

HOLOGRAPHIC MEMOIRS OF A DREAM – THE INVENTION OF TRAM HOPPING

by

JOHANNES ANDRIES NORTJÉ

submitted in accordance with the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF THEOLOGY

in the subject

SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY

at the

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AFRICA
SUPERVISOR: PROFESSOR E VAN NIEKERK

JANUARY 2012

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To be true to the thesis of my dissertation, this dissertation is an ubuntuing, a dependent arising, and so it is our dissertation: we have put pen to paper and so credit is due to a whole community.

My first acknowledgement goes to the one LORD our one God-s (El-ohim), YAHWEH, Yeshua and Raach HaKodesh, who has not only inspired this story, but also given the opportunity to tell this story. It has literally been as if this path I/we walked has chosen me/us, and not I/we the path: so many choices and events could have been so different so that the dot pattern drawing could be no co-incidence, especially since many things had been contrary from what I intended. To add to this, all the aha moments I had in the ubuntuings of my meditations, and all the 'out of the blue' 'bright ideas' I accredit to these ubuntuings, and want to assure my LORD I'm not committing plagiarism – it is our/Your dissertation, since the inflation of the cognitive balloon has been with the breath of heaven, so it's in the first place YOUR informationing dissertation.

Starting with names is a long list and longer than what I can list. To start with I want to say thank you to my family, Helen, Leandra-Joelle and Enrico, and all the sacrifices they had to make, and particularly Helen that had to work a full-time job while running a household when I was battling with my health (part of my story) and working on this dissertation. I want to thank my parents and my brother for time and money and food and so many sacrificial offerings all the years without expecting anything in return. They have proven to be truly family. I also want to thank my parents-in-law for putting food on our table, and helping with the children, and even funding a German language course for me and buying the property our house is on. My father-in-law is already in heaven and my mother-in-law in the intensive care unit at the time of writing, and so we don't know how long we're still going to have her, but this is also their story.

I want to thank Hannes and Annemarie Marais for their faithful financial support every month all these years since I left for my first Bible college, for Cobus and Marlize Breedt for their faithful financial support every month since my second Bible college. I want to thank Deon Janse van Rensburg for his financial support in so many ways all these years: 5% of our house in Germany belongs to him, many plane tickets to South Africa were

partly paid by him, and then the language editing of this dissertation as well as opening his house and lending his cars, etc. when I'm in South Africa. I also want to thank Cornu and Ingrid Pretorius for all their generous and lavish donations, and that Cornu has been a personal doctor when ever needed: never once has Cornu refused to help me in any way, ranging from plane tickets to South Africa, to financing my stays in South Africa, etc. I want to thank Werner and Mariaan Van der Merwe for their sacrificial financial support and open house, Dr. Markus Bali in Germany for his financial support, Professor Dr. Erasmus Van Niekerk for paying such a big part of my doctor's degree and opening his house and heart.

I want to thank Randolph Bitter for being a private, 24/7, doctor to me and that he has been so willing to spend such long hours on the phone with me, and that we could become such good friends.

I want to thank all the Mennonites in Germany that helped build our house and working Saturday after Saturday from early mornings to late evenings. I want to thank Jacob and Lorinda Esau for their support and every time Jacob helped me with all the practical things I couldn't accomplish with my two left hands. Without a home this story would have been a different story. Thank you for the belonging.

I also want to thank Anna Goosen for helping me in my predicament I was in with my MTh and for Professor Dr. Johannes Reimer, both Mennonites, that were helping me out of the cul-de-sac when me story was in a dead-end in 2005. Without them their would have been no story, or a different story at another university. My mother-in-law always says that we are out of the same pot as tribes.

I want to thank all my professors in all the Bible colleges and fellow students and Africa and everyone that has helped constituting me and my story. I'm truly raised by a community. Thank you community for the belonging.

Last but not the least, I want to thank Professor Dr. Erasmus Van Niekerk for assisting me to put this story on paper. When I sat in his office that day, floundering around not knowing how to communicate what I intended to do, I'm sure I could see the disappointment in his eyes, and even after I gave him my first 120 pages I'm not sure he was convinced yet of what I wanted to accomplish and even to what extent that he once mentioned that it at first appeared to him as if I didn't know my field. In retrospect I'm thankful for his

professionalism and experience, and most of all his trust and patience to see how my medium became the message.

DECLARATION

I declare that **Holographic Memoirs of a dream - the invention of tram hopping** is my own work and that all sources that I have used or quoted have been indicated and acknowledged by means of complete references.



Signature

Johannes Andries Nortjé

3439-451-6

Date: 17 January 2012

SUMMARY

The medium is the message in the first place: the medium as presence, as the author. His contribution to the academic world is his academic Holographic Memoirs. His story, the author's memoirs, is a fictive-narrative discourse with an organic ubuntu open-endedness. The Hologram is both an autobiography, but also all the information at all places simultaneously – nonlocal in quantum physical terms - within an intense hallucinating dream: no illusion, but rather a HyperReality with all its Virtual Identities. The invention of tram hopping is the plot of the story. The plot is like an hourglass where the first part of the story is the emptying of the sand, the deconstruction of modernism, but while the top chamber runs empty and the bottom chamber fills up, so the deconstruction is simultaneously a dependent arising/(social) construction/ubuntuing to revival – the synagogal Shekinah presence of YAHWEH. The top chamber is the unreasonable Newtonian physics and the bottom chamber reasonable quantum physics. The metaphysics (before the physics) of the top chamber is poststructuralism and deconstruction, while the bottom chamber is the virtual Hebraic worldview that delutively merges ubuntu and Buddhism. The long narrow neck in the middle is the moonily narrative that lives us with psychology (Psycho-logic) lost in sociology (Social-physics). Hermeneutics is set forth in the same contrasting hourglass of the top chamber, the inherited tradition, emptying to what it should accomplish – (virtual) presence.

Keywords:

YAHWEH, Yeshua, Holy Spirit, theology, philosophy, deconstruction, poststructuralism, narrative, consciousness, unconsciousness, dream, hermeneutics, revival, radical inductive, modernism, postmodernism, postliberal, liberal theology, novels, Virtual Reality, HyperReality, simulacrum, ubuntu, Buddhism, Hebrew, quantum mechanics, physics, Newton, Einstein, Bohr, Euclidean, Riemannian, Siddhartha Guatemala, hermeneutical circle, fictive-narrative, Van Niekerk, currency

Table of Contents

Prologue:.....	1
1. Self introduction and embedding of setting – the start of a mental journey.....	1
2. Radical inductive contemplation.....	2
3. Mental journey continues.....	2
4. Pertinent cultural reflection.....	4
5. Inductive reflection continues.....	5
6. Mental journey continues.....	6
7. Inductive reflection continues.....	7
8. Mental journey continues in physical tram journey.....	10
9. Wider theolosophy debate.....	11
Bibliography:.....	14
10. Prescript as Postscript.....	45
11. Dozing off the session.....	48
Chapter 1: The muddy mess of modernism swept clean.....	49
1. Contextual embedding of session.....	49
2. Radical inductive contemplation.....	49
3. Wider theolosophy debate.....	52
4. Pertinent cultural reflection.....	57
5. Biblical narratives as string succession.....	65
6. Dozing off the session.....	74
Chapter 2: Theolosophy’s Hyp(ostasis)ochondria.....	75
1. Contextual embedding of session.....	75
2. Wider theolosophy debate.....	77
3. Radical inductive contemplation.....	83
4. Biblical narratives as string succession.....	95
5. Dozing off the session.....	96
Chapter 3: B'rit Hadashah Theolosophy.....	97
1. Contextual embedding of session.....	97
2. Wider theolosophy debate.....	97

3. Biblical narratives as string succession.....	104
4. Radical inductive contemplation.....	118
5. Dozing off the session.....	122
Chapter 4: Tanakh Theolosophy.....	123
1. Contextual embedding of session.....	123
2. Wider theolosophy debate.....	125
3. Pertinent cultural reflection.....	135
4. Biblical narratives as string succession.....	139
5. Radical inductive contemplation.....	143
6. Dozing off the session.....	146
Chapter 5: Memoirs of a dream.....	147
1. Contextual embedding of session.....	147
2. Radical inductive contemplation.....	148
3. Wider theolosophy debate.....	154
4. Biblical narratives as string succession.....	166
5. Dozing off the session.....	167
Chapter 6: Psycho-logic lost in Social-physics.....	168
1. Contextual embedding of session.....	168
2. Pertinent cultural reflection.....	169
3. Radical inductive contemplation.....	173
4. Wider theolosophy debate.....	175
5. Biblical narratives as string succession.....	186
6. Intermediary flip side addition.....	195
7. Dozing off the session.....	197
Chapter 7: The Narrative Container.....	199
1. Contextual embedding of session.....	199
2. Radical inductive contemplation.....	199
3. Wider theolosophy debate.....	202
4. Biblical narratives as string succession.....	209
5. Dozing off the session.....	218

Chapter 8: Witnessing my witnessable, not yours!.....	219
1. Contextual embedding of session.....	219
2. Radical inductive contemplation.....	219
3. Middle script as postscript.....	228
4. Biblical narratives as string succession.....	229
5. Wider theolosophy debate.....	230
6. Dozing off the session.....	246
Chapter 9: The Virtual of Hermeneutics' Reality - the experiential story of Hermeneutics!.....	247
1. Contextual embedding of session.....	247
2. Wider theolosophy debate.....	248
4. Biblical narratives as string succession.....	267
5. Radical inductive contemplation.....	272
6. Dozing off the session.....	274
Chapter 10: YAHWEH's memorandum of esteem - His dream!.....	275
1. Contextual embedding of session.....	275
2. Wider theolosophy debate.....	275
3. Radical inductive contemplation.....	280
4. Wider theolosophy testimony.....	284
5. Biblical narratives as string succession.....	287
6. Pertinent cultural reflection.....	295
7. Dozing off the session.....	299
Off-the-record.....	300
Director's cut:.....	301
1. Contextual embedding of session.....	301
2. Pertinent cultural reflection.....	302

Prologue:

1. Self introduction and embedding of setting – the start of a mental journey

Every time I see my 120kg, 1.93m, figure momentarily conflated with the crowd around me, I'm once again astonished by my size. It's not like I shop for clothes every other day to see myself unveiled in dressing room mirrors. Actually I never shop for clothes; I'm fortunate that my other half cares more about my appearance than me. I mostly out-space others in the incoming tram window daub; although still in proportion. The few surplus pounds could be due to married life, as some say, but I can also attest to the English weather we so enthusiastically experience every autumn, winter and spring and even most of summer. Such a debilitating mood immobilises keen intentions. I used to jog six to ten km three to four times a week when I was still baking under the reanimating African sun. Maybe it also has something to do with the lack of vitamin D the sun medically administers to us. On the other hand, my wife deposes my 'balanced' size as iconic for South African men, whatever that means! I certainly excel above the average German.

I inevitably also notice the blond nest on my head hiding lesser and lesser skin by the day at the age of 40. How can I put it? I certainly had an interesting life, or an eventful life, or however you'd like to put it. My family back in South Africa jokes, they say that whatever misfortune can happen will happen to me, but although the joke is meant for the mostly insignificant, but rather inconvenient things, like missing a train connection or the plane's tire that bursts before take off, it pretty much also depicts a bigger picture; so much so that I've been many a times dazzled, and once or twice even bitter, that so many misfortunes can befall one person while others only know smooth sailing.

Autumn in Kassel; not everyone is wearing the full amount of hats and winter gear yet, but that will soon follow. The circle of trees, marking off Kings square, appears naked, stripped of every leaf and surgically trimmed to limbless physiques. The circle of arch spitting fountains, closed in by these trees, has already gone into hibernation for the approaching winter.

The way to the source of the water for these fountains is the way the tram will take us up Kings Street, that's now from Kings Square where we're now. Kings Square is split in half

by Kings Street, the pedestrian high street of Kassel, but also the tram network's compounding centre spider webbing our entire city. From everywhere consumers can commute via Kassel's navel drawing on downtown's shopping menu, only limited by what can be carried back by tram.

To the source the tram strolls past the usual German and international perfume, clothes and accessories stores, exactly as one would expect in any European architectural showcase with antique looking buildings certifying edifices of times long past. The height of this experience comes every Christmas, when this inner city is transformed into a fairyland with a fairy market with lights and decorations arching from one pavement to the other. The arcane street lamps ranking from the white snow carpet innervate the mystic atmosphere yielded by the fog.

2. Radical inductive contemplation

The fairyland also befits Kassel as the hometown of the brothers Grimm that put those fairytales on paper in the 19th century, and through that saved the German language buckling under the French language in the days of Napoleon. This was only a few years after the Mühlenberg vote when the German language almost became the official language of the United States of America, but missed the opportunity by one vote only. When I once raised this to an American, he, just like English Wikipedia (Wikipedia 2010a), called it a legend, but not according to the report that made me aware of it on German television, obliquely in Germany (Nortje 2004).

I guess it doesn't matter, since both Wikipedia and the television are solely Virtual Reality, but then again this dissertation is also only Virtual Reality embedded in a narrative. Who knows what really happened in the 18th and 19th centuries? Do you? Were you there? What really happened are the narratives that were playing out in our history books, and internet sources, and multimedia devices? What is real? I guess *at least* the narrative, but maybe just the narrative; are we not empirically strained for anything more? The *at least* is the best we can do, so that only our engagement in the unfolding holographic dissertational story here is real. Livingly engaged while telling the story of the ongoing praesentific presences of us, many other you-s and YAHWEH, nothing more!

3. Mental journey continues

In approximately 300m the next stop is Friedrich's Square. Just before the tram comes to a halt take note of Kings Gallery on the right. Kings Gallery is not a big shopping mall, but significantly connects to the underground parking lot, crossing over underneath Kings Street, and stretches out for about 300m on two levels. The parking lot has two car entrances outside the pedestrian area and actually outside the inner city. The one entrance is already in the slope down the hill to the significant Fulda River, while the other one is in the middle section of Frankfurter Street. How practical and convenient!

As you can imagine this is our default entry into downtown Kassel, that's now when we come by car; anyway ineluctable since we are being tagged by two children. With children these small conveniences rank top priority.

The Fulda River is a landmark and connects Kassel with Bad Karlshafen on the Eder. A breathtaking little town from where textile was brought down to Kassel by river a few centuries ago. Bad Karlshafen has always been under the jurisdiction of Kassel and is on the border of the state Hessen, a few meters from the most populated state in Germany, Nordrhein Westphalia. Fleeing Huguenots founded Bad Karlshafen.

Also in Friedrich's Square, opposite Kings Gallery, is Alex Café. They make the best saucy-juice hamburgers in town, real American - whatever that means since hamburger derives its name from the port city of Hamburg in Germany (Smith 2006:151). Anyway this is a traveller's tip for a good burger should you ever be moving around in the city of Kassel!

From Friedrich's Square it is another 250m to the end of Kings Street, and the last stop in the pedestrian area. The tracks lead past more stores, but most significantly past the biggest department store in town. What makes this department store so remarkable, called Galleria Kaufhof, is that they stock a number of real and traditional South African products in their big assortment, although pricy. These products range from the South African type of jerky, called biltong, to prime cut steaks, to the whole renowned spectrum of South African wines, and last, but not least, Savannah apple cider, which is unaffordable for a common bloke like me. Fortunately I abstain from alcohol these days. They also stock Mrs. Balls chutney, but with apology to Mrs. Balls, or her great-grandson who actually founded at least the commercial side (Katooch 2008), their chutney just doesn't match up to the homemade chutney of my beloved wife, and mother-in-law.

The last stop is named after the antiquarian but impeccable city hall of Kassel on the left, which is on the corner of Kings Street and Fünffenster Street. City halls are the centre of German administration of towns and cities similarly to what we would call municipalities or boroughs in most English-speaking countries. The one plain feature of Kassel's city hall is the inherent beauty of the building, like many city halls in Germany, which I guess should convey something of the adage of "leading by example", or is it rather an expression of the sign language of a "make-believe" attitude that carries the clear efficacy of the bureaucracy? However, for me the only real significant feature is the Argentinian steakhouse in the basement of the city hall. They grill the best steaks in middle Germany.

4. Pertinent cultural reflection

Steaks, and meat in general, are certainly part of the South African cultural breed and I guess could partly be blamed for the heart and obesity plight we are also notorious for. In the 32 years before my arrival in Europe, apart from meeting only one identified vegetarian and reading about vegetarians, the mindset of being a vegetarian or vegetable eater was far removed from the meat-eating mind. Was the lack of noticing vegetarians due to the Virtual Identity of a meat-eating mind, or rather the lack of vegetarians? What came first, the chicken or the egg? For the proverbial meat-eating mind when vegetables and salads were offered with meat as the main dish, the-tongue-in-cheek question was raised, especially by white males, as to whether they are to be regarded as goats, implying that only goats eat greens and salads.

In Europe I have discovered vegetarianism to be a more common phenomenon, even more than in the Cape Town area which always has been a hotbed of free spirits with the weirdest types of spirituality, even while I lived there for two years. Furthermore, it might have been part of my isolated experience that I did not meet a couple of the thousands of vegetarian Tamil Indians in the Durban coastal area in my one year I used to live there with my parents, and visiting them many times after leaving home. They even had Indians as neighbours for a few years.

However, even more astonishing is that, in the previous year when I was, for the second time in 13 months, in India (India 2010) I learnt that half of one of the most populated nations in the world is vegetarian. O my gosh, how would they do in South Africa?

Fortunately I know there is not enough space for half a billion or more in the arid and semi-arid Karoo type areas of southern Africa, even if a strong incentive could be produced of immigrating to the land of sun and biltong, or am I just selfish?

5. Inductive reflection continues

Funny, South Africa already has half a million plus Tamil Indians (Sethu 2010), but are they truly still Indian Indians, or are they now South African Indians, after more than a century in South Africa; that's now after our common English dominators displaced them for cheap labour in the Victorian days? We got our chutney from them (Drummies Chutneys 2008), not Mrs Balls, which would be too ghastly to contemplate. If they are still Indian, why are the Americans not Europeans any more, or the Australians and the Canadians and the New Zealanders Europeans? Maybe we are all just people?

Back to India. There I learnt that vegetarianism is not necessarily due to poverty per se, but because of religion; to be precise the Hindu religion. However, to be fair, on my second last day in India they took me to the best finger dripping steakhouse I've been to outside of South Africa, owned and operated by a Muslim (Steakhouse India 2010). If the blurring lines between religion and culture are so obvious in India, couldn't the same be said about our culture in the eyes of an outside beholder¹? O yes, I'm convinced of that!

Today the state religion of old Europe is agnosticism and atheism, but nonetheless it is a religion (Mandryk 2010:75) or a sweeping sense making approach that has an encompassing grip on the heart and lives of people (Van Niekerk 2009:30-62). Christianity has been marginalised to such a degree that Anton Wessels' title of his 1994 book *Europe: Was it Ever Really Christian?* is an incisive description of the mixture of the Judaeo-Christian, Graeco-Roman, Celtic, Germanic and Arab-Muslim worlds and philosophies from which the current European world emerged (Wessels 1994).

1 By utilising the insider-outsider dichotomy it might seem like I'm flirting with modernist's interpretationist ethos, but what if I rather profess a cognitive relativism? So, in short, the insider-outsider 'objective' interpretation is superfluous in my radical inductive proposal, as opposed to reductive mechanisms 'understanding' of others. Inductive and reductive is also a dichotomy I detest, but can we avoid dichotomies? Yes, if we do away with modernism, and is part of my argument in the first chapter *The muddy mess of modernism swept clean*. My exposal is the copulation of radical and inductive giving birth to a unique radical inductive Hebraic unity of a dependent arising.

The current worldview, sadly but indubitable, almost exclusively bears the features of the gene pool of the Graeco-Roman, Celtic, Germanic and Muslim mixed worlds and threatens to completely out mutate the Messianic or the Judaeo-Christian gene pool; so much so that it indeed appears that Athens in the mixed worlds of modern Europe gained the upper hand and trampled Jerusalem (Wessels 1994:166-71). The Arab-Muslim (re)introduction of Aristotle from 1000 AD into the already mixed world of Europe had an immense impact not only around a renewed engagement with nature but the newly delivered Aristotle played a strong role in the formulation of theological images of the Divine (Cloud 2007).

Along the way in a mixed European world a strong concentration of the Judaeo-Christian world has nearly been lost. It is in such a dire state that even the little remnant of Messianic followers left, behave like functional atheists with atheism as their 'Arbeitshypothese' not only in daily life but primarily in the whole scientific world (Kreck 1970:226). In practice they abide by the same materialistic and hedonistic value system as their atheistic and agnostic counterparts, but still cling to YAHWEH for either recreation on Sundays, or playing a save game as agnostics, or for whatever reason. Even in the modernist overly Graeco-Roman conceptualisation of the Divine in theology and philosophy, the praesentia presence of YAHWEH is a superfluous notion hovering outside of these theoretical domains like a bird outside its own habitat.

Back at the Argentinian steakhouse and the meat-loving South Africans; my second father, coming from the farm, relays the story that when they were children, when they had nothing else to eat, they would only eat meat - red meat. That is right, red meat! In the 20th century that used to be the plight of a typical white farmer's family living in the dry and semi-dry parts of southern Africa just living above the breadline. Or was it the meatline on the brink of poverty? Can you imagine red meat as a sign of poverty in Europe? That is just outright unthinkable, but illustrates how habitat also shapes culture, just like religion and philosophy bear their share, and almost unequivocally stereotyping us in the eyes of the outside beholder. Does the outsider see an individual?

6. Mental journey continues

At the city hall the tram can go in any of three directions; however, the way to the source of the water is directly into Wilhelmshöhe Allee that veers to the right and then slowly starts

ascending up the hill to Wilhelmshöhe Mountain Park. After the feeble right turn out of the inner city, Wilhelmshöhe Allee is as straight as a plumb line. The two parallel tram lines, one coming and one going, split Wilhelmshöhe Allee in length with two car lanes on both sides up and down the mountain in and out the posh area of Kassel.

Two thirds up the way the tram turns left out off Wilhelmshöhe Allee into the Inter City Express (ICE) train station, or shall I say onto the underground drive-through ICE train station? The train station is also not only a tram stop, but also a bus stop.

Amusingly the ICE train station is also encumbered with the name Wilhelmshöhe and is called Kassel-Willhelmshöhe Train Station. On the other hand, this fairly new train station dilates the development of the high-speed trains Germany is known for and fits the Bodoni font stylish area of Willhemshöhe. These ICE high-speed trains peak at 250km/h and cover the 200km from Kassel south to Frankfurt in just over an hour with two stops along the route.

Kassel-Willems Höhe ICE train station is the hub of the German train network. If you want to know where Kassel is, take a map of Germany and put your finger as close to the middle as you can and then you won't be far from Kassel. Kassel connects the north with the south, and the east with the west, and ensues Kassel with a strategic intersection status.

From Kassel-Willhelmshöhe the trams still go on either higher up the mountain, or left circling back to the tram line I take home everyday; another direction is to the workshop and overnight garage. One tram that stops higher up the mountain connects with the bus taking you up to *Hercules* at the top of the mountain park. *Hercules* is the trade mark, par excellence of Kassel.

7. Inductive reflection continues

Hercules is the Latin name for the Greek demigod *Heracles*, the patron saint of Kassel, of Europe or is it the larger part of western culture? Just like the virile naked torso of *Hercules*' exemplifying the distorted sexual power orientation of Graeco-Roman men of old over "weaker" women, so the Graeco-Roman philosophies that surrogated theology, has demolished Jerusalem.

Hercules' mise-en-scène is spectacular and was erected by landgrave Karl the first (1654-1730) who started with the park in 1696, and built the *Hercules* monument in 1701 (Hercules 2010). *Hercules'* straight line of view is Willhelmshöhe Allee, but also serves as the source of a spectacular waterworks running down the mountain terminating in a 50m high water fountain propelled by artesian pressure alone, nothing electrical. What an amazing feat?

The mountain water of the waterworks also serves as the source of this circle of arch spitting fountains in Kings Square, the place we are now patiently awaiting tram 5.

This is the contradiction, the nurturing of the Graeco-Roman worlds of intellectual aesthetics incubated in the European Renaissance and the incubation of their intellectual constructivism in the modernity of Copernicus, Galileo and Isaac Newton has largely gone unnoticed, even in the 50m high fountain in Willhemshöhe Mountain Park produced by 1200 m³ water pressure alone. Not to mention the state of the art hospitals unobserved on the way up to *Hercules*, the hospitals my whole family have enjoyed at some point or another and once saved my life².

The Graeco-Roman worlds not only served indirectly as incubation areas for these hospitals, but also for the biggest locomotive factory in the world, located in our city, as well as the 500km/h Transrapid magnetic driven train engineered in our city (Bombardier 2008). The contradiction is, although Athens trampled Jerusalem, we love our cell phones, laptops, iPad tablets, blood pressure tablets, glasses, and houses that effortlessly maintain

2 By linking Kassel with the Graeco-Roman worlds, not just the broader ideological is noticed, but also the political. Scott Lesnett points out that Kassel was originally a Roman settlement, and that up until the Italian Renaissance (Lesnett 2010:5); but interestingly enough the architect that masterminded the *Hercules* gardens was the Italian Giovanni Francesco Guerniero, who Landgrave Karl learnt to know during his tour to Italy in 1699 and 1700 (Boswell 1995:45). That doesn't say much about the ideology though, since by that time Italy had but all lost its grip on the modernist shift that was sweeping over Europe. That Landgrave Karl was welcoming the French Huguenots to settle in an around Kassel is another story though. The French Huguenots were the typical hybrid of the religious and the cultural outflow of the Italian Renaissance. See e.g. *The Huguenots: Fighters for God and human freedom* by Otto Zoff (Zoff 1942). They were what we would call the middle class of the day in industrial entrepreneurship, artisan production, luxury manufacturers, etc. (Biesinger 2006:470).

temperatures over 20°C with minus temperatures slumping outside to the same double digits below zero.

In a strange way, some Germans get agitated when a high-speed train is five minutes late, but what a breathtaking proliferation of technology to move a small number of a 1000 people, with luggage, effortlessly at staggering speeds of 250km/h over long distances?³ Why be perturbed about five minutes when it was physically impossible only a few years ago to cover the distance in more than half a day?

The scripture that comes to mind is Matthew 16:26:

“What good will it do someone if he or she profits the whole world but disposes his or her life? Or what will someone give in exchange for his life?”

In accomplishing all this technological advancement and prosperity, has the western culture and world not gained the whole world, but forfeited meaningful life and sharing of presence with YAHWEH as that which everything is revolving around?

Now here, at this juncture, is where I, Rabbi Yôḥanan⁴, come into the picture and hope we

- ³ A 1000 people on an ICE most probably indicate some are standing. Lengths and types of ICE trains obviously vary between ICE 1, 2 and 3, but a 1000 is certainly more than even a conservative estimated number of seats on an ICE. The ICE 3 can go over 300km/h, but the tracks don't necessarily allow such high speeds.
- ⁴ By using the word Rabbi I'm using a loaded word that has to be qualified. Although the first century AD use is predominately meant, and the surface meaning portrayed in the B'rit Hadashah/Tanakh, the context also includes, what Avigdor Shinan calls, the period of the Rabbinic Sages (although detesting the modernist word Sages), centring around the synagogue, and attaining its ultimate form in the geonic period which ended just beyond 1000 AD (Shinan 2009). Significantly the period ended at the break of the Italian Renaissance, and by that also endorsing my postmodern turn, which simultaneously trademarks a premodern turn (or almost exclusively a premodern turn, but because the clock can't be turned back to before the modern, the (virtual) modern in the (virtual) premodern, and not the (virtual) modern in an apparent watertight new independent epoch called postmodern). Characteristics I do share with this period are:
1. Firstly, the Omnisignificance of the Scriptures (Elman 2009), which will be delineated in the unfolding of my memoirs, which concur with what Adele Berlin and March Zvi Brettler say, “The Bible is the key text of Jewish life” (Berlin 2009). By this life, in my memoirs, I mean the one Hebraic compounded and united life in which “the constant reworking of biblical

can have a fruitful time together the next few days.

