable because of its eternally repeated rebirths.[165]

Kerenyi's description sounds a little like one of the functions of myth that Joseph Campbell describes as the metaphysical function.

Campbell, Jung, and Postmodern Mythology

Joseph Campbell was a productive writer and compelling lecturer. Perhaps he was best at story-telling. Whatever his talent, he was magnetic in his ability to interest people in the topic of myth. Campbell describes mythology as having four functions: the metaphysical function which arouses awe at the mystery of being; the cosmological function which explains the physical universe; the sociological function which supports social order, and the psychological function which guides the individual through various stages of life.[166]

However, Campbell's work is not without criticism from other mythologists. Campbell promoted the notion of universal motifs in myth and for this he was sharply criticized by mythologists chiefly from the social sciences who complained that Campbell, like Frazer in some ways, made broad strokes with his interpretive brush.

Two primary critics of Campbell's work are Alan Dundes, a folklorist from the University of California at Berkeley, and Robert A. Segal, a Religious Studies Professor from Louisiana State University. Although Dundes has little regard for Campbell's work, he does recommend that students of mythology study the work of Campbell primarily

165 Jung and Kerenyi, *Essays on a Science of Mythology*, 7.
166 Campbell, *Pathways to Bliss*, 3–9.

because Campbell was charismatic and caused many otherwise uninterested individuals to *become* interested in the field of mythology. For that ability to spark interest, Dundes does give Campbell credit. However, his criticism of Campbell's work is sharp. Dundes critique of Campbell's work is primarily the "anti-universalism" critique and focuses on Campbell's assertion that there are universal themes in mythology which Dundes believes Campbell made no effort to validate. As Dundes states,

> *The Hero with a Thousand Faces* tries to delineate a 'monomyth' which might apply to heroes from all cultures. However, Campbell's pattern is a synthetic, artificial composite which he fails to apply in toto to any one single hero. Campbell's hero pattern, unlike the ones formulated by von Hahn, Rank, and Raglan, is not empirically verifiable, e.g., by means of inductively extrapolating incidents from any one given hero's biography.[167]

Robert A. Segal, Associate Professor of Religious Studies at Louisiana State University and cohort of Dundes, is equally critical of Campbell. If Dundes's criticism takes a hatchet to Campbell's work with one large stroke, Segal follows afterward by picking up a scalpel. Segal agrees with Dundes in his attack on Campbell's universal approach, and he also criticizes Campbell for his Jungian-like psychological focus and emphasis on the symbolic nature of myth. To quote Segal:

> Campbell no more proves that these varied causes and functions of myth are the true ones than he proves that the changing meanings he unravels are the true ones. He bases his assertions not on arguments but on examples . . . For well-nigh every example he cites is interpretable in one or more of the other ways he arbitrarily rejects—literally rather than symbolically, sociologically rather than psychologically, sexually rather than spiritually, as a particular rather than a universal. In sum, for all his lifelong devotion to myth, Campbell has yet to prove that his interpretation of myth is correct.[168]

---

167 Dundes, *In Quest of the Hero*, 187–8.
168 Robert A. Segal, "Joseph Campbell's Theory of Myth," *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* no. 44 suppl 1 (March 1978): 114.

It has been proposed that Campbell's theories are more attractive to those from the humanities who employ analysis and interpretation, as opposed to those from certain areas of social sciences or natural sciences who use an empirical approach for evaluation and explanation. Perhaps this is true and there may be a very good reason for the difference which resembles the previous distinction made between the brain and the mind by Shermer and Wilbur. Using an externally validated, empirical approach leads to the physical-structural entity of the myth, or the "brain" if you will. Following a symbolic-psychological approach leads to the metaphysical or "mind" of the myth. Disagreement is not a bad thing. There are many perspectives on myth with each one being valid in one way or another at different times, to different people, for different reasons. So, when Segal states:

> If no one conclusive interpretation of myth exists, and if all interpretations are equally correct, then the advocacy of any interpretation reflects only the bias of its advocate. Campbell's advocacy of a Jungian interpretation is therefore no longer an assertion of the one true meaning of myth, as one would have supposed, but simply an expression of his personal preference.[169]

The obvious response to Segal is, "Absolutely right!" Who can suppose that there is one "right" interpretation of myth. Myth is a shape shifter reminiscent of the quantum physics description of a photon of light that can express itself as a wave or a particle or both depending on the observer. Campbell is not saying his is the *only* way to interpret myth. He is proposing *his* view which seems to resonant with many individuals he has drawn to the study of myth. We have already seen that theorists of equally respected stature disagree on virtually every aspect of myth. Perhaps, this is one of the most intriguing

169 Ibid., 113.

aspects of myth.

The debate over the definition and purpose myth continues into postmodern writing. The continuum of theories extends from the assertion of Sophia Heller, independent scholar of mythology, that one hallmark of the postmodern culture is the "absence of myth" to the opposite pole expressed as the "innateness of myth" by the religious studies scholar, Ritske Rensma.

From the perspective of Sophia Heller, the development of mythological studies as a discipline stands as evidence that "original or archaic" myth has retreated and the vacuum that remains has resulted in the possibility of theorizing *about* myth. To support her belief Heller states:

> The absence of myth is hardly a radical notion. It antecedes the phenomenon called mythology insofar as a loss of myth makes theorizing about myth possible. A culture still living in myth would not need to theorize about that which fashioned the fabric of its existence. The narratives would be self-explanatory and sufficient.[170]

The loss of myth is the inheritance of the postmodern society, according to Heller. This loss is not one to be mourned, however. The death of myth allows for the birth of psychology, which is not only possible but necessary. We must accept the movement of life and not try to live it retrospectively. Interestingly enough, she ends her treatise by referring back to Joseph Campbell when she states:

> Recall that Joseph Campbell believed we desired the *experience* of living far more than life to be meaningful. But in order to experience life we have to be willing to release the attachment as to how life should be and be penetrated by

170 Heller, *The Absence of Myth*, 13.

> life—and by things far less idyllic than bucolic summer walks . . . Because in the moment of living one's life and not trying to find myth or meaning, one shows without needing to justify that reality is, in fact, enough.[171]

In contrast to Heller's view, Rensma writes about his hope that there will emerge an interest in "psychological approaches to the study of religions."[172] For Rensma, "psychological approaches" include mythic elements such as "the archetype." Rensma reframes the relationship between Jung's work and that of Campbell by conducting a dedicated review of original sources of Campbell's work and identifying three distinct stages of evolution in Campbell's thinking about Jung's concept of the archetype which Rensma believes to be a critical topic inherent in the study of religion. Rensma emphasizes that both Jung and Campbell made important contributions to the field of religious studies as evidenced when he states:

> Both Jung and Campbell propagated ideas related to this field that are only now being taken seriously by the academic community. The fact that the mind bears the imprints of humankind's evolutionary history, for example (as both Jung and Campbell held), is now commonplace among scholars working in fields like evolutionary psychology and neurobiology. In Religious Studies, a cognitive approach to the study of religions is drawing much interest; here, too, the idea that the mind is not a 'blank slate' but a complex and highly structured mental mechanism with a clear evolutionary history is becoming commonplace.[173]

In support of Rensma's view of the mind as bearing the imprints of human evolution, Lionell Corbett explains the religious nature of the "archetype," when he asserts:

> Numinous experience is synonymous with religious experience. Translated into psychological parlance, this means the relatively direct experience of those deep intrapsychic structures known as archetypes. The archetype is a

171 Ibid., 222–3.
172 Ritske Rensma, *The Innateness of Myth* (London: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2009), 12.
173 Ibid., 12–3.

> fundamental organizing principle which originates from the objective psyche, beyond the level of the empirical personality. In the religious literature, what the depth psychologist calls an archetype would be referred to as spirit; operationally they are synonymous. But crucially for the depth psychologist, the archetypes are not only numinous manifestations of the divine, they also play a part in the organization of the personality.[174]

To summarize, the twentieth century ushered in new approaches to the study of mythology. While, in general, the nineteenth century notion of mythology was that it was a pre-scientific theory of the workings of nature specific to a stage of human development, in the twentieth century there have evolved numerous theories of myth which include: myth as sustaining social institutions; myth as a reflection of culture; and myth as a result of historical formation; myth as religious communication; myth as religious genre; myth as a medium for structure of language; myth as a source of cognitive explanation; myth as a form of symbolic expression; myth as a projection of the subconscious; myth as an integrating factor in man's adaptation to life; and myth as justification for behavior.[175] For the purpose of this dissertation, many of the above stated theories have been discussed explicating the similarities and differences within the various disciplines of the theorists.

Summary

The review of the pertinent literature has presented some of the most prominent research together with statements of opinion in relations to the subjects of the biological foundation of the function of narrative; the elements of language that support narrative formation; the function of hermeneutics in evaluating oral and written narratives; the differentiation of the types of narrative; metaphor in narrative; historical patterns in the

174 Corbett, *The Religious Function of the Psyche*, 15.
175 Honko, "The Problem of Defining Myth," 46–7.

study of myth and sacred narrative; and authoritative opinion regarding the meaning and methods of interpretation of sacred narratives. These areas have been researched with the goal of building the theoretical foundation for evaluating the sacred narratives about Siddhartha Gautama and Jesus of Nazareth.

One goal of this dissertation is to emphasize the importance of holding a balance between the literal and the non-literal aspects of knowledge. Science and empirical data are important for human survival. However, as we have seen throughout modernity, literal knowledge alone is not enough. In addition, prior to the Age of Enlightenment, we see what happened when non-literal belief is given preeminence over empirical knowledge. This is not a good situation either. Humans, and the survival of the world, require an equal balance between literal and non-literal knowledge. This dissertation seeks to include both. Speaking about methods and the study of religion Morton Smith, a scholar and systematic theologian, states:

> For good observation it is of course necessary to study with sympathy. But for good judgment it is necessary to regain objectivity. The study of religion is in this respect like the study of poetry. One must come to the material with what Coleridge called 'that willing suspension of disbelief which constitutes poetic faith,' or one will never feel the moving power which the material has, and one will never, therefore, be able to understand what the believers are talking about. But neither religions, nor even poems, exist *in vacuo*. Therefore, having experienced what the ceremony or the composition has to offer, the historian, like the critic, must then be able to return from the world of imagination to that of fact, and to determine the relation of the poetic or religious complex to its environment in the historical world.[176]

Though the literature acknowledges that any attempt to empirically evaluate and quantify mythic structures of sacred narratives is a difficult task, subject to dispute and

176 Morton Smith, "Historical Method in the Study of Religion," in *On Method in the History of Religions*, ed. James S. Helfer (Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 1968), 15.

controversy, the overwhelming opinion of theorists studying sacred narratives is that an attempt should be made to do just that. The following chapter will explain the methodology this dissertation uses to evaluate the contemporary human process of interpretation of the narratives of Siddhartha and Jesus by employing a scientific, experimental design.

Chapter 3

Method of Study

This study attempts to define the relationship between the primary attributes of the myth of the hero and the narratives of Siddhartha Gautama and Jesus of Nazareth. The primary attributes of the hero myth as described by the five selected theorists are compared to the attributes of Siddhartha and Jesus as recorded in the narratives about each individual.

Scope of the Study

Population. The population consists of the infinite attributes of the myth of the hero as designated by any and all theorists who have studied the various hero myths over time and from diverse cultures, and about which inferences can be made based on findings of a sample of that population. Also included in the population are all the attributes of the hero found in the narratives of Siddhartha and Jesus.

Sample. The sample consists of the attributes identified by von Hahn (1876), Rank (1909), Raglan (1934), Campbell (1949), and Dundes (1990), are designated "the primary attributes," and are found in the narratives of Siddhartha and Jesus.

Method of Data Collection

The five prominent theorists who have studied and identified the attributes of the hero myth were read and a list of attributes from each theory was compiled (See Table 2).

Table 2. Attributes of the Mythic Hero

Attribute Number	Attribute Description	Von Hahn 1876	Rank 1909	Raglan 1934	Campbell 1949	Dundes 1990
1	Questionable Conception/birth	Illegitimate Birth	Difficult Conception	Unusual Conception	Special Manifestation of the Immanent Divine Incarnate	Sky Father Earth Mother
2	Royal Parents	Mother is a Princess	Distinguished Parents	Mother is a Royal/Virgin	Mother's Fallow Womb is Progenitor	Universe as Royal
			Father is a King	Father is a King	Initiating Priest, is Distant, Symbolic	
				Father Related to Mother		
3	Parent is God	Father is a God		Hero called Son of God	Human father Symbolic of God; God the Father is Procreator	Mother Represents Goddess Father God
4	Prophecy Foretells	Prophecy of Ascendance	Prophecy Warns of Birth		Warning of Coming Hero, Conqueror	
5	Abandonment	Hero Abandoned	Put in Box or In Water Light Appears		Due to Threats to Kill, often Hid in Box, Water, Pot	
6	Attempt to kill Hero who is saved by Human, Animal, Divine Intervention	Suckled by Animals	Saved by Animals or Lowly People	Attempt by Father to Kill Hero Spirited Away	Supernatural Assistance given to Hero	Father wants to Eliminate Son
7	Raised Non Parent	Raised by Childless Shepherd Couple	Suckled by Fe Animal or Humble Woman	Reared by Foster Parents Far Away	Found Hidden by a Lowly Human or Animals	Animal Intervention
8	Early Childhood	"High Spirited Child"	"Hero grows Up"	No details Of Childhood	Extraordinary Power from Birth Onward	
9	Hero Goes on Adventure	Hero Seeks Service Abroad		Goes to Future Kingdom	Separation Off to Adventure	Separation Physical Spiritual
10	Return with Special News or Knowledge	Triumphant Homecoming	Returns home Finds Distinguished Parents		Return from Strange New World with Boon of Knowledge	Physical Spiritual

Attribute Number	Attribute Description	Von Hahn 1876	Rank 1909	Raglan 1934	Campbell 1949	Dundes 1990
11	Revenge and/or Victory	Slays Original Persecutors	Takes Revenge on Father	Victor Over King, Dragon, or Beast	Victory During the Adventure	Victory Spiritual
12	Acknowledged	Founds Cities	Acknowledged By people	Becomes a King	Recognized as Different, Holy, Supernatural	Recognition Positive or Negative
13	Period of Reign	Uneventful	Achieves Honor	Marries a Princess	Provides Knowledge Serves Others	Proposes Sweeping Changes
14	Decline	Reviled due to Illegitimacy	N/A	Loses Favor With Gods or Subjects	Refusal of the call or Attempts to Eliminate Hero	
			N/A	Driven from Throne/city		
15	Death	Extraordinary Death	N/A	Mysterious Death	Death may be Symbolic	Psychological Spiritual
		Dies as an Act of Revenge			Hero not Afraid Reconciliation with Death	
		Murders Younger Brother	N/A	Death on a Hill	Thereafter lives in Everyone	
			N/A	No Children or No Succession		
			N/A	Body not Buried		
				One or more Holy Sepulchers		

The narratives of Siddhartha and Jesus were read from the sacred texts and passages from the narratives that appeared to correspond to the list of primary attributes were identified. (See Appendix A for the narrative of Siddhartha and Appendix B for the narrative of Jesus.)

The narrative account of the life of Siddhartha was taken from selected Pali and Sanskrit texts. The Pali texts included the following: *Sutta-vibhange, Pārājika, Sanghādiseasa, Pācittiya, Mahāvagga, Cullavagga, Dīgha-nikāya, Majjhima-nakāya, Saṃyutta-nikāya, Anguttara-nikāya, Khuddaka-pātha, Udāna, Itivuttaka, Sutta-nipāta, Dhammapada, and Theragāthā*. The Sanskrit texts included the following: *Lalitavistara Sutra, Buddhacarita, and Mahāvastu*.

The narrative account of the life of Jesus was taken from the synoptic gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, as well as the canonical gospel of John as presented in the New International Version Bible.

The group of attributes in the narrative of Siddhartha and the group of attributes in the narrative of Jesus were compared to the list of theorists' attributes to determine Content Validity (See Table 3 for narrative source comparison of theorist identified attributes with those of Siddhartha and Jesus). Content Validity or Face Validity is established through a process of judgment (See Chapter 4 for a more complete description). The first step in determining the statistical method of Content Validity is for one individual to make a judgment of the representativeness of the content to that which is being measured.

Table 3. Narrative Sources of Mythic Hero Attributes for Siddhartha and Jesus

Attribute Number	Attribute Description	Siddhartha	Jesus
1	Questionable Conception/Birth	*Majjhima-nikāya* 123 *Dīgha-nikāya* 14 *Mahāvastu* Vol. II, 3	Matthew 1:18 -21 Luke 1:26-33 John 1:14
2	Royal or Distinguished Parents	*Dīgha-nikāy*a 14 *Mahāvastu* Vol. II, 3	Matthew 1:1-17 Luke 3:21-37
3	Parent is God Or Descended from Heaven	*Majjhima-nikāya* 123 *Dīgha-nikāya* 14	Matthew 1:20-21 Luke 1:29-37 Luke 3:21-37
4	Prophecy Foretells Worshipped by Gods or Royalty	*Sutta-nipāta* 3:11 *Mahāvastu* Vol. II, 29	Matthew 1:22 Matthew 2:1-6 Luke 2:8-14
5	Abandonment Placed in Box Water/Light Appears	*Majjhima-nikāya* 123 *Dīgha-nikāya* 13,14 *Lalitavistara Sutra* Vol. I, 116	Luke 2-16
6	Attempt to kill Hero Who is Saved By human, Animal or Divine Intervention	*Vinaya Cullavaga* 7:3 *Buddhacarita Canto* 21	Matthew 2:13 Matthew 27:46 Mark 15:33
7	Raised by Non Parent	*Majjhima-nikāya* 123 *Dīgha-nikāya* 14 *Vinaya Cullavaga* 11:1-10	Matthew 1:18-21 Luke 1:34-35
8	Early Childhood Unusual	*Majjhima-nikāya* 36 *Anguttara-nikāya* 3:38 *Lalitavistara Sutra* Vol. I, 175	Luke 2:22-52
9	Hero goes on Adventure	*Majjhima-nikāya* 26-100	Matthew 4:1-11 Matthew 1:23-25 Mark 1:9-15
10	Return Home with Special News or Knowledge	*Vinaya Mahāvagga* 1:6	Matthew 2:19-23 Matthew 4:12-17 Matthew 13;53-58 Luke 4:14-20

11	Revenge and/or Victory	*Vinaya Mahāvagga* 1:6 *Majjhima-nikāya* 26 *Saṃyutta-nikāya* 4:1 *Buddhacarita Canto* 13:15	Matthew 4:10-11 Luke 4:12-13 John 1:29-31
12	Acknowledged as Special	*Vinaya Mahāvagga* 1:6 *Saṃyutta-nikāya* 35:28 *Lalitavistara Sutra* Vol. I, 242	Matthew 3:11 Matthew 8:1-3 Matthew 9:1-8 Mark 1:29-24 John 3:27-36
13	Period of Reign	*Vinaya Mahāvagga* 1:21 *Dīgha-nikāya* 16 *Saṃyutta-nikāya* 47:9 *Anguttara-nikāya* 4:76	Matthew 3:13-17 Matthew 12:15-21 Matthew 17:1-9 Luke 3:23
14	Decline Reviled Hunted	*Dīgha-nikāya* 16 *Saṃyutta-nikāya* 47:9	Matthew 26:1-5 Matthew 26:14-16 Matthew 26:47-50 Matthew 26:57-67 Mark 14:43-46 Mark14:63-65 Mark 15:12-15 Luke 23:18-25 John 19:12-16
15	Extraordinary Death Body not Buried More than one Grave or Honored Site	*Dīgha-nikāya* 16	Matthew 27:32-54 Matthew 27:57-60 Mark 15:21-41 Mark 15: 42-47 Luke 23:26-49 Luke 23:50-56 John 19:17=37 John 19:38-42 Matthew 28:1-8 Mark 6:1-8 Luke 24:1-12 John 20:1-18

The second step is to include other judges or raters in the determination of the representativeness. This leads to the inclusion of reliability data which analyzes the

stability and dependability of that which is being measured. (See Chapter 4 for a more complete description).

Each passage from the narrative of Siddhartha that appeared to contain a hero attribute was written on standard copy paper and each passage was identified with a number (Appendix A). The numbers one through fifteen were written on 3 x 5 cards and placed in a plastic container. The cards were drawn blindly to establish the order in which the passage would be written on standard copy paper from which the raters would read and assess the passages. The process was repeated for the narrative of Jesus (Appendix B).

At the conclusion of the selection and randomization of the narrative passages by the researcher four individual volunteers were chosen to read the narrative selections and rate them in comparison to the primary attributes identified by the theorists. The only explanation given to the raters was that this was a project with the goal of determining if certain characteristics were present in the narratives of Siddhartha and Jesus.

The raters were given three rating tools. The first tool (See Table 4) listed the passages (1-15) and the attributes (1-15) for the narrative of Siddhartha. The raters were given the instructions that they were to read the numbered passages and mark the box for each attribute if, in their opinion, the passage was an example of the attribute. Each passage could be an example of none, one, or more of each of the attributes. The second tool (See Table 5) listed the passages (1-15) and the attributes (1-15) for the narrative of Jesus. The raters were given the same instructions that they were to read the numbered

passages and mark the box for each attribute if, in their opinion, the passage was an example of the attribute. Again, each passage could be an example of none, one or more of each of the attributes. The third rating tool given to the raters consisted of a table of examples for each attribute to be used in evaluating the narrative passages (See Table 6).

The raters were not acquainted with each other and they were given the rating tools and the passages independently. They answered the questions independently, not in a group setting, to avoid the opportunity for them to discuss their answers with each other or discuss the content of the passages among themselves. Each rater agreed to take the questionnaire individually and alone.

The rating checklist tool is constructed so that the numbers relating to the specific hero attributes outlined by the five chosen theorists run across the page horizontally. The numbers assigned to the chosen passages containing potential attributes run vertically down the page. The raters were instructed to read a passage and then place a check in the box coinciding with the number of the attribute if, in their opinion, the passage contained an example of that attribute.

Subsequent to completing the questionnaire, the raters was asked if they felt they understood the instructions and if they felt they were able to follow the instructions. Each of the raters indicated that they understood the instructions and that they were able to answer the questions with confidence.

Table 4. Attributes in Narrative of Siddhartha – Rater Tool

Rater # ____ Age ____ Gender _____ Religious Affiliation_____

Please read each passage and place a check on the checklist if in your opinion the sutras contain an example of the identified attribute. Complete the checklist for each one of the listed attributes. Thank you for your participation.

Attributes → *Passages ↓*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1															
2															
3															
4															
5															
6															
7															
8															
9															
10															
11															
12															
13															
14															
15															

Table 5. Attributes in Narrative of Jesus – Rater Tool

Rater # ____ Age ____ Gender _____ Religious Affiliation _____

Please read each passage and place a check on the checklist if in your opinion the scriptures contain an example of the identified attribute. Complete the checklist for each one of the attributes. Thank you for your participation.

Attributes → *Passages ↓*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1															
2															
3															
4															
5															
6															
7															
8															
9															
10															
11															
12															
13															
14															
15															

Table 6. Primary Attribute Examples – Rater Tool

Attribute Number	Attribute Description	Example of Attribute	Example of Attribute	Example of Attribute	Example of Attribute	Example of Attribute
1	Questionable Conception/Birth	Illegitimate Birth	Difficult Conception	Unusual Conception	Special Manifest of the Immanent Divine Incarnate	Sky Father Earth Mother
2	Royal Parents	Mother is Princess	Distinguished Parents, Father King	Mother Royal or Virgin, Father King	Mother's Womb Symbolic	Universe as Royal
3	Parent is God	Father is God		Called Son of God	God is Procreator	Parent God-like
4	Prophecy Foretells	Prophecy of Ascendance	Prophecy Warns of Birth		Warning of Coming Hero	
5	Abandonment	Hero Abandoned	After Birth Put in Box, Water, or Light Appears		Due to Threats to Kill Hid in Box Water or Pot	
6	Attempt to Kill Hero who is saved by Human, Animal, or Divine Intervention	Suckled by Animals	Saved by Animals or Lowly People	Father Attempts to Kill Hero, Hero Spirited Away	Supernatural Assistance Given to Hero	Father Plans to Kill Hero
7	Raised by Non Parent	Raised by Childless/Shepherd Couple	Suckled by Fe Animal, Humble Woman	Reared by Foster Parents	Found Hidden by Lowly People	Animal Intervention
8	Early Childhood	"High Spirited Child"	"Hero Grows Up"	No Details	Extraordinary Power	
9	Hero Goes Adventure	Hero Seeks Service Abroad		Goes to Future Kingdom	Separation for Adventure	Separation Physical/ Spirit

Attribute Number	Attribute Description	Example of Attribute	Example of Attribute	Example of Attribute	Example of Attribute	Example of Attribute
10	Return with special News or Knowledge	Triumphant Homecoming	Returns Home Finds Distinguished Parents		Return from Strange World with Knowledge	Physical/Spirit
11	Revenge and/or Victory	Slays Original Prosecutors	Takes Revenge on Father	Victor over King, Dragon, Beast	Victory During Adventure	Victory is Spiritual
12	Acknowledged	Founds Cities	Acknowledged by People	Becomes a King	Recognized as Holy Different	Recognition
13	Period of Reign	Uneventful	Achieves Honor	Makes Laws	Provides Knowledge, Serves	Proposes Sweeping Changes
14	Decline	Reviled due to Illegitimacy		Loses Favor with God or Subjects	Attempt to Eliminate Hero	
15	Death	Extraordinary Death, Dies as act of Revenge		Death on Hill, Multiple Sepulcher Body not Buried	Death Symbolic, Hero not afraid, Lives in Everyone	Psychological or Spiritual

Finally, the raters were asked to give information about their gender, age, and religious affiliation for future reference and research (See Table 7).

Table 7. Rater Information

Rater	Gender	Age	Buddhist	Christian	Pagan	No Religion
1	F	32			X	
2	M	38				X
3	F	38				X
4	F	49		X		

Summary

Both experimental methods and explanatory methods were employed to assess whether the major attributes of the narratives of Siddhartha and Jesus conform to the theoretically postulated attributes of the myth of the hero. Experimental methods of statistical analysis were used to determine validity and reliability while the explanatory method was used to establish the theoretical basis for the study.

Chapter 4:

Results

After completion of the rating procedure the results were collected for processing and analysis. The treatment, significance, and interpretation of this data are considered here.

Treatment of the Data

Validity and reliability measures were selected as the statistical techniques for processing the data. The statistical analysis includes:

1. Content validity is the degree of representativeness or sampling adequacy of the topic and was chosen to answer the question: Is the content of this measure representative of the universe of content of the property being measured? Because a universe of content only exists in theory, it is not possible to extract random samples of items from that universe. However, it is possible to collect a large quantity of items and select random samples for evaluation purposes. Content validation is basically judgmental. A reasonable degree of content validity can be achieved through the judgment of one individual alone or with others who judge the representativeness of the items. The items must be judged for their presumed relevance to the property being measured. When judges are given specific directions for making judgments and comparisons, then methods of pooling independent judgments can be utilized for analysis.[1]

1 Fred N. Kerlinger, *Foundations of Behavioral Research*, 2nd ed. (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1964), 457–9.

2. Reliability can be approached in at least two ways. The first way emphasizes stability or dependability. That is, if the same set of items is compared multiple times or by many observers, will the results be similar? A second approach emphasizes the accuracy of the measurement. In other words, is the measurement a "true" measure of the item? Essentially, reliability is the accuracy or precision of a measurement.[2]

Presentation of the Data

The central question guiding the collection and analysis of the data was: Do the narrative accounts of Siddhartha Gautama and Jesus of Nazareth fit the pattern of the myth of the hero?

Content Validity.

To establish content validity, the researcher read the narrative accounts of both Siddhartha and Jesus looking for passages that would fit the various attributes of the myth of the hero. Passages whose content were judged to fit an attribute of the myth were written down and given a number. This step of determining "face validity" (the item has obvious representation) by the judgment of one observer is the first step in verifying content validity.

First Step to Establish Content Validity. To initiate the first step, a comparison of the narratives of Siddhartha and Jesus was conducted by this researcher. If I, as the initial judge, can see hero attributes in the text of the narratives then the first step in establishing content validity will have been met.

2 Ibid., 442–3.

The following paragraphs reflect my judgments, as the initial rater, about the attributes. I compare the primary attributes of the hero myth to the narrative accounts of both Siddhartha and Jesus as discussed in the last chapter and presented in Table 3.

Attributes within the Narrative of Siddhartha Gautama with References.

Questionable Conception or Birth. This attribute can refer to an illegitimate birth, a difficult conception, a special manifestation of the immanent divine incarnate, or a combination of a sky father and an earth mother. Within the narrative of Siddhartha, one passage that represents this attribute is paraphrased below (See Appendix A).

Siddhartha spent one whole life span in the Heaven of the Contented and then determined that he would descend into the womb of his mother. It could be argued that Siddhartha's descent from the Heaven of the Contented into his mother's womb is a questionable conception in that it is very supernatural. After his descent a great light appeared and four deities came to guard Siddhartha and his mother. This is another supernatural event. After the birth two jets of water poured forth from the sky to cleanse Siddhartha who then set foot on the earth, took seven steps, and spoke words.[3] All these events could be interpreted as manifestations of the Immanent Divine thereby fulfilling the criteria for the hero attribute of a questionable conception or birth.

