Philosophical Discussion

Julian Jaynes and Ezekiel's' Wheel*

by Peter Novak

"The two hemispheres can function so as to seem like two independent persons, which in the bicameral period were, I suggest, the individual and his god." "The gods were in no sense 'figments of the imagination' of anyone. They were man's volition. They occupied his right hemisphere, and from stores of admonitory and preceptive experience transmuted this experience into articulated speech which then 'told' the man what to do."- Julian Jaynes (Jaynes, pp. 117, 202-203).

Abstract: As a follow-up to the discussion of the binary soul doctrine in my book, "The Division of Consciousness," a further discussion of the binary soul doctrine is given highlighted by Julian Jaynes hypothesis and the four modes of perspective.

Introduction

Sometimes, according to the ancient world's Binary Soul Doctrine, the two halves of the mind function entirely independently of one another. In fact, it is entirely natural and commonplace for them to do this after death, according to many ancient spiritual traditions. But most people can't even imagine such a division existing inside their minds; for the average person living today, the union between the conscious and unconscious usually seems so complete that it's hard to even accept the idea that the human psyche is comprised of two distinct components.

Jaynes' Hypothesis

But the human mind may have not always worked the way it does today. Julian Jaynes, a professor of psychology at Princeton, argues that many thousands of years ago the two halves of the mind may have had a very different relationship than they do today, a relationship much closer to that described by the Binary Soul Doctrine, in which the conscious and unconscious functioned far more independently of one another than they do today.

Jaynes' seminal work, *The Origin of Consciousness* in the Breakdown of the Bicameral Mind, postulated that a profoundly important change took place in the nature of human consciousness around 2500 BC. Prior

* Adapted from Novak, P. *Divided by the Light.* Charlottesville, VA, Hampton Roads Publishing Co., 2002, Chapter 12: pp. 370-389 (tentatively). © by Peter Novak; reprinted with permission.

to that date, Jayne postulated, the human mind worked very differently than it does today, and mankind did not possess truly subjective, self-aware consciousness as we know it now. Instead, the two halves of the human mind functioned far more independently of one another, each half performing its own functions in a state of near-complete isolation from its partner, the two just sending communiqués back and forth to one another. Today, of course, these two halves of the psyche no longer stand apart from one another and merely send messages back and forth; now they intimately intermingle. And that intermingling is, or produces, our subjective self-aware consciousness.

Prior to 2500 BC, Jaynes maintained, the objective left-brain conscious half of the mind was basically the whole "self", so far as human beings were concerned. The other half of the mind, the subjective right-brain unconscious, was nowhere in the picture, according to Jaynes; prior to 2500 BC human beings had virtually no subjective self-awareness, nothing, at least, like what we experience today. Self-reflection was impossible, he reported; although it's difficult for us to comprehend today, prior to 2500 BC, people were psychologically incapable of standing back and imagining what they might do or how they might feel in one situation or another, or what might be going on inside another person's mind. Their entire experience of reality, Jaynes argued, was far more detached and objective than ours is today. Their minds simply worked different back then.

This doesn't mean that their right-brain unconscious minds weren't functioning at all, but only that the interactive relationship between the two sides of the mind was very different than what we're used to today. The right-brain, unconscious half of the mind was still functioning, but when it did have something to say, when it did have some input to inject into a person's thought processes, this input was experienced very differently than it is today. Prior to 2500 BC, Jaynes insisted, this input from the unconscious half of the mind seemed so alien to the person that he or she wouldn't even recognize it as having originated within his own mind. Instead, it seemed as if this input was coming from an entirely separate, objectively real being — a "god". And in this way, Jaynes' theory seems to explain one of the greatest mysteries of human history — why the literature of most ancient cultures reports quite matter-of-factly that men used to personally talk "face-to-face" with "the gods."

Jaynes' argument makes a great deal of sense. If a person's entire perspective and sense of "self" was centered exclusively in the objective conscious mind, everything he experienced would have been seen through that filter. Anything that the person saw or heard or felt, everything that registered on his mind at all would have seemed objectively real. Just as when one looks through a blue filter and finds that everything looks blue, when humanity looked at life through an objective filter, everything looked objective. When the "alien other" half of the

mind, the unconscious, downloaded input into the person's thought processes as it normally does, that input would have been interpreted as if it had come from an entirely separate being existing in objective reality.

The mental input coming from the "unconscious" half of one's mind would have seemed to have been the voice of an entirely separate, independent, alien being — a god. Jaynes presented abundant textual evidence that prior to 2500 BC, it was common and normal for people in cultures all over the world to "hallucinate" the voices of gods, completely convinced that they were personally hearing and sometimes even seeing these gods. Jaynes argued that all those legendary voices actually originated in the right brain unconscious half of the human mind itself.

The actual functions of the unconscious don't seem to have changed. Just as today, the mental input from the unconscious in 2500 BC (the "god voice") defined what was right and wrong, and did everything it could to urge the conscious mind to follow its advice. It was very effective; the literature of this period in history informs us that people in cultures all over the globe did not think of themselves as being autonomous, free men in control of their own lives, but as mere slaves of the gods, who could not help but follow the orders and instructions they received from "on high."

But around 2500 BC, Jaynes argued, something changed, and humanity has never been the same since. Actually two things changed, at pretty much exactly the same point in history, which convinced Jaynes that these changes were related :

1. Subjective, autonomous self-awareness started to appear in culture after culture.

2. And the voices of the gods started to be heard less and less.

Long ago, the voices of the gods had once been utterly commonplace, according to Jaynes; virtually everyone walking around on the planet heard these "divine communications" in their heads pretty much all the time. But a shift in human consciousness appeared to have taken place around 2500 BC, after which people seemed to have gone through a great deal more trouble to try to hear these voices.

