

TA51, Response 12 (to Muller, note to R11)

CORRECTIONS by Glenn C. Wood, 24 September 2002, posted 8 October 2002

Mr. Muller is close to being wholly correct and I being woefully incorrect. In R11 a quote was attributed to Mr. Muller whereas it was a quote from Mr. Jaspers. If I'd included the reference that would have at least been helpful to the reader to see Muller should have been Jaspers. I apologize too for apparently misinterpreting Muller's reference to Greek divinities and Roman gods and happy to be corrected (a pleasure unappreciated without comparison to at least one more mistake).

Though the R11 comments were directed to Mr. Muller they also should be seen as referring to Mr. Pivnicki's possible interpretation of Jaspers' views of Anaximander's theology. That should have been made clear.

It's doubtful that Anaximander had the Old Testament except by "influence" which is the word I used. This could include oral transmission (Apaches have been reported to travel up to fifty miles in a day on foot). Thank you though for objecting to something for which there's no evidence -- except possibly in effects. Mr. Muller's objection can be taken as instructions for the Forum to disallow it as evidence in their deliberations.

Mr. Muller's corrections draw attention too to the evidence that Jaspers' view on this would be that there was no such communication as I suggested during the axial period. His comments can be found in *The Origin and Goal of History*, where he states that his view might suggest he "were out to prove direct intervention on the part of the deity." His position is to "prevent the comfortable and empty conception of history as a comprehensible and necessary movement of humanity." (Yale University Press, 1965, p.18) My purpose for mentioning the "influence" is to show that the apeiron concept may not have been independent and therefore empty from another realist-like perspective. Divine intervention and dynamic movement of a personal nature can give stability to movement in history, but can also be exploited in the name of religion. Apeiron talk may have been a reaction to the "influence" of exploited gods -- and even God -- to make room for exploitation by biology educators.

Zeroing in on Tertullian seems healthy after hearing Mr. Muller's reasons and it would seem worthwhile to also take another look at David Hume.