8. Mental journey continues in physical tram journey

Anyway here's our tram, let us get in! I always try to get a seat right at the back on the bench turned skew with ample leg space for whatever reason to avoid the crooked and twisted switchblade posture of doing something with my legs. However, it is also nice to sit at the back, at the big rear window, giving me a wide-angle from which I can anatomise the street goers who I sometimes ruefully see as slaving away in their inflicted chores while I could just stare helplessly at them.

The back is also a bit like the last few rows in the school bus claimed by the naughty boys and their pretty faced girls. School children are of no concern in this tram today, but as they say "Boys will be boys". So most of the times I have to share the bench with those who never outgrew the rebellion against the status quo. On the other hand, this has offered me a myriad of opportunities to be what YAHWEH has called me to be, a roving missionary in Europe through a myriad of successive and simultaneous and ongoing praesentific encounters, with and in YAHWEH, with and in clusters with others, and relationally engaged time after time from home to town, from tram to train and from field to hill.

After the next stop is the city hall, and after the city hall we won't go straight over into Wilhelmshöhe Allee or right into Fünffenster Street, but turn left just to turn right again into Frankfurter Street in 200m. Take note, just after we've turned right into Frankfurter Street you'll see the Brothers Grimm Museum on the left. From there the tram will take us down a

material is a hallmark", like Hindy Najman points out to be the case of this Rabbinic period (Najman 2009). In my words, "the constant cognitive and suspected relativistic recycling of Biblical material."

2. Secondly, the direct outflow, in the words of David Stern, is the "... uniquely Jewish "ontology",..., usually identified with allegory, [which] has been seen as closer to that of poststructuralism" (Stern 2009), and thus the text before us (what I'll designate as the last commentary in the unfolding of my memoirs), and not behind us – not a history, but *thé* story.

By saying that, I'm not ignorant of cognitive contradictory issues, like the Talmud and Midrash, and the derailing (unbelonging) due to Yeshua being rejected as the Messiah.

slope to the next stop called Am Weinberger. From Am Weinberger the tracks are pretty straight for a good 2.8km before the tram line first makes a 90° turn right before it slowly turns back between the houses until the stop called Mattenberg. Mattenberg is the final stop for one of those tram lines that goes over Kassel-Willhelmshöhe ICE train station after passing part of the University of Kassel. From Mattenberg there is one more stop in Kassel before the tram leaves for Baunatal, where we live.

The division between Kassel and Baunatal is only theoretical though, more on paper than anything else. It is a crossover from one municipality to another in a built-up area, but nothing more; for all practical reasons, for us anyway, Baunatal is part of Kassel. Others might see it differently, but when they are, in Berlin or Stuttgart for instance, and are being asked where they live, they will say Kassel. I do the same when I'm in South Africa or England, although for the most people Kassel is just as insignificant as Baunatal; they can't even pinpoint Frankfurt or Hannover on a map of Germany.

I was once called by a South African radio station to talk about Soap Operas and obviously indicated that I live in the city of Kassel, not even Baunatal, but it meant so little to them that they labelled Kassel a town.

The third stop of five stops in Baunatal is our last stop for now. In Baunatal you'll find the second biggest Volkswagen plant in Germany; Wolfsburg, the home of Volkswagen, is obviously the biggest. To be honest, the second stop in Baunatal is called Volkswagen, but finds itself right at the back of the plant so you won't get the overwhelming impression of how big the plant really is and the splendour it radiates coming off the highway to the main entrance of the plant.

Another significant bit of information about Baunatal is that Baunatal was the residence of Catharina Dorothea Pierson, married Viehmann, who memorised the fairytales from travellers passing by and relayed them to the Brothers Grimm. Catharina Pierson was the second generation French Huguenot (VHS 2004), so maybe genetically not so far removed from some of our closely related Huguenot descendants of South Africa.

9. Wider theolosophy debate

But why do I tell all of this when we haven't even turned out of the city yet? Just as we are

setting out to a destination, our family abode, and almost in a straight line as the crow flies, so I want to point out the intended progressive line and destination of our conversations the next few days. I want you to stay close to me and listen and learn, and most of all monitor me and see how my words and actions tie together. I'm a Rabbi, and as a Rabbi I first and foremost teach with what they call the hidden curriculum (NTC 1998); the hidden curriculum teaches by example, by lifestyle, by practical application or outcome, and not by apparent objective independent self-existing *concepts* or knowledge, like currency which I have earned and pass on to you. Such knowledge derives from a Newtonian worldview which is an illusion based on apparent objective independent self-existing matter spread over the cosmos which could or could not interact with each other in the real praesentific sense.

The hidden curriculum is relational learning, in the way we learn our first language, culture and customs. From our hidden curriculum emerges our first principles which made us what we are through our parental or guardian care. I'm a typical meat, rugby and barbeque-loving South African because of the hidden curriculum; in short, I feel at home when I go to South Africa and effortlessly blend in with my fellow mates. They don't have to explain jokes and customs to me and I can even give my input on how I think a barbeque should be conducted. As we'll see the hidden curriculum is all that there is, and truth is only relational; but again I don't want to jump the gun.

Take note I don't use, and abstain from the word Memes that Richard Dawkins coined of how he explains this transmission, and what he calls "a unit of imitation" (Dawkins 1989:171). These units sound to me too much like currency units, billiard balls on a billiard table.

The line of progression and movement from the beginning to the end and from the end to the beginning of our talks could be embraced by you in you becoming a Rabbi for others, albeit a postmodern Rabbi. That is the dynamics of being a Rabbi. I want you to negotiate a lifestyle with me the next few days and construct your own blend of what you wish your disciples should negotiate from you. Not currency, but relationship.

The motto is, "To acquire knowledge, one must study; *but to acquire wisdom, one must observe.*" (Wikiquote 2010) - Marilyn vos Savant (the italic for emphasis). To observe I

would like to add, smell, hear, taste, touch, intuition, and also just being in all the dimensions of interconnectedness.

So, first of all, let us think what made me what I am. Was it just my past? When yes, then I have to reconstruct my whole life from A-Z and you would have to be able to mathematically reconstruct me and come to what I am today. That would be a physical impossibility though, because should I start telling you about my first experience after conception, which I actually don't remember any more, and then each consecutive day, by the time we get to today a considerable amount of days would have lapsed so that the catching up would be a repetition and in turn pull us into an infinite spiral. Secondly this is also too much Newtonian causality for me. Am I really just the product of external forces? Am I really purely just the accumulation of my past in a cause-and-effect lineage of the conservation of momentum and energy that can't be created or destroyed, only transformed⁵?

No way, dear reader. I obviously had the *existential* power to choose either A or B, but why did I then “choose” to become a typical South African, and why did the Germans I know choose to become typical Germans, and the Indians I know to become typical Indians? Why are the choices people make so predictable? Or is the process more complex and less predictable just as this dissertation is enfolding with a narrative through-line that is not sensationally set as making a once off predictable choice or as being immersed to make us part participators, part witnesses and part being drawn along in the modernist's perverse overseer's role of how the relationships evolved and how the narrative process is enduring so long.

The answer is really not that simple, although we could, with a little bit of contemplation, come to an answer that approximates the dynamics of our lives. Freedom, the noble characteristic of being human, is certainly at risk, but if there was no freedom, then why our discussions? I can just as well then stop and ask you to stop moving along with me the next few days.

5 The law of the conservation of Energy's roots lie in the law of the conservation of Momentum which owes its dues to Christiaan Huygens, a contemporary of Newton who he refers to as one of the three greatest geometers of his time (Holton 2004:219). In the sentiment of this dissertation both laws are as Newtonian as you can get.

I refrain from doing that!

So what or who am I really? Don't answer me yet, wait till we have finished our discussion, but in the mean time, in terms of academic standards, I want to turn things around. In Nicholas Royle's (Royle 2003:9) description of Derrida, he points out that for Derrida the preface succeeds the academic work; it's been written after the academic work, and for me, in the same way, the bibliography precedes the academic work. My bibliography is (in) the preface, and that's what I'm going to do, give you my bibliography even before we dive into the discussions. You know I can construct our discussion like tram hopping from one quote or reference to another, which is so typical of the rhetoric of so many academic works, but if knowledge, lets say wisdom, is relational then it is about me coming to you, relating to you my me-worldview to your you-worldview in a hermeneutised readable way of these readings.

In the implosion of time and space (see my MTh), the reading of these books was simultaneously a reflective writing of these books into my worldview, otherwise I would be a fool. To quote Marilyn vos Savant (Wikiquote 2010) again, who made it into the Guinness Book of World Records under "Highest IQ", she says "A fool is someone whose pencil wears out before its eraser does". Unreflective reading implies unedited writing, which is nothing but a fool's game.

The point I want to make is that even if I should have read some of the stuff utterly wrong, which I hope I didn't, the way I've read them is the way I've written them into my worldview and therefore quote-hopping is of little value, since I'm only quoting myself from my wide reflective reading. Quantitise me on my proximity to you, and decide if I am a Rabbi that shares time and space with you; or am I just a hoax teacher who wants a doctor's degree?

So here we roll out the biographical pockets and packages of my narrational networking:

Bibliography:

Acquaintance. 1987. I don't remember this friend's name, so he was more of an acquaintance than anything else.

AEB. 1924. When the Faith Mission came over to South Africa, through the work of the two

Garrat sisters from Dublin, and with another lady miss Cameron, they opted for the name Africa Evangelistic Band to avoid confusion with the pentecostal denomination called the Apostolic Faith Mission.

Alcorn, R. 2004. *Heaven*. Wheaton: Tyndale House Publishers, Inc.

Alcorn, R. 2008. *Deception (Ollie Chandler, Book 3)*. Colorado Springs: Multnomah Books.

Alcorn, R. 2009. *If God is Good: Faith in the midst of suffering and evil*. Colorado Springs: Multnomah Books.

Alfie. 1995. One friend I confined in and visited again years later was Alfie in Sabie. In 1995 I was in Sabie and he actually forgot all about me and the meeting had no resemblance to a reunion.

Amsterdam RSA. 1982. We moved from Sunnyside, in 1980, to Amsterdam on the Swaziland border, where we lived until 1982. This extreme loneliness was during our stay in Amsterdam.

Archer, Caroline., Burnell, Alen. (ed.). 2004. *Trauma, attachment, and family permanence: fear can stop you loving*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Arnold, E. 2007. *The Early Christians In Their Own Words*. Farmington: Plough Publishing House.

Asika-Enahoro, Chidi. 2004. *A Slice of Africa: Exotic West African Cuisines*. Lincoln: iUniverse, Inc.

Assemblies of God. 2003. I don't remember the name of this fellow pastor any more. He was the pastor of the Assemblies of God church in town and a few Monday mornings I used to join him, and one other Methodist pastors and a retired nuclear scientist, for a time of sharing and praying. It was on such a Monday morning that he asked me this question about the difference between Africa and Europe.

Bangalore. 2010. August 2010. I was for the 2nd time in India for a missionary organisation called Christian Endeavour. I was putting a sponsorship program on computer and had to go to Bangalore to do training. The evenings I usually had to myself and sometimes I would just sit in my little room and stream a radio station from somewhere. This particular instance I was streaming Radio Pretoria that could work well on low-bandwidth. It was a program about the soccer world cup and the exposure and experience some Dutch tourist had concerning these white squatter camps. According to the Dutch tour guide, that also speaks Afrikaans and was

interviewed on the radio, the Dutch were under the impression that all white people were rich or at least well off in South Africa.

- Baptists. 1991. I have nothing to say against Anabaptists, and I'm married to one today, but at that time I had no conviction to get baptised again; on this one I sadly did buckle under the rhetorical pressure for financial support for my first Bible college from a Baptist church. I rather say, "It's not the one that's outside wet that's born again, but the one that's inside wet in the baptismal water of the Holy Spirit"
- Barad, K. 2007. *Meeting the Universe Halfway: Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and Meaning*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Battle, J.A. 2007. *Biblical Interpretation: Introduction to the science of hermeneutics; the various literary forms in the Bible, use of OT in NT, typology, the various methods and tools of exegesis and exposition*. April 2011.
<http://wrs.edu/academics/interdepartmental-studies/biblical-interpretation/>.
- Baudrillard, J. 1994. *Simulacra and Simulation*, translated by Sheila Faria Glaser. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Beller, Mara., Cohen, Robert Sonn ., Renn, J rgen. 1993. *Einstein in context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Belousov, L. 2002. *The formative powers of developing organisms, What Is Life?* editors Hans-Peter D rr, Fritz-Albert Popp and Wolfram Schommers. London: World Scientific.
- Berkeley, G. 1713. *A Treatise concerning the Principles of Human Knowledge*. London: Jacob Tonson.
- Berkhof, H. 1986. *Christian Faith An Introduction to the Study of the Faith*. Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans Pub Co.
- Berkhof, L. 1941. *Systematic Theology, with a Complete Textual Index, Fourth Revised and Enlarged Edition*. Grand Rapids: WM. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.
- Berkhof, L. 1969. *Principles of Biblical Interpretation (Sacred Hermeneutics)*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House.
- Berle, Reinhard. 2009. Reinhard Berle is the CEO of Kinderhilfswerk Global Care in Germany that is predominantly working between AIDS orphans in Africa.
- Berlin, Adele, Brettler, March Zvi. 2009. *Introduction to the Essays*. In The Jewish Study Bible. Oxford Biblical Studies Online. 17 July 2011.

<http://www.oxfordbiblicalstudies.com/article/book/obso-9780195297515/obso-9780195297515-partFrontMatter-2>.

- Bevernick, Echard. 2008. Before he retired, he had been the principal of the Bible college called *Christliche Bildungsstätte Fritzlar*, which is a Wesleyan Bible college of the American denomination called Church of God Anderson.
- Bezuidenhout, Steven., Kruger, Bernard., Pieterse, Riaan. 1987. The inner hedonistic circle of my life were these three names and me.
- Biesinger, Joseph A. 2006. *Germany: a reference guide from the Renaissance to the present*. New York: Fact On File, Inc.
- Biocca, F. 1997. *The Cyborg's Dilemma: Progressive Embodiment in Virtual Environments [1]*. Journal of Computer Mediated-Communication. 16 September 2005.
<http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol3/issue2/biocca2.html>.
- Bitter, Randolph. 2009. Randolph Bitter is an anaesthesiologist I became good friends with; he also diverted into alternative medicine due to the illusions of the traditional medical system that predominantly, and almost exclusively, treats symptoms and not causes. Due to my dire state of falling through the cracks of the traditional medical system I had to turn to alternative medicine and that's how we became friends.
- Bly, Robert W. 2005. *The Science in Science Fiction: 83 SF Predictions that Became Scientific Reality*. Dallas: BenBella Book.
- Bohr, N. 1928. *The quantum postulate and the recent development of atomic theory*, NATURE 121: 580-591.
- Bohr, N. 1935. *Quantum mechanics and physical reality*, NATURE 136: 65-65.
- Bombardier. 2008. I taught English for three years, from 2005-2008, at Bombardier Transportation; Bombardier is the biggest locomotive producer in the world, and this factory in Kassel the biggest of Bombardier. On the same premises are also the factory and producer of the Transrapid magnetic train, and so I also learnt a lot about the Transrapid in these three years.
- Boswell, James., Lustig, Irma S. 1995. *Boswell: citizen of the world, man of letters*. Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky.
- Boxx, T. William., Quinlivan, Gary M. (ed.). 1996. *Culture in crisis and the renewal of civil life*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Boylan, M., Johnson, C. 2010. *Philosophy: An Innovative Introduction: Fictive Narrative*,

Primary Texts, and Responsive Writing. Boulder: Westview Press.

Boysen, Rudy. 2000. This apprehension, put in these words, I heard from Rev. Rudy Boysen who used to be the District Superintendent of the Church of the Nazarene over the jurisdiction of the Nazarene Theological College where I studied for four years from 1998-2001 doing my BA(Hon).

Bromiley, Geoffrey W. (ed.). 1979. *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, Illustrated in four volumes, Volume One: A-D, Fully Revised*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.

Brouwer. 2002. In my first year in England I started my MTh-Ph.D. with the college of the Church of the Nazarene in Manchester, also called Nazarene Theological College, affiliated with Manchester University, and only did one module with them. The reason I didn't go on with them was even while I was a pastor on the British Isles for the Church of the Nazarene they were too pricy. After this module I first approached Durham University, that did accept me on their program, but then opted for Unisa. The module I did at NTC was called Biblical Holiness, and it was during this module that Dr. Brouwer told us about the world conference of the Church of the Nazarene held in Brazil, and the outcome of no clarity on the doctrine of the second barrel, anyway in his eyes.

Buechner, F. 1982. *The Sacred Journey: A Memoir of Early Days*. San Francisco: Harper and Row.

Bunn, T.D. 2001. *Drummer in the Dark*. London: Doubleday.

Bunyan, John. 2007. *Christ a Complete Saviour: Come and Welcome to Jesus Christ Justification by Imputed Righteousness*. Teddington: The Wildhern Press.

Büsingén. 2007. Actually we were going to stay at the Bible college of the Church of the Nazarene for a week in a place called Büsingén. Büsingén politicaly belongs to Germany, but is an enclave surrounded by Switzerland and economically belongs to Switzerland. My house doctor said if we wanted to go there I had to go and see a doctor there as well a few times, but as that would have been a Swiss doctor, I first had to pay upfront and then claim the money back in Germany, we decided against going.

Buswell, R.E. (ed.). 2004. *Encyclopedia of Buddhism*. London: Macmillan Reference USA.

Canine, Muse. 1991. In 1991 and 1992 I went a number of times to a mission station in

Kwazulu Natal called Kwasizabantu, and it was at this station that I once heard Muse Canine preaching and telling this about the god of the white man.

Card, Michael. 2007. *Joy in the Journey Through the Year*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press.

Charismatics. 1988. At the end of the 80's charismatic theology was a hype running through the east of Pretoria with big and vibrant churches formed around this theology. Existing churches were also jumping on the bandwagon. The thing was, hanging out with my friends was to go to these churches, and their wizardry magic of naming and claiming health, wealth and property rhetorically tempted me to a large extent.

Clorfene, C., Rogalsky, Y. 1987. *The Path of the Righteous Gentile: An Introduction to the Seven Laws of the Children of Noah*. Jerusalem: Feldheim Pub.

Cloud, R.R. 2008. *Aristotle's Journey to Europe: A Synthetic History of the Role Played by the Islamic Empire in the Transmission of Western Educational Philosophy Sources from the Fall of Rome through the Medieval Period*. Ann Arbor: ProQuest Information and Learning Company.

Cobb, J.B., Griffin, D.R. 1976. *Process Theology An Introductory Exposition*. London: Westminster John Knox Press.

Coetzee, P.H., Roux, A.P.J. (ed.). 2003. *The African Philosophy Reader. Second edition*. A text with readings. London: Routledge.

Cohn-Sherbok, Dan. 2000. *Messianic Judaism*. London: Continuum.

Colebrook, C. 2002. *Gilles Deleuze*. London: Routledge.

Colquhoun, Alan. 2002. *Modern architecture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Comte, Auguste. 2009. *The Positive Philosophy of Auguste Comte, Vol. I*, translated by Harriet Martineau. New York: Cosimo, Inc.

Cooper, David Edward. 1999. *Existentialism: a reconstruction, second edition*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, Ltd.

Copeland-Carson, Jacqueline. 2004. *Creating Africa in America: translocal identity in an emerging world city*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Copleston, Frederick Charles. 2003. *A history of philosophy: Greece and Rome*. London: Continuum.

Cosby, Michael R. 1999. *Portraits of Jesus: an inductive approach to the Gospels*.

- Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Cramlington. 2001. The little Nazarene congregation is in the town called Cramlington, a few miles north of Newcastle upon Tyne, and also bears the same name called Cramlington Church of the Nazarene.
- Crocker, Gustavo. 2005. In 2005 I was still a member of the Church of the Nazarene and that February of 2005 I went down to Switzerland for a leadership conference of the Church of the Nazarene and that's where I heard a presentation by Gustavo Crocker.
- Cropper, William H. 2001. *Great physicists: the life and times of leading physicists from Galileo to Hawking*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, Inc.
- Crystal, E. 2010a. *Australian Dreamtime*. 9 December 2010. <http://www.crystalinks.com/dreamtime.html>.
- Crystal, E. 2010b. *Dreams*. 9 December 2010. <http://www.crystalinks.com/dreams.html>.
- CSS. 1991. I used to work for Central Statistical Services in Pretoria from April 1991 until the end of 1992.
- Currie, M. 2007. *About Time Narrative, Fiction and the Philosophy of Time*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press Ltd .
- Dam. 1981. This incidence at the dam took place while we were living in Sabie between 1980-1982, so I guess it was the winter of 1981.
- Daniel, Keith. 1993. Keith Daniel is an evangelist in the Africa Evangelistic Band and has travelled the world. He used to spend three months every year in the USA preaching from meeting to meeting. He can literally reel off books of the Scriptures from his memory. His integrity confirms his message, and contrary to so many men I know in ministry, all three his sons are following closely in his footsteps with the same integrity.
- Dauenhauer, Bernard., Pellauer, David. 2011. *Paul Ricoeur*, The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, edited by Edward N. Zalta. <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2011/entries/ricoeur>.
- Dawkins, R. 2006. *The God Delusion*. London: Bantam Press.
- Dawkins, Richard. 1989. *The Selfish Gene*. Ebook v1.0 . United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.
- Dawkins, Richard. 2003. *A Devil's Chaplain: Reflections on hope, lies, science, and love* .

United States: A Mariner Book Houghton Mifflin Company .

De Saussure, F. 1959. *Course in general linguistics*. New York: Philosophical Library.

Delegation. 2000. This delegation that came around Nazarene Theological College in 2000 was there for a meeting of the youth world counsel that was rotating between countries. This delegation was composed of cultures of all the major regions in the world.

Deleuze, G. 1994. *Difference and Repetition*, translated by Paul Patton. New York: Columbia University Press.

Denzin, Norman K. 2009. *The research act: a theoretical introduction to sociological methods*. Piscataway: Aldine Transaction.

Derrida, J. 1977. *Of Grammatology*, translated by Gayatri Chakravorty Sivak. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

Descartes, R. 1892. *The Philosophy of Descartes in Extracts from his writings*, selected and translated by Henry A. P. Torrey. New York: Henry Holt and Company.

Detesters. 1989. Detesters in the outer circle had no effect on me, but in the inner circle it was a different story. One thing was my meditations/quiet times. Many rhetorically tried to convince me it is not good or necessary to have meditations everyday. One such person was a Lizette, an ex-flame and missionary, although I've never made it a rule for anyone.

Diakonie. 2007. The Diakonie hospital is founded as a medical extension of the Lutheran church, and is situated in Kassel-Wilhelmshöhe, but on hindsight I'm not so sure it was the right choice to go to this hospital, since this infection was beyond their scope.

Dickens, Arthur Geoffrey. 1966. *Reformation and society in sixteenth-century Europe*. London: Thames and Hudson.

Dickerson, Maureen. 2011. Maureen was my wife's English teacher in Bible college in Büsingen, a German enclave in Switzerland. Maureen is already 90 years of age and this Autumn of 2011 she was visiting the Bible college for a last time with air miles she still had left of previous flights over the Atlantic. My wife attended a little reunion at the college with Maureen, other students, and other American missionary teachers that were doing the same trip on memory lane as Maureen at this time. Maureen was also the English teacher of the wife of my college chaplain back in

South Africa. Maureen has taught most of her life in universities and Bible colleges over a number of generations.

Dixon, Patrick. 2007. *Future of Education, Colleges and Schools - and wider trends.*

Google Videos. 28 September 2001. <http://video.google.co.uk/videoplay?docid=-6617682680734984771>.

DM. 2010. DM is a drogerie chain store in Germany we gladly support since they look well after their employees with, contradictory to German management styles, a flat hierarchy where no employee is threatened. Supporting DM, instead of Schlecker, that's even a bigger and maybe even a cheaper drogerie, is where theosology really turns practical and is really where theosology should make a social difference.

Donald, F. Theall. 2001. *The virtual Marshall McLuhan*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University press.

Dorrien, Gary J. 2003. *The making of American liberal theology: idealism, realism, and modernity 1900 – 1950*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.

Drews, Alexander. 2005. I met Alexander at a GBFE conference at Bergneustadt in Germany where I had to meet up with my third professor during my MTh, Johannes Reimer. He was doing his MTh through GBFE. He went on to do his Ph.D. with a university in Germany, and he actually told me this story when I was preaching in his church the following year in Bielefeld.

Drotsky, Danie. 1993. Although I have huge respect and admiration for Danie Drotsky, and can only testify of an impeccable lifestyle, on the sequence of the Tanakh before the B'rit Hadashah he had it wrong.

Drummies Chutneys. 2008. *History of Chutney*. September 2010.

<http://drummieschutneys.co.uk/history.aspx>.

Du Plessis, Magriet. 2009. My mum, Magriet, has been to Germany twice, and every time it was after the birth of a child. The first time was in 2006 for three months after the birth of Leandra-Joelle, our daughter; she was there from September through November. The second time in 2009, when I told this story, she was only there for a month, the whole of August. That was seven and a half months after the birth of our son Enrico Angelus.

Du Plessis, Magriet. 2011. This discussion with my mum, Magriet, was one evening in

February, 2011.

- Du Toit, C.W. 2005. Professor C.W. Du Toit (the head of the Research Institute for Theology and Religion) was my second MTh promoter, after Professor Adrio König (Professor Emeritus in Systematic Theology) felt my postmodern turn was out of his field of scope. Both were at Unisa.
- Dundas, Paul. 2002. *The Jains*, Second edition. London: Routledge.
- Dunning, H.R. 1988. *Grace, Faith and Holiness: A Wesleyan Systematic Theology*. Kansas City: Beacon Hill Press.
- Duplantier, Bertrand., Raimond, Jean-Michel., Rivasseau, Vincent. 2007. *Quantum decoherence: Poincaré Seminar 2005*. Basel: Birkhäuser Verlag.
- Durban. 1985. While we were with my dad over the summer holiday my parents moved and so we started school in Durban in January 1985. The fact that I was in two schools in this one year in Durban was due to my rebelliousness: I wanted to go to a school far from home that consumes a lot of travelling by train.
- Dutch Reformed. 1988. Silverton's closest church was the Dutch Reformed church which was walking distance from home. To give credit, Reverend Loots had nothing bad to say to me, or anyone in the church, but they also had no food-for-thought and so they rather were a discouragement than an encouragement.
- Dyson, Freeman. 1979. *Disturbing the Universe*. London: Harper & Row, Pub.
- Eco, U. 1984. *Semiotics and the Philosophy of Language*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Electroherbalism. 2009. *Hulda Clark*. 8 December 2011. <http://www.electroherbalism.com/Bioelectronics/HuldaClark/index.htm>.
- Electroherbalism. 2009. *The Consolidated Annotated Frequency List (CAFL)*. 8 December 2011. <http://www.electroherbalism.com/Bioelectronics/FrequenciesandAnecdotes/CAFL.htm>.
- Elman, Yaakov. 2009. *Classical Rabbinic Interpretation*. In *The Jewish Study Bible*. Oxford Biblical Studies Online. 17 July 2011. <http://www.oxfordbiblicalstudies.com/article/book/obso-9780195297515/obso-9780195297515-div1-1057>.
- Energy Remedy. 2011. *Energy Remedy*. 8 December 2011. <http://www.energyremedy.net/>.