It seemed to have started when cultures began manufacturing multitudes of personal idols with exaggerated ears and open mouths, which were apparently used to help people hear these bicameral voices, perhaps simply by giving them something to focus their attention on. But eventually, these inner voices seemed to have faded away more and more, until the average person could no longer easily hear the voices of the gods at all. At this time, Jaynes theorized, the cultural office of prophet was created, elevating those special few who still heard these bicameral voices to an exalted place in society. But soon, even the prophets were having a hard time hearing the voices. To compensate for this, the rituals and procedures and idols that were used to help achieve this com-

munication began to get more and more elaborate and complicated. But despite these efforts, the voices slowly grew weaker and weaker as the centuries dragged on. Eventually, virtually no one, neither priest, prophet, nor ordinary man, could personally hear the voices of the gods anymore. This progressive disappearance of the voices of the gods seems to have taken around 2000 years from start to finish. During these centuries, Jaynes explains, humanity's struggles to reestablish communication with the gods basically invented religion as we know it today.

But as these voices faded away, something else, something entirely new in the annals of human experience, appeared — subjective self-conscious awareness. Jaynes did a masterful job of exploring the legacy of mankind's earliest literature, and provided compelling textual evidence that human beings' subjective awareness of their own consciousness increased at the exact same time that these voices were decreasing. Our familiarity with ourselves increased even as our familiarity with the gods decreased.

What Changed, Exactly?

In a nutshell, Jaynes' hypothesis declares that we used to have two separately functioning minds co-existing within the same head a few thousand years ago, but they have since united together into a single mind that is now aware of its own existence, which it wasn't previously.

But Harvard Professor of Psychiatry Fredrick Schiffer disagreed, arguing that we still have two independently functioning minds co-existing within the same head. In his recent book, Of Two Minds: The Revolutionary Science of Dual-Brain Psychology, Schiffer endorses the neuropsychological theory first presented in Right Brain, Left Brain, that two entirely distinct minds function side-by-side in the human brain. However, these two halves of the mind were functioning quite separately prior to 2500 BC, while now they seem, at least, to be dancing together in an intimate embrace in our heads, so intertwined they genuinely seem to be a single element (at least until the neuropsychologists start taking exact measurements).

One of Jayne's studies — an EEG study of hemispheric dominance — suggests it could be just a matter of the degree of integration. It seems that one side of the brain or the other is always working a bit harder than its partner, but the rate at which they switch back and forth from one side to the other varies. In normal healthy people, the rate of such switching is usually once or more per minute. But in schizophrenics (which Jaynes feels are closer to the original bicameral human), this rate of switching is much slower, about once every four minutes. This reminds one of Taoism's famous Yin/Yang symbol, in which the two Primordial Forces are always dancing with each other and taking one another's places.

In some respects, the ancients' Binary Soul Doctrine seems to conflict with Jayne's theory of the evolution of human consciousness. The Bi-

nary Soul Doctrine maintained that a Primordial Division took place at the dawn of human history, when the two halves of the mind disassociated from one another. But Jayne argued that the human mind was originally comprised of two elements that had never truly formed an integrated union so much as a simple well-oiled partnership. The nature of that interactive partnership dramatically changed, according to Jaynes, such that the unconscious no longer manifested to the conscious in quite the same way anymore. That familiar form of the manifestation of the unconscious — the voices of the gods — disappeared, and in the vacuum left by their passing appeared a new thing — self-awareness, consciousness of one's own consciousness. To the left brain/conscious mind at the time, this loss of the voices of the gods seemed dramatic and lamentable. There indeed seemed to be a separation or division. Both scenarios have much in common. Each begins by reporting that in a primordial period, the human mind was differentiated into two distinct components, which had an intimately close interactive relationship with one another. Both report that this relationship suddenly changed dramatically, and that our present state of consciousness resulted from that change.

Did Egypt Anticipate the 2500 BC Jaynes Shift?

In his book, *From Atlantis to the Sphinx*, the celebrated author and researcher Colin Wilson threw much support behind Jaynes' theory. Yes, he agreed, a fundamental shift in the functioning of human consciousness does seem to have taken place around 2500 BC. Similarly to Jaynes, Wilson also accepted that this earlier form of human consciousness had been the status quo for many thousands of years, perhaps since the origin of the species. Prior to 2500 BC, these two agreed, human consciousness had always been "bicameral", with one half of the mind placing the part of a man and the other part of the mind playing the part of the gods. Wilson maintained that the Egyptians built the Sphinx around 10,500 BC using this earlier form of human consciousness, and then 8000 years later built the mighty pyramids while their minds were still centered in this same mode of consciousness.

But if so, if humanity's minds had always been bicameral prior to 2500 BC, some questions arise. Immediately after the historic, still-unduplicated, and seemingly impossible feat of building the Great Pyramid monument around 2500 BC, the human race just happened to participate in another, even more monumental event — the Jaynes Shift in human consciousness. Was this merely a coincidence, or had the Egyptians foreseen that something truly monumental indeed was about to occur in their immediate future? Did they in fact built these massive monuments in honor of that approaching change?

