

10.9. Special ontology

Contents

1. Special ontology: theology.	(1)
2. The essence of a. Pagan religion (Santeria).	(3)
3. The eternal covenant as cosmic.	(6)
4. Philosophical theology.	(7)
5. Theology as theodicy.	(10)
6. Coarse and tenuous substance or matter.	(11)
7. Aretalogy.	(12)
8. Apocalypticism.	(13)
9. Philosophical theology: religion back from the brink.	(14)
10. The essence of a non-Biblical religion.	(17)
11. Theodicy: god, at least the truly Biblical one, creates free beings.	(20)
12. "The death of god" according to J.-P. Sartre.	(22)
13. Beaten atheism and tragic atheism.	(23)
14. Biblical reading of the Bible.	(25)
15. The eternal covenant includes all peoples (Jews and Gentiles).	(33)
16. Freedom yes but also seed-harvest law.	(34)
17. Twofold resurrection.	(36)
18. Even for the gravest 'sin' (unconscionability).	(37)
19. Demonism or dualism regarding (origin of) evil.	(42)

1. Special ontology: theology.

'Theology' is understood here as religion or religious ontology. It is called 'philosophical' because it sets itself outside every religion (as far as this is possible) as well as outside every irreligion (atheism or agnosticism ("I don't know")). Otherwise it would be 'theology' in the ordinary sense, i.e. the theory of the sacred seen from the perspective of one or another religion.

Philosophical theology.

Here the basic concepts ('models') are discussed.

Typology.-- The ancient Greeks knew three: the mythical (speaking in terms of myths about the sacred), the political (speaking in terms of official or public religion about the sacred), the physical or (natural) philosophical (speaking in terms of natural philosophy or of philosophy without more about the sacred).

Method.-- The directly known (phenomenology of religion) and the indirectly known (logic of religion) concerning what is called - to begin with the common sense - "the sacred" is what founds theology.--

The apophatic method is one aspect of the theological method: for if there is one feature which stands out, it is what R. Otto calls the mystery, i.e. the sacred which is practically inaccessible to the human mind and its earthly models.

The essence of deity.-- All that is called “holy” is living (non-dead), life-force (vitalizing or revitalizing: in the Bible “spirit”), causative (something that stands out by its life and life-force, working out).-- Thus Nathan Söderblom.

Theodicy.-- In the general sense, this means one aspect of theology, namely, reconciling the physical and especially the moral evil in the universe with the sacred, especially with the Biblical deity.

Matter / energy / information.

Every sacred reality exhibits its own matter, the rarefied or subtle (fluid), divisible into mortal etheric (which emanates, e.g., from the corpse of someone) and immortal astral (which accompanies the incorporeal soul).-- Note: some schools reverse the names. Matter of agreement.-- Putting such a ‘smidgen’ (taking all forms) of substances in front of the matter of physics is called “hylic pluralism”.

Every sacred reality exhibits -- in the wake, incidentally, of subtle matter, especially the astral -- energy, life force, which was the object of ancient aretology. Aretè” (or “dunamis”) means life force showing itself in a sign which distinguishes itself from non-sacred or profane phenomena.-- The putting forward of such a power(s) is called dynamism.

Note.-- That archaic and ancient mankind very clearly distinguished natural power from extra- and supernatural power is evident from Numbers 16: 29/30, among others.

Every sacred reality is only noticed in its full sense by means of an information process which in ancient Greek is called ‘apocalyptic’. In the broad sense, ‘apokalupsis’ (alètheia), lat.: revelatio, unveiling, revelation. Seeing and hearing summarizes the information objectively present and at work in the sacred.-- A common term is mantic (from Greek ‘mantis’, seer).

Religion back from being away.

In the last decade especially, it is striking - believers and non-believers (who can no longer see beyond it) - that the sacred is breaking through again in a proliferation of neo-sacralisms, spread all over the globe. Two phenomena:

a. fundamentalisms which defend the foundations of culture against the reduction of the sacred (e.g. Catholic integrism);

b. New Age (New Era) -- a jumble of non-Biblical and Biblical revivals (“revivals”), in which the paranormal plays a leading role,-- in the form of “expanded” consciousness and magic.

Against the atheistic tendency of enlightened rationalism, religious science arose -- especially in the XVI -th / XVII -th centuries. This was due to contacts with non-western peoples and cultures (primitivology, ethnology).

At the same time we are witnessing the triumph of atheism (from the XVIIIth century onwards with the French materialists, whose offshoot is, among other things, the barbaric religious persecution under the Soviet regime) and a breakthrough of a God-is-dead theology.

The two opposites are reflected in Derrida's religion denunciation (revival, of which he wonders if it is more than a sign of the death of God (Nietzsche, Heidegger), and "the end of religion"). Intellectuals in particular struggle with the problem in this sense.

2. The essence of a Pagan religion (Santeria).

We take one specimen to clarify the idea (basic structure) of religion.-.

'Re.ligio' is "reverent care". Of what? Of the life-force insofar as it depends on higher, i.e., more life-force disposing, beings. -- Thus, within Santeria, there are Olorun, (Olodumare), the supreme being, source of all life-(force) and the orishas, the cosmic court council (as in Job 1:6), who, with the Supreme Being, control the universe -- especially the destiny of human beings, insofar as his worshippers. Problem solving depends on life force or ashé.

The praxis of this religion consists of communicating (much less directly) with Olorun through the orishas by means of the exchange of "gifts. One gives in order to receive ("Do ut des").

It should be noted that Santeria is and syncretism, a mixture of superficial Catholicism and West African paganism.

One finds this basic structure or idea. Pretty much found in all religions. Since the whole culture (the profane) is one continuous problem-solving (given + demanded: solution) which only appears possible in virtue of life force of higher nature, religion is the basis of the whole culture.

Only the secularized, profane cultures (western type) neglect (neg.ligere) that basic structure: they think they can grasp and solve all problems correctly without 'higher' life force. Autonomous. Self-powerful. This is the secularization so typical of our culture.

Theodicy : God, the Biblical at least, creates free beings.

"If thou, God-believer, assert that thy God is good and omnipotent, it follows, if one thinks of the fact of evil, what thou refutest." - Logical-syntactical rewriting exposes the reasoning.

But the ontological view of that reasoning discovers that this reasoning conceals God's ability to govern a (to a very high degree) autonomous creation. It confuses creation with "creating unfreedom." Moreover, if God does not exist and evil does exist,

God is not responsible for that evil but the creation. Which is precisely the position of the Bible believer: not God is responsible but his autonomous creation.

Theodicy: the death of God (Sartre).

Beate atheism differs from tragic atheism.

Sartre was an “existentialist-humanist.” ‘Existence’ (in a very limited sense (not the transcendental-ontological one) means “autonomous humanity in this world.” ‘Autonomous’ in his case means “without God.”“ -

The death of God (Nietzsche) is, as with most Western intellectuals, not interpreted energetically (they feel strong, possessing sufficient life force) but ethically. Indeed, what becomes the code of conduct of the atheistic man in this godless world, if there is no God to think and prescribe as well as sanction that code of conduct? Being pointed only to himself as a creator of values the consistent atheist decides that not in fact but in principle everything is permitted (Dostoyevsky). -

a. Beate Atheism: lay morality - considers itself liberated from the yoke of God but retains his values, i.e. a kind of ten commandments without God.

b. Tragic Atheism. - the counterpart of biblical Platonism - recognizes that, if God does not exist as legislator and judge, then “nowhere is it written” what man must do and not do, but that autonomous man himself prescribes his own commandments. Thus there are neither transcendent apologetics (a pre-given human nature e.g.) nor transcendent brakes (there is no name in whose name we are judgeable).-- man, sartrically thought, is doomed to freedom.

Biblical reading of the Bible.

Since the West is on the one hand antique-Greek on the other hand Biblically formed, we dwell - at length - on the basic structure or idea of Biblical religion.-- If we do this according to the Bible itself, this does not exclude that one can also interpret the Bible differently - rationalist-critical (secularizing e.g.; one thinks of R. Bultmann’s demythologization of the Bible).

But then one takes a ‘higher’ standpoint from which one views and judges the Bible that misses at least some of the axioms of the Bible.

1. The Bible is historical (more than imagined myth) and inspired (more than human mental product,-- e.g., an ideology).

2. God is the creator of the universe according to his thoughts (ideas) which he creatively realizes. God also creates man according to his thought (= origin). Sexuality too springs (‘origin’) from the same source of existence.

Note.-- The mythical language of e.g. many pages of the Bible does not prevent the presence of an ounce of ‘cognition’ (i.e. information that can be tested, anyhow). Even if the testing method is different from e.g. the beta or gamma sciences or even the alpha sciences: the sciences do not have the monopoly of truth. In other words: there are many things that are true for which there is (provisionally or not) no scientific evidence.

God’s thoughts (especially the Decalogue).

God is creator but not without his creation having a code of conduct imbibed.

The great theophany.-- ‘Theo.fanie’ is the fact that deity shows itself. This includes the phenomenological aspect. -- Well, the creating God of the Bible, whose proper name is “I am” (Exod. 3:14; Jn. 8: 24; (Jesus claims that name for himself)), i.e., “I am the one who creates and asserts myself as creator,” shows himself as creator-legislator in the form of the ten commandments. Note that his creating is inseparable from his requirement that creation, however autonomous, be conscientious creation.-

Ex. 19: 16ff. expresses, in a vernacular way, the code of conduct immanent (built in) to autonomous creation: 1/3 (religious-theological), 4/10 (religious-moral). -- The New Testament keeps it at that.

The judgment of God. - “I am” asserts itself as a tester of behavior: “Behold what ye do, and I (I am) would be silent?”.

The eternal covenant.-- Is. 24:1/6.-- “I am” asserts itself such that if one violates the code of conduct transgressively, catastrophic situations occur. Whether one is a Jew or a Christian or a pagan, the covenant immanent (embedded) in creation is eternal, -- independent of times or places.

The mechanism that is active in this is expressed in Gen. 6:3. “That my Spirit (op. :divine life-force) be not indefinitely abased (and therefore responsible concerning man since (inasmuch as) he / she is flesh (op.: conscience-less).”

Immediately we have the axiom that dominates the entire Bible, in its negative wording: if flesh, unscrupulous, then God’s spirit, life force, humiliated, no longer responsible for that flesh. Positively worded: if flesh (in the neutral sense of “finite being”) but conscientious, then God’s spirit, life force, successful and thus responsible for destiny,-- saving in (emergency) situations.

