

Visiting Opus Archives and Research Center: Explorations into the Worlds of Campbell, Gimbutas, and Hillman

Paul Astin
Preliminary Research Report – Mythos Grant
February 2011

INTRODUCTION

I spent a total of five days in the archives and collections. While I spent a good deal of my time reading unpublished correspondence of James Hillman and listening to recorded lectures of Joseph Campbell. I also allowed for some spontaneous exploration, as when I viewed and reflected upon a dozen or so Katherine M. Sanford's paintings before then reading her written interpretations of them in *The Serpent and the Cross*. I also handled several replicas of Upper Paleolithic goddess figurines that had belonged to Marija Gimbutas in an attempt to arrive at a more visceral and tactile experience of the carvings that so inspired her work and that of other scholars.

As a writer, I know and trust the power of intuition and I was willing to follow my gut sense of how I might best explore the vast holdings in such a short time. So while I had a road map that I was willing to modify, I also sat in reflection before every visit, reviewing the description of holdings from the Opus webpage, and seeking to follow a research path that might be free from too much preconception or predetermined direction. Were there nuggets of knowledge, avenues of discovery, that might reveal themselves to an open-minded researcher? I hoped to find out.

For my first two days in the archives, I decided I would start by exploring the link between two of my most significant intellectual heroes: Joseph Campbell and Marija Gimbutas. Prior to visiting the archives, I had read Campbell's foreword to Gimbutas's book, *The Language of the Goddess*. The book was not published until four years after Campbell's death, and it seemed to reflect Campbell's increasing recognition of, and respect for, the central role of the feminine in Paleolithic cosmologies and Neolithic social orders. His written endorsement in Gimbutas's foreword is anything but faint praise, and I was curious to explore how the grandfather of mythological studies had arrived at such feminist views about the centrality of the Goddess, and had become so willing to poetically¹ articulate them near the end of this long life. Did he always hold these views? I was interested to find out. To understand how a scholar as erudite as Campbell arrived at beliefs sympathetic to a renegade like Gimbutas interested me for what it might offer other intellectuals who continued to regard the Neolithic as a backward time in the development of social and cultural values, and who consider ideas

¹“Gimbutas's lexicon of the pictorial script [is] of that primordial attempt on humanity's part to understand and live in harmony with the beauty and wonder of Creation...One cannot but feel that in the appearance of this volume at just this turn of the century there is an evident relevance to the universally recognized need in our time for a general transformation of consciousness. The message here is of an actual age of harmony and peace in accord with the creative energies of nature which for a spell of some four thousand prehistoric years anteceded the five thousand of...the 'nightmare'...from which it is now certainly time for this planet to wake” (Campbell, xiv, Foreword to Gimbutas' *The Language of the Goddess*).

about the centrality of a Female Divine in early human societies to be merely the contrivances of a fringe element in feminist historiography.

DAY 1

On day one, I decided it would be useful to examine Campbell's unpublished lectures –most notably those found in the huge collection of audiocassettes at Opus. In this way, I could begin my explorations by tracing the development of his views and perspectives about veneration of the feminine.

The earliest lecture I could find was one given for WNYC television in New York from 1963, part of a series entitled “Mask, Myth, and Dream.”

As it turned out, this lecture was rather dry and matter-of-fact, although it had a few useful kernels of information that inspired my note-taker's hand. Campbell related the work of archaeologist James Mellaart whose excavations at Catal Huyuk in Turkey in the early 1960s –one of the first Neolithic sites unearthed- revealed the presence of a culture in which, according to Mellaart, veneration of the goddess was central. I was particularly impressed that Campbell was both privy to this information and willing to share it in his lecture, because Mellaart did not fully publish these theories until 1967, four years after Campbell's talk. Clearly Joseph Campbell –as early as 1963- was aware of the controversial stirrings in archaeological circles about emerging ideas such as those that would later make Mellaart famous (if not infamous). And he was not afraid to speak about them publicly.