Wilson argued that in choosing 2500 BC to build the pyramids, the Egyptians were not merely satisfying the impulsive whims of the Pharaoh, but had methodically synchronized the timing of this project to an

extremely long-term astronomical cycle. Noting that Egyptian culture placed enormous emphasis upon the constellation of Orion (for some reason still unfathomable to us), Wilson pointed out that they just happened to produce their greatest achievements — the pyramids — precisely at the moment in history when the vernal point came into conjunction with Orion, an event that only happens once every 25,920 years. This could not have been a coincidence. Such an astronomical event would have held incalculable meaning to ancient Egypt; indeed, it might well have seemed as if the most magnificent moment they could imagine was about to occur.

If so, they weren't far off. They believed, according to Wilson, that this astronomical alignment would allow the Pharaoh to finally perform a ceremony that would "gain immortality for himself and for his people". That was the world-altering event they thought was just about to occur at that point in their history. The world-altering event that actually did occur at that point in history, we know now, was the Jaynes Shift in human consciousness, which allowed people for the first time to experience themselves as fully self-aware and autonomous individuals, instead of semiconscious "slaves to the gods".

It seems, then, that ancient Egypt had correctly anticipated that some sort of profoundly transforming event was about to take place in the third millennium BC, and they built their colossal monuments to reflect that anticipated change. And looking back at those monuments today, their awesome dimensions do seem to reflect the nearly-inconceivable dimensions of the change that did take place for humanity shortly thereafter.

How Many 'Jaynes Shifts' Have There Been?

But if the Egyptians built the Great Pyramid because they thought that a profound change in human affairs was about to take place in the third Millennium BC, another question comes to mind — had they built the Sphinx for the same reason thousands of years earlier? Recent geological research on the weathering patterns on the Sphinx compellingly suggests that it was probably built far earlier than Egypt's Old Kingdom. Dates recently suggested for the original building of the Sphinx tend to range between 7000 BC - 10500 BC. Had the Egyptians also been expecting some sort of profound change in human affairs to occur immediately after they finished building that monument? If so, that change must have occurred on schedule, or Egypt wouldn't have been so keen on following the exact same behavior pattern in 2500 BC. What change was it, then, that took place shortly after the Sphinx was built?

Was it an earlier Jaynes Shift? How many Jaynes Shifts have there been? We don't know. We can only be sure that there was at least one, and we've only recently become aware of that one. Even though our current species, "Homo Sapiens Sapiens", has been wandering around on this globe for perhaps as much as 120,000 years, our recorded his-

tory only goes back about 5000 years, and we have only the vaguest sort of idea about what happened culturally prior to that.

Fortunately, we know a little about what happened on the planet during the missing time, even if we don't know exactly what was going on within human culture itself. There was, for example, an Ice Age that lasted from 75,000 BC - 10,000 BC. But the Ice Age really doesn't make much difference, since the areas around Earth's equator were still very hospitable throughout those early years, so human culture should have still been able to thrive and progress on the planet. So why didn't we? What were we doing during all that time between 120,000 BC - 5000 BC? It only took us 7000 years to advance all the way from the stone age to the space age, so why did we stay at the stone age from 120,000 BC - 5000 BC? Or did we?

Science's basic assumption is that we made virtually no cultural/intellectual/technological progress until only a few thousand years ago, when we started making metal tools and organizing ourselves into cities. This assumption is based, of course, on the accuracy of the archaeological data we have available today, and if our data is incomplete, it could well point towards an erroneous conclusion. This is a real concern for three reasons :

(1) Less than 1% of the Earth's current land surface has thus far been submitted to any in-depth archaeological examination, and

(2) A great deal of the Earth's pre-10,000 BC land surface is no longer accessible to archaeological examination anyway, having submerged beneath the ocean when sea levels rose at the end of the Ice Age, and

(3) Most of the pre-10,000 BC population centers would probably have resided in the very areas that ended up under water when the ice melted.

The melting of the last Ice Age caused ocean levels to rise high enough to submerge entire forty-story buildings. The shorelines of the world retreated from the edge of the continental shelf to their present location, often moving fifty miles inland (up to 1000 miles in some cases), wiping away all traces of pre-10,000 BC coastal populations. This would be a very efficient way to hide a civilization; if sea levels rose 400 feet today, virtually all the major population centers of America, including the entire East Coast, most of the West Coast, as well as Chicago, Detroit, Milwaukee, Cleveland, New Orleans, and Houston would all simply disappear, washed out to sea. And 12,000 years later, it's doubtful any hint of today's East Coast civilization would remain for future archaeologists to find and explore. The only real question before today's archaeologists is, how much of the Earth's human population had settled along coastal areas in 10,000 BC? If they were anything like people today, then the great majority lived near a sea coast; if so, then as much as 90% of that pre-historic civilization could have easily disappeared under the waters 12,000 years ago, making today's paltry archaeological examination of 1% of the earth's current land surface examination unlikely to

turn up any remaining evidence of their existence.

A Cycle of Changes?

Science's assumption that humanity made no cultural/intellectual/technological progress during its first 110,000 years raises an obvious question — why? Why would we have decided to "get busy" only just recently? This doesn't seem to make any sense, especially when one considers that during all those previous 110,000 years, our species was just as smart and capable of learning as we are today.

There are, of course, many theories about the direction of progress in human history. Some schools of thought assure us that we are evolving, that progress is occurring. Other schools, such as Hinduism, Judaism, Christianity, and Islam, maintain that humanity has fallen from an original state of perfection and is now deteriorating and regressing, at least in some respects. Still other schools say that everything is always the same, that the more things change, the more they stay the same.

