

Sept. 1968

I Am: 2:23 or 2:12-12

Theme of 2:12 (= T). Visual interp. Now: if T means only turning from sin - what of Jesus' praise to man who is 2:12-1:11 B - does it mean he sins instinctively? And further, is this greatest of all 1:12 to be denied to one who instinctively enough to be a 1:12 1:33? Following analysis is mostly but not completely based on 2:12 (esp. 2:12 2:12 2:12 2:12):

2 kinds T: 1. 1:12 (= 2:12) - from sin, & this in 2 ways: 2:12 2:12 and 2:12 2:12, depending on temperament. If pessimistic, introspective - 2:12 2:12... if optimistic, extraverted & activist - 2:12 2:12. But both motivated by consciousness of failure. 2:12 2:12 (= 2:12) - nothing to do w. sin. Is the search for a which comes from human condition of being far from Him, & hence the 1:12 which 1:12 2:12 strives to T = return, i.e. genuine religious yearning.

Now, 2:12 is rational: return of spirit to source. The religious drive makes sense. But 2:12 is irrational, almost absurd: it seeks to undo past, declaring past sins as nonexistent or even transformed into 2:12 2:12. 2:12 is matter of heart & spirit - 2:12 is matter of heart & personality (others usually do not follow rules of logic or dictates of reason). 2:12 seeks freedom - rational. 2:12 seeks 2:12 2:12 - irrational. Thus: 2:12 2:12 2:12 2:12 2:12 - when 2:12 2:12 2:12, human reaction is 2:12 2:12 - awe, overwhelmingly 2:12's conquest of mere reason, of necessity, of causality.

Analysis of 2:12 2:12 in 2:12 2:12 reveals that there really are 2 portions of T: from 30:1-6 (2:12-2:12) is 2:12, and 30:7-10 (2:12-2:12) is 2:12. In 2:12 part, 2:12's reaction is 2:12 2:12 - & love is non-rational & hence in 2:12, man's T is 2:12 2:12 - restore previous friendship that had been disturbed by 1:12 - but no more; in 2:12 - 2:12 2:12 2:12 - you never have "arrived" 2:12 - it's an asymptotic, endless striving to

reach out to the Infinite. $\gamma\bar{\alpha}$ is theological; $\alpha\bar{\alpha}$ is moral & has moral unexcuses: $\alpha\bar{\alpha}$ is by $\gamma\bar{\alpha}$ encourages imitatio dei by man - to forgive (absurdly!) his fellow man. $\alpha\bar{\alpha}$ is psychologically based - sin & guilt & personal responsibility. $\gamma\bar{\alpha}$ is universal, ~~not~~ cognitive, existential.

According to (1.1.1) (in $\alpha\bar{\alpha}$ / 1.1.1.), $\gamma\bar{\alpha}$ is striving for God as He is beyond personality: for $\alpha\bar{\alpha}$ who is above $\delta\alpha\alpha$ $\gamma\bar{\alpha}$. This makes sense. $\gamma\bar{\alpha}$ is, in part of man, also beyond personality & his psycho-biological unexcuses. $\alpha\bar{\alpha}$ is a rapprochement w. divine Personality, w. $\delta\alpha\alpha$ $\gamma\bar{\alpha}$ thru 210 $\alpha\bar{\alpha}$, $\gamma\bar{\alpha}$ $\gamma\bar{\alpha}$. Thus, acc. (1.1.1), $\gamma\bar{\alpha}$ is best achieved thru striving of Torah ($\alpha\bar{\alpha}$ $\gamma\bar{\alpha}$), whereas $\alpha\bar{\alpha}$ - thru 113 $\alpha\bar{\alpha}$, specifying: $\gamma\bar{\alpha}$ $\gamma\bar{\alpha}$ = $\alpha\bar{\alpha}$ $\gamma\bar{\alpha}$ = $\gamma\bar{\alpha}$.

Now, both forms of T are present in $\alpha\bar{\alpha}$ - $\gamma\bar{\alpha}$ person, but differing emphasis. $\alpha\bar{\alpha}$ speaks not of sin but of $\alpha\bar{\alpha}$ - and, in small, of $\alpha\bar{\alpha}$ ($\alpha\bar{\alpha}$ $\gamma\bar{\alpha}$). Thus = $\gamma\bar{\alpha}$. $\gamma\bar{\alpha}$ is sin-involvement, hence $\alpha\bar{\alpha}$. From $\gamma\bar{\alpha}$'s point of view, $\gamma\bar{\alpha}$ > $\alpha\bar{\alpha}$; it is more selfish. Hence progression in Torah is from $\alpha\bar{\alpha}$ to $\gamma\bar{\alpha}$. But from man's p.v., $\alpha\bar{\alpha}$ is harder, more demanding, taxing. Because it involves personality & unconscious of failure, $\alpha\bar{\alpha}$, it's more difficult. $\therefore$ progression holiday is $\alpha\bar{\alpha}$ $\rightarrow$ $\gamma\bar{\alpha}$ $\rightarrow$ $\alpha\bar{\alpha}$.