

is re-feeling (Fr., "sentiment"), **feeling again**, reexperiencing past feelings, good or bad, which the erosions of time & of memory have weakened or extinguished from consciousness.

ELLIOTT THINKSHEETS

309 L.Eliz.Dr., Craigville, MA 02636

Phone 508.775.8008

Noncommercial reproduction permitted

While repressed, sentiments distort rational thinking: when raised (yes, "consciousness-raising"), they impede rational living. And, thought or unthought (ie not deliberately brought to the level of awareness), they are cumulative even if unnursed but accumulate faster when nursed.

"Good or bad" sentiments? Take away the moral layer & you have positive or negative sentiments. Example of POSITIVE: Falling in love, as everybody knows, rises to consciousness when one realizes (1) that memories of his/her face or voice keep re-turning unbidden & (2) one is nursing, encouraging, their return. Example of NEGATIVE: The Boston Tea Party. The citizens of Boston & beyond had for some time been *nursing a grudge*, working up a high dud-geon, against King George's "taxation without representation."

You've never heard of good-feelings resentments? True: the word's long been used only for bad (in the sense of negative) feelings. The word is nonjudgmental: some things you should feel bad about feeling bad about; some things you should feel good about feeling bad about, resenting. If people didn't feel resentful, there'd be no murders or progress. This is the datum this Thinksheet will apply, if you have patience to await the application.

1 As my conscience requires, & I believe God wills, I did my Bible-language thing on "resentment." First, I was surprised that the King James Version uses no form of the stem "resent-." Why not? OED (Oxford Eng. Dictionary) answered: the stem is almost entirely uncited till after 1611. So my search took me through English-to-Hebrew biblical & modern dictionaries & English to Greek biblical & modern dictionaries as dragnets to bring up ("access," to use yucky computerese) all words suspected of harboring "resentment." Then I studied all the words & noted all their occurrences in the Bible, the while connection-making to what I'm trying to get at in this Thinksheet. Then there's the possibility that the Bible may have some resentment-stories in which no "resentment" word occurs, so I did a bit of mental dragnetting about that....That's more than you wanted to know about my word-processing. I've never before told you the process, & I promise never to do it again. (What you mean by "word processing" didn't get meant till the early 1970s, & I've been using the word in its original meaning a lot longer than that.)

2 The American colonials resented insensitive, unfair British rule, & we got **progress**. The blacks resented antiConstitutional discrimination, & we got legal **progress** (though with some reverse discrimination). Women resent gender putdowns & shutouts, so we're getting **progress** (though with some reverse discrimination). So why does resentment have such a bad name? Because so much of it is, in the moral sense, bad, being not a mature response of the Self but merely a thin-skinned, irrational reaction of the Ego. The skin-thickness metaphor is very useful. Too pachydermal & you're not sensitive enough to know how you/others feel: too skelphrodermal & you're too irritable for human company (1Cor.13.5: "Love...is not irritable or resentful" [NRSV; KJV, "is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil"]); the radical quietism of vv.4-7 is intended as a corrective to the Corinthians' touchy wrangling & is not to be read, out of that context, as a posy of propositional Christian virtues).

Space is another useful metaphor here. The mature person has enough distance between the Ego and the Self--let's call it moat-width--to provide the Self with some protection & thus peace when the Ego suffers obloquy. Now note, under the fusion of the skin & space metaphors, the sad condition of the person who resents uncreatively: when the Ego is insulted or otherwise injured, the Self feels as offended, as attacked, as the Ego. Scratch the Ego's skin & the Self hurts because (1) of immaturity, Ego & Self being not yet differentiated (distanced from each other), or (2) pathology, the Self having collapsed into (having lost its distance from) the Ego.

3 Any liberation movement has its up & down sides. It's **thereapeutic** on

its up side, encouraging constructive resentment: it's **pathogenic** on its down side, promoting destructive resentments. In a tough call, yesterday the NAACP invited Louis Farrakan to its convention despite the Nation of Islam's promoting of destructive resentments against Jews. And radical feminism promotes destructive resentments against the male world, including civilizations (all of which are "androcentric")--in my health/pathology analysis here, the feminine gender taking the place of the immature/sick Ego.