But one very old theory, based on the precession of the equinoxes, seems to reflect and explain and account for all these perspectives simultaneously. Human history, the traditions suggest, is in a cyclical pattern of change called the "Great Year" or "Platonic Year" which repeats every 25,920 years. Certain sections of this cycle make it seem humanity is regressing, while other portions look as if we are advancing.

Just as a normal year is divided into 12 months, each Great Year is also divided into twelve sub-periods commonly called "Ages" (such as in the familiar phrase "the Age of Aquarius"). And just as every three calendar months form a unique season, so too every three Ages combine to form a 6,480 year long period which can be called a "Great Season."

Two Times Two: The Four Modes of Perspective

Interestingly, these four Great Seasons seem to have a great deal in common with Ken Wilber's four "Quadrants of the Kosmos". Wilber, perhaps the most celebrated scientific philosopher of the late 20th century, has concluded that all perceived reality falls into a four "quadrant" pattern which he labels the "Interior Individual", the "Interior Collective", the "Exterior Individual", and the "Exterior Collective".

"These four territories," Wilber explained, "have an incredibly simple foundation." They simply deal with "the inside and outside of a holon, in both its individual and collective forms — and that gives us four quadrants. Inside and outside, singular and plural — some of the simplest distinctions we can make, and these very simple features, which are present in all holons, generate these four quadrants." (Wilber, K, 1996. p. 73)

Wilber's four-quadrant system reflects a pattern familiar to cultures across the globe; the famous psychoanalytical pioneer Carl Jung discovered that maps depicting a four-part reality have been drawn as

mandalas all over the world. The similarities between these various four-part depictions of reality are quite astounding, and all seem to reiterate the idea that the universe is a unity comprised of four fundamental components.

This four-part pattern makes perfect sense from the perspective of the Binary Soul Doctrine, although the connection between a two-part system and a four-part system isn't immediately apparent. The ancient world's Binary Soul Doctrine, of course, maintained that creation began when a great Primordial Unity differentiated itself into two equal-but-opposite parts. This event would in and of itself produced two parts and only two parts, but those two parts would have found that, altogether between them both, they had four different ways of looking at things, four different modes of perspective and perception.

This is simply explained. The division made it possible to observe reality from one part or from the other part, and since reality itself was just these two parts, the only things that could be observed were these two parts; the two parts had to take on the roles of both the subject who was doing the observing, and the object that was being observed. But since there were two parts, it was possible for the subject who was doing the observing to observe either just one of the two parts, or both parts together, and it was also possible for the object being observed to be observed by either one part alone or by both parts together. The subject doing the observing could be either singular or plural, and the object being observed could also be either singular or plural. So a single differentiation into two parts produced four different ways for those two parts to look at themselves: a single or plural subject observing a single or plural object. There were only two parts, but four different perspectives.

This simple differentiation of the Primordial Unity into two parts, it seems, would in and of itself generate Wilber's Four Quadrants. The differentiation would have produced two entirely different sets of distinctions — interior/exterior and singular/plural — which together would have produced four possible perspectives, the same four-part pattern that Wilber, Jung, and many primitive cultures have noticed and studied:

1. The Interior Individual, or the Subjective Perspective of the Individual

One part looks at itself. This is a "right brain", or "unconscious mind" mode of awareness, in which one is primarily conscious of the connections, patterns, and relationships between things. One looks at everything from a personal, subjective, interpretational perspective. This perspective tells us what the individual looks like from the inside, what reality looks like from inside his skin, from his own subjective perspective.

2. The Exterior Individual, or the Objective Perspective of the Individual

One part looks at the other part. This "left brain", or "conscious mind" mode of awareness only sees the differences and distinctions between

things. This detached, objective perspective tells us what the objects of one's awareness look like from the outside.

3. The Interior Collective, or the Subjective Perspective of the Collective

The whole looks at itself. This "right brain", or "unconscious mind" mode of thought looks at collectives from the inside. This perspective tells us what the collective looks like from the inside, and what reality looks like from the subjective perspective of the collective.

4. The Exterior Collective, or the Objective Perspective of the Collective

The whole looks at the part, or the part looks at the whole. This "left brain", or "conscious mind" mode of thought looks at collectives objectively, from the outside of those collectives. This perspective tells us what collectives look like from the outside, and what reality looks like from the objective perspective of the collective.

Three of the above match up perfectly with the three known levels of the human psyche :

1. The Subjective Perspective of the Individual seems to be the same thing as the Personal Subconscious Mind : the subconscious mind of the individual.

2. The Subjective Perspective of the Collective seems to be the same thing as the Collective Unconscious Mind : the subconscious mind of the collective

3. The Exterior Individual Perspective seems to be the same thing as the Personal Conscious Mind: the conscious mind of the individual.

These three parallels suggest that there is yet another level of the human mind still awaiting discovery by modern science, a part that would match up with the Exterior, or Objective Perspective of the Collective. This postulated level of the human mind might be called something like the Collective Conscious, or the conscious mind of the collective. A level of the human psyche that might validly be labeled a "Collective Conscious Mind" is not yet known and admitted to exist by science. However, we may be on the verge of seeing the first pangs of such a mind being born today, through various intellect-sharing, intellect-integrating communications methods such as television, radio, cell phones, and the Internet.

The Four Seasons of the Zodiac

Interestingly, the traditional meanings of the signs of the zodiac also divide into these same four groups. This probably wouldn't be surprising to Jung, who recognized the wheel of the zodiac as merely another mandala. Although astrology is scoffed at today, the symbolism of the zodiac ranks among the oldest of man's concepts. No one knows precisely where or when they originated; they seem to have been with us from the beginning.