3. The eternal covenant as cosmic.

The divine idea “marriage” (as the realization of God’s thought). The actual marriage (as realization of cosmic beings (sons of God. angels). Divergent power-filled beings - against God’s - I am - will - thwart the origin, eternity (God). But “Behold what these deviated people do, and I am would be silent?” (Jud. 6; 1 Pet. 3:19; 2 Pet. 2: 4/10; cf. Luc 17: 26/ 30; .cf. Ps. 88 (87): 11/13).

The eternal covenant: planetary.

The eternal covenant as “If conscientious, then God’s spirit(life force) problem-solving” also includes the Gentiles in whose hearts the law is built, who receive God’s charismatic spirit, if conscientious, as the baptized. All classes, all peoples, all ages are basically equal before God who knows no respect for persons.

Freedom and sowing - harvest lawfulness.

God is not responsible for the evil that man does. For he is thoroughly different from “the other deities” who “know” good and evil (are comfortable with it): he keeps his law.

Gal. 6:7.-- “What one sows - while living - one also reaps”. Always according to Gen 6:3: if flesh, then destruction; if (God’s) spirit, then eternal divine life.

Twofold resurrection. (31).

The basic Old Testament text is Ps. 16(15):9/11, where the unity of (what we call) soul (called) and body (immortal body then) asserts itself in the afterlife as resurrection. But if flesh, then resurrection to death (condemnation); if spirit (of God), then resurrection to life (John 5:29).

Even for the gravest sin.

The biblical paradox par excellence: no matter how stern, “I am” God, asserts itself not only as a condemner of evil but as an educating leniency to the one who creates evil: Wis. 11:15 /12:22. “You close your eyes to the unscrupulousness of men so that they may come to repentance. This applies to pagans (Egyptians, Canaanites) and to Biblical believers.

Demonism or / and dualism.

The Bible knows demonism, i.e. the awareness that (some) beings are at home in both good and evil. But it also knows dualism, i.e. the fact that there are good and evil.

4. *Philosophical theology.*

'Theology' (Greek: 'theos', deity, and '-logia', to bring up) is "to bring up all that is deity".

Types.-- Antiquity left us with a triad.

1. *Mythic theology.*-- This expresses all that is theos/ thea (god/goddess) in terms of stories, myths. These myths are primarily meant to serve in the context of rites, i.e. sacred acts that address problems. Why? Because the telling of a myth (which invariably evokes and activates as power something divine, i.e., something involving a higher life force) means power. A myth is a story that holds life force.

2. *Political theology.*-- This is the bringing up of all that is deity insofar as public, official life within a society is involved. Thus the first Christians were obliged by the state, for example, to "worship" (if only pro forma) the Roman deities.

Political theology has recently experienced a revival, especially in left-wing, secularist circles, who want e.g. to 'prove' that the modern Christian/Christian can also be valuable in the social field, if need be by political means (basic groups, violence if need be, etc.).

3. *Physical theology.*-- This brings up deity insofar as it becomes visible and tangible through the 'fysis', lat.: natura, nature (cosmos, universe), as it were. It is the product of the 'fusikoi', lat.: physicists, natural philosophers.

Thales of Miletos (Thales of Miletus (-624/-545)) -- in his wake: Anaximandros of Miletos (Anaximander (-610 /-547)), -- Anaximenes of Miletos (Anaximenes (-588/-524)) called the totality of all that is, 'fysis', nature. From this they sought an explanation ('water', the void (i.e., all that itself has no form but can take all possible forms), inhaled air (soul dust).

Since they came fresh from traditional, archaic religious thinking, nature was still to them a somewhere sacred, filled with deity/deities and divine forces. Yet they represented a break in sacred theology: they proceeded with their observations and their reasoning (with their own, "natural" (understand: uninspired) mind or intellect) and did not rely on hunches etc. as the mythologists had before.

Today's "natural or philosophical theology" is the heiress of that "physical" theology.

The theological method.-- This is, mostly, ontological. Traditional ontology always proceeds in two ways.

1. Phenomenological.-- 'It pays attention first to the given (with the requested that there is always something to it). The given (GG) is what shows itself. This is the 'phenomenon' or 'phenomenon'. This immediately known is represented, described / narrated, defined in phenomenology.

2. Logical. - It transcends the known, the given or phenomenon, towards the requested or sought (GV) and does so by means of (deductive or reductive) reasoning. Thus it arrives at the indirectly known, which is initially the unknown.

Note.-- Apophatic (lat.: negative) theology.-- This term refers first and foremost to a method.-- To speak of deity theology usually employs models that belong to the realm of the non-godly. Thus e.g. to show that God is "holy" (which is a divine term but rather unknown), a theologian will say that he is powerful (think of powerful people, of powerful and impressive natural phenomena such as thunder-and-lightning) but not without more "powerful like people or natural phenomena", i.e. powerful with strong reservations. God is more not like the humans who are powerful or the terrifying natural phenomena, for he is incomparably powerful.

He is powerful but in an exalted, i.e., transcending all finite powers.-- Well, anyone who does theology and insistently repeats that all that is deity is more not than is like the human or natural models is an apophatic theologian. Deity as original is like an unattainable limit or boundary. Such that it is exalted or transcendent', transcending.

In other words, 'negative' theology does not ignore all that is deity. On the contrary! It ignores the comparability of human or nature-based models with respect to the original which is deity.--: In the same way one can do with the 'model of goodness': God e.g. in the Bible is:

- a. 'good', as e.g. good people are 'good',
- b. but with enormous reservation, i.e. not as good people are good. He is good in an exalted, mysterious or 'holy' way.

The essence of divinity.-- When we read N. Söderblom (1866/1931) in his *Das Werden des Gottesglaubens (Untersuchungen über die Anfänge der Religion)*, (The Becoming of the Belief in God (Investigations into the Beginnings of Religion)), Leipzig, 1926-2, we find a brief but solid definition of all that is “divine” or (in the strict sense) “holy” (the original).

1. *All that is holy, yes, divine*, has something to do with aliveness. All religions that are not secularized call what is dead, non-holy, non-godly. Life is the basic concept that defines the sacred. Whether one calls it e.g. ‘animism’ (soul belief, animated-ness belief) or gives it another name (‘hylozoism’, matter that is alive e.g.), always life is central.

2. *All that is divine represents ‘power’*, i.e. life force, because what is really alive is powerful, i.e. capable of achieving something. Life as life force or power, solves problems. This aspect is usually called ‘dynamism’.

3. *Söderblom therefore calls everything that is holy, divine, ‘Urheber’, causer*. We explain.-- He distinguishes two layers or levels in divinity and holiness. On the one hand many mysterious beings - numina - who are often called “gods/goddesses” or so and who solve a lot of problems (provided many sacrifices e.g.) and on the other hand the one supreme being, whom Söderblom calls ‘Urheber’ in the proper sense, who among the many peoples “dwells up there and is at once easily seen with the heavens and the sun in narrow connection, but is distinguished ready from the other powers (note: deities) of the religion in question and of the magic in question.” (O.c. 141).

In a traditional language; polytheism, on the one hand, and, on the other, monotheism.

Thus, the Cora Indians distinguish the nature spirits, on the one hand, from “the heavens and the sun”-whom they address as “our father”-on the other. Curiously, the peoples designate the supreme being as a “deus otiosus,” a fatherly god, who is there and is there as creator of the universe but who, it seems, cares very little in what constitutes in the universe and in the ancestral souls and - the foreground of all that is called sacred or divine, while the background pales, as it were, but functions as sacred or divine in the incomparable sense. Immediately we find ourselves in the domain of what, since Leibniz, has been called theodicy.

5. Theology as theodicy.

G.W. Leibniz (1646/1716; Cartesian rationalist), in his *Essais de théodicée sur la bonté de Dieu, la liberté de l'homme et l'origine du mal* (Essais de théodicée sur la bonté de Dieu, la liberté de l'homme et l'origine du mal), 1710), introduces the term “theodicy”.

1. Starting point: the undeniable fact of ‘physical’ (present in, nature) and especially ‘ethical’ (present in the behavior of free beings) evil as an inexhaustible source of arguments against God’s existence and his goodness especially.

2. The defense, on the philosophical-rationalistic level, of God against the said fact and the related arguments. -- ‘Theos’, God, and ‘dikè’, right, give ‘theo.dicee’, justification of God.

Immediately atheism, the negation of God, and dualism (understand: theological dualism), the putting forward of two camps and two advocating powers, God and the evil powers, which seek to assert the fact of evil and the arguments that become possible from it, in favor of denying or declaring God finite, are discussed.

Note.--Theodicy in France between 1840 and 1880.

The curriculum of philosophy at that time was: psychology, logic, morality, theodicy. The latter subject included:

- a.1. proofs of the existence of God,
- a.2. special attributes of God,
- a.3. the providence of God,
- a.4. the refutation of arguments against God (note: which is “theodicy” in the narrower sense),
- b.1. the destiny of man (note: basis of morality),
- b.2. proofs of the immortality of the human soul,
- b.3. theological (op.: God concerning) morality (our duties towards God).

As *an aside*, this program corresponded to the *Theologia naturalis methodo scientifico pertractata* (Natural or physical theology set forth in a scientific manner) of Germany’s great enlightened mind or rationalist, Christian Wolff (1679/ 1764).

Christian theology.

This lapses into two sections.

- 1. Physical theology which brings up God insofar as he is active in nature.
- 2. Moral theology that brings God into play insofar as he comes through in man’s conscientious behavior. The method is twofold: positive (Bible, Church Fathers, Council texts, great theologians e.g.) and scholastic’ (‘rational’, systematization of the (revealed) truths.

6. *Coarse and tenuous dust or matter* .

A work like that of E.J. Speer, *Die geistige welt aus dem Hintergrund der materiellen Welt*, (The spiritual world from the background of the material world), Lausanne, 1987, devotes two comprehensive chapters to:

- a. the etheric plane and
- b. the astral plane concerning rarefied or ‘smooshy’ (fluidic) matter.

That there are other types of matter besides ‘coarse’ or ‘heavy’ matter is an ancient belief. The Milesians - Thales, Anaximandros, Anaximines - saw in a kind of ‘primordial matter’ (origin matter) that which, with regard to the universe - called ‘fuisis’, lat.: natura, nature - was the explanation par excellence of all that was ‘ta onta’ the available things or ‘being’. They denoted them as ‘water’ (flowing), ‘a.peiron’, tenuous (that which has no solid form of its own), ‘aèr’, air(like) or ‘psuchè’, animate air.