3 *Majjhima-nikāya 123; Dīgha-nikāya 14; Mahāvastu Vol. II, 3.*

Royal Parents. This attribute can be established if the mother is a princess, the parents are distinguished, the father is a king, the mother is from a royal line, the mother is a virgin, the mother's womb is considered symbolic, or the universe is described as royal. The narrative account of Siddhartha that represents this attribute is paraphrased below (See Appendix A).

In these passages it is clearly stated that the father of Siddhartha, Suddhodana, is a king. Māyā, Siddhartha's mother, is a queen and Siddhartha is born in a royal capital thus allowing for the interpretation that the criteria for the attribute of royal parents have been met.[4]

Parent is God or Descended from Heaven. This attribute can include a direct statement in the narrative that God is the father or procreator. The hero may also be called the son of God or known as the son of God. Alternately, the parent may be reported as "God-like." The narrative may state that the hero existed in heaven prior to his earthly life. The narrative account of Siddhartha that reports this attribute is paraphrased below (See Appendix A).

In this passage Siddhartha descends from the Heaven of the Contented while a measureless light appeared that surpasses the splendor of "the gods." From a mythological perspective, it could be argued that only gods come from godly places which would require that Siddhartha is

4 *Dīgha-nikāya 14; Mahāvastu Vol. II, 3.*

somehow a god, produced by a god, or one with the gods. This is the argument that I am making here, and one reason that I believe that Siddhartha fits the pattern of the myth of the Hero.[5] The narrative implies, from a mythological perspective, that Siddhartha engages in behavior that can be interpreted as "other than just human, superhuman, or god-like." This argument is, of course, rejected by Buddhists who maintain, as did Siddhartha himself, that he is not, and never was, a god.[6]

Prophecy Foretells. Worshipped by Gods or Royalty.

This attribute is established if a religious leader, sage, or prophet foretells the coming of the hero. There may be a prophecy of ascendance, a warning about the coming birth, or a joyous prediction of wonders that will accompany the coming of the hero. The narrative account of Siddhartha which includes this attribute is paraphrased below (See Appendix A).

In this account, the "seer" Asita has a vision while in meditation. In the vision the "Company of Gods" is rejoicing. Asita asks them about the occasion that has caused such joy and then he learns about Siddhartha. Subsequent to being told about Siddhartha, he makes a forecast about the life of Siddhartha and the prediction that he will become a Buddha. Later, the sage Kanhasiri sees Siddhartha and the aura surrounding him. The

5 *Majjhima-nikāya 123; Dīgha-nikāya 14.*
6 Sarla Khosla, trans., *The Lalitavistara and the Evolution of Buddha Legend* (New Delhi: Galaxy Press, 1991).

vision causes him sadness because he is old and realizes that he will not see the culmination of events that will be produced by Siddhartha. One interpretation suggests that Kanhasiri even uses the word "hero" in referring to Siddhartha.[7] It could be argued that these events meet the criteria for the attribute of prophecy.

Abandonment. Placement in a Box. Water or Light Appears. This attribute refers to the hero being abandoned by the parent usually during stressful political or social events. The purpose of the abandonment is usually to save the child from some type of harm. Alternately, the hero may be placed in a box or in water after birth. It is also possible that a bright light may appear in this instance as an announcement of the arrival of the hero. In addition, if there are threats of death to the hero, he may be hidden in a box or a pot and/ or be put in water. The narrative of Siddhartha that describes this attribute is paraphrased below (See Appendix A).

In these passages it is recorded that when the Buddha leaves the Heaven of the Contented to enter his mother's womb, and when he is born into this world there is what is described as a "measureless light," and/or a "golden-colored light" both of which illuminate all states of being.[8] If the presence of a great light occurring when Siddhartha descends into his mother's womb and when he is born can be construed to be a sign of

7 *Sutta-nipāta 3:11; Mahāvastu Vol. II, 2*.
8 *Dīgha-nikāya 13; Dīgha-nikāya 14; Majjhima-nikāya 123; Lalitavistara Sutra Vol. 1, 116*.

protection or announcement then it could be interpreted that the attribute of abandonment, placement in a box, and water or light appear has been met.

Attempt to Kill Hero who is saved by Divine Intervention, a Human, or Animal.

This attribute refers to a form of protection for the hero who is saved from being killed. The intervention may come in the presence of animals, lowly people, or some form of divine intervention. It is often the father, or father figure in the form of some authority who threatens to kill the hero. The hero is protected by being spirited away, given supernatural assistance, or is given a hiding place in another land. The narrative of Siddhartha explains this attribute is paraphrased below (See Appendix A).

In this passage Prince Ajatasattu, a father figure by virtue of his position of authority, is manipulated and persuaded by Devadatta to attempt to kill Siddhartha. Devadatta's jealousy of Siddhartha's position and popularity causes him to devise this plan for eliminating Siddhartha. When the assassins who are dispatched by Ajatasattu repent upon hearing the Dharma, Devadatta is enraged by this failure and attempts to kill Siddhartha himself, first by launching a huge stone and second by letting loose a mad elephant. Both the boulder and the elephant are stopped by unusual circumstances that could be considered forms of divine

intervention.[9] The events of this passage could be interpreted to fit the attribute of an attempt to kill the hero.

Raised by Non-Parent. This attribute can be established by the hero being raised by a childless couple, a shepherd couple, a female animal, a humble woman, or a foster parent. The narrative of Siddhartha reports this attribute and is paraphrased below (See Appendix A).

In this passage, although it is referring to other circumstances, is it clearly stated that the sister of Siddhartha's mother raises him due to the death of his biological mother.[10] This passage could be interpreted to establish the attribute of being raised by a non-parent.

Early Childhood is Unusual. This attribute refers to the existence of some kind of unusual circumstances in the childhood of the hero. It could mean that the hero was considered "high spirited," was "special" in some way, or evidenced some unusual power. The narrative of Siddhartha explains this attribute and is paraphrased below (See Appendix A).

In this passage there appears a description of the lavish lifestyle that surrounded Siddhartha as a young child. In addition, there is evidence that he is already meditating and thinking about the way of enlightenment which would represent an unusual preoccupation for a young child.[11] Therefore, this passage could be interpreted fit the attribute of an unusual childhood.

---

9 *Vinaya Cullavagga 7:3; Buddhacarita, Canto 21.*
10 *Dīgha-nikāya 14; Majjhima-nikāya 123; Vinaya Cullavaga 11:1-10.*
11 *Anguttara-nikāya 3:38; Lalitavistara Sutra Vol. 1, 175; Majjhima-nikāya 100.*

Hero Goes on Adventure. This attribute is represented by the hero seeking service in another land, going to a future kingdom, or separating himself from his usual life to seek a new experience. The narrative of Siddhartha describes this attribute is paraphrased below (See Appendix A).

This passage indicates that Siddhartha sets out on a journey to discover what he considers to be a new and worthwhile experience of life. In his search, Siddhartha tries several different approaches and moves from one teacher to another. Eventually, he will choose his own solitary, inward adventure to understand the universe.[12] This passage could be interpreted to establish the attribute of the hero going on an adventure.

Return Home with Special News or Knowledge. This attribute refers to the return home of the hero, after his adventure, and with some new or special knowledge which he intends to impart to the community. It can be represented by a triumphant homecoming, a return from a strange world with special knowledge, or a return home to establish his position in the community. The narrative of Siddhartha presents this attribute and is paraphrased below (See Appendix A).

This passage clearly describes Siddhartha instructing his followers about the new knowledge he has attained regarding the experience of enlightenment. His inward journey brings him new understanding, allows him to overcome evil distractions, and provides encouragement for the

12 *Majjhima-nikāya 26, 36, 85, 100*.

future. He now imparts to his community of followers the nature of his enlightenment.[13] This passage could be interpreted to verify the attribute of the return with special knowledge.

Revenge and/or Victory. This attribute refers to the hero exhibiting either revenge or victory upon his return from his adventure. It can be represented by the hero slaying some original persecutors, taking revenge on an evil father, obtaining victory or an authority, a beast, or a circumstance. The narrative of Siddhartha includes this attribute and is paraphrased below (See Appendix A).

In these passages Siddhartha describes what could be considered a victory over an old adversary, Māra, who represents evil, bondage, and death.[14] This passage could be interpreted as confirmation of presence of the attribute of revenge or victory.

Acknowledged as Special. This attribute refers to the hero being acknowledged as special in some way. He might found a new city, become a king, or be recognized as different, or holy. The narrative of Siddhartha describes this attribute and is paraphrased below (See Appendix A).

These passages give evidence of Siddhartha teaching a large group of followers some of whom apparently had previously been ascetics seeking a spiritual path. These passages indicate that the teaching of Siddhartha allowed the followers to advance on their spiritual quest. The response is

13 *Vinaya Mahāvagga 1:6.*
14 *Buddhacarita, Canto 13:15; Majjhima-nikāya 26; Saṃyutta-nikāya 4:1; Vinaya Mahāvagga 1:6.*

the crowd exhibiting respect and admiration for the wisdom of Siddhartha.[15] These passages could be interpreted as meeting the criteria for the attribute of acknowledgement.

Period of Reign. This attribute refers to a period of time in which the hero leads or influences the community. He may achieve some form of honor. He may make laws or rule the community. He might also instruct and serve the community. Lastly, he may institute sweeping changes in the way people live or view their world. The narrative of Siddhartha states a description of this attribute and is paraphrased below (See Appendix A).

These passages describe the teaching of Siddhartha about life and the potential future of mankind. In this setting, he is traveling with a large group of believers that are being instructed by his words. Siddhartha refers to his long period of service as a teacher and the aging process. He refers to his "holy life" having been lived out.[16] The content of these passages could be interpreted as confirmation of the attribute of a period of reign.

Decline, Reviled, Hunted. This attribute refers to a period of deterioration when the hero's influence may be questioned, diminished, or faded. Expectations may not be fulfilled. For some reason the hero now loses favor with God or his subjects. Attempts to eliminate the hero may begin here. The narrative of Siddhartha reports this attribute and is

15 *Lalitavistara Sutra Vol. 1, 242; Saṃyutta-nikāya 35:28; Vinaya Mahāvagga 1:21.*
16 *Anguttara-nikāya 4:76; Dīgha-nikāya 16; Saṃyutta-nikāya 47:9; Vinaya Mahāvagga* 1-21.

paraphrased below (See Appendix A).

This passage recounts the physical decline of Siddhartha after which others began to consider who would take Siddhartha's place as leader of the Sangha. The followers have grown used to the presence of Siddhartha and now appear to be uncomfortable with the notion of his leaving.[17] This passage could be interpreted to establish the attribute of the decline.

Extraordinary Death. Body not Buried. More than One Burial Site. This attribute refers to the death of the hero. It is often described as an unusual, extraordinary, death at the hands of another, death on a hill with multiple burial places, or the body not buried. The hero is not afraid and lives on in others. The narrative of Siddhartha describes this attribute and is paraphrased below (See Appendix A).

These passages describe the death of Siddhartha who appears to go into a meditative state that culminates in the final attainment of nirvana. The passages also describe the response of his followers to the death of Siddhartha as they attend to the disposition of his body. There appears to be some confusion, some disagreements, and undoubtedly the obtunded thinking that accompanies grief. The body is raised up on a funeral pyre and eventually burned. The passages describe the separation of the bones and ashes into eight separate monuments.[18] All of these occurrences could be interpreted as exemplifying the attribute of extraordinary death.

17 *Dīgha-nikāya 16; Saṃyutta-nikāya 47:9.*
18 *Dīgha-nikāya 16*.

Attributes within the Narrative of Jesus of Nazareth with References

Questionable Conception or Birth. This attribute can refer to an illegitimate birth, a difficult conception, a special manifestation of the immanent divine incarnate, or a combination of a sky father and an earth mother. Within the narrative of Jesus we find this attribute which is paraphrased below (See Appendix B).

These passages directly states that Mary was a virgin and that Jesus was conceived by God through the Holy Spirit.[19] This could be interpreted to establish the attribute of a questionable conception or birth.

Royal Parents. This attribute can be established if the mother is a princess, the parents are distinguished, the father is a king, the mother is from a royal line, the mother's womb is considered symbolic, or the universe is described as royal. The narrative account of Jesus includes this attribute and is paraphrased below (See Appendix B).

These passages give the genealogy of Jesus which eventually leads back to God as the father of all these generations within which are numerous kings of Israel. In addition, the passages make a direct statement that a voice from heaven (whom we presume to be God) announces that Jesus is his son.[20] This passage could be interpreted to confirm the attribute of royal parent

.

19 Matthew 1:18-21; Luke 1:26-33; John 1:14.
20 Matthew 1:1-17; Luke 3:21-37.

Parent is God or Descended from Heaven. This attribute can include a direct statement in the narrative that God is the father or procreator. The hero may also be called, or known as, the son of God. Alternately, the parent may be reported as "God-like." The narrative account of Jesus reports this attribute and is paraphrased below (See Appendix B).

This passage clearly states that Mary is a virgin and that Jesus is conceived by God through the Holy Spirit.[21] This passage could be interpreted to confirm the attribute of God as the parent.

Prophecy Foretells. Worshipped by Gods or Royalty. This attribute is established if a religious leader, sage, or prophet foretells the coming of the hero. There may be a prophecy of ascendance, a warning about the coming birth, or a joyous prediction of wonders that will accompany the coming of the hero. The narrative account of Jesus includes this attribute and is paraphrased below (See Appendix B).

These passages report that there were direct prophecies from sages of the past related to the birth of Jesus. In addition, an angel gives a pronouncement about the birth and a star leads the wise men to Jesus.[22] All of these occurrences could be interpreted as confirming the attribute of prophecy foretells.

21 Matthew 1:20-21; Luke 1:29-37; Luke 3:21-37.
22 Matthew 1:22; Matthew 2:1-6; Luke 2:8-14.

Abandonment. Placed in a Box. Water or Light Appears. This attribute refers to the hero being abandoned by the parent. Alternately, the hero may be placed in a box or in water after birth. Light may also appear in this instance. In addition, if there are threats of death to the hero, he may be hidden in a box or a pot and/ or be put in water. The narrative of Jesus describes this attribute and is paraphrased below (See Appendix B).

These passages indicate that Jesus was placed in a manger after birth. A manger is a feeding box for animals. In addition, the passages report that a star (a bright light) led the way for the shepherds and wise men to find the infant.[23] These passages could be interpreted to establish the attribute of being placed in a box and the existence of a bright light after birth.

Attempt to Kill Hero who is saved by divine intervention, a human or an animal.

This attribute refers to a form of protection for the hero who is saved from being killed. The intervention comes in the presence of animals, or lowly people. It is often the father, or father figure in the form of some authority who threatens to kill the hero who is protected by being spirited away, given supernatural assistance, or is given a hiding place in another land. The narrative of Jesus explains this attribute and is paraphrased below (See Appendix B).

23 Matthew 2:1-2; Luke 2:8-12.

These passages indicate that an angel instructed the family of Jesus to leave and go to Egypt due to Herod's wish to kill Jesus. The passages that make reference to the last words of Jesus have often been cited to indicate that it was God the Father who allowed for, or designed, the death of Jesus in order to save humanity.[24] These passages could be interpreted to establish the attribute of attempt to kill with divine intervention.

Raised by Non-Parent. This attribute can be established by the hero being raised by a childless couple, a shepherd couple, a female animal, a humble woman, or a foster parent. The narrative of Jesus reports this attribute and is paraphrased below (See Appendix B).

These passages indicate that Joseph is not the father of Jesus. Therefore, Jesus was raised by a non-parent.[25] These passages could be interpreted to verify the attribute of raised by a non-parent.

Early Childhood is Unusual. This attribute refers to the existence of some kind of unusual circumstances in the childhood of the hero. It could mean that the hero was considered "high spirited," was "special" in some way, or evidenced some unusual power. The narrative of Jesus explains this attribute and is paraphrased below (See Appendix B).

These passages describe the somewhat precocious childhood of Jesus as exhibited by the young Jesus interacting with the wise men in the temple. Jesus rebukes his parents for chastising him by indicating that they

24 Matthew 2:13; Matthew 27:46; Mark 15:33.
25 Matthew 1:18-21; Luke 1:34-35.

should know he was doing God's (his father's) work. At this early age Jesus seems to understand that he is not of this world.[26] These passages could be interpreted to establish the attribute of unusual early childhood.

Hero Goes on Adventure. This attribute is represented by the hero seeking service in another land, going to a future kingdom, or separating himself from his usual life to seek a new experience. The narrative of Jesus describes this attribute and is paraphrased below (See Appendix B).

These passages describe the journey of Jesus into the wilderness where he encounters Satan who tempts him. Jesus responds with statements that indicate he has identified with God. After this wilderness experience Jesus seems to have established his identity and returns to his community to begin his teaching and healing.[27] These passages could be interpreted to confirm the attribute of the hero going on an adventure.

Return with Special Knowledge. This attribute refers to the return home of the hero, after his adventure, and with some new or special knowledge which he intends to impart to the community. It can be represented by a triumphant homecoming, a return from a strange world with special knowledge, or a return home to establish his position in the community. The narrative is Jesus relates this attribute and is paraphrased below (See Appendix B).

These passages give numerous examples of Jesus moving from

26 Luke 2:22-52.
27 Matthew 4:1-11; Matthew 1:23-25; Mark 1:9-15.

town to town teaching, healing and giving his newly acquired message of how to obtain salvation to the community.[28] These passages could be interpreted to confirm the attribute of return with special knowledge.

Revenge and/or Victory. This attribute refers to the hero exhibiting either revenge or victory upon his return. It can be represented by the hero slaying some original persecutors, taking revenge on an evil father, obtaining victory or an authority, or a beast. The narrative of Jesus includes this attribute and is paraphrased below (See Appendix B).

These passages give account of Jesus having victory over Satan and the recognition of Jesus as the Son of God by John the Baptist. The message is that Jesus would introduce a method of salvation to allow humanity to have victory over sin.[29] These passages could be interpreted to affirm the attribute of revenge or victory.

Acknowledged as Special. This attribute refers to the hero being acknowledged as special in some way. He might found a new city, become a king, or be recognized as different, or holy. The narrative of Jesus describes this attribute and is paraphrased below (See Appendix B).

These passages indicate that many members of the community to which Jesus belonged acknowledged him as a special agent of God.[30] These passages could be interpreted to establish the attribute of

28 Matthew 2:19-33; Matthew 4:12-17; Matthew 13:53-58; Luke 4:14-20.
29 Matthew 4:10-11; Luke 4:12-13; John 1:29-31.
30 Matthew 3:11; Matthew 8:1-3; Matthew 9:1-8; Mark 1:29-34; John 27:36.

acknowledgement.

Period of Reign. This attribute refers to a period of time in which the hero leads or influences the community. He may achieve some form of honor. He may make laws or rule the community. He might also instruct and serve the community. Lastly, he may institute sweeping changes in the way people live or view their world. The narrative of Jesus states this attribute and is paraphrased below (See Appendix B).

These passages recount the period of time, approximately three years, that Jesus spent teaching the message of salvation. He was followed by many people and enjoyed a period of popularity during the brief period of his teaching.[31] These passages could be interpreted to affirm the attribute of period of reign.

Decline, Reviled and Hunted. This attribute refers to a period of decline where the hero may be reviled for being illegitimate. For some reason the hero now loses favor with God or his subjects. Attempts to eliminate the hero may begin here. The narrative of Jesus reports this attribute and is paraphrased below (See Appendix B).

These passages describe the period of decline that follows the popular ministry of Jesus. The jealousy and politics of the period that cause the decline of his ministry eventually cause the turn against him.[32]

31 Matthew 3:13-17; Matthew 12:15-21; Matthew 17:1-9; Luke 3:23.
32 Matthew 26:1-5; Matthew 26:14-16; Matthew 26:47-50; Matthew 26:57-67; Mark 14:43-46; Mark 14:63-65; Mark 15:12-15; Luke 23:18-25; John 19:12-16.

These passages could be interpreted to establish the attribute of decline.

Extraordinary Death, Body not Buried, More than one Grave or Burial Site. This attribute refers to the death of the hero. It is often described as unusual, extraordinary, death at the hands of another, death on a hill with multiple burial places, or the body not buried. The hero is not afraid and lives on in others. The narrative of Jesus describes this attribute and is paraphrased below (See Appendix B).

These passages describe the trial and death of Jesus. His death is described as quite gruesome with some elements of revenge and jealousy. His death on a hill, multiple sepulchers, and eventual non-burial[33] could be interpreted to confirm the attribute of extraordinary death.

Second Step in Establishing Content Validity. The second step in determining content validity required that the four volunteer raters read the passages and evaluate whether, in their opinions, the attributes were present in the narrative passages.

Fifteen attributes and fifteen passages were randomized and given to the four raters to evaluate. All fifteen passages were identified by all four raters as having at least one hero attribute present indicating in the judgment of all the raters the content was representative of the identified attributes.

33 Matthew 27:32-54; Matthew 27:57-60; Mark 15:21-41; Mark 15:42-47; Luke 23:26-49; Luke 23:50-56 John 19:17-37; John 19:38-42; Matthew 28:1-8; Mark 16:1-8; Luke 24:1-12; John 20:1-18.

Reliability.

To determine the conformity of the measurements of the raters, the statistical method of kappa coefficient was employed. The kappa coefficient is a statistical measure of inter-rater agreement for items of category and is considered a conservative measure of agreement because it is believed to underestimate agreement for categories commonly used. (See Table 8 for an example calculation of kappa coefficient).

Table 8. Calculation of a Kappa Statistic for a Marker between Rater 1 and Rater 2

	Rater 1		
	Marker is present	Marker is absent	
Rater 2			Subtotal
Marker is present	A	B	A + B
Marker is absent	C	D	C + D
Subtotal	A + C	B + D	A + B + C + D

Observed agreement = (A + D)

Expected Agreement = (((A + B) * (A + C)) + ((C + D) * (B + D))) / (A + B + C + D)

Kappa = ((observed agreement) – (expected agreement)) / ((A + B + C + D) – (expected agreement)) Note: A, B, C, and D are the frequencies in which a marker is identified in same observation between rater 1 and rater 2.

Source: Quanta Healthcare Solutions, Inc. "Calculating the Kappa Coefficient for 2 Observations by 2 Observers." *The Medical Algorithms Project*. (October 2002): 23-30. Accessed December 15, 2012, http://www.medal.org.

Fifteen attributes were identified in the narrative of Siddhartha. All the kappa coefficients were evaluated using the guideline outlined by Landis and Koch (1977), where the strength of the kappa coefficients = 0.01- 0.20 slight; 0.21 – 0.40 fair; 0.41 – 0.60 moderate; 0.61 – 0.80 substantial; 0.81 – 1.00 almost perfect, according to Landis and Koch. Of the fifteen attributes, six had slight agreement, two had fair agreement, two had moderate agreement, four had substantial agreement, and one theme had almost perfect agreement (See Table 9).

Fifteen attributes were identified in the narrative of Jesus. All the kappa coefficients were evaluated using the guideline outlined by Landis and Koch (1977), where the strength of the kappa coefficients = 0.01- 0.20 slight; 0.21 – 0.40 fair; 0.41 – 0.60 moderate; 0.61 – 0.80 substantial; 0.81 – 1.00 almost perfect, according to Landis and Koch. Of the fifteen attributes, five had slight agreement, three had fair agreement, three had moderate agreement, three had substantial agreement, and one attribute had almost perfect agreement (See Table 10).

For this analysis there were four raters and the kappa values presented in the tables represent the measure of agreement among the raters. The kappas were calculated to determine the agreement between rater one and rater two; rater one and rater three; rater one and rater four; rater two and rater three; rater two and rater four; and rater three and rater four. This pairing of raters provided six kappa scores per attribute. The corresponding kappa scores for each attribute were averaged together to get one overall kappa score for each attribute. The kappa values range from 0 – 1, where higher values indicate greater agreement between the raters.

Table 9. Attributes and Kappas for Siddhartha

Attribute	Kappa
1	0.50
2	0.77
3	0.01
4	0.63
5	0.60
6	0.67
7	0.82
8	0.03
9	0.13
10	0.01
11	0.18
12	0.23
13	0.43
14	0.16
15	0.21

Table 10. Attributes and Kappas for Jesus

Attribute	Kappa
1	0.71
2	0.09
3	0.11
4	0.29
5	0.23
6	0.66
7	0.44
8	0.14
9	0.01
10	0.27
11	0.52
12	0.08
13	0.51
14	0.67
15	0.82

Kappa Results of Individual Attributes

Attribute 1 Questionable Conception or Birth. For the narrative of Siddhartha the raters obtained a kappa score of 0.50 which represents moderate agreement. For the narrative of Jesus the raters obtained a kappa score of 0.71 which represents substantial agreement.

Attribute 2 Royal Parents. For the narrative of Siddhartha the raters obtained a kappa score of 0.77 which represents substantial agreement. For the narrative of Jesus the raters obtained a kappa score of 0.09 which represents slight agreement.

Attribute 3 Parent is God. For the narrative of Siddhartha the raters obtained a kappa score of 0.1 which represents slight agreement. For the narrative of Jesus the raters obtained a kappa score of 0.11 which represents slight agreement.

Attribute 4 Prophecy Foretells. For the narrative of Siddhartha the raters obtained a kappa score of 0.63 which represents substantial agreement. For the narrative of Jesus the raters obtained a kappa score of 0.29 which represents fair agreement.

Attribute 5 Abandonment. For the narrative of Siddhartha the raters obtained a kappa score of 0.60 which represents moderate agreement. For the narrative of Jesus the raters obtained a kappa score of 0.23 which represents fair agreement.

Attribute 6 Attempt to Kill. For the narrative of Siddhartha the raters obtained a kappa score of 0.67 which represents substantial agreement. For the narrative of Jesus the raters obtained a kappa score of 0.66 which represents substantial agreement.

Attribute 7 Raised by Non-Parent. For the narrative of Siddhartha the raters obtained a kappa score of 0.82 which represents almost perfect agreement. For the narrative of Jesus the raters obtained a kappa score of 0.44 which represents substantial agreement.

Attribute 8 Early Childhood Unusual. For the narrative of Siddhartha the raters obtained a kappa score of 0.03 which represents slight agreement. For the narrative of Jesus the raters obtained a kappa score of 0.14 which represents slight agreement.

Attribute 9 Hero Goes on Adventure. For the narrative of Siddhartha the raters obtained a kappa score of 0.13 which represents slight agreement. For the narrative of Jesus the raters obtained a kappa score of 0.01 which represents slight agreement.

Attribute 10 Hero Returns with Special Knowledge. For the narrative of Siddhartha the raters obtained a kappa score of 0.01 which represents slight agreement. For the narrative of Jesus the raters obtained a kappa score of 0.27 which represents fair agreement.

Attribute 11 Revenge and/or Victory Obtained. For the narrative of Siddhartha the raters obtained a kappa score of 0.18 which represents slight agreement. For the narrative of Jesus the raters obtained a kappa score of 0.52 which represents moderate agreement.

Attribute 12 Acknowledged as Special. For the narrative of Siddhartha the raters obtained a kappa score of 0.23 which represents fair agreement. For the narrative of Jesus the raters obtained a kappa score of 0.08 which represents slight agreement.

Attribute 13 Obtains a Period of Reign. For the narrative of Siddhartha the raters obtained a kappa score of 0.43 which represents fair agreement. For the narrative of Jesus the raters obtained a kappa score of 0.51 which represents moderate agreement.

Attribute 14 Decline in Favor. For the narrative of Siddhartha the raters obtained a kappa score of 0.16 which represents slight agreement. For the narrative of Jesus the raters obtained a kappa score of 0.67 which represents substantial agreement.

Attribute 15 Extraordinary Death. For the narrative of Siddhartha the raters obtained a kappa score of 0.21 which represents fair agreement. For the narrative of Jesus the raters obtained a kappa score of 0.82 which represents almost perfect agreement.

Summary

Analysis of the data indicated that all the attributes were identified in both the narratives of Siddhartha and Jesus although the reliability of the identification of the attributes in specific passages ranged from slight to almost perfect.

Within the narrative of Siddhartha, the attributes that showed the strongest agreement were Attribute 7 (Raised by a Non-Parent) which had almost perfect agreement; Attribute 2 (Royal Parents) which had substantial agreement; Attribute 6 (Attempt to Kill) which had substantial agreement; Attribute 4 (Prophecy Foretells) which had substantial agreement; Attribute 5 (Abandonment) which had moderate agreement; and Attribute 1 (Questionable conception or Birth) which had moderate agreement. Within the narrative of Siddhartha, the attributes that showed the weakest agreement were Attribute 3 (Parent is

God) with slight agreement; Attribute 10 (Return with Special Knowledge) with slight agreement; and Attribute 8 (Early Childhood Unusual) with fair agreement.