- England. 2002. I was the pastor for two years of a small church in a town called Hartlepool in north-east England south of Newcastle upon Tyne.
- Entertainment Software Association. 2005. *Computer and Video Game Software Sales Reach Record \$7.3 Billion in 2004*. 15 February 2005.
http://biz.yahoo.com/bw/050126/265772_1.html.
- Esau, Jacob. 2009. Our best friends in Germany, Jacob and Lorinda Esau, are both Mennonites, although she's a Canadian Mennonite, belonging to a Mennonite church in Höxter Germany. Jacob is one of the brothers/leaders in the church, but the problems in the church have gotten him to a point where he seriously considered leaving the church. The inside problems he has shared with me I promised not to tell anyone, so I won't do that, but it seems like the lies of permanence, as opposed to temporality, has made its inroads.
- Ethiopia. 2007. I used to teach English with Berlitz in the centre of Kassel, and she was specifically in a group called the Arbeitsamt group: they are ones that lost their jobs and are given the opportunity to do further training to better their chances for getting a job again. I had so many students, and heard so many stories, that I don't remember her name anymore.
- Fagg, Lawrence. W. 2003. *The becoming of time: integrating physical and religious time*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Flocker, Michael. 2004. *The Hedonism Handbook: Mastering the Lost Arts of Leisure and Pleasure*. Cambridge: Da Capo Press.
- Flood, Gavin. (ed.). 2005. *The Blackwell Companion to Hinduism*. Oxford: Blackwell Pub, Ltd.
- Ford, David. 1997. *The modern theologians: an introduction to Christian theology in the twentieth century*. Oxford: Blackwell Pub, Ltd.
- Frei, Hans. W. 1974. *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative: A Study in Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century Hermeneutics*. London: Yale University Press.
- Gadamer, Hans-Georg. 1989. *Truth and Method, second revised edition*, translated by Joel Weinsheimer and Donald G. Marshall. London: Continuum.
- Gallie, W.B. 1964. *Philosophy and the Historical Understanding*. London: Chatto & Windus.
- Garcia, V. 2010. *The Resurrection Life Study Bible*. Longwood: Xulon Press.

- Gergen, K. 1999. *An Invitation to Social Construction*. London: SAGA Pub.
- Gibson, J.A. 2010. *An Investigation into the Historical, Cultural-Religious, Mystical and Doctrinal Elements of Paul's Christology and Soteriology: A Theoretical Study of Faith*. Unpublished DTh dissertation at University of South Africa.
- Giddens, A., Duneier, M., Appelbaum, R.P. 2007. *Introduction to Sociology sixth edition*. Santa Barbara: University of California.
- Gitt, Werner. 2005. *In the Beginning Was Information: A Scientist Explains the Incredible Design in Nature*. Green Forest: Master Books.
- Glasgow Royal Infirmary. 2007. We were in a place called Ardrossen on the west coast of Scotland just south of Glasgow, July 2007, for two weeks. The emergency's of Glasgow Royal Infirmary was the best known and the biggest hospital to go to.
- Glegg, B. 2003. *A Brief History of INFINITY. The Quest to Think the Unthinkable*. London: Robinson.
- Glenvar. 1994. These two years in Glenvar are actually three years of training condensed into two years due to short holidays and the academical and practical being so closely knit together. The best I can describe Glenvar is something like the school of prophets in the days of Elijah and Elisha (2 Kings 2:3); these two years have done more character building then any other studies I have undertaken.
- Goble, Phillip E. 2003. *The Orthodox Jewish Bible: Tanakh and Orthodox Jewish Brit Chadasha*. New York: AFI International Pub.
- Goh, Jeffrey C. K. 2000. *Christian Tradition Today: A Postliberal Vision Of Church And World*. Louvain: Peeters Press.
- González, J.L., González, C.G. 1994. *The Liberating Pulpit*. Eugene: Wipft and Sock Pub.
- Gould, S.J. 1999. *Rock of Ages: Science and Religion in the Fullness of Life*. New York: Ballantine.
- Griffin, David Ray. 2004. *Two great truths: a new synthesis of scientific naturalism and Christian faith*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Grinberg-Zulberbaum, J., Delaflor, J., Attie, L., Goswami, L. 1994. *The Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen paradox in the brain: The transferred potential*. Physics Essays 1994, 7(4), 422-428.
- Gruber, E.R., Kersten, H. 1995. *The Original Jesus: The Buddhist Sources of Christianity*. Shaftesbury: Element Books Ltd.

- Grün, Anselm. 2007. *The Seven Sacraments*. London: Continuum.
- Grunfeld, Dayan I. 2003. *The Sabbath: a guide to its understanding and observance, fifth edition revised and expanded*. Jerusalem: Feldheim Publishers.
- Halahawi, Rabbi Shalomim. Y. 2007. *The Way! the Prophetic Messianic Voice to the Path of the Edenic Kingdom Redemption, Revisions and Expansions of Growing Intellectually, Spiritually and Prophetically in the Hebrew Israelite Culture and Faith*. Raleigh: Lulu.com.
- Hale, Tom., Thorson, Stephen. 2007. *Applied Old Testament Commentary: Applying God's Word to Your Life*. Colorado Springs: David C. Cook.
- Halverson, D.C. (ed.). 1996. *The Compact Guide to World Religions*. Minneapolis: Bethany.
- Harman, Willis 1988. *Global Mind Change. The Promise of the Last Years of the Twentieth Century*. Indianapolis: Knowledge Systems, Inc.
- Harper, Joe., Yantek, Thom (ed.). 2003. *Media, profit, and politics: competing priorities in an open society*. Kent: Kent State University Press.
- Harrison, Paul A. 2004. *Elements of Pantheism: Religious Reverence of Nature and the Universe, Second Edition*. Shaftesbury: Element Books.
- Hartlepool. 2004. I was the pastor of Hartlepool Church of the Nazarene from January 2002 until the end of February 2004; so I lived in England for two years and two months.
- Harvey, Graham. 2005. *Animism: respecting the living world*. Kent Town: Wakefield Press.
- Hawking, S. 2001. *Brief history of time*. 9 December 2010.
http://www.fisica.net/relatividade/stephen_hawking_a_brief_history_of_time.pdf.
- Heidegger, Martin. 2001. *Being and Time*, translated by John Macquarrie and Edward Robinson. Oxford: Blackwell Pub. Ltd.
- Heisenberg, W. 1927. Über den anschaulichen Inhalt der quantentheoretischen Kinematik und Mechanik, in *Zeitschrift für Physik* 43:172-198. (English translation: 1983 Wheeler, J.A. and Zurek, H. *Quantum Theory and Measurement*. Princeton Univ Press: Princeton. 1983:62-84)
- Hellerman, Joseph H. 2001. *The ancient church as family*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress.
- Hercules. 2010. *City Map*. September 2010. <http://www.kassel.city-map.de/02013600/hercules>.

- Hinduism Today Magazine. 2007. *What Is Hinduism?: Modern Adventures into a Profound Global Faith*. Kapaa: Himalayan Academy Pub.
- Hirsch, Alan. 2006. *The forgotten ways: reactivating the missional church*. Grand Rapids: Brazos Press.
- Hobson, J.A. 2002. *Dreaming, a Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hollon, Brayan. 2003. *History, Authority, and Interpretation: A Theology of Scripture* , Quodlibet Journal: Volume 5 Number 4, October 2003.
- Holton, Gerald., Brush, Stephen G. 2004. *Physics, the human adventure: from Copernicus to Einstein and beyond*. Piscataway: Rutgers University Press.
- Holy Bible. 1998. *Complete Jewish Bible*. Clarksville: Jewish New Testament Publications, Inc.
- Holy Bible. 2003. *The Orthodox Jewish Bible*. New York: AFI International Pub.
- Holy Spirit. 1988. This event of the filling of the Holy Spirit was about September-October 1988 at a teenager-student meeting of the neighbouring/daughter in the Dutch Reformed church in Silverton, Pretoria. A John in the group heard about my change and invited me to come and share my testimony, but I don't think they really had a clue what they were doing.
- Horwitz, Allan V. 2002. *Creating mental illness*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Hospital HF Verwoerd. 1987. No private hospital would have anonymously taken me up, so the government funded academic hospital was the natural procedure. The name of the hospital changed though to Steve Biko Academic hospital in the mean time.
- Hospital HF Verwoerd. 1995. HF Verwoerd was the name of the hospital when I was admitted there in October 1995, today it is called Steve Biko Academic hospital. This was and is a government funded hospital, and consequently I had to go there since I had no private medical insurance.
- Houston, G. 1998. *Virtual Morality Christian ethics in the computer age*. Leicester: Apollos.
- Hoy, D.C. 1978. *The critical circle: literature, history, and philosophical hermeneutics*. London: University of California Press.
- Hsing Yun, Venerable Master., Xingyun., Stevens, Robin., Chang, Edmond. 2005. *Humanistic Buddhism: A Blueprint for Life*. Hacienda Heights: Buddha's Light Pub.
- Hudson, Josefina U. 2008. *Beautiful Words of Life: From the Internet with Love*. Bloomington: Xlibris Corporation.

- Hughes, Selwyn. 2005. *Why Revival Waits*. Nashville: Broadman & Holman Pub.
- Ikuenobe, Polycarp. 2006. *Philosophical perspectives on communalism and morality in African traditions*. Oxford: Lexington Books.
- Inception. 2010. Film. Directed by Christopher Nolan. USA: Warner Bros.
- India. 2010. I helped out for one and a half years at Christian Endeavour putting a sponsorship program for 1500 children in 30 hostels in India on computer. Up until then everything was still done on paper. The first time I went to India, July 2009, I went to train the staff, and the second time, August 2010, I went to wrap-up things while implementing their request of the first visit.
- Irwin, William (ed.). 2002. *The Matrix and Philosophy: Welcome to the Desert of the Real*. Chicago: Open Court.
- Jacobkapp. 2010. *The Parable of the Poison Arrow (Majjhima-nikaya, Sutta 63)*. 3 November 2010. <http://wastelandbuddhism.wordpress.com/2010/03/24/the-parable-of-the-arrow-of-time/>.
- James, W. 1907. *Pragmatism: A New Name for Some Old Ways of Thinking*. London: Longman.
- James, W. 2002. *The Varieties of Religious Experience: A Study in Human Nature, a Penn State Electronic Classics Series Publication*. The Pennsylvania State University.
- Janse van Rensburg, Deon. 1995. Deon Janse van Rensburg is very good friend of mine since 1988; he also had malaria a year or two before me and I got this saying from him.
- Janse Van Rensburg, Deon. 2010. I was visiting South Africa in July 2010, and spent a lot of time with Deon on his plot. It was during this visit that I told him about bio-resonance therapy and all the treatments I had, and this conversation naturally went into quantum mechanics and that was when he shared his concerns with telecommunications' objectives with nonlocality.
- Janse Van Rensburg, Michael. 2003. Their farm was at a place called Lion's Den north of Harare. They were ten siblings and only two were not on the farm: one is my friend Michael that went to Bible college and the other one is his oldest sister. The four youngest siblings were still in school, but worked on the farm on weekends and over holidays just like the adults.
- Janzen, J. Gerald. 1997. *Exodus*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.

- Jeans, James 1931. *The Mysterious Universe*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Joel. 2000. I had a fellow student in Bible college called Joel whose dad had two wives, and he was the son of one of these wives. He shared a bit about the relationships in such a constellation and the envy and feelings that were breeding between the siblings.
- Kant, Immanuel. 1984. *Critique of Pure Reason* translated by J.M.D. Meiklejohn. London: Everyman's Library.
- Katooch. 2008. *Mrs Balls Chutney History*. 1 September 2010.
<http://www.mrsballschutney.com/History.html>.
- Kellner, Douglas. 2009. *Jean Baudrillard*, The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Winter 2009 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.). 29 November 2011.
<http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2009/entries/ baudrillard>.
- Kindgen, Axel. ca2009. Axel Kindgen is an engineer, and today a director with Alstom; I heard this the first time from Axel when we once discussed quantum mechanics, but also read about it in *Quantum Enigma Physics Encounters Consciousness* (Rosenblum 2006:112).
- King, David 2010. *Red Star over Russia. A Visual History of the Soviet Union from 1917 to the Death of Stalin*. London: Tate Publishing.
- Kinnes, T. 2009. *Dhammapada On-line*. 10 November 2010.
<http://oaks.nvg.org/richards.html>.
- Kirkpatrick, Larry D., Francis, Gregory E. 2007. *Physics: A World View, sixth edition*. Belmont: Thomson Brooks.
- Klinikum Kassel. 2007. Klinikum Kassel is the biggest and most specialised hospital in the north of Hessen, and is an academic hospital associated with the University of Kassel. They have a dermatological section I should have gone to in the first place.
- Klinikum Kassel. 2009. Again the same hospital as in 2007, I only shared rooms with different people this time around.
- Klinner, Rainer. 2009. Rainer Klinner is the principal of the Bible school called Christliche Bildungsstätte Fritzlar in Fritzlar not far from Kassel.
- Knierim, T. 2010. *The big view*. 28 November 2010.
<http://www.thebigview.com/spacetime/uncertainty.html>.
- Kochan, Sandra. 2007. *The Great Gatsby and the American Dream*. Norderstedt: Grin

Verlag.

Kramer, Jürgen. 2011. I attended a church planting conference in Hamburg in August 2011 partly organised by Jürgen Kramer, who did his Ph.D. in philosophy at a German University.

Kreck, W. 1970. *Grundfragen der Dogmatik*. München: Chr Kaiser Verlag.

Kruger, Bernard. 1987. Bernard and I sort of became real close friends, and a good drinking buddy, but how he treated me after I converted to Yeshua's narrative is unbelievable. He had a nice black Yamaha DT 125cc motorbike, and I only had a Yamaha 50cc, so he wasn't really allowed to drive his 125 at the age of 16-17. His 125, however, could go a good 140km/h on the clock, and that even with two on the bike, and this speed I loved.

Kugel, James., Greer, Rowan. 1986. *Early biblical interpretation*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press.

Kumar, Manjit 2010. *QUANTUM. Einstein, Bohr and the great debate about the nature of reality*. London: Icon Press.

Lacoste, Jean-Yves. (ed.). 2005. *Encyclopedia of Christian theology*. London: Routledge.

Ladd, G.E. 1993. *A Theology of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Pub. Com.

Lakoff, G., Johnson, M. 1980. *Metaphors we Live By*. London: The University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, G., Johnson, M. 1999. *Philosophy in the Flesh The Embodied Mind and its Challenges to Western Thought*. New York: Basic Books.

Landgrebe, O. 2007. Dr. Ottmar Landgrebe in Bauntal, suburb Großenritte, used to be my house doctor from 2004 to 2008. For one thing he was too far from us, but secondly I'm not so sure he took my leg serious enough.

Langer, S.K. 1942. *Philosophy in a New Key. A Study in the Symbolism of Reason, Rite and Art*. New York: Mentor Books. Ramachandran 2011

Laszlo, E. 2003. *The Connectivity Hypothesis Foundations of an Integral Science of Quantum, Cosmos, Life and Consciousness*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Lesnett, Scott A. 2010. *Nine Generations: The Family History of Thomas Dell Lesnett III 1752-2008*. Bloomington: AuthorHouse.

- Levine, L.I. 2005. *The ancient synagogue: the first thousand years*. London: Yale University Press.
- Lindbeck, George A. 1984. *The Nature of Doctrine Religion and Theology in a Postliberal Age*. London: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Lindbeck, George A. 2002. *The Church in a Postliberal Age*, edited by James J. Buckley. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Litzwele, Enoch. 2001. Enoch Litzwele was the principal of Nazarene Theological College the whole time I was studying there, and must have been in his 60's. He's a South African Shangaan that got part of his training in the USA. He certainly had deep insight in cultures and could fluently speak eight languages. At that point I could only speak two languages, but other students testified how good he was in utilising these different languages.
- Lombard, M., Ditton, T. 1997. *At the Heart of It All: The Concept of Presence*. In *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, Volume 3, No. 2 September, 1997*. 1 July 2004. <http://www.ascusc.org/jcmc/vol3/issue2/lombard.html>.
- Louw, Amy. 2002. Amy Louw was deep in her 80's when I was pastoring Hartlepool Church of the Nazarene. She was a dear saint and it was a great joy to spend time with her. She invited me regularly over for a cooked lunch, and it was during one of these lunches that she shared the fact that half of her died with her husband. Her husband was a college professor and a musician.
- Lukes, Steven. 1985. *Emile Durkheim, his life and work: a historical and critical study*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Maimela, S., König, A. (ed.). 1998. *Initiation into Theology: The Rich Variety of Theology and Hermeneutics*. Pretoria: J L van Schaik.
- Mandryk, Jason. 2010. *Operation World, Seventh Edition*. Colorado Springs: Biblica Publishing.
- Mann, William E. (ed.). 2005. *The Blackwell Guide to the Philosophy of Religion*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Martin, Phyllis., O'Meara, Patrick. (ed.). 1995. *Africa, third edition*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Maslow, Abraham H. 1999. *Toward a psychology of being, 3rd edition*. New York: J. Wiley & Sons.

- Matabula, Kaleb. 2001. Kaleb was doing his doctor's degree on Paul the apostle while I was in Bible College and so we didn't see him too much. The one subject I had with him was on the Paulinian letters.
- Mbiti, John. S. 1989. *African religions & philosophy, second edition*. Oxford: Heinemann Educational Pub.
- McConnell, D.R. 1995. *A Different Gospel: Biblical and Historical Insights into the Word of Faith Movement*. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc.
- McLuhan, M. 1964. *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- McQuillan, M. 2000. *The Narrative Reader*. London: Routledge.
- McTaggart, John., McTaggart, Ellis. 2005. *Studies in the Hegelian dialectic*. Chestnut Hill: Adamant Media Corporation.
- Middle East conflict. 2011. At the time of this writing, 21 March 2011, Tunisia's and Egypt's conflicts were already over, but Libya's was raging. Other countries in the region may follow. Conflicts were also reported in Libanon, Jordan and Yemen, but not in size like Tunisia, the catalyst, and Egypt and Libya.
- Military. 1990. I was in the first group that only had to do a year compulsory military training after it used to be two years. The training only dropped to one year one month before we commenced with training, so I was mentally prepared for a two year military training. So I was in the military in 1990 at Wonderboom Pretoria.
- Missionaries. 2001. I don't remember the names of this missionary couple anymore; they just briefly passed by the Bible college one day, and I only had a short private conversation with the man. As a white student, in a predominately non-white college, I must have stood out a bit. What I do remember is that the man had a real Texan American draw that could knock one over. Texas, I guess, is known for the typical American superiority complex, and their theology is very stereotype.
- Mitra, A., Schwartz, R.L. 2001. *From Cyber Space to Cybernetic Space: Rethinking the Relationship between Real and Virtual Spaces*. In *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, Volume 7, No. 1 October, 2001*. 2 July 2004.
<http://www.ascusc.org/jcmc/vol7/issue1/mitra.html>.
- Mitra, Asoke N. (ed.). 2008. *History of Science, Philosophy and Culture in Indian Civilisation, General editor D.P. Chattopadhyaya, Volume XIII Part I, India in the*

- World of Physics: Then and Now*. Delhi: Centre for Studies in Civilisations.
- Moberly, R.W.L. 1992. *From Eden to Golgotha: Essays in Biblical Theology*. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Mohr, Carsten. 2007. Dr. Carsten Mohr is a dermatologist and has been my dermatologist up until today. He practices in Großenritte Baunatal.
- Motorbike. 2006. The one friend Gideon, who was the incentive behind the business, had been doing guided tours for years all over the south of Africa. He and my friend Deon Janse van Rensburg got the idea to tap into the massive German motorbike market, and therefore they approached me for the marketing. Unfortunately, at the end, I had to back out since remuneration would be on commission, handsome commission, but when organised tours didn't come about soon enough I had no resources to draw on anymore.
- Mullarkey, John. 2006. *Post-continental philosophy: an outline*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Muller, F.M. 2010. *India, What Can It Teach Us?* Forgotten Books.
- Murray, Andrew. 2008. *With Christ in the School of Prayer, unlock the power of prayer*. Radford: Wilder Publications.
- Najman, Hindy. 2009. *Inner-biblical Interpretation*. In *The Jewish Study Bible*. Oxford Biblical Studies Online. 17 July 2011.
<http://www.oxfordbiblicalstudies.com/article/book/obso-9780195297515/obso-9780195297515-chapter-40>.
- Neusner, Jacob. 2001. *The Social Teaching of Rabbinic Judaism: God's presence in Israel*. Leiden: Koninklijke Brill, nv.
- New House. 2006. Our wooden house was built in three months, but that was without any floors or bathrooms or doors. The only thing in each bathroom was a toilet, but even the bathtub itself and the showers and sinks we had to put in ourselves. The company from who we bought the house did put the doors in, but only a month after we had moved in. Actually our house stands in a small village just outside Baunatal called Gudensberg-Deute. The place of the house in the fictive-narrative is where we used to rent a little flat in Baunatal.
- Nicholas, Lionel. 2008. *Introduction to Psychology, second edition*. Cape Town: UCT Press.

- Nietzsche, F. W. (n.d.). *Works of Friedrich Wilhelm Nietzsche from MobileReference*.
Electronically Developed by MobileReference.
- Nietzsche, F. W. 1885-6. *The will to power*. 25 November 2010. http://evans-experientialism.freewebspace.com/nietzsche_wtp01.htm.
- Nietzsche, F.W. 1872. *The Birth of Tragedy Out of the Spirit of Music*, translated by Ian C. Johnston. Electronically Developed By MobileReference
- Nietzsche, F.W. 1878-9. *Human All-Too-Human, A Book For Free Spirits*, translated by Helen Zimmern, R. J. Hollingdale, and Marion Faber. Electronically Developed by MobileReference.
- Nietzsche, F.W. 1886. *Beyond Good and Evil, Prelude to a Philosophy of the Future*, translated by Helen Zimmern. Electronically Developed By MobileReference.
- Nietzsche, F.W. 1888. *The Antichrist: Curse on Christianity*, translated by H. L. Mencken. Electronically Developed by MobileReference.
- Nir, Y., Tononi , G. 2009. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences Vol.14 No.2 Feature Review, Dreaming and the brain: from phenomenology to neurophysiology*. Atlanta: Elsevier Ltd .
- Nortje, Andre. 1999. My dad's brother retired (early retirement) in Parys in the Freestate, South Africa. He used to work, as a farmer, for the correctional services in South Africa. Before 1994 he was wholeheartedly against apartheid, like our family tradition, like my granddad, his dad, who used to be a (liberal) South African Party political leader outside Brits South Africa. After 1994 though, the change in the correctional services had been so detrimental for white people that he had a nervous breakdown and was put on early retirement. Needless to say he became a racist. One day when he went to the local café to buy a newspaper this accident happened. It was a band of white young people that smashed his skull to a pulp; when they saw what they had done to him they had the audacity, or is it kindness, to take him home, but not to hospital so that they wouldn't get into trouble.
- Nortje, Daniel. 1982. My dad's name is Danie and he actually has all the qualifications that an electrician can get, high voltage included, but alcohol has destroyed his life and dictated his selfishness.
- Nortje, Helen. 2004. I heard about this Mühlenberg vote for the first time from my wife, shortly after we got married. She seemed pretty serious about it, but I've never

confronted her about it again.

Nortje, Helen. 2005. I first heard about this notion after my wife did an official city tour with her office. Their tour guide was a Jewish woman. I've heard and read this many times over again after this encounter.

Nortje, J.A. 2005. *A Theological Analysis of what sin would be in Virtual Reality*. Unpublished MTh dissertation at the University of South Africa.

Nortje, J.A. 2007. The first time I experienced and encountered this postmodern part of town was during a guided tour organised and conducted by my students. Because of this encounter I read up about it in tourist literature produced by the city of Kassel.

Nortje, J.A. 2010. These similarities between Ubuntu and Buddhism have a lot to do with insight and reading up about Buddhism, but in the case of Ubuntu I picked the most up through personal experience living with Africans. A lot are interconnected, like the absence of the individual and the notion of communal time that sheds light on the Ubuntu perception of death. A lot of the referencing I'm doing in this list is cold academic referencing and can't capture the insight I've gained. Previous parts of our discussions also serve as reference.

Nortje, J.A. 2010a. Interconnectedness is a quantum physics apprehension I recognised in both ubuntu and Buddhism. In Buddhism through the reading I've done, and with ubuntu both the readings and the personal interaction with them.

Nortje, J.A. 2011. That's not completely the case, Sigmund Freud had an original sin, sex, which functioned within the Oedipus narrative complex (Yandell 2001:155-7). Actually everyone has an original sin, except if someone really thinks that the old heaven and earth is absolute paradise lacking nothing. The original sin held by modernism proper was ignorance; for modernism's baby, liberal theology, the original sin is sociological forces that make us what we are. For the physicist original sin is the mystery of the universe, for the engineer the mathematical complexity of the universe hosts original sin, and so we can go on, but all and all they all miss the Scriptural original sin of the absence of Shekinah. Even fundamentalism misses it in the apparent substantial nature of sin, so that the image of YAHWEH is substantially imparted in us. It's funny, in this apprehension it means should YAHWEH indeed disappear today, humanity would still be sinful,

although I thought sin was exclusively trespassing YAHWEH's Torah (1 John 3:4)? When the lawgiver is removed, won't the law be redundant? Can you see where modernism ran into problems once 'god died' for them? When there's no lawgiver anymore, and thus no sin, they had to invent a new original sin and a lawgiver that is very problematic. We have seen in the last Gulf War when some claimed the United Nations (UN) to be the international lawgiver, while the Americans in general denied the UN such status. Who says Iran may not pursue nuclear power?

Nosotro, R. 2003. *Thomas Edison February 11, 1847 - October 18, 1931 Atheist and Renowned Inventor*. December 2010.

<http://www.hyperhistory.net/apwh/bios/b4edison.htm>.

Nserat. 2009. After a serious infection in my leg, I was in hospital twice, and I went to Dr. Nserat, a Palestinian, in October 2009, for a check-up to see how we could boost my immune system. He's both a cardiologist, but also a tropical specialist. Because of the last title I decided on him.

NTC. 1998. During my studies at Nazarene Theological College Muldersdrift, Johannesburg, South Africa the notion Hidden Curriculum was introduced to me by my Education 1 teacher, Mrs. Bumpus, who only taught there for six months. Education II I had with Miss Fetters.

NTC. 2001. NTC stands for Nazarene Theological College, and was the only Bible College of the Church of the Nazarene in South Africa in the years 1998-2001 when I used to study there. I did my BA(Hon) with them as a satellite college of the Canadian Nazarene University, although we were the last group to be affiliated with this University.

O'Reily, F. 26 March 2010. *Tough times for white squatters*. 22 October 2010.

<http://www.pretorianews.co.za/?fSectionId=&fArticleId=nw20100326081411442C713420>.

Oakes, Peter. (ed.). 2002. *Rome in the Bible and the Early Church*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic .

Oesterley, W. O. E., Robinson, Theodore H. 1930. *Hebrew Religion: Its Origin and Development*. London: The Macmillan Company.

Ògúnjìmí, Báýò., Na'allah, Abdul Rasheed. 2005. *Introduction to African oral literature and performance*. Trenton: Africa World Press, Inc.

Pagels, E. 1979. *The Gnostic Gospels*. New York: Vintage Books.