Other than this, there was little discussion of the importance of the goddess to early peoples in Campbell's 1963 lecture. Campbell describes the work of a Professor [Leonard] Woolley whose excavations of grave sites belonging to the later Civilization of Ur, showed significant patriarchal elements, including the burial of kings with dozens of sacrificed women. Of special interest to my research on the demise of the goddess however, was Campbell's statement that the emergence of the patriarchal Civilization of Ur occurred, “exactly in this time that writing was developed.”²

The overall tone of Campbell's lecture suggests that he shared some of the common biases of his time, prizing what he refers to as the ‘high civilizations’ that emerged after the Neolithic. He talks about how these later civilizations, unlike their Neolithic predecessors, embodied the greatest achievements in art, science, and architecture. No mention is made however of ‘high’ civilization's establishment of, and dependence upon slavery, warfare, and social stratification –elements Gimbutas (and

²As part of my research and thesis on the demise of Goddess worshipping civilizations of the Neolithic, I have been intrigued with the writings and theories of the late Dr. Leonard Shlain. In his well-researched book, *The Alphabet versus the Goddess*, he argues that it was the advent of literacy –and specifically not Gimbutas's Kurgan invaders- that ultimately led to patriarchal social structures. As a vascular brain surgeon and art historian, Shlain claimed that the left hemisphere of the brain –the one associated with male hunting and dissociated with empathy- became dominant with the introduction of systems of writing (a process reliant on right-handedness and left-brain structures), and that this caused a societal shift to masculine, linear, and logical social orders which contrasted with more feminine, right-hemispheric principals largely present in the preliterate Neolithic societies.

Eisler) would later describe in pointing to the limitations of post-Neolithic patriarchal social orders.

After reviewing this early 1963 Campbell audio lecture, I jumped ahead to some of his notes from a series of talks entitled, "Myths and Mysteries of the Great Goddess." These talks were given at the New School in New York City on April 21 and 22, 1983.

In this presentation, I can see a very different Joseph Campbell from his lecture of 20 years earlier. Campbell begins to describe the different ways that social organization can influence cosmological models. The following quote both supports and provides an explanation for Gimbutas's critical theory that herding peoples venerated male sky gods, while pastoralists revered a female goddess. As Campbell writes,

"Where you have agricultural people, basically the women are the magicians, you might say. It is their magic that influences the soil, and the representation mythologically as the goddess becomes the principal devoted deity...Where you have herding peoples, however, the hunting and herding tribes, their principal deities tend to be male deities. The principal work of raising cattle and slaughtering is in the men's department, and consequently, stands in radical contrast to the goddess system" (page 3).

Also in this presentation, unlike his lecture from 1963, Campbell begins to show an emotional identification with his ideas, particularly as they relate to the Goddess. He becomes very prosaic, even poetic, as when he says:

"The goddess...is the incarnation of the power of nature to pour future forward from past. Between past and future is the goddess. Between seed and new life is the goddess" (page 4-5).

Finally, in this lecture I was impressed with Campbell's explanation of why there are significant gender differences in the puberty rites of passage among tribal peoples. I have long known that the rites of passage for boys tend to involve more rigorous ordeals of transformation, but I had never before heard such a compelling account of why this was so. I found Campbell's explanation very persuasive:

"One of the problems of the boy is to disengage his libido, his psychic energy, from the mother. And the young girl doesn't have this problem. She becomes a mother. But the primitive people have enormously complicated rituals, and a painful one for the boys. They have to be *turned into* men. Life, you might say, overtakes the girl with her first menstruation. Then she's a woman. And in these early societies, the girls is [new page] usually put in a menstruation hut, just a place to sit there for a little time...meditating, realizing what has become of her, that she is now a vehicle of a power that is beyond herself. The boy doesn't have anything like this. He has to be turned not into a nature power, but into a socially active entity. And so he has to be turned into a man" (page 11-12).

DAY 2

On the second day at Opus, I asked Richard to take me to the personal libraries of Campbell and Gimbutas, housed in separate building from the archived file boxes. I was especially interested to look at their respective collections and, in particular, to examine the margin notes that Richard told me Campbell had often made in his personal books. Did Campbell make margin notes in the books of his written by Gimbutas? I wanted to find out what captured his attention.

The first book I looked at was one belonging to Campbell and containing early writings of Gimbutas³. As I had hoped, this edited book of articles from 1956 contained Campbell's underlining and margin notes.

The opening line of Gimbutas' article in the volume highlights her early interest in interdisciplinary pursuits, something uncommon in academic circles at the time, although Campbell himself had left graduate studies 10 years earlier because his professors felt –at least in part- that he was stretched too thin between competing disciplines. Campbell must have felt an immediate empathy with Gimbutas, who writes:

“The final solution of the problem of the origin of the Indo-European speaking people will be brought about only by an exquisite synthesis of results achieved by linguists and cultural and physical anthropologists. Admittedly some branches of research, such as archaeology, have not yet reached sound enough results to be widely used for this *interdisciplinary synthesis*” (p. 541, emphasis added).