Now what's interesting is that, similarly to Wilber's model, the circle of the zodiac is also twice divided, by the exact same two dichotomies : it is bifurcated once into subjective and objective halves, and partitioned

once more into individual and collective halves. The first six signs, Aries, Taurus, Gemini, Cancer, Leo, and Virgo, address the individual's own interior, subjective perspective, focusing on what's going on inside the observer. The second group of six signs, Libra, Scorpio, Sagittarius, Capricorn, Aquarius, and Pisces, focuses on the objective perspective, on what's going on outside the observer, out in the real world. Meanwhile, the Easternmost signs, Capricorn, Aquarius, Pisces, Aries, Taurus, and Gemini, focus on the individual, his/her own life experiences and perspectives, while the Western most signs, Cancer, Leo, Virgo, Libra, Scorpio, and Sagittarius, focus on others, on one's interaction with others, on group interaction, and on the experiences and perspectives of the collective rather than the individual.

Thus, we again find that these same two variables (interior or exterior, singular or plural) divide the Divine Whole (here symbolized by the circle of the zodiac) into four unique parts or quadrants. The signs Aries, Taurus, and Gemini (the quadrant of Spring) observe reality through the eyes of Wilber's Interior Individual perspective, Cancer, Leo, and Virgo (the signs of Summer) reflect the perspective of the Interior Collective, Libra, Scorpio, and Sagittarius (the Fall quadrant) experience life from the view of the Exterior Collective, and the signs Capricorn, Aquarius, and Pisces (the Winter quadrant) look at life through Wilber's Exterior Individual category.

Just as each season of the calendar brings a major change in the weather, each seasonal quadrant of the zodiac is also associated with a major change — a change in human attitude, expression, perspective, and approach to life. Each seasonal quadrant of the zodiac has three signs, the sequence of which is traditionally thought to provide more detailed information about the seasonal change that take place during the quadrant. The first sign in each quadrant is called "cardinal", the second "fixed", and the third "mutable". Normally, the seasonal change begins boldly and dynamically in the cardinal signs, those fresh new conditions are locked in during the fixed signs, becoming crystalized and solidified into a fully-formed state, and then final, more subtle adjustments are made during the mutable signs. The cardinal signs tend to be dynamic and attention-getting, the fixed signs solid and unmoving, and the mutable signs flexible and less-attention-getting.

Reversal of the Four Seasons Emphasizes the Fixed Signs

That's the way progress through the signs normally goes — from cardinal to fixed to mutable. There is only one exception to this rule — the precession of the equinoxes. Due to a wobble in the Earth's axis, the vernal point (the sign the sun is in on the first day of spring) moves backwards through the zodiac, moving so extremely slowly that it takes 25,920 years to make one complete revolution through the entire circle of the zodiac (a Great Year), and about 2,160 years to make it through just one sign (an Age).

Because precession moves backwards through the zodiac in the Great Year, the mutable signs come first, then the fixed signs, and finally the cardinal signs, in the opposite order from how the planets orbit through the zodiac. This suggests that the pattern of change would be different during the Great Year. Instead of changes starting boldly and with initiative during the Age of the cardinal sign, then getting locked into place during the Age of the fixed sign, and then fully adjusted to during the Age of the mutable sign, the opposite should be expected to occur. The change of the seasonal quadrant would first begin subtly and quietly during the Age of the mutable sign, then become firmly locked into place during the Age of the fixed sign, and then would produce creative and bold aftereffects during the Age of the cardinal sign. Under this pattern, the seasonal change would seem to take place far more suddenly and without much advance notice, during the Age of the fixed signs. The reverse direction of the precession of the equinoxes during the Great Year places far more emphasis on the appearance of dramatic and sudden change during the Ages of the fixed signs, highlighting the signs of Taurus the Bull, Leo the Lion, Scorpio the Scorpion (which used to be an Eagle), and Aquarius the Man. An identical emphasis, as it turns out, seems to appear in a Biblical prophecy.

The Four Faces of Humanity

In the thirtieth year, in the fourth month, on the fifth day of the month ... the heavens were opened, and I saw [...] the likeness of four living creatures. And this was their appearance : they had the form of men, but each had four faces and four wings [...] each had the face of a man in front, the face of a lion on the right side, the face of an ox on the left side, and the face of an eagle at the back. Such were their faces. And their wings were spread out above; each creature had two wings, each of which touched the wing of another, while two covered their bodies [...] Now as I looked at the living creatures, I saw a wheel upon the earth beside the four creatures, one for each of the four of them [...] their construction being as it were a wheel within a wheel. The four wheels had rims and they had spokes, and their rims were full of eyes round about.— Ezekiel 1: 1-18.

Now, one of the first things one notices in the above report is that the four faces of the divine creatures correspond perfectly to the animals associated with the four fixed signs of the Zodiac, Taurus, Leo, Scorpio, and Aquarius, which strongly suggests that this vision has some astrological meaning. But these four faces are closely associated with four wings in a curiously postured, obviously meaningful formation. One pair of wings — outstretched, touching the outstretched wings of the others so that all four creatures are in contact and effectively forming a collective unit — suggests an objective, other-oriented, collective, interactive state. But the other set of wings covering its own body suggests a more subjective, interior focus on the individual self. But these wings

are not presented as being sets, but merely as four wings, two in one position, and two in another position. The four wings can thus be variously organized into four different sets :

(1) a right and left wing extended out to the other
(2) a right and left wing held close to the creature's own body
(3) a right wing held close and a left wing extended
(4) a right wing extended and a left wing held close

Thus we find that, just as the four faces correspond to the fixed signs of the Zodiac, this image of four wings also stands as an elegant symbol for the two dichotomies of perspective (interior/exterior and individual/collective) and the four modes of perspective — the Exterior Collective, the Exterior Individual, the Interior Collective, and the Interior Individual.