- Pais, Abraham. 2000. *The Genius of Science, A Portrait Gallery*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Peckham, Colin., Peckham, Mary. 1992. Colin and Mary Peckham used to be in the Africa Evangelistic Band. Colin Peckham did his MTh at Unisa and then his Ph.D. in the United States of America (USA); he was the principal of the Bible college of the Africa Evangelistic Band, but then became the principal of the Bible college of the Faith Mission in Edinburgh Scotland. When I went over to England I became good friends with them, and spent many a weekend with them. It was during one of these visits that Mary Peckham shared the testimony that once a person has tasted revival one doesn't want anything else.
- Peckham, Colin., Peckham, Mary. 2004. *Sounds from Heaven, The Revival on the Isle of Lewis, Scotland 1949-1952*. Fearn: Christian Focus Pub.
- Peguera. 2009. We had a two week family package holiday in Hotel Club Europa for the first two weeks of September. This package holiday, in this hotel in Spain, is all we could afford, but on hindsight put too much strain on my leg as we were so far from town and down a hill to the beach.
- Pentecostals. 1988. In the first place I'm not necessarily referring to friends in the pentecostal church, but friends converted to parts of pentecostal theology and particularly the need of speaking in tongues. Actually my first Yeshua follower friend, John, that was the Barnabas to bring into the body of Yeshua, was one. He, and others weren't forcing me to speak in tongues, but rhetorically they vehemently tried to convince me that that's of paramount importance though. They weren't successful, but fortunately haven't caused me to resent them either.
- Petersen, Peter. 2006. *Riemannian geometry, second edition*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics. Los Angeles: University of California.
- Petrella, Ivan. 2004. *The future of liberation theology: An argument and manifesto*. Burlington: Ashgate Publishing Company.
- Pieterse, Riaan. 1977. I remember having two friends in the first year of school, the one coming along from kindergarten, Rudolf, and one I became friends with in school, Riaan Pieterse. Riaan Pieterse became a life long friend (we always somehow kept in contact), and the best friend I'm referring to, and he's the one I came to live with when I left my parent's house. Our friendship temporarily terminated when I

became a follower of Yeshua, and I was kicked out of the house by his mum, but beginning last year, 2010, he tracked me down on Facebook and so we're in contact again. He became a Yeshua follower himself and is a lawyer with the Navy today.

Pisters, Patricia. (ed.). 2001. *Micropolitics of media culture: reading the rhizomes of Deleuze and Guattari*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Plot. 1991. This plot is close to Boschkop in the east of Pretoria. My last four years in South Africa I was on the plot most Sundays for this barbeque, and when I'm in South Africa visiting I try to miss none.

Plusminus. 2010. The name of the documentary is Plusminus on the first German channel called ARD. I didn't take notice of the date, although I can say with certainty it was in the first part of 2010.

Potter, Jonathan. 1996. *Representing Reality: Discourse, Rhetoric and Social Construction*. London: SAGE Publications.

Pretoria. 1986. Riaan Pieterse was living in Silverton; a lot of the sinful activities took place in the east of Pretoria. We had endless house parties, but we were also well-known at two nightclubs, Jacquelines in downtown Pretoria and Lime Light (today called Presleys) in Lynnwood Road.

Quanstrom, M.R. 2004. *A Century of Holiness Theology The doctrine of entire sanctification in the church of the Nazarene 1905 to 2004*. Kansas City: Beacon Hill Press.

Queen, Edward L., Prothero, Stephen R., Shattuck, Gardiner H. 2009. *Encyclopedia of American religious history, third edition*. New York: Proseworks.

Ramsbotham, Richard. 2004. *Who wrote Bacon?: William Shakespeare, Francis Bacon and James I: a mystery for the Twenty-first Century*. Forest Row: Temple Lodge Publishing.

Reimer, J. 2005. Professor Johannes Reimer (Professor Extraordinarius in Germany) helped me out of a predicament in 2005 when I was getting nowhere with my MTh and was on the verge of starting all over again at another University. I got to him through the Mennonite grapevine, since I'm married to a Mennonite. My wife was in the Mennonite Bible college in Canada with an Anna Goosen, who was after this also in the Mennonite Bible college in the USA where Johannes Reimer used to

study. Anna Goosen brought me in contact with this Bible college and they with Johannes Reimer.

Richard, Suzanne. (ed.). 2005. *Near Eastern archaeology: a reader*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns Pub.

Ricoeur, P. 1984. *Time and Narrative, Volume 1*, translated by Kathleen Mclaughlin and David Pellauer. London: The University of Chicago Press, Ltd.

Rosenblum, B., Kuttner, F. 2006. *Quantum Enigma Physics Encounters Consciousness*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, Inc.

Royle, N. 2003. *Jacque Derrida*. London: Routledge.

Ryle, Gilbert. 2009. *The Concept of the Mind*. Oxon: Routledge.

Sabhlok, P. 2001. *Glimpses of Vedic Metaphysics*. 17 December 2010.

<http://www.sabhlokcity.com/metaphysics/introduction.html>.

Sabie. 1984. We moved from Amsterdam, close to the Swaziland border, to Sabie in 1982. Sabie is not far from the city of Nelspruit near the Kruger National Park.

Said, Edward W. 1975. *Beginnings: intention and method*. New York: Basic Books.

Salleh, A. 2008. *Never mind the Higgs boson*. 18 December 2010.

<http://www.abc.net.au/science/articles/2008/09/10/2361062.htm>.

Sawyer , Rickard L. (ed). 2002. *Torah Rediscovered* , originally written by Ariel and D'vorah Berkowitz. Parkersburg: Adat B'Nei HaMelech .

School. 1989. I was in all one year longer in school due to my motorbike accident. The names of all the schools are: Silverton primary, Sunnyside primary, Amsterdam primary, Sabie primary, Sabie high, Verda high, Geloft high, Silverton high. Once when my dad kicked us out of the house, before my parents got divorced, I was in another school for a week, at the most two, but I don't even remember the place anymore.

Schrödinger, E. 1944. *The statistical law in nature*, NATURE 153: 704-705.

Sethu. 2010. This was brought up in an encounter with Dr. Sethu in Bangalore India, August 2010, when I was installing Ubuntu OS for him in Tamil. In trying to confirm the facts on the internet I got conflicting numbers ranging from more than 250 000 to 1 million Tamil Indians, but I find it easy to believe that they're more than a half a million, so the half a million plus I would estimate couldn't be far off.

Shelburne, Walter A. 1988. *Mythos and logos in the thought of Carl Jung: the theory of the*

collective unconscious in scientific perspective. Albany: State University of New York.

Sheldon, C.M. 1982. *In His Steps*, revised and rewritten by Harold J. Chadwick. New Jersey: Bridge-Logos Pub.

Shinan, Avigdor. 2009. *The Bible in the Synagogue*. In *The Jewish Study Bible*. Oxford Biblical Studies Online. 17 July 2011.

<http://www.oxfordbiblicalstudies.com/article/book/obso-9780195297515/obso-9780195297515-chapter-48>.

Shorter, Aylward. 2004. *East African Societies, Routledge Library Edition, Anthropology and Ethnography*. London: Routledge.

Sills, Franklyn. 2009. *Being and Becoming: Psychodynamics, Buddhism, and the Origins of Selfhood*. Berkeley: North Atlantic Books.

Silverton. 1979. After Queenswood, which I don't remember, we had a house in Silverton extension. One or two glimpses I still remember from this house, but somewhere around my third birthday my dad bought a big house and property in Silverton. My dad had a big and upcoming business and money was no problem. After the divorce we were in Silverton one more year living in a flat.

Simms, K. 2003. *Paul Ricoeur*. London: Routledge.

Smith, Chrysti M. 2006. *Verbivore's Feast: Second Course: More Word & Phrase Origins*. Helena: Farcountry Press.

Smith, H., Novak, P. 2003. *Buddhism: A Concise Introduction*. New York: HarperOne.

Smith, Jim. 2000. Jim Smith was the college chaplain all four years I was studying at Nazarene Theological College. He is American from the Midwest. In the four years we became really good friends. I spend almost every Sunday evening with them for supper having a great time of fellowship. These Sunday evenings were branded into my memory as deep theolosophising times of ubuntuing.

Soanes, Catherine, Stevenson, Angus (ed.). 2003. *Oxford Dictionary of English, Second Editions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Spartan Communications. 2011. *R.I.F.E.* 8 December 2011. <http://www.rifehealth.co.za/>.

Steakhouse India. 2010. A steakhouse owned and operated by a Moslem in Bangalore in India. Dr. Sethu's son was in school with the owner's son.

Stern, David. 2009. *Midrash and Jewish Interpretation*. In *The Jewish Study Bible*. Oxford

Biblical Studies Online. 17 July 2011.

<http://www.oxfordbiblicalstudies.com/article/book/obso-9780195297515/obso-9780195297515-chapter-43>.

- Stern, David H. 2009. *Restoring The Jewishness of the Gospel, A Message for Christians Condensed from Messianic Judaism*. Clarksville: Messianic Jewish Publishers. Electronically Developed by Kindle.
- Stivers, R. 2004. *Shades of Loneliness Pathologies of a Technological Society*. Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Stone, Gavin. 1986. The helmet belonged to Gavin Stone that lent it to me to take this acquaintance back home. Gavin Stone had to walk the 10km plus back home that night, since I also had he jacket on with his bike keys.
- Suárez, Mauricio. (ed.). 2010. *Probabilities, Causes and Propensities in Physics*. London: Springer Science+Business Media B.V.
- Summerfield, D. 2006. *Depression: epidemic or pseudo-epidemic? Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine 2006 March; 99(3): 161–162*. 20 December 2010. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1383767/>.
- Sunnyside 1980. My mum and stepdad got married the December of 1979 and the first few months of 1980 we lived in a flat in Sunnyside in Pretoria.
- Suzuki, D.T. 1906. *Sermons of a Buddhist abbot addresses on religious subjects the RT. Rev. Soyen Shaku Lord abbot op Bngaku-Ji and Kenchoji, Kamakura, Japan including the Sutra of forty-two chapters*. London: The Open Court Publishing Company.
- Tachibana, Shundō. 1995. *The ethics of Buddhism*. London: Routledge.
- Teaching Week. 2006. In 2006 I was invited to speak at a teaching week in one of these Mennonite Russian German churches in Bielefeld Germany. The Saturday afternoon I was invited over for coffee by one of the members, and I specifically confronted him about the unity today and the unity they used to have in the USSR. His testimony was that the unity and sharing have deteriorated in Germany.
- Telkom. 1991. I worked for Telkom in the first three months of 1991 at Data Installations. I actually tried as best I could to get in on their computer programmer course, but they wouldn't give me an opportunity, and I could only do the aptitude test with a huge fight. Just before I commenced with the test, they reminded me again it

doesn't matter how good I do with the test they won't take me as a programmer.

Temple, William. 1940. *Nature, Man, and God*. London: Macmillan.

The Matrix. 1999. Film. Wachowski, Andy, Wachowski, Lana. USA: Warner Bros. Pictures.

Thinking Allowed Productions. 1998. *The Holographic Brain With KARL PRIBRAM, Ph.D.*

19 October 2010. <http://twm.co.nz/pribram.htm>.

Thiselton, A.C. 2009. *Hermeneutics, An Introduction*. Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans Pub. Com.

Tillich, P. 1967. *Systematic Theology, three volumes in one*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Tirosh-Samuels, Hava. 2009. *The Bible in the Jewish Philosophical Tradition*. In *The Jewish Study Bible*. Oxford Biblical Studies Online. 17 July 2011.

<http://www.oxfordbiblicalstudies.com/article/book/obso-9780195297515/obso-9780195297515-div1-1114>.

Toussaint-Samat, Maguelonne. 2009. *A History of Food*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Trimm, James. [c.a.]. *The Seven Rules of Hillel*. April 2011.

<http://www.yashanet.com/studies/revstudy/hillel.htm>.

Tweed, T. 2000. *The American Encounter With Buddhism, 1844-1912: Victorian Culture and the Limits of Dissent*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press. *University of Michigan Health System*. 2005. *Television*. 15 February 2005.

<http://www.med.umich.edu/1libr/yourchild/tv.htm>.

Van Aardt, Johan. 1996. My mum's bother, Johan, was highly intelligent and very gifted, but psychologically not the stablest, fighting depression and some other issues. He was the head of Computers and IT development of the government of South Africa.

Van Aardt, Peet. 2005. My mum's mum had four grandsons and we grew up together and were very close. Peet was one of the cousins. A week and a half before he died I flew out from Germany to visit him one last time to discuss his relationship with Yeshua before he would face eternity. He made right with YAHWEH in the last few days of his life. This is now after his life had been one great mess. The doctors actually said he got cancer at such a young age due to his drugs, alcohol and promiscuous lifestyle.

Van der Merwe, Werner., Van der Merwe, Mariaan. 1995. I became good friends with them through common friends, just before I left for Bible college in 1992. Originally

because they didn't have children yet, I used to stay a lot with them when I had college breaks, and also after I started working for the Africa Evangelistic Band as missionary-evangelist. It was during one of these visits that they told me this story.

Van der Woude, Marc., Hill, Steve., Fokker, Jonathan. 2010. *Simple Church in Europe: Status Report 2010*. September 2011.

http://simplechurch.eu/images/uploads/Simple_Church_Europe_Status_Report_2010_Final_Version.pdf.

Van Dyck, Jurg. 2000. I know Jurg van Dyck from the days I was working as an evangelist-missionary with the Africa Evangelistic Band; he was also briefly in their Bible college, but became the African director of Global Missions sponsored from the USA. He got this saying from a sermon from their American global director, who I never met.

Van Niekerk, E. 2006. *The church as golden calf in history and the meandering processes of the commonwealth of God*. *Studia Historiae Ecclesiasticae*, Vol XXXII, Nr 3, 315-405.

Van Niekerk, E. 2009. *Faith, Philosophy and Science*. TL 501/2009. Pretoria: Unisa.

Van Niekerk, E. 2010. In July 2010 I was staying with professor Van Niekerk for two days, discussing my dissertation, and he's the one that centralised the whole of modernism in this one dictum he probably got/constructed from Gilbert Ryle's Official Doctrine in his book *The Concept of Mind* (Ryle 2009).

Van Niekerk, E. 2010a. A day or two before I enrolled at Unisa for my doctor's degree I had long discussions with professor Van Niekerk and actually had written a preliminary outline of my dissertation. During these discussions my professor made the comment that John Calvin stuck his philosophical model onto the Scriptures.

Van Niekerk, E. 2010b. This conversation took place in professor Van Niekerk's office at Unisa when we went there to print a few papers I called *Total subjective claims*, with which I wanted to communicate something of my direction and train of thought. This was a real challenge since I knew what I wanted to do, but would the university go with it? Professor Van Niekerk has really helped me in this dialogue.

Van Niekerk, E. 2011. Both these events took place while I was in South Africa to work on my dissertation for three months.

Van Niekerk, E. 2011a. After the first reading of my first seven chapters, this was the

comment professor Van Niekerk made on my arguments concerning the death of the individual. He also made the comment that he can't get under my skin.

Varma, S. 1984. *Vedic Studies*. New Delhi: Bharatiya Prakashan.

VHS. 2004. VHS is an acronym for a non-profitable school system for adults in Germany, where I did a three month language and cultural course in the German language, culture and history. The course took place in the last quarter of 2004 in Kassel.

Viola, Frank. 2009. *From Eternity to Here*. Colorado Springs: David C. Cook.

Viola, Frank., Barna, George. 2008. *Pagan Christianity?: Exploring the Roots of Our Church Practices*. Carol Stream: Tyndale House Publishers, Inc.

Virkler, Henry, A., Ayayo, Karelyne, G. 2007. *Hermeneutics: Principles and Processes of Biblical Interpretation, Second Edition*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.

Von Rad, Gerhard. 1963. *Genesis A Commentary*, translated by John H. Marks. London: SCM Press LTD.

Warren, Rick. 1995. *The Purpose Driven Church: Growth Without Compromising Your Message and Mission*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Watson, Peter. 2006. *Ideas: A History of Thought and Invention, from Fire to Freud*. London: HarperCollins Publishers.

Weir, Jane. 2007. *Max Planck: Uncovering the World of Matter*. Huntington Beach: Teacher Created Materials Publishing.

Wenham, G.J. 1987. *Word Biblical Commentary Volume 1 Genesis 1-15*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson.

Wessels, Anton. 1994. *Europe: Was it Ever Really Christian? The interaction between gospel and culture*. London: SCM Press.

Wicksteed, Julian. 2007. *A Catch on Africa - An Angler's Walkabout Adventure*. Raleigh: Lulu.com

Wiersbe, Warren W. 2007. *The Wiersbe Bible Commentary: The Complete New Testament in one volume*. Colorado Springs: David C. Cook.

Wijesekera, O.H. De A. 1994. *Buddhist and Vedic Studies, A Miscellany*. Delhi: Motilal Banarshidass, Pub. Ltd.

Wikipedia. 2010a. *German in the United States*. 24 November 2010.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/German_in_the_United_States/. Last modified on 19 November 2010.

- Wikipedia. 2010b. *Reality in Buddhism*. 8 December 2010.
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Reality_in_Buddhism. Last modified on 8 December 2010.
- Wikipedia. 2010c. *House of Windsor*. 3 February 2011.
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/House_of_Windsor. Last modified on 3 February 2011.
- Wikiquote. 2010. *Marilyn vos Savant*. 15 October 2010.
http://en.wikiquote.org/wiki/Marilyn_vos_Savant/. Last modified on 9 December 2008.
- Wiktionary. 2010. *Pragmatism*. 30 November 2010. <http://en.wiktionary.org/wiki/pragmatism>.
 Last modified on 24 October 2010.
- Winters, L. Alan., Yusuf, Shahid. (ed.). 2007. *Dancing with giants: China, India, and the global economy*. Washington DC: The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/The World Bank.
- Wittgenstein, L. 1922. *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*. London: Routledge
- Wittgenstein, L. 1958. *Philosophical Investigations*, translated by G. E. M. Anscombe.
 Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd.
- Wolfson, Elliot R. 2009. *The Bible in the Jewish Mystical Tradition*. In *The Jewish Study Bible*. Oxford Biblical Studies Online. 17 July 2011.
<http://www.oxfordbiblicalstudies.com/article/book/obso-9780195297515/obso-9780195297515-chapter-51>.
- Wynkoop, M.B. 1972. *A Theology of Love The Dynamic of Wesleyanism*. Kansas City: Beacon Hill Press of Kansas City.
- Yandell, K.E. 2001. *Faith and Narrative*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Young, S. 1999. *Dreaming in the Lotus: Buddhist dream narrative, imagery & practice*. Somerville: Wisdom Publications.
- Zdero, Rad. *The Global House Church Movement*. Pasadena: William Carey Library.
- Zoff, Otto. 1942. *The Huguenots: Fighters for God and human freedom*, translated by E. B. Ashton and Jo Mayo. London: G. Allen & Unwin.

10. Prescript as Postscript

At this stage a prescript as a postscript is in place as part of a circular movement that incessantly starts with the end as the beginning and the beginning as the end of the unfolding holographic event-shapes of the story. Whether you read the lengthy Preface for a second time or gloss over the Director's Cut for a last time to be embraced by the

ambience of the narrational movement from beginning to end, you will notice precisely how I have introduced many of the topics in the discussion seemingly drifting wayward and out of their contextual settings just to be saved at the last minute by coincidental or synchronicity of the beginning as the end and vice versa. Is it a coincidence that I have been living in Kassel, in middle Europe in the same ambience as the demi-god Hercules?

Something else I also deem necessary to point out, which could also have been the Postscript as Prescript, is the layers in which my dissertation, as a story, has been cast into a holograph, like the layers of a tar road: from one side to the other, or from the other side back, or even from both sides meeting in between. The first layer is the formulation of what I felt I would like to deal with, which is actually my MTh (Nortje 2005), and the *Timeless/Spaceless Paradigm of HyperReality* I coined.

The next layer is the time after my MTh, and the layer in which the narrative vehicle of the plot has been born and bred. The picture is that of a boxing match, and the hard training preceding the boxing match; up until this point I was training alone, apart from the MTh, but when my dissertation had to be put on paper I had to get into the boxing ring with a training partner, who has been my current supervisor, prof Van Niekerk (although it has been a middleweight seeking out a heavyweight).

The many training sessions we had together were all levels. The first one was when I went to South Africa to propose my hypothesis to him, with all the writings that accompany this level. After staying with him for two days, I came back to Germany and for months I was labouring away in an intensive period of self-training again. When I went back to South Africa, this time for an exclusive training time of three months, I could give him the first 120 pages of my dissertation. In these three months we got into the ring almost weekly, sometimes even biweekly and trained, and I mean trained. Sometimes sessions lasted from nine in the morning until eight in the evenings. This level of my dissertation negotiated the next 180 pages in an intensive time of writing, rewriting, editing, reflecting and contemplation⁶.

At this point my paper copy of the dissertation functioned on three planes: the first one the

⁶ Contemplation has a heavy idealistic ring to it, but my intention is rather the devotional and meditational.

story, the second one the bibliography of books I've read before and during the dissertation, but thirdly also the event-shapes as referenced in my bibliography.

After this level, and after I had written most of my dissertation, I came back to Germany leaving my dissertation with my supervisor, but inevitably couldn't stop doing self-training. However, a few months later I got my dissertation back from my supervisor with close to 50 pages of comments, (unpublished) writings and negotiations in the margins and text to coach my dissertation.

What an enrichment, but what a challenge? How could I, or should I, incorporate these super high level trainings into my story, without altering my story (and abstain from quoting him), as well as adding my additional self-trainings of these few months and the self-trainings that still followed? And so I decided to add a new plane, dimension, to my dissertation? Footnotes. These footnotes are my ubuntu/dependent arising with these challenges, perceptions, and, according to him, contradictions, and loopholes he has coordinated with me, plus my own mulling over the dissertation in these months with the accompanied reading, etc.

Actually I think this new plane/dimension is a fortunate accident, since, just like the reciprocal play between real time and imaginary time plays a cardinal part in my story, so my story and the footnotes are two intersecting time lines. To contextualise my footnotes, they can be seen as additions while reading my story backwards, or additions outside the time line of the story although a time line in itself. It is something like The Making Of Genre we get with films with a new plot and casting sharing the what, why, where and how as the story plays off. In the same way I'm walking with the story, and by adding footnotes, narrating the Making Of.

Take note, in these footnotes I'm not quoting or even using my supervisor's comments, writings or negotiations, but rather intend these footnotes to be listening to only one side of a telephone conversation: my side of the conversation, while picking up the thread of what's being said on the other side. I make no effort to show what is a response to my supervisor's challenges, and what comes from my self-trainings and is 100% my thematic input in the phone call.

So when is the boxing match? When I submit my dissertation to UNISA and fight for a

doctor's degree in the evaluation process. Fingers crossed.

11. Dozing off the session

So, this is our last snake turn left and right; in the middle of the turns is the Volkswagen stop and from there it's only a few meters and then it's our stop called Kleingartenverein. So this is where I'm going to say, "Farewell for now! See you in the morning".

Chapter 1: The muddy mess of modernism swept clean

“With regard to the superstitions of logicians, I shall never tire of emphasizing a small, terse fact, which is unwillingly recognized by these credulous minds--namely, that a thought comes when "it" wishes, and not when "I" wish; so that it is a PERVERSION of the facts of the case to even gone too far with this "one thinks"--even the "one" contains an INTERPRETATION of the process, and does not belong to the process itself.” (Nietzsche 1886: 242-3)

1. Contextual embedding of session

“Good morning!” So I got a seat on the back bench, but as you can see the tram is filled to capacity. Look at these poor people around us, do you detect any joy or excitement about their day ahead? Sorry but I don't. No one is saying a word, everyone is stirring their own pot of thoughts. Sometimes I wonder when a typical working day starts like this, are these people not indeed just numbers in some subservient crunching machine. A machine where everyone has a role to play, a script to act, a stereotype to live, but is that really so extraordinary, isn't that exactly what modernism made of our dynamic world? Hasn't modernism turned our organic world into numbers and equations, cause-and-effect, so that each one has only a calculated task in an ecological system/food-chain and nothing more? I'm just always amazed that the ones that devised the system, the educated and enlightened élite in this case, are always at the top of the food-chain, and the creating of a chain of desires, while these poor people are just numbers and equations obligated to make the world go round!

2. Radical inductive contemplation

You're right modernism is more an ideology than anything else.

As we enter Kassel, just look at the estate at the left with the endless squares and blocks of apartment buildings stretching as far back as you can see. Aren't they unattractive? They look like army barracks which at least in the army setting has a functional deadening uniformity but here they seem to be permeated by a sort of modernist functionality gone wrong. Every time I see them a dislike of them or renouncement is stirred up in me because they are expressive of modernist architecture (Colquhoun 2002:233) driven by

numbers and equations, by technological and engineering achievements of putting a roof over people's heads and not providing them with a home.

Why the deadening uniformity of buildings and houses? I guess people need to relax a bit after work, get into bed in good time and be able to work again the next day, crunching numbers for the system which surrounds them, enfolding them and to which they contribute through the energies of their daily bread. People and animals in this system share similar type of environments in which they have to be fed, made secure and have to be surrounded by all sorts of conveniences and amenities from being heated up to being cooled down.

The beauty of the system is embedded in the numbers and equations that are self supportive like the hanging gardens of Babylon, no god is needed, and no god was there in the first place. Keeping the system ticking has no traditional religious motive, and to be honest nearly no real motive is detectable because the system as the objectified edifice is itself the motive. The grand total of the system is valueless numbers and systematised pointers, loved by the educated and enlightened élite while the others are permeated with the proneness to commit suicide within such an ambience of nihilism.

These buildings personify nihilism to me, and the sad thing is that they are a reminder of the blown up castles of modernism continuing in their stationary modes until the arrival of doomsday. Since the buildings are too expensive to be demolished they just carry on operating as the undercarriage of the consumerist society with its chains of food and unbridled packages of desires.

Who are the people sticking it out in these buildings? A direct product and outflow of migration brought about by the current late modernist globalisation processes. The majority of people living in these apartment buildings are foreign nationals, or nationals with foreign roots, who have been looking for greener pastures and with their presence here and now, they are not only causing political upheavals here, but all over Europe.

All around us we see the cracks in the walls of modernism. The east-bloc communist world is already been pulverised, capitalism is adamantly paving its own pulverisation process globally, and multi-party liberal democracy has paralysed Europe with fractured parliaments and minority coalitions, while a number of countries seem to be without

governments or are at least being burdened with a lame duck government for several years.

In addition more and more industries, whether they are established as macro or micro manufacturing plants, are on a sliding scale in their abuse of the planet⁷ and the grand project of primordial modernist pride, the scientific enterprise with all its sophisticated articulations and magnitudinal results does not deliver on a promise of a better life for all.

So the list goes on...

Secondary outcomes of modernism are public healthcare systems becoming rapidly unsustainable, while the coffers of public pension schemes are already not able to sustain an ageing society. Moreover, on the one hand, the job market has become all but secure with more than half of the workforce seeing themselves as modern-day slaves trapped in the perpetual anxiety of time-constrained contracts that could be terminated at any point.

Contrastingly, more than half of the people in certain societies who are able to work are without any employment in some or other form – the best example thereof is South Africa with the deepest and widest chasm between the haves and the have-nots in the global context. The employment/unemployment trap has become the order of the day globally (Harman 1988:137-169).

The modernist dream, the American dream, has become unsustainable.

Not even 20 years ago many, if not most, people on this planet idolised the USA as the land of opportunities, wealth and of the property class. Most of the world was actually dreaming the American dream, except the Kremlin, the premier of the state council of the

7 I know there is a strong incentive to green energy in countries like Germany, but this doesn't come without any contradictions. In September of 2011, when I was in hospital for 16 days, one of my room mates was an engineering student at the University of Kassel. He was very outspoken about the contradictions hidden in the fact that Germany has decided to completely pull the plug on nuclear energy. He says the inevitable is that Germany will have to import electricity, and one of the places will be from the nuclear power stations being constructed on the boarder to Germany in Poland. Why are they being built on the boarder? Because they are intended to export electricity to Germany, according to him. On the other hand, is the move to green energy not exactly illustrating the cracks in the wall of modernism I'm arguing?