She then makes what is probably her first reference to the Kurgans when she writes,

“In the northern Caucasus, along the river Kuban and the shores of the black Sea a vigorous group of people appeared with knowledge of agriculture, stock-breeding, copper, gold and silver. They buried their dead in house-like structures of stone or timber under large barrows or ‘kurgans’ (‘kurgan’ is the Russian word for barrow). Hence the designation ‘Kurgan Culture’.” (p. 542).

Campbell has carefully underlined this section, and written ‘Kurgan’ in the margin. While this article is mostly about the artifacts, and includes Gimbutas's detailed descriptions of the pottery from this area, she also begins to describe how the culture in this region shifted as a result of the arrival of the Kurgan pastoralists:

³In 1956, Marija Gimbutas presented a paper at the 5th International Congress on Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences (Philadelphia, September 1-9). Her paper was entitled “Culture Change in Europe at the Start of the Second Millennium B.C. A Contribution to the Indo-European Problem,” and outlined some of her earliest theories about the presence and later decline of goddess worshipping cultures in the Balkan region of Europe. This paper was later published in a book entitled Men and Cultures (University of Philadelphia Press, 1960) edited by Anthony F.C. Wallace. As noted above, the book is in the Campbell collection and Gimbutas's article contains his underlining and margin notes.

“Totally new elements of culture were brought...by the Kurgan people...They are: (a) social (distinct systems of classes and of *patriarchy*), (b)...dominance of symbols associated with *the sky deity*, particularly often solar symbols)...(d) economic (vehicles and predominance of stock breeding over agriculture)” (p. 543, emphasis added).

Here, Gimbutas foreshadows her later theories about the social influences impacting early Neolithic culture and leading to patriarchal social orders dominated by male gods (a world we still live in five thousand years later).

As I dug a little deeper into Campbell’s vast library collection, I found some important works which he had edited and which revealed early scholarly influences that must have shaped Campbell’s later views around issues of the mythological roles of male and female, and the ways in which ancient traditions presented models vastly different from the typically Western patriarchal gender biases.

In particular, Campbell’s library included a volume edited by Campbell in 1968 entitled The Mystic Vision: Papers from the Eranos Yearbooks. Within that volume was an article by the late Heinrich Zimmer, an important friend and mentor of Joseph Campbell’s. Zimmer died of pneumonia in 1943 at the age of 52. Upon his death, Campbell was given the task of editing and posthumously publishing many of Zimmer’s papers. The aforementioned article, entitled “The Indian World Mother,” had originally been presented in 1938 as part of the Eranos Lectures, and Campbell’s edited volume was published fully 25 years after Zimmer’s death.

In the forward to the volume, Campbell writes that all of the presentations of the Eranos gatherings, in their eloquence and philosophical optimism, point to a “hidden harmony [which] might be thought to promise a day of peace to come” (p. xiv). Campbell clearly had great hopes that the ideas presented therein could further the emergence of a more egalitarian world.

During his lifetime, Zimmer was a renowned Indologist and historian of South Asian arts. In “The Indian World Mother,” his comments on the feminism inherent in Hinduism must have influenced the thinking of the younger Campbell. In the essay, Zimmer calls Hinduism a religion in which,

“the gods are all aware of this highest, female world force. They know that their male intelligence and pride can accomplish nothing without her –and this is disclosed in a myth concerning the genesis of the goddess...the Great Goddess...takes the weapons and implements of all the gods with her many arms, and adorns herself...Here, all the gods, by renouncing their weapons...admit that all divine energy of the universe, in its multiple manifestations, is gesture, emanation, form of the one primal force: the ‘*sakti* and World Mother” (pp. 77-78).

These are provocative ideas for Zimmer to lecture about in 1938, the same year Marija Gimbutas was graduating from secondary school in far-off Lithuania!

Zimmer’s ideas seem to foreshadow the later work of Riane Eisler, whose 1996 book *Sacred Pleasure: Sex, Myth, and the Politics of the Body* drew heavily on the seminal work of Gimbutas. In his article, Zimmer (1938) writes:

“The erotic sacrament of the sexes stands above the enjoyment of meat and drink as the supreme intoxicant by which men can attain redemption in their lifetime. Though distrusted, excoriated, and subjected to wise limitations, it remains the natural and primal fulfillment of the cult of the Great Goddess” (p. 93).