Within the narrative of Jesus, the attributes that showed the strongest agreement were Attribute 15 (Extraordinary Death) with almost perfect agreement; Attribute 1 (Questionable Conception or Birth) with substantial agreement; Attribute 14 (Period of Decline) with substantial agreement; Attribute 6 (Attempt to Kill) with substantial agreement; Attribute 11 (Revenge or Victory) with moderate agreement; and Attribute 13 (Period of Reign) with moderate agreement. Within the narrative of Jesus, the attributes that showed the weakest agreement were Attribute (Hero Goes on Adventure) with slight agreement; Attribute 12 (Acknowledged as Special) with slight agreement; and Attribute 2 (Royal Parents) with slight agreement.

Although all the primary attributes were identified by all the raters, the question arises as to why the inter-rater reliability varied from slight to almost perfect within the passages of the narratives. Several explanations for this phenomenon could be considered.

The first explanation might have to do with the raters themselves. There was no attempt to establish information about the raters other than their gender, age, and religious affiliation. Three of the raters identified themselves as not being affiliated with either the Buddhist or Christian spirituals paths. The history of their religious affiliations is not known. Any one of them could have been affiliated with Buddhism or Christianity in the

past, but not at the present. The religious affiliation history of the raters could influence the interpretation the narratives in many ways. If a rater was familiar with a narrative or a passage, that rater might have a predetermined understanding of the passage, unlike someone who was totally unfamiliar with the passage. This might be especially relevant to the Buddhist sutras, the language of which might seem quite foreign to a Western rater.

The second explanation could be related to the task of hermeneutics. As discussed in the literature review, hermeneutics is the theory of the operations that occur in an attempt to understand and interpret a narrative. According to Paul Ricoeur a major obstacle in narrative interpretation is the polysemic nature of language.[34] In this research project the narrative passages were lifted out of context by this researcher who made the initial interpretation of the meaning of the passages. Words have multiple meanings and therefore require a context to result in an adequate interpretation. It is possible that raters who were unfamiliar with the narratives, and who lacked the context for the story, could have interpreted specific passages differently. All the raters were able to identify the attributes, but the passages in which they identified the attributes varied.

One example from the narrative of Siddhartha and one example from the narrative of Jesus can be used as examples of the possible context error and are presented as follows:

Example from Narrative of Siddhartha.

Primary Attribute 10 (See Table 6) is "Hero Returns with Special Knowledge." This attribute is represented by the qualities of the return home from an adventure with

34 Ricoeur, *Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences*.

special knowledge which is then disseminated to the community. In the randomized passages of Siddhartha (See Appendix C), Passage 7 was chosen by this researcher as one representation of Primary Attribute 10 because it indicates that after the meditation under the Bodhi Tree, Siddhartha returns enlightened and tells his followers that he has obtained this knowledge which he will pass on to them. However, only two raters identified this attribute in this passage. This passage was also rated as Attribute 13 (Period of Reign), Attribute 11 (Victory), Attribute 15 (Death), and Attribute 12 (Acknowledge). This resulted in a kappa coefficient of 0.01 or only slight agreement.

Example from Narrative of Jesus.

Primary Attribute 9 (See Table 6) is "Hero Goes on an Adventure." This attribute is represented by the qualities of the hero experiencing a separation from others which may be physical or spiritual and it is after this separation that some form of special knowledge is imparted to the hero and he return to teach this knowledge to the community. When the passages were randomized for the narrative of Jesus (See Appendix D), it was coincidence that Passage 9 was chosen to represent Attribute 9. In the randomized passages of Jesus, Passage 9 was chosen by this researcher as one representation of Primary Attribute 9 because it indicates that Jesus separated himself from his family and followers by going into the wilderness for forty days. During that time he was tempted by Satan and solidified his relationship as One with God. He then returned to the community to begin teaching and healing. However, the raters identified this passage as Attribute 13 (Period

of Reign), Attribute 11 (Victory), Attribute 12 (Acknowledge), Attribute 3 (Parent is God), Attribute 4 (Prophecy Foretells), Attribute 10 (Returns with Special Knowledge). This resulted in a kappa coefficient of 0.01 or only slight agreement.

Summary of Results

The results of this study supported the hypothesis that the narratives of Siddhartha and Jesus fit the pattern of the hero myth as exemplified by all the attributes being identified in the narratives of both men by four different raters of different ages, backgrounds, and religious identifications. There were substantial findings but no consistency in the strength of the agreements which varied from attribute to attribute and between the narratives. The fact that the raters were able to identify all the attributes in both narratives gives weight to the hypothesis that the narratives do generally fit the hero pattern, but there was not inter-rater reliability with regard to which passages exhibited which attributes. In many cases, multiple attributes were identified in the same passage but not always consistently between raters.

Chapter 5

Discussion of Religious Critical Terms and Metaphor Subcategories Found in the Narratives of Siddhartha and Jesus

Returning to the previous discussion of metaphors as foundational to religious narratives, I would like to address some of the critical religious studies terms that occur in the narratives of Siddhartha and Jesus chosen for this study. The function of these metaphors is to weave together the familiar and the unfamiliar for the purpose of understanding. In the study of religious narratives the familiar concept is used metaphorically to enable the reader to understand the numinous concept.

I would now like to evaluate how the narrative passages used for this research exemplify the critical metaphorical terms previously identified as belief, body, image, god, performance, territory, sacrifice, and transformation. Although there are many examples in the narratives, one example from the narrative of Siddhartha and one example from the narrative of Jesus will be chosen as representative of each critical term.

Evaluation of Critical Terms

The Critical Term Belief

As previously pointed out, the word "belief" has evolved to become an abstract metaphor for "religion." To speak of religion in terms of belief suggests that religion is the external materialization of some internal metaphoric concept we call belief and that religion then becomes the representation of that internal state. In the following passage the sage, Kanhasiri, observes the young Siddhartha and immediately makes proclamations of his "belief" that Siddhartha will develop and teach a new practice of faith.

Siddhartha Narrative

"The sage with matted hair, called Kanhasiri, seeing the boy, like a gold jewel upon brocade, with the white sunshade held above his head, received him full of joy and happiness. As soon as he received the Sakyans' Lord the adept in construing marks and signs exclaimed with ready confidence of heart: 'Among the biped race he is unique.' Then he remembered: seeing his own lot, in very sadness tears came to his eyes. The Sakyans saw him weeping, and they asked: 'Will some misfortune then befall our prince?' But to the anxious Sakyans he replied: 'As I foresee, no harm will touch the boy, nor is there any danger that awaits him. Be sure he is not of the second rank; for he will reach the summit of true knowledge. A seer of the peerless purity, through pity for the many he will set The Dhamma Wheel turning and spread his life of holiness. But little of my life-span now remains, and I shall die meanwhile. I shall not hear the matchless Hero teaching the Good Dhamma. That saddens me; that loss distresses me.'[1]

In this passage the sage, Kanhasiri, after seeing the young Siddhartha, expresses his belief in the future spiritual leader and the knowledge that Siddhartha will obtain and give to others. Kanhasiri's words are his external expression of the internal conceptual belief in the future Buddha and his religion which he refers to in the phrase "Dhamma Wheel turning."

1 *Sutta-nipāta* 3:11.

Jesus Narrative

"When the time came for the purification rites required by the Law of Moses, Joseph and Mary took him to Jerusalem to present him to the Lord (as it is written in the Law of the Lord, 'Every firstborn male is to be consecrated to the Lord'), and to offer a sacrifice in keeping with what is said in the Law of the Lord: 'a pair of doves or two young pigeons.' Now there was a man in Jerusalem called Simeon, who was righteous and devout. He was waiting for the consolation of Israel, and the Holy Spirit was on him. It had been revealed to him by the Holy Spirit that he would not die before he had seen the Lord's Messiah. Moved by the Spirit, he went into the temple courts. When the parents brought in the child Jesus to do for him what the custom of the Law required, Simeon took him in his arms and praised God, saying: 'Sovereign Lord, as you have promised, you may now dismiss your servant in peace. For my eyes have seen your salvation, which you have prepared in the sight of all nations: a light for revelation to the Gentiles, and the glory of your people Israel.'"[2]

In an encounter similar to the one between Kanharsiri and Siddhartha, the devout and righteous Simeon encounters the young Jesus in the temple, where his parents brought him to be consecrated. Simeon's response when seeing Jesus indicates that he is now ready to die and go to heaven because he has seen the

2 Luke 2:22-52

promised messiah. He clearly believes and expresses his belief that Jesus is the promised one and the fulfillment of a religious promise for salvation through a messiah.

The Critical Term Body

Turning from the internal belief to the external representation, the concept of body as a metaphor has a history in many religions. In the religion of Christianity, the church is considered the "body" of Christ. In the observance of Holy Communion the bread is called "the body" of Christ. In different cultures, whether it is acceptable to alter the body is dependent on the cultural view of how the body is related to God. Again, in Christianity, the body is the "temple" of the Holy Spirit.

Siddhartha Narrative

> "When the Bodhisatta came forth from his mother's womb, a great measureless light surpassing the splendor of the gods appeared in the world and its deities, its Māras, and its Brahmā divinities, in this generation with its monks and brahmans, with its princes and men. And even in those abysmal world interspaces of vacancy, gloom and utter darkness, where the moon and sun, powerful and mighty as they are, cannot make their light prevail—there too a great measureless light surpassing the splendor of the gods appeared; and the creatures born there perceived each other by that light: 'So it seems that other creatures have appeared here!' And this ten-thousandfold world-system shook and quaked and trembled;

and there too a great measureless light surpassing the splendor of the gods appeared."[3]

In this passage, the physical birth Siddhartha is accompanied by unusual and highly symbolic events. Just the appearance of his physical body causes the world to shake and produce measureless light. In this event the physical presence of Siddhartha is a metaphor for the coming spiritual power he would acquire.

Jesus Narrative

"And there were shepherds living out in the fields nearby; keeping watch over their flocks at night. An angel of the Lord appeared to them, and the glory of the Lord shone around them, and they were terrified. But the angel said to them, 'Do not be afraid. I bring you good news that will cause great joy for all the people. Today in the town of David a Savior has been born to you; he is the Messiah, the Lord. This will be a sign to you: You will find a baby wrapped in cloths and lying in a manger.' Suddenly a great company of the heavenly host appeared with the angel, praising God and saying, 'Glory to God in the highest heaven, and on earth peace to those on whom his favor rests.'"[4]

Just as in the narrative about the birth of Siddhartha, the birth of Jesus causes miraculous events. The shepherds see and hear angels as well as a great light. Again, just the physical presence of Siddhartha causes supernatural events;

3 *Majjhima-nikāya 123; Dīgha-nikāya 14.*
4 Luke 2:8-14.

the presence of Jesus also causes supernatural events to occur. Ultimately, the followers of Jesus would be considered the "body" of Christ, a metaphor for the union of spirit and flesh.

The Critical Term Image

The concept of image arises from the imagination and spawns intuition and personally significant experience according to the biblical scholar Margaret Miles who states,

> As a critical term in religious studies, 'image' is singularly difficult to define, even if the discussion is confined . . . to the Christian and post-Christian West. . . . In historical Christianity, image was seen as dependent (in varying degrees) on its original. Its primary use was in describing humanity's relationship to God through Christ. In twentieth-century media culture, however, the meaning and value of image have altered dramatically. The media image often stands alone, without a referent, reflecting nothing but its creator's imagination.[5]

To hark back to the previous discussion of Lakoff and Johnson, unbridled imagination results in losing touch with reality, unfairness, bias, and self-indulgence. Therefore, religious images focus on providing a sort of grounding for the intuition. This function is perhaps one of the things that makes the definition of image difficult. It has many facets and a variety of functions.

Siddhartha Narrative

"Now after staying at Uruvelā for as long as he chose, the Blessed One set out for Gayāsīsa with a large following of bhikkhus, with a thousand bhikkhus,

5 Miles, "Image," 166.

with all the former matted-hair ascetics. The Blessed One stopped at Gayāsīsa near Gayā together with the thousand bhikkhus. There he addressed the bhikkhus. . . . And while this discourse was being delivered the hearts of the thousand bhikkhus were delivered from taints through not clinging."[6]

This passage describes the faith that is arising in the followers as they listen to the teaching of Siddhartha. In this scene, Siddhartha functions as a model for the faith. He becomes an image to be emulated by the followers, many of whom, we are told, achieve a level of faith on that day.

Jesus Narrative

"Jesus returned to Galilee in the power of the Spirit, and news about him spread through the whole countryside. He was teaching in their synagogues, and everyone praised him. He went to Nazareth, where he had been brought up, and on the Sabbath day he went into the synagogue, as was his custom. He stood up to read, and the scroll of the prophet Isaiah was handed to him. Unrolling it, he found the place where it is written: 'The Spirit of the Lord is on me, because he has anointed me to proclaim good news to the poor. He has sent me to proclaim freedom for the prisoners and recovery of sight for the blind, to set the oppressed free, to proclaim the year of the Lord's favor.' Then he rolled up the scroll, gave it back to the attendant and sat down. The eyes of everyone in the synagogue were fastened on him."[7]

---

6 *Vinaya Mahavagga 1:21; Saṃyutta-nikāya 35-28.*
7 Luke 4:14-20.

As with Siddhartha, in this passage Jesus stands up to teach in the temple. He picks a particular scripture that relates to his being the messiah. The listeners are fascinated by his presence. Standing in the temple and reading with, what I believe to be an air of authority, he must have been a commanding presence, an image of a spiritual leader and quite impressive.

The Critical Term God

Moving from the concept of the image of God to the concept of God itself, provides an opportunity to look at the way that the concept of God can be discussed in both human and figurative ways. God can be described in an anthropomorphic manner using the metaphors of lord, king, father, and shepherd. In addition, the concept of God can be referred to in very abstract ways such as being the most high, the first, the last, love, and the source, to name just a few examples.

Siddhartha Narrative

"Then the one man took his sword and shield and fixed his bow and quiver, and he went to where the Blessed One was. But as he drew near, he grew frightened, till he stood still, his body quite rigid. The Blessed One saw him thus and said to him: 'Come, friend, do not be afraid.' Then the man laid aside his sword and shield and put down his bow and quiver. He went up to the Blessed One and prostrated himself at his feet, saying: 'Lord, I have transgressed, I have done wrong like a fool confused and blundering, since I came here with evil intent, with intent to do murder. Lord, may the Blessed One forgive my transgression as

such for restraint in the future.'

'Surely, friend, you have transgressed, you have done wrong like a fool confused and blundering, since you came here with evil intent, with intent to do murder. But since you see your transgression as such and so act in accordance with the Dhamma, we forgive it; for it is growth in the Noble One's Discipline when a man sees a transgression as such and so acts in accordance with the Dhamma and enters upon restraint for the future.'"[8]

In this passage, the man who was sent to kill Siddhartha is moved to repentance by his encounter with Siddhartha. The would-be killer is affected by the nature of Siddhartha and repents. The assassin asks for forgiveness and addresses Siddhartha as Lord, one of the metaphors for God. Although Siddhartha did not consider himself a God, from a mythological perspective, he did act in what would consider "Godly" ways. The assassin asks for forgiveness for his evil intent. While we might ask forgiveness of another human, generally we think of this kind of forgiveness as being issued by a god. And, in fact, in the second passage we see that Siddhartha does issue forgiveness.

Jesus Narrative

"One of the criminals who hung there hurled insults at him: 'Aren't you the Messiah? Save yourself and us!' But the other criminal rebuked him. 'Don't you fear God,' he said, 'since you are under the same sentence? We are

8 Vinaya Cullavagga 7:3.

punished justly, for we are getting what our deeds deserve. But this man has done nothing wrong.' Then he said, 'Jesus, remember me when you come into you kingdom.' Jesus answered him, 'Truly I tell you, today you will be with me in paradise.' It was now about noon, and darkness came over the whole land until three in the afternoon, for the sun stopped shining. And the curtain of the temple was torn in two. Jesus called out with a loud voice, 'Father, into your hands I commit my spirit.' When he had said this, he breathed his last. The centurion, seeing what had happened, praised God and said, 'Surely this was a righteous man.' When all the people who had gathered to witness this sight saw what took place, they beat their breasts and went away. But all those who knew him, including the women who had followed him from Galilee, stood at a distance, watching these things."[9]

In this passage, Jesus clearly states that he is one with God and promises the one thief that he will be in paradise with Jesus that very day. This has the effect of forgiveness of sin and establishing the power of Jesus to be with God.

The Critical Term Performance

The terminology of performance harbors some basic ambiguity. The oldest meaning of the noun denotes the accomplishment or execution of a specified action, most notably a command or a promise. Similarly, performance has also come to mean the enactment of a script or score, as in a theatrical play or musical recital. More recent uses,

9 "Luke 23:26-49."

however, emphasize a type of event in which the very activity of the agent or artist is the most critical dimension and not the completion of the action. With this repertoire of meanings, religious studies uses the language of performance to stress the execution of a preexisting script for activity (as in conducting a traditional church service) or the explicitly unscripted dimensions of an activity in process (as in the spirit or quality of the service).[10]

Siddhartha Narrative

> "'Being myself subject to birth, ageing, ailment, death, sorrow, and defilement, seeing danger in what is subject to those things and seeking the unborn, unageing, unailing, deathless, sorrowless, undefiled supreme surcease of bondage, Nibbāna, I attained it. The knowledge and vision arose in me: 'My deliverance is unassailable; this is my last birth; there is now no renewal of being.'[11]
>
> Then the Blessed One recognized Māra the Evil One, and he answered him. . . Then Māra the Evil One knew: 'The Blessed One knows me, the Sublime One knows me.' Sad and disappointed, he vanished at once.[12]
>
> When the sage of the Shakyas paid no heed and did not even give up his posture, even after he was so admonished, Māra then discharged the arrow at him, placing his sons and girls in front of him. But even after he shot the arrow at him, he paid no heed and did not veer from his resolve; seeing him thus, Māra was

10 Bell, "Performance," 205–6.
11 *Majjhima-nikāya* 26
12 *Saṃyutta-nikāya* 4:1

despondent. . ."[13]

In this passage, Siddhartha is performing the meditation that results in his enlightenment. During this ritual performance he is confronted by evil and temptation, but he is able to resist and accomplish his goal. In this example the performance of Siddhartha was an enactment that had a profound effect on him as well as other entities that were present.

Jesus Narrative

"Jesus stepped into a boat, crossed over and came to his own town. Some men brought to him a paralyzed man, lying on a mat. When Jesus saw their faith, he said to the man, 'Take heart, son; your sins are forgiven.' At this, some of the teachers of the law said to themselves, 'This fellow is blaspheming!' Knowing their thoughts, Jesus said, 'Why do you entertain evil thoughts in your hearts? Which is easier: to say, 'Your sins are forgiven,' or to say, 'Get up and walk'? But I want you to know that the Son of Man has authority on earth to forgive sins." So he said to the paralyzed man, 'Get up, take your mat and go home.' Then the man got up and went home. When the crowd saw this, they were filled with awe; and they praised God, who had given such authority to man."[14]

In this passage, Jesus is performing miracles of healing for the purpose of compassion, but also for the purpose of presenting his authority to the followers.

13 *Buddhacarita, Canto 13:15*.
14 Matthew 9:1-8.

The metaphor he enacts likens the physical healing to spiritual healing. He is performing a metaphoric spiritual lesson for the crowds.

The Critical Term Territory

Transitioning from the "action" of performance to the "place" of territory the notion of "mapping" becomes an example of the use of metaphor, and a core religious concept, that involves the concept of place. The idea advanced here is that myths and rituals play an important role in negotiating the unknown territory of the spiritual domain. According to Sam Gill, a religious studies scholar from Colorado,

> Advancing this metaphor, as maps are used by travelers to negotiate some territory or are constructed by cartographers to chart the significance of a territory from some perspective, so too function the myths and rituals that play major roles in religious traditions. As there are endless ways to map a territory and to use maps to negotiate a territory, there are endless ways to perform rites and apply myths in the effort to construct meaning in life.[15]

In this example, metaphoric narratives can be considered "road maps" for the spiritual journey of life and hopefully aid in finding the desired destination.

Siddhartha Narrative

"Now after staying at Uruvelā for as long as he chose, the Blessed One set out for Gayāsīsa with a large following of bhikkhus, with a thousand bhikkhus, with all the former matted-hair ascetics. The Blessed One stopped at Gayāsīsa near Gayā together with the thousand bhikkhus. There he addressed the bhikkhus . . . . And while this discourse was being delivered the hearts of the thousand

15 Gill, "Territory," 307.

bhikkhus were delivered from taints through not clinging."[16]

This passage is just one example of the travels of Siddhartha. He was almost constantly moving from one physical area to another. In part, this moving had the purpose of being able to teach his method to new people. But, in another way, the constant travel was a metaphor for "walking a spiritual path."

Jesus Narrative

"Jesus went throughout Galilee, teaching in their synagogues, proclaiming the good news of the kingdom, and healing every disease and sickness among the people. News about him spread all over Syria, and people brought to him all who were ill with various diseases, those suffering severe pain, the demon-possessed, those having seizures, and the paralyzed; and he healed them. Large crowds from Galilee, the Decapolis, Jerusalem, Judea and the region across the Jordan followed him."[17]

Jesus moved from place to place in the same way as Siddhartha. Again, this constant travel is a way of giving the spiritual message to more people, but also, just like with Siddhartha, it functions as the same metaphor, "walking a spiritual path."

The Critical Term Sacrifice

In virtually every religion there is the concept of sacrifice which involves either voluntarily or involuntarily giving up something as a metaphorical act representing

16 *Vinaya Mahāvagga* 1:21; *Saṃyutta-nikāya* 35:28
17 Matthew 1:23-25.

something else. It is exactly this notion of sacrifice that figures prominently in the religion of Christianity when Christ becomes the metaphoric sacrifice for the sin of mankind by becoming the blood of the lamb that saves the world. Siddhartha also embraces sacrifice as he leaves his palace home and enters into a vagabond existence. The metaphor of sacrifice is a difficult one to incorporate with the other more positive and frequently invoked metaphors of religious practice. Yet, it is a central concept in the majority of religions.

Siddhartha Narrative

"Now I went forth from the house life into homelessness to seek what is good, seeking the supreme state of sublime peace. Therefore, I went to Āḷāra Kālāma, and said to him: 'Friend Kālāma, I want to lead the holy life in this Dhamma and Discipline.'"[18]

In this passage, Siddhartha leaves the comfort of his palace home and sets off to find the way of perfect peace. He suffers homelessness, deprivation, and starvation while on his search. Most of us would experience this as a great sacrifice. During his life Siddhartha had very little material possessions and ate only what others offered him. In essence, his life exemplified the sacrificing of the material aspects of life for the spiritual rewards.

Jesus Narrative

"It was now about noon, and darkness came over the whole land until three

18 *Majjhima-nikāya* 26,36,85,100.

in the afternoon, for the sun stopped shining. And the curtain of the temple was torn in two. Jesus called out with a loud voice, 'Father, into your hands I commit my spirit.' When he had said this, he breathed his last. The centurion, seeing what had happened, praised God and said, 'Surely this was a righteous man.'"[19]

In this passage Jesus suffers death on the cross for the purpose of providing a sacrificial substitute for the death of humanity. He endures the cross as a sacrifice for the sins of men and establishes a reconnection with God the Father in the process. His death refers back to the animal sacrifices that constituted a central piece of the Hebrew religious practice up to that time. The animal sacrifices act a metaphor for the future sacrifice of the "Son of God." Both sacrificial acts are metaphoric.

The Critical Term Transformation

Transformation connotes a metamorphosis, a change, the emergence of something new. Often, a sacrifice of sorts is required for a transformation to take place. This change can be considered a termination, or final change. However, it can also be considered a dynamic process that continues over time.

Siddhartha Narrative

"Then the Blessed One entered upon the first meditation. Emerging from that, he entered upon the second meditation. Emerging from that, he entered upon the third meditation. Emerging from that, he entered upon the fourth meditation.

19 Luke 23:26-49

Emerging from that, he entered upon the base consisting of the infinity of space. Emerging from that, he entered upon the base consisting of the infinity of consciousness. Emerging from that, he entered upon the base consisting of nothingness. Emerging from that, he entered upon the base consisting of neither-perception-nor-non-perception. Emerging from that, he entered upon the cessation of perception and feeling. With the Blessed One's attainment of final Nibbāna there was a great earthquake, fearful and hair-raising, and the drum of heaven resounded."[20]

In this passage Siddhartha enters into his last meditation. This is a ritual he had performed most of his adult life, but never to this end. This passage gives the account of the transformation of the human Siddhartha into the experience of Nibbāna, although we do not know exactly what this condition is, it is clearly a transformation.

Jesus Narrative

"After six days Jesus took with him Peter, James and John the brother of James, and led them up a high mountain by themselves. There he was transfigured before them. His face shone like the sun, and his clothes became as white as the light. Just then there appeared before them Moses and Elijah, talking with Jesus. Peter said to Jesus, 'Lord, it is good for us to be here. If you wish, I will put up three shelters—one for you, one for Moses and one for Elijah.' While he was still

20 *Dīgha-nikāya 16.*

speaking, a bright cloud covered them, and a voice from the cloud said, 'This is my Son, whom I love, with him I am well pleased. Listen to him!' When the disciples heard this, they fell facedown to the ground, terrified. But Jesus came and touched them. 'Get up,' he said. 'Don't be afraid.' When they looked up they saw no one except Jesus. As they were coming down the mountain, Jesus instructed them. 'Don't tell anyone what you have seen, until the Son of Man has been raised from the dead.'"[21]

In this passage Jesus is transformed in the presence of Peter, James and John. This occurs as a foretelling of what is to come, although the disciples have no idea what is happening. This is the beginning of the end of the earthly life of Jesus and his transformation into the sacrificial lamb ultimately becoming one with God.

Evaluation of Metaphor Subcategories

The earlier discussion of metaphor emphasized its pervasive nature. Referring back to the discussion of how Lakoff and Johnson conceptualize metaphor we are reminded that they assert,

> . . . most people think they can get along perfectly well without metaphor. We have found, on the contrary, that metaphor is pervasive in everyday life, not just in language but in thought and action . . . . They also govern our everyday functioning, down to the most mundane details . . . . Primarily on the basis of linguistic evidence, we have found that most of our ordinary conceptual system is metaphorical in nature.[22]

21 Matthew 17:1-9.
22 Lakoff and Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, 3–4.

Lakoff and Johnson not only emphasize the pervasiveness of metaphor, they also identify many significant qualities of metaphor that generally go unattended in discussions of metaphor. In addition to being pervasive, Lakoff and Johnson consider metaphor to be conceptual, highlighting, hiding, structural, orientational, experiential, culturally coherent, ontological, containing, personification, metonymy, partial, grounding, causative, simple, complex, and creating similarity to new a few subcategories.

Included the concept of "metaphorical structuring," or the ability of the concept to extend beyond its literal definition, is the ability of the metaphor to impart understanding of the unknown through association with the known. If the narratives of Siddhartha and Jesus are themselves metaphorical vehicles transporting humans into understanding of the numinous through metaphoric representation, then we should be able to identify metaphoric subcategories embedded within the narratives. In fact, the narratives do contain examples of the metaphoric subcategories that resonate with the human psyche. The following are just a few of the examples including the Subcategories of Spatial Orientation, Cultural Concept, and Ontological Metaphor.

The Subcategory of Spatial Orientation

The subcategory of spatial orientation is one example of metaphorical structuring. A spatial orientation metaphor has to do with orientations such as up, down, in, out, front, and back. In many cultures "up" equals happy and "down" equals unhappy. In addition, when using metaphorical structuring and spatial orientation together, "up" equals "good" and "down" equals "bad." In both the narratives of Siddhartha and Jesus the direction

"up" connotes happiness, peace, goodness, and heaven as we can see from the following examples.

Siddhartha Narrative

"Mindful and fully aware the Bodhisatta passed away from the Heaven of the Contented and descended into his mother's womb."[23]

In this passage, the Siddhartha is "descending" into his mother's womb, indicating that the Heaven of the Contented is above or "up."

Jesus Narrative

"As soon as Jesus was baptized, he went up out of the water. At that moment heaven was opened, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove and alighting on him."[24]

In this passage, after Jesus is baptized, the Spirit of God "descends" from heaven which is clearly located "up."

In these examples, without directly making the statement, it is clear that being "up" is to be in heaven, in peace, in happiness, and in goodness. In the case of Siddhartha the descent into his mother's womb is necessary to complete his mission of providing enlightenment to the world, so it is not totally "bad." But, it is clear from the sutra that the descent to earth is not as good as being in the Heaven of the Contented. The metaphor delivers the message. In the example of the baptism of Jesus, the Spirit of God descends

23 *Majjhima-nikāya* 123; *Dīgha-nikāya* 14.
24 Matthew 3:13-17.

from what we must assume to be heaven. Again, up is where heaven is located.

The Subcategory of Fundamental Culture Concept

The most important cultural values will be represented by, and coherent with, the metaphorical structure of the most fundamental concepts of the culture. In order to be meaningful, the cultural values need to be expressed in a coherent system of metaphorical concepts that are used by the culture. When experiences can be identified they can be categorized and subsequently evaluated through reason.

Siddhartha Narrative

Speaking of Siddhartha Kanhasiri says, "As I foresee, no harm will touch the boy, nor is there any danger that awaits him . . . . A seer of the peerless purity, through pity for the many he will set the Dhamma Wheel turning and spread his life of holiness."[25]

In this passage Kanhasiri uses the term "Dhamma Wheel" as a metaphor for the spiritual action and religion that will come from Siddhartha. This is a cultural concept that was very familiar to the community to which he is speaking, and they know exactly what this means.