Each of these creatures is associated with a wheel which has spokes and a rim, reminding us of the classic diagram of the wheel of the zodiac. Upon the rim of this wheel, there were eyes all around, which suggests that the wheel contains or represents a multiplicity of views or perspectives, and as the wheel turns, different eyes, or different perspectives, come to the fore.

Now, what is particularly interesting is that this wheel is not said to merely be a normal wheel, but "a wheel within a wheel". This instantly reminds one of a mill, which has one wheel revolving in one direction while another wheel revolves in the opposite direction. And just such an image of a mill has been used in countless cultures to represent the precession of the equinoxes (as illustrated to perfection in Hamlet's Mill by Giorgio Santillana and Herta von Dachend, 1977). Indeed, the precession of the quinoxes would be just such a "wheel within a wheel", each revolving opposite to the other. The planets revolve in one direction around the zodiac, measuring days, weeks, years, and even centuries, while the vernal point revolves around the zodiac in the opposite direction, measuring the millennia.

The symbols in this peculiar Biblical vision seems to do three things:

1. It points our attention to the precession of the Equinoxes, and then
2. It singles out Leo, Taurus, Aquarius, and Scorpio as having apparently special significance in that context, and then
3. It seems to point to the dualities of individual/collective and interior/exterior as also having special significance within that context.

Taken together, the first two points suggest that unique historical developments would occur during the Ages of Leo (10,700 BC - 8,540 BC), Taurus (4,220 BC - 2,060 BC), Aquarius (2,260 AD - 4,420 AD), and Scorpio (8,740 AD - 10,900 AD). The third point suggests that these historic developments would somehow revolve around the dualities of individual/collective and interior/exterior.

The Four Seasons of the Human Mind

There is quite a bit of evidence to support this theory. From what we

know about history, Humanity's two biggest known changes took place during two of these Ages.

The Age of Leo witnessed a great natural catastrophe. Although the Ice Age had taken 40,000 years to build up, it only took 2000 years to melt, and this melting took place during the Age of Leo (10,700 BC - 8,540 BC). As the ice melted, sea levels rose 400 feet, islands and land bridges disappeared, and huge sections of coastline were reclaimed by the ocean. The seas were so rough they whipped up great tidal waves that temporarily engulfed areas much further inland; Ice Age marine features have been found at altitudes of 200 feet in Mississippi, 160 feet in Georgia, and 240 feet in Florida. Central Europe, England, and a number of Mediterranean islands were completely submerged at times, and mass extinctions of animals took place all over the world between 11000 BC- 9000 BC. The best candidate for the next biggest change in human history would be when we finally moved out of the Stone Age into the Bronze Age, which, of course, occurred during the Age of Taurus (4,220 BC - 2,060 BC). A single individual, now equipped with sword and shield, could for the first time be a great champion, a king ruling over many, thus ushering in the first great Empires. This technological breakthrough set the pattern, it seems, for the next 5000 years, which have seen a steady path of technological advancement.

This Age also saw a Jaynes Shift take place.

Did a similar Jaynes Shift also occur during the previous Age of Leo? Prior to the Jaynes Shift in 2500 BC, there may have been other, equally-fundamental shifts in human awareness, perhaps a new one occurring during each new Great Season. The changes occurring around 10,500 BC and again around 2500 BC do fit the pattern of the Great Year, suggesting that the Ages of the fixed signs, Scorpio, Leo, Taurus, and Aquarius, all bring unique and dramatic new conditions into the human experience. In each new Great Season, tradition declares, human experience undergoes a major change.

If each new Great Season brings another Jaynes Shift, that would certainly do the trick. The last major shift, as Jaynes reported, was the spontaneous development of an Personal Subjective awareness; in other words, the (re)discovery of the Personal Unconscious.

Did a similar Jaynes Shift occur during the previous Age of Leo? Specifically, did humanity shift from a Collective Conscious perspective to a Collective Unconscious perspective in the Age of Leo? There's no way to know for sure, since no written record of mankind's thoughts survive from that remote period. In fact, there's practically nothing left from which we might reconstruct a model of humanity's mentality during that distant age. But a few hints do seem to point in that direction.

The earliest known appearance of agriculture on the planet occurred in Egypt around 13,000 BC (during, appropriately enough, the Age of Virgo) with the domestication of barley, but then in the subsequent Age

of Leo, that technological advancement seems to have been suddenly abandoned and forgotten. No one knows why, but after about 10,500 BC, Egypt's early agricultural activities ceased, replaced again by hunting, fishing, and gathering. A Jaynes Shift in the way humanity's minds functioned would neatly explain this otherwise inexplicable technological reverse. If a Jaynes Shift caused the center of human consciousness to shift from the Collective Conscious mind to the Collective Unconscious mind, that would go a long way towards explaining why such a recent technological advance would have been so suddenly and wholeheartedly abandoned. After the Jaynes Shift refocused our thought processes towards the unconscious, our minds simply wouldn't have been able to perform the abstract logic necessary to maintain that level of technology anymore.