4 Resenting God, atheists view him as Oppressor & accuse theists, who experience God as Liberator-Savior, of having "internalized oppression." The objective situation, according to all liberationists, is that the target populace consists of (1) the adequately resentful (prepared for revolutionary action), (2) the marginally resentful (who should be helped to move from the margins to the hot center of resentment-grudge-spleen-antagonism), & (3) the unconsciously resentful (the situation-definition not allowing for the possibility that some may be just plain unresentful)....The parallel conversion-model categories are the penitent, the wavering (as young Augustine's "Lord, make me pure, but not yet"), & the impenitent. The evangelist tries to empty categories 2 & 3 into category 1, so all the unconverted feel bad, bad enough to open themselves to receive God's Good News in the Lord Jesus Christ. So the liberationist tries to get the whole target population feeling as **resentful** as the transformation, however defined, requires....In the case of religious conversion, the target is one's own sinful self, whom the Holy Spirit is calling to repentance: the sinner is self-oppressed, & the salvific process includes resenting-abjuring what one has done in disservice to oneself. In the case of social conversion (liberationisms), the aim is to intensify the target populace's sense of resentment at being others-oppressed. Eg, radical feminism teaches women the hermeneutics of suspicion, to be alert to clues of oppression when they read classic literature such as the Bible (as it were, reading the Bible with distrust as well as trust).

5 But how do you sort auto-oppression (doing yourself in) from hetero-oppression (being done in by others)? Let's stay with women's resentments: how can a woman know when a particular resentment is objective (somebody or society is abusing her) & when subjective (she's projecting her self-disgust on others, perhaps unfocusedly on the so-called androcentric-hierarchical-patriarchal society)? And how when gender-specific (resenting the truth [while rejecting the culture-specific sexism] in Freud's "biology is destiny": males have no physical burdens parallel with conception-gestation-parturition-lactation)? Then there's the divine dimension of resentment: God is "to blame" for the fact that in any society, males have more freedom & more muscle-power as well as greater hormonal drive to control.....Better **resentment analysis** would (1) give the women's movement better reality-grounding, (2) help women have more control of their +/- resentment potential, (3) decrease unjust-unfair accusations against men & their products, & thus (4) improve female/male relationships....Two German psychiatrists I got to do short intensives with would add further light to our understanding of resentment:

.....Fritz KUNKEL's *Wiefühlung* ("We-feeling") maps the life-long process of solidarity (without which we're monads, not persons) in tension with sensitivity ([including resentment] without which, again, we're monads, not persons). "Sensitivity is the one side of culture and character, and solidarity, responsibility and assistance are the other side" (162, in "The Maturing-We" section of HOW CHARACTER DEVELOPS, with Roy E. Dickerson, Scrib/51). Failure to manage resentments splits "we" into "you" & "I" (interpersonal level) or "we"/"they" (societal level). I resent what radical feminism is doing to constructive feminism & thus to women & men. And I resent the bum rap it's giving to the Bible & the biblical God. Because radical feminism's resentment-rage is cumulative, no changes in the rendition of Scripture or the re-edition of God will satisfy. The we/they split will prove final.

.....Viktor FRANKL's *Daseinexistenzanalyse* (the realistic analysis of one's actual life-situation face to face with death, the world, & God) reveals that many of our resentments arise from refusal to accept life's limitations & limits. Gender has nothing to do with this refusal/acceptance: in this perspective, men & women are not different, & actual differences are diminished in importance.