Jesus Narrative

When Jesus is in the temple we are told, "He stood up to read, and the scroll of the prophet Isaiah was handed to him. Unrolling it, he found

25 *Sutta-nipāta* 3:11.

the place where it is written: 'The Spirit of the Lord is on me, because he has anointed me to proclaim good news to the poor. He has sent me to proclaim freedom from the prisoners and recovery of sight for the blind, to set the oppressed free, to proclaim the year of the Lord's favor.' Then he rolled up the scroll, gave it back to the attendant and sat down."[26]

In this passage, Jesus uses the cultural tool of the scriptures to make a statement about himself and the community of the Jews who were at the time oppressed by the Romans. In addition, there is the larger implication that anyone who feels oppressed can be set free. Not only do the people who were in attendance on that day get the message, today people who read this scripture understand the message.

The Subcategory of the Ontological Metaphor

Ontological metaphors allow us to comprehend experience with nonhuman or supra-human entities in terms of human characteristics thereby making a connection with that which is not human. In the case of the following examples ontological metaphors allow us to have some understanding of the concepts of God and nirvana.

Siddhartha Narrative

"Birth is exhausted, the holy life has been lived out, what was to be done is done, there is not more of this to come."[27]

26 Luke 4:14-20.
27 *Vinaya Mahavagga* 1:21.

In this passage, Siddhartha speaks of life and death. He is equating the spiritual passage into nirvana with the human experiences of birth, life, and death. The phases of life are concepts with which his followers are familiar and using these concepts provides a metaphorical bridge between the known life concepts and the unknown numinous concepts.

Jesus Narrative

"The high priest said to him, 'I charge you under oath by the living God: Tell us if you are the Messiah, the Son of God.' 'You have said so,' Jesus replied."[28]

In this passage Jesus refers to God as his father, a concept he uses many times to convey the relationship that humans have to God by making the human comparison of child to father. On the cross, it is reported that Jesus said, "Father, into thy hands I commit my spirit."[29]

This particular metaphor of God as father is clear to all humans because everyone has a father. This metaphor turns out to be a mixed metaphor with regard to personal interpretation. If someone has had a negative experience with an earthly father that experience gets projected onto the "heavenly father." However, all humans understand the concept of what a father symbolizes.

28 Matthew 26:57-67.
29 Luke 23:26-49.

Summary

The presentation of the various critical terms categories and subcategories of metaphor is helpful in visualizing how the structure of the sacred narratives of Siddhartha and Jesus accomplish the overall function of bridging the gap between human experience and the realm of the numinous. The critical terms body, image, God, performance, territory, sacrifice, and transformation are selected as examples of critical terms because they are ubiquitous concepts found in religious narratives and practices worldwide. The specific subcategories of spatial orientation, fundamental cultural concepts, and ontological metaphor, are chosen as representative metaphoric structures because of their "rootedness" within the conceptual framework of human cognitive processes.

Within the narratives considered in this dissertation we see both Siddhartha and Jesus speaking in metaphor and performing metaphoric acts for the purpose of helping humans cross the bridge between the world of the material and the world of the spiritual. The oral and written narratives that are created to communicate the significance of these two lives also employ the use of critical terms and metaphoric descriptions to provide a means for grounding the ethereal concepts that are central to their messages to the earthly world of humans.

Having considered the metaphoric structure of the narratives, I would now like to turn to some conclusions about the narratives of Siddhartha and Jesus that can be drawn from this research project.

Chapter 6

Summary, Limitations, and Conclusions

Summary

This study begins with a hypothesis about the concept of human cognitive development employing the model of religious thought and experience as a by-product of evolution. The theories of agent detection, narrative etiology, and mind theory coalesce to provide a model for assessing the possible origins of spiritual experience and religious ideas. One hypothesis that uses this model is the theory of Michael Shermer which combines the three above named theories into one explanation. In this research, Shermer's theory is followed to examine the likelihood that the human cognitive manifestations of patternicity and agenticity set the stage for the possibility that our perception of both Siddhartha and Jesus could be understood in the context of the functioning of the human brain interpreting experience through perception of certain patterns and then attributing meaning to those patterns for the purpose of survival.

As previously discussed, it is hypothesized that in the early stages of human cognitive development the human brain began to see patterns, the patterns were projected onto environmental agents, and then a story was created to explain the experience. Story is a continuum of narrative from empirical fact on one end to fantasy on the other. At one end of the continuum is empirical truth. That is, the words of the story correspond as accurately as possible to the actual events that occurred. At the other end of the

continuum is fiction: narratives that are not intended to depict externally validated events but rather imaginal thought. Somewhere in the middle of the continuum is a place where empirical fact and imaginal thought are pressed together and become something different than either one. Those stories at the center of the continuum are the ones that develop into the cultural myths and sacred narratives. Northrop Frye believes that two types of these stories take form in most societies and explains this process when he states,

> At the center is a body of "serious" stories: they may be asserted to have really happened, but what is important about them is not that, but that they are stories which it is particularly urgent for the community to know. They tell us about the recognized gods, the legendary history, the origins of law, class structure, kinship formations, and natural features. [They] become the cultural possession of a specific society: they form the verbal nucleus of a shared tradition. . . . The less serious stories become folktales. . . . and are told simply for entertainment.[1]

Frye goes on to explain that myth, as he understands it, is a narrative that gives two inconsistent messages: first, this is what happened, and second, this is almost certainly not what happened.[2] Returning to the theories of William Bascom discussed in chapter one, we can see that his beliefs about the formal features of prose narratives are consistent with Frye's perception that the stories themselves evolve over time.

In many cultures there are mythological stories that describe individuals that are considered "heroes." The aggregate attributes of those individuals deemed to be heroes have been reported by a number of theorists from different disciplines of study. If we follow Shermer's theory, the process of labeling someone a hero would occur by first developing some conceptualization about what attributes make up a hero; encountering

1 Frye and Denham, *Myth and Metaphor: Selected Essays 1974-1988*, 5.
2 Ibid., 4.

someone upon whom that conceptualization is projected; labeling that person with the term; then developing a story about how that individual acted out the hero qualities. Today, those of us who watch the news on television experience this process daily. For example, a child falls into a rapid river and a bystander jumps in to save the child. After both are on the river bank, observers talk to the rescuer who is humble and says anyone would have done the same. The bystanders tell the story to the news reporter and the news tells the story to millions of people that evening. In this situation the observers have in their minds what attributes constitute a hero (selfless, courageous, daring, humble, etc.). They see this man acting in ways that resonate with their conception of a hero. They label him a hero. They tell the story to the evening news who reports the story to the world at large.

The question arises, "Could this process have been applied to the lives of Siddhartha and Jesus?" If so, it might have taken the following form: (1) The community of individuals into which Siddhartha and Jesus were born had a conceptualization of what a Buddha, or a Savior, was like from their traditions; (2) The community observed the actions of Siddhartha and Jesus; (3) The community projected its concept of hero onto Siddhartha and Jesus; (4) The story of each man was created over time in the retelling; (5) The stories became the sacred narratives.

For the purpose of this research, it is not important whether Siddhartha or Jesus *actually* embodied the qualities of the hero, or whether they *actually* performed all the identified hero behaviors. Whatever actually happened with Siddhartha and Jesus, the

question is did the stories and narratives eventually written about them contain the attributes expected of a hero. The next question is whether the reading of these narratives, in which the attributes are embedded, results in the hero pattern being identified in the *readers*' mind.

In the far distant past, the process would have been to develop the hero pattern consisting of certain qualities, see those qualities in someone, label that person a hero, and tell (or write) a story about the person. Today, with respect to heroes of the past, we are going through that process in reverse. No one alive today has encountered either Siddhartha or Jesus. All that we know of these two individuals is recorded in the narratives written about them. Today, we read the narratives and if our minds recognize the hero pattern (aggregate attributes), we recognize a hero (Buddha or Savior).

To evaluate this "reverse" process of recognizing a hero, this study employs the explanatory method to describe the theories of narratization, patternicity, and agenticity of the human brain to myth making; discusses the linguistic use of metaphor in sacred narratives; applies theories of the functions of mythology in the human psyche to the interpretation of sacred narrative; and recounts the myth of "The Hero's Quest." The experimental method is used to compare the mythic hero patterns identified by von Hahn, Rank, Raglan, Campbell, and Dundes to the mythic narratives of Siddhartha Gautama and Jesus of Nazareth to determine if they result in a "good fit" as measured by the statistical methods of validity and reliability.

This study begins with the explanatory method by considering the concept of human cognitive development. The theory of Michael Shermer regarding the human cognitive manifestations of patternicity and agenticity sets the stage for the possibility that our perception of both Siddhartha and Jesus could be understood in the context of the functioning of the human brain interpreting experience through the perception of certain patterns and then attributing meaning to those patterns for the purpose of survival.

After the brain establishes a pattern of perception and attributes meaning to the pattern, the process of narratization takes over and the human mind develops a "story" to explain the pattern. For the purpose of this research the narratization theory of Julian Jaynes is used for guidance. It proposes that the ability to perform this function of story-making is critical to the individual's state of mental health and ability to successfully deal with the world outside of the self. The discussion progresses by centering on the relationship between the functioning of the brain and the process of narratization. Consciousness is defined by Jaynes as the functional employment of internal narratization which gives structure and meaning to external events that are unique or stressful in some way. Several theories explaining how the process of narratization evolves and its impact on humanity are discussed. The implication of external, written narratization as opposed to internal and external verbal narratization is explored including some theories about how narratives can be understood through explanation or interpretation.

At this point the question arises "Why does narratization occur?" It seems things could go along nicely with the brain just performing patternization, agenticity, and

projection. Why does a story about the process develop? And, why is this part of the process seemingly so important to humans?

One explanation might be that life is lived like a story. As human beings, we live a narrative life that has a beginning, middle, and end. Because we experience our lives as unfolding events, it makes sense that "story," or narrative, would resonate with our psyches. We view ourselves as the central charter in the *story* of our lives, and as previously discussed, we must be able to engage in this type of secondary process thinking in order to function in society.

Humans are, generally speaking, a communal species. We like to talk about ourselves and talk to others. Historically, this process probably also had survival significance. Talking to one another provides reality testing to confirm or contradict individual perceptions about experience. As people learned to communicate with each other they were able to work together to provide for not only the individual but the collective community as well. They were able to hunt together, gather food, build houses, and group together for protection; all of these advantages aided in the survival of the group.

The process of developing a narrative story seems to be natural to humans. Most of us have had the experience of being so impressed by a story that we are changed in some fundamental way by that experience. Afterwards, we never see things quite the same way again. Take, for example, the criminal who, upon hearing the story of the gospel of Christ, completely changes and acts like a different person. After having such a powerful experience there is generally a "need" to "tell" others about the story. Sometimes we need

to tell the story many times before the "drive to tell" lessens. It is as if we cannot assimilate the story ourselves until we have repeated it many times.

Throughout time, people have shared their experiences with each other in conversation and then, after the development of writing, through written documents like letters or journals. Toward the end of the nineteenth century, the common experience of relief after telling someone else about a significant event became the cornerstone of Sigmund Freud's newly evolving "talking cure" for psychopathology.[3] Since that time, psychotherapy (which harks back to the oral tradition of telling stories), has generally consisted of a patient telling a therapist his or her story for the purpose of various goals. The patient's goal may be to feel better, or understand something, but it may also be just to "tell the story."

Mythic narrative often follows the process just described above. That is, one person tells a story to another until eventually it becomes the property of the community. Roland Barthes, the French philosopher, describes the value of mythic narrative as ". . . being a type of speech. Of course, it is not any type: language needs special condition in order to become myth [narrative] . . . but, what must be firmly established at the start is that myth [narrative] is a system of communication, that it is a message."[4]

The importance of narrative as a message needs to be emphasized here. Although, as discussed earlier, many scholars of religious studies criticize Joseph Campbell for

---

3 Joseph R. Rychlak, *Introduction to Personality and Psychotherapy: A Theory-Construction Approach* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1973), 69–80.
4 Barthes, *Mythologies*, 109.

espousing a theory of myth that includes universal themes, I believe this present study will provide a basis for considering the possibility that a pattern might be embedded in a narrative, and that the perception (whether conscious or unconscious) of that pattern will resonate with the receiver of the narrative resulting in a form of cognitive and affective understanding that could be universally comprehended.

When considering the basic definition of myth as a message and discussing the historical development of mythology, Campbell states:

> The comparative study of the mythologies of the world compels us to view the cultural history of mankind as a unit; for we find that such themes as the Fire-theft, Deluge, Land of the Dead, Virgin Birth, and Resurrected Hero have a worldwide distribution, appearing everywhere in new combinations, while remaining, like the elements of a kaleidoscope, only a few and always the same. Furthermore, whereas in tales told for entertainment such mythical themes are taken lightly—obviously in a spirit of play—they appear also in religious contexts, where they are accepted not only as factually true but even as revelations of the verities to which the culture is a living witness and from which it derives both its spiritual authority and its temporal power.[5]

Here, we see the importance of the message in narrative. Paraphrasing Campbell, one could say that mythic narrative may be defined as a collective belief that is accepted by the community and used to direct social interaction. Sometimes the etiology of a socially significant mythic narrative may be found in the dream of an individual member of the society, as in the example of Black Elk who was given a dream about the fate of his people. This dream had a significant impact on the future of the Lakota people and the way they organized their community. Walker describes this process in his discussion of Lakota beliefs and rituals when he states:

---

5 Campbell, *The Mythic Dimension: Selected Essays 1959-1987*, 10.

> A man in whom the people had confidence sought a vision and in the vision was instructed in the forms and ceremonies for establishing an association, and what the duties of such as association were. He would instruct others in these matters and associate with them for the purposes of the organization in compliance with this vision.[6]

Within the Lakota community, the individual's dream may be repeated or reinforced by dreams and actions of the other community members. These dreams become the communal "glue" that binds the group together and gives them a common reference for meaning. They believe that "the creator, the old person, God by whatever name, spoke through dreams and visions . . . ."[7] For the Plains Indians, the process of sharing would often begin with a novice seeking guidance from an elder shaman. The seeker is then instructed in how to go about obtaining a vision in which he might receive a message from a dream-spirit. The initiate returns from the vision and tells the experience to the shaman who interprets the experience. The process is then completed by the dreamer retelling the vision to the community during ceremonial circumstances. Telling the story and the reenactment of the ceremony then becomes a ritual of significance for the community.[8]

Stories, narratives, and myths provide the opportunity to see, perceive, or reframe events in a new way. The realization of the new perspective often hits unexpectedly. James Hillman, an American archetypal psychologist, describes this experience as the "process of seeing through." He outlines four steps in this process as follows:

---

6 James R. Walker, *Lakota Belief and Ritual*, ed. R. DeMallie and E. Jahner (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1980), 185.
7 William Brandon, *Indians* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1987), 329.
8 Lee Irwin, *The Dream Seekers* (Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1994), 168–9.

> First there is the psychological moment, a moment of reflection, wonder, puzzlement, initiated by the soul which intervenes and countervails what we are in the midst of doing, hearing, reading, watching . . . . Second, psychologizing (seeing through) justifies itself . . . . As we penetrate or try to bring out, expose, or show why, we believe that what lies behind or within is truer and more real . . . . Third, the present event . . . is given a narrative . . . . A tale is told of it in the metaphors of history, or physical causality, or logic . . . . Fourth are the tools with which the operation proceeds. Here we return once again to ideas, for ideas are the soul's tools. Without them we cannot see, let alone see through.[9]

The discipline of psychology played an important role in the development of the discipline of religious studies as did anthropology, sociology, theology, literature, history, and linguistics to name a few. Here, Hillman describes a psychological process that may explain why narratization arises after patternicity and agenticity. The construction of a narrative plays an important role in the process of the evolution of understanding—the understanding of an event, a feeling, a perception, etc. It is, in part, the way humans make sense out of their experiences.

The discipline of depth psychology may also provide clues about why specific characteristics found in certain stories result in the perception of the narrative being sacred. From a depth psychological perspective, religious experience is equal to numinous experience. Within this theoretical framework, the divine is unable to be differentiated from the whole of consciousness. This belief is the reason for my earlier statement that I do not totally agree with Jaynes's definition of consciousness as just "narratization." Narratization is important, but it is not the totality of consciousness.

Numinous experience is the direct experience of the deep-seated intra-psychic structures called archetypes. The term archetype can be equated with the religious term

9 James Hillman, *Re-Visioning Psychology* (New York: Harper Collins, 1975), 140–1.

spirit and is not only a manifestation of the divine but also functions to organize the individual's personality. In other words, an archetype is a spiritual law within the psyche that produces the development of the psyche. As an example, the father of a child represents to the child an individual model of what has been known mythically as "God the Father." Behind the specific features of the personal father exists the archetypal power of the divine Father as represented in many religions.

The notion that the very structure of the mind is formed by essential components of the spirit is not widely accepted because our culture has bifurcated the religious experience and worldly experience as if they are mutually exclusive events. In addition, the numinous foundation of psyche cannot be discerned by self-analysis or other quantifiable investigative attempts because the origin of the numinous is not within our measurable reality; rather, our physical reality is within the numinous.

From this perspective, the existence of this organizing principle within the human psyche is the reason that when presented with a constellation of attributes within a narrative the human psyche resonates with a deep understanding. Just as there is an intra-psychic archetypal template of "Mother" and "Father," there is also an archetypal template of "Hero." The notion that the archetypal "Hero" attributes being embedded in a narrative could resonate with the human psyche to produce a recognition response propels this study.

At the most basic level, narrative is an account of an event using language to communicate meaning; therefore, it is essential to look at the nature, the development, and the function of language as a precursor to the interpretation and understanding of sacred

and mythic narratives. Within this study the central place of metaphor in language is examined including both its augmentation and reductionist facets which leads into a review of hermeneutics and the opposition between explanation and interpretation of a narrative.

The definitions and functions of metaphor are central to language and narrative. Lakoff and Johnson's theories of metaphoric functions are employed to evaluate the metaphoric nature of the narratives of Siddhartha and Jesus. In this study, metaphor is presented as a word or phrase denoting one kind of object or idea, and is used in place of the other to suggest similarity between them. When reading the narratives of Siddhartha and Jesus which contain the embedded attributes that define "hero;" using the name Siddhartha and/or Jesus functions in a metaphoric way to connote sameness. That is, Siddhartha and Jesus are seen as "the same as" the word hero. As previously stated, it is not just about the function of the words, the process of metaphoric representation is built into the way we think. The pervasive nature of metaphor often goes unattended in our daily lives. This quality of metaphor allows it to function subliminally, below the level of awareness. The expressions that are used when describing a person or an event translate into a conceptual framework. This process can be better understood by deconstructing the functions of myth using examples provided by Lakoff and Johnson.

The metaphoric descriptions in the narratives of Siddhartha and Jesus emphasize the conceptual nature of metaphor in relation to these two figures. For example, in the narrative of Siddhartha we read the following:

> I heard and learned this, Lord, from the Blessed One's own lips:
> Mindful and fully aware the Bodhisatta, the Being Dedicated to Enlightenment, appeared in the Heaven of the Contented. And I remember that as a wonderful and

marvelous quality of the Blessed One.

I heard and learned this, Lord, from the Blessed One's own lips: Mindful and fully aware the Bodhisatta remained in the Heaven of the Contented.

For the whole of that life-span the Bodhisatta remained in the Heaven of the Contented.

Mindful and fully aware the Bodhisatta passed away from the Heaven of the Contented and descended into his mother's womb.[10]

In this passage Siddhartha is described as being in the Heaven of the Contented and volitionally descending from this implicitly "godly" place to earth and into the confinement of his earthly mother's womb. From both mythological and psychological points of view, this description like many others found in the sutras, encourages the reader to conceptualize Siddhartha as "god-like," "super-human," "powerful," and so forth. This interpretation of the narrative is not one that Buddhism would embrace. Within the spiritual confines of Buddhism, Siddhartha is not considered a god. He directly stated he was only human. However, from a more distant perspective, for one outside the Buddhist "belief-system," it is certainly understandable why the actions of Siddhartha could be interpreted as "god-like."

Moving from Siddhartha to Jesus, a similar pattern can be identified. Of course, one difference is that Jesus openly said he was "one with god."

In the narrative of Jesus we read the following:

After six days Jesus took with him Peter, James and John the brother of James, and led them up a high mountain by themselves. There he was transfigured before them. His face shone like the sun, and his clothes became as white as the light. Just then there appeared before them Moses and Elijah, talking with Jesus. Peter said to Jesus, 'Lord, it is good for us to be here. If you wish, I will put up three shelters—one for you, one for Moses and one for Elijah.' While he was still speaking, a bright cloud covered them, and a voice from the cloud said, 'This is my Son, whom I love, with him I am well pleased. Listen to him!' When the

10 Majjhima-nikāya 123; Dīgha-nikāya 14.

> disciples heard this, they fell facedown to the ground, terrified. But Jesus came and touched them. 'Get up,' he said. 'Don't be afraid.' When they looked up they saw no one except Jesus. As they were coming down the mountain, Jesus instructed them. 'Don't tell anyone what you have seen, until the Son of Man has been raised from the dead.'[11]

As in the passage about Siddhartha, Jesus is portrayed as "god-like" and "powerful." These kinds of metaphoric descriptions promote the linking of a concept such as "god-like" with the object of the description, thereby producing the metaphoric leap. Chapter five of this study includes numerous examples of the linking of metaphoric subcategories, as proposed by Lakoff and Johnson, with passages from the narratives of both Siddhartha and Jesus.

A second paradigm to consider when evaluating the metaphoric power of a sacred narrative is the use of what are considered "critical terms." These terms describe core concepts in the study of religion and are illustrations of metaphoric interpretation. Common religious critical terms are used in this study to exemplify the presence of these concepts within the narratives of both Siddhartha and Jesus. In chapter five of this study many of the terms considered "critical terms" in religious studies are applied to the narratives of Siddhartha and Jesus. For example, the work of Donald Lopez, a Buddhist scholar, is mentioned in the discussion of the critical term "belief."[12] People read the narratives of Siddhartha and Jesus and then develop a belief in the divinity of these two individuals. Lopez suggests that religion is the external manifestation of the ineffable concept of belief. Additional critical terms evaluated are body, image, God, performance,

11 Matthew 17:1-9.
12 Lopez, "Belief."

territory, sacrifice, and transformation. Each of these concepts is applied to the narratives of Siddhartha and Jesus in an attempt to demonstrate the presence of significant metaphoric terms that are often rooted in religiously noteworthy texts.

The study continues by employing the experimental method of data collection which begins with the recognition of five prominent theorists who have written about the myth of the hero from 1909 to 1990. The collective attributes identified by these theorists are used as the primary attributes for classification of a hero within a narrative. The researcher first read selected narratives of Siddhartha and Jesus to identify which narratives appear to have examples of the hero attributes embedded in them. The narrative selections were then randomized and four independent raters were selected to read the narratives and identify any narrative selections that appear to contain the selected mythic hero attributes. The rater responses were evaluated statistically for validity and reliability.

The first step in establishing content validity is for one researcher to read the selected narratives and identify any mythic attributes present. The second step in establishing content validity is to include four independent raters to read the selected narratives and identify any mythic attributes present. The data from all the raters is evaluated using the statistical method of kappa coefficient of inter-rater agreement for items of category. In this study, all of the kappa coefficients were evaluated using the guideline outlined by Landis and Koch,[13] where the strength of the kappa coefficients are

13 J.R. Landis and G.G. Koch, "The Measurement of Observer Agreement for Categorical Data," *Biometrics* no. 33 (1977): 159–74.

as follows: 0.01 – 0.20 is slight agreement; 0.21 – 0.40 is fair agreement; 0.41 – 0.60 is moderate agreement; 0.61 – 0.80 is substantial agreement; and 0.81 – 1.00 is almost perfect agreement.

Analysis of the data indicates that all the attributes are identified in both the narratives of Siddhartha and Jesus although the reliability of the identification of the attributes in specific passages ranges from slight to almost perfect.

Although all the primary attributes are identified by all the raters, the question arises as to why the inter-rater reliability varied from slight to almost perfect within the passages of the narratives and from attribute to attribute. Several explanations for this phenomenon are advanced.

First, the explanation for the variable inter-rater reliability might have to do with the raters themselves. Perhaps lack of familiarity with the language or the story causes some complication. All of the raters are "Westerners." That is, they are educated in the United States. None of the raters have experience with the Buddhist Sutras. At the same time, only one of the raters has experience with Biblical Scriptures. Although as a group living in the United States, they are undoubtedly more familiar with Biblical stories and concepts than with Buddhist Sutras. The fact that none of the raters are particularly familiar with the narrative passages can be viewed in both positive and negative ways. The positive result is that lack of familiarity prevents a certain predisposition to bias and allows for the interpretations of the passages to be "fresh" and unconstrained. The negative result is that there may be confusion about the meaning of words, and the

confusion might influence the interpretation as discussed below.

Second, the polysemic nature of language may have interfered with the interpretation of the narrative selections. Although all the attributes are identified, the passages in which they are identified varied and some of the passages are interpreted to contain several attributes. The narrative passages that the raters evaluate are, on one hand, simply stories. However, on the other hand, they are quite metaphorical and symbolic in nature requiring the rater to maintain a focused attention to pick out the potential attribute within the passage. Different people reading the same passage may interpret the passage in different ways depending on their understanding of the terms.

The task set forth in this research project is that of assessing whether the narratives of Siddhartha and Jesus fit a pattern that human beings find particularly meaningful: that of the hero. While other humans come and go, these two larger-than-life individuals continue to be studied, quoted, and worshiped. If, as this research hypothesizes, the narratives of Siddhartha and Jesus fit into a pattern that the human mind interprets as valuable and significant, and that meaningful pattern is projected on the individuals of Siddhartha and Jesus, that may, in part, answer the question of why these two men have enjoyed veneration for thousands of years.

Analysis of the data indicated that all the attributes of the hero pattern were identified in both the narratives of Siddhartha and Jesus although the strength of the identification or agreement among the raters ranged from slight to almost perfect. The results of this study supported the hypothesis that the narratives of Siddhartha and Jesus fit the pattern of the hero myth as exemplified by all the attributes being observed by four

different raters of different ages, backgrounds, and religious preferences. Although there were substantial findings, there was no consistency in the strength of the agreements which varied from one attribute to another and between narratives. However, the raters were able to identify all the attributes in both narratives which indicated the narratives do fit the hero pattern.

Limitations

This study is a preliminary study meant to inspire further questions and support the creation of research methods that include both scientific and religious hermeneutics. The variability of inter-rater reliability; rater lack of familiarity with the mythic language of the stories; personal interpretation of narrative descriptions; restricted religious backgrounds of raters; the limited number of raters; and the polysemic nature of language are all limitations on the scope of this research. Any subsequent research evaluating narrative etiology and mind theory should address these limitations. This particular study, if repeated, could provide additional insights by including a larger number of raters who are more diverse in their religious backgrounds and understanding. I believe repeating the study addressing the above named limitations and including sacred scriptures regarding Muhammad would result in a more robust research project.

As previously stated, although the literature acknowledges that any attempt to empirically evaluate and quantify mythic structures of sacred narratives is a difficult task, subject to dispute and controversy, the overwhelming opinion of theorists studying sacred narratives is that an attempt should be made to do just that.

Reviewing the exhortation of the Biblical scholar, Morton Smith, we are reminded

that he urges,

> For good observation it is of course necessary to study with sympathy. But for good judgment it is necessary to regain objectivity. The study of religion is in this respect like the study of poetry. One must come to the material with what Coleridge called 'that willing suspension of disbelief which constitutes poetic faith,' or one will never feel the moving power which the material has, and one will never, therefore, be able to understand what the believers are talking about. But neither religions, nor even poems, exist in vacuo. Therefore, having experienced what the ceremony or the composition has to offer, the historian, like the critic, must then be able to return from the world of imagination to that of fact, and to determine the relation of the poetic or religious complex to its environment in the historical world.[14]

Smith is referring to the historical method used to study religion, but his point is also valid for this particular research which is an attempt to understand the mythic narrative in the context of its environment, including the context of human cognition and reasoning. While the environment of the mythic narrative includes the concepts of story, language, and metaphor, it also includes human reason and understanding.

Conclusions

The application of the experimental design and the statistical evaluation of the data collected is a unique approach to the understanding of religious narrative which yields not only qualitative, but quantitative results. Lakoff and Johnson support this type of research and, in fact, they call for more experimental approaches to the understanding of narrative and metaphor. In support of this type of research they declare,

> It is crucial to recognize that questions about the nature of meaning, conceptualization, reasoning, and language are questions requiring empirical study; they cannot be answered adequately by mere a priori philosophizing . . . . What is needed is still more empirical research that seeks converging evidence and is gathered by using different empirical methods of inquiry.[15]

14 Smith, "Historical Method in the Study of Religion," 15.
15 Lakoff and Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, 146–7.