People's Republic of China, Kim Il-sung of North Korea, Fidel Castro, Saddam Hussein, and all other dictators, but many, if not the most, of their subjects though were dreaming the American dream⁸.

Sandra Kochan encapsulates the notion well: "But the American Dream has come to mean at a popular level. It is to go to the West and become a millionaire." (Kochan 2007). With our present realisation that modernism is only a pipe dream, no more real than the most virtual of virtualities, how do we carry forward the obligation to clean up the muddy mess? Some would say, and I tend to agree, that modernism is the number one culprit of the majority of our problems today (Said 1975). In short, that places modernism on par with the narrative of the Fall of Mankind (Genesis 3). We could ask ourselves whether such a direct linkage is not too far-fetched? I don't think so. I see the same idolatry and apostasy in both.

That said, take note, I'm saying this out of, or within, a suspected cognitive relativism, and so my judgement is not on what modernism was in times I have no access to. To be honest I'm proud to be of Huguenot descent, and even having a surname with a strong French ring to it. My problem with modernism is not 150 years ago, but today; not tomorrow, but today. Should the word "problem" be too modernist to your taste, let us call it the (absolute reductionist) ideology that's responsible for the dysfunctions today.

3. Wider theolosophy debate

⁸ I know putting America up on such a high pedestal is radical, but what is America? A (relativistic) reduction. In Peter Watson's impressive book *Ideas: A History of Thought and Invention, from Fire to Freud* he describes the birthplace and times of ideas (take note, referring to such a colossal work, I reject the implied German Idealistic and Dialectical Process (something I can't help); (my choice of words would have been rather something like the genesis of (abstract) knowledge or content that would have been more friendly to my thesis). One such an Idea he describes is Europe (Watson 2006:239). He doesn't refer to America as an Idea, but with this clue, and the many other Ideas he puts forward, I put forward the Idea of America, and particularly the post Second World War Idea, coming from the certainty of modernism in the ideological cold war, and how this Idea won the race (east block communism was originally rooted in the same certainty). The thing is that that was only for a brief time, since this Idea, America is rapidly loosing pace against a new competition, (a) new emerging Idea(s) that could maybe be called China and/or India (Winters 2007).

Now what's really the issue with modernism then? If I have to summarise modernism in one sentence I would say "modernism is the inventor of the individual", the apparent objective agent experiencing the world from outside the world. If I can summarise poststructuralism, and particularly deconstruction, that has done us the favour of exposing modernism's presuppositional illusion, I would say poststructuralism epitomises the death of the individual, since the death of the individual's presence is the death of the individual self. This portrays presence in modernist metaphysical terms, not in mine.

In the modern era Descartes' well-known phrase 'I think therefore I am' (Cogito ergo sum) (Descartes 1892:116) encapsulates the reductionist and individualistic character of the objective individual agent operating as historical absolute meaning-giver of what is really worthwhile in people's lives (Van Niekerk 2010:158-60).

In line with this strategy of modern theologians YAHWEH was equated with the position of an objective individual agent, doing all sorts of "lonely" (Lone Ranger) things, such as the creation of everything (what makes us evil then?), driving the historical and natural processes and guiding and intervening in people's everyday life. In short, that's fatalism, although they might deny it, or cover it up as good as possible. Saying that I don't defend Proses Theology either, as set forth by authors like Cobb and Griffin (Cobb 1976), since although they could successfully ditch fatalism, they still constrain YAHWEH to a time. Moreover, still in the strategies of modern theologians, humanity and the natural cosmic environment each in turn has been declared trans-human mega subjects or the objective individual agents by philosophers and scientists (Van Niekerk 2010:41-44).

Now if the individual does not exist, even postmodernism perishes in the seed of the modernist creed that somewhere along the line there should be an objective individual agent, driving all the processes of life. If the individual turns out to be unreal and/or a construction and/or a negotiation, modernism dissolves itself. Dissolving itself is the right terminology. In this sense poststructuralism is a modernist tool and a methodology boomeranging on itself by exposing the modernist dissolutive supposition of the individual. This in turn discloses the messy debris in the water trail we have to sift out.

At the backdrop of the modern scene poststructuralism and deconstructive philosophies, with all the fanfare with which they were announced as really the annunciation of the

postmodern era, are also part of the debris of modernity. If staying with poststructuralism would not take us to any conclusive conjecture, it would rather conjure up the absurd notion of recycling suicide. Poststructuralism, and deconstruction in particular, is nothing else than modernism that has committed suicide. So our task is to get past poststructuralism and deconstruction, but before that we'll first have to do a thorough autopsy on modernism and illustrate the cause of death of the objective individual agent - which I claim is the unreal individual. This autopsy will also entail a detective investigation where we have to re-enact part of the suicide poststructuralism performed with the tools of modernism.

To start with, it think it is fair to admit that in the toolbox of modernism, the master tool called poststructuralism, also has a presupposition which I intend to expose as the mother of all presuppositions in the modernist toolbox and would conclusively confirm the suicide of modernism. The presupposition is that all cognitive potentiality is confined to language. If you disagree with me it can actually be a sign that you have already stepped over the dividing line between modernity to postmodernity. Though this is only a presupposition of modernism in our doing of an autopsy and investigation of the death of modernism, we are left with no choice but to partly utilise this tool of modernism, this language presupposition, to conclude our postmortem examination "beyond doubt".

The place to start the postmortem is with the concept of metaphysics handed down from the classical Greek age. In short, the platonic dualism is the backdrop that cranked out this metaphysics. In the platonic dualism the world of ideas has all the blueprints of what is in the material world, and is the impetus behind the signifier and signified (De Saussure 1959:65-70). The mechanics of this metaphysics in which language only names things that are in the real world is the signifier blueprint itself. The signifier, blueprint, became the categories of Immanuel Kant (Kant 1984), around 2000 years later, and the setting for the modernist creed coined by Descartes "I (the signifier) think, therefore I am (the signified)" The presence of the I, in the signifier, is assumed out of the premises of the Platonic dualism. That the thinking can rather be part of the I am (signified) has not occurred to anyone until the dawn of deconstruction, although it would be fair to recognise the predecessors and co-creators paving the way in people like Heidegger (Heidegger 2001), Nietzsche (Nietzsche (n.d.)).

The modern individual mega objective agent as a reductionist absolute meaning-giver took on hundreds of forms such as in Luther and Calvin's 16th century main adage of 'I believe therefore I am', Newton's 17th century notion of 'I am embedded in causality of the one universe therefore I actually exist' and what is more scary of the late modern or postmodern project is that late modern philosophies and popular self-help books latch unawaresly on to the 20th century quantum mechanics paradigm by creating a mega individual objective agent which operates with the adage "I am encapsulated in a wavelike process therefore I exist as a photon one after the other along a series of photonlike points" (Clegg 2003:13-14; Van Niekerk 2010:156-169).

I guess the most obvious fallacy of the Platonic assumption is to think that there is a blueprint idea for everything observable in the material world⁹. This means that every new invention has already had a blueprint idea. This would mean that this tram we are sitting in right now has always been there in an idea blueprint. That is absurd to say the least.

Let us take this idea of a tram and from where trams originate? Let me first ask you, what is a tram? Am I wrong to assume that a picture of a tram comes to your mind; maybe a street car in San Francisco, or even a tram in Europe. From question to picture, or idea, I do not think it is too difficult to see how the Platonic illusion could originate from a blueprint

9 By solely tracing my arguments back to the Platonic dualism, and taking it exclusively from there, I'm not sidestepping the other big gun called Aristotle. No, just the contrary. I rather see the same dualism reincarnated in Aristotle, this time not a vertical dualism, with ideas above and matter below, but a horizontal dualism with ideas in us, and matter out there (again ideas and matter are not the same things, like oil and water). Anyway, I would contradict myself, should I give Plato individual status; no, he is rather an abstract incidence being encountered today – a resuscitated simulacrum. The abstract incidence Aristotle is a transmigration or renaissance of the abstract incidence Plato, where the perfect/ideal above is transmigrated into us/organisms, that is called essence, perfect essence. From ideas/essence to matter, in the abstract Aristotle event, it is not mirroring and mimetic per se, but processual, although the same dualism. Many forms into which this Platonic dualism has renaissance into rather mirrored Aristotle, but what is the difference; all are transmigrations from Plato? Examples are philosophical schools like Pragmatism where the inside and outside are not ideas or essence versus matter, but (perfect) theory inside versus the practical outside that should become intelligent/perfect practice. Another school is Phenomenology where consciousness is inside and experience outside, and so we can go on. Both these schools, to some degree, do feature in my dissertation, but, take note, in an analogical and cognitive differentiation.

concept of ideas that supersedes the material, especially in a world with not much technological advancement yet. But a blueprint for a tram? Is that realistic? A blueprint for every new cellphone on the market, or is it a camera, or is it rather an internet platform? I would not be surprised when a new cell phone would one day hit our markets where they will have forgotten to add the function to make an old-fashioned phone call on, or is it really that old yet that it could be designated old-fashioned?

So, what is a tram? Many will say it is a vehicle, running on rail tracks in an urban area, transporting people but rarely goods. You are right but exactly at this point the blueprint idea or concept of signifier and signified is being shattered. The tram is most certainly a sociological assibilation, and in deconstructional terms, an eruption from abstract concept to abstract concept, violating the presence of the previous abstract concept (Derrida 1977:112). The signifier, the individual, is lost in an infinite series of backward abstract concepts. Cognition is the ability to jump over the void (absence of presence) between these abstract concepts. This is being done in a constructed contrast of what something is not; it cannot be the same "presence" duplicated, for sanity to hold.

So what is the origin of trams? Semantically trams start with the Sanskrit word *Bharati*, which means *well maintained*. With a bit of imagination a leap could be made straight from these words *well maintained* to a tram, but that is not how it happened. The first eruption to cross over the void was from *well maintained* to *bear/carry*. What does *maintain* really have to do with *bear/carry*? Nothing, that is exactly the eruption, and the absence of *maintain* in *bear*. What comes before *well maintained*, I do not know, but whatever that is, some abstract concept has come before that, and an abstract concept before that, and an abstract concept before that,... From *bear* we have a number of eruptions, one of them is *born* and she *bears* a baby. Can you see anything of the signifier in *well maintained* in *born* or *bears* a baby? I cannot. Have you ever seen pregnant women; they do not always look that well maintained to me? Maybe one could still try to see something of the signifier in *bear/carry* from *well maintained* with a bit of imagination, but not in *born*.

The way to tram is, however, not even from *born* or *bear* a baby, but from *barrow* that also erupted out of *well maintained*. A *barrow*, the cart of a street vendor, which funny enough reminds me of India with all its street vendors taking us back to the Sanskrit origin, brings us closer to a tram. The thing is actually that tram only erupts from the *shaft of a barrow*,

not even the *barrow* itself¹⁰.

Adding to that now that we are at a tram, trams were not initially vehicles to transport people, but small vehicles transporting the ore from mines in Wales, pulled by horses. In 1807 the first tram started transporting people, hopefully not seen as ore taken like batteries¹¹ to the workplace to produce more surplus for the rich?

Today we have many tram networks all over Europe and other cities and countries. Although trams, sort of, fell out of favour in the 20th century, they are making a comeback within the consciousness of green technology at the start of the 21st century. The comeback, and social evolution, is naturally even a greater and bigger eruption from what preceded. Given the absence of the signifier, what Jean Baudrillard calls simulacrum is a simulation without an origin¹². Simulacra are orphaned simulated commodities in use by society as objects of trade in the power play of late capitalism (Baudrillard 1994:3).

The trade of simulacrum, the signified without a signifier, is the absence of truth and absolutes and consequently nihilism – the death of god. In modernism the signifier is god, the “I”, even when YAHWEH is apparently claimed as God, but our autopsy, however, discloses that this god of modernism is indeed dead since when there is no origin (no singularity of creation) it is suicide by proxy, because without a birthday the only other alternative is stillborn. Fortunately, YAHWEH is only cognitively dead in modernism, not in the proposed present virtual post- and pre-modernism.

4. Pertinent cultural reflection

So now I have to reason like a madman, a modernist man, to illustrate the power play of

10 The main source used to trace the origin(s) of this notion tram has been The Oxford Dictionary of English, for tram (Soanes 2003:1871), for barrow (Soanes 2003:133), for bear (Soanes 2003:142)

11 The word battery is used on purpose, and particularly with the Marxist connotation as depicted in the movie *The Matrix* (*The Matrix* 1999). The people plugged into the Matrix are batteries for the machines. In the book *The Matrix and Philosophy* Martin Danahay and David Rieder, in their essay *The Matrix, Marx, and the Coppertop's Life*, take up this theme and make the following statement “Under capitalism, the “commodity” that many workers sell to the companies and the factories for which they work is nothing more than their power” (Irwin 2002:219).

12 Simulacra is the map that precedes the territory (Baudrillard 1994:3), the signified the signifier, the *I am the I*.

these simulacrum commodities – the lack of truth and absolutes. What is truth? Give me any truth statement? Say, e.g. “Thou shalt not commit murder”! What about wars? What would have happened if the Nazis were not stopped in the Second World war? What if the Muslim Arabs were not stopped at the Battle of Tours? Nazis wouldn’t then have been a issue, but how would the Messianic Kingdom have fared in Europe today, or even in the world? You could further assert: “Commit killing when necessary”, but when is killing or murder for that matter necessary? Without a god or YAHWEH could you, while placing yourself above criticism, make such a judgement? No!

The muddy mess of capital punishment is a good example. Someone kills someone else on purpose. The one shouts for the death penalty to apparently protect the sanctity of life and protect the innocent as a deterrent, the other one shouts in no way should such a barbaric act of collective violence by the community be enacted. Collective killing of someone who committed a murder should be stopped since there are 'valid' reasons from the background of someone who committed a murder in the first place. Anyone with such a background would have had committed the murder. Guilt and innocence are blurring in rhetoric.

Rhetoric is precisely that which captures the power play of simulacrum commodities – simulations without a god or YAHWEH. To what extent was it pure rhetoric that convinced the people of the USA to go to war in Iraq a second time to displace Saddam Hussain? Was this ploy really based on truth or a Higher Authority?

I was living in England (England 2002) during the build up to this war and made some effort to follow the rhetoric on television and how the USA dragged the United Kingdom (UK) with them into the war. It was informative to experience the rhetorical differences between independent television stations. On any one given day one could see the news on four different and independent television stations in the UK, and stated the obvious of who the clientèle of each station was, on the left or the right side of the political spectrum. Soaking in the rhetoric on one station made me shout “Go to war guys, can't you see the axes of evil”, but right after that the rhetoric of the next station changed my mind “No way guys, we can't just go to war on such flimsy evidence.”

To add to that, when the war at last did break out the whole war only took place on our

televisions, since it was still only the rhetoric of the media that assembled the stories they wanted us to make believe. Did you not know that the news is only a commodity that the media sells for a profit? Stephen Lacy asks the question “Are Media Corporations Lowering the Quality of Democratic Discourse by Making Excessive Profit?” (Harper 2003:133-6). There is no easy answer to such a question, since it's not just about the news, but rather what news gets priority, and then how (rhetorically) the news is being brought across. Stephen Lacy talks about the marketplace of ideas (to be sold at a profit though), and states that the economist will readily point out the “... consumer surplus...” (Harper 2003:133-6) by the media corporations.

Is the news about truth or facts, or rather about power? Okay, I admit not always, but how shall we know the difference? Which is worse, not knowing the difference, or knowing that money, or the lust for money, makes news?

Closer to home, is the recent pandemic outbreak of the H1N1 virus, that lined the pockets of the pharmaceutical companies in Germany, not the same stunt. Pandemic? When I heard the word the first time in connection with the H1N1 virus I just knew it was rhetoric, a power play, a way to make money. If not in other countries, certainly in Germany. Some states in Germany bought stockpiles, worth millions of Euros, of vaccines for an influenza less dangerous than a seasonal flu, but the worst of it all, when the pandemic was lifted the same states dumped the stockpiles on developing countries. Anyway that was what was reported on German television (Plusminus 2010). One cardiologist (Nserat 2009) even tried to force the vaccine on to me, but when I asked him if he had taken it himself he admitted he had not, and when I ask if he would still do it he said no. Hypocrite, but at least not a liar!

So we can go on, give me any moral or truth statement, or even a fact statement, and a counter argument can be voiced. True modernism, in the real sense of no authority or origin, has truly illustrated that modernism is nihilism, which can only lead to hedonism - “Let us eat and drink and steal and murder and party, and enjoy life, tomorrow we die”. It is funny, post-modernism is always accused of moral relativity, as if post-modernism is the antecedent of moral relativity, but it is right the opposite; moral relativity is rather the unwanted child of modernism. It is the child modernism does not want to talk about, and so rather transfers the blame to post-modernism, which, rather than denying the obvious,

made peace with (a) relativity.

This, however, still does not make our autopsy conclusive, we still need to clarify precisely how cognition takes place, and the eruption, from one abstract concept to the other and how cognition works in general. Until now we have liberally used the notion of concepts, but that is rather ambiguous since concepts might appear to have preceded language with language only naming them. That is not the case, concepts are rather metaphors, language pictures with semantics.

I want to challenge you to think of something that you do not have a word for. Can you do that? Maybe you can think of something that does not really exist, but would it be something that you cannot use words to describe? Am I right to conclude that you cannot think of anything outside your language? I know, when the first European ships reached South Africa a few hundred years ago, black Africans would not have had words for these new contraptions on the water, but I am convinced they could not think of these ships apart from something they already knew and had words for. Maybe they saw them as big logs/trees drifting on the water; maybe even as fish. Anyway, as something new, I agree, but metaphorically depicted from known metaphors.

Ludwig Wittgenstein (Wittgenstein 1958:134-135) drives this point home with colours. I want to reason along these lines and ask you how many different colours you can write down on a piece of paper. White, blue, pink, purple, orange. How many? Six, seven, maybe even eight. Look at your surroundings, how many of these colours can you point out and identify on the items or objects you see? Maybe the walls are white, the carpet brown and the windows covered with red curtains. Make a mental image of this room and now go to a real paint store; one of those stores with these little colour cards one can take home to match the exact right colour for them to mix the colour you want. Would you be able to identify the exact right colour on these cards that match the colours of the room you made a mental image of, that's now without taking them back to this room and physically matching them? I am not so sure, except if you have had a lot of training in paintings and colours.

What is the lesson to learn? Pink looks like pink to me, it is only by taking these cards that an array of pinks open up to me; light pink, baby pink, bright pink, brink pink, candy pink,

etc. Cognitively I am bound to see the whole array of pinks only as pink, except with training or a lot of experience, and then it still won't be easy, if ever, to match these cards purely from memory. Cognitively I am confined to basic colours and I see everything in these colours, and I am convinced you would not do much different.

The same mental manoeuvre can be performed with fonts like *Arial*, *Times New Roman*, *Verdana*, *Adobe Jenson*, *Clarendon*, *Plantin Schoolbook*, *Literaturnaya*, etc. How many of these fonts would you spontaneously recognise? Be honest! The thing is when two people's handwriting is not the same, then there is actually as many fonts in the world as people, plus all these digital fonts, etc.¹³

To fonts and colours we can also add smells and perfumes? *Eau de Lubin*, *Lavender*, *Pot Pourri*, *Hammam Bouquet*, *Narcisse Noir*, etc.

So what draws these cognitive boundaries? That is the question we want to come to. For that I want to pick your brain a bit more. I want you to imagine that I am an alien out of space that miraculously speaks English, but does not really know things on earth. Somehow I see the word cat written on a piece of paper and so I ask you to tell me what a cat is. How will you go about telling me what a cat is? You can spill the beans and tell me the biological name of most cats around, *Felis catus*, but that would mean nothing to me just as it would mean nothing to your daughter when she sees a *Felis bieti* in China and thinks it is a cat, like one back home, and you correct her that it isn't actually a *Felis catus*.

No, the biological name will bring me nowhere closer to what a cat is.

So how will you go about telling me what a cat is? You can tell me that a cat has hair, but when I look out the window and see a dog and say, "Wow, I see a cat over there" would I be right? No. You can tell me that a cat can extract its nails for a hunt or for climbing a

¹³ I actually made a font of my handwriting to be used in this hologram, since this is also the definition of a hologram, but my scribbling is so aesthetically dubious, and would have almost doubled the length of my dissertation, that I decided to leave it. Anyway this new font then had to be installed on my supervisor's computer, and I didn't want to get into that. In a pdf it can be embedded, but I use LibreOffice typing this dissertation and he uses MS-Word. The intention was to embed a diversified DNA from the whole, since it has to be eligible letters I use, into the Virtual Reality – HyperReality. The incompatibility between my supervisor's computer and mine illustrates something of the cognitive relativism I'm suspecting.

tree, but do leopards not do the same? You can tell me that cats have split pupils, anyway during day time, but what about snakes that also have split pupils? You can tell me that a cat makes a meow sound, but have you ever heard an *Enhydra lutris* mum, known as a sea otter mum? It goes without saying that if you tell me a cat is small or has a tail or is a carnivore, it wouldn't help me in any way in my pursuit to know what a cat is. There are just too many animals, small animals with tails eating meat.

No, I don't think there is a way you would be able to tell me what a cat is by listing attributes of the cat specie; actually not even the sum of the attributes of a cat would tell me what a cat is. What about the specie called *Manx* cats which have no tails, or domestic cats that learnt to eat vegetarian? Then there is the *Donskoy* breed of cats without hair, and not to even mention mutilated cats with maybe only having three legs and/or one eye and/or only one ear. What about a cat being hit by a car so that just enough is left to recognise it as a cat; will the cat stop being a cat?

If you say to me that a cat has blood, and is actually a homoeothermic animal, a warm-blooded animal, what about my daughter's toy cat on my desk right now? Now we can really run with our imaginations of what a cat can be. My daughter's toy cat is pink, have you ever seen a natural pink cat in nature? This cat doesn't even have split pupils and also no tail, and not even claw nails. Is it really a cat according to cat-like attributes? It's not even a vegetarian, actually it eats nothing as far as I've noticed, but it is a cat. My daughter would fight for life and death to confirm that.

So what is a cat then? Easy, a cat is what it is not, anyway for my daughter who knows nothing about the biological and genetic make-up of different species. Cognitively a cat is just what it is not, that is the only way you can tell me what a cat is. A cat is not a dog, a cat is not a cow, a cat is not a lion, a cat is not a snake, a cat is not a human being, etc.

But now you will say, "What about the genetic make-up of a cat?" That is actually the point, each cat has its own DNA profile so you can't say two cats are the same thing based on DNA, except maybe for identical twins, but even that is not completely true as we'll see in the next few days. Sorry to say, no one constructs a cat, and the cat specie, on the DNA make up of cats, otherwise this toy cat is indeed not a cat. No one knew anything about genes until recently, anyway not before the First World War.

We can even still look at it from another angle, every single cat in the world is unique and so we can completely discard the category cat because the category cat is anyway just an abstract construction/reduction to actually group unique things together. This way we can give every single cat in the world a unique name, but not a number, since then we cannot use this number again for something else.

Do you get the picture, we can't get away from the fact that this category cat is only an abstract category, since no attribute, or sum of attributes, can univocally classify this category; it is only a cognitive ploy to group unique things together on the account of relative observations, but when modernism denies anything else but the individual, the *I*, that is the apparent objective starting point, the poor cat is doomed for nihilism, no truth and no absolute, since the individual is absent - the individual has not invented language, only learnt to use it.

Like with colours, say I am still the alien from outer space for instance, and you tell me a cat (say blue) is an animal (a colour), and then I see a dog (say pink) and I ask you what that is and you tell me that's an animal (a colour), would it be wrong to think that a dog (pink) is a cat (blue), and pink's the same as blue? If you teach me that there are only two categories, human and animal, won't I see all animals as one and the same thing? How many lay people in the world would see the difference between a white and a black Rhino before being taught differently? No one.

Let us still stay with the two categories, human and animal, would I, as this alien, then differentiate between races in Europe or in Africa? Is that not exactly the typical misconception that White-people in Europe see all Black-people in Africa as the same, and Black-people in Africa see all White-people in Europe the same, and both whites and blacks the Asians as the same?

So this brings us to the million dollar question, "When is a metaphor born?" This is now in modernist terms. The answer is, "When presence terminates!" (Derrida 1977:43-7).

The most tangible way I can explain this is with identity. Say my wife, that is a German, grew up in a little village on the country side of Germany, with no television or even a radio and no transport to leave the town. Say her mother told her, her whole life that she is German and that there were other people in the world that are not Germans, would that

have meant anything to her? No, nothing. This metaphor, German would be a dead/unborn metaphor as long as she only hushed and buzzed with other Germans everyday. But then one day they get a visit from China, and for the first time my wife saw someone who didn't look like her or the people she mixed with everyday. At first she might think nothing of it, but the moment her mother told her that this person was not a German, but a Chinese, right that moment the metaphor German and the metaphor non-German, in this case Chinese, would be born. The metaphor non-German would really be the eruption, and the loss of presence, since my wife is not Chinese. In principle Chinese would be eradicated from my wife. My wife would somehow not be present by proxy in the new metaphor anymore.

Is this not the issue behind culture shock? In the clash between cultures the absence of presence is so evident that it leads to a shock. Culture shock usually takes place when someone is totally immersed in a new culture; a culture with completely different constructed metaphors, we call meaning in symbolism, so that the lack of presence leads to insularity.

These constructed metaphors are mostly not necessarily physical abstracted things of life, but are rather metaphors of life, as argued by George Lakoff and Mark Johnson in their ground breaking book, *Metaphors we Live By*, when they say,

We have found... that metaphor is pervasive in everyday life, not just in language but in thought and action. Our ordinary conceptual system, in terms of which we both think and act, is fundamentally metaphorical in nature... If we are right..., then the way we think, what we experience, and what we do every day is very much a matter of metaphor.

But our conceptual system is not something we are normally aware off. (Lakoff 1980:3)

Metaphors of life can manifest in things like, e.g., Germans that see everything in black or white, right or wrong. This is the reason why Germans like rules; this is the reason why, what we call customer service does not exist in Germany. In the place of customer service Germans only refer people to the rulebook. This was my culture shock when I came to live in Germany, and only made peace with it when I learnt to first enquire about the rules before undertaking anything. The thing that makes me wonder is that these rules are metaphors themselves, and are not open for debate – is it not what we do in customer

service? On the other hand, I guess, it is the use of the black and white metaphor that made Germany so efficient.

The / in my culture shock is not the individual, but the metaphors that I have learnt in my home country being forcefully pushed out by other metaphors in Germany that led to insularity at first. Actually the real first insularity already came when I first wanted to move to Europe, to England to be exact. My first visit to England, to a little church that was interested in me as their pastor, was the biggest culture shock I could ever imagine (Cramlington 2001). The small and dirty houses, the people, the language I could not really understand, led to a total detachment, a total absence. It is funny, it was during this first visit to England that I learnt that I am a South African, even when I had lived in a country for 30 years with 11 official languages, and actually a whole spectrum of cultures.

So, to come back to our autopsy, if things/metaphors only come into existence through what they are not, and those things/metaphors only come into existence by what they are not, and they only come into existence by what they are not, and that going back infinitely, what then exists? This is exactly where modernism lost the plot in the categories based on what they are not. Nietzsche said: "The faith in the categories of reason is the cause of nihilism." (Nietzsche 1885-6). Categories in modernism are like watertight compartments, like the planets and stars far removed from each other over vast empty spaces (anyway in the classical view of the cosmos), defined by what they are not. Defining something by what it's not, and not by what it is, could even be noticed by a child as a deficit in logic.