This notion of ‘tenuous’ substance stems, of course, from religious myths and rites. It has continued to move along throughout philosophical (and even natural science) history. For example, none other than A. Lange, *Geschichte des Materialismus und Kritik seiner Bedeutung in der Gegenwart*, (History of materialism and criticism of its meaning in the present), 2 Bde., Leipzig, 1866, mentions the two types of matter: that of scientists (of his time) and that of religious traditions.

By the way: also in church circles the concept of “materia subtilis” (subtle matter) has been known for centuries,--especially in connection with the bodies of the resurrected with the return of Christ at the end of time.

Materialisms that presuppose a fine-material world structure are ancient stoicism and epicureanism (which were at the same time deeply religious,-- certainly the stoa). One does forget to mention it in the textbooks of philosophy history.

Thorough is J.L. Poortman, *Ochêma* (Geschiedenis en zin van het hylisch pluralisme), (History and meaning of hylic pluralism), Assen, 1954, and id., *Vehicles of Consciousness*, 4 vols.; Utrecht, 1978. What ‘hylic’, (‘hylè’ in Ancient Greek is ‘substance’) pluralism is, is explained by Poortman with a lot of expertise and nuance. Thus, according to traditions on the subject, there are:

- a. the gross substance (natural sciences, -- biology included),
- b.1. the etheric substance (which dies with the death of the biological organism) and
- b.2. the astral substance (which continues to exist together with the immortal soul and which explains, among other things, the apparition with which the dead reveal themselves).

7. Aretalogy.

To the (natural) scientific concept of “energy” corresponds the paranormal and, among other things, sacred or religious concept of “power” or “life force.

1.-- The ancient aretalogy.

Bibl. sample : S. Reinach, *Cults, myths and religions*, III, 1913-2, 293/301 (les arétalogues dans l’antiquité).

Reinach shows that ‘aretalogos’ miracle teller, harbors one neutral and two non - neutral (pejorative and meliorative) meanings.

a.-- ‘Aretè’(lat.: virtus, fortitudo) means sign of power. Thus e.g. in the expression “tès theias dunameos aretai”, literally: of divine (paranormal, coming from a deity) power (life force) the miracles.-- In this sense it coincides with ‘energeia’, power.

Miracle.-- Miracle, i.e. outworking caused by an extra- or supernatural factor, is ‘aretè’, miraculous act.-- The Biblical-Hebrew ‘gebura’ recurs in the Greek: for Matt. 13:58 says that Jesus could not perform many ‘dunameis’, miracles, in his native land for reason of unbelief. ‘dunamis’, lat.: virtus, miracle power, is the causative factor that shows itself in ‘aretè’, miracle, power-sign.

Reinach.-- “It is certain that, long before the triumph of Christianity, the term ‘aretè’ was used in the sense of ‘miracle,’ i.e., supernatural fact.” (O.c., 300).

b. -- The pejorative meaning is ‘fabulator’, fable-teller,-- farcical thinker,-- also quack (as healer).

2. -- The recent theory of religion ‘dynamism’.

A work like G. van der leeuw, *Phänomenologie der Religion*, (Phenomenology of religion), Tübingen, 1956-2, is one long, scientific ‘aretalogy’ on religion, -- magic included.

O.c., 8ff. -- Astonishment stands at the beginning not only of philosophy (Aristotle) but also -- as N. Söderblom, the Swedish religionist, says -- of religion. That type of astonishment applies to “all that in things or persons is unusual, non-natural, i.e. power, the sacred.

Dynamism, then, is that theory of religion which emphasizes all that, in religions, is miraculous and thus transcends (“transcends”) the secular or secular.

As an aside, that type of energy is only accessible by means of a phenomenology and applied logic appropriate to it. Physics lacks the necessary tools of thought for that purpose.

13. *Apocalypticism.*

Paranormal and a.o. typically sacred (religious) phenomena involve a (subtle) matter, a (subtle) energy and also a “subtle” information that established physics, with its secular methods, cannot handle. Let us examine this information process for a moment.

1. -- *S. Reinach, Cultes, myths et religions*, III, Paris, 1913-2, 284/292 (L’apocalypse de Saint Pierre), begins with a definition:

An Apocalypse (revelation) is essentially, as the Greek name implies, revelation of facts that escapes the knowledge of men. Indeed, “apokalupsis,” paralleling “alètheia,” means “to bare,” “to blot. -- Natural knowledge is transcended (transcended): it is (the description and) the narration by a ‘privileged’ (say we a gifted one) of something of which he/she is the only witness or at least the only guarantor. Thus Reinach.

Reinach refers to two ancient apocalypses, that of John which has become the last book of the Bible, and that of Peter which was declared apocryphal (wrongly attributed) by the church.-- He also refers to the ‘hell flights’ (journeys into the underworld) of Homer’s *Odyssey* and Virgil’s *Aeneid*, - as one type.

Note.-- Shamanism knows this as a kind of being-definition as D. Vazeilles, *Les chamanes* (Paris, Cerf), says: getting in touch with the world of spirits in the form of a soul journey (consciously or in trance) in “the other world.”

Note.-- The antique-Greek term *mantic*, the praxis of penetrating the other world, refers to *apokalupsis*.

2.-- *C. Kapper and others, Apocalypses et voyages dans l’au-delà*, (Apocalypses and trips to the beyond,), Paris, 1987 is a collection of texts by specialists in the matter.-
- O.c., 33, defines as broad (more encompassing than John’s end-time apocalypse) as Reinach. The revelation by a gifted one is the general feature. But the modalities (e.g., a mediating angel; cf. Job 33:23) and the objects (faces (visual), hearing (auditory; e.g., hearing voices), soul travel (in heavenly or infernal regions; cf. Dante’s work)) book reading etc.).

As a general object the structure of the universe as it evolves in time (from the primal beginning until the end times) can be considered. A kind of theology of events or a kind of evolutionary theology,

9. *Philosophical theology: religion back from the past.*

Actually, religion never went away, for the great masses of the West and certainly of the rest of the planet still live by religion(s). Meant are Western intellectuals who - among others with Fr. Nietzsche's "Gott ist tot" (and immediately with the whole God-is-dead-theologies) - saw "the end of religion" in sight.

Already last century - one reads G. van der Leeuw, *Phänomenologie der Religion*, (Phenomenology of Religion,), Tübingen, 1956-2, 788/798 (**Geschichte der Religionsphänomenologie**) - and earlier the intellectuals were interested in the scientific study of religion.

One detail speaks volumes: the first course for the science of religion dates from 1833. (Johan Georg Müller continued this professional science in Switzerland, at the Universität Basel, in 1837. Müller held 'Vorlesungen' on the polytheistic religions which, despite being held very early in the summer - note the gracious hour: from 6 to 7 a.m. - achieved remarkable success. The Université de Genève followed in 1873. From then on the enlightened-rationalist universities could not hold it back.

M. Treml, *Die Unversehrtheit der Religion (Neue Literatur zu einem alten und neuen Thema)*, (The Integrity of Religion (New Literature on an Old and New Subject), in: *Neue Zürcher Zeitung* 17/18.05.1997, 69f., states that in earlier times in our West one wanted to learn wisdom concerning the sacred (the object of religion) from people who knew something about it, priests, magicians etc. Since modernity, however, one wants to learn it from professors at universities, even if they do not even believe,--yes, preferably if they do not believe, for only then are they 'objective'. This tendency has been particularly marked since 1960+. It is thought that this shift in authority regarding religion is not unrelated to the decline of Christian confessions.

M. Treml, along with many others, has observed that in recent years "religious phenomena" have become more frequent and successful, despite a decline in church attendance and progressive secularization (note: everything that is profane and profane is desecrated; the intelligentsia (the artistic and intellectual vanguard) have taken the place of the we-men (clergy, for example)). - become more frequent and successful.

Note.-- This striking phenomenon is not there without New Age.

“Religion itself is on the market again, whether it is interpreted as a revival of the traditions of salvation (sacred, neo-sacred) or as a conversion to mere values (secular, secularized). By the latter the author means axiology as a substitute for the old religions: instead of God or the sacred in the old sense, there are now ‘values’, which are therefore declared to be (higher) values.

Derridian interpretation.-- Trembl mentions J. Derrida / G. Vattimo, dir. *La religion* (Séminaire de Capri), Paris, 1996. He characterizes the work as skepticism, doubtfulness, directed against the concept of religion itself, insofar as religion with “mondialatinisation” (one of the many word formations in which Derrida excels).

Latin -- for Derrida, who has mastered the book -- is not only the theological language of Christianity (*note*: he forgets our Eastern brothers in faith, of course),-- a language that therefore cannot articulate the phenomenon of Judaism (Derrida is a Jew) or Islam, not to mention Eastern religions. Latin is also the metaphor, a kind of typical summary, for the political-military complex of “the West.”

This complex, at first glance: and together with its own pathos (*note*: world of mind and will) that puts science at the center, seems to be strictly anti-religious. That Western being, namely, has aimed at an uprooting of the ‘orthodoxies’ (*note*: the established religions) and ‘orthopraxis’ (*note*: a term indicating life according to one’s own assumptions).-- That is the global (world-encompassing) and Latin ‘religion’. So much for criticism.

But beware: both the technical politics of modernity and the alleged hostility to religion(s) as well as, without a doubt, all the phenomena usually defined as ‘religion’, sprout from two identical sources. Derrida discovers these two sources in the term ‘sacred’ as the Indo-European languages use it:

a. fullness, power integrity (of which the phallus, the sexual organ in the ‘sacred’ sense, is the sign or symbol,-- phallus which the three monotheisms (Judaism, Christianity, Islam) ‘circumcise’, at least spiritually).

b. The second source is the concept of “consecrated” -- concept in which -- according to Derrida always -- trust, covenant (agreement), not without being with fellow human beings, are present as presuppositions. With “das radical Böse” (the radical evil), (Kant).

Kant considered something like the radically evil conceivable (which cost him, among other things, the criticism of Goethe) - as a possibility (as a counter model). This is what 'faith' (as Derrida understands it, of course) is based on.

Treml: "In this ellipse (note: bipolar circle) whose foci are integrity (first source) and faith (second source), the complex is enclosed which reveals itself as 'religion' but in such a way that it also reveals itself as the secularization of religion. Thus Treml summarizes.

Note.-- We ourselves have read o.c., 9/86 (*Foi et savoir*), (Faith and knowledge), by Derrida.

a. The style is, for a 'man' not hyper-specialized in philosophy, unfeasible.

b. What one knows more about religion after reading, is what Derrida, in the line of Nietzsche and Heidegger et al, also says elsewhere.