The combination of an explanatory and experimental design in a study to evaluate religious narrative is a change of approach. Although the combination of the two methods is becoming more frequent, it is a deviation from the generally accepted method of evaluating religious texts. As Brockelman points out in his work on the narrative approach to religious understanding and truth, American's were quite dissatisfied with the state of the culture and religious traditions at the time of the millennial change. He maintains that the shift from modernity to postmodernity opens up the possibility for new spiritual understanding by permitting an alliance between science and religion which allows the two disciplines to focus on the same reality which he considers the whole universe. With the shift from modernity to postmodernity, Brockelman advances the notion that he and many other religious scholars are attempting to develop a "postmodern, narrative model of religious knowledge and interpretation which might enable us to better address the spiritual issues and needs we face today."[16]

The transition from the second to the third millennium of the Common Era was a crossroads where uncommon events occurred: the spiritual realm seemed to incarnate the secular world while the mythical domain moved in to animate literal territory. As the second millennium gave way to the third, the centuries converged in a thin space where the spiritual realm and humankind squeezed together to pass through a portal of change that ushered them into a new story about life. There were many stories told about the third millennium of the Common Era. "New beginnings" and "last times" were common themes for these stories, so is it any wonder that the consummation of this event was

16 Brockelman, *The Inside Story A Narrative Approach to Religious Understanding and Truth.*, xii.

nurtured in the form of story? No wonder at all, for stories are psyche's sustenance—the food that keeps our souls alive.

There was a particular energy in the air as the year 2000 approached and virtually everyone was telling a story about something that would happen as the midnight hour arrived. Our souls were quickened just by imagining it all. Barry Lopez knows this feeling when he writes:

> 'I would ask you to remember only this one thing,' said Badger. 'The stories people tell have a way of taking care of them. If stories come to you, care for them. And learn to give them away, where they are needed. Sometimes a person needs story more than food to stay alive. This is why we put these stories in each other's memory. This is how people care for themselves.'[17]

The world waited with anticipation as television broadcasted the first celebration from the South Pacific. From all the excitement it seemed evident that change was anticipated at the time of the millennial shift, but one of the legacies we inherited from the passing age of modernity presented us with an ironic twist. We all focused on the literal event of numerical change from 1999 to 2000, as if that was the exact moment when a new era would begin.

What I would like to suggest is that the event of the millennial change is not a discrete point in time, but rather encompasses a range of time, and it is not just a literal event, but a mythic one as well. The irony of the worldwide celebration of January 2000 was that the new millennium, which to many people represented the postmodern era and a re-inclusion of the mythic realm, does not literally announce itself. The empirical characteristic "see me—count me," is the hallmark of modernity. In contrast, the

17 Lopez, *Crow and Weasel*, 48.

postmodern return of the mythic steals into our presence silently. It is this silent but undeniable presence that stirs the imagination, and as human beings we respond to the stirring.

To speak in general terms, the industrialized world, filled with drive and "will to power," spent the last several hundred years amassing literal "facts" of experience through the efforts of empirical research and the accumulation of scientific knowledge only to discover, as Friedrich Nietzsche believed, "Only where the radiance of the myth falls is the life of the Greeks bright; elsewhere it is gloomy."[18] As the second millennium drew to a close, the Industrial Age passed its apogee and a new narrative began. Mythological themes have become increasingly prominent in Western world consciousness. Of course, mythological themes have always been present, but the foreground-background experience of life shifts: sometimes the literal is in the fore and sometimes the mythic. Many contemporary philosophers maintain that since the middle of the twentieth century, Western society has been experiencing a fundamental shift in belief about knowledge and understanding.[19] The period of time in which this change of perception has taken place has been designated the postmodern era because it moves beyond the central tenets of modernity, which posits that the scientific method is the most valid way of acquiring knowledge.[20] Postmodern philosophy affirms that there are other valid ways of "knowing" as Lyotard points out:

---

18 Friedrich Nietzsche, "Will to Power," in *A Nietzsche Reader*, trans. R.J. Hollingdale (London: Penquin Books, 1977), 215.
19 Jean-Francois Lyotard, *The Postmodern Condition: A Report of Knowledge* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997); John Horgan, *The End of Science: Facing the Limits of Knowledge in the Twilight of the Scientific Age* (New York: Broadway, 1996); Lawrence E. Cahoone, ed., "Introduction," in *From Modernism to Postmodernism: An Anthology* (Cambridge: Blackwell, 1996).
20 Cahoone, "Introduction," 12.

> In the first place, scientific knowledge does not represent the totality of knowledge; it has always existed in addition to, and in competition and conflict with, another kind of knowledge, which I will call narrative . . . . I do not mean to say that narrative knowledge can prevail over science, but its model is related to ideas of internal equilibrium and conviviality next to which contemporary scientific knowledge cuts a poor figure . . . . [21]

Exactly when the era of modernity began is a topic of debate in intellectual circles. The word modern simply means "what is current today." However, the term modernity refers to a new conceptualization of civilization that began several hundred years ago in Western Europe. Some historians identify the origin of modernity in the sixteenth century with the beginning of the Protestant Reformation.[22] Other theorists believe it began with the Scientific Revolution of the Age of Enlightenment, which in seventeenth century Europe began when scientific knowledge was accumulating as such a rapid rate it was difficult to keep up with the progression of knowledge.[23] Langdon Gilkey describes the modern worldview as one based on "a philosophy built on faith in knowledge and its power to control, on the triumph through knowledge of human purposes over blind fate, and on the confidence that change, if guided by intelligence informed by inquiry, can realize human fulfillment in this life."[24]

The foundation of empiricism underlying modernity did enable Western society to develop tools and strategies for making human life somewhat easier and safer—up to a point. Developments in Newtonian physics, medicine, agriculture, and manufacturing allowed Western humanity to subordinate nature for the human benefits of increased health

---

21 Lyotard, *The Postmodern Condition: A Report of Knowledge*, 7.
22 Cahoone, "Introduction," 2.
23 Cahoone, "Introduction"; Vattimo, *The End of Modernity*.
24 Langdon Gilkey, *The Sacred and Society* (New York: Crossroad Publishers, 1981), 94–5.

and comfort, but in doing so the scales of life became weighted heavily toward the literal end of the continuum. This imbalance is partially responsible for the present disaster we are experiencing in the ecological, physical, economic and spiritual domains. Like a great web, they are all related. Whenever there is an imbalance in the mythic-to-literal relationship, catastrophe awaits.[25] The disaster could take many forms: Gunther Stent predicts a loss of motivation to pursue further scientific research as the returns diminish;[26] John Horgan anticipates the end of science and history as pure science runs out of revolutionary shifts in basic knowledge;[27] and Ray Kurzweil proposes that there will ultimately be no distinction between humans and computers.[28]

Fortunately, there is some unseen energy that attempt to balance the scales, and so at the end of the decade, the century, the millennium, we felt the power of that unseen energy. As Paul Brockelman explains:

> Just as the Copernican revolution and the Cartesian program triggered the advances of modern industrial and technological society, so too our present awareness of some of the implicit interpretive assumptions on which it rested and which it systematically avoided making conscious has led to a cultural and intellectual paradigm shift which some have termed "postmodern." [which includes] the broadened and deepened understanding of human, interpretive understanding (hermeneutic) which lies at the heart of the postmodern attitude.[29]

As previously pointed out, it seems that many people are becoming increasingly

---

25 Marcel Detienne, *The Creation of Mythology*, trans. Margaret Cook (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981).
26 Gunther S. Stent, *The Coming of the Golden Age: A View of the End of Progress* (New York: Natural History Press, 1969).
27 Horgan, *The End of Science: Facing the Limits of Knowledge in the Twilight of the Scientific Age*.
28 Ray Kurzweil, *The Age of Spiritual Machines When Computers Exceed Human Intelligence* (New York: Viking, 1999).
29 Brockelman, *The Inside Story A Narrative Approach to Religious Understanding and Truth.*, xi.

conscious of mythological themes. The rise in the popularity of mystical religions;[30] a renewed interest in homeopathic medicine;[31] and the dissemination of the new quantum physics[32] are just a few examples of the way that mythic thinking is filtering back into society at large. But why are myth and mythology important? And, why is it so important for there to be a balance between the literal and the mythic?

By balanced I mean we must include both literal and non-literal ways of knowing. Empiricism asserts that the only way to attain true or factual knowledge is through the process of the scientific method. This is an unbalanced thesis.[33] Other methods of acquiring knowledge have existed for a much longer time in the history of the world, and must be included in our thinking.[34] It is important that both literal and non-literal information; both empirical and mythical data; both external and internal experience, are maintained in a balance of understanding of, and appropriate response to reality—a response that uses all the data available, both empirical and mythical.

Marie-Louise von Franz, a Jungian analyst, points out that when one side predominates consistently over the other, a kind of possession occurs. When speaking of possession she states:

> It can be said that whenever someone is completely one-sidedly swept away by a pattern of behavior, adaptation is disturbed . . . . This probably is the natural basis in man, for he, too, tends to be swept away by certain patterns of behavior, that is by archetypal patterns, which cause affects and fantasies . . . . Possession for

30 Thom Hartman, *The Last Hours of Ancient Sunlight* (New York: Harmony, 1999); Dalai Lama, *Ethics for the New Millennium* (New York: Riverhead, 1999).
31 Chopra, *Quantum Healing*.
32 John Gribbin, *Schrodinger's Kittens and the Search for Reality* (Boston: Little, Brown Company, 1995); Fred Alan Wolf, *The Dreaming Universe* (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1995); Gary Zuckav, *The Dancing Wu Li Masters* (New York: William Morrow, 1979).
33 Thompson, *Foundations of Physiological Psychology*.
34 Wilbur, *A Brief History of Everything*.

> us is still just as bad as in primitive society, for it means being swept away by one tune in the melody of one's inner possibilities, and in that there is already a great amount of evil. Now you see why and how that links with pure evil in nature, because if you are swept away by an affect, it is exactly like landslide, but one within you rather that outside. The boulders of your affect roll over you, and you are completely overcome . . . . [Likewise], many modern scientists are like skulls rolling along, lacking any heart or other normal human reactions.[35]

Therefore, within this dissertation I have chosen to include both scientific and explanatory theories about why we respond to the world the way we do. I have been trying to demonstrate the importance of holding the balance between the literal and the non-literal domains of knowing by presenting data from both perspectives, including theories of hermeneutics, linguistics, neuroanatomy, neurophysiology, developmental psychology, historical record, and subjective experience. In addition, I compare the emphasis on the exclusion of the non-literal ways of knowing so characteristic of modernity, to the postmodern inclusion of mythic narrative as an equally valid and way of knowing. The hypothesis that a personal interpretation of a narrative is an equally valid method of interpreting data is included in this dissertation, but not to the exclusion of the literal, scientific way of knowing. Hopefully, we have learned from the scientifically driven age of modernity that holding the balance between mythic and literal ways of knowing is important.

Within this dissertation, mythic narrative is described as an important way human beings attain meaning and purpose; or, if not meaning and purpose, at least an experience of living. Although it is considered historically unreliable, and is scientifically devalued, the method of personal experience is something more primal as gnosis—a more

35 Marie-Louise von Franz, *Shadow and Evil in Fairy Tales* (Boxton: Shambhala, 1995), 181–3.

foundational way of grasping meaning. An opposing source of information is the more theoretically "solid" evidence produced by the fields of linguistics, neurology, developmental psychology, and history which collectively provide a more "scientific" basis for this work. Although it seems somehow incongruent to attempt to establish the validity of a mythic concept through the application of the modern scientific method, perhaps it's not so incongruent after all because one does not exist without the other. They do, of course, define each other.

The tension between the literal way of knowing and the mythic way of knowing seems to be caused by humanity taking a polar position and elevating one element over the other. Prior to the Age of Enlightenment, the mythic element reigned supreme through the influence of religious institutions. After the Age of Enlightenment, it was the literal element that dominated with the proliferation of scientific theories. Hopefully, in the postmodern era, a balance between the two elements can be achieved. Perhaps, if we continue to encourage the working together of human narrative interpretation and scientific reasoning we will see a new dimension of awareness emerge; one that includes the totality of possibilities, and one that opens up an evolution of human understanding. Personally, I came to this particular course of study with an inclination to consider *both* the literal and the metaphoric interpretations. As I said earlier, I believe these two aspects of life are complementary.

This dissertation follows Jung's belief that religion is a defense against religious experience and is a container for anxiety. In other words, it is difficult, if not impossible, for humans to understand a numinous encounter, and the "awful-ness" of it usually

produces tremendous anxiety. To manage these feelings we invent concepts to cognitively contain the experience. Thinking is what humans have become especially good at, and the thing that separates us from numerous other species.

One of the difficulties with conducting research in the field of religious studies is that we are confined to words that simply cannot describe what needs to be discussed. Because we exist in the physical, dualistic world of time and space, the opposing elements of this existence such as good and evil; light and dark; literal and mythic, and so forth, are inherent in our perceptions. It is so difficult for us to apprehend that which is of another dimension that we invent concrete concepts in a somewhat feeble attempt to grasp the ineffable. We use these concepts to talk about that which cannot be talked about. But, somehow it makes us feel better at least to try.

Once we have created mental concepts, we generate narratives around these concepts resulting in elaborate systems of explanation, all in the attempt to reassure ourselves that we really can "know" that which is unknowable. Here is a pitfall: He who thinks he knows does not know. So an inherent problem with this approach is that we can get "stuck" in the concepts, the words, the stories, and forget that they are just tools of reference pointing to that "other," the transcendent which we cannot conceptualize. God is one of those concepts. God is a thought, but the entity of the transcendent is beyond thought; beyond being; beyond non-being. Buddhahood is also one of those concepts. This is how religions are born.

Of course, words, concepts, language, and theological systems are all necessary for communication about life's experiences. Without them we would all be isolated in our

own solitary experience of life. We would not be able to push forward in personal experience because learning of another's experience often provides a springboard for our own new encounters. In this regard, each god is true and each religion is true in the sense that it is a metaphor for the cosmic reality of the transcendent.

In his comparison of Buddhism and Christianity the prominent Vietnamese Buddhist monk, Thich Nhat Hanh, describes the tension between concepts in religion and the experience of the religion when he states, "Discussing God is not the best use of our energy. If we touch the Holy Spirit, we touch God not as a concept but as a living reality. Reality is free from all notions. . . . It is our duty to transcend words and concepts to be able to encounter reality."[36] In his writing it can be clearly seen that he has a reverence for thoughtfulness and a sincere respect for concepts, but in the context of providing a means to reach a goal, not the end itself. The Buddhist emphasis on practice helps to keep the focus on the experience, not the concept. The same cannot be said for today's Christianity in which the practice of Christian principles has slipped quietly into the background.

Although they are separated by several hundred years and come from different cultures, the narrative messages of Siddhartha and Jesus are very similar if read metaphorically rather than literally. Within the early Christian community there was more diversity of belief than we see today owing to the copious redaction of Christian narratives by the Church officials. Elaine Pagels, a contemporary Biblical scholar proposes there was an early connection between Buddhists and the Gnostic Christians resulting in a conjoining of early beliefs within the two religions. She believes that

36 Thich Nhat Hanh, *Living Buddha, Living Christ* (New York: Riverhead Books, 1995), xvii.

Gnostic Christians encountered traveling Buddhists monks. As an example of the similarities of belief she cites the following passage from the Gospel of Thomas:

> Jesus said, 'If those who lead you say to you, 'Look, the Kingdom is in the sky,' then the birds of the sky will get there first. If they say, 'It is in the sea,' then the fish will get there first. Rather, the Kingdom is inside of you, and it is outside of you. When you come to know yourselves, then you will become known, and you will realize that it is you who are the children of the living father. But if you will not know yourselves, then you dwell in poverty, and it is you who are that poverty.'[37]

Clearly, both Siddhartha and Jesus recognize the spiritual reality that rests within is the transcendent reality. A person who realizes the presence of the transcendent reality in his/her own existence is often experienced by others as a magnetic person. The attraction can be very powerful when the archetype of the transcendent shines through an individual. Most of us have had an encounter with someone we might describe in this way.

Although there is this similarity of emphasis in both Siddhartha and Jesus, the religions that evolved from the two men offer different metaphoric narratives. Both of the narratives point to the reality that lies behind the world of our senses but with different emphases. The traditions that come from the Middle East to the West view "God" as the source of the mysterious and powerful energy experienced in nature or any other numinous encounter. The traditions that come from indigenous cultures and the Eastern cultures view God, or the representational image of the transcendent, as only the manifestation of the energy. In both traditions, East and West, the manifestations of the transcendent are personifications of the mysterious, numinous energy. In Eastern traditions the gods are

37 Elaine Pagels, *Beyond Belief: The Secret Gospel of Thomas* (New York: Random House, 2003), 48.

more representative of the powers of nature. They often represent different energy systems and are simply the instrument of the energy system.

Herein exists one of the differences between Siddhartha and Jesus. Siddhartha emerges from an Eastern tradition and is defined as the representative of "the way" to embody the source of transcendence. In this tradition, Siddhartha is a man, like any other, who learns to identify with the all-encompassing transcendent reality. Jesus, however, emerges from a more Western tradition and is presented as not only a representative of the transcendent, but as the actual person of the transcendent. The difference has to do with the way the narrative evolved over time. However, it is possible that Siddhartha and Jesus were saying the same thing. Each was just being presented to a different audience. When Jesus says, I and the father are one, it might indicate that they are two separate entities connected in some way (the mystery of the trinity). Or, it could be interpreted that when the transcendent is "within" you, you are one and the same. Both Siddhartha and Jesus pointed inward. Often the concepts we develop for the transcendent point to "out there." But, both Siddhartha and Jesus seem to say, "Look inside."

This dissertation can be criticized for the particular view of mythology advocated. Although this research project is not based on the work of Joseph Campbell, the symbolic interpretation of myth as promoted by Eliade and Campbell is the view presented. Of religion and religious metaphor Campbell would undoubtedly say, "truth is one, but the wise ones speak of it in many ways." Campbell's perspective can be defended despite the recent criticisms of his "universalist" view, on the basis that it is the pioneer's job to have the first word, not the last word. Campbell drew people to the study of mythology.

Whether you agree with him or not, he did more to open up the contemporary discussion of mythology then most of his critics combined. Whether his view is considered simplistic, over-inclusive, or just poor scholarship, it resonates with a many people. However, this view of mythology does not fare well in today's discipline of religious studies, and so it must be addressed.

This research project did spring from the proposition that there are common mythic themes evident in the narratives of widely divergent cultures. This is Campbell's view, although he is not the only one to espouse this proposal, he is probably the theory's most popular proponent. The criticism of this view was addressed in Chapter Two of this dissertation. Akin to this universalistic theme in mythology is the proposition of archetypal psychology that there are universal images existing in the unconscious realm of humans. These images are constellations that are the psychic inheritance of humans just as physical characteristics are inherited through genetics. Archetypes are conceptualized as spiritual principles that originate from the objective psyche and have a function in the organization of the empirical personality of each individual.

The concepts of universal themes in mythology and of archetypal energies in the psyche are related and support each other. If it is true that there are similar mythological themes to be found in divergent cultures that are wholly unrelated to each other and located in geographically distant places then one explanation for this occurrence is that there are archetypal images inherent in the human psyche which causes the creation of mythic narratives replete with the same images. There are two basic explanations for the occurrence of similar motifs in the narratives of distant cultures. The first is the theory of

diffusion. That is, people from distant locations traveled to a new location bringing with them the themes of their narratives. The second explanation is that of the universal archetypes embedded in the human psyche that produce the same narrative themes.

In every discipline of knowledge there is a cycle of criticism that occurs. First, a theory regarding that particular field of study is proposed and then a reactive cycle of criticism occurs as the knowledge base is refined. Theories go out of favor and then often recycle through again as new information or new perspectives are gained.

Although both the symbolic interpretation of mythic narrative and universal theme proposition of mythic narrative have been criticized in recent years, this is not the first round of criticism, and it will probably not be the last. However, there are still significant sites of research and education in both mythology and psychology that embrace the symbolic-universal theme interpretation of myth and the existence of numinous archetypes. These theories should not be entirely discredited because they offer intellectual verities that will undoubtedly recycle again.

The methodology of this research project was constructed to evaluate the possibility that the mental construct of the "hero," embedded in religious narratives, could be one cause for the continued reverence of both Siddhartha and Jesus. If one holds the view that universal themes do not exist in mythology or psychology then this research will be judged to be built on an untenable foundation.

This research project can also be criticized with regard to its methodology which includes both the explanatory method and the experimental method. This is a somewhat unorthodox way to address a research project in religious studies. However, as noted

earlier in this chapter, it is being advocated by some religious studies scholars as a way to advance research in this discipline. Nevertheless, this combination of research methods is not the usual and accepted method of conducting research in the field of religious studies. One risk in combining these methods is that the research will be viewed as indefensible. Hopefully, over time, the field of religious studies will see an increase in novel approaches to questions of religious significance.

The limitations of this particular research project were outlined earlier in this chapter and include the limited number of independent raters; the rater lack of familiarity with the mythic language of the stories; and the restricted religious backgrounds of the raters. To provide a more robust research project, a replication of this study should include a greater number of raters with an increased variety of backgrounds.

The criticism that the raters should be more familiar with the narrative languages is of questionable significance. One goal of this research is to test the proposition that there are archetypal constructs embedded in the narratives. If, in fact, there are universal archetypes existent in the human psyche that produce similar mythic themes, then theoretically the raters should be able to identify the themes regardless of their familiarity with the narratives. However, it is a reality that words are abstractions, and because this is true, the nature of words allows for multiple interpretations between individuals. The polysemic nature of language is a basic limitation on the scope of this research project.

The limitation of personal interpretation of the narrative descriptions is similar to the limitation that words are abstractions. There simply is no way to account for the personal interpretation of a written narrative. As discussed in chapter two of this

dissertation, a written narrative presents a particular hermeneutic challenge because it does not allow the option of questions and answers that would be allowable in a verbal discussion of the narrative. When the narrative to be interpreted is written, the reader must make certain assumptions that may not be accurate or consistent.

The statistical analysis of the inter-rater reliability shows variability in the interpretation of which narrative passages contained the target attributes. A post-test debriefing of the raters might assist in determining how the raters interpreted the individual passages. In addition, although the study is based on a collection of attributes presented by five notable theorists, it is possible that some of the attributes are intrinsically stronger than others. Although collectively the list of hero attributes was put forth by von Hahn, Rank, Raglan, Campbell, and Dundes, not all of the attributes were present in each individual list. In other words, not all the theorists identify exactly the same attributes. The list of hero attributes that were used in this study is a compilation of the individual attributes identified by each theorist. Although there is a substantial repetition of attributes, not all the theorists identify exactly the same attributes. Therefore, it is possible that some of the identified attributes are more representative of the hero constellation than other attributes. With the statistical analysis in place it is possible to eliminate those attributes that show low reliability, or alternatively, choose other narrative passages that might result in high inter-rater reliability for certain attributes.

A replication of this study that addressed the identified limitations and includes the narratives of Mohammed would be an interesting project.

In summary, this research project does show that the narratives of Siddhartha and Jesus do contain the attributes that exist in the hero pattern. The results may indicate one reason why these two men have been elevated and revered for thousands of years. However, because the function of mythological narratives is to produce a transformation of consciousness, the decision as to whether Siddhartha was the Buddha, or Jesus was the Christ, remains a judgment to be made only by each discerning individual.

Bibliography

Aeschylus. *Prometheus Bound: Aeschylus II Four Tragedies*. Translated by David Grene. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.

Agamben, Giorgio. *Stanzas: Word and Phantasm in Western Culture*. Translated by Ronald L. Martinez. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993.

Alexander, Franz G. and Sheldon T. Selesnick. *The History of Psychiatry: An Evaluation of Psychiatric Thought and Practice from Prehistoric Times to the Present*. New York: The New American Library, Inc., 1966.

Andreasen, N. C., and M. Flaum. "Schizophrenia: The Characteristic Symptoms." *Schizophrenic Bulletin,* no 17 (1991): 2749.

Arieti, Silvano. *Interpretation of Schizophrenia*. 2nd ed. New York: Basic Books, 1974.

Asvaghosha Bodhisattva. *The Fo-Sho-Hing-Tssan-King A Life of Buddha*. Edited by F. Max Müller. Translated by Dharmaraksha (Sanskrit to Chinese) and Samuel Beal (Chinese to English), vol. 19 Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Press, 1990.

———. *Buddhacarita – The Life of the Buddha*. Translated by Patrick Olivelle. New York: New York University Press, 2009.

Atran, Scott. *In Gods We Trust*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Barthes, Roland. *Mythologies.* Translated by Annette Lavers. New York: The Noonday Press, 1993.

Bachelard, Gaston. *The Peotics of Reverie*. Translated by Daniel Russell. Boston: Beacon Press, 1971.

Bascom, William. "The Forms of Folklore: Prose Narratives." *Journal of American Folklore,* no 78 (1965): 3-20.

Bell, Catherine. "Performance." *Critical Terms for Religious Studies*. 205-24. Edited by Mark C. Taylor. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1998.

Berger, Peter and Thomas Luckmann. *The Social Construction of Reality*. New York: Doubleday, 1966.

Black, Max. *"How Metaphors Work: A Reply to Donald Davidson." On Metaphor.*181-92. Edited by Sheldon Sacks. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979.

Boas, Franz. *Race, Language and Culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1940.

Bolinger, Dwight. *Meaning and Form*. London: Longman's Publisher, 1977.

Brandon, William. *Indians*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1987.

Breault, K. D. Suicide in America: "A Test of Durkheim's Theory of Religious Family Integration 1933-1980." *American Journal of Sociology,* no 92 (1986): 628-656.

Brockelman, Paul. *The Inside Story A Narrative Approach to Religious Understanding and Truth*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992.

Brown, Donald E. *Human Universals*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1991.

Brunel, Pierre. *Companion to Literary Myths, Heroes and Archetypes*. New York: Routledge, 1995.

Burkert, Walter. *Creation of the Sacred—Tracks of Biology in Early Religions*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1996.

Cahoone, Lawrence E., ed. "Introduction." *From Modernism to Postmodernism: An Antholoogy*, 2-12. Cambridge: Blackwell, 1996.

Campbell, Joseph. *The Hero with a Thousand Faces*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1949.

———. *The Mythic Dimension: Selected Essays 1959-1987*. Edited by Antony Van Couvering. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1997.

———. *Occidental Mythology*. New York: Penquin Books, 1964.

———. *Oriental Mythology*. New York: Penquin Books, 1962.

———. *Pathways to Bliss*. Edited by David Kudler. Novato: New World Library, 2004.

———. *The Power of Myth*. Edited by Betty Sue Flowers. New York: Doubleday, 1988.

Cassirer, Ernst. *The Myth of State*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1946.

Chopra, Deepak. *Quantum Healing*. New York: Bantam, 1990.

Corbett, Lionell. *The Religious Function of the Psyche*. New York: Routledge, 1996.

Dalai Lama. *Ethics for the New Millennium*. New York: Riverhead, 1999.

Darwin, Charles. *The Descent of Man*. London: John Murray, 1871.

Davidson, Donald. "What Metaphors Mean." *The Philosophy of Language*. Edited by A.P. Marinich, 415-26. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Dawkins, Richard. *The God Delusion*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 2006.

De Gardelle, Vincent and Sid Kouider. "How Spatial Frequencies and Visual Awareness Interact During Face Processing." *Psychological Science*. (Nov. 2009): 1-9.

Denham, Robert D., ed. *Northrop Frye Myth and Metaphor Selected Essays 1974-1988*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1990.

Dennett, Daniel. *The Intentional Stance*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1987.

Dervic, Kanita, et.al. "Religious Affiliation and Suicide Attempt." *American Journal of Psychiatry*, no161 (2004): 2303-2308.

Detienne, Marcel. *The Creation of Mythology*. Translated by Margaret Cook. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981.

Dolan, Josephine A. *Goodnow's History of Nursing*. Philadelphia: Saunders, 1963.

Doty, William G. *Mythography: The Study of Myths and Rituals*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1986.

Downing, Christine. *The Long Journey Home: Re-Visioning the Myth of Demeter and Persephone for Our Time*. Boston: Shambhala, 1994.

Dundes, Alan. "The Hero Pattern and the Life of Jesus." *In Quest of the Hero*. 179-221. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990.

———. *Sacred Narrative: Readings in the Theory of Myth*. Berkeley: University of California Press. 1984.

Eagleton, Terry. *Literary Theory: An Introduction*. 2nd ed. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996.

Eliade, Mircea. *Myths, Rites, Symbols*. Edited by Wendell C. Beane and William G. Doty, vol. 2 New York: Harper & Row, 1975.

———. Mircea. *The Sacred and the Profane*. Translated by Willard R. Trask. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1987.

Falloon, I. R. H. and R. E. Talbot. "Persistent Auditory Hallucinations: Coping Mechanisms and Implications for Management." *Psychological Medicine,* no 11 (1981): 329-39.

Feinstein, David, and Stanley Krippner. *Personal Mythology: The Psychology of your Evolving Self*. New York: Putnam, 1988.

Fiorenza, Francis Schussler and Gordon D. Kaufman. "God." *Critical Terms for Religious Studies*. 136-59. Edited by Mark C. Taylor. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1998

Fontana, David. *Psychology, Religion, and Spirituality*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2003.

Foster, Kevin R. and Hanna Kokko. The Evolution of Superstitious and Superstition-Like Behaviour." *Proceedings of the Royal Society B 276*, no. 1654, (2009): 31-7.