In examining the holdings in Gimbutas’s personal library, we also can appreciate the role that early scholarly mentors and seminal written sources may have had on the emerging ideas of this brilliant archaeologist. In the Gimbutas collection there is a three-volume tome written by Robert Briffalut, entitled, *The Mothers: A Study of the Origins of Sentiment and Institutions*. Though we can’t say when she acquired this book, it was written in 1927 and it presents many quite radical ideas that could well have influenced Gimbutas’s thinking on the importance of earlier non-patriarchal social orders:

“Our object in this book will be to trace the origin of human society. What was the character of the first social groupings which arose as humanity evolved from the level of the animal?...In primitive society the role of women and their influence was much greater than has been the case during historical times in civilized societies. This conclusion is generally called ‘The Theory of Matriarchy’ –a name given to it by McLennan in opposition to the theory which traced social origins to a patriarchal age such as is presented in the Bible” (p. 27).

Briffalut, as a possible influence in Gimbutas, espouses remarkably egalitarian views at a time when there was great prejudice against so-called ‘inferior’ races. In particular, he writes:

“It is often thought that civilized man inherits a higher intellectual development than the savage, and a greater aptitude for education, which enables him to acquire more easily than backward races the cultural inheritance of his society. The facts are, however, that the children of savage peoples learn just as rapidly as those of Europeans, or even more so. Thus of the Negro children of the coast of Guinea Captain Binger says: ‘They have an extraordinary memory and capacity to learn anything that one may teach them. They are quite as highly gifted as our European children of the same age.’ And a missionary in East Central Africa writes: ‘It has been the general experience in other parts of Africa that negro children have no greater difficulty in learning to read and write than European children, but quite the reverse; and that experience is confirmed in our own schools.’ When schools were first established in Hawaii, teachers were often embarrassed by being unable to keep up with their up with their pupils” (pp. 29-30).

Books such as these could well have influenced the emerging sense in Gimbutas that there was a different historical ‘truth’ than what the prevailing patriarchal and ethnocentric attitudes of the day were promulgating about social and cultural history.

I spent the late afternoon of Day 2 reading some of Gimbutas's early writings to get a better sense of how her later ideas about Neolithic civilizations might have first developed. To this end, I read through her first book, *The Prehistory of Eastern Europe Part I: Mesolithic, Neolithic and Copper Age Cultures in Russia and the Baltic Sea*, which was published in 1956 and is part of her collection. As it turned out, this book does indeed hint at her later interests and pursuits. One passage in particular stands out; In examining a number of Neolithic figurines covering a wide area, she writes:

“The resemblance of the northern Caucasian female figurines with those from the Aegean and those found west and northwest of the Black Sea in the Ukraine, Rumania and Bulgaria is a significant indication of the existence of continuous relations between the western and eastern regions of the Black Sea. *These figurines were presumably religious symbols exhibiting the pre-eminent role of the Mother-Goddess cult*” (p. 54, emphasis added).

While her focus in the book is to describe a number of specific artifacts from these regions, she does not shy away from already proposing possible social forms implied by the artifacts, though she does this with much less fanfare than would be the case in her seminal *Goddesses and Gods of Old Europe*, appearing nearly 20 years later.

DAY 3

On day three, I decided to tackle some of Hillman's copious materials. While I originally had hoped to find additional biographical pieces from *Soul's Code* that had perhaps not made it into his book, I did not find such material. I decided to then go through the files in Box 171, which included some of his correspondence between the years of 1983 and 1997. In my reading, I wanted to get a deeper sense of the man, how he thought, interacted, communicated, and related. I wanted to see what mattered to him, how his informal voice sounded, even where he perhaps faced personal demons. My handling of his personal communications felt at first a bit voyeuristic, but I also understood that my ideas about this preeminent figure in depth psychology were formed only through my readings of his published writings. I appreciated that while I considered him a 'teacher' of mine, I had never met him, nor garnered any sense of his personal life and mannerisms. To be a better 'disciple' of his teachings, I reasoned, a careful look at his correspondence and personal communications was in order.

DAY 4

For the past two months, whenever I have a free moment, I have been pouring over the writings of David Abram. I have posted blog about his work, recorded video logs based on his ideas, and converted several of his ideational models into lesson plans for my twenty-six 5th graders, remarkable children who spend 6 hours day with me. This has been one of the gifts of James Hillman; he has introduced me to David Abram.

Perhaps in order to open my own creative stream, I concluded my work on Day 4 in the archives a bit differently. I asked Richard if I could handle some of Gimbutas's replicas of the goddess figurines. I carefully examined the Terracotta Cucutemi from North Moldavia in Romania, as well as the Ivory Head from Dolni Vastonice, a replica of a 26,000-year-old figurine. I took notes on what I observed.