5. Biblical narratives as string succession

It is exactly at this point where my turn to postmodern necessitated; where I got disillusioned in these apparent categories by what they are not. The one says a Messianic follower should not drink alcohol, the other one says a Messianic follower may; the one says a Messianic follower may dance, the other one says a Messianic follower should not. Everyone defines *Israelism* on a list of attributes, or the sum of attributes, but never notice the inconsistency of this categorical definition of what entitles Israel with that of gentiles. When I look at these lists of attributes, or even the sum of attributes, I see exactly the same mix between gentiles, but why are they not Israel and why are they so unfortunate to go to hell when some of them are actually far better people than many of these Messianic

followers?

Now you say the problem is that they do not believe in YAHWEH and Yeshua the Messiah and the atonement, etc.? Is this the key attribute of the category called Israel? What then of the Indian - should one still exist - that still runs around nearly naked in the Amazon jungle? Will he or she go to hell at death? Now you start with theology and tell me that YAHWEH can't keep him or her accountable for his or her sins, because of ignorance, and so he or she will go to heaven. To me this sounds more like rhetoric, and actually justifies the notion not to bring the gospel to this Indian, then at least you know he or she goes to heaven. What if you bring the gospel and he or she rejects it, then the poor Indian goes to hell in any case?

When salvation hinges on faith, don't the Scriptures tell us that even the devil believes (James 2:19), and gosh does the devil believe, since after he first witnessed Yeshua's atonement work on the cross, coupled with the resurrection, he still zealously turned on Yeshua's followers as we read in the Scriptures that

“the dragon (called the devil) was really angry over the woman and went off to fight the rest of her children, those who obey YAHWEH's mitzvot and bear witness to Yeshua.” (Revelation 12:17).

Now I know that, every reputable theologian “worth his or her salt” will have ready made answers for all of these arguments, but that exactly proves the point. It's all rhetoric as the one contradicts the other, they both can still have watertight models. How is that possible?

The Trinity; how do you want me to understand the Trinity in view of these categories? If Yeshua is Yeshua, because Yeshua is not the Father or the Holy Spirit who is also not Yeshua or the Father, but Yeshua is also YAHWEH, just like the Father and the Holy Spirit, although there is really only One YAHWEH, how do you bring all of this together? With modernist tools it is just not possible, but that is exactly where my difficulties emerge when the same fundamentalists, that construct meaning in their whole enigma with modernist tools, tell me faith has to take over where rationality terminates. How do they know where rationality stops and something else has to take over? If the whole modernist paradigm of fundamentalism is constructed and maintained in these modernist categories of difference, faith then rather appears to me as an apparent magic balm, as a

psychological trick on oneself, to keep sanity¹⁴.

This trick rather appears as the flaw of modernism disguised. Is that not precisely why so many people have a problem with YAHWEH and his followers when these fundamentalists think other people are so stupid to not notice faith as an invented category to cover up irrationality?¹⁵

To come back to the Trinity, you really have to be stupid, in terms of these modernist categories of difference, to think Yeshua and the Father are one and the same ontological entity, when Yeshua in the garden of Gethsemane asked the Father to take the cup of suffering away from Him, but not according to his will, but that of the Father. How can they have different wills if they are ontologically one and the same? The rabbit hole is so evident that some have even gone as far as to completely exchange the ontological Trinity with the economic Trinity; but is that not just again another rhetorical gimmick of modernism? Do not understand me wrong, I am not saying that I'm not convinced about Yeshua's divinity, since he's in

“...the likeness of the invisible YAHWEH, the firstborn, the heir of all creation, because in him all things were created in heaven and on earth, the visible and the unseen,... and he's before all things, and he holds everything together.” (Colossians 1:15-17),

as well as the Holy Spirit's divinity, but why does it have to be in these categories?

Another good example of what modernism did with the church is the self-definition of denominations. What is a baptist? A baptist is not an Anglican or a Roman Catholic or a

14 Take notice I'm not demonising faith per se, although I actually don't want to use this word due to the baggage, but I'm rather demonising modernist's faith in the watertight categories defined by what they are not.

15 Isn't modernist faith being used to cover up a similar irrationality why phenomena of suffering are so random and no respecter of the person, and why suffering hits the one left, right and centre, while bypassing the other irrespective of their standings before YAHWEH? Randy Alcorn says “The problem of evil [and random suffering] is atheism's cornerstone... Atheists write page after page about evil and suffering. The problem of evil never strays far from their view; it intrudes upon chapters with vastly different subjects. It's one of the central reasons Sam Harris writes, “Atheism is not a philosophy; it is not even a view of the world; it is simply an admission of the obvious.”” (Alcorn 2009:23)

Methodist, etc. What is an Anglican? Not a baptist, or a Lutheran, or a ..., etc. Why don't I really see a big difference between the most of these; that is now where it really matters, in the day-to-day life of making an existence? Simply because when each denomination defines itself with an abstract body of theology, which only boils down to what their members are not, what does it contribute to life? Instead, in 'real' life, outside this abstract category, each member rather needs to identify with people, and not think what they are not as opposed to others, to get work done, to live life. Denominationalism is exactly what drives people away from church. Is it not just nihilism?

Controversies between doctrines are only unresolvable rhetorical self-definitions. Every answer attempting to solve a controversy in an opposing view in things like baptism, the Lord's supper, eschatology, the Sabbath, etc., only probes the next question which endlessly drags the issue deeper into the self-refuting spiral of rhetoric. Many times I wonder, "What does YAHWEH really think of these issues? Doesn't YAHWEH have a say?" Isn't YAHWEH, YAHWEH that He's allowed to think what He wants and even be dynamic, like every person I know, and also negotiate His own will with Himself?

Is YAHWEH really caught up in the Newtonian deterministic worldview of cause-and-effect so that theologians can mathematically determine YAHWEH's next move in each action like billiard balls on a billiard board? Or can theologians even dynamically pattern the complexity of YAHWEH's dynamic actions and behaviour like a kangaroo on a trampoline in terms of the second wave approach of quantum physics (Heisenberg 1927; Bohr 1928 and 1935; Schrödinger 1944). Do theologians really think they can strip YAHWEH of free will and understand Him scientifically like science attempts to do with either the Newtonian universe or even mix the Newtonian with the dynamic quantum physical Bohrian nano universes of particles in and around us? Is YAHWEH really so static and predetermined that a set of mathematically equations could capture Him?

If we could do that to YAHWEH, YAHWEH could just as well have been dead, since the equations of causality as well as latter day indeterminist patterns are then YAHWEH and since theologians can understand the static equations and the dynamic patterns, theologians can play the role of YAHWEH. YAHWEH would not be necessary anymore, and theologians and scientists could be the magi working the equations and the patterns.

To summarise our arguments so far: Modernism's trajectory of defining things by what they are not is exactly the downfall of modernism. The problem comes from the Platonic dualism, where the world of ideas is the signifier and the material world the signified and both are fixed (eternal in Hegel's Being) entities; in this static worldview language only names real things that exist in the world. The creed of modernism became Descartes 17th century words "I think therefore I am" where the *I* is the signifier and the *I am* the signified. The error was to attach the *think* to the *I* that *think* and not to the *I am* that *think*, in short the error was that we think language and not language us.

We must be aware however that language, biology and quantum physical patterns in the 20th century took over Descartes' statement in a slightly changed but still highly modernist way. Where the 17th and 18th century espoused the grip of the Cartesian-Newtonian constructed systems of rational causality, the 19th and 20th century reduced the 'I think therefore I am' to a new series of reductionist currencies. They include currencies such as 'I speak therefore I am' (early Wittgenstein), 'I evolve therefore I am' (Gould and Dawkins) and 'I being a wavelike process therefore exist as an I series of photons' (Bohr and Heisenberg).

Poststructuralism, starting with Nietzsche, did us the favour of showing us that the *think* is rather the rationality of the signified (rationality is in the language) and not of the signifier (the one who only learns the language); the signifier is absent, or has never been there. This is nihilism – a world that only has the signified, categories, simulacrum, with no god that gives them real/fixed meaning.

My turn to post-modernism has been inspired by the futile searching for YAHWEH in the Newtonian worldview¹⁶. Actually YAHWEH is dead, or just has never been there, in the

16 If I'm stoning/deconstructing the abstract Newtonian worldview, both with quantum mechanics but also with the metaphysics quantum mechanics enabled, a valid question is if this deconstructing is not just another reductionist mechanical scheme that can be deconstructed? First of all, is a no reductionist system possible in the cognitive relativistic balloon of those that recognise all for its reductionist systems by using e.g. poststructuralist methodology (if all are reductionism, then all are reductionism)? So by deconstructing the abstract Newtonian worldview to the minimum part of causality, and the billiard board metaphor where things are what they are not, I had to think hard and long what my reductionist system could be in the eyes of a deconstruction, and what they would get to in peeling off the layers; and the only answer I

Newtonian mathematical predetermined worldview. In being fair to the person Newton¹⁷ I have to ask a follow-up question whether in the 20th century indeterminist quantum physicalist worldview if YAHWEH will still be alive or dead or just again will never be there when physics is an instance of metaphysics, that can be just as atheistic as any other metaphysics, even with currently right maths.

The operation of modern self-destruction happens conclusively every time that YAHWEH

could come to is a nonlocal presence; my minimum value, minimum unit, is presence - an all-embracing presence, or rather a presence at all possible places – the diversified of all. Now this is exactly the point where I'm both friends and foes with poststructuralism, since I find their deconstruction compelling, and convincing, but the absence of presence they apparently prove in this demolishing process is where we part ways. (Another word poststructuralism uses, capturing the same thread, that I find very useful is simulacrum: the absence of a genesis simulation (Baudrillard 1994), which I utilise and tweak to a simulation by putting presence back into it). For me the minimum part is YAHWEH with us in a type of a panentheism/information(ing) – information(ing) is not singular or plural, or singular and plural. So, although poststructuralism is appealing to me, we have to part ways in the tradition of thoughts and physics we are in, together our respective metaphysics. Quantum mechanics, and its philosophical schools, like Buddhism and ubuntu (and many others I don't adhere to), could more convincingly do that, although the aim is rather a Hebrew cognition, or let us say my virtual Hebrew cognition. In these schools reductionism won't actually take one to presence, since that is not the minimum part/unit. Presence is rather the all embracing part. In terms of these schools reductionism is turned around (for me the radical inductive): not everything reduced to something, like presence or some other unit, but presence diversified to unique all-s. The thing is that quantum mechanics is still an enigma, a riddle, a mystery, and although it can be shown in laboratories, it can't be explained beyond the maths without turning to metaphysics. This enigma is exactly what makes quantum mechanics postmodern to me (even when mysticism has high-jacked it), and it might be, when the day comes that this enigma is solved, that quantum mechanics can't comprehensively serve my purpose anymore, since then it might just prove to be a dream. How can I, or any other person, know it's not just a late 20th century and early 21st century dream we're currently in? That's now until we awaken from it.

17 My attack is not on the person Newton per se. Actually I can understand why Newton rejected the doctrine on the Trinity in his day, and therefore dodged ordination in the Anglican church that used to be a prerequisite for Cambridge professors (Cropper 2001:21), since the doctrine on the Trinity wasn't compatible with his causality and the billiard board metaphor as I've indicated. One wonders if Newton would have been an atheist should he have lived after (macro) evolution could take YAHWEH out of the equation; on the other hand, the fact that he was an alchemist

is reduced to a modern constructivist currency such as that of rationality and thought (Descartes; Newton), language and linguisticity (Wittgenstein; Gadamer), evolution and evolution (Gould; Dawkins) and even quantum mechanics if the enigma is quantized. These scientific constructions purports to be scientific in the face of how YAHWEH's presence is to be understood although YAHWEH is already declared dead in the beginning of the operational construction and pattern. Any judge would have thrown such a case out the court, how can any argument or accusation or statement be verified?

The direct outflow of the death of modernist's individual is the end of certainty. The mood of late modernism, at the break of the 20th century, was certainty and a certainty as we can't really imagine today. The words of the physics professor of the German Max Planck, the founder of quantum mechanics, illustrates this felony of modernism best when Philipp von Jolly discouraged Max Planck to pursue physics since, as he said, "In this field, almost everything is already discovered... All that remains is to fill a few holes" (Weir 2007:8). How has quantum mechanics not proven this notion wrong!

One outstanding example is the Wesleyan theological movement at the beginning of the 20th century, although I'm very proud to be in this tradition.¹⁸ At the turn of the century, the optimism of grace, the trademark of Wesleyanism, reached such a high pinnacle that sinless perfection was conceived. From this an evangelistic optimism was born reckoning that the whole world would be evangelised and converted in a matter of time, with America as the "Promised Land" (Quanstrom 2004:18). Mark Quanstrom says:

Perhaps no time in American history has there been such an unshakable and generally shared confidence in the future than there was at the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th centuries. Political progressive, social reformers, social "gospellers", evangelical idealists, and many Holiness people, while fundamentally disagreeing over the means to achieve the "golden age", all agreed that the millennium was approaching. While they certainly did not share the same vision concerning the nature of the coming "millennial kingdom", and while their philosophical and theological presuppositions were often times in conflict, they all agreed that with the right technique, program, effort, reform, or grace, America as the land of promise would be realised. (Quanstrom 2004:17)

O, and how did we not all dream with Americans! Don't make a mistake, the same

(Cropper 2001:27) argues a mystic and spiritualist side to his worldview.

18 I don't deny or intend to hide my dependent arising.

optimism was on the other side of the Atlantic. In liberalism, in continental Europe the goodness of humanity, under the right conditions with the right education, was accentuated, while on the other side of the Atlantic the goodness of humanity was embedded in the optimism of grace. The certainty was that there would be no wars in the 20th century, all illnesses would be terminated, all poverty would be eradicated, and heaven would at last come to earth.

O, how terribly have we not failed in, e.g., the bloodiest wars you can imagine. In the shattering of this certainty the rise of relativism is engraved: when there is no certainty there cannot be truth, and when there is no truth then all is relative. The god of modernism, the individual mega agent, has shown how cruel and wrong it can be in the 20th century, and because this god has been confused with thé God (YAHWEH), atheism and mysticism became the religion(s) of Europe today. With no god, truth can only be opinions.

This is now where postmodernism takes over.

Admittedly, no one has dared to say a word to us on the tram yet, but that is fine as we have enough on our plate. So in going up the slope from Am Weinberger, the snake turn into Kings Street is now ahead of us from Frankfurter Street, but should you be in a car you could continue on with Frankfurter street over the parking lot under Frederich's square. On the left you will see the Fridericianum Museum, Europe's first public museum, that by the end of the 19th century held one of the largest collections of watches and clocks in the world. Times have really changed since then, since we know today that these watches only measured imaginary time. But here I am running ahead of myself again.

If you turn right at the next traffic light, after Frederich's Square, a little winding road will take you down to the Fulda River and what is called the *Karlsaue* with the *Orangerie* Palace, the summer residence of the landgraves of old which today is a planetarium. The whole sovereign city-state of Monaco fits in the salient Karlsaue Park (Nortje 2005). Ironically the *Orangerie*, that originates from the Renaissance gardens, the notorious Italian Renaissance, finds itself opposite, what is called, the new downtown, constructed in a postmodern architectural style (Nortje 2007). No wonder postmodernism auspicated with architecture, people wanted homes. People wanted their souls and lives back, they wanted

to be able to uniquely express themselves again, not just with numbers and equations, but as interconnected people that long for dialogue - dependent arising as we'll come to see. The lonely ghosts in a body did not want to be a lonely individual anymore which could only know itself!

“So what is postmodernism to you?”, you might ask me at his point. To answer the question with currency would not do justice to postmodernism. Ask me this question later after all our discussions, after you have learnt to know me, after you have seen how I understand things, after you know where I come from. Ask me again after you have seen the holographic postmodern architecture of my academic autobiography.

Postmodernism is just a word, a word for the dawn of a new epoch. The epoch might even gain an altogether different name as it takes on shape in the generations to come, but might even have to wait for the dawn of the following epoch altogether since only hindsight is the right sight. In modernist terms, postmodernism is only what it is not, and at this point postmodernism is still more in the defining stages of what it is not than what it is by what it is not. To put it in different words, postmodernism is still more of a reaction against modernism than an epoch in its own right.

To use an example; if I think I had to move in with my parents again, as when I lived there as a boy, it will certainly take some effort getting accustomed again. When I was a boy I was still an extension of my parents' house, and their ways of doing things were my ways as well, or at least compatible. Today I'm living in my own house with my own family, and we have dependently been arising our own ways of doing things differently from our parents. Although I am a product of my parents' house, I am now also a product of a new house.

At this stage postmodernism is still like the newly weds that just moved into their own little apartment. Postmodernism does not really know yet exactly where it is heading and going to end up, but the underlining features are fairly evident, just like the newly weds that also don't know where they'll be in ten years, but some anticipations can be made based on the underlining characteristics, features, education and the uniqueness of the mix.

Postmodernism has to do with getting used to uncertainty, anyway the uncertainty of what modernism held as certain. Postmodernism has to make peace with relativity, anyway with

what modernism held as truths and facts. Modernism's uncertainty and relativity are the two sides of the same coin. The peace treaty with this uncertainty will feature in our discussions, and particularly in the language we'll use. I don't see a problem using words like 'I think so', 'I guess', 'maybe', etc., since I'm honest about the uncertainty of absolute scientific facts and truths. On the flip side I am not uncertain of the relationships I cherish, and therefore, while language is relationally owned, it is also dynamic.

Can my dissertation be postmodern? Clouded in uncertainty? Can the uncertainty be exactly the certainty needed for a doctor's degree? Is this not something new and worthy of a doctor's degree?

The thing is, postmodern epistemology is relational, and relative in the eyes of modernism, and so even when the content might be relative, the relationship itself is not. This is all because of the postmodern ontology of the new physics, quantum physics, and the interconnectedness in nonlocality. Although I know I have to ask myself whether the new physics is not maybe a late modern product, albeit an extremely dynamic reductionist one-sided constructive pattern of explanation. Am I evading the sucking power of the mighty modern mega subject of reductionism in replacing static with dynamic, concept with word, symbol and trace and isolated individual with relational connectedness?

6. Dozing off the session

OK, here we're back in Kings Square. See you this afternoon.

Chapter 2: Theolosophy's Hyp(ostasis)ochondria

“Metaphysical world. -- It is true, there could be a metaphysical world; the absolute possibility of it is hardly to be disputed. We behold all things through the human head and cannot cut off this head; while the question nonetheless remains what of the world would still be there if absolutely nothing with it, not to speak of letting happiness, salvation and life depend on the gossamer of such a possibility. -- For one could assert nothing at all of the metaphysical world except that it was a being-other; it would be a thing with negative qualities. -- Even if the existence of such a world were never so well demonstrated, it is certain that knowledge of it would be the most useless of all knowledge: more useless even than knowledge of the chemical composition of water must be to the sailor in danger of shipwreck.”
(Nietzsche 1878-9:1176-7)

1. Contextual embedding of session

It is now exactly 3:35 pm, and this seat at the door is the second best after the back bench. It has also more leg space than the normal rows. The only thing I don't like about these seats is the fact that every single time the tram door opens the cold air in winter fiercely rolls over one, and in the mornings that can quickly lead to a sudden cold. It's amazing what difference one meter more from the door does, and the fuller the tram the better.

Anyway beggars can't be choosers, I have to do something with my legs! One day in these normal benches can spoil my whole day with back pain and sore knees, so who said the physical is not connected to the emotional, or spiritual? The possible cold at the door will only spoil tomorrow, not today, so why should I worry about a cold tomorrow? That's a metaphysical question if you want one!

I know metaphysics is a thorny topic. When I was doing my MTh, I was tossed around between professors, and I think one of the issues one professor had, was the topic of metaphysics (Du Toit 2005). In his office one morning in 2005 he said I can't just use words out of context of the bigger academic world; he didn't particularly refer to metaphysics by name, but I was pretty sure that was what he meant. My next professor (Reimer 2005) said I should just completely leave the word metaphysics altogether¹⁹, but

¹⁹ I'm convinced he meant it for my good to actually try and help me avoid the muddy mess of metaphysics.

that I did not want to do, since I did not ever want to concede to modernism that gave up on the presence of YAHWEH, and thereby wholly embraced atheism. For professor Du Toit I wanted to ask if he had ever read Gilles Deleuze, who argues, as Clare Colebrook puts it,

“The ethics of thinking lies in the opposite direction of reducing difference to common forms; we think when we differentiate.” (Colebrook 2002:37).

This difference is not what the *concept* is not, but what it can become - the first example of this new mutation is difference itself.

Metaphysics can be bizarre, like the late modernist quote of Nietzsche we started our discussion with. It can be like the irrational trajectory of cancer, like the body that kills itself. In the same way modernist metaphysics led to the self-destruction of certainty through certainty. In principle we can say that modernism is a metaphysical short-circuit that turns out the lights on the Western, Graeco-Roman encumbered intelligentsia.

That is why those that despise postmodernism call postmodernism a wandering in darkness, but that is purely because they are sitting in darkness themselves, and think everyone else is also embraced by darkness. They are like someone who goes blind during the night, and thinks YAHWEH is doing a trick on us by putting out the sun, and assumes no one else can see anything either. Like an antediluvian living in the past, modernists despise postmodernism that points out the fact that they are actually blind.

Having said this, I know I have to be very wary of what I'm saying at this point, and again admit my suspected cognitive relativism. I am, even paradoxically, aware that YAHWEH is not bound to be more friendly towards postmodern metaphysical schemes and tools because I/we think so. My predilection for some postmodernists with all their breaking, fragmentising, momentalising and dynamising of all the mega reductionist ambiences and all the big individual subjects of modernity cannot be carried over and placed in the hands of YAHWEH just like that. YAHWEH is YAHWEH present in this context of what we are dealing with at this moment. Not a word could be added. The metaphysical fragments and moments of light that seep and creep through the darkness in the postmodern dynamic environment are immensely helpful in the ongoing holographic event-shape of this dissertation.

Deconstruction rightly cast the verdict on modernists' self-destructed metaphysics as we have discussed this morning, but reaches its limit in no attempt to come up with an alternative metaphysics - no metaphysics is their metaphysics. Others like Paul Ricœur (Simms 2003:51), George Lakoff and Mark Johnson assert apriori, the flesh, which is legibly captured in George Lakoff and Mark Johnson's book called *Philosophy in the flesh: the embodied mind and its challenge to Western thought* (Lakoff 1999)

Their effort to escape the Graeco-Roman dualism, the vascular system of modernism, is praiseworthy, and therefore has a place in my worldview, but raises the question "If they attempt to precede a priori modernist metaphysics, aren't they just doing more metaphysics?" Actually I think they might just agree though, since we cannot escape metaphysics and still stay sane, or make sense, and get a doctor's degree, or even go to heaven?

2. Wider theolosophy debate

So let us start at the beginning: What is metaphysics? A simple but all-embracing answer is, "Metaphysics precedes physics, and so inscribes the meaning of physics". Metaphysics precedes the physical and material world around us, and produces, in some respects, the physical and material world around us, since without meaning physics has no cognition (except if you really do opt for nihilism). So the understanding of metaphysics can't be without an understanding of the physical world around us, and this is precisely the point where modernism got derailed.

Since the birth of philosophical metaphysics, in the classical Greek age, the nature of the physical world was assumed in overt Newtonian terms. In short, time and space were invariable constants with matter as independent self-existing particles, or assemblies of particles, interacting with other independent self-existing particles, or assemblies, on the law of cause-and-effect. Obviously the full-fleshed Newtonian worldview only came about in the times of Isaac Newton, but the seed of this worldview was intrinsic in all worldviews before Isaac Newton.

Embedded in the platonic heritage (which preceded Plato in praxis) the metaphysics is the eternal, constant, world of ideas, which became the ghost in the machine (Ryle 2009:5) in the modernist epoch, "I think, apart from my body, and therefore I can observe and

scrutinise my body, and therefore I am” as we saw this morning. The platonic heritage is the assumption that we can objectively scrutinise the other part of the eternal dualism, the material, the physical. William Temple refers to this Descartes abstraction as “... the most disastrous moment in the history of Europe” (Temple 1940:57).

Just to draw your attention to something in passing, I just used ghost in the machine for the 20th century phase coming from Ryle, but I prefer ghost in the body as a tweaked version to preserve something of the dual, but separate, biological part this notion depicts.

Back to metaphysics, this is where I have to compliment Paul Ricœur, George Lakoff and Mark Johnson for turning things around in saying that the body comes first, and then the ‘I’ that thinks. Unfortunately I still don't see them escaping the Newtonian worldview with its illusionary physics, and inevitable modernist metaphysics, although they're on the right track, and to be taken seriously.

One does not have to be bright to know that when something is wrong with modernist's physics, something would be wrong with modernist metaphysics, and is the place to look for the cracks in the wall. Before Galileo (Rosenblum 2006:23) we could have quarantined ourselves in the idealistic, in the true sense of the word, domains of philosophy and theology, without any outside defiance, since the metaphor *experiment* was not born yet. Now it is not possible anymore. Today we are obligated to probe the physical to get to the metaphysical. Is it not like that for us today that any attempt at getting at the metaphysical demands an understanding of that of which the metaphysics is expressive of?

So let us start with our physical discussion. This morning I pointed out that quantum mechanics started with the German Max Planck. His physics' professor discouraged him to pursue physics, since, according to him, physics was only tying up the last few knots and there was nothing important left to discover (Kumar 2010:8). As we said, this was the endemic certainty of modernism that soon came to an end.

In physics the Newtonian worldview of gravity, motion, and the cause-and-effect of independent and self-existing particles, or groups of particles, came to an end. The best example of this dismissed worldview is the billiard board; every ball exists independent of the other balls, but causality determines the motion of each ball at impact. In short the trajectory of each ball can be mathematically determined from the first instance of energy

on the cue ball, and how the cue ball impacts other balls, and these balls others. The only other energy at play is gravity when a ball is pocketed. The analogy is that mathematics, the metaphysical, can understand the whole billiard board, and determine the outcome of all trajectory paths. In this worldview there are no secrets anymore.

Starting with Max Planck, the Nobel price winner in physics; in less than a century quantum mechanics shattered the far reaching certainty of Newtonian physics, and in turn the modernist philosophers and theologians, and to such an extent that physicists themselves are dumbfounded how quantum mechanics really add up today. I would like to call quantum physics postmodern physics.

The moment these words had been written down I could see my supervisor's smile looming up in my imagination, attesting to his approach of viewing postmodern worldviews as late modern champions of reductionist mega subjects. Though they are slightly different than high modernity, according to him, they still are attempts of postponing the deathbed of modernity while staving off the era of multiversity that is dawning upon us and which he sees all around us. The three mega subjective reductionist champions of the 20th century according to him are the quantum physics physicalist second wave approach (Heisenberg 1927; Bohr 1928 and 1935; Schrödinger 1944), the bio-organic evolutionary approaches (Gould 1999; Dawkins 2006; Ramachandran 2011) and the metaphorical lingual and narrational stories approach (Langer 1941; early Wittgenstein 1922; Eco 1984) (Van Niekerk 2010:156-169).

I however, in spite of arguments to the contrary, rather find quantum physics useful and fitting to the postmodern metaphysics I propose, and therefore still would like to call quantum physics postmodern physics.

So what was the first breakthrough? The turning of tides? Easy, Max Planck discovered quantum particles in 1900, which are little small pockets of energy. From this Albert Einstein postulated, in 1905, that light is a finite number of "energy quanta", later dubbed "photons", that are localised points in space. At this point no one has yet given up on the idea that matter, or let us say a particle, is localised in space and time, however, in 1924 Louis de Broglie put forward the idea that matter exhibits wave characteristics.