Foundas, A. L., et al. "Planum Temporale Asymmetry and Language Dominance." *Neuropsychologia,* no 32 (1994):1225-31.

Frazer, Sir James G. *Folklore in the Old Testament*. Cambridge: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1923.

———. *The Golden Bough*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1922.

Frye, Northrop and Robert D. Denham. *Myth and Metaphor: Selected Essays 1974-1988*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1990.

Gallup, G. and J. Castelli. *The People's Religion*. New York: Macmillan Press, 1989.

Gaster, Theodor H. "Myth and Story." *Numen,* no 1 (1954): 184-212.

Gribbin, John. *Schrodinger's Kittens and the Search for Reality*. Boston: Little, Brown Company, 1995.

Gilkey, Langdon. *The Sacred and Society*. New York: Crossroad, 1981.

Gill, Sam. "Territory." *Critical Terms for Religious Studies*. 298-313. Edited by Mark C. Taylor. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1998

Gleick, James. *Faster: The Acceleration of Just About Everything*. New York: Pantheon, 1999.

Gribbin, John. *Schrodinger's Kittens and the Search for Reality*. Boston: Little Brown Company, 1995.

Gross, Rita. *Feminism and Religion*. Boston: Beacon, 1996.

Groves, Philip and Kurt Schlesinger. *Biological Psychology*. Dubuque: William C. Brown Company, 1979.

Guyton, Arthur C. *Textbook of Medical Physiology*. 4th ed. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders, 1971.

Hall, Calvin S. *A Primer of Freudian Psychology*. New York: Mentor, 1954.

Hamer, Dean. *The God Gene: How Faith Is Hardwired into Our Genes*. New York: Anchor, 1999.

Hanh, Thich Nhat. *Living Buddha, Living Christ*. New York: Riverhead Books, 1995.

Hartman, Thom. *The Last Hours of Ancient Sunlight*. New York: Harmony, 1999.

Hawking, Stephen and Leonard Mlodinow. *The Grand Design*. New York: Boston Books, 2010.

Heller, Sophia. *The Absence of Myth*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2006.

Highwater Jamake. *The Language of Vision. Meditations on Myth and Metaphor*. New York: Grove Press, 1994.

Hillman, James. *A Blue Fire*. Edited by Thomas Moore. New York: Harper Collins, 1989.

———. *The Dream and the Underworld*. New York: Harper & Row, 1979.

———. *Healing Fiction*. New York: Spring, 1998.

———. *Re-Visioning Psychology*. New York: Harper Collins, 1975.

Hogenson, George B. *Jung's Struggle with Freud*. Wilmette: Chiron, 1994.

Hood, Bruce M. *Supersense: Why We Believe in the Unbelievable*. New York: Harper Collings, 2009

Hooke, S. H. *Middle Eastern Mythology*. New York: Penquin Press, 1966.

Honko, Lauri. "The Problem of Defining Myth." *Sacred Narrative Readings in the Theory of Myth.* Edited by Alan Dundes. 41-52. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.

Horgan, John. *The End of Science: Facing the Limits of Knowledge in the Twilight of the Scientific Age*. New York: Broadway, 1996.

Horkheimer, Max, and Theodor Adorno. "Dialectic of Enlightenment." *From Modernism to Postmodernism: An Anthology*. 68-84. Edited by Lawrence E. Cahoone. Cambridge: Blackwell, 1996.

Irwin, Lee. *The Dream Seekers*. Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1994.

Jaynes, Julian. *The Origin of Consciousness in the Breakdown of the Bicameral Mind*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1976.

Johnson, Robert A. *Inner Work*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1986.

Joseph, Rhawn. *The Transmitter to God*. San Jose: University Press California, 2001.

Jung, C. G. *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*. Edited by Aniela Jaffe. Translated by Richard and Clara Winston. New York: Random House, 1961.

———. *The Portable Jung*. Edited by Joseph Campbell. Translated by R.F.C. Hull. New York: The Viking Press, 1971.

———. *The Spirit in Man, Art, and Literature*. vol 15 Translated by R.F.C. Hull. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1971.

Jung, C.G. and C. Kerenyi, *Essays on a Science of Mythology*. Translated by R.F.C. Hull. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.

Kerenyi, Carl. *Prometheus: Archetypal Image of Human Existence*. Translated by Ralph Manheim. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1991.

Kerlinger, Fred N. *Foundations of Behavioral Research*. 2nd ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc. 1964.

Kimble, Gregory A., Norman Garmezy, and Edward Zigler. *Principles of General Psychology*. 5th ed. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1980.

Kimura, D. "The Asymmetry of the Human Brain." *Scientific American*, no 228 (1973): 70-8.

Kirk, G. S. "On Defining Myths." *Phronesis: A Journal for Ancient Philosophy*, suppl 1 (1973): 61-9.

Kurzweil, Ray. *The Age of Spiritual Machines When Computers Exceed Human Intelligence*. New York: Viking, 1999.

LaFleur, William R. *Critical Terms for Religious Studies*. Edited by Mark C. Taylor, 36-54. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998.

Lakoff, George. *Whose Freedom? The Battle over America's Most Important Idea*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2006

Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1980.

The Lalitavistara and the Evolution of Buddha Legend. Translated by Sarla Khosla, New Delhi: Galaxy Press, 1991.

The Lalitavistara Sutra The Voice of the Buddha The Beauty of Compassion. Translated by Gwendolyn Berkeley: Dharma Press, 1983.

Landis, J. R. and Koch, G. G. "The Measurement of Observer Agreement for Categorical Data." *Biometrics,* no 33 (1977): 159-74.

Larousse Encyclopedia of Mythology. Translated by Richard Aldrington and Delano Ames. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1994.

Lawrence, Bruce B. *Critical Terms for Religious Studies*. Edited by Mark C. Taylor, 334-63. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998.

Lefrancois, Guy R. *Psychology*. Belmont: Wadsworth, 1980.

Levi-Strauss, Claude. *Structural Anthropology*. Translated by Monique Layton. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1974.

Lopez, Barry. *Crow and Weasel*. San Francisco: North Point, 1990.

Lopez, Donald S. Jr., "Belief." *Critical Terms for Religious Studies*. Edited by Mark C. Taylor, 21-35. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998.

Lorenz, Konrad. *On Aggression*. Translated by Marjorie Kerr Wilson. New York: Harcourt, 1966.

Lucas, Phillip. "The Association of Research and Enlightenment: Saved by the New Age." *American's Alternative Religions*. Edited by Timothy Miller, 353-61. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1995.

Luria, Aleksandr Romanovich. *Higher Cortical Functions in Man*. 2nd ed. New York: Basic Books, 1966.

Lynch, William. *Christ and Prometheus; A New Image of the Secular*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1970.

Lyotard, Jean-Francois. *The Postmodern Condition: A Report of Knowledge*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997.

The Mahavastu. Translated by J. J. Jones. London: The Pali Text Society, 1987.

Malinowski, Bronislaw. "The Role of Myth in Life." *Psyche,* no 24 (1926): 29-39.

Martinich, A. P., ed. *The Philosophy of Language*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Masuzawa, Tomoko. *In Search of Dreamtime*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993.

McGuire, P. K., G. M. S. Shah, and R. M. Murray. "Increased Blood Flow in Broca's Area during Auditory Hallucinations in Schizophrenia." *Lancet,* no 342 (1993): 703-6.

McLuhan, Marshall. *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964.

Meadow, Mary Jo and Richard D. Kahoe. *Psychology of Religion*. New York: Harper & Row, 1984.

Melton, J. Gordon. "Whither the New Age?" *America's Alternative Religions*. Edited by Timothy Miller, 347-52 Albany: State University of New York Press, 1995.

Miles, Margaret R. "Image." *Critical Terms for Religious Studies*. 160-72. Edited by Mark C. Taylor. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1998

Miller, George A. *Language and Speech*. New York: W. H. Freeman, 1981.

Milner, Peter M. *Physiological Psychology*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970.

Minsky, Marvin. *The Society of the Mind*. New York: Simon & Shuster, 1985.

Müller, Max. *The Essential Max Müller*. Edited by Jon R. Stone. New York: Palgrave Macmillen, 2002.

Nanamoli, Bhikkhu. *The Life of the Buddha According to the Pali Canon*. Onalaska: BPS Parivatti Editions, 1992.

Narayanan, Srinivas. *Embodiment in Language Understanding: Sensory-motor Representations for Metaphoric Reasoning about Event Descriptions*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Berkeley: University of California, 1997.

New International Version Bible. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2011.

Nietzsche, Friedrich. "Will to Power." *A Nietzsche Reader*. Translated by R. J. Hollingdale, 215-31. London: Penquin, 1977.

Novak, Michael. *Ascent of the Mountain, Flight of the Dove*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1971.

Nutt, Alfred. "The Aryan Expulsion-and-Return-Formula in the Folk and Hero Tales of the Celts." *Folk-lore Record*, no 4 (1881): 1-44.

Olen, Jeffrey and Vincent Barry. *Applying Ethics*. Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1999.

Ornstein, Robert E. *The Right Mind*. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1997.

Otto, Rudolf. *The Idea of the Holy*. Translated by John W. Harvey. London: Oxford University Press, 1923.

Pagels, Elaine. *Beyond Belief: The Secret Gospel of Thomas*. New York: Random House, 2003.

Pargament, Kenneth I. *The Psychology of Religion and Coping*. New York: The Guilford Press, 1997.

Persinger, Michael A. *Neuroophyshological Bases of God Beliefs*. New York: Praeger, 1987.

Pfennig, D. W., W. R. Harcombe and K. S. Pfennig. "Frequency-Dependent Batesian Mimicry." *Nature*, no. 323 (March 2001): 4-10.

Quanta Healthcare Solutions, Inc. "Calculating the Kappa Coefficient for 2 Observations by 2 Observers." *The Medical Algorithms Project*. (October 2002): 23-30. Accessed December 15, 2012, http://www.medal.org.

Raglan, Lord. "The Hero of Tradition." *Folklore,* no 45 (1934): 212-31.

———. *The Hero. A Study in Traditon, Myth, and Drama*. New York: Vintage, 1956.

Rank, Otto. *The Myth of the Birth of the Hero*. New York: Vintage, 1959.

Rensma, Ritske. *The Innateness of Myth*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2009.

Rico, Gabriele Lusser. *Pain and Possibility: Writing Your Way Through Personal Crisis*. Los Angeles: Jeremy P. Tarcher, 1991.

Ricoeur, Paul. *Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences*. Edited and Translated by John B. Thompson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

———. "The Hermeneutics of Symbols and Philosophical Reflection: I." *The Conflict of Interpretations: Essays in Hermeneutics*. Translated by Denis Savage, Edited by Don Ihde, 299-300 Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1974.

Roberts, J. M. *History of the World*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Roberts, Richard H. "Body." *The Blackwell Companion to the Study of Religion*. Edited by Robert A. Segal. 213-28 Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009.

Robbins, Jill. "Sacrifice." *Critical Terms for Religious Studies*. Edited by Mark C. Taylor, 285-97. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998.

Rogerson, J. W. "Slippery Words: Myth." *Expository Times,* no 90 (1978-79): 10-14.

Rychlak, Joseph R. *Introduction to Personality and Psychotherapy: A Theory-Construction Approach*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1973.

Sacks, Oliver. *The Man Who Mistook His Wife for a Hat*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1985.

Scholes, Robert and Robert Kellogg. *The Nature of Narrative*. London: Oxford University Press, 1966.

Segal, Robert A., ed. *The Blackwell Companion to the Study of Religion*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009.

———. Robert A. "Joseph Campbell's Theory of Myth." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion,* no 44 suppl 1 (March 1978): 97-114.

Shermer, Michael. *The Believing Brain*. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 2011.

———. *The Science of Good and Evil*. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 2004.

Shlain, Leonard. *The Alphabet Versus the Goddess—The Conflict Between Word and Image*. New York: Penguin 1998.

Shore, Cecilia M. *Individual Differences in Language Development*. London: Sage, 1995.

Skinner, B. F. "Supersition in the Pigeon." *Journal of Experimental Psychology,* no. 38 1948: 168-72.

Smart, Ninian. *Religions of Asia*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1993.

Smith, Morton. "Historical Method in the Study of Religion." *On Method in the History of Religions*. Edited by James S. Helfer. 8-16. Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 1968.

Solomon, Philip and Vernon D. Patch. *Handbook of Psychiatry*. Los Altos: Lange Medical Press, 1971.

Sperry, R. W. “Lateral Specialization in the Surgically Separated Hemispheres.” *The Neurosciences: Third Study Program*. Edited by F. O. Schmitt and F. G. Worder, 1749-57. Cambridge: M.I.T. Press, 1974.

Sperry. R. W. and M. D. Gazzaniga. “Language Following Surgical Disconnection of the Hemispheres.” *Brain Mechanbisms Underlying Speech and Langu*age. Edited by C. H. Millikan and F. L. Karley, 108-21. New York: Grune & Strattonm, 1967.

Stack, S. “The Effect of Religious Commitment on Suicide: A Cross National Analysis.” *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, no 24 (1983): 362-374

Stack, S. and D. Lester. “The Effect of Religion on Suicidal Ideation.” *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, no 26 (1991): 168-170.

Stent, Gunther S. *The Coming of the Golden Age: A View of the End of Progress*. New York: Natural History Press, 1969.

Taylor, Mark C., ed. *Critical Terms for Religious Studies*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1998.

Tedlock, Barbara. “Dreaming and Dream Research.” In *Dreaming: Anthropological and Psychological Interpretations*. Edited by Barbara Tedlock, 1-30. Sante Fe: School of American Research Press, 1992

Thompson, Richard F. *Foundations of Physiological Psychology*. New York: Harper & Row, 1967.

Tolstoy, Leo. *The Death of Ivan Illych*. Translated by Lkynn Solotaroff. New York: Bantam, 1981.

Tracy, David. “Metaphor and Religion: The Test Case of Christian Texts.” *Critical Inquiry,* vol 5 no 1 (1978): 91-106.

Underwood, Richard A. “Living by Myth: Joseph Campbell, C.G. Jung, and the Religious Life-Journey.” *Paths to the Power of Myth Joseph Campbell and the Study of Religion*. Edited by Daniel C. Noel, 13-14 New York: Crossroad Press, 1990.

Vattimo, Gianni. *The End of Modernity*. Translated by Jon R. Snyder. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985.

Von Franz, Marie-Louise. *Shadow and Evil in Fairy Tales*. Boston: Shambhala, 1995.

von Hahn, Johann Georg. *Sagwissenschaftliche Studien*. Jena: Mauke, 1876.

Walker, James R. *Lakota Belief and Ritual*. Edited by R. DeMallie and E. Jahner. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1980.

Waller, N. G., B. Kojetin, T. Bouchard, D. Lykken, and A. Tellegen. "Genetic and Environmental Influences on Religious Attitudes and Values: A Study of Twins Reared Apart and Together." *Psychological Science* 1, no. 2 (1990): 138-42.

Ward, Keith. *God, Chance, & Necessity*. Oxford: Oneworld Publishing, 1996.

Wilbur, Ken. *A Brief History of Everything*. Boston: Shambhala, 1996.

———. *The Marriage of Sense and Soul*. New York: Broadway Books, 1998.

Witham, Larry. *By Design*. San Francisco: Encounter Books, 2003.

Williams, Bernard. "Ethics." *Philosophy 1*. Edited by A. C. Grayling, 546-79. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998

Wilson, Holly Skodol, and Carol Ren Kneisl. *Psychiatric Nursing*. Menlo Park: Addison-Wesley, 1979.

Witelson, Sandra F. "Hand and Sex Differences in the Isthmus and Anterior Commissure of the Human Corpus Callosum." *Brain,* no 112 (1989): 799-835.

Wittrock, M. C. *The Brain and Psychology*. New York: Academic Press, 1980.

Wolf, Fred Alan. *The Dreaming Universe*. New York: Macmillan, 1995.

———. *The Spiritual Universe*. New York: Simon & Shuster, 1996.

Woodruff, Peter, et al. "Auditory Hallucinations and Perception of External Speech. *Lancet*, no 346 (1995): 1035.

Zukav, Gary. *The Dancing Wu Li Masters*. New York: William Morrow, 1979.

Appendixes

Appendix A

Narrative Attributes of Siddhartha Gautama with References

Questionable Conception or Birth – Random Passage 3

"I heard and learned this, Lord, from the Blessed One's own lips: Mindful and fully aware the Bodhisatta, the Being Dedicated to Enlightenment, appeared in the Heaven of the Contented. And I remember that as a wonderful and marvelous quality of the Blessed One."

"I heard and learned this, Lord, from the Blessed One's own lips: Mindful and fully aware the Bodhisatta remained in the Heaven of the Contented."

"For the whole of that life-span the Bodhisatta remained in the Heaven of the Contented."

"Mindful and fully aware the Bodhisatta passed away from the Heaven of the Contented and descended into his mother's womb."

"When the Bodhisatta had passed away from the Heaven of the Contented and entered his mother's womb, a great measureless light surpassing the splendor of the gods appeared in the world with its deities, its Māras and its Brahmā divinities, in this generation with its monks and brahmans, with its princes and men. And even in those abysmal world interspaces of vacancy, gloom and utter darkness, where the moon and sun, powerful and mighty as they are, cannot make their light prevail—there too a great measureless light surpassing the splendor of the gods appeared; and the creatures born there perceived each other by that light: 'So it seems that other creatures have appeared here!' And this ten-thousandfold world-system shook and quaked and trembled; and there too a great measureless light surpassing the splendor of the gods appeared." "When the Bodhisatta had descended into his mother's womb, four deities came to guard him from the four quarters, so that no human or non-human beings or anyone at all should harm him or his mother."

"When the Bodhisatta had descended into his mother's womb, she became intrinsically pure, refraining by necessity from killing living beings, from taking what is not given, from unchastity, from false speech, and from indulgence in wine, liquor and fermented brews. When the Bodhisatta had descended into his mother's womb, no thought of man associated with the five strands of sensual desires came to her at all, and she was inaccessible to any man with lustful mind."

"When the Bodhisatta had descended into his mother's womb, she at the same time possessed the five strands of sensual desires; and being endowed and furnished with them, she was gratified in them."

"When the Bodhisatta had descended into his mother's womb, no kind of affliction arose in her: she was blissful in the absence of all bodily fatigue. As though a blue, yellow, red, white, or brown thread were strung through a fine beryl gem of purest water, eight-faceted and well cut, so that a man with sound eyes, taking it in his hand, might review it thus—"This is a fine beryl gem of purest water, eight-faceted and well cut, and

through it is strung a blue, yellow, red, white, or brown thread'—so too the Bodhisatta's mother saw him within her womb with all his limbs, lacking no faculty."

"Seven days after the Bodhisatta was born, his mother died and was reborn in the Heaven of the Contented."

"Other women give birth after carrying the child in the womb for nine or ten months; but not so the Bodhisatta's mother. She gave birth to him after carrying him in her womb for exactly ten months."

"Other women give birth seated or lying down; but not so the Bodhisatta's mother. She gave birth to him standing up."

"When the Bodhisatta came forth from his mother's womb, first deities received him, then human beings."

"When the Bodhisatta came forth from his mother's womb, he did not touch the earth. The four deities received him and set him before his mother, saying: 'Rejoice, O queen, a son of great power has been born to you.'

"When the Bodhisatta came forth from his mother's womb unsullied, unsmeared by water or humours or blood or any sort of impurity, clean and unsullied."

"When the Bodhisatta came forth from his mother's womb, two jets of water appeared to pour from the sky, one cool and one warm, for bathing the Bodhisatta and his mother."

"As soon as the Bodhisatta was born, he stood firmly with his feet on the ground; then he took seven steps to the north, and, with a white sunshade held over him, he surveyed each quarter. He uttered the words of the Leader of the Herd: 'I am the Highest in the world, I am the Best in the world, I am the Foremost in the world; this is the last birth; now there is no more renewal of being in future lives.'

"When the Bodhisatta came forth from his mother's womb, a great measureless light surpassing the splendor of the gods appeared in the world and its deities, its Māras, and its Brahmā divinities, in this generation with its monks and brahmans, with its princes and men. And even in those abysmal world interspaces of vacancy, gloom and utter darkness, where the moon and sun, powerful and mighty as they are, cannot make their light prevail—there too a great measureless light surpassing the splendor of the gods appeared; and the creatures born there perceived each other by that light: 'So it seems that other creatures have appeared here!' And this ten-thousandfold world-system shook and quaked and trembled; and there too a great measureless light surpassing the splendor of the gods appeared."

"All these things I heard and learned from the Blessed One's own lips. And I remember them as wonderful and marvelous qualities of the Blessed One."

"That being so, Ānanda, remember also this as a wonderful and marvelous quality of a Perfect One: A Perfect One's feelings of pleasure, pain or equanimity are known to him as they arise, known to him as they are present, and known to him as they subside; his perceptions are known to him as they arise, known to him as they are present, and known to him as they subside; his thoughts are known to him as they arise, known to him as they are present, and known to him as they subside."

"And that also I remember, Lord, as a wonderful and marvelous quality of the

Blessed One."

That is what the venerable Ānanda said. The Master approved. The bhikkhus were satisfied, and they delighted in the venerable Ānanda's words.[1]

The Bodhisattva considered the matter of the place in which he should be reborn. "This king Suddhodana," thought he, "is worthy to be my father." He then sought a mother who should be gracious, of good birth, pure of body, tender of passion, and short-lived, of whose span of life there remained only seven nights and ten months.[2]

Royal or Distinguished Parents – Random Passage 13

"I am of khattiya, warrior-noble stock. I was reborn into a khattiya family. I am a Gotama by clan. My life's span is of short length, it is brief and soon over; one who lives long now completes the century or a little more. I was enlightened at the root of an assattha banyan as my Enlightenment Tree. My chief disciples are Sāriputta and Moggallāna. I have had one convocation consisting of twelve hundred and fifty disciples, all of them Arahants. My attendant, my chief attendant, is the bhikkhu Ānanda. A king, Suddhodana by name, was my father. A queen, Māyā by name, was the mother that bore me. The royal capital was the city of Kapilavatthu."[3]

The Bodhisattva considered the matter of the place in which he should be reborn. "This king Suddhodana," thought he, "is worthy to be my father." He then sought a mother who should be gracious, of good birth, pure of body, tender of passion, and short-lived, of whose span of life there remained only seven nights and ten months.[4]

Parent is God or Descended from Heaven – Random Passage 9

"When the Bodhisatta had passed away from the Heaven of the Contented and entered his mother's womb, a great measureless light surpassing the splendor of the gods appeared in the world with its deities, its Māras and its Brahmā divinities, in this generation with its monks and brahmans, with its princes and men. And even in those abysmal world interspaces of vacancy, gloom and utter darkness, where the moon and sun, powerful and mighty as they are, cannot make their light prevail—there too a great measureless light surpassing the splendor of the gods appeared; and the creatures born there perceived each other by that light: 'So it seems that other creatures have appeared here!' And this ten-thousandfold world-system shook and quaked and trembled; and there too a great measureless light surpassing the splendor of the gods appeared."[5]

---

1 *Majjhima-nikāya 123; Dīgha-nikāya 14*.
2 *Mahāvastu Vol. II, 3*.
3 *Dīgha-nikāya 14*.
4 *Mahāvastu Vol. II, 3.*
5 *Majjhima-nikāya 123; Dīgha-nikāya 14*.

Prophecy Foretells. Worshipped by Gods or Royalty – Random Passage 2

The Sage Asita, in his daytime meditation, saw that the gods, those of the Company of Thirty, were happy and gay, all brightly clad, waving flags the while their ruler Sakka they were wildly cheering. Now when he saw the gods so happy and elated, respectfully he greeted them and asked them this:

"Why is the Company of Gods so joyful? Why have they brought out flags to brandish thus? There was no celebration such as this even after the battle with the demons wherein the gods won and the demons lost; what marvel have they heard that so delights them? See how they sing and shout and strum guitars, clapping their hands and dancing all about. O you that dwell on Meru's airy peaks, I beg you, leave me not in doubt, good sirs."

"At a Sakyan city in the Land of Lumbinī a Being To Be Enlightened, a Priceless Jewel, is born in the world of men for welfare and weal; because of that we are extravagantly gay. The Unique Being, the Personality Sublime, the Lord of all men and Foremost among mankind, will turn the Wheel in the Grove of the Ancient Seers with the roar of the lion, the monarch of all beasts."

On hearing this, the Sage in haste went to Suddhodana's abode. There he sat down: "Where is the boy?" He asked the Sakyans, "Show him to me."

Now when the Sakyans showed the child to Asita, his color was as pure as beams of brilliant gold wrought in a crucible, shining and clear. The joy of rapture flooded Asita's heart on seeing the boy bright as a flame and pure as the Lord of the stars' herd riding in the sky, dazzling as the cloudless autumn sun; while gods in the heavenly vault held over him a many-ribbed sunshade with a thousand circles, brandishing gold-sticked chowries, though none saw the holders of the sunshade and the chowries.

The sage with matted hair, called Kanhasiri, seeing the boy, like a gold jewel upon brocade, with the white sunshade held above his head, received him full of joy and happiness. As soon as he received the Sakyans' Lord the adept in construing marks and signs exclaimed with ready confidence of heart: "Among the biped race he is unique." Then he remembered: seeing his own lot, in very sadness tears came to his eyes. The Sakyans saw him weeping, and they asked: "Will some misfortune then befall our prince?" But to the anxious Sakyans he replied: "As I foresee, no harm will touch the boy, nor is there any danger that awaits him. Be sure he is not of the second rank; for he will reach the summit of true knowledge. A seer of the peerless purity, through pity for the many he will set The Dhamma Wheel turning and spread his life of holiness. But little of my life-span now remains, and I shall die meanwhile. I shall not hear the matchless Hero teaching the Good Dhamma. That saddens me; that loss distresses me."

He that lived the holy life left the inner palace chamber after he had filled the Sakyans with an all—abounding joy. To his sister's son he went, moved by feelings of compassion, telling him the Peerless Hero's future finding of the Dhamma.

"When news shall reach you that he is enlightened and living out the Dhamma he

has found, then go to him and ask about his teaching and live with that Blessed One the holy life."

So Nālaka, who had laid up a store of merit, forewarned by one who wished him well, who had foreseen the Being to come, attained to utter purity, waited with guarded senses, expecting the Victor.

On hearing that the Nobel Victor had rolled the Wheel, he went to him; he saw the Lord of all the Seers, and trusted in him when he saw, fulfilling Asita's behest, he questioned then the Perfect Sage about the Silentness Supreme.[6]

Asita the seer was renowned in heaven also. He travelled through the air, being possessed of great magic and power. He dwelt in his hermitage in the company of five hundred pupils and Nālaka.

At the birth of the Bodhisattva he saw the quaking of the earth and the great radiance. . .

Afterwards in the palace the seer heard the report that the boy was to become a universal king, for the diviners had so foretold. But the seer thought to himself, "This boy will not become a universal king. He will become a Buddha in the world."[7]

<u>Abandonment, Placed in a Box, Water or Light Appears – Random Passage 6</u>

"When the Bodhisatta had passed away from the Heaven of the Contented and entered his mother's womb, a great measureless light surpassing the splendor of the gods appeared in the world with its deities, its Māras and its Brahmā divinities, in this generation with its monks and brahmans, with its princes and men."[8]

"When the Bodhisatta came forth from his mother's womb, a great measureless light surpassing the splendor of the gods appeared in the world and its deities, its Māras, and its Brahmā divinities, in this generation with its monks and brahmans, with its princes and men. And even in those abysmal world interspaces of vacancy, gloom and utter darkness, where the moon and sun, powerful and mighty as they are, cannot make their light prevail—there too a great measureless light surpassing the splendor of the gods appeared; and the creatures born there perceived each other by that light: 'So it seems that other creatures have appeared here!' And this ten-thousandfold world-system shook and quaked and trembled; and there too a great measureless light surpassing the splendor of the gods appeared."[9]

When the Bodhisattva, the holiest of beings, enters into the womb of a mother, the earth with its forests shakes in six ways. A golden-colored light spreads in all directions, and all the lower states of being are purified.[10]

---

6 *Sutta-nipāta 3:11.*

7 *Mahāvastu Vol. II, 2, 29.*

8 *Majjhima-nikāya 123; Dīgha-nikāya 14.*

9 Majjhima-nikāya 123; Dīgha-nikāya 13.

10 *Lalitavistara Sutra Vol. 1, 116.*

Attempt to Kill Hero Who is Saved by Humans, Animal, or Divine Intervention – Random Passage 5

Devadatta went to Prince Ajatasattu and said to him: "Great king, send some men to take the monk Gotama's life."

So Prince Ajatasattu gave orders to some men: "Do as the Lord Devadatta says." And Devadatta told one of the men: "Go, friend; the monk Gotama lives in such and such a place. Take his life and return by such and such a path." Then he posted two men on that path, telling them: "Take the life of the man who will be coming along by that path, and return by this path." Then he posted four men on that path. . . eight men on that path. . . sixteen men on that path. . .