6 On the theme of resentment, the Bible's riches in word & story overwhelm me--& frustrate me, for I've trouble selecting the few I can use within the small compass of a Thinksheet. If I stare at the "Contents" & think through the books, the stories pop out at me. Or if I hunt out the words, I find them embedded in stories. Let's note here two uses of the word **domain**: (1) "Semantic domain" indicates the meaning-field in which a word is found along with the other members of its team. "Resentment" is often found in contexts where also are "malice," "hate," "hostility," "rage," "vengeance," "revenge," etc. You can improve your semantic-domain sense by reading the frequent articles on synonyms at the end of dictionary definitions (or entries in WEBSTER'S DICTIONARY OF SYNONYMS, which has these after "resentment": offense, umbrage, pique, dudgeon, huff). As for the NT, you needn't know Greek to get at the Greek words' semantic domains in Darton (Michael D., MODERN CONCORDANCE TO THE NT) or, more technical, Louw (Johannes P. L., et al, GREEK-ENGLISH LEXICON OF THE NT Based On SEMANTIC DOMAINS, 2 vols.). In the latter, "resent/fulness/ment" is domain 88.162,167-170,201 ("Moral and Ethical Qualities and Related Behavior"). (2) "Domain" can also refer to the story within which a word occurs, word & story being intercoloring.

7 Think, now: what's the Bible's first resentment-story? Right, Cain & Abel (Gn.4). God's preferential treatment of Abel fills Cain with resentment, which turns to rage, which becomes malice, which murders. In this evil cumulative process, God intervenes before the murder, warning Cain that "sin is lurking at the door...you must master it." But, it masters him. Flip 32 chapters & you come to the Joseph saga (so beautifully & profoundly spun out by Jos. Mann's JOSEPH IN EGYPT), 37,39-50. Joseph's brothers are resentful both of their father's preferential treatment of J. and also of what they took to be J.'s youthful arrogance, & J. counters not with resentment but with forgiveness. In the final scene of Genesis, the wily brothers, whom J. had first humiliated (minor vengeance?) & then benefited, say "'What if J. still bears a grudge against us and pays us back in full for all the wrong that we did to him?'" So they report that Jacob-Israel wanted J. to forgive his brothers, & add "please forgive the crime...." Abjuring any act that would be the end-product of resentment, J. says "'Am I in the place of God? Even though you intended to do harm to me, God intended it for good.'" Thus "he reassured them, speaking kindly to them."

Now let's have a lexical look at the Joseph saga as it bears on this Thinksheet's topic. In 37, the brothers' resentment builds up into hate (*shana'*, in vs.4, repeated as "more" in vv.5 & 8; LXX $\mu\iota\sigma\text{-}mis$ [no "hate" in Gk. of vs.5]). Full of jealousy (*kan'* in vs.11; LXX $\zeta\eta\lambda\text{-}zel$, which transliterates as "zeal," the Gk. root meaning "boiling," as "boiling mad"), the brothers are on the slippery slope from resentment to murder (vv.18-19: "conspire to kill him...let us kill him"; cp. Esau's plan to kill Jacob, culminating his resentment over being displaced as the primary heir of their father Isaac, 27.41)....It's not till almost the end of the saga that the biblical-Hebrew word closest in area to Eng. "resentment" occurs. In Jacob's blessing on Joseph, "The archers...pressed him hard" (*satam* in a literal sense, as LXX [23.24] $\sigma\upsilon\nu\text{-}\tau\rho\iota\beta\text{-}sun\text{-}trib\text{-}$ [Heb. is vs.23], in J; in E 50.15, the figurative sense, "bear a grudge, cherish animosity, against"; cp. twice in Hos.9.7-8, "hostility")....In 50.15, LXX $\mu\eta\sigma\iota\kappa\alpha\kappa\text{-}mnesikak\text{-}$, lit. "remember-evil," a Gk. wd. not in NT but in Philo, Josephus, & the Apostolic Fathers. Twice in Joel 3.4 the meaning is "paying back." In Eze.25.12 it's for Edom's vengeful activity against Judah. And in Zech.7.10 it's "do not devise evil in your hearts against one another." The vb. is to "remember evil," with the result that you "bear malice, bear a grudge against." And the n. is "grudge-bearing, vengefulness, vindictiveness." Let's take just one early Christian use: The Didache begins with an expansion of the Decalog & at 2.3 says "thou shalt not bear malice [lit., "remember-evil"]."