G. Vattimo, o.c., 7/8 (Circumstances), sketches the atmosphere of the intellectuals who thought together on Capri concerning "the revival of religion": "That phenomenon which is erroneously called "the revival of religion" (within parliaments, in the midst of terrorism and media, even more than in the churches which are more and more emptied), really something else than "the death of God"? This is the question we have asked ourselves -- undoubtedly as everyone does today".

Note -- Whether everyone today is asking themselves the question whether revival is more than the death of God is, in our opinion, very much the question: on the island of Capri where the rose gardens bloom - have they identified with the rest? It seems to us that by thinking God dead a priori one has not found him on Capri. Not even amidst the undeniable phenomenon of neo-sacralism.

P. Antes, Hrsg., *Die Religionen der Gegenwart (Geschichte und Glauben)* (The religions of the present (history and faith)), speaks of a proliferation of traditions and movements of a religious nature. Sketchily, twelve religions are discussed. Including many native (primitive) and syncretistic (religions mixing) movements: these are called "ethnic religions" (tribal religions, newer religions).

Note.-- According to Treml, the work recalls H. van Glasenapp, *De niet Christelijke godsdiensten*, (The non-Christian religions), Antwerp/ Utrecht, 1967, or M. Eliade, *Traité d'histoire des religions*, (Treatise on the history of religions), Paris, 1964-2.

Note.-- One reads e.g. M. Meslin, *Pour une science des religions*, (For a science of religions), Paris, 1973 (to learn the main theories concerning religion).

10. *The essence of a non-Biblical religion*

In Latin, “re.ligio” is care, the counter model of “neg.ligere,” neglect. The whole problem is, “What does the religion take care of as a religion?” For a pagan religion like Santeria or La Regla Lucumi, this comes down to the following.

Bibl. Sample.. -- One of the most appropriate sources is Migene Gonzalez-Wippler, an anthropologist, who was raised as a white person in Santeria by an adherent of it.

Works:

- Santeria: *the Religion (Faith, Rites, Magic)*, St.Paul (Minnesota), 1994-2;
- *The Santeria Experience (A Journey into the Miraculous)*, St.Paul (Minn.), 1992-2, a work that is strongly autobiographical.
- She also wrote *The Complete Book of Spells, Ceremonies and Magic*, London, 1978 (where earlier the Santeria believing anthropologist is speaking).

In passing: see <http://www.nando.net/prof/caribe/caribbean.religions.html>

What she writes is confirmed on the Internet. This proves that this ‘primitive’ religion is not so ‘primitive’, although it is more ranked with Candomblé, Fon, Hoodoo, Macumba Arara, Palo, Voudun (Voodoo).

Basic structure.-- The “idea” is in summary the following.

a.-- The “First Builder” of the universe and the source of ashé (energy or life force) is Olodumare (= Olorun), God, the Creator,-- a mysterious being.

Note.-- This agrees wonderfully with what anthropology teaches us about, all the past biblical religions: a Deus otiosus (a God-on-holiday) controls all that is.

b.-- The orishas (deities, spirits) are Olorun’s messengers and possessors of his ashé, his divine life force.

Note. This corresponds to what e.g. Job 1:6; 2:1 says about “the court council consisting of ‘sons of god or saints’ (understand high spirits) of Yahweh whose ‘kingdom’ (universe government) does not proceed without these ‘angels’ (messengers).”

c.-- Human beings need ashé to function,-- to solve e.g. all their problems. In short, “to survive”.

Note.-- In the Bible, it reads that human beings (like all creatures) need God’s “spirit” (Gen. 6:3) or life force to “function” as the Decalogue dictates.

Conclusion.-- One sees that there is an ‘idea’, basic structure at work in the religions, though with variants.

Thus Gonzalez-Wippler, *The Santeria Exp.*, 320. The Internet confirms this pretty much verbatim.

Practical religion.-- Now what becomes the idea or basic structure in praxis? Gonzalez-Wippler, o.c., *ibid.*, says: "To acquire ashé from the orishas (note: Olodumare rules the universe through his help(s) who are the orishas; they make up his 'court council'), who are the perceiving spirits of it, it is necessary to provide them with ebbo (note: also ebo), a gift, a sacrifice happening. The orishas take the ebbo and -- thanks to their magical abilities -- transform it into that type of life force or ebbo which is necessary to obtain what is desired.

Note.-- This is the famous rule "do ut des" (I give that ye may give) of the religionists.

The gift or ebbo differs from orisha to orisha and must be created from the attributes (being qualities) peculiar to each individual orisha.

Note.-- Usener, a religion scholar last century, called this 'Funktionsgottgeit' (each deity or spirit has its own 'function or role,-- a 'specialty').

O.c., 270.-- An ebbo is a remedy, a magic remedy, a cleansing(sritus),-- some way among thousands of ways in which a person favors an orisha such that he/she helps.

On the Internet.-- Communication between the orishas and humanity is done through rites, divination (mantic, divination) and ebo or gifts (animal sacrifices included). Chanting, rites, and transporting grips are also means of communicating with the orishas.

Note.-- As one can see, magic is at the very center of this religion (as it is in all the past-biblical religions, for that matter). Scholars who themselves know nothing of magic try to deny this but they interpret a religion from their individual or group axioms.

Syncretism.-- 'Sunkrètismos' in ancient Greek is 'mixture' of those ready, yes, inconsistent things.-- Santeria is such a mixture.-- Santeria comes from West Africa (Nigeria, Benin) and is the religion of the Yoruba peoples. Large masses were brought as slaves/slaves at the time to Cuba, Puerto Rico, Haiti, Trinidad,-- Brazil. In Florida and New York, for example, Santeria is widespread (300,000 in New York).

In the New World, a lot (the orishas first and foremost) were hidden under a facade of Catholicism. The orishas, for example, were identified with Catholic saints. The slave and slave-girl owners would say “See how pious our slave is, she worships Saint Barbara all day long!”. In fact, she was praying to Shango, the Lord of lightning, fire and dance, who through these cosmic life forces provided vitality, masculinity, strength of character (his “function”) and who had as his “attributes” red and white, the numbers 4 and 6, apples, bananas,-- roosters, male sheep, -- things that must be employed during the rites and prayers if one is to favor him.

It is so that the name “santeria” (saint worship) came into vogue. But it is clear that the soul of the adherents is fundamentally pagan and remains so to this day.

Internet.-- La Santeria is notorious for its magic based on skill, i.e. knowledge of the ‘mysteries’ (op.: arcane things) or the orishas,-- of how one interacts with the orishas. (...). This knowledge seems ‘supernatural’ to those who do not understand it but it is in fact ‘natural’.

Note.-- The terms ‘supernatural’ and ‘natural’ are used here in a non-Catholic or Biblical sense. For in fact a great deal of religion in this case is ‘extra-natural’ (paranormal) without therefore already being strictly ‘supernatural’ (in the Biblical sense: possible only by virtue of God’s intervention).

Note . - To clarify the (magical) praxis Oshun, whose natural or cosmic energy is situated in the river waters, whose ability (‘function’, specialty) includes eroticism, marriage,-- gold, artistic things, pleasures,-- children -- the belly (the domain of the problems she solves), has as attributes yellow, the number 5, honey, mirrors, pumpkins, cakes, wine, yellow hens (chickens). Every ebbo one gives her must contain at least one of her attributes: e.g. a hollowed out pumpkin filled with honey and olive oil.

This is a very brief sketch of a non-Biblical religion that is gaining more and more followers, especially among “the Hispanics” on the new continent. One thing: where in the Bible the Holy Trinity is central, here the orishas are central.

11. Theodicy: God, at least the truly Biblical one, creates free beings.

Given: ... the existence of the Biblical God (Yahweh, H. Trinity).

Asked: how to reconcile God with the brutal fact of physical and ethical evil?

a. -- The vernacular articulation of a reasoning

The reasoning amounts to a reduction to the incongruous: "If thou, God-believer, assert that thy God is good and omnipotent, then it follows, including the fact of evil, what thou refutest."

Proposition 1. -- If God exists" then he is omnipotent-and-good. But either, if God can prevent evil but will not, then he is not good, or, if he will prevent evil but cannot, then he is not omnipotent.

Proposition 2.-- Well, evil can only exist either if God can prevent it but will not, or if he wills it but cannot.

Proposition 3. -- Well, evil exists.

Conclusion. -- So God does not exist.

Note.-- This sequence of sentences seems to be a perfectly conclusive argument: if the three propositional sentences, then the one post-sentence.

b.-- The logical-syntactic rewrite.

'Syntax' in logic pays attention to sentences insofar as they are interrelated - which is 'syntax' - To make this orderly, sentences are rewritten in symbol-shortened form.

a.1.-- Rewriting of sentences.-- "God exists" = p. "God is good" = q1. "God is omnipotent" = q2.-- "God can prevent evil" = r1. "God wants to prevent evil" = r2.-- "Evil 'exists'" = s.

a.2.-- Rewriting of conjunctions.-- The implication (implication = if, then) =). (Peano's pasigraphic way).-- The contradiction or inner contradiction (inconsistency) = w (which corresponds to the Latin 'aut' (= either) (dilemma).-- The negation = - (e.g. : -/P = not p).-- See the connectives.-. Also still: the connective 'and' = ^.

b.-- The logical syntax of reasoning.-- This makes clear the skeleton of reasoning. We first note the sentences separately for reasons of clarity. Then we summarize in an even more abbreviated form.

voorzin 1 $p \vee (q_1 \wedge q_2 \wedge r_1 \wedge \bar{r}_2) \vee (\bar{q}_1 \wedge r_2 \wedge \bar{r}_1) \vee \bar{q}_2$

voorzin 2 $r_1 \wedge \bar{r}_2 \wedge r_2 \wedge \bar{r}_1 \vee s$

voorzin 3 s

nazin \bar{p}

The whole reasoning: $VZ 1 \wedge VZ 2 \wedge VZ 3 \vee NZ$

The ontological vetting.-- Stringing sentences together is one. To justify the content, semantically (i.e. what truth there is in it), is two! The syntax i.e. can salvage semantic nonsense.

1.-- The whole reasoning stands or falls with the elimination of the autonomy of the creature.

God can prevent evil, but he does not want to do so without more! God wants to prevent evil, but to the extent that he respects the autonomous freedom of the spiritually gifted creature (intellect and reason, mind and sense of value, freedom of will), he cannot do this without more.