Then the one man took his sword and shield and fixed his bow and quiver, and he went to where the Blessed One was. But as he drew near, he grew frightened, till he stood still, his body quite rigid. The Blessed One saw him thus and said to him: "Come, friend, do not be afraid." Then the man laid aside his sword and shield and put down his bow and quiver. He went up to the Blessed One and prostrated himself at his feet, saying: "Lord, I have transgressed, I have done wrong like a fool confused and blundering, since I came here with evil intent, with intent to do murder. Lord, may the Blessed One forgive my transgression as such for restraint in the future."

"Surely, friend, you have transgressed, you have done wrong like a fool confused and blundering, since you came here with evil intent, with intent to do murder. But since you see your transgression as such and so act in accordance with the Dhamma, we forgive it; for it is growth in the Noble One's Discipline when a man see a transgression as such and so acts in accordance with the Dhamma and enters upon restraint for the future.

Then the Blessed One gave the man progressive instruction. . . Eventually the spotless, immaculate vision of the Dhamma arose in him. . . He became independent of others in the Teacher's Dispensation. He said: "Magnificent, Lord! . . . Let the Blessed One receive me as his follower. . ."

The Blessed One told him: "Friend, do not go back by that path; go by this path." And he dismissed him by the other path.

Then the two men thought: "How is this? The one man is a long time coming." They followed up the path till they saw the Blessed One sitting at the root of a tree. They went up to him, and after paying homage to him, they sat down at one side. The Blessed One gave them progressive instruction. Eventually they said: "Magnificent, Lord! . . . Let the Blessed One receive us as his followers. . ."

Then the Blessed One dismissed them by another path. The same thing happened with the four, the eight and the sixteen men.

Now the one man went to Devadatta and told him: "I have not taken the Blessed One's life, Lord. The Blessed One is mighty and powerful."

"Enough, friend; do not take the monk Gotama's life. I will take the monk Gotama's life myself."

At that time the Blessed One was walking up and down in the shade of the Vulture Peak Rock. Then Devadatta climbed the Vulture Peak Rock, and he hurled down a huge

stone, thinking: "I shall take the monk Gotama's life with this."

Two spurs of the rock came together and caught the stone; but a splinter from it drew blood on the Blessed One's foot. Then he looked up and said to Devadatta: "Misguided man, you have made much demerit; for with evil intent, with intent to do murder, you have drawn the blood of a Perfect One."[11]

Devadatta becomes jealous of the Buddha's fame and instigates a schism within the Buddhist community. Then he rolls down a large rock from the Gridhra-kuta mountain at the Buddha, but the rock splits in two and does not hurt him. Then he lets loose a huge mad elephant who causes widespread carnage in Raja-griha. But when the elephant approaches the Buddha, he kneels down.[12]

Raised by Non-Parent – Random Passage 8

"Seven days after the Bodhisatta was born, his mother died and was reborn in the Heaven of the Contented."[13]

"I did so, Lords, thinking that this Mahāpajapati Gotamī was the sister of the Blessed One's mother, was his nurse, his foster mother, his giver of milk. She suckled the Blessed One when his own mother died. I do not see it as a wrongdoing. Nevertheless, out of faith in the venerable ones, I acknowledge it as a wrongdoing."[14]

Early Childhood is Unusual – Random Passage 12

"I thought of a time when my Sakyan father was working and I was sitting in the cool shade of a rose-apple tree: quite secluded from sensual desires, secluded from unwholesome things I had entered upon and abode in the first meditation, which is accompanied by thinking and exploring, with happiness and pleasure born of seclusion. I thought: 'Might that be the way to enlightenment?' Then, following up that memory, there came the recognition that this was the way to enlightenment.[15]

"I was delicate, most delicate, supremely delicate. Lily pools were made for me at my father's house solely for my benefit. Blue lilies flowered in one, white lilies in another, red lilies in a third. I used no sandalwood that was not from Benares. My turban, tunic, lower garments and cloak were all made of Benares cloth. A white sunshade was held over me day and night so that no cold or heat or dust or grit or dew might inconvenience me.

"I had three palaces; one for the winter, one for the summer and one for the rains. In the rains palace I was entertained by minstrels with no men among them. For the four months of the rains I never went down to the lower palace. Though meals of broken rice with lentil soup are given to the servants and retainers in other people's houses, in my

11 *Vinaya Cullavagga 7:3.*
12 *Buddhacarita, Canto 21.*
13 *Majjhima-nikāya 123; Dīgha-nikāya 14.*
14 *Vinaya Cullavaga 11:1-10.*
15 *Majjhima-nikāya 100.*

father's house white rice and meat was given to them.

"Whilst I had such power and good fortune, yet I thought: 'When an untaught ordinary man, who is subject to ageing, not safe from ageing, see another who is aged, he is shocked, humiliated and disgusted; for he forgets that he himself is no exception. But I too am subject to ageing, not safe from ageing, and so it cannot befit me to be shocked, humiliated and disgusted on seeing another who is aged.' When I considered this, the vanity of youth entirely left me.

"I thought: 'When an untaught ordinary man, who is subject to sickness, not safe from sickness, sees another who is sick, he is shocked, humiliated and disgusted; for he forgets that he himself is no exception. But I too am subject to sickness, not safe from sickness, and so it cannot befit me to be shocked, humiliated and disgusted on seeing another who is sick.' When I considered this, the vanity of health entirely left me.

"I thought: 'When an untaught ordinary man, who is subject to death, not safe from death, sees another who is dead, he is shocked, humiliated and disgusted, for he forgets that he himself is no exception. But I too am subject to death, not safe from death, and so it cannot befit me to be shocked, humiliated and disgusted on seeing another who is dead.' When I considered this, the vanity of life entirely left me."[16]

O monks, when the child's chariot was prepared and decorated, King Suddhodana took him in his arms. Attended by brāhmins, merchants, householders, and advisers, by the kings of the outlying fortresses, by gatekeepers and servants, friends and relatives, they went forth into the beautifully adorned crossroads, the streets, and the public squares. The smoke of incense drifted along the flower-strewn road. Horses, elephants, chariots, and foot soldiers marched to the sound of many instruments, while parasols, banners, and standards fluttered in the breeze. Gods by the hundreds of thousands drew the chariot of the young Bodhisattva, while hundreds of thousands of niyutas of koṭis of devaputras and apsarases hovered in the sky, tossing down flower and playing sweet music.[17]

Hero Goes on Adventure – Random Passage 11

"Now I went forth from the house life into homelessness to seek what is good, seeking the supreme state of sublime peace. Therefore, I went to Āḷāra Kālāma, and said to him: 'Friend Kālāma, I want to lead the holy life in this Dhamma and Discipline.'

"When this was said, Āḷāra Kālāma told me: 'The venerable one may stay here. This teaching is such that in no long time a wise man can enter upon the dwell in it, himself realizing through direct knowledge what his own teacher knows.'

"I soon learned the teaching. I claimed that as far as mere lip reciting and rehearsal of his teaching went I could speak with knowledge and assurance, and that I knew and saw—and there were others who did likewise.

"I thought: 'It is not through mere faith alone that Āḷāra Kālāma declares his teaching; it is because he has entered upon and dwelt in it, himself realizing it through

16 *Anguttara-nikāya 3:38.*
17 *Lalitavistara Sutra Vol. 1, 175.*

direct knowledge. It is certain that he dwells in this reaching knowing and seeing.'

"Then I went to Āḷāra Kālāma, and I said to him: 'Friend Kālāma, how far do you declare to have entered upon this teaching, yourself realizing it through direct knowledge?'

"When this was said, he declared the base consisting of nothingness. It occurred to me: 'It is not only Āḷāra Kālāma that has faith, energy, mindfulness, concentration and understanding, but I too have these faculties. Suppose I strove to realize the teaching that he declares to enter upon and dwell in, himself realizing it through direct knowledge?'

"I soon succeeded. Then I went to Āḷāra Kālāma and I said to him: 'Friend Kālāma, is it thus far that you declare to have entered upon and dwelt in this teaching, yourself realizing it through direct knowledge?' and he told me that it was.

" 'I too, friend, have thus far entered upon and dwelt in this teaching, myself realizing it through direct knowledge.'

" 'We are fortunate, friend, we are indeed fortunate, to have found such a venerable one for our fellow in the holy life. So the teaching that I declared to have entered upon, myself realizing it through direct knowledge, that you enter upon and dwell in, yourself realizing it through direct knowledge. And the teaching that you enter upon and dwell in, yourself realizing it through direct knowledge, that I declare to have entered upon, myself realizing it through direct knowledge. So you know the teaching that I know; I know the teaching that you know. As I am, so are you: as you are, so am I. Come, friend, let us now lead this community together.' Thus Āḷāra Kālāma, my teacher, placed me, his pupil, on an equal footing with himself, according me the highest honour.

"I thought: 'This teaching does not lead to dispassion, to fading of lust, to cessation, to peace, to direct knowledge, to enlightenment, to Nibbāna, but only to the base consisting of nothingness.' I was not satisfied with that teaching. I left it to pursue my search.

"Still in search of what is good, seeking the supreme state of sublime peace, I went to Uddaka Rāmaputta, and I said to him: 'Friend, I want to lead the holy life in the Dhamma and Discipline.'"[18]

<u>Return Home with Special News or Knowledge – Random Passage 7</u>

When this was said, he told them: "Bhikkhus, do not address the Perfect One by name and as 'friend': the Perfect One is accomplished and fully enlightened. Listen, bhikkhus, the Deathless has been attained. I shall instruct you. I shall teach you the Dhamma. By practicing as you are instructed you will, by realizing it yourselves here and now through direct knowledge, enter upon and abide in that supreme goal of the holy life for the sake of which clansmen rightly go forth from the house life into homelessness."[19]

18 *Majjhima-nikāya 26, 36, 85, 100.*

19 *Vinaya Mahāvagga 1:6*.

Revenge and/or Victory – Random Passage 1

The Blessed One was able to convince them. They heard the Blessed One; they listened and opened their hearts to knowledge.[20]

"Being myself subject to birth, ageing, ailment, death, sorrow, and defilement, seeing danger in what is subject to those things and seeking the unborn, unageing, unailing, deathless, sorrowless, undefiled supreme surcease of bondage, Nibbāna, I attained it. The knowledge and vision arose in me: 'My deliverance is unassailable; this is my last birth; there is now no renewal of being.'"[21]

Then the Blessed One recognized Māra the Evil One, and he answered him. . . Then Māra the Evil One knew: "The Blessed One knows me, the Sublime One knows me." Sad and disappointed, he vanished at once.[22]

When the sage of the Shakyas paid no heed and did not even give up his posture, even after he was so admonished, Māra then discharged the arrow at him, placing his sons and girls in front of him. But even after he shot the arrow at him, he paid no heed and did not veer from his resolve; seeing him thus, Māra was despondent. . . .[23]

Acknowledged as Special – Random Passage 14

Now after staying at Uruvelā for as long as he chose, the Blessed One set out for Gayāsīsa with a large following of bhikkhus, with a thousand bhikkhus, with all the former matted-hair ascetics. The Blessed One stopped at Gayāsīsa near Gayā together with the thousand bhikkhus. There he addressed the bhikkhus. . . And while this discourse was being delivered the hearts of the thousand bhikkhus were delivered from taints through not clinging.[24]

Full of respect and regard, with palms joined, the deva-putras bowed before the Bodhisattva, and gazing upon him, they expressed their desire: "When will we see this being, pure and noble, the greatest of all, withdraw from the world? When will we see him, seated at the foot of the great king of trees, overcome the demon and his army, and attain the perfect and complete Enlightenment of a Buddha?"[25]

Period of Reign – Random Passage 4

The Blessed One stopped at Gayāsīsa near Gayā together with the thousand bhikkhus. There he addressed the bhikkhus thus:

. . . "Becoming dispassionate, his lust fades away; with the fading of lust his heart is liberated; when his heart is liberated, there comes the knowledge: 'It is liberated.' He

---

20 Ibid.
21 *Majjhima-nikāya 26*.
22 *Samyutta-nikāya 4:1*.
23 *Buddhacarita, Canto 13:15*.
24 *Vinaya Mahāvagga 1:21; Samyutta-nikāya 35-28.*
25 *Lalitavistara Sutra Vol. 1, 242.*

understands: 'Birth is exhausted, the holy life has been lived out, what was to be done is done, there is no more of this to come.' "[26]

"Now I am old, Ānanda, my years have turned eighty: just as an old cart is made to carry on with the help of makeshifts, so too, it seems to me, the Perfect One's body is made to carry on with the help of makeshifts."[27]

Then the Blessed One addressed the bhikkhus thus: "Indeed, bhikkhus, I declare this to you: It is in the nature of all formations to dissolve. Attain perfection through diligence."[28]

Decline or Reviled or Hunted – Random Passage 10

The Blessed One recovered from that sickness. Soon afterwards he came out from the sick-room and sat on a seat made ready at the back of the dwelling. The venerable Ānanda went to him and said: "I have been used to seeing the blessed One in comfort and in health, Lord. Indeed, with the Blessed One's sickness I felt as if my body were quite rigid, I could not see straight, my ideas were all unclear. However, Lord, I comforted myself knowing that the Blessed One would not attain final Nibbana without a pronouncement about the Sangha of bhikkhus."

"But, Ānanda, what does the Sangha expect of me? The Dhamma I have taught has no secret and public versions: there is no 'teacher's closed fist' about good things here. Surely it would be someone who thought thus: 'I shall goven the Sangha' or 'The Sangha depends on me' who might make a pronouncement about the Sangha? A Perfect One does not think like that. How then can he make a pronouncement about the Sangha? Now I am old, Ānanda, my years have turned eighty: just as an old cart is made to carry on with the help of makeshifts, so too, it seems to me, the Perfect One's body is made to carry on with the help of makeshifts."[29]

Extraordinary Death. Body not Buried. More than One Burial Site – Random Passage 15

Then the Blessed One entered upon the first meditation. Emerging from that, he entered upon the second meditation. Emerging from that, he entered upon the third meditation. Emerging from that, he entered upon the fourth meditation. Emerging from that, he entered upon the base consisting of the infinity of space. Emerging from that, he entered upon the base consisting of the infinity of consciousness. Emerging from that, he entered upon the base consisting of nothingness. Emerging from that, he entered upon the base consisting of neither-perception-nor-non-perception. Emerging from that, he entered upon the cessation of perception and feeling. With the Blessed One's attainment of final Nibbāna there was a great earthquake, fearful and hair-raising, and the drum of

---

26 *Vinaya Mahāvagga 1:21.*
27 *Dīgha-nikāya 16; Saṃyutta-nikāya 47:9.*
28 *Anguttara-nikāya 4:76.*
29 *Dīgha-nikāya 16; Saṃyutta-nikāya 47:9.*

heaven resounded.[30]

Four leading Mallians who had bathed their heads and put on new garments thought: "Let us light the Blessed One's pyre." But they were unable to do so. Then they asked the venerable Anuruddha for the reason. "The deities have a different intention, Vāseṭṭhas." "But, Lord, what is the deities' intention?" "The deities' intention is this, Vāseṭṭhas: There is the venerable Mahā-Kassapa travelling on the high road from Pāvā to Kusinārā with a large community of bhikkhus, with five hundred bhikkhus. The Blessed One's pyre shall not be lit until the venerable Mahā-Kassapa has saluted the Blessed One with his head.' " "Then, Lord, let it be as the deities intend."

The venerable Mahā-Kassapa came to the Blessed One's pyre at the Mallians' Makutabandhana Shrine at Kusinārā. When he had done so, he arranged his robe on one shoulder, and raising his hands palms together, he circumambulated the pure three times to the right. Then the Blessed One's feet were revealed, and he saluted the Blessed One's feet with his head. And the five hundred bhikkhus arranged their robes on one shoulder, and they did as the venerable Mahā-Kassapa had done. But as soon as they had finished, the pyre caught alight of itself. And just as when butter or oil burns it produces neither cinder nor ash, so too, in the burning of the Blessed One's body, neither the outer skin nor the inner skin nor the flesh nor the sinews nor the oil of the joints produced any cinder or ash; only the bones remained. And of the five hundred twin wrappings only two were burnt: the innermost and the outermost.

When the Blessed One's body was consumed, a cascade of water poured down from the sky and extinguished the pyre, and water welled up from underground and extinguished the pyre, and the Mallians of Kusinārā extinguished the pyre with all kinds of scented waters.

Then the Mallians kept the Blessed One's bones in the assembly hall for seven days, and they made a lattice frame of spears set round with a rampart of bows; and they honored, respected, revered and venerated them with dances, songs, music, garlands and scents.

Then the brahman Doṇa addressed the assembled group with these stanzas:

> Sirs, hear a word from me: our Wakened One preached patience. So it ill becomes us now that we should come to clash over a share in that exalted personage's bones. Sirs, let us all unite in harmony and in agreement to make up eight parts. Let the monuments be set up far and wide, That many may gain trust in the Seer.

"Then, brahman, you yourself should divide up and distribute the Blessed One's bones fairly into eight equal parts."

"Even so, sirs," he replied, and he divided up and distributed the Blessed One's bones fairly into eight equal parts.

30 *Dīgha-nikāya 16.*

Then Ajātasattu Vedehiputta, King of Magadha, had a monument built to the Blessed One's bones, and he held a ceremony. And all the others did likewise. So there were eight monuments to the Blessed One's bones, and one to the vessel, and one to the ashes. That is how it happened.[31]

31 Ibid.

Appendix B

Narrative Attributes of Jesus of Nazareth with References

Questionable Conception or Birth – Random Passage 6

This is how the birth of Jesus the Messiah came about: His mother Mary was pledged to be married to Joseph, but before they came together, she was found to be pregnant through the Holy Spirit. Because Joseph her husband was faithful to the law, and yet did not want to expose her to public disgrace, he had in mind to divorce her quietly. But after he had considered this, an angel of the Lord appeared to him in a dream and said, "Joseph son of David, do not be afraid to take Mary home as your wife, because what is conceived in her is from the Holy Spirit. She will give birth to a son, and you are to give him the name Jesus, because he will save his people from their sins."[1]

In the sixth month of Elizabeth's pregnancy, God sent the angel Gabriel to Nazareth, a town in Galilee, to a virgin pledged to be married to a man named Joseph, a descendant of David. The virgin's name was Mary. The angel went to her and said, "Greetings, you who are highly favored! The Lord is with you." Mary was greatly troubled at his words and wondered what kind of greeting this might be. But the angel said to her. "Do not be afraid, Mary; you have found favor with God. You will conceive and give birth to a son, and you are to call him Jesus. He will be great and will be called the Son of the Most High. The Lord God will give him the throne of his father David, and he will reign over Jacob's descendants forever; his kingdom will never end."[2]

The Word became flesh and made his dwelling among us. We have seen his glory, the glory of the one and only Son, who came from the Father, full of grace and truth.[3]

Royal or Distinguished Parents – Random Passage 14

This is the genealogy of Jesus the Messiah the son of David, the son of Abraham:

Abraham was the father of Isaac, Isaac the father of Jacob, Jacob the father of Judah and his brothers, Judah the father of Perez and Zerah, whose mother was Tamar, Perez the father of Hezron, Hezron the father of Ram, Ram the father of Amminadab, Amminadab the father of Nahshon, Nahshon the father of Salmon, Salmon the father of Boaz, whose mother was Rahab, Boaz the father of Obed, whose mother was Ruth, Obed the father of Jesse, and Jesse the father of King David. David was the father of Solomon, whose mother had been Uriah's wife, Solomon the father of Rehoboam, Rehoboam the father of Abijah, Abijah the father of Asa, Asa the father of Jehoshaphat, Jehoshaphat the father of Jehoram, Jehoram the father of Uzziah, Uzziah the father of Jotham, Jotham the father of Ahaz, Ahaz the father of Hezekiah, Hezekiah the father of Manasseh, Manasseh the father of Amon, Amon the father of Josiah, and Josiah the father of Jeconiah and his

1 Matthew 1:18-21.
2 Luke 1:26-33.
3 Luke 1:14

brother at the time of the exile to Babylon. After the exile to Babylon: Jeconiah was the father of Shealtiel, Shealtiel the father of Zerubbabel, Zerubbabel the father of Abihud, Abihud the father of Eliakim, Eliahim the father of Azor, Azor the father of Zadok, Zadok the father of Akim, Akim the father of Elihud, Elihud the father of Eleazar, Eleazar the father of Matthan, Matthan the father of Jacob, and Jacob the father of Joseph, the husband of Mary, and Mary was the mother of Jesus who is called the Messiah. Thus there were fourteen generations in all from Abraham to David, fourteen from David to the exile to Babylon, and fourteen from the exile to the Messiah.[4]

When all the people were being baptized, Jesus was baptized too. And as he was praying, heaven was opened and the Holy Spirit descended on him in bodily form like a dove. And a voice came from heaven: "You are my Son, whom I love; with you I am well pleased." Now Jesus himself was about thirty years old when he began his ministry. He was the son, so it was thought, of Joseph, the son of Heli, the son of Matthat, the son of Levi, the son of Melki, the son of Jannai, the son of Joseph, the son of Matthias, the son of Amos, the son of Nahum, the son of Esli, the son of Naggai, the son of Maath, the son of Mattathias, the son of Semein, the son of Josek, the son of Joda, the son of Joanan, the son of Rhesa, the son of Zerubbabel, the son of Shealtiel, the son of Neri, the son of Melki, the son of Addi, the son of Cosam,, the son of Elmadam, the son of Er, the son of Joshua, the son of Eliezer, the son of Jorim, the son of Matthat, the son of Levi, the son of Simeon, the son of Judah, the son of Joseph, the son of Jonam, the son of Eliakim, the son of Melea, the son of Menna, the son of Mattatha, the son of Nathan, the son of David, the son of Jesse, the son of Obed, the son of Boaz, the son of Salmon, the son of Nahshon, the son of Amminadab, the son of Ram, the son of Hezron, the son of Perez, the son of Judah, the son of Jacob, the son of Isaac, the son of Abraham, the son of Terah, the son of Nahor, the son of Serug, the son of Reu, the son of Peleg, the son of Eber, the son of Shelah, the son of Cainan, the son of Arphaxad, the son of Shem, the son of Noah, the son of Lamech, the son of Methuselah, the son of Enoch, the son of Jared, the son of Mahalalel, the son of Kenan, the son of Enosh, the son of Seth, the son of Adam, the son of God.[5]

<u>Parent is God or Descended from Heaven – Random Passage 12</u>

But after he had considered this, an angel of the Lord appeared to him in a dream and said, "Joseph son of David, do not be afraid to take Mary home as your wife, because what is conceived in her is from the Holy Spirit. She will give birth to a son, and you are to give him the name Jesus, because he will save his people from their sins."[6]

Mary was greatly troubled at his words and wondered what kind of greeting this might be. But the angel said to her, "Don not be afraid, Mary; you have found favor with God. You will conceive and give birth to a son, and you are to call him Jesus. He will be great and will be called the Son of the Most High. The Lord God will give him the throne of his father David, and he will reign over Jacob's descendants forever; his kingdom will

4 Matthew 1:1-17.
5 Luke 3:21-37.
6 Matthew 1:20-21.

never end." "How will this be," Mary asked the angel, "since I am a virgin?" The angel answered, "The Holy Spirit will come on you, and the power of the Most High will overshadow you. So the holy one to be born will be called the Son of God. Even Elizabeth your relative is going to have a child in her old age, and she who was said to be unable to conceive is in her sixth month. For no word from God will ever fail.[7]

Prophecy Foretells. Worshipped by Gods or Royalty – Random Passage 13

All this took place to fulfill what the Lord had said through the prophet: "The virgin will conceive and give birth to a son, and they will call him Immanuel" (which means "God with us").[8]

After Jesus was born in Bethlehem in Judea, during the time of King Herod, Magi from the east came to Jerusalem and asked, "Where is the one who has been born king of the Jews: We saw his star when it rose and have come to worship him." When King Herod heard this he was disturbed, and all Jerusalem with him. When he had called together all the people's chief priests and teachers of the law, he asked them where the Messiah was to be born. "In Bethlehem in Judea," they replied, "for this is what the prophet has written:" "But you, Bethlehem, in the land of Judah, are by no means least among the rulers of Judah; for out of you will come a ruler who will shepherd my people Israel."[9]

And there were shepherds living out in the fields nearby; keeping watch over their flocks at night. An angel of the Lord appeared to them, and the glory of the Lord shone around them, and they were terrified. But the angel said to them, "Do not be afraid. I bring you good news that will cause great joy for all the people. Today in the town of David a Savior has been born to you; he is the Messiah, the Lord. This will be a sign to you: You will find a baby wrapped in cloths and lying in a manger." Suddenly a great company of the heavenly host appeared with the angel, praising God and saying, "Glory to God in the highest heaven, and on earth peace to those on whom his favor rests."[10]

Abandonment. Placed in a Box. Water or Light Appears – Random Passage 4

So they hurried off and found Mary and Joseph, and the baby, who was lying in the manger.[11]

After Jesus was born in Bethlehem in Judea, during the time of King Herod, Magi from the east came to Jerusalem and asked, "Where is the one who has been born king of the Jews? We saw his star when it rose and have come to worship him."[12]

And there were shepherds living out in the fields nearby, keeping watch over their

7 Luke 1:29-37.
8 Matthew 1:22.
9 Matthew 2:1-6.
10 Luke 2:8-14.
11 Luke 2:16.
12 Matthew 2:1-2.

flocks at night. An angel of the Lord appeared to them, and the glory of the Lord shone around them, and they were terrified. But the angel said to them, "Do not be afraid. I bring you good news that will cause great joy for all the people. Today in the town of David a Savior has been born to you; he is the Messiah, the Lord. This will be a sign to you: You will find a baby wrapped in cloths and lying in a manger."[13]

Attempt to Kill Hero Who is Saved by Humans, Animal, or Divine Intervention – Random Passage 3

When they had gone, an angel of the Lord appeared to Joseph in a dream. "Get up," he said, "take the child and his mother and escape to Egypt. Stay there until I tell you, for Herod is going to search for the child to kill him."[14]

About three in the afternoon Jesus cried out in a loud voice, "Eli, Eli, lema sabachthani?" (which means "My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?").[15]

At noon, darkness came over the whole land until three in the afternoon. And at three in the afternoon Jesus cried out in a loud voice, "Eloi, Eloi, lema sabachthani?" (which means "My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?").[16]

Raised by a Non-Parent – Random Passsage 15

This is how the birth of Jesus the Messiah came about: His mother Mary was pledged to be married to Joseph, but before they came together, she was found to be pregnant through the Holy Spirit. Because Joseph her husband was faithful to the law, and yet did not want to expose her to public disgrace, he had in mind to divorce her quietly. But after he had considered this, an angel of the Lord appeared to him in a dream and said, "Joseph son of David, do not be afraid to take Mary home as your wife, because what is conceived in her is from the Holy Spirit. She will give birth to a son, and you are to give him the name Jesus, because he will save his people from their sins.[17]

"How will this be," Mary asked the angel, "since I am a virgin?" The angel answered, "The Holy Spirit will come on you, and the power of the Most High will overshadow you. So the holy one to be born will be called the Son of God . . . "[18]

Early Childhood is Unusual – Random Passage 1

When the time came for the purification rites required by the Law of Moses, Joseph and Mary took him to Jerusalem to present him to the Lord (as it is written in the Law of the Lord, "Every firstborn male is to be consecrated to the Lord"), and to offer a sacrifice in

13 Luke 2:8-12.
14 Matthew 2:13
15 Matthew 27:46.
16 Mark 15:33.
17 Matthew 1:18-21.
18 Luke 1:34-35.

keeping with what is said in the Law of the Lord: "a pair of doves or two young pigeons." Now there was a man in Jerusalem called Simeon, who was righteous and devout. He was waiting for the consolation of Israel, and the Holy Spirit was on him. It had been revealed to him by the Holy Spirit that he would not die before he had seen the Lord's Messiah. Moved by the Spirit, he went into the temple courts. When the parents brought in the child Jesus to do for him what the custom of the Law required, Simeon took him in his arms and praised God, saying: "Sovereign Lord, as you have promised, you may now dismiss your servant in peace. For my eyes have seen your salvation, which you have prepared in the sight of all nations: a light for revelation to the Gentiles, and the glory of your people Israel." The child's father and mother marveled at what was said about him. Then Simeon blessed them and said to Mary, his mother: "This child is destined to cause the falling and rising of many in Israel, and to be a sign that will be spoken against, so that the thoughts of many hearts will be revealed. And a sword will pierce your own soul too." There was also a prophet, Anna, the daughter of Penuel, of the tribe of Asher. She was very old; she had lived with her husband seven years after her marriage, and then was a widow until she was eighty-four. She never left the temple but worshiped night and day, fasting and praying. Coming up to them at that very moment, she gave thanks to God and spoke about the child to all who were looking forward to the redemption of Jerusalem. When Joseph and Mary had done everything required by the Law of the Lord, they returned to Galilee to their own town of Nazareth. And the child grew and became strong; he was filled with wisdom, and the grace of God was on him. Every year Jesus' parents went to Jerusalem for the Festival of the Passover. When he was twelve years old, they went up to the festival, according to the custom. After the festival was over, while his parents were returning home, the boy Jesus stayed behind in Jerusalem, but they were unaware of it. Thinking he was in their company, they traveled on for a day. Then they began looking for him among their relatives and friends. When they did not find him, they went back to Jerusalem to look for him. After three days they found him in the temple courts, sitting among the teachers, listening to them and asking them questions. Everyone who heard him was amazed at his understanding and his answers. When his parents saw him, they were astonished. His mother said to him, "Son, why have you treated us like this: Your father and I have been anxiously searching for you." "Why were you searching for me?" he asked. "Didn't you know I had to be in my Father's house?" But they did not understand what he was saying to them. Then he went down to Nazareth with them and was obedient to them. But his mother treasured all these things in her heart. And Jesus grew in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and man.[19]