8 DIMENSIONS of resentment: (1) **ontological**, God's resentment of idolatry & of moral evil; (2) **historical**, tribal-national long grudges, as now in former Yugoslavia (lit., "yoked-slavia" that's come unyoked); & (3) **personal**, the bitter-sour-smoldering animosities against, between, among human beings (bitter root, bitter

fruit). Somebody should do a PhD on Rosenberg's & Goebbel's orchestration of these three dimensions (the first being, for them, resentment not by God but by the German Spirit). Hitler was the firebrand, but those two prepared & lit the torch. The political tinder was the accumulated resentments among the German people, cleverly focused on the Versailles Treaty & the Jews. Into the conflagration was thrown the people's personal real & imagined injuries & insults. Paradoxically, the more alienated they felt, the less separated (from one another) they felt: separation from "them" (the old Allies & the Jews), the more solidarity. Before the Nazi evil was (Hannah Arendt) "banal," the resentment slippery-slope was ordinary, though extraordinarily greased by psycho-political genius..... In radical feminism's tightening ideology, greasing the slippery slope, I've observed all three dimensions of resentment in action. In the first dimension, the Goddess increasingly resents the biblical God & vies to displace him; in the second, long grudges against what's variously called androcentrism-hierarchicalism-patriarchalism; & in the third, each woman's collected slights & hurts from males. On the analogy, I've heard some radical feminists called "fascists," but I'd never call them that.

9 In §6, after mentioning some words in the domain of "resentment," I closed with "etc." Now I need to add two more, viz "jealousy" (grudging resentment at not having what one thinks one should, or [as in God's j.] vigilant guarding of what one has) & "envy" (a spiteful or malicious coveting of another's possessions or accomplishments). The latter in the NT (φθον- *phthon*-) is resentment become ill-will because of someone's presumed unfair advantage--often associated, in action, with strife, as in Phil.1.15; in Gal.5.26, with irritation). For the former, see ¶2 of §7. The Eng. wds. "zeal" & "jealousy" have the same root, ζελ- *zel*-, & combining them gets the force of "jealousy" in early Christian Greek: it's "a particularly strong feeling of resentment....strong envy" (Louw). It is, according to 1 Clement, the first book in the Apostolic Fathers, the key to history's downside. Writing to the Corinthian Christians a generation later than Paul did, he bewailed their prosperity ("all glory and enlargement was given to you," 3.1), which they'd permitted to corrupt them: "From this arose jealousy and envy [the two Gk. wds. in this Thinksheet's present §], strife [the wd. in the Phil. ref. above] and sedition [better, "rebellion"], persecution and disorder, war and captivity" (vs.2). "Jealousy and envy wrought fratricide" (4.7, on Cain & Abel--the passage continuing thus: "Through jealousy our father Jacob ran from the face of Esau his brother. Jealousy made Joseph to be persecuted to the death, and come into slavery. Jealousy forced Moses to fly from the face of Pharaoh....Through jealousy David incurred envy...from Saul....Through jealousy and envy the greatest and most righteous pillars of the Church were persecuted...unto death....Peter....Paul....Jealousy has estranged wives from husbands,...overthrown great cities, and rooted up mighty nations....[Against all this,] let us come to the glorious and venerable rule of our tradition, and let us see what is good and pleasing and acceptable in the sight of our Maker. Let us fix our gaze on the blood of Christ...poured out for our salvation," bringing "the grace of repentance to all the world." Next we hear of two repentance preachers, Noah & Jonah. In chap.16, Jesus is used as model against envy-jealousy: "See...the example...given to us; for if the Lord was thus humble-minded, what shall we do, who through him have come under the yoke of his grace?" (The next two chapters are on humility in the OT.) In 33.1--"Shall we be slothful in well-doing and cease from love?....let us be zealous to accomplish every good deed"--he avoids using the normal word for zeal in the good sense, because he's nailed it down in its bad sense as the root sin (which is not, as in medieval vice-lists, pride, though false pride is the root of much resentment); but once in the good sense [45.1]: "Be contenders and zealots for the things which lead to salvation" [my tr.; otherwise, Kirsopp Lake in LOEB])....In chap.43, intertribal jealousy caused Moses to devise a way of restoring & maintaining order, inter-party strife in Corinth being the occasion of the Roman church's writing & sending this 65(!)-chapter letter to the Corinthian church. (A circulated letter early considered part of the NT: it's the last book in Codex Sinaiticus, the earliest complete Greek Bible).