In other words, the reasoning presupposes an axiom which says “God creates only unfree beings, incapable of independent decision.” Or, if you will, “to create is to create unfreedom. To create is to create automatons, robots. So that the whole responsibility for evil lies with God and there is no co-responsibility on the part of the spiritually gifted creature.

Note -- In the language of Christian Platonism: God’s ideas about the universe and the things within it contain, as far as free creatures are concerned, both the norm or rule of conduct (in the Bible the Ten Commandments) and the possibility in the creature of deviating from that norm at the same time. God’s idea in this regard is not simple!

2.-- Argumentum ad hominem.

Paradox! The atheist, precisely because of his atheism, agrees with this view against his will. For a. For him God does not exist; b. For him evil, notwithstanding God’s absence, still exists. So the sufficient reason or ground for that evil, for the atheist, certainly lies not in God but in the finite, free world and what deviations are present in it. Atheistically, the sufficient reason for the evil that the atheist plays out against God lies totally outside of God for there is none.

12. “The death of God” according to J.-P. Sartre.

Jean-Paul Sartre (1905/1980) was “the celebrated thinker” in France for at least two generations. With international resonance. -- We turn briefly to his little work *L’existentialisme est un humanisme*, (Existentialism is a humanism), Paris, 1970.

Note. -- Was Gabriel Marcel (1889/1973), known among other things for *his Etre et avoir*, (Being and having), Paris; 1953, a Christian existentialist, Sartre was an atheistic existentialist. Existentialism’ focuses on the concept of ‘existing’, i.e. existing in the world as a human being.

Characteristic.-- Sartre himself mentions the criticisms that affected him. They may serve as an indirect characterization of what he puts forward

a -- Sartre’s starting point.

Like Descartes, he starts from the “cogito ergo sum,” -- I live through an inner life. Thus I am. Both Catholics and Communists reproach him for this. For, who departs in this way, puts man first as a mere individual, and even then as an inner being. Thus from the outset every human solidarity is undermined, - the social dimension of ‘existing’ (existing in the world as a human being). For - so Catholics and Communists reason - either we are together with fellow human beings in this world up to our inner life or ‘cogito’, or existing together with others comes across afterwards as a meaningless appendage to the inner life.

b.-- Sartre’s ethics.

Christians accuse Sartre of the phase-out of “eternal values” (think of the Ten Commandments). Deconstruction that leaves nothing unless total absence of justification on objective grounds of every moral behavior. For Sartre argues that man himself can create “the values” (which are not eternal, objectively valid values). In this sense, Sartre is “humanist.

The communists accuse him of ‘quietism’ (‘quies’ = resignation, rest), peculiar to his despairing thinking. They ‘interpret this as a last vestige of bourgeois thinking. Those who preach despair (some of his students committed suicide) resign themselves to the established order and become not active and dynamic but inert.

The death of God.-- The axiom par excellence with Sartre is the death or absence of (the Biblical) god. For, if God does not exist (Sartre is an atheist), then “le délaissement” the god-absence follows. Man is then left to rely solely on himself,--stand alone.

13. *Beate atheism and tragic atheism.*

Sartre, o.c., 33/37, characterizes his existential morality by a roundabout way, French radicalism with its “classical” lay morality.

a.-- the beate counter-model.-- The existentialist(s) is the radical opponent(s) of the established “morale laïque” which holds that disabling God as the sufficient reason or “foundation” (justification) of any morality causes virtually no unpleasant consequences. For, when around 1880 French professors founded lay morality, they espoused the following axioms.

1.- Atheism.-- God is a useless and demanding hypothesis. We therefore drop them.

2.- Axiology (theory of values).-- If some values are taken seriously and taken as a-priori i.e. as pre-existing realities, then a civilized world is possible and liveable. For example, one should be honest, not lie, not cheat on one’s wife, beget children and so on. All this is a-priori obligatory.-- “We, French radicals, are therefore going to show for a moment that these values do exist -- in a ciel intelligible, a world or heaven situated in the mind -- , even though God does not exist. In other words, nothing will have changed if God does not exist”.

b.-- The tragic model.-- O.c., 35ss.. -- The existentialist(s), on the other hand, believes that it is very unpleasant that God does not exist. For -- with God -- weakening any possibility of putting a thought that exists before whatever actually exists and finding values in it.

Note - In Sartre ‘s parlance, “a-priori” means, “before anything exists, -- even before there are human beings.”-- This is his articulation of the traditional Christian Platonism that God’s thinking mind, which as unconditionally being, before anything exists, is pre-existent, pre-existing. Immediately the ideas that prefigure the world, creation, as norms and ideals and structures. Those ideas come through in our sense of value as values, higher, sacred, i.e., inviolable values.-- Behold what Sartre knew from home. That Christian Platonism he actually puts first.

Sartre: “An a-priori is impossible since there is no longer an infinite and perfect consciousness (op.: God’s consciousness) to think that a-priori.” (O.c., 35s.). For it is nowhere written, that e.g. the good exists,--that one should be honest etc.. --Sartre’s humanism: “After all, we are in a space of life in which only human beings exist” (o.c. 36).

Dostoyevsky (1821/1881). -- Sartre: “Dostoyevsky wrote: ‘If God did not exist, everything would be permissible’.” -- Sartre transforms this sentence into: “Since God does not exist, everything is permitted”. From the unrealis to the realis!-”

Note.-- One understands Dostoyevsky (and Sartre) correctly: he is not claiming that, because God is dead, everything is in fact permitted, because practicable. For fellow men - police, judiciary - are there to put a stop to godforsaken freedom (God’s commandments as dead letter); he does claim that in principle, axiomatically, everything is permitted if God as legislator and judge is not present.

Definition of French Sartrian existentialism.-- “Well, precisely that -- Dostoyevsky’s axiom -- is the presupposition of existentialism.” (O.c., 36).--

Tragic humanism.-- If God is dead and his commandments are dead letter, then “man” stands alone. He is “délaisé,” left to his own devices. He lacks the security of the believer in God.

1.-- No excuses.-- After all, if the existence, i.e. the actual man in this world, without God and his commandments, is there before “the essence” i.e. the a-priori existing idea of God and value then one will never be able to use e.g. “human nature” to explain anything. Man does not act in a natural way, in a deterministic way. That man is free: he is freedom.

2. -- No brakes. -- If God does not exist, we are not faced with commands or values that must justify our behavior. There are no justifications, in whose name we can act or speak.

“This I express as follows: man is condemned to be free” (o.c., 37).-- Such, in a nutshell, is Sartre’s existential atheism, He feels it to be an unbeaten liberation from what he calls “determinism.

14. *Biblical reading of the Bible.*

Ontology (metaphysics) includes the foundations - the “reality” of the religion(s). The fact that there is a plural regarding religion proves beyond doubt that its foundations are not clear. It is therefore that we - not so haphazardly, for Biblical religion is still one of the backgrounds of the - even atheistic or humanistic - West, dwell more extensively on the basic lines of the Bible so that - perhaps - the basic features of every religion are exposed equally.

The Bible is both historical and inspired.

1.-- Historical.-- Every religion rests on facts. In this sense it is ‘historical’, i.e., susceptible to historical verification because it is based on facts that happened in time.

2. *Peter 1:16* -- Not by following complicated myths (*note*: in the sense of “fables”) have we made known to you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but having been eyewitnesses of his majesty. Indeed: he received from God the Father honor and glory when (*note*-- historical fact)-- the glory full of majesty (*note*: God the Father as exalted) addressed him with a word like this, “This is my beloved son in whom I am well pleased.”

Note-- Peter speaks of the transfiguration (“metamorphosis”) or transformation of Jesus (Matt. 17:1/9; Mark o. 9: 2/10; Lu. 9: 28/36) whereby he displays his divine aura (radiance) from after his resurrection.

Peter - like Luke (1:2; Acts 1:8) and John (1 Jn. 1: 1/3) emphasizes the historical Character: “This voice: we, we heard it. It came from heaven (*note*: not from the sheol or underworld). For we were on the holy mountain with Jesus” (2 Pet. 1 :18).--.

By analogy, all true religions rely on extra- or supernatural facts which, although “coming from the other world,” nevertheless become historical fact. When only imaginary ‘facts’ (false mysticism) form the basis, there are always discerning people around who with their critical sense notice the deception and denounce it.

2.-- Inspired,-- 2 Peter 1:19 - In this way we hold more firmly to the prophetic word (note: the Old Testament).-- Realize above all that no “prophecy” (note: communication inspired by God) is susceptible to individual interpretation. For never has a prophecy sprung from a human will: driven by the Holy Spirit (note: God’s life force), men have spoken, albeit from God’s will.”

Which 2 Timoth. 3:14 affirms: “The holy scripture(s) mount(s) the wisdom (note: here: God’s insights) that leads to salvation through faith in the Christ. Every scripture is inspired by God (...).

This does not prevent - and modern textual criticism has done this abundantly - that one nevertheless interprets the Scriptures individually: if only one realizes that one then interprets the Bible in a non-biblical way. We, in this introduction to the main ideas of scripture, stick to the axiomatics of the Bible itself.

Note that every true religion (‘true’ in the sense of ‘based on extraterrestrial or supernatural realities’) speaks a language similar to that of Peter and Paul. Immediately we have a second characteristic of religion: inspired by ‘deity’.

God creates the universe.

It was once written: Creation and the Decalogue are the main features of the Old and New Testaments. In other words: God - Yahweh (Old Testament), Holy Trinity (New Testament) - creates a universe which presupposes as its basic code of conduct the Ten Commandments.

The creating deity.-- Heb. 11:3.-- On the basis of faith, we recognize that “the worlds” (op.: the universe) were formed on the basis of a “word” (op.: idea of God). Consequence: all that one sees springs from what one does not see”.

Note -- Biblical man does not “believe” only in what he sees (so do unbelievers). He believes that the visible and tangible ‘being’ springs -- however it may be -- from an invisible and intangible reality which founds (serves as a foundation for) the ‘reality’ of the visible...

Is. 24: 1/6 speaks of a ‘decree of counsel’ from which everything springs, accompanied by an “eternal covenant” of the deity with its creation that will only cease if this creation does not take “the laws” seriously.

Conclusion.-- The (visible) realities, before they are actually created, already exist in advance in God (and his ideas on the subject) from whom all creation springs.

Rom. 1:20. - "All that is invisible (note: is meant God's creative reality)-since the creation of the world-shows itself through his (note: visible and tangible) works, namely, the eternal power of God and his deity.