I also examined a dozen or so of Katherine M. Sanford's paintings. My methodology was to look carefully at the ones which most stood out for me. I recorded my impressions, then opened her book, *The Serpent and the Cross* (which was based on these paintings), and compared my notes with her own writing about the paintings. There were some interesting connections between what I was seeing and recording in my observations, and what she had written in her book. One painting hit me with more emotion than the others, although I didn't know why. After my description of what I was seeing, I wrote, "A very important moment." Sanford begins her description of this painting by saying, "This image was triggered by a heart-pounding nightmare" (*The Serpent and the Cross*, p. 53). There were some other interesting parallels. While I cannot say for sure what I gained from this examination of art, I noticed that it helped me to process the written archival material with fresher eyes.

DAY 5

Day 5 was devoted to Joseph Campbell. Intentionally or not, Campbell's work sandwiched my five days in the archives.

On this last day, I listened to several recorded lectures whose theme, based on their titles, was purportedly the Goddess. Several of the lectures turned out to be informal discussions that had little connection to ideas of Goddess mythology, although two of the talks became the focus of my attention and energy that day. These lectures were given less than a year apart, and were held on opposite coasts. The first lecture was part of a set entitled "The Mythic Goddess Series" and was held on May 18th, 1972 at Sarah Lawrence as part of the Sarah Lawrence Alumni College. The second lecture, held 10 months later on March 24th, 1973 in San Francisco, was entitled "Return of the Goddess."

What I found very interesting about these two lectures is that while many of the themes and stories were nearly identical, Campbell seems to have undergone a significant change of tone in his manner of delivery of the material. The change was subtle, but notable. In both lectures he is addressing the need for greater discussion of mythology from a woman's perspective, but in the first lecture, he seems to take a more joking, even mocking appraisal of this agenda, a somewhat male and even sexist iteration of women in myth, while in the second lecture, there is a more serious and humble manner in his talk, what seems a clearly more egalitarian position vis-à-vis women. I listened to both lectures twice in an attempt to identify why they felt so markedly different to me. Was it the way he said things, was it his overall tone? In the later lecture, there seems a softer, less arrogant discussion of mythology from a woman's perspective. I had to wonder if there had been some pivotal events during those months that could have impacted him deeply enough to significantly change his tone of presentation. In the later lecture, I could hear the seeds of the Joseph Campbell who would write the very feminist introduction to Gimbutas's *The Language of the Goddess* some 20 years later. What happened during those 10 months?

Here are two juxtaposed excerpts from the talks on the Goddess, given 10 months apart that illustrate something of the difference in tone and approach that I noticed between the lectures:

The Mythic Goddess <i>May 1972</i>	Return of the Goddess <i>March 1973</i>
--	---

Audiotape L445	Audiotape L473
<p>“You coming back to the college might be wondering, ‘what’s new?’ What’s new is, of course, Women’s Lib. And this occurred to me, a few weeks ago, when a question was asked –<u>I’ve been teaching this subject of mythology now for decades</u>- when a question was asked that had not been asked of me before. And it was, ‘Well what about mythology from a woman’s point of view? What about her standpoint?’ ‘Well,’ I said, ‘she is represented in the myths as the enfolding order of the cosmos, as the guide, as the mother, as the temptress, as the savior, what more do you want?’ And the answer was, ‘I want to be the hero.’ [laughter] Well, that <u>tomboyish attitude [more laughter] set me thinking</u>. And so when I was asked to give a talk here on the Goddess, I thought some more, specifically, and I’ve come to the conclusion that I’m going to present here today.”</p>	<p>“<u>I had been teaching mythology, or thought I had been teaching mythology for some 30 odd years</u>, and a student came up to me, perhaps 3 years ago, and asked, ‘what about mythology from a woman’s perspective?’ I replied, ‘Well, the Goddess is the enveloping sphere within which we all live. She plays the role of the mother, the guide, the inspiration, the temptress, the savior, the muse, what more do you want?’ ‘Well,’ she said, ‘I want to be the hero!’ Well, that little <u>remark was the inspiration for this series</u> that I’m launching here this very minute.”</p>
<p>“I’ve been teaching this subject of mythology now for decades”</p>	<p>“I had been teaching mythology, or thought I had been teaching mythology for some 30 odd years”</p>
<p>“tomboyish attitude set me thinking”</p>	<p>“remark was the inspiration for this series”</p>