10 Why so much attention to I Clement? Because we, as did the early Christians, should take its message seriously, seriously considering the possibility that resentment *is* the fly in the human ointment, the root of all evil rising up out of the human soul & society, the key to history's downside. (The 65 chapters might persuade you if my précis doesn't.) What happens when we use this as epistemologoumenon (root-explanatory phenomenon)? Let's compare:

...."Search for the woman" (Cherchez la femme) is French-sexist advice is to look for a woman at the bottom of the problem. On this model,

...."Search for the man" or masculinist distortion is the current feminist advice while considering culture-products, especially classic literature, including the Bible. It goes by the pseudo-classy name of "hermeneutics of suspicion."

...."Search for resentment" is androgynous advice, transcending the female-male divide. Resentments, whether in effect creative or destructive, are hot buttons to powerful springs of action. Yes, we need to be careful in using this epistemologoumenon, for the same reason a liver specialist should guard against seeing liver disease where it isn't. But my conviction is that suspicion-explanation has been overused **by** feminism against male-masculine products & underused **on** feminism, which so far has shown too little interest in / ability at self-criticism, without which any movement goes crazy, its lunatic fringe moving (as now in radical feminism) toward the center. Why so little self-criticism? Because leaders don't want to be accused of counter-revolutionary activity. Why so little criticism from males? Because most of us are afraid of being accused of sexism or, worse, misogyny (here, projecting male resentments into, then out of, women & the women's movement)....Currently I'm writing qualifiers on radical feminism, but I'm a philologist: I *love* women. None of them ever beat me out of a job; & the only one I ever asked to marry me, did. Personally, I can't think of any reason for resenting them. But I resent radical feminism's enticing them into misandry, man-hating, which is as bad for women & men as misogyny is for men & women.

11 Now I must mention an overarching suspicion that relativizes, & diminishes the intensity of, reciprocal gender suspicions. Christians, women & men, should be more suspicious than the mainline churches have been of today's **neopagan** culture which offers the blandishments of sex, money, & power for the classical Christian virtues of faith, hope, & love. Compounding the problem is that many of the would-be reformers of Christianity (1) are near-illiterate on the Faith, having had little or no spiritual-intellectual formation in classical Christian thinking, & (2) easily adopt, from the neopagan surround, ideas to use as weapons against the Christian tradition, including Scripture. Also, some avant-garde church leaders claim that the Faith needs supplementation by **paleo-paganisms**, in America especially from pre-Christian Amerind cultures. Radical Christian monotheism--one God, who calls us to knuckle under to him & to reject all competitors as idols--does not sit well with these reformers & deviant leaders.

Which brings us to this: In the mainline-churches' debate over feminism, sharply focused in "inclusive language," we should separate out the neo- & paleo-pagan factors so as to get down to considering what changes, *within the limits of the Faith*, are now appropriate in light of current awarenesses & sensitivities.

12 The conversation can be further advanced in intelligence by women's learning to consciousness-raise on their **resentments** & **disappointments** so as to give proper separate attention to them. Disillusionment is now widespread over the past three decades' adolescent "have-it-all" goal, which has been a bust for all but a few highly gifted, high-energy women. This dismal situation does not nonplus radical feminism, which--you guessed it--blames men: if men had reduced their expectations commensurate with women's increase of expectations, women would now have it all without going crazy. Eg, men expected their wives to do as much of the housework as their mothers had, viz almost all, & studies indicate that men have not much reduced that expectation. Consequence: the liberated woman, free to work outside the home, is not free to work less at home, as she hoped she'd be. So she's disappointed, exhausted, & resentful of her husband, who should (I agree) have taken off some housework pressure if circumstances allowed. But