Note -- This means that in principle (which does not yet mean "in fact") God (above all as creator) is known by virtue of what He works out creatively, His "works". So that the person who really seeks God, for example, can obtain a definite answer to the question of whether God exists and 'works'.

By the way, this statement by Paul has been much debated. But the whole Bible upholds it.

So far it has been about God's possibility. Now it is about the fact.

Gen. 1:1.-- In the beginning (note: of time or history) God created heaven and earth (note: all created reality)."

Conclusion: -- a. The universe b. has a beginning. Thus, God created and creates that universe.

God creates man.-- As a visible and tangible being, man too, along with the rest of "the visible" was created.

Gen. 1:26.-- God said, "Let us make man in our image, as our likeness. That men may rule over the fish of the sea, the birds of the air, the cattle, all wild beasts, and all creeping beasts." -- Note that, precisely because man is "image and likeness of God," he can rule over the rest of the living things.

God creates sexuality. -- Gen. 1:27. -- God created man in His image. In his image he created him. Man-and-woman he created them. God blessed them: "Be fruitful. Multiply; populate the earth and subdue it. (...).

Again, the prevailing character of man as the "image and likeness of God" (this time with an emphasis on being male and female)!

Gen. 2:18.-- Yahweh God said, "It is not good that 'man' (note: man before any introduction of sexuality) should be 'alone'." -- Necessity is that I make him (note.: this time 'the man') a help suitable to him. (...). It is because of this that 'man' leaves his father and mother and attaches himself to his wife: they become one flesh."

Notes:

1. From the text set in mythical language, it is clear that that human being as the image and likeness of God, is co-responsible for the rest of “all that lives”“, for its own reproduction as a means of earth-population.

2. Notice that the ordained writer does not think ethnocentrically Jewish: there is no mention of “a chosen people” anywhere! God holds all humanity - “all flesh” - partly responsible. Israel is nowhere central in these texts. Just as in the text of Isaias (24:1f.), where there is talk of “an everlasting covenant.” All peoples count as co-responsible.

3. Sexuality is sometimes, in a well-defined “Christian” tradition, dismissed as inferior, indeed as Satan’s work: here, sexuality springs directly from God. Man - as a sexed being - is image and likeness of God! As if in the deity itself (the idea of) sexuality existed beforehand.

God’s “thoughts.

Listening to a few psalm texts.-- Ps. 1:6.-- Yahweh knows the way of the conscientious.

Note.-- ‘Knowing’ in Biblical parlance means “being at home with”. God “knows” the way of life of the “righteous” (understand: conscientious) in a very typical way: they are already living out the idea He has of them! -- Ps. 139 (138):17.-- To me, Yahweh, your thoughts are difficult. God, how impressive is the sum of them.

Note.-- Indeed: of everything, even that which differs from His ideas in the matter, God possesses “thoughts. Well, the extent and the content of the creation are simply gigantic: of the extent we only get to know in limited samples and of the content we only understand parts.

The great theophany.

All religions worthy of the name rely on some kind of theophany, i.e. deity - however to be understood - reveals itself. Let us consider Exod. 19:16. -- There, at last, when creation is long advanced, the code of conduct applicable to all that is created is discussed.

1. From the morning there were thundering’s, lightning’s and a dense cloud on Mount (Sinai). All the people (note: this time of Israel) in the camp trembled: Moses spoke.

2. God answered him.

Note.-- According to Acts 7:38, it was the angel (of God) who spoke. According to Galat. 3: 19 and Heb. 2:2 this angel would be a “one sent from God.

“

In other words, if we assume with S. Paul that the Jewish law is the product of “the elements of this world” (understand: high spirits that assist God in His universe government), then the angel in question would be an “element of the world” (cf. Galat. 4:3: “We too (understand: Jews) were subject to the elements of the world as slaves/slaves”). However, this does not prevent God from using such an element of the world to promulgate the code of conduct that also applies to the elements of the world for the Jewish people and, in time, for all peoples.

The “ten words” (ten commandments, Decalogue).

There are several versions in the Bible, complete (Ex. 20:1 (Ex. 34: 10), (in Deut. 4:13 (10:4) they are called “the ten words”; Deut. 5:6/21 also gives a version) and incomplete (in some psalms e.g.). Take - abbreviated - Deut. 5:6.

The religious (theological) commandments.

‘Theological’ because they refer directly to God. -- I (Yahweh) am your God. (...). “Other gods” you shall not have before me. The name of Yahweh your God you shall not use without valid reason(...). Observe the Sabbath so that you sanctify this day. So much for the first three commandments.

The ethical (moral) commandments.

The seven last commandments govern life (together).-- 4. Respect thy father and mother (...). 5. Kill thou shalt not. 6. Thou shalt not commit adultery. 7. Thou shalt not steal. 8. Thou shalt not bear false witness. (...). 9. Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor’s wife (...). 10 Thou shalt covet neither his house nor his field (...).

Note.-- Commandments 6 and 9 (sexuality) and 7 and 10 (possessions) belong together such that 9 and 10 reject even inner coveting as “sinful” (understand: unconscionable).

Jesus sticks to the commandments.

Luk. 18:20.-- Jesus to the rich one at the front: “You know the commandments: Do not commit adultery (6;9). Do not kill (5). Do not steal (7;10). Do not bear false witness (8). Respect thy father and thy mother (4)”.

Note.-- Jesus lists the moral commandments as at the time “the angel” on Mount Sinai had articulated them. They apparently still make up the basis of the Christian religion.

The “judgment of God”.

How does God judge behavior? Ps. 50 (49):16.-- God addresses the unscrupulous.

To what do ye recite my commandments'? Wherefore have ye my covenant (note: Is. 24:5: the everlasting covenant) in your mouth'? Ye who disdain the rule of conduct and shake off my words -- If ye meet a thief (7;10), join with him. Thou feelest at home with adulterers (6;9). Thy tongue thou employest in the service of evil, and thy language deviseth deceit (8). Thou setteth down: thou accusest thy brother; thou accusest thy mother's son (4;8). Behold what ye do, and I would be silent'? Do ye imagine that I am like unto you? I denounce thee and explain.

Note -- Clearly the psalm lists some commandments. As the basis of God's dealings when he judges, i.e. acts as judge.

The eternal covenant.

Now we can understand the concept of the "eternal covenant" (with all its parts as the covenant with Noë (Noah), with Abraham, with Moses, through Jesus with us, as Christians). To this end, we read Is. (Isaiah) 24:1/6. We give the essentials in short.

As a seer (prophet), Isaias sees into the far future of the earth.

a. *Yahweh is destroying the earth and afflicting it (...).*

An equal fate will befall both the priest and the people, both the lord and the slave, (...) both the debtor and the creditor.(...).-- So much for the facts.

b. *And now the statement.*

The earth was profaned by the feet of its inhabitants. For they have transgressed the laws (opn.: the law, the ten commandments). They violated the counsel (op.: God's idea), They broke the eternal covenant. As a result, the curse has devoured the earth: its inhabitants are suffering the punishment of it. Only a few people are left.

Note-- Illuminate this text on the basis of Gen. 6:3. There the basis of the destruction of the earth and of its (unscrupulous) inhabitants (except for a conscientious rest) is expressed. The vast majority have become 'flesh' (understand: unscrupulous) so that God suspends his eternal covenant, namely the promise that he will place his 'spirit' (understand: his divine, saving life force) at the disposal of the unscrupulous for reasons of disregard for the cosmic code, and abandons them to their fate.

Immediately we stand before one of the fundamental insights of the Bible, namely the “flesh/spirit” couple.

God no longer considers Himself indefinitely responsible with His divine life force or “Holy Spirit” for those who do not take Him and His commandments seriously, in the case of (transboundary) unconscionability. That is the lesson of Gen. 6:3. The proposal (covenant) emanating from him - and from him alone - to put his life force at his disposal indefinitely on the basis of moral good behavior (basis of all true happiness) is rejected. Such a person is outside the eternal covenant: through his own fault. “Behold what thou, unscrupulous, dost, and I, God, wouldst be silent?”

Note -- The Biblical dichotomy “vast majority/small remainder. Few people are left” says Isaias.-- as in the days of Noë. Reading Gen. 6:5, it shows that “the unscrupulousness of man” (note: “man is here taken broadly so that exceptions to “the rule” are not excluded) was great over the earth in the days of Noë and that his heart harbored nothing but unscrupulous plans for a long time. But... Noë “found grace in God’s eyes” because “he was a righteous (conscientious) man, cool in the midst of his contemporaries, and he lived in agreement with God! -- The duality “masses/exceptions” returns again and again throughout the Bible.

The eternal covenant is cosmic.

Usually we, in our secularized West think that this world and the whole cosmos thinks without any reference to God, that the ten commandments are a human matter. - Do we dwell on the following.

1. *The divine idea of “marriage.”*-- Sexuality is a divine idea. Indeed, it founds and orders the actual sexual life.-- Gen. 24.-- Isaac’s marriage.-- Gen. 24:43.-- “I keep myself at the well. The girl who will come down to draw water, to whom I will say, “Please give me to drink: a little water from your pitcher,” and who will reply, “Drink yourself. I will also draw water for your camels,” that girl will be the woman whom Yahweh has destined for the son of my lord (Abraham).” It was Rebecca.

2. *The actual marriage.*-- The divine idea is opposed by cosmic beings who want to be “flesh,” i.e., unscrupulous.

Tob. 3:17.-- It was to Tobias (the son of Tobit) that Sarra was entitled before all other candidates.

Note-- The “right” by virtue of which Sarra is assigned to Tobias is fundamentally (a part of) the council decision of which Is. 24:5 is talking about.

Tob. 6:18.-- “Ask the Lord of heaven that he may grant you (Sarra and Tobias) his grace and his shielding. Have no fear, Tobias: Sarra was destined for you from the origin (...). Thus says the angel Raphael.

Note -- “From the origin” is also translated by “from eternity.” The “origin” which is “eternity” is (the idea of) God. This shows that a matter such as marriage is not to be understood “horizontally,” (as a merely secular or earthly matter) but “vertically” (as a matter regulated by God),--at least if one wants to understand the Bible from the Bible.

But already Gen. 6:1 ff. says that “sons of God” (note: “saints,” “angels: i.e., beings to be highly situated; cf. Jude 6; 2 Pet. 2:4; 1 Pet. 3: 19 (spirits)) found that “the daughters of men” suited them and took as wives all those who appealed to them.