In 1925 the second generation quantum mechanics were born in the laboratories of Max

Born and Werner Heisenberg, simultaneously with Erwin Schrödinger, who invented wave mechanics. In 1927 Werner Heisenberg presented the uncertainty principle that argues that the velocity and position of a particle can't both be known; when the velocity of a particle is measured the position becomes unpredictable, and vice versa, when the position is measured the velocity becomes unpredictable.

From this followed the Copenhagen interpretation, and the quantum enigma that point-blank challenges our metaphysical interpretation. The enigma that gave rise to the Copenhagen interpretation has been verified many times over in the span of eight decades in different laboratories, and is an incontestable fact held by all scientists today, although the Copenhagen interpretation itself has been replaced by other interpretations. Mostly engineers, physicists, chemists, mathematicians, etc., although utilising the enigma, are told to "Shut up and do the maths" (Kindgen ca.2009) since the enigma is what the word means, a perplexity.

On the other hand, as a postmodern theologian I would like to dare such a move, and that because of three reasons:

1. One, since Elohim created the world *Ex Nihilo*²⁰,
2. Secondly also because both theology and philosophy are speculative disciplines²¹,

²⁰ Maybe a hallow statement of trust in the origin of the cosmos and all living beings, but what else shall I use? Or why use something else? In the Newtonian linear time using such a term would be to step into the three-tier or levels of the stationary earth as the midpoint of the universe geocentric era trap, but in the quantum implosion of time not. I can't exchange *Ex Nihilo* with *Creatio Ex Continua*, since the intersection of times can be for a time a zero instance, and then there is no continuation. On the other hand a zero instance can be *Ex Nihilo* and *Ex Nihilo* a zero instance of real time on a imaginary timeline of *Creation Ex Continue*, or vice versa.

²¹ At the break of the 20th century the fundamentalist, and much of the evangelical branch of theology were so steeped in certainty that nothing was left for speculation. Something like Max Planck's professor who saw no room for development left in physics, and so he couldn't speculate past his certainty. Jürgen Kramer (Kramer 2010) told me that when they as a family left for the States to study at a Bible college in Kansas City, the first words of the theological professor, on the first day of class, were exactly arguing the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures: YAHWEH, that dictated the Scriptures from heaven. How un-ubuntuing with Newtonian causality? That just rips the sting out of any possible speculations/discoveries/challenges. For Jürgen Kramer, a Ph.D. philosopher, that was enough so he quit the college even before he

3. Thirdly, the enigma is busy changing our world. Examples are bountiful in things like MRI scanners, possible quantum computers that will be exponentially faster than the fastest computers we have today, but most of all the billions of microchips spread over every imaginable contraption we have today and only illustrates the fact that we can't do without quantum mechanics anymore. To this list lasers can also be added.

Quantum mechanics will continue to shape our world to unrecognisable proportions in the future, and therefore necessitates the obligation to ask the Theo-Logos question, and the moral significance behind such a revamping of the world? What does YAHWEH relationally think of it all?

Moreover, are my detractors not correct that with the last two questions that I unwittingly connect quantum mechanics and YAHWEH in a typical modernist theological way thereby spoiling the mystery of YAHWEH's concrete presence here and now? Up until this point maybe yes. Is YAHWEH doomed to operate and make Himself present exclusively in terms of the indeterminable patterns of quantum mechanics? Do we not have to go beyond the currency of quantum mechanics? And if we do, with what metaphysical tools?²²

The thing is that we cannot resist, or just ignore, the technological advancements brought about by quantum mechanics. If we do resist or ignore them, we are certainly doomed for cultural irrelevance or would step into the same trap as the Roman Catholic Church in the

started.

²² I don't want to jump the gun here, but the metaphysical schools we'll turn to in due time is Buddhism and ubuntu, but then also the metaphysics of a dream where I specifically try to communicate my postmodern stance of bringing these arguments over in a radical inductive proposal of certainty in an uncertainty. My dissertation can't be understood apart from seeing my certainty playing off against the uncertainty embedded in the radical inductive of an acknowledged dream. If this paradox is not noticed, a thesis of my dissertation is missed. If my certainty comes across as that of a preacher making radical, but contradictory, truth claims, let it be, but don't miss my metaphysics of a dream where I make no claim apart from hallucinating (if that's too controversial, just call it swimming in simulacra (Gergen 1999:200) with and through and in the presence with others, myself, the cosmos and YAHWEH). The hallucination is most certainly embedded in the temporality of the old heaven and earth, but not the intensity of the presence.

epochal change from the medieval ages to the dawn of modernity, an oversight that contributed to the vastness of the 16th century Reformation.

So what is the enigma? In short it means that particles can both exhibit wave like properties, and localised time space properties, called matter as we see around us. The wavefunction state is called the superposition state of the particle, which means the particle is at all possible places simultaneously, but by observation/measurement the wavefunction collapses and then we observe the particle. It is so weird that even when the Geiger counter is turned off attached to the emitting source of the particle, the wavefunction collapses (Laszlo 2003:6).

This is what the quantum enigma grapples with, since consciousness, our consciousness, collapses the wavefunction; it is only when we decide to observe/measure the particle that the particle really comes into existence apart from just being a wavefunction. In short, the quantum enigma wrestles with the fact that we make matter.

Einstein vehemently fought the Copenhagen interpretation and came up with sayings like “I like to believe that the moon is still there even if we don't look at it” (Knierim 2010) and “The Old One (God) doesn't play dice.” (Knierim 2010), but when the calculations add up, what could a Nobel price winner, and maybe one of the most renown scientists ever, do?²³

The rabbit hole still goes deeper; have you ever heard of the physics term called *nonlocality*? Summarised, nonlocality implies that two particles that have ever shared the same quantum state behave in the same way (Laszlo 2003:10). They can be billions of light years apart in space, and come into existence billions of time years apart, they still behave in the same way. When, i.e., one particle's polarisation changes, the other one's polarisation instantaneously changes the same way, at exactly the same moment.

According to Einstein's theory of relativity nothing can travel faster than the speed of light. Therefore the nonlocality, since either the communication travels faster than the speed of light between the particles, which is not possible, or they are non-local, at the same time and place. When space is time and time is relative, space is also relative, and then proximity of the two particles has the same time and space co-ordinate.

Ervin Laszlo, the philosopher of science, mulls over coherence in his book *The*

²³ This renownness is my sentiment with Einstein.

Connectivity Hypothesis Foundations of an Integral Science of Quantum, Cosmos, Life, and Consciousness (Laszlo 2003). Coherence in physics refers to the wave like properties where each individual wave or field is in phase with every other wave or field. The enigma recognises this coherence not only in the micro world, but also in the macro world; when the cosmos is constructed with little particles, which are subjected to wavefunctions, superpositions and nonlocality, somehow it must also count for the bigger things that are made up of these little things. Nonlocality indeed appears to contravene the “laws” of time and space. It is like Bruce Rosenblum and Fred Kuttner put it in their book *Quantum Enigma: Physics Encounters Consciousness* “Events at the edge of the galaxy influences what happens at the edge of your garden” (Rosenblum 2006:139).

3. Radical inductive contemplation

This is now where I want to share my experience with wavefunction, superpositions and nonlocality, and how it saved my life so that I have a tale to tell today.

I’ve never been a healthy person, but I’ve also been unfortunate, or challenged, or educated for this dissertation, by two insect-borne diseases. The first was *Schistosoma haematobium*, which goes under the layman's term bilharzia, and was the only term I knew, even used by the doctors, until not long ago. So, for the sake of brevity, lets use bilharzia.

What is bilharzia? Bilharzia is a trematode, a flat worm, that penetrates the human skin that has come in contact with contaminated water, infested with the infective larval cercariae. We all know about bilharzia in Africa. The worms enter the bloodstream and make their way to the liver to mature to adult flukes. After about three weeks they migrate to the bladder to copulate, to have sex. The female fluke lays as many as 3,000 eggs per day, and causes schistosomes characterised by infection, and a gradual destruction of the tissues of the kidneys, liver, and other organs.

These parasites I had for more than twenty years. Where I actually picked them up is a good question, but I assume on my late granddad’s farm. We use to spend most school holidays on the farm, and went swimming in the crocodile river almost every day (no crocodiles on my granddad’s farm though), or in the channel feeding irrigation water to the crops, or just in the farm dam close by. Should it not have been on my granddad’s farm, it

could also have been on a summer holiday in my first Bible college on a trip to Zimbabwe with a fellow student, December 2003. There, on his dad's farm, we also went swimming in a muddy local farm dam.

On hindsight, I'm not so sure it was in Zimbabwe although the first symptoms made their initial appearance shortly after this holiday. The testimonies I have heard from others are that they take a few years to surface.

Anyway, whatever the case, in 1998 I was diagnosed with bilharzia, and only by desperation, when the urologist, Dr. Amos Van der Merwe in Pretoria, couldn't find the cause of pain in my essential tools, and had to physically enter my bladder under local anaesthesia.

However, as if this is not a bad enough adversity, just over two years before this I was almost died of malaria. In the year of 1995 I picked up malaria, or did malaria pick me up? This disease is so oversized that it felt like the mosquito did pick me up, and almost carried me to the graveyard. Someone (Van Dyck 2000) once put it beautiful, "It is not the lions or the elephants or the big animals in Africa one has to be scared off, but the little ones, the mosquitoes"; to mosquitoes I would like to add the flat worms, and other parasites.

Anyway, back to the malaria, I'm not sure where I picked up the malaria either, since I was in no malaria area shortly before it hit me, but I've been told in hospital (H.F. Verwoerd 1995) that the incubation period can take up to several years. If that is the case I had certainly been in many malaria infected areas, like Zim and the Kruger National Park. At that point two years had not yet passed since I went to Zim with my fellow student. In that December we weren't only on his dad's farm, we also went to Lake Kariba (the biggest artificial lake in the world), on the border of Zambia but still in Zimbabwe. We also crossed the border into Zambia for a few days, and actually went all the way around to the Victoria Falls, on the Zambian side.

However, at Lake Kariba, the day temperatures were close to 50° C, and the nights weren't much better. We were camping a stone's throw from the lake under the starry sky on camp beds. The thing is, although it was really hot, we couldn't afford one bit of skin to come out of the sleeping bag, that is to avoid a forced blood transfusion to the thirsty vampirish mosquitoes. It was a catch twenty-two situation, since one had to let fresh air

come into the sleeping back every now and again to slow down dehydration through perspiration, only to start an immediate blood intromission.

Now you may ask, “Didn’t you see the need to go and see a doctor for antimalaria medication before undertaking such an adventure?” No, we did not. I guess it has something to do with the lack of brains of a 23 year old, but also coming from Africa: South Africa has hardly any malaria infected areas, and one doesn’t always take notice of such “little” details.

So, to cut a long story short, Kariba could have been the place where the incubation period started, but whatever the case, the Tuesday night I was admitted to hospital with a fever of 42° C, and went through an ordeal where I at first feared for death, and then feared I was not going to die (Janse van Rensburg 1995). Although bouncing back from malaria was no easy thing, the worst was my liver that got a hard blow; so much so that for a few years I couldn’t enjoy my mega steaks anymore, like a used to, without fighting a hangover the following day.

Malaria and bilharzia were together a propagation of two immune deficiency diseases, and while I was still going through the motions of getting over the malaria, the symptoms of the bilharzia kicked in. At that point I was enjoying a fruitful ministry with the African Evangelist Band as a missionary-evangelist in the south of Africa, but had to get off the road since I could only manage an hour in the mornings before I felt I had skipped a night, and needed to get to bed as soon as possible.

As you can imagine, functioning became impossible, and off the road, back into Bible college in the year of 1998, I could undertake serious medical treatment with focused examinations, and “catchup” on lost sleep; the bilharzia was discovered, and so the tiresome process of putting my life back together had started, or so I thought.

The bilharzia and malaria were like aids, they were just the immune system diversionists, and inevitably opened the door for endless bacterial, influenza and even swam infections. Treating the bacterial infections turned out to be most problematic, since as my doctor’s friend says (Bitter 2009), “If a handyman only knows how to work with a hammer, he tries to fix everything with a hammer” (the same applies to a handywoman though). In the same way the doctors only treated all my infections with antibiotics, and antibiotics, and more

antibiotics. No one considered the long-term side effects, which only enlarged the problem by poisoning my liver with more toxic waste, and further crushed my immune system.

Putting my life back together turned out to be not that easy, since I was drawn into a vicious circle of infection-antibiotics-immune deficiency-infection-antibiotics..., and so it went on and on and on.

Now as if this was not enough, the bilharzia worms didn't die when initially discovered and treated, but were only crippled for a few years, or even as little as months. When I came to Europe at the end of 2001, I was enjoying better health, and for one thing I was really fit from jogging my 6-10km every other day, but the good health was short lived, and soon the infections furiously started taunting me again. The final turn came when on the last day of April 2007, I bruised myself on the right leg, and was admitted to hospital the following morning with, in layman's terms, blood poisoning.

My first stay in hospital (Diakonie 2007) was ten days, but I was released way too early since the infection was still not containable with tablets only; at this point no one yet knew that my good old friends were having sex in my bladder again producing their thousands of eggs per day, and so crippling my immune system. Out of hospital, a long, tiring, and intense struggle followed; for months on end (to be exact four months) I had to see my house doctor (Landgrebe 2007) daily. That's right, daily, losing two-three sometimes four hours per day with travelling there and back, and still sitting up to two hours in his depressing waiting room.

I think everyone will agree, that's enough to drive anyone off a cliff. We had to cancel a long anticipated, and planned holiday to Switzerland with friends (Büsingen 2007); and even during a short trip to Scotland I had to see a doctor at the emergency centre at the local hospital when my leg got really bad again (Glasgow Royal Infirmary 2007). If that was not enough, as the infection persisted, I persisted seeing a specialist again (Mohr 2007), and so the next day I was admitted to hospital again, and this time for 14 days.

This time though the hospital (Klinikum Kassel 2007) did temporarily take care of the infection, although the residue was a traumatised leg. Even months after this time in hospital, when I showed my leg to people, who hadn't seen it yet, they would think I was still seriously ill, and needed to see a doctor or go to hospital immediately. The specialists

though were happy.

For two years I got along with this traumatised leg, but in September 2009, when we were in Spain for a late summer holiday (Peguera 2009), the infection triggered again. The reason defies everyone, although speculation points to sun on the bare leg, or bare feet around the swimming pool, or even my old worn-out sandals that could have been the culprit. Whatever the case, this time I touched the gates of heaven.

Praise YAHWEH it did not spoil the holiday, and particularly the children's holiday, since the nightmare relived only started again on the last day, but incited a horrendous journey back to Kassel.

The following day I was admitted to hospital again (Klinikum Kassel 2009), but this time the antibiotics just wouldn't do the trick anymore. I was already allergic to penicillin, because of the exclusive hammer effect, but the second best, Cefroxine, just wouldn't agree with my system either anymore. When I told the young hospital doctor that, her nonchalant answer was that there is nothing else they could give me anymore, and that no one should apparently get allergic reactions to the second best, it was only a side effect she told me I had to endure. It was evident she was only taught how to work with a hammer.

I was pumped full of this antibiotics for 25 days non-stop, 11 days with infusion in hospital, and 14 days with tablets. This, however, was only the beginning of the horror; once I was out of hospital the problems escalated. The worst was fluctuating high blood pressure, and twice I came to a point where I said my good byes and prayers while kissing the gates of heaven. Once this even happened right in the presence of the cardiologist (Nserat 2009), who could only give me more tablets to contain the symptoms. It seems as if the applicators of school medicine can't think further than their noses, or is it rather the issue of Newtonian physics that fogs their minds?

At this low point I was brought into contact with Dr. Randolph Bitter (Bitter 2009), who was actually an anaesthesiologist in the Black Forest in the south of Germany, but who also

branched off in what is called *alternative medicine*²⁴, in his case bio-resonance therapy²⁵. I guess postmodern physics therapy would also do.

Honestly, 10 years ago I would have had serious questions about some of his techniques, and could only imagine how I would have viewed some of them as demonically inspired. Bitter was recommended to me by high standing Yeshua followers, amongst others the principal of a foundational and evangelical Wesleyan Bible college (Klinner 2009)²⁶. At this point I was dying and needed the help of fellow brothers and sisters in Yeshua's body. At

24 Richard Dawkins rightly quotes John Diamond who says "There is really no such thing as alternative medicine, just medicine that works and medicine that doesn't" (Dawkins 2003:36), but are only these two designations alone enough? What works can also be subdivided though. The school medical industry predominantly focuses only on treating symptoms, therefore one only goes to the doctor when one is sick, not when one is healthy. Sometimes this has its place, like when one is dying of pneumonia; at that point no one can get past antibiotics. When I was in the thick of things with the infections in my legs, with the red line of blood poisoning past my groin on the way to my heart, antibiotics were the only option. I guess alternative medicine can also be applied to this use, like homoeopathy, although I don't think in such severe cases. Richard Dawkins calls homoeopathy useless (Dawkins 2003:36), and what I've read he's got a point and is not what I designate as alternative medicine. What I designate as alternative medicine has rather to do with prevention than cure. Seeing the doctor so that one doesn't get sick, but also looking at the interrelationship of parts of the body, like the organs, and how they work together, and not separately, and how the effect on the one influences the others, etc. - dependent arising. Alternative medicine means the way to Shalom, wellness, wholeness, like before sickness, rather than curing the sickness, and in my case to the Shalom I used to have before all my little parasite friends and the immune deficiencies, etc.

25 Bio-resonance is also just called resonance therapy by Rife Health (Spartan Communications 2011) in South Africa deriving their name from Dr. Royal Raymond Rife (1888-1971) who assembled a list of frequencies, that is still being used, but is far from exclusive, in bio-resonance therapy, to kill viruses, bacteria, fungi, parasites, and other interferences. Another set of frequencies is The Consolidated Annotated Frequency List (CAFL) (Electroherbalism 2009). Hulda Clark, a cellular physiology/biophysics Ph.D. (Saskatchewan U, McGill U, Univ Minn, one magna cum laude and one with high honours) (Electroherbalism 2009), is also a big name in this type of therapy. Another provider of bio-resonance devices in South Africa is Energy Remedy (Energy Remedy 2011).

26 The Wesleyan indicator I've only read on the internet in a statement of believe, but never orally confessed. When I confronted Reiner Klinner (Klinner 2009) about this he said they, in Germany, used to be characteristically Wesleyan.

the same time Randolph Bitter and I became good friends, and I came to know him to be an exemplary servant and follower of our Master YAHWEH Yeshua our Messiah.

So my bio-resonance treatments started at the beginning of February 2010, my treatments of quantum mechanics. In short, bio-resonance treatment rivets on the wavefunction state of the particles in our body. The premise is that when we are healthy our bodies produce smooth, regular oscillation. The treatment is to bring the particles in the body back to a healthy state of oscillation through interference. The bio-resonance machine, with a whole spectrum of electrodes performs this interference. The medical examination is to determine where the oscillation is out of the ordinary, rather than focusing on the negative agent that produces the negative interference. Bringing the oscillation back to normal in principle dilapidates the negative agent.

I had six treatments, ranging from one hour to almost five hours each, and Bitter discovered that the beloved flat worms were still alive, their resonance was known to the machine, or rather to the inventors and developers of the machine. It's interesting that the layman's term bilharzia derives its name from Theodor Maximilian Bilharz, the German physician who discovered these adoring parasites, and it had taken me 20 years plus, since being infected by them, to make my circle to Germany where they at last kicked the bucket. What would we have done without the Germans?

Five treatments focused on the worms, but also on my immune system in general, aggressive liver detoxification, the bacterial infection on my right leg, but also on all the fungi infections that accumulated almost from head to toe through the abuse of all the antibiotics throughout the years. The last treatment brought me out of the black hole of depression I evanesced in.

Astonishingly, my system got so used to the worms, fungi, bacteria and toxic waste killing me that when they started dying off, my system protested, and forced me into a depression. If in a similar sense when hard liquor destroying the alcoholic is been taken away, withdrawal symptoms and systems very nearly kill the person.

I realise though that I would be naïve to blame the bereavement so to say of my microbial partners alone for my depression. I also had, for the first time ever, the SAD syndrome. SAD syndrome stands for Seasonal Affective Disorder syndrome. In short, my mood was

muddled up by the depressing English weather which lasted just too long over the exceptionally, and record breaking, cold winter. The deprecating weather, the hospital and long train journeys almost every week to Randolph Bitter, all contributed to my depressive state. My system was most certainly not oscillating correctly, but praise YAHWEH, the bio-resonance machine took care of that as well.

So here I am, a first person testimony of postmodern medical treatment that works and saved my life. At some point, I guess about a month after the last treatment, I felt as good as I ever could remember. So that also makes me a first person testimony of controversial physics explaining a different world than what we see around us.

However, the treatment with the bio-resonance machine is not the whole story; I haven't yet explained how Randolph Bitter exactly performed his check-ups. This brings us to the part I would have had an issue with ten years ago.

Randolf Bitter uses a tool called a *tensor*, a copper rod, that he holds about a foot from me to ask my body questions, and when the *tensor* starts oscillating, bouncing up and down, my body says yes to whatever the question might be, and when the *tensor* shows no response the answer is no²⁷. This is where consciousness hits physics. The bizarre thing is that he can ask me the question in Arabic, as he once illustrated, and the effect would be the same, even when I only know a few standard words in Arabic.

My body and brain, Randolph Bitter's body and brain, and the tensor somehow got connected, somehow consciousness embedded in nonlocality! This probes another dimension of what I regard as postmodern physics.

The astrophysicist Sir James Jeans said in the 1930's,

27 To be honest I prayed long and hard about this effect, and is actually still in my list of supplications I pray for almost daily, if this is not somehow quantum mechanic's principles within an occultism or esoteric mysticism or, Scripturally called, an evil divination, but nothing has spoken against it yet, only for it like the Urim and Thummim, and in the context of my professed synagogal hermeneutics, I have to include it to keep my integrity. I seriously considered leaving this out of my story (to be economic about the truth/fact/event/trust), in order not to step on toes, but that would deny the dependent arising of my synagogal ubuntuing in Germany and the ethics I'm arguing.

The universe begins to look more like a great thought than like a great machine. Mind no longer appears to be an accidental intruder into the realm of matter; we are beginning to suspect that we ought to rather hail it as the creator and governor of the realm of matter. (Jeans 1931:137).

It seems like consciousness indeed plays a role in shaping and/or making of “physical” reality. Niels Bohr said “Anyone who is not shocked by quantum theory has not understood it” (Barad 2007:254). According to Bohr “There is no quantum world. There is only an abstract physical description” (Pais 2000:24)²⁸.

In any case, though Bohr’s background is modernist to the core, including his atheism, I view his physics as postmodern physics²⁹. That means that if all matter has wave

28 These words of Bohr, just on the ring of it, does not only sound very late modern - thus low modern or postmodern when taken in isolation, but when the backdrop of his works and his statements on physics as the all carrying vehicle of all that is to be explained and described in the world is taken into account the reductionist Bohr peeps over the wall. Bohr describes physics as the all carrying vehicle of all that is to be explained in the world in the following words: “Physics is to be regarded not so much as the study of something *a priori* given, but rather as the development of methods of ordering and surveying human experience. In this respect our task must be to account for such experience in a manner independent of individual subjective judgement and therefore objective in the sense that it can be unambiguously communicated in ordinary human language” (Bohr 1960). In this statement Bohr lets human experience, the individual subjective judgement and human language evaporate in the thin air of his physicalist mega objective reductionist approach.

29 I know I’m walking a dangerous path by just randomly mixing scientists in one hat, with their metaphysics, and by that playing epochs off against each other as if following Yeshua has nothing to do with it. To turn it around, what I’m doing is nothing more than a radical inductively use of what I already had (apparent hermeneutical circle) and how, in the words of Hugh Ross, “Quantum mechanics does not provide a challenge to the Christian faith; it provides support” (Hudson 2008:256) to ground my testimonial negotiations – my present memoirs. To take it one step further, I’m illustrating my inevitable European ubuntuing today, not a century or more ago, and that I don’t have insularity issues integrating with those I’m rubbing shoulders with everyday, and by that admit an ubuntuing and dependent arising, as much as I rigorously want to deconstruct the world around us. Unavoidably atheists are also participating in raising my children (e.g. secular school curriculums), since the community is raising them and some are outspoken atheists (I’ve even met some outspoken Dawkins disciples in our community). I guess we can leave Europe to avoid this atheist interpolating ubuntuing, but how else will we fulfil the

properties, and waves are actually nothing else than information, then the whole universe is information. Bio-resonance therapy is also called information therapy. In engaging with information I am not paradoxically affirming the platonic dualism of the world of ideas, and all the categorical and metaphysical baggage that comes with it. The use of the word information gains a new meaning in this context, something like the Deleuzian method (Deleuze 1994), where it is analogically related with the traditional meaning. Informationing would actually even be better, since it is then a gerund, both a verb and a noun. The informationing can also be designated consciousness, or whatever, all I know is that none of us can get out of its grasp to objectively explain it. The quantum enigma cannot (yet) be explained, therefore it is an enigma.

With my first treatment by Randolph Bitter he took a blood sample, blood spread on a piece of paper, and he did that only once. With every treatment he used the same piece of paper with my blood in a little input cup the bio-resonance machine has for this use. The dried-up blood has nonlocally my osculation, since it is my blood. Do you remember nonlocality occurs when any two particles have at any time shared the same quantum states? One does not have to be clever to know my blood, even outside my body, qualifies for that. The nonlocality even goes further, in what seems like a voodoo style he can test me with the *tensor*, using only my blood, when I am at distance back in Kassel and he in the Black Forest, more than 400km apart. Actually we could have also been 4×40^{10} light years apart, and it would have produced the same outcome.

Asking my blood questions, and a *tensor* oscillating, how eldritch?

Space and time implodes in quantum mechanics, and maybe just because they are an illusion? Is it not Einstein who said, "People like us, who believe in physics, know that the distinction between past, present, and future is only a stubbornly persistent illusion."(Dyson 1979:193)³⁰, but when space is intertwined with time in spacetime then

great commission (Matthew 28:18-20) if we don't embody Yeshua along side them in our synagogal interconnectedness of Matthew 28:20b where "Yeshuah will always be with us,..., even until the end of the age"?

30 I know I'm hijacking Einstein's physicist definition of time to another metaphysical definition – simulacrum, like the cool BMW across the road: what does cool have to do with BMW? Sentiment! Emotion! The sentimental emotion of hijacking such a statement by Einstein is my simulacrum. The new simulation is, however, the second hermeneutical rule of Rabbi Hillel,

space is also a stubbornly persistent illusion?

That exactly brings us to metaphysics and the challenge we face, which is not just theologosiphising about the right metaphysics, but the fact that there is already a metaphysical model that fits the glove - Vedism. Vedism's physics, 500 BC, was quantum mechanics, and subsequently their metaphysics the more of quantum mechanics. That sounds scary?

The challenge is not hypochondria or the anxiety of making a mistake to move into postmodern physics, but the hypostasis, philosophical hypostasis, the right Scriptural kernel and not Newtonian or Euclidean kernel.

When we are information, and this tram is information, then the Matrix hypothesis does not seem that far fetched, or is it? What about the clothes we have on, and the fashionable ipods you see everywhere just in this tram alone? When everything is information, then maybe George Berkeley (Berkeley 1713) with his total subjective idealism had a point. On the other hand, without the right physics how can that really be possible. It rather seems to me William James had a point with his pragmatism (James 1907) standing over against idealism as its antonym (Wiktionary 2010). Or is that not also just a typical Graeco-Roman dualism?