did circumstances allow? Did his workworld adjust so as to eat him up less? What should now be done to improve the relationship by (1) reducing expectations (a move from idealism to realism), (2) readjusting workloads, (3) facing & analyzing disappointments, & so (4) eliminating resentments?....As I was writing this §, I remembered a chapter ("Relationships") in Allan Bloom's THE CLOSING OF THE AMERICAN MIND (S&S/87). The subsections on Self-Centeredness, Equality, Race, Sex, Separateness, Divorce, Love, Eros are full of wisdom. Sample, from pp.115f: Rousseau, worried about the rampant individualism of women & men, preached romantic love as an interdependency counterpoise; & Tocqueville, observing "the absolute differentiation of husband's and wife's functions and ways of life in the American family,...attributed the success of American democracy to its women." Now? "Romantic love is now as alien to us as knight-errantry," leaving male & female, but especially the female (with a greater urge for children & nest), feeling unfulfilled. I must add this:

To attribute women's woes to men's "sexism" is a superficial analysis sustained by the grain of truth in it. The profounder cause lies in **cultural history** --the fact that in the late Middle Ages (in Europe, of course, our culture being "Eurocentric"), individualism & romance were twin-born. The first was do-your-thing freedom; the second, do-our-thing responsibility. The second could be sustained only by high fantasy, which could not be sustained without severe genital control (the ideal of virginal marriage & marital faithfulness). In the past thirty years, the so-called sexual revolution has loosened genitals progressively downward in age, till now intercourse is common in junior highschool. Now, when intercourse is disconnected from love, imagination is disconnected from mystery (which is 34% of romance) & longing is disconnected from fantasy (which is 66% of romance). Remaining room for romance, 0%. (You don't like my percentages? What are yours?) Conclusion: feminism, all of us, should be preaching premarital abstinence, which with the help of AIDS is making a comeback. And now "family values" is no longer a liberal sneer: society is breaking down with the breakdown of the family (eg, almost $\frac{1}{2}$ of Americans are now born bastards)....Romance (in my phrase, "the mutual superiority of the sexes") is, in our culture, the only counterpoise to a radical individualism that oppresses women even more than it does men. (In cultures without individualism, romance is not necessary for social cohesion & personal sense of fulfillment.)

13 Being sinners, men & women wrong each other across (as well as within) genders & so occasion legitimate resentments. Justice-fairness-love demands that we separate these out from the **illegitimate resentments** which call for knowledge (where they spring from ignorance) & repentance (where they spring from ill will). An ILLUSTRATION from academic history: Prussia, the most macho of German-speaking states, singlemindedly (in 1875 under Bismarck) created Germany & that most penile of academic degrees. Of course women are as capable of the PhD as are men, but it requires them to damp down their superior relational awareness so they can singlemindedly concentrate on their project, like a hunter. (Many early-"man" cave paintings show the hunter with erect penis pointing in the same direction as his spear.) I admire women who get the PhD for the same reason I admire men who develop their relational powers: both are crossover achievements. But there is a cost, & I've known many of these crossovers (ie, female PhD) to resent having had to pay the price. Another group of female resisters are those who started out on a PhD & were waylaid by marriage/pregnancy.

Of the latter group, one had published in 1964 a book I read that year on my white-male commuter train to & from Grand Central. (It was white because Chappaqua was white, & it was male because way back then females didn't have executive-type Manhattan jobs.) In her introduction, the author exposed her spleen, her resentment, that a man got her into marriage & pregnancy so she couldn't finish her PhD. When I read that, I said to myself "This whole book is going to be a venting of her resentment-jealousy-envy-rage & blaming of her husband & of men who give women such lousy deals." And it was. Betty Friedan's THE FEMININE MYSTIQUE was, & is. Consider now that that book, a woman's resentment book, is credited with midwifing the modern American feminist movement. Let's not make too much of this, or too little.