<u>Hero Goes on Adventure – Random Passage 9</u>

Then Jesus was led by the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted by the devil. After fasting forty days and forty nights, he was hungry. The tempter came to him and said, "If you are the Son of God, tell these stones to become bread." Jesus answered, "It is written: 'Man shall not live on bread alone, but on every word that comes from the mouth

19 Luke 2:22-52.

of God.' "Then the devil took him to the holy city and had him stand on the highest point of the temple. "If you are the Son of God," he said, "throw yourself down. For it is written: 'He will command his angels concerning you, and they will lift you up in their hands, so that you will not strike your foot against a stone.' "Jesus answered him, "It is also written: 'Do not put the Lord, your God to the test.' "Again, the devil took him to a very high mountain and showed him all the kingdoms of the world and their splendor. "All this I will give you," he said, "if you will bow down and worship me." Jesus said to him, "Away from me, Satan! For it is written: 'Worship the Lord your God and serve him only.' "Then the devil left him, and angels came and attended him.[20]

Jesus went throughout Galilee, teaching in their synagogues, proclaiming the good news of the kingdom, and healing every disease and sickness among the people. News about him spread all over Syria, and people brought to him all who were ill with various diseases, those suffering severe pain, the demon-possessed, those having seizures, and the paralyzed; and he healed them. Large crowds from Galilee, the Decapolis, Jerusalem, Judea and the region across the Jordan followed him.[21]

At that time Jesus came from Nazareth in Galilee and was baptized by John in the Jordan. Just as Jesus was coming up out of the water, he saw heaven being torn open and the Spirit descending on him like a dove. And a voice came from heaven: "You are my Son, whom I love; with you I am well pleased." At once the Spirit sent him out into the wilderness, and he was in the wilderness forty days, being tempted by Satan. He was with the wild animals, and angels attended him. After John was put in prison, Jesus went into Galilee, proclaiming the good news of God. "The time has come," he said. "The kingdom of God has come near. Repent and believe the good news!"[22]

Return Home with Special News or Knowledge – Random Passage 10

After Herod died, an angel of the Lord appeared in a dream to Joseph in Egypt and said, "Get up, take the child and his mother and go to the land of Israel, for those who were trying to take the child's life are dead." So he got up, took the child and his mother and went to the land of Israel. But when he heard that Archelaus was reigning in Judea in place of his father Herod, he was afraid to go there. Having been warned in a dream, he withdrew to the district of Galilee, and he went and lived in a town called Nazareth. So was fulfilled what was said through the prophets, that he would be called a Nazarene.[23]

When Jesus heard that John had been put in prison, he withdrew to Galilee. Leaving Nazareth, he went and live in Capernaum, which was by the lake in the area of Zebulun and Naphtali—to fulfill what was said through the prophet Isaiah: "Land of Zebulun and land of Naphtali, the Way of the Sea, beyond the Jordan, Galilee of the Gentiles—the people living in darkness have seen a great light; on those living in the land of the shadow of death a light has dawned." From that time on Jesus began to preach,

20 Matthew 4:1-11.
21 Matthew 1:23-25.
22 Mark 1:9-15.
23 Matthew 2:19-23.

"Repent, for the kingdom of heaven has come near."[24]

When Jesus had finished these parables, he moved on from there. Coming to his hometown, he began teaching the people in their synagogue, and they were amazed. "Where did this man get this wisdom and these miraculous powers?" they asked. "Isn't this the carpenter's son? Isn't his mother's name Mary, and aren't his brothers James, Joseph, Simon and Judas? Aren't all his sisters with us? Where then did this man get all these things?" And they took offense at him. But Jesus said to them, "A prophet is not without honor except in his own town and in his own home." And he did not do many miracles there because of their lack of faith.[25]

Jesus returned to Galilee in the power of the Spirit, and news about him spread through the whole countryside. He was teaching in their synagogues, and everyone praised him. He went to Nazareth, where he had been brought up, and on the Sabbath day he went into the synagogue, as was his custom. He stood up to read, and the scroll of the prophet Isaiah was handed to him. Unrolling it, he found the place where it is written: "The Spirit of the Lord is on me, because he has anointed me to proclaim good news to the poor. He has sent me to proclaim freedom for the prisoners and recovery of sight for the blind, to set the oppressed free, to proclaim the year of the Lord's favor." Then he rolled up the scroll, gave it back to the attendant and sat down. The eyes of everyone in the synagogue were fastened on him.[26]

<u>Revenge and/or Victory – Random Passage 11</u>

Jesus said to him, "Away from me, Satan! For it is written: 'Worship the Lord your God, and serve him only.' "Then the devil left him, and angels came and attended him.[27]

Jesus answered, "It is said: 'Do not put the Lord your God to the test.' "When the devil had finished all this tempting, he left him until an opportune time.[28]

The next day John saw Jesus coming toward him and said, "Look, the Lamb of God, who takes away the sin of the word! This is the one I meant when I said, 'A man who comes after me has surpassed me because he was before me.' I myself did not know him, but the reason I came baptizing with water was that he might be revealed to Israel."[29]

<u>Acknowledged as Special – Random Passage 7</u>

[John the Baptist said] "I baptize you with water for repentance. But after me comes one who is more powerful than I, whose sandals I am not worthy to carry. He will baptize you with the Hold Spirit and fire."[30]

---

24 Matthew 4:12-17.
25 Matthew 13:53-58.
26 Luke 4:14-20.
27 Matthew 4:10-11.
28 Luke 4:12-13.
29 John 1:29-31
30 Matthew 3:11.

When Jesus came down from the mountainside, large crowds followed him. A man with leprosy came and knelt before him and said, "Lord, if you are willing, you can make me clean." Jesus reached out his hand and touched the man. "I am willing," he said. "Be clean!" Immediately he was cleansed of his leprosy.[31]

Jesus stepped into a boat, crossed over and came to his own town. Some men brought to him a paralyzed man, lying on a mat. When Jesus saw their faith, he said to the man, "Take heart, son; your sins are forgiven." At this, some of the teachers of the law said to themselves, "This fellow is blaspheming!" Knowing their thoughts, Jesus said, "Why do you entertain evil thoughts in your hearts? Which is easier: to say, 'Your sins are forgiven,' or to say, 'Get up and walk'? But I want you to know that the Son of Man has authority on earth to forgive sins." So he said to the paralyzed man, "Get up, take your mat and go home." Then the man got up and went home. When the crowd saw this, they were filled with awe; and they praised God, who had given such authority to man.[32]

As soon as they left the synagogue, they went with James and John to the home of Simon and Andrew. Simon's mother-in-law was in bed with a fever, and they immediately told Jesus about her. So he went to her, took her hand and helped her up. The fever left her and she began to wait on them. That evening after sunset the people brought to Jesus all the sick and demon-possessed. The whole town gathered at the door, and Jesus healed many who had various diseases. He also drove out many demons, but he would not let the demons speak because they knew who he was.[33]

To this John replied, "A person can receive only what is given them from heaven. You yourselves can testify that I said, 'I am not the Messiah but am sent ahead of him.' The bride belongs to the bridegroom. The friend who attends the bridegroom waits and listens for him, and is full of joy when he hears the bridegroom's voice. That joy is mine, and it is now complete. He must become greater; I must become less." The one who comes from above is above all; the one who is from the earth belongs to the earth, and speaks as one from the earth. The one who comes from heaven is above all. He testifies to what he has seen and heard, but no one accepts his testimony. Whoever has accepted it has certified that God is truthful. For the one whom God has sent speaks the words of God, for God gives the Spirit without limit. The Father loves the Son and has placed everything in his hands. Whoever believes in the Son has eternal life, but whoever rejects the Son will not see life, for God's wrath remains on them.[34]

<u>Period of Reign – Random Passage 8</u>

Then Jesus came from Galilee to the Jordan to be baptized by John. But John tried to deter him, saying, "I need to be baptized by you, and do you come to me?" Jesus replied, "Let it be so not; it is proper for us to do this to fulfill all righteousness." Then John consented. As soon as Jesus was baptized, he went up out of the water. At that

31 Matthew 8:1-3.
32 Matthew 9:1-8.
33 Mark 1:29-34.
34 John 27:36.

moment heaven was opened, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove and alighting on him. And a voice from heaven said, "This is my Son, whom I love; with him I am well pleased."[35]

Aware of this, Jesus withdrew from that place. A large crowd followed him, and he healed all who were ill. He warned them not to tell others about him. This was to fulfill what was spoken through the prophet Isaiah: "Here is my servant whom I have chosen, the one I love, in whom I delight; I will put my Spirit on him, and he will proclaim justice to the nations. He will not quarrel or cry out; no one will hear his voice in the streets. A bruised reed he will not break, and a smoldering wick he will not snuff out, till he has brought justice through victory. In his name the nations will put their hope."[36]

After six days Jesus took with him Peter, James and John the brother of James, and led them up a high mountain by themselves. There he was transfigured before them. His face shone like the sun, and his clothes became as white as the light. Just then there appeared before them Moses and Elijah, talking with Jesus. Peter said to Jesus, "Lord, it is good for us to be here. If you wish, I will put up three shelters—one for you, one for Moses and one for Elijah." While he was still speaking, a bright cloud covered them, and a voice from the cloud said, "This is my Son, whom I love, with him I am well pleased. Listen to him!" When the disciples heard this, they fell facedown to the ground, terrified. But Jesus came and touched them. "Get up," he said. "Don't be afraid." When they looked up they saw no one except Jesus. As they were coming down the mountain, Jesus instructed them. "Don't tell anyone what you have seen, until the Son of Man has been raised from the dead."[37]

Now Jesus himself was about thirty-years old when he began his ministry.[38]

Decline, Reviled and Hunted – Random Passage 2

While Jesus was in Bethany in the home of Simon the Leper, a woman came to him with an alabaster jar of very expensive perfume, which she poured on his head as he was reclining at the table. When the disciples saw this, they were indignant. "Why this waste?" they asked. "This perfume could have been sold at a high price and the money given to the poor." Aware of this, Jesus said to them, "Why are you bothering this woman? She has done a beautiful thing to me. The poor you will always have with you, but you will not always have me. When she poured this perfume on my body she did it to prepare me for burial. Truly I tell you, wherever this gospel is preached throughout the world, what she has done will also be told, in memory of her."[39]

Then one of the Twelve—the one called Judas Iscariot—went to the chief priests and asked, "What are you willing to give me if I deliver him over to you?" So they counted out for him thirty pieces of silver. From then on Judas watched for an opportunity

35 Matthew 3:13-17.
36 Matthew 12:15-21.
37 Matthew 17:1-9.
38 Luke 3:23.
39 Matthew 26:1-5.

to hand him over.[40]

While he was still speaking, Judas, one of the Twelve, arrived. With him was a large crowd armed with swords and clubs, sent from the chief priests and the elders of the people. Now the betrayer had arranged a signal with them: "The one I kiss is the man: arrest him." Going at once to Jesus, Judas said, "Greetings, Rabbi!" and kissed him. Jesus replied, "Do what you came for, friend."[41]

Those who had arrested Jesus took him to Caiaphas the high priest, where the teachers of the law and the elders had assembled. But Peter followed him at a distance, right up to the courtyard of the high priest. He entered and sat down with the guards to see the outcome. The chief priests and the whole Sanhedrin were looking for false evidence against Jesus so that they could put him to death. But they did not find any, though many false witnesses came forward. Finally two came forward and declared, "This fellow said, 'I am able to destroy the temple of God and rebuild it in three days.'" Then the high priest stood up and said to Jesus, "Are you not going to answer? What is this testimony that these men are bringing against you?" But Jesus remained silent. The high priest said to him, "I charge you under oath by the living God: Tell us if you are the Messiah, the Son of God." "You have said so," Jesus replied. "But I say to all of you: From now on you will see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of the Mighty One and coming on the clouds of heaven." Then the high priest tore his clothes and said, "He has spoken blasphemy! Why do we need any more witnesses? Look, now you have heard the blasphemy. What do you think?" "He is worthy of death," they answered. Then they spit in his face and struck him with their fists. Others slapped him and said, "Prophesy to us, Messiah. Who hit you?"[42]

Just as he was speaking, Judas, one of the Twelve, appeared. With him was a crowd armed with swords and clubs, sent from the chief priests, the teachers of the law, and the elders. Now the betrayer had arranged a signal with them: "The one I kiss is the man; arrest him and lead him away under guard." Going at once to Jesus, Judas said, "Rabbi!" and kissed him. The men seized Jesus and arrested him.[43]

The high priest tore his clothes. "Why do we need any more witnesses?" he asked. "You have heard the blasphemy. What do you think?" They all condemned him as worthy of death. Then some began to spit at him; they blindfolded him, struck him with their fists, and said, "Prophesy!" And the guards took him and beat him.[44]

"What shall I do, then, with the one you call the king of the Jews?" Pilate asked them. "Crucify him!" they shouted. "Why? What crime has he committed?" asked Pilate. But they shouted all the louder, "Crucify him!" Wanting to satisfy the crowd, Pilate released Barabbas to them. He had Jesus flogged, and handed him over to be crucified.[45]

---

40 Matthew 26:14-16.
41 Matthew 26:47-50.
42 Matthew 26:57-67.
43 Mark 14:43-46.
44 Mark 14:63-65.
45 Mark 15:12-15.

But the whole crowd shouted, "Away with this man! Release Barabbas to us!" (Barabbas had been thrown into prison for an insurrection in the city, and for murder.) Wanting to release Jesus, Pilate appealed to them again. But they kept shouting, "Crucify him! Crucify him!" For the third time he spoke to them: "Why? What crime has this man committed? I have found in him no grounds for the death penalty. Therefore I will have him punished and then release him." But with loud shouts they insistently demanded that he be crucified, and their shouts prevailed. So Pilate decided to grant their demand. He released the man who had been thrown into prison for insurrection and murder, the one they asked for, and surrendered Jesus to their will.[46]

From then on, Pilate tried to set Jesus free, but the Jewish leaders kept shouting, "If you let this man go, you are no friend of Caesar. Anyone who claims to be a king opposes Caesar." When Pilate heard this, he brought Jesus out and sat down on the judge's seat at a place known as the Stone Pavement (which in Aramaic is Gabbatha). It was the day of Preparation of the Passover; it was about noon. "Here is your king," Pilate said to the Jews. But they shouted, "Take him away! Take him away! Crucify him!" "Shall I crucify your king?" Pilate asked. "We have no king but Caesar," the chief priests answered. Finally Pilate handed him over to them to be crucified.[47]

Extraordinary Death, Body not Buried, More than one Grave or Burial Site – Random Passage 5

As they were going out, they met a man from Cyrene, named Simon, and they forced him to carry the cross. They came to a place called Golgotha (which means "the place of the skull"). There they offered Jesus wine to drink, mixed with gall; but after tasting it, he refused to drink it. When they had crucified him, they divided up his clothes by casting lots. And sitting down, they kept watch over him there. Above his head they placed the written charge against him: This is Jesus, the King of the Jews. Two rebels were crucified with him, one on his right and one on his left. Those who passed by hurled insults at him, shaking their heads and saying, "You who are going to destroy the temple and build it in three days, save yourself! Come down from the cross, if you are the Son of God!" In the same way the chief priests, the teachers of the law and the elders mocked him. "He saved others," they said, "but he can't save himself! He's the king of Israel! Let him come down now from the cross, and we will believe in him. He trusts in God. Let God rescue him now if he wants him, for he said, 'I am the Son of God.' " In the same way the rebels who were crucified with him also heaped insults on him. From noon until three in the afternoon Jesus cried out in a loud voice, "Eli, Eli, lema sabachthani?" (Which means "My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?") When some of those standing there heard this, they said, "He's calling for Elijah." Immediately one of them ran and got a sponge. He filled it with wine vinegar, put it on a staff, and offered it to Jesus to drink. The rest said, "Now leave him alone. Let's see of Elijah comes to save him." And when Jesus had cried out again in a loud voice, he gave up his spirit. At that moment the curtain

46 Luke 23:18-25.
47 John 19:12-16.

of the temple was torn in two from top to bottom. The earth shook, the rocks split and the tombs broke open. The bodies of many holy people who had died were raised to life. They came out of the tombs after Jesus' resurrection and went into the holy city and appeared to many people. When the centurion and those with him who were guarding Jesus saw the earthquake and all that had happened, they were terrified, and exclaimed, "Surely he was the Son of God!"[48]

As evening approached, there came a rich man from Arimathea, named Joseph, who had himself become a disciple of Jesus. Going to Pilate, he asked for Jesus' body, and Pilate ordered that it be given to him. Joseph took the body, wrapped it in a clean linen cloth, and placed it in his own new tomb that he had cut out of the rock. He rolled a big stone in front of the entrance to the tomb and went away.[49]

A certain man from Cyrene, Simon, the father of Alexander and Rufus, was passing by on his way in from the country, and they forced him to carry the cross. They brought Jesus to the place called Golgotha (which means "the place of the skull"). Then they offered him wine mixed with myrrh, but he did not take it. And they crucified him. Dividing up his clothes, they cast lots to see what each would get. It was nine in the morning when they crucified him. The written notice of the charge against him read: The King of the Jews. They crucified two rebels with him, one on his right and one on his left. Those who passed by hurled insults at him, shaking their heads and saying, "So! You who are going to destroy the temple and build it in three days, come down from the cross and save yourself!" In the same way the chief priests and the teachers of the law mocked him among themselves. "He saved others," they said, "but he can't save himself! Let this Messiah, this king of Israel, come down now from the cross, that we may see and believe." Those crucified with him also heaped insults on him. At noon, darkness came over the whole land until three in the afternoon. And at three in the afternoon Jesus cried out in a loud voice, "Eloi, Eloi, lema sabachthani?" (Which means "My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?") When some of those standing near heard this, they said, "Listen, he's calling Elijah." Someone ran, filled a sponge with wine vinegar, put it on a staff, and offered it to Jesus to drink. "Now leave him alone. Let's see if Elijah comes to take him down," he said. With a loud cry, Jesus breathed his last. The curtain of the temple was torn in two from top to bottom. And when the centurion, who stood there in front of Jesus, saw how he died," he said, "Surely this man was the Son of God!" Some women were watching from a distance. Among them were Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James the younger and of Joseph, and Salome. In Galilee these women had followed him and cared for his needs. Many other women who had come up with him to Jerusalem were also there.[50]

It was Preparation Day (that is, the day before the Sabbath). So as evening approached, Joseph of Arimathea, a prominent member of the Council, who was himself waiting for the kingdom of God, went boldly to Pilate and asked for Jesus' body. Pilate was surprised to hear that he was already dead. Summoning the centurion, he asked him if

48 Matthew 27:32-54.
49 Matthew 27:57-60.
50 Mark 15:21-41.

Jesus had already died. When he learned from the centurion that it was so, he gave the body to Joseph. So Joseph bought some linen cloth, took down the body, wrapped it in the linen, and placed it in a tomb cut out of rock. Then he rolled a stone against the entrance of the tomb. Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of Joseph saw where he was laid.[51]

As the soldiers led him away, they seized Simon from Cyrene, who was on his way I from the country, and put the cross on him and made him carry it behind Jesus. A large number of people followed him, including women who mourned and wailed for him. Jesus turned and said to them, "Daughters of Jerusalem, do not weep for me; weep for yourselves and for your children. For the time will come when you will say, 'Blessed are the childless women, the wombs that never bore and the breasts that never nursed! Then 'they will say to the mountains, "Fall on us!" and to the hills, "Cover us!"' For if people do these things when the tree is green, what will happen when it is dry?" Two other men, both criminals, were also led out with him to be executed. When they came to the place called the Skull, they crucified him there, along with the criminals—one on his right, the other on his left. Jesus said, "Father, forgive them, for they do not know what they are doing." And they divided up his clothes by casting lots. The people stood watching, and the rulers even sneered at him. They said, "He saved others; let him save himself if he is God's Messiah, the Chosen One." The soldiers also came up and mocked him. They offered him wine vinegar and said, "If you are the king of the Jews, save yourself." There was a written notice above him, which read: This is the King of the Jews. One of the criminals who hung there hurled insults at him: "Aren't you the Messiah? Save yourself and us!" But the other criminal rebuked him. "Don't you fear God," he said, "since you are under the same sentence? We are punished justly, for we are getting what our deeds deserve. But this man has done nothing wrong." Then he said, "Jesus, remember me when you come into you kingdom." Jesus answered him, "Truly I tell you, today you will be with me in paradise." It was now about noon, and darkness came over the whole land until three in the afternoon, for the sun stopped shining. And the curtain of the temple was torn in two. Jesus called out with a loud voice, "Father, into your hands I commit my spirit." When he had said this, he breathed his last. The centurion, seeing what had happened, praised God and said, "Surely this was a righteous man." When all the people who had gathered to witness this sight saw what took place, they beat their breasts and went away. But all those who knew him, including the women who had followed him from Galilee, stood at a distance, watching these things.[52]

Now there was a man named Joseph, a member of the Council, a good and upright man, who had not consented to their decision and action. He came from the Judean town of Arimathea, and he himself was waiting for the kingdom of God. Going to Pilate, he asked for Jesus' body. Then he took it down, wrapped it in linen cloth and placed it in a tomb cut in the rock, one in which no one had yet been laid. It was Preparation Day, and the Sabbath was about to begin. The women who had come with Jesus from Galilee followed Joseph and saw the tomb and how his body was laid in it. Then they went home and prepared spices and perfumes. But they rested on the Sabbath in obedience to the

51 Mark 15:42-47.
52 Luke 23:26-49.

commandment.[53]

So the soldiers took charge of Jesus. Carrying his own cross, he went out to the place of the Skull (which in Aramaic is called Golgotha). There they crucified him, and with him two others—one on each side and Jesus in the middle. Pilate had a notice prepared and fastened to the cross. It read: Jesus of Nazareth, The King of the Jews. Many of the Jews read this sign, for the place where Jesus was crucified was near the city, and the sign was written in Aramaic, Latin and Greek. The chief priests of the Jews protested to Pilate, "Do not write 'The King of the Jews,' but that this man claimed to be king of the Jews." Pilate answered, "What I have written, I have written." When the soldiers crucified Jesus, they took his clothes, dividing them into four shares, one for each of the, with the undergarment remaining. The garment was seamless, woven in one piece from top to bottom. "Let's not tear it," they said to one another. "Let's decide by lot who will get it." This happened that the scripture might be fulfilled that said, "They divided my clothes among them and cast lots for my garment." So this is what the soldiers did. Near the cross of Jesus stood his mother, his mother's sister, Mary the wife of Clopas, and Mary Magdalene. When Jesus saw his mother there, and the disciple whom he loved standing nearby he said to her, "Woman, here is your son," and to the disciple, "Here is your mother." From that time on, this disciple took her into his home. Later, knowing that everything had now been finished, and so that Scripture would be fulfilled, Jesus said, "I am thirsty." A jar of wine vinegar was there, so they soaked a sponge in it, put the sponge on a stalk of the hyssop plant, and lifted it to Jesus' lips. When he had received the drink, Jesus said, "It is finished." With that, he bowed his head and gave up his spirit. Now it was the day of Preparation, and the next day was to be a special Sabbath. Because the Jewish leaders did not want the bodies left on the crosses during the Sabbath, they asked Pilate to have the legs broken and the bodies taken down. The soldiers therefore came and broke the legs of the first man who had been crucified with Jesus, and then those of the other. But when they came to Jesus and found that he was already dead, they did not break his legs. Instead, one of the soldiers pierced Jesus's side with a spear, bringing a sudden flow of blood and water. The man who saw it has given testimony, and his testimony is true. He knows that he tells the truth, and he testifies so that you also may believe. These things happened so that the scripture would be fulfilled: "Not one of his bones will be broken," and, as another scripture says, "They will look on the one they have pierced."[54]

Later, Joseph of Arimathea asked Pilate for the body of Jesus. Now Joseph was a disciple of Jesus, but secretly because he feared the Jewish leaders. With Pilate's permission, he came and took the body away. He was accompanied by Nicodemus, the man who earlier had visited Jesus at night. Nicodemus brought a mixture of myrrh and aloes, about seventy-five pounds. Taking Jesus' body, the two of them wrapped it, with the spices, in strips of linen. This was in accordance with Jewish burial customs. At the place where Jesus was crucified, there was a garden, and in the garden a new tomb, in which no one had ever been laid. Because it was the Jewish day of Preparation and since

53 Luke 23:50-56.
54 John 19:17-37.

the tomb was nearby, they laid Jesus there.[55]

After the Sabbath, at down on the first day of the week, Mary Magdalene and the other Mary went to look at the tomb. There was a violent earthquake, for an angel of the Lord came down from heaven and, going to the tomb, rolled back the stone and sat on it. His appearance was like lightning and his clothes were white as snow. The guards were so afraid of him that they shook and became like dead men. The angel said to the women, "Do not be afraid, for I know that you are looking for Jesus, who was crucified. He is not here; he has risen, just as he said. Come and see the place where he lay. Then go quickly and tell his disciples: 'He has risen from the dead and is going ahead of you into Galilee. There you will see him.' Now I have told you." So the women hurried away from the tomb, afraid yet filled with joy, and ran to tell his disciples. Suddenly Jesus met them. "Greetings," he said. They came to him, clasped his feet and worshiped him. Then Jesus said to them, "Do not be afraid. Go and tell my brothers to go to Galilee; there they will see me."[56]

When the Sabbath was over, Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James, and Salome bought spices so that they might go to anoint Jesus' body. Very early on the first day of the week, just after sunrise, they were on their way to the tomb and they asked each other, "Who will roll the stone away from the entrance of the tomb?" But when they looked up, they saw that the stone, which was very large, had been rolled away. As they entered the tomb, they saw a young man dressed in a white robe sitting on the right side, and they were alarmed. "Don't be alarmed," he said. "You are looking for Jesus the Nazarene, who was crucified. He has risen! He is not here. See the place where they laid him. But go, tell his disciples and Peter, 'He is going ahead of you into Galilee. There you will see him, just as he told you.'" Trembling and bewildered, the women went out and fled from the tomb. They said nothing to anyone, because they were afraid."[57]

On the first day of the week, very early in the morning, the women took the spices they had prepared and went to the tomb. They found the stone rolled away from the tomb, but when they entered, they did not find the body of the Lord Jesus. While they were wondering about this, suddenly two men in clothes that gleamed like lightning stood beside them. In their fright the women bowed down with their faces to the ground, but the men said to them, "Why do you look for the living among the dead? He is not here; he has risen! Remember how he told you, while he was still with you in Galilee: 'The Son of Man must be delivered over to the hands of sinners, be crucified and on the third day be raised again.'" Then they remembered his words. When they came back from the tomb, they told all these things to the Eleven and to all the others. It was Mary Magdalene, Joanna, Mary the mother of James, and the others with them who told this to the apostles. But they did not believe the women, because their words seemed to them like nonsense. Peter, however, got up and ran to the tomb. Bending over, he saw the strips of linen lying by themselves, and he went away, wondering to himself what had

55 John 19:38-42.
56 Matthew 28:1-8.
57 Mark 16:1-8.

happened.[58]

Early on the first day of the week, while it was still dark, Mary Magdalene went to the tomb and saw that the stone had been removed from the entrance. So she came running to Simon Peter and the other disciple, the one Jesus loved, and said, "They have taken the Lord out of the tomb, and we don't know where they have put him!" So Peter and the other disciple started for the tomb. Both were running, but the other disciple outran Peter and reached the tomb first. He bent over and looked in at the strips of linen lying there but did not go in. Then Simon Peter came along behind him and went straight into the tomb. He saw the strips of linen lying there, as well as the cloth that had been wrapped around Jesus' head. The cloth was still lying in its place, separate from the linen. Finally the other disciple, who had reached the tomb first, also went inside. He saw and believed. (They still did not understand from Scripture that Jesus had to rise from the dead.) Then the disciples went back to where they were staying. Now Mary stood outside the tomb crying. As she wept, she bent over to look into the tomb and saw two angels in white, seated where Jesus' body had been, one at the head and the other at the foot. They asked her, "Woman, why are you crying?" "They have taken my Lord away," she said, "and I don't know where they have put him." At this, she turned around and saw Jesus standing there, but she did not realize that it was Jesus. He asked her, "Woman, why are you crying? Who is it you are looking for?" Thinking he was the gardener, she said, "Sir, if you have carried him away, tell me where you have put him, and I will get him." Jesus said to her, "Mary." She turned toward him and cried out in Aramaic, "Rabboni!" (Which means "Teacher"). Jesus said, "Do not hold on to me, for I have not yet ascended to the Father. Go instead to my brothers and tell them. 'I am ascending to my Father and you Father, to my God and your God.'" Mary Magdalene went to the disciples with the news: "I have seen the Lord!" And she told them that he had said these things to her.[59]

58 Luke 24:1-12.
59 John 20:1-18.