In the earlier talk, Campbell states that he had been ‘teaching mythology,’ while in the latter talk, he says he ‘thought’ he had been teaching it, suggesting that his exchange with the female student had given him cause to question the thoroughness of his teaching. This is a very different tone. In the first lecture, he characterizes her question in a somewhat condescending way, calling it a ‘tomboyish’ attitude, to laughter from his audience. In the second lecture, he states quite plainly that her question has inspired his entire series on the Goddess. Interestingly, in the first lecture, Campbell claims that the question was presented to him “a few weeks ago,” as if he had just recently been challenged to consider his approach to the teaching of mythology. In the second lecture, less than a year later, he says the question about mythology from a woman’s perspective, was posed to “perhaps 3 years ago.” It seems possible that in the first lecture he wanted to give the impression that he had abruptly altered his pedagogical views within weeks of the question, structuring an entire talk to address it, while in the second lecture, he may have been willing to offer a more accurate indication of how long ago this female student actually had challenged the gender emphases in his delivery of mythological studies curricula and talks.

Other examples of these sorts of differences within the talks suggest that Campbell may have undergone a transition between the time of the first lecture in 1972

and the second lecture the following year⁴. There is limited data to make such an assessment with any certainty, but clearly within the course of our lives, we all grow and mature, and develop new ways of conceptualizing our world. In the earliest of Campbell's talks that I examined, the 1963 lecture "Mask, Myth and Dream," he characterizes the patriarchal cultures of the post-Neolithic as 'high civilizations.' Fast-forward some 30 years and he is writing that Marija Gimbutas has discovered "an actual age of harmony and peace [which]...antedeceded the five thousand of...the 'nightmare'... from which it is now certainly time for this planet to wake." This points to a significant evolution in Campbell's views regarding the nature of the Neolithic, and the centrality of Goddess worship among early human populations.

CONCLUSION

I am fascinated with how people evolve their own ideas and theories. I am about to turn 50 years old in two weeks, and for the last four years, I have been engaged in the most exciting and provocative work in my life. Encountering the writings of people like Thomas Berry, Paul Shepard, Michael Meade, James Hillman, Marija Gimbutas and Joseph Campbell, has been a hugely important breakthrough for me in the evolution of my own thinking. In exploring the archives and personal libraries at Opus, I developed a much deeper appreciation for Hillman, Campbell, and Gimbutas. Seeing Hillman's passionate thinking and forceful character, developing theories about Campbell's emerging feminism, exploring the personal libraries of Gimbutas and Campbell, and reading some of the seminal books in their libraries which may well have influenced the development of their thinking –these have been some of the most notable rewards of my archival work at Opus. Having been directed to the work of David Abram has also been very important for me, and will guide my articulation of The New Story. I am very excited to move forward, developing my ideas, building on the materials gathered at Opus, and assembling my own written work to guide me and those for whom I am responsible, my students.

⁴National and world events at this time reflected a great many crises in social systems and belief structures. Many 'myths' were being shattered. These circumstances could have played a role in Campbell's evolving sense of values. For example, in late 1972, hundreds of thousands of Hutus were killed in the Burundian genocide. That same fall, Israeli athletes were massacred in Munich, and in early 1973, the Vietnam war –which Campbell supported- was increasingly causing the United States to become the object of international criticism. Finally, on March 23rd, literally the day before Campbell's later Goddess talk, the Watergate scandal had blown wide open.

SOME THOUGHTS

“It struck me what it means to live with a myth, and what it means to live *without* one...So, in the most natural way, I took it upon myself to get to know my myth, and this I regarded as my task of tasks” (Carl Jung, *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*).

“Mythology begins where madness starts. A person who is truly gripped by a calling, by a dedication, by a belief, by a zeal, will...give himself entirely to his myth...The beginning of the mythic world... is a seizure, something that pulls you out of yourself, beyond yourself, beyond all rational patterns” (Joseph Campbell, *Pathways to Bliss*).

“For peoples...their story of the universe and the human role in the universe is their primary source of intelligibility and value. Only through this story... does a person come to appreciate the meaning of life or to derive the psychic energy needed to deal effectively with those crisis moments that occur in the life of the individual” (Thomas Berry, *The Dream of the Earth*)

“As crucial as it may be for the sustenance of our hearts and for the perpetuation of our species, the gravitational attraction between one naked body and another is but a small reflection of the more ongoing and insistent eros between our body and the earth.” (David Abram, *Becoming Animal*).