If each Jaynes Shift brings a major change in the way the human mind functions, people of one Great Season would no longer think the same way that people from the previous Great Season thought. It would not be easy to understand the behavior or priorities of people from a previous Great Season. It would be hard to "get inside their heads"; people on the other side of a Jaynes Shift would seem almost like an alien species. In the same way that the Egyptians abandoned agriculture after it had served them well for over 2000 years, people on the opposite side of a Jaynes Shift would do things that seem to make no sense from the current point of view.

If the human mind shifted into an Interior Individual, or Personal Subjective, or Personal Unconscious perspective during the Age of Taurus, then did the earlier Age of Leo see a previous Jaynes Shift that jolted human consciousness into a Collective Subjective, or Collective Unconscious mode of awareness? Was this when 'the gods' were first 'born', the same gods who were abandoned 6000 years later during the Age of Taurus? Was this when all of humanity started operating with a common unconscious mind — the Collective Unconscious — when we all became dominated by the same unconscious thought forms, complexes, and archetypes?

If the precession of the equinoxes brings a new Jaynes Shift during each of the Ages of the fixed signs, an even earlier shift would have occurred in the Age of Scorpio, around 16,000 BC, which would perhaps have jolted humanity into a Collective Objective, or Collective Conscious mode of thought. And prior to that, a Jaynes Shift in the Age of Aquarius around 21,000 BC would have slipped humanity into an Individual Objective, or Personal Conscious mode of thought. If so, human history is not a matter of the evolution of human consciousness, but the revolution of human consciousness. Human history would then be, like the ancient symbol of the snake eating its own tail, a circle that returns again and again to its own beginnings.

Do such shifts occur during the Ages of Scorpio, Leo, Taurus, and Aquarius? In his book From Atlantis to the Sphinx, Colin Wilson ar-

gued that ancient Egyptian history revolved around two primary events — the erection of the Sphinx in 10,500 BC and the building of the pyramids around 2500 BC — and the timing of these events would neatly mirror such a cycle of Jaynes Shifts. Wilson pointed out that the second of these corresponds precisely in time with the Jaynes Shift that occurred around 2500 BC. The hypothesis of a regular cycle of such shifts in human psychology would suggest that the earlier primary event in Egyptian history — the building of the Sphinx, would have also coincided with another Jaynes Shift, moving from minds centered in a Collective Conscious to minds centered in a Collective Unconscious. From this we could anticipate an entire cycle of Jaynes Shifts, a cycle which would continually repeat throughout history: This cycle would be comprised of four overlapping sets, or hemispheres, of experience: the cycle would be divided into an objective half and a subjective half, and the cycle would also be divided into an individual half and a collective half. Together they would define a 25,920 year-long cycle of development that would trace human consciousness as it progressed from preconsciousness to personal consciousness to collective consciousness.

Development of Self Identity

Great Season of the Interior Individual: Development of the Personal Unconscious — This would have been when humans first became subjectively conscious of "self", when a sense of self-identity and personality would have first begun to develop. Here we would have first realized we existed as autonomous beings, becoming conscious of our own consciousness.

Great Season of the Exterior Individual: Development of the Personal Conscious — This would be when humans first become objectively conscious of "self." This would see the first development of the objective awareness of one's true individuality. Here we would have first begun to see ourselves, and the world around us, more objectively, acquiring more of a sense of how others see things.

Development of Collective Identity

Great Season of the Exterior Collective: Development of the Collective Conscious — This would have been humans first became objectively conscious of "the collective", when the consciousness of human beings first began to unite or integrate together into a single objective conglomerate. This conglomerate would be objectively observable, but not subjectively observable. It could be seen, as it were, from outside only, but it could not yet see itself from inside; it would not yet possess any subjective self-awareness. The entire collective, for the first time, would act as a single entity — man became Man.

Great Season of the Interior Collective: Development of the Collective Unconscious —This would be when humans first become subjectively conscious of "the collective", when that integrated conglomer-

ate of human minds finally coalesces together into an actual subjectively self-aware "person" with a sense of its own existence. Perspective would have shifted, and the conglomerate would now find that it is seeing itself from the inside, having become subjectively aware of its own autonomous existence.

Traditions of Four World Ages

Many ancient cultures believed that a number of previous worlds or world ages had come and gone before our present one. While the specific number of ages that were supposed to have come and gone differs from people to people and tradition to tradition, the notion of four world ages figures most frequently (although other numbers do occur, such as seven and twelve). A record of these four world ages is found in several Hindu and Greek books, in the Avesta of the Persians, in the Hebrew tradition, and in the traditions of the Incas, Aztecs, and Mayas.

India, in both Hindu and Buddhist texts, has developed the most complex system of world ages. One Mahayuga, or Great Age, includes four Yugas — the Krita, Treta, Dvapara, and Kali ("yuga" stands for "pair", reminding us that in each Great Season, the mind is still composed of two parts, a dominant component and a recessive component). Sri Yukteswar, guru to Paramahansa Yogananda, believed that India's calculations of the Yugas were originally related to the "Great Year" or "Age of the Gods" — one complete precession of the equinoxes.

Similarly, the Book of Daniel in the Old Testament also mentions four kingdoms — of gold, silver, bronze, and a mixture of iron and clay, respectively — after which God will establish an everlasting kingdom.

In the Americas, similar folk memories of four great ages are also found in the traditions of the Toltecs, Aztecs, Maya, and Navahos. The calendar of the current Mayan age started on August 11, 3114, BC, which is not all that different from the beginning of the Jewish calendar, or from the date legend ascribes to the foundation of Egypt's Old Kingdom, or the date Jaynes points to as the dawn of subjective self-awareness in the human psyche.