Tob. 3:17 gives an example of such “guilty angels”: “Sarra is spurned by Asmodeus, the worst of the demons.” Tob. 6:14.- Sarra was married off “seven times.” Each time, her husband was left dead in the bridal chamber: he died the night of his entry into her room. A demon killed them! But he does nothing to her because he desires them. Yet as soon as someone approaches Sarra (note: as a man), he kills him.

Note -- Not surprisingly, Jude 6 says that such angels who did not live up to their rank but left their (heavenly) dwelling place are held captive by God “with indissoluble fetters” in the darkness of the underworld awaiting God’s judgment on the last day.

In other words: also for high spirits, who belong to God’s court council (collaborator group concerning universe governance) (Job 1: 6; 2:1), the following applies: “Behold what you unscrupulous ones do, and I, God, would be silent?”

In other words: at Mount Sinai a cosmic moral law, valid for the whole of creation, was proclaimed, which was valid from the beginning but, because of the extensive unconscionability, also among God’s angels (Job 4:18), was obscured in the depths of the souls, so that a proclamation was required,

15. *The eternal covenant includes all nations (Jews and Gentiles).*

When the gentiles, though ignorant of the law (note: of Israel), naturally live up to its precepts, then these people - without possessing the law - are themselves the law: they show the reality of the law as written in their hearts (note: which is actually Jer. 31: 33 and Ps. 51 (50): 8 and 12).

As proof: the testimony of their conscience and the inner judgments they make (...).

Note -- Ps. 16 (15):7/11 shows that God through his spirit (life force) is indefinitely responsible -- long before the New Testament (though not to the same degree) -- for those who live in his presence.

Acts 10:34.- Peter attends the miraculous (charismatic) descent of the Holy Spirit into Cornelius' home over Gentiles who had not yet been baptized (Acts 10: 47), which to him, as a traditionally fastidious Jew, was: "I see that in truth God knows no respect for persons, but that in every nation the one who respects him and lives conscientiously is pleasing to him".

This makes it understandable that a Joel 3:1/3 predicts, "Then I (Yahweh) will pour out my spirit (op.: life force) on all flesh. Your sons as well as daughters will act as seers. Your elders will experience dreams (Job 33:14/18) and your youths will experience visions. I will pour out my spirit even over slaves and captives in those days (note: in the end times).

This is what Peter sees confirmed in Acts 2: 17/18 (in the Jerusalem Pentecostal event). And what is realized again in Acts 19: 1/7 (the charismatic spirit of God also over the Johannites).-- Truly: God, the Holy Trinity, knows himself with his spirit to be indefinitely responsible for all people who live up to the Decalogue.

In other words: the eternal covenant transcends the narrow boundaries of the Judeo-Christian covenant. This explains Jesus' cross-border incantation in Mark. 7:24, where - somewhat against his mission limited to the Jews - he even saves the girl of a syro-phoenician pagan woman from a demon. Redeemed. This explains Luk. 13: 22/30 where Jesus speaks of "the narrow gate" such that he predicts the rejection the (unbelieving) Jews and announces the calling of the Gentiles - from all around (13:29).

16. Freedom yes but also seed-harvesting law.

The divine idea of ‘man (he)’ does not only include controlling the rest of everything on earth or the sexual reproduction process (earth’s population): freedom of will belongs essentially and even first and foremost to this idea, -- even if it is sometimes greatly reduced. This is already evident from the fact that God creates with the condition, for beings gifted with freedom of will, of the Decalogue.-- Let us consider the structure of the duality “freedom of will / seed-harvest law”.

Ecclesiasticus (Jesus Sirach) 15:11.

Usually this text is taken as biblical evidence for human freedom. But one forgets to think of it as the seed-harvest law.

Do not say, “The Lord has caused me to act unscrupulously.” For he does not cause what he disapproves of.

Note-- This wording brings out the thorough difference from what Gen. 3:5 says of the “other gods”: “the gods who know good and evil,” (op.: know themselves at home). Indeed: even all pagan theologians admit that their deities, on the one hand, incite to unscrupulous action (which Satan and his unclean (op.: God-fearing) spirits do, e.g.) and, on the other hand, act accusingly immediately thereafter (which Satan and his God-hostile spirits also do, isn’t ‘Satan’ the word for ‘accuser’ “?”).

In other words: the “other gods” honor the Decalogue (which they know perfectly well) and at the same time they “tempt” to violate that same Decalogue. W.B. Kristensen called this “harmony of opposites.” - If ever the Biblical religion differs from the other religions, then certainly first of all in this: God Himself is the first to adhere to His Decalogue. His ‘court council’ (co-workers in his universe government (Job 1:6) do not!

Ecclesiastes 15: 12. --Do not say, “It is he who led me astray.” For with an unscrupulous one he knows not what to do (Deut. 13:14: “belial” = useless because unscrupulous; Law. 19: 22).

Note-This recalls Gen. 6:3, where God says that he, with his holy spirit (life force), is not indefinitely responsible for those who are merely “flesh” (alienated from God and thus incapable of conscientious action). What the covenant formula is in its negative formulation: God is faithful to his proposal but some of his creatures are not!

The reason. -- For the Lord in the beginning “made man (Gen. 1:26f.), leaving him to his freedom of will. If thou wilt, thou wilt fulfil the commandments to be faithful to what he likes. For you he has laid the fire and the water: according to your (free) desire put out the hand!

In other words: before men are life (note: from God’s spirit (life force)) and death (note: from the ‘flesh’).-According to their free choice, either the one or the other is given.

Note.-- This involves God creating a very far-reaching autonomy, which -- on the face of it, strongly contradicts his emphasis on the Decalogue as a means of salvation. As the sole means of salvation. -- In other words, the freedom of will is not without a stake for it is essentially choice between “fire” (life in God’s spirit) or water” (life in the flesh).

Galat. 6:7.--Do not commit a misconception in this regard: one does not mock God. For what one sows, that one also reaps. He who sows in his “flesh” (note: poor existence without God’s spirit), will reap destruction because of his flesh. He who sows in the “spirit” (note: God’s life force), will reap eternal life by virtue of the spirit.

Paul, in the spirit of Gen. 6:3, (God’s spirit indefinitely responsible for those who live up to the Decalogue (model) or God’s spirit not indefinitely responsible for those who neglect the Decalogue (counter-model)), draws the conclusion: “Therefore never cease to do good: the harvest will come at the appointed time if we do not give it up.”

Note -- In other words, Paul’s wording is clear: there is a kind of law (based on God’s predictability (faithfulness)) such that, if we continue to act conscientiously (the so-called final perseverance in the tradition), we will experience his responsibility through his spirit in the form of happiness or salvation. Salvation which - in sacred (sacred) history - is always centered as the stake - that which ultimately matters - of our lives.

One sees it: Gen. 6:3 (spirit/meat) is always central as the expression of the eternal covenant (Is. 24:1/6) in its model and in its counter-model. Free yes, but not without consequences.

17. Dual resurrection.

The seed-harvesting law extends beyond this earthly life: “There will be the resurrection of the ‘righteous’ (conscientious) and the ‘sinners’ (unscrupulous).” (Acts 24:15).-- Explain.

1.-- Job 19:25 (// 33:28ff) briefly touches on escape from the sheol, in ancient Greek ‘hades’, underworld (‘hell’).-- Ps. 16 (15): 9/11 is already more explicit: “My flesh (note : here evidently the soul body that survives after death) will rest in safety for you, Yahweh, cannot leave my soul (op.: my flesh and my soul run parallel) in the shetol;-- your friend you cannot let the pit (op.: shetol and pit run parallel) see (op.: experience).

2.-- Dan. 12: 2.-- “Many who sleep in the land of dust shall awake: some to live forever, others to walk in shame, eternal horror.

Note -- Except for the term “many” instead of “all,” this text clearly contains the dual sowing-harvesting law.

2 Makk. 7:9.-- The prince of the world (op.: Yahweh) will resurrect us for the purpose of eternal life,-- us who for the reason of his laws (Is. 24:5) leave our lives.-- 2 Makk. 7:14.-- Preferable is to die at the hands of men while from God’s side one cherishes the hope of rising thanks to him. But for you (op.: Antiochus IV, the religion follower) there will be no resurrection to life.

Note -- Again, Antiochus will live after his death but not “for life,” that is, in the form of a life springing up from God’s “spirit” (life force). His afterlife will bear witness to “flesh,” i.e., to a life force that lacks God’s addition and re-creation.

The New Testament on the subject.

Speaking of Jesus as judge (John 5:30: “I, Jesus, judge according to what I (note : of my heavenly Father as my inspirer) hear”) John 5:29 says: “The hour is coming when all who are in the graves will hear the voice of the son of man (op. : Jesus) will hear and will be resurrected: the conscientious during their lives resulting in a resurrection that is life (note.: out of God’s spirit); the unscrupulous during their lives resulting in a resurrection that is judgment (op.: condemnation for reason of flesh).”

Clearly: in virtue of the inseparability of soul and soul body in the Bible, there is survival after death. But not by any means.

18. *Even for the gravest 'sin' (unconscionability)*

The radical demand to live up to the Decalogue may give the impression that the Bible religion is a guilt and penalty religion. Nothing could be further from the truth.

To this end, one must pause to consider the biblical concept of God's educating leniency.-- We begin with a paradoxical model.

Jefte's history.-- Law. 11 (especially 11:29).-- Jefte (Jephthah) had been fathered by his father to a prostitute. Something his brothers later chased him away for. But he was a brave man. He fled far from his brothers and settled in Tob, where he became a gang leader. When the Ammonites attacked Israel, the elders appealed to him: "(...). If Yahweh gives them into my power, then I also want to remain your leader".

He is appointed leader "before Yahweh" by the people.-- He negotiates but to no avail.-- "Then the spirit (note: the charismatic divine life force) of Yahweh came upon Jefte".

Note.-- It is seen that, apart from great -- sometimes exasperating -- leniency, God "holds no regard for the Lord (Lev. 19:15; Malak. 2:9;-- especially Jesus' example: Matt. 22:16; Acts 10:34)" knows: the product of a prostitute is filled with His 'spirit'!

Jefte's vow.-- Jefte approaches Yahweh with a vow: "If you, Yahweh, deliver the ammonites into my hands, then the one who first comes out of the gates of my house will meet me when I return victorious (...): that one will "belong to Yahweh" (note: will be considered "holy") and I will dedicate him as a burnt offering ("holocaust").

Note -- That which "belongs to Yahweh" is no longer profane (unconsecrated) but sacred and is sacrificed. Archaic Humanity went very far in this!

The burnt offering of a girl.

Losing the ammonites. When Jefte reached his house, his daughter came out the door to meet him with tambourines and dances. She was his only child. As soon as he saw them, he exclaimed: "Ah, my daughter! Truly thou art hard upon me! (...). However, I have given Yahweh my word. I cannot go back". She "Father, Yahweh hast given thee thy word. So do with me as thou hast promised. (...). This favor however I ask of you: give me two months to go into the mountains with my friends and weep there because I must die a virgin".

She went with her friends into the mountains. When she returned to her father after two months, he made her swear (...).

Note.-- The sacred text adds the reason for her weeping: “She had never had intercourse with a man”.

Indeed: to die without “tôledôt” (Gen. 2:4 (the “tôledôt” or genesis of the universe); Gen. 6:9 (Noë), 25:19 (Isaac), 37:2 (Jacob);-- Matthew 1:1 (genesis of Jesus)), i.e., without enriching the family tree with children, was a disgrace.

One does not forget that in Eph. 3:14 Paul says that “from the Father (the First Person) all that is ‘patria’, offspring (eponymy), in heaven and on earth receives its ‘name’.” Indeed: creation by Yahweh counted as Yahweh ‘s paternity thus procuring an offspring. To bear children is to participate in that encompassing process. Any group descended from a common couple (patria) has a lineage history (tôledôt) that goes back to the act of creation.

By the way: such a pedigree history is for the better and for the worse! Paul’s concept of original sin rests on it (Rom. 5: 12ff; 1 Cor. 15: 21ff;-- Wis. 2: 23v. (Satan’s share)): the original sin of the first couple has an effect in the original sin of the descendants for the reason of the sacred bond between ancestors and descendants. It was pointed out that fatherhood and motherhood, together with the history of the family tree, is a sacred matter in the first place and not a purely biological matter.

Note -- ‘Holocaust’ is a form of sacrifice.-- Lev. 1:1 (large cattle); 1 Kings 18:23 (two young bulls).-- Holocaust of humans has been forbidden since Gen. 22 (Abraham’s holocaust of his son Isaac prevented by Yahweh’s angel (either the appearance of Yahweh himself or a ‘son of God’ sent by him)).

Note -- Such a holocaust of people is apparently an idea of “the elements of the world” (Gal. 4:3; especially 4:8/11; Col. 2:8; 2:20) among whom Satan occupies a place of his own (Jn. 8:44: Satan as man-killer who demanded Jesus’ holocaust (Jn. 8:40)). Jesus’ suffering and death becomes understandable in the background of that “religious” tradition: human sacrifice was a part of the culture. Whereby it appears that Yahweh is extremely lenient and tolerates such a thing (Mark. 9:21v.;-- Mark.10:5) “for the reason of the hardness of your heart” (in ancient Greek: sklèrokardia),-- in older Dutch: rigidity.

In Matt. 19:8 it reads, “For the reason of your inveterate nature Moses allowed you to send away your wife. But “ap’ archès” from the origin (note: Tob. 6:18 (from God’s eternity)), was it not so!

Note: In the Greek it says: ‘gegonen’, from the origin it was not so conceived (caused).

In other words: on the one hand there is God’s idea (the origin); on the other hand there is the rigidity, i.e. the closed-offness towards God’s idea. God resolves this contradiction - at least as far as possible - by being lenient in an educational way. God sees the present rigidity including future possible conversion. Let us now consider this.

Introduction.

Beginning with Luke 18:24, Jesus looks at the rich man at the front: “How difficult it is for those who possess riches (note: result of mammon, i.e. unscrupulous use of property) to enter the kingdom of God! Yes: a camel gets through the eye of a needle more easily than a rich person into the kingdom of God.” Those who listened: “And who then can be saved?” Jesus: “What is impossible for men is possible for God.”

Note.-- Wealthy and rich people become “inveterate” they become disconnected from the Decalogue not entering it (anymore). And yet: Jesus seems to indicate a method of God to penetrate the hardened heart.

Wisdom 11: 15 / 12:22.-- God’s educating leniency.

We give the essentials.

a. God’s leniency toward Egypt.-- The sacred writer reflects the religious and moral deviations of the heathen who were the Egyptians.-- The law of immanent sanction.-- One of God’s methods reads, “They had to see that a man is punished precisely by that by which he acts unconscionably.”

Note: ‘Immanent’ means: “what does not come from outside” but is inherent. In other words, out of profound respect for the radical autonomy of creation, God, by withdrawing his “spirit” (life force), leaves the “flesh” (the creation living outside God, indeed against God) to its immanent fate.

In other words: God strengthens the already far-reaching autonomy in such a way that precisely by the radicalization of the autonomy insight is generated in this regard.

Note.-- Since Jesus, as the son of man who - according to Daniel 7:13 - arrives “with the clouds of heaven” but is at the same time Yahweh’s servant (“ebed Yahweh”) on whom “Yahweh brings down the guilt of us all” (Is. 53:6ff.) and to whom one gave a grave with the wicked” (up to and including the fate of Jonah who spent three days and three nights in the womb of the sheol, the underworld or “hell” (Jonah 2: 1ff; Lu. 11/29; Matt. 12:40)), took on our “autonomy,” it becomes understandable that when he became holocaust to the fullest, he cried out, “Eli, Eli, lema sabachtani?” (“My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?”).

In other words: Jesus underwent, but as one who can handle, that which we undergo if we are consciencelessly left to our radical autonomy but as beings who cannot handle it without God’s resurrection spirit.

God’s generosity.

1. With one breath, the Egyptians could collapse: persecuted by “justice” (note: God’s condemnation), swept away by the breath of your power, Yahweh.
2. But thou hast regulated all things by measure, number, and weight.

Justification.

For thy great power is always “in thy service” (op.: thou mastered thy power). (...).

1. The whole world is to thee as the nullity that tilts the scales (op.: very very small).
2. But you take care of everyone precisely because you are able to do everything: you turn a blind eye to the unconscionability of men so that they may come to repentance.

Indeed: you love all that exists. For all that thou hast “made,” thou hast no aversion. For if thou hadst hated a thing, thou wouldst not have ‘formed’ it. (...). Thou sparest all because it is “thine,” master, friend of life... For thy “spirit” (op.: creative life-force) which is immortal, is in all things.

a. Educating leniency.

Also: gradually apprehend those who ‘fall’ (op.: violate the Decalogue): you warn them by reminding them that they are without conscience. This that, loosed from evil, they may believe in thee, Lord.

b. God’s leniency toward Canaan.-

The ancient inhabitants of the holy land (Deut. 7:1) were primarily Canaanians.-- You, Yahweh, had taken a dislike to them for the reason of their vile practices: acts of (black) magic, godless rites.

These merciless child-killers, these gut-eaters after meals of human flesh and blood, these initiates who were members of (secret) societies, these parents who kill children, creatures without defense: thou wouldst have wished to exterminate them (...).

Well! Such beings - because they were 'men' - thou hast spared! (...). While thou didst exercise thy judgments with gradualness, thou didst leave room open for repentance.

Thou wast not ignorant, however, of the fact that their nature was perverse, that their wickedness was innate, and that their opinions would never change (...). -- Thou, seeing that thou hast mastered thy power, judge with measure. And thou reignest with great signs of mercy. For thou hast but to will and thy power is there!

c. Biblical morality.

Wisdom 12:19.-- By acting thus you have taught "your people" (note: those who live up to the eternal covenant (Is. 24:1/6)) that "the righteous" (note: conscientious) should be friends of men. (...). For:

1. thou punishest with so many signs of mercy and indulgence those who were the enemies of thy children (op.: the Jews, but actually all that respects the everlasting covenant) and to death (op.: the sheol; Num. 16: 28/35; 1 Pet. 3:19 v.; 4: 6; 2 Pet. 2: 4v.; Jud. 6/7) written down, while you give them time and place to get rid of their wickedness.

2. With what precautions hast thou judged thy children (op.: Israelites but all who honor the everlasting covenant also) -- thou who on oaths and covenants (op.: noahic, Mosaic), have promised such beautiful promises?

In this way thou dost teach us when thou dost punish, that we mayst remember thy goodness when we judge and when we are judged. We count on the mercy.

Note -- Many people speak of "the Old Testament Barred God." They thereby prove that they have never bothered to examine the whole Old Testament doctrine about God and his educational leniency which is counterbalanced by his high demands which he wants to see fulfilled at least in - what the Bible calls - "the elect.

19. *Demonism or dualism concerning (origin of) evil.*

The good-and-evil in the Bible.-- Gen. 2:9 (the tree of the knowledge of good and evil), 2:17 (id.),-- Gen. 3:5 (you will be like deities who know good and evil, i.e. are comfortable with it), 3:22 (id.) speaks of the “autonomous” (literally: self-serving law, moral law, stealing deities, -- represented in the serpent, alluding to a. not “fearing” God (taking Him seriously) and b. not taking anyone seriously (like the cynical-autonomous judge (Luk. 18:1)).

In other words, God is dead and his law is dead letter.-- Which according to Is. 5:20 “mischief” (as Gen. 6:3 says, i.e., God withdraws his spirit (life force, sole source ultimately of happiness)) establishes,--as judgment of God.

Well, W. B. Kristensen, *Verzamelde bijdragen tot kennis van de antieke godsdiensten*, (Collected contributions to the knowledge of ancient religions), Amsterdam, 1947, vrl. 272ff, called ‘totality’. ‘Totality’, in his parlance, means “union of good and evil” (in ancient Greek: harmony of opposites), as the traditional black magic, the globe around, and the pagan numina (= all that non-Biblical religions call ‘holy’) practice this.

For for them the Supreme Being - as deus otiosus, literally: fat god, i.e. as a Supreme Being who cares as good as nothing for this earth and its unconscionables - is “dead”, (God is dead) and thus his moral law (in the Bible: the Ten Commandments) is “dead letter”.

By virtue of that twofold axiom the black (unscrupulous) magics and those who are content with them, as well as the entities in the unseen who hold that axiom, act autonomously. ‘Autos’, self, and ‘nomos’, law. They are themselves self-determined law. Without God or his commandment.

Inconsistent-- “Righteous in the ordinary sense (...) the pagan deities were not: by their conduct they denied the laws which they had established for men. The ancients were perfectly aware of this contradiction at work in the ‘divine’ being. (o.c., 273). The pagan mythologies testify to this.

Dualism’ is what Kristensen and his school called that opinion on evil which posits either good or evil beings (deities, humans). A middle class that is both good and evil does not seem to distinguish the dualistic opinion.

However, the differential must certainly apply to the Supreme Being who is purely good and salvific.