The Double-Headed Serpent

In their artwork, the ancient Maya portrayed the zodiac as a double-headed serpent which upheld the sky. This two-headed mythological figure was very important to the Mayan people; it was as culturally prevalent a symbol in their day as the Christian cross is today. It seems almost as if they believed that this zodiac serpent had somehow "given birth" to the human race; the image of a human face emerging from the jaws of this serpent is a recurrent theme in Maya art. And such an image — the human face emerging from the jaws of the zodiac — seems a simple and elegant symbol for the Jaynes Cycle of the Evolution of Human Consciousness.

Why was this zodiac serpent portrayed as having two heads? If in-

deed it was meant to signify the emergence of human consciousness, these two heads can only mean one thing — that more than one component of consciousness was involved — that, similarly to the Dakota and the Innuit to the north, the ancient Maya was yet another early American culture that subscribed to the Binary Soul Doctrine.

Quetzalcoatl was the Aztec name for this legendary two-headed creature. The Mayans were the Aztecs' predecessors, and Quetzalcoatl was the Aztec equivalent to the older Mayan god Kukulcan. In the ancient Mayan language, the word "can" meant both "serpent" and the numeral "four", and it also sounded a great deal like the Mayan word for sky — "caan." Their single word for serpent, therefore, efficiently included meanings that combined to describe a four-part, long thin creature that was alive in their sky. And the Mayan words "Ku" and "Kul", as it turns out, both translate as "divine" or "holy", so together, as Kukul, they would mean "holy holy", or "twice holy", or perhaps "holy duality" (reminding us again that this figure was portrayed with two heads). Together, these three Mayan words "Ku kul can" would mean something like "the twice-holy, four-part long thin creature that was alive in the zodiac."

Such a meaning, of course, would be particularly relevant to the Jaynes Cycle, which indicates that over the course of four different Great Seasons, two entirely different consciousnesses are created in turns — individual consciousness is created and developed over the first 12,960 years of the cycle, and then collective consciousness is created and developed over the next 12,960 years of the cycle.

The Mayan word for "feathered" is "kukum", which sounds very close to the Mayan words "ku" and "kul" when they are combined as "kukul." This similarity suggests that the original Mayan meaning "the twice-holy, four-part long thin creature that was alive in the zodiac" became corrupted into a phrase that would have seemed at least more comprehensible, if not actually meaningful, to the average uninformed person — a "feathered serpent." This, of course, would explain why the Aztecs, who came after the Mayans, called this mythological god "Quetzalcoatl" — the feathered serpent.

Bibliography

Jaynes, J. *The Origin of Consciousness in the Breakdown of the Bicameral Mind*. New York, Houghton Miffin Co., 2000.

Novak, P. *The Division of Consciousness: The Secret Afterlife of the Human Psyche*. Charlottesville, VA, Hampton Roads Publishing Co. Inc., 1997.

Novak, P. *Divided by the Light: Afterlife Phenomena and the Lost Secret of Death*. Charlottesville, VA, Hampton Roads Publishing Co. Inc., 2002.

Schiffer, F. *Of Two Minds: The Revolutionary Science of Dual-Brain Psychology*. New York, The Free Press, 1980.

Wilber, K.. *A Brief History of Everything*. Boston: Shambala, 1996.
Wilson, C. *From Atlantis to the Sphinx*. New York, International Publishing Co., 1996.

Reprint requests to:
Peter Novak
1428 Illinois Ave.,
LaPorte, IN 46350
e-mail:Novak@divisiontheory.com

The Pope and the Rabbi

Several centuries ago, the Pope decreed that all the Jews had to leave Italy. There was, of course, a huge outcry from the Jewish community, so the Pope offered a deal. He would have a religious debate with a leader of the Jewish community. If the Jewish leader won the debate, the Jews would be permitted to stay in Italy. If the Pope won, the Jews would have to leave.

The Jewish community met and picked an aged Rabbi, Moishe, to represent them in the debate. Rabbi Moishe, however, could not speak Latin and the Pope could not speak Hebrew. So it was decided that this would be a "silent" debate. On the day of the great debate, the Pope and Rabbi Moishe sat opposite each other for a full minute before the Pope raised his hand and showed three fingers. Rabbi Moishe looked back and raised one finger.

Next, the Pope waved his finger around his head. Rabbi Moishe pointed to the ground where he sat. The Pope then brought out a communion wafer and chalice of wine. Rabbi Moishe pulled out an apple. With that, the Pope stood up and said, "I concede the debate. This man has bested me. The Jews can stay."

Later, the Cardinals gathered around the Pope, asking him what had happened.

The Pope said, "First I held up three fingers to represent the Trinity. He responded by holding up one finger to remind me that there was still one God common to both our religions. Then I waved my finger around me to show him that God was all around us. He responded by pointing to the ground to show that God was also right here with us. I pulled out the wine and the wafer to show that God absolves us of our sins. He pulled out an apple to remind me of original sin. He had an answer for everything. What could I do?"

Meanwhile, the Jewish community crowded around Rabbi Moishe, asking what happened. "Well," said Moishe, "first he said to me, 'You Jews have three days to get out of here.' So I said to him, 'Up yours'. Then he tells me the whole city would be cleared of Jews. So I said to him, 'Listen here Mr. Pope, the Jews ... we stay right here!" "And then?" asked a woman. "Who knows?" said Rabbi Moishe. "We broke for lunch."

— *Submitted by Dr. Barbara Rommer*