Kelal uferat (The general and the particular) where a general principle may be restricted by a particularisation of it in another verse – or, conversely, a particular rule may be extended into a general principle, and in this case time – time for Einstein extended into a general principle for the full-fledged quantum mechanics. The same hermeneutical rule is what we unconsciously use/develop to say 'I'm eating potatoes!' By definition, almost all the potatoes are cooked or fried and so in saying 'I'm eating potatoes', the cooking or frying is assumed. Did this come naturally? No, I'm convinced the same hijacking through the hermeneutical rule of Kelal uferat had to happen in the 16th century onwards when potatoes were introduced to Europe. The cooking of other food, and most probably meat, was analogically extended to cooking potatoes (Toussaint-Samat 2009:646), to make it soft and easily consumable, when most/many vegetables could easily be eaten raw – although it is a starch, but how would the peasants of the 16th to the 19th century have known that, or cared? Today the general rule of cooked or fried potatoes are being taken for granted, and in the same way, lining up epochs, Einstein and time, the extended relativity of time and space, is the sentiment I'm carrying over boundaries, like the sentiments of the Iliad and the Odyssey ascribed to Homer.

Sorry to say, pragmatism is also an idealism, even when theory is apparently subtracted from praxis, it's a theory/idealism that considers the praxis. On the other hand I would like to high jack this word, since in countering idealism this informationing has to be called something, and so why not use the same word for the same apparent endeavour in two different cognitive relativistic balloons?

This tram takes us back home, that's practical; I'm certainly not going to walk this distance every day, would you? It's not practical with a wife and two children at home; I don't have three-four hours to walk home everyday; taking a bicycle might have its advantages, but only in summer, our notorious short summer. Just imagine the scores of extra cars on the road, should only the people on this one journey have taken the car rather than the tram. Now multiply that with the thousands of people on all the tram journeys on one single day only in our city Kassel. How many extra cars on the road are we talking about then?

Do you get the picture? It's not practical for our planet. O, yes we can get green cars, like electrical cars, or even those new cars that run on compressed air. That would really be the most practical of all but is the steady increase of prosperity really so good for us? This is where the teleological and practical traverse, but a practical prevails.

The thing is that this tram cannot function without the underlying mathematics of quantum mechanics. In this sense the teleological of the mathematics is the practical. I know that someone, some engineer needs to know how quantum mechanics' mathematics make it all work, otherwise the practical tram will not work, but again what comes first, the chicken or the egg?

Have you noticed every time the tracks split into two directions the tram takes the right direction without any effort? Years ago the tram driver first had to get out of the tram to manually change the switch at every junction. Imagine the waste of time, and what the poor driver must have gone through on a -20°C snow-covered pitch dark winter's night? No, the tram communicates with the switch, and the switch changes itself.

The other amazing thing is that every tram has a GPS telling the driver exactly where the tram is, and how he or she is doing with the time according to the given schedule. This is narrowing the time for each particular stop. Commuters have a five minutes, or money back guarantee, to get to their destination. One can only begin to imagine the amount of

microchips, and other astonishing quantum mathematical calculations we are talking about, not leaving out the satellites mapping the co-ordinates on the GPS's. Who would really be able to establish a concrete number of the amount of chips and calculations?

Just listen how precise this lady is telling us about the next stop, "Baunsberg". Do you really think that's a person? No way, that is a computer animated voice operating within an inboard system, tracking the tram's position with the GPS, and "intelligently" makes this benign digital announcement at exactly the right place. What is the difference between this information, and matter as information? You tell me! What I know is that it is all about being practical, and not necessary about "understanding"³¹.

Until now I have not heard anyone asking yet how this tram functions at subatomic levels, while considering to get into the tram or not. Why bother with such impractical exercises when one might just miss the tram? Don't we just want to get back home or to work, isn't that our purpose in the first place? Asking such questions is like Graeco-Roman dualists dissecting all of life, and then missing the purpose of life altogether. That is now what one could call nihilism. However, turning the gun on us by concluding that once nihilism, as modernism in its most pristine form, has arrived and is all around us, the most practical thing would be to just blow up the planet with one of the most powerful nuclear atomic bombs, or a few of them when one is not enough.

4. Biblical narratives as string succession

Now that's the point I want to make; when part of the authoritative practical is indeed qualified, with the right physics with the right mathematics, the right practical Scriptural mathematics can now be applied; although I now a taxing question stays, "Who or what is the authoritative qualifier?" The modernist issue is hereby reincarnated but then in the same breath it is the reason why we cannot give up on the metaphysical to nullify modernism's ideology! For me it is easy "YAHWEH is the authority!" "How do I know it is YAHWEH?" Easy, it's because I know Him personally, but, and take note, this cannot be

³¹ As you can see I'm substituting the quantum enigma with what we couldn't "understand", and the usefulness of quantum mechanics with the practical. I know this really looks like I'm utilising the pragmatism of modernism where the practical determines the value, but when the value/theory merges with the practical, not like mixing oil and water, but in informationing, it is another metaphysics, another cognitive use of pragmatism.

practically verified with words alone, since words alone only give way to rhetoric. You either accept it, or you don't accept it! You either learn to know YAHWEH personally, in the presence with YAHWEH and you, or you don't! The practical teleology of postmodern physics is the impact it has on our relationship with YAHWEH and each other? This will be our discussion tomorrow.

5. Dozing off the session

"See you in the morning!"

Chapter 3: B'rit Hadashah Theolosophy

“--Buddhism is a hundred times as realistic as [late philosophical] Christianity--it is part of its living heritage that it is able to face problems objectively and coolly; it is the product of long centuries of philosophical speculation.” (Nietzsche 1888: 43) (the words *late philosophical*, in the square brackets, are the time signifier in my reciprocal application of this quote.)

1. Contextual embedding of session

“Good morning, it’s Friday today”. Catholics eat fish on Fridays, and for Muslims Friday is *jumu'ah*, Friday prayers. In Saudi Arabia, and Iran, Friday is the last day of the weekend, and in Iran actually the only day of the weekend, while in Bahrain, the United Arab Emirates, and Kuwait, Friday is the first day of the weekend. On a Friday Yeshua was crucified, and so are we who are His followers (Romans 6). In the Orthodox church Friday is a day of fasting throughout the year. The Jewish Sabbath starts on a Friday. So I guess we can say that Friday has sacred meaning, at least for the biggest part of the great monolithic religions.

The thing about Friday is that Friday is named after the Germanic love goddess called Frijjō (Wessels 1994:110), and is consequently inherently religious in nature; but saying that about Friday, what about the most other days of the week that are also either named after a god, or held to observe a god?

One thing we can persuasively say is that religion cuts deep into our nature; but is it so wrong to admit that that’s also the case with metaphysics, the more than physics? Doesn’t metaphysics, in precisely the same way cut deep into the gut of who we are? Needless to say that my claim is that religion and metaphysics are one and the same thing. I know that is a brave step I am taking, but without these Greek dualisms, why not? Our worldview is our religion. The religion of the Vedics was their metaphysics, while their physics was quantum mechanics.

2. Wider theolosophy debate

The Vedic religion is a pre-Hindu, but also a pre-Jainism and pre-Buddhism, religion. The Vedic religion also goes under the name of Vedic Brahmanism, or simply Brahmanism, and ended about 500 B.C.; a significant date as you’ll see when we come to collective

consciousness and collective unconsciousness, since this was the maternity time of the “great” schools of philosophy.

To illustrate in brief I want to add one quote from Prem Sabhlok’s online book *Glimpses of Vedic Metaphysics* (Sabhlok 2001:106)

The physical sciences have traversed a long journey of over two thousands years independent of Vedic metaphysics... [but] The Vedic science remained consistent during all this period. However, science is now itself proving in the laboratory some of the Vedic scientific truths.

The Vedic religion held that all matter is energy (Varma 1984:78), quanta, and that 'physical reality' is consciousness (Varma 1984:79), and consciousness creates all (Varma 1984:58). They even calculated the earth’s rotation around the sun in exactly 364.24675 days (Sabhlok 2001:114). Amazing, don’t you agree?

Their metaphysics that sprang out of this accurate physics, however, turned problematic in the “*Vedic theism* [that] looks to be *polytheistic* from one angle, while it seems purely *monotheistic* from the other” (Varma 1984:160), - which doesn’t sound like the YAHWEH I know personally. From the polytheistic side we can easily notice the inspiration for the succeeding Hindu metaphysics that turned everything into god as the ultimate “being”, while the cosmos is only the manifested world with attributes, functions and relationships (Laszlo 2003:106). Paul Harrison says that “Pantheism runs like a golden thread through the philosophical strand of Hinduism” (Harrison 2004:13).

To be fair to Hinduism, Hinduism could rather and indeed be a Western conceptualisation, as Declan Quigley says,

Every serious work on Hinduism emphasizes the extraordinary diversity of that “religion” to the point where many ask whether it makes a great deal of sense to call Hinduism a religion at all... Hinduism might well have come from Weber or any of his intellectual descendants whose interpretations of caste have dominated intellectual discussion of the subject in the disciplines of sociology and social anthropology. (Flood 2005:495)

As stated before, Hinduism is being rejected, and is in practice a demonic construction mobilising the bossing over others, while justifying the abuse of power in its hierarchy with a dominating cycle of rebirths, within an oppressive caste system³².

32 The overall deconstruction pattern of my story should be evident by now. Firstly I started off

About Jainism, that also proceeded out of Vedism (Dundas 2002:13-6), I do not want to say much, except that the Vedic DNA is most certainly apparent in the proclaimed non-violence towards all living beings coupled with the philosophy and practice emphasising self-effort to move the soul towards divine consciousness, and liberation, and by that reaching the state called Jina, which means 'conqueror' (Dundas 2002:3).

Buddhism, on the other hand, that has also proceeded out of Vedism (Wijesekera 1994:175), with its reasonable physics³³, needs to be taken seriously, although, take note,

with a general impression and description of Kassel, and what I call the modern – Graeco-Roman philosophy. From there I initiated a rigorous deconstruction where I first deconstructed modernism with poststructuralism, and Wittgenstein's colour-game, and then with quantum mechanics and the quantum enigma (the enigma defies deconstruction yet). Now I'm even taking it one step further by deconstructing some of the metaphysics on quantum mechanics, and therefore the demonic in Hinduism. From a certain perspective, up until now, I've been as modern as can be, and from this perspective stay as modern as can be, but in my proposed radical inductive initiative, in my suspected relative cognitive balloon, it isn't a radical demolishing of times and events I have no access to, like e.g. revivals of the previous century, etc., but the implosion into now – simulacra that metamorphose into simulations where the historical is allegorically hidden. In this chapter the tide is turning with the intended (social) construction (Gergen 1999: 24-31)/ubuntuing/dependent arising out of the simulacra. That said, this simulacra is only simulacra from outside the story, not in the story, the narrative itself, although some would ask if that is not just a convenient way of leaving the back door open by avoiding a definition? But what if the outside is another cognitive relativistic balloon? So actually all I can do is suspect them to be simulacra, since in the story they are narrative-marks. To put it differently, just as my rigorous deconstruction has proven all to be simulacra, so my proposed virtual Hebraic hermeneutics proposes a virtual and horizontal (social) construction/ubuntuing/dependent arising with myself, other people, the cosmos and YAHWEH metamorphosing simulacra to simulations, imploded/nonlocal simulations. Together we are telling a present narrative that live us, so that even when the story of the simulacra itself becomes dubious, simulations are what we are working with, narrative-marks, so that simulacra itself is a narrative-mark in this intratextual setting.

33 Twice I have designated quantum mechanics as the right physics, and by that strongly excluded the wrong physics of the Newtonian worldview. The nature of my deconstructing process has necessitated this strong dichotomy, as if no overlap is possible and/or as if I totally reject the Newtonian physics with a type of modernist and reductionist tunnel vision. In my cognitive relativism though actually only three areas of the Newtonian physics are being corrected/supplemented by the quantum physics. They are:

not as a religion, but as a philosophy. The distinction I make is both practical, but also to avoid confusion, although I am aware religion and philosophy cannot really be separated within one worldview. The practical distinction is the religion, with its post-death-to-life metaphysics that followed Siddhartha Gautama (the Buddha) over against the philosophy Siddhartha Gautama himself promoted for this side of the grave alone. A philosophy that actually detested the religions of his day with its rituals and traditions. To illustrate his position I recount his famous parable of the arrow:

The Buddha was sitting in the park when his disciple Malunkyaputta approached him. Malunkyaputta had recently retired from the world and he was concerned that so many things remained unexplained by the Buddha. Was the world eternal or not eternal? Was the soul different from the body? Did the enlightened exist after death or not? He thought, 'If the Buddha does not explain these things to me, I will give up this training and return to worldly life'.

Thus, he approached the Buddha with this question, who replied:

“Suppose, Malunkyaputta, a man were wounded by an arrow thickly smeared with poison, and his friends and companions brought a surgeon to treat him. The man would say: “I will not let the surgeon pull out the arrow until I know the name and clan of the man who wounded me; whether the bow that wounded me was long bow or crossbow; whether the

-
1. Matter has dual characteristics of waves and localised matter,
 2. The enigma – consciousness that creates matter, and
 3. Nonlocality with superstates where matter is at all possible places.

These three areas correct the Newtonian causality on the billiard board and to these three areas alone I would like to restrict the right and the wrong physics, and only as far as the Newtonian physics contradicts or contravenes the virtual Hebraic metaphysics being set forth. To put it differently, just as these three areas actually only tell us more about matter, and not demolishing matter, in the same way quantum physics is rather telling me more, of what I would like to call reasonable physics, than violating anything. The good the Newtonian physics have made possible I don't deny, and don't wish away, like the light in my study right now and Newtonian physics conquering apparent gravity in aviation to visit my parents in South Africa, etc. The good things that came out of the Newtonian physics don't contradict quantum physics, but quantum physics rather contradict Newtonian physics. Newtonian physics have a problem with quantum physics, more than the other way around. Now I know I have to be careful, since have I not deconstructed the Newtonian physics within metaphysics? That just confirms that the issue at hand is not really the physics, but the metaphysics, and therefore, from now on, I don't want to refer to right or wrong physics, but rather to reasonable physics versus unreasonable physics. Reasonable rather relatevises right with rhetoric and concurs to the narrative that lives us.

arrow that wounded me was hoof-tipped or curved or barbed.

All this would still not be known to that man and meanwhile he would die. So too, Malunkyaputta, if anyone should say: "I will not lead the noble life under the Buddha until the Buddha declares to me whether the world is eternal or not eternal, finite or infinite; whether the soul is the same as or different from the body; whether an awakened one ceases to exist after death or not," that would still remain undeclared by the Buddha and meanwhile that person would die.

Whether the view is held that the world is eternal or not, Malunkyaputta, there is still birth, old age, death, grief, suffering, sorrow and despair – and these can be destroyed in this life! I have not explained these other things because they are not useful, they are not conducive to tranquility and Nirvana. What I have explained is suffering, the cause of suffering, the destruction of suffering and the path that leads to the destruction of suffering. This is useful, leading to non-attachment, the absence of passion, perfect knowledge." (Jacobkapp 2010)

The point is just that, these last two underlined sentences, that suffering is this side of the grave, and for now it has to be overcome this side of the grave, irrespective of what is on the other side - to be honest I do not see much of a difference in people's day-to-day effort of making an existence around me, the question is only the how in the effort.

The tradition that followed Siddhartha Gautama, on the other hand, transformed into a religion. The religious turn did not only take place in the fabricated supernatural mystery attached to Siddhartha Gautama in things like queen Maya's conception with him in a dream through a white elephant (Young 1999:24-38), but also a tradition that in India totally collapsed back into Hinduism (Smith 2003:118), while in other parts of the world assimilated and accommodated Hinduism (Hinduism Today Magazine 2007:142).

Although the Buddhist religion makes an effort defining itself something else than Hinduism, when Hinduism is actually so broad in spectrum and an invention of the West, the Buddhist assimilations of Hindu doctrines can easily argue Buddhism a sect of Hinduism. Although, and take note, this collapsing back contradicts Siddhartha Gautama's aspiration, whose intention was to derail Hinduism. The assimilation is awfully evident in some sects of Buddhism, like in Tibetan Buddhism, with their apparent interaction with gods in meditation, coupled with reincarnation where, e.g., your holiness, and nobel prize winner, the Dalai Lama has apparently successfully *reincarnated* himself 14 times up until now (Smith 2003:111).

The least I can say is that is rubbish, although we cannot say that of the whole tradition,

and especially not of the philosophical roots which did not intend to assimilate Hinduism. In 1883 the German, Max Müller set out to illustrate the superiority of the Bible over Buddhism, but almost contradicts himself in his *India: What it Can Teach Us?* when he says

"That there are startling coincidences between Buddhism and Christianity cannot be denied, and it must likewise be admitted that Buddhism existed at least 400 years before Christianity. I go even further, and should feel extremely grateful if anybody would point out to me the historical channels through which Buddhism had influenced early Christianity." (Muller 2010:284)

The striking thing is that when I read the book, quoting sayings of Siddhartha Gautama, called *Sermons of a Buddhist Abbot Addresses on Religious Subjects* translated from Japanese by Daisetz Teitaro Suzuki, I feel like I am reading the Scriptures:

The Buddha said: "If you endeavor to embrace the Way through much learning, the Way will not be understood. If you observe the Way with simplicity of heart, great indeed is this Way." (Suzuki 1906:8)

The Buddha said: "When an evil-doer, seeing you practise goodness, comes and maliciously insults you, you should patiently endure it and not feel angry with him, for the evil-doer is insulting himself by trying to insult you." (Suzuki 1906:7)

I certainly do not think it is too far fetched to see the plausible arguments of Buddhism that might have had a say in the Gnostic heresy of the early church (Pagels 1979:xxi), as well as the monastic movement that originated in the late Roman Empire (Gruber 1995), and is still with us until today. For the rest I will be very careful when some even goes as far as to say that Jesus was educated by the Therapeutae sect of mystics and ascetics who were present in the holy land in the days of Jesus (Gruber 1995). Therapeutae is a Hellenisation of the Pali term for the Theravada Buddhist sect (Gruber 1995). I, however, go along with the generally accepted conclusion by another German called Albert Schweitzer who says that "although some indirect influence through the wider culture was "not inherently impossible", the hypothesis that Jesus' novel ideas were borrowed directly from Buddhism was "unproved, unprovable and unthinkable." (Tweed 2000:280)

So Buddhism as a religion is rejected, but the initial philosophy, negotiated and constructed around the reasonable physics, has to be taken seriously. For those that still think I am treading on thin ice I can only say that is like a scientist who has made a

medical breakthrough. The breakthrough might change a multitude of lives this side of the grave. Should the phenomenon be discarded as an illusion or deception, and even immediately abandoned, once it has become clear that this scientist was not a Yeshua follower, and might even be in hell today?

Thomas Edison has given us the light bulb, but denied the existence of YAHWEH, and the afterlife (Nosotro 2003), should we turn off all our lights now and go back to candles? I am sorry but then it is the end of our discussions because I cannot do without the back light of my computer in these discussions³⁴.

Thomas Edison has given us a light bulb for this side of the grave, on the other side of the grave YAHWEH is our light, as the Scriptures tell us (Revelation 21:23). Would not the light bulb then be absolute? In the same way the philosophy of Siddhartha Gautama is about nothing else, but how the reasonable physics should, or could, be interpolated into our everyday living right now, and nothing more. When the Scriptures are our world, let us evaluate this philosophy by way of YAHWEH's physical world, or at least the physical world we (hallucinatory) know. Let us allow the Scriptures to cast the judgement, and nothing else³⁵!

34 Could I justify atheist Thomas Edison, and his (meta)physics/religion, without contradicting myself? I've already indicated that it is not about right and wrong physics really, but rather about the metaphysics. It is like watching a soccer game on the television; the game is the same irrespective of all the players being Yeshua followers or not, and irrespective of what the metaphysics are for the respective players, the beauty of the game is the simulacra on our television screens. Simulacra because the ambiance of watching with friends is just as part of the game as what is happening in the stadium, or what is happening in the stadium is part of the ambiance in the living room – an implosion, but also a rapture of space since literally in the stadium would be different though. The ambiance of light, that Thomas Edison gave us, is the ambiance right now, that should be with YAHWEH, and not what it literally was in his day (in the stadium). I'm convinced some Christians used to have a problem with the popularisation of light following Edison as a dichotomising simulacrum between the have-s and have-nots, rich and poor, but would that still be the case today?

35 If I call the Scriptures in as judge, then I also say that I am/we are the judge. See my hermeneutics in the chapter *The Virtual of Hermeneutics' Reality - the experiential story of Hermeneutics!* and my horizontal and vertical lines of presence with others, the cosmos and YAHWEH. By the words *nothing else* I imply “reading ourselves into the Scriptures”. The thing is the Scriptures are before us, not behind us; in this sense, the Scriptures are still events in the

3. Biblical narratives as string succession

So what is the philosophy of Siddhartha Gautama? First of all, no dualisms and thus no ghost in the body, and thus no apparent independent objective individual. What I like about this philosophy is the fact that it exactly has a problem with modernism, although from a different angle. Buddhism is an oriental philosophy, and modernism a western phenomena, so the modernism of the one is not physically the same as the other, but, on the other hand, when all is god in Hinduism, the two coalesce, since nothing is god in modernism – all as god is the same as nothing as god. Atheism mirrors pantheism, because when non is god all is god.

You know the saying, “The enemy of my enemy is my friend”. When Hinduism is Siddhartha Gautama’s problem, we are friends, because modernism is my problem.

Siddhartha Gautama calls his problem suffering, not Hinduism or modernism, but take note, his suffering is not what we hear in the term. The word suffering is *duhkha* (Buswell 2004:239), and is not a pessimistic word, it does not even imply the lack of fun or laughter, but rather points to a disjointedness in the fun and laughter. It says something is wrong in the fun and laughter; something is out of joint. For one thing it is impermanent, but it is also not completely satisfactory.

I don’t think the Scriptures tell us something else; the disjointed joy and laughter of the old heaven and earth, that won’t survive the New Heaven and Earth, are also incomplete and temporary. Isn't this what the Psalmist noticed in Psalm 73:3-20 when he says that

“he envied the arrogant when he saw the well-being of the wicked. They have no difficulties; their bodies are healthy and strong... This is what the wicked are like—always carefree, they increase in wealth... When he tried to comprehend all of this, it was difficult to him until he went into the sanctuary of Elohim; then he understood their destiny. Surely YAHWEH placed them on slippery places; YAWEH casted them into destruction. How suddenly are they broad into desolation, in a moment, completely devoured by terrors! As a dream when one awakes, so when you arise in judgement, O Lord, you will despise their shadow-like form.”?

future.

I don't, however, say that all joy and laughter are temporary, there is a joy and laughter that foreshadows the New Heaven and Earth, but the joy and laughter in *duhkha* is that of the old heaven and earth.

The suffering and impermanence go deeper; suffering and impermanence dawned on Siddhartha Gautama when he experienced three things he had always been shielded from by his royal and powerful dad. The three things are old age, sickness and death, while the fourth thing was seeing a monk that allured him on a journey seeking freedom from this impermanence and suffering. He first tried religion, Hindu religion, but to no avail. To cut a long story short, he found freedom in the understanding of quantum mechanics, flux, nonlocality, interconnectedness, and that consciousness is at work in every phenomenon.

Is Siddhartha Gautama in heaven today? I don't know, anyway not according to the Scriptures, although I hope so because I don't want any one to be in hell who hadn't had the opportunity to wilfully and openly resist the gospel, but that is beside the point, it still doesn't mean he couldn't have made a massive scientific, physics, breakthrough! (Isn't it exactly the inherited Platonic dualism to see scientific breakthroughs as unrelated to the unseen spiritual world – the parallel train tracks of spiritual versus the material?).

Siddhartha Gautama realised that suffering resides exactly in the desire for independence, for locality, for freedom from others, in the likes of the Newtonian billiard table of independent objects put in motion through cause-and-effect. Siddhartha Gautama's philosophy exactly argues suffering springing out of each object, each ball's fight for his or her own existentialism apart from others. Suffering ceases when the quantum interconnectedness is discovered, the nonlocality of the individual that doesn't exist.

Emptiness, *Sunyata* (Buswell 2004:809), is the word that is being used, but again this emptiness sounds different to us than what it really means. The emptiness from self is the fullness of others. Another notion that's being used instead of emptiness is dependent arising. To use an example, a glass that is empty of air is full of something else, like water; for Siddhartha Gautama the person that is empty of self is full of love and compassion. Love and compassion are the end of suffering.

I know, that brings a conflicting picture to mind! The Buddhist that sits for hours in

meditation is not showing much love and compassion to others, or what?³⁶ That is purely the case in the dominant Buddhism that has blown over to the USA, Zen Buddhism. Zen Buddhism is the upper class Buddhism of Japan being practiced by people with a surplus of time - doesn't that sound pretty familiar? Theravada Buddhism might appear the same in the value it places on solitude, but the other streams know no such thing since intense meditation is only reserved for a few, or is being practised exactly in the physical caring for people - meditation while working for the good of others.

Dependent arising (Smith 2003:61), instead of emptiness, I would imagine makes more sense to us. I once said "The happiest people are people who live for something greater than themselves", that's YAHWEH and humanity in a whole. The holistic interconnectedness, of quantum mechanics, is what dependent arising is about.

Nirvana, the ultimate state, is the point where one is freed from the (selfish) self, from selfish desires caught in impermanence: nirvana is where one becomes part of the bigger picture, the consciousness, the interconnected network, that creates phenomena, part of the *ubu* in *ubu-ntu*, and not just the *ntu* anymore. Bodhisattvas, in Mahayana Buddhism (the biggest of two parent Buddhist streams, the other one is Theravada Buddhism), are those that turn around before the door of solitude Nirvana to become missionaries to others to bring them to Nirvana. The thing is, Wijesekera says, Nirvana refers to the absolute state of mental quietude, and in the Pali Canon it is characterised as the 'Heaven of Peace'. *Santi*, peace, denotes essentially the absence of conflict in the personal psychology (Wijesekera 1994:94).

The Hebrew word is *Shalom*! I've said many times, YAHWEH never promises us wealth, health and prosperity, per se, but He promises us peace. When one has peace, one has contentment, and the Joy of the LORD.

About Bodhisattvas I can't say that the Scriptures contradict such a notion. Don't we often hear that the reason YAHWEH hasn't taken us to heaven yet is so that we can be missionaries for His cause, while we are still on this old heaven and earth? Don't we say

36 That reminds me of the Theologian/Reverend/Vicar that sits for hours in the study preparing an impeccably good sermon, in meditation, or writing a book or two, but does nothing beyond the meditation to get his or her hands dirty for others.

our number one calling is bringing people to the Messiah, to be reconciled with YAHWEH, since we have a testimony of being healed (Shalomed) by the Messiah ourselves? What does the Hebrew writer tell us? He tells us that we have reached Nirvana, the heaven of Shalom, when he says that

“we have come to Mount Zion, that is, the city of the living YAHWEH, heavenly Jerusalem; to myriads of angels in festive assembly; to a community of the firstborn whose names have been recorded in heaven; to a Judge who is YAHWEH of everyone; to spirits of righteous people who have been brought to the goal; to the mediator of a new covenant, Yeshua; and to the sprinkled blood that speaks better things than that of Abel.” (Hebrews 12:22-24)

Can't we testify of tasting heaven when we were first filled with the Spirit, with YAHWEH, and every time afterwards; doesn't this empower us to be witnesses to others of the glory(land) that awaits us? Are we not the real Bodhisattvas, and the Bodhisattvas in Buddhism in error? Or is it true what Friedrich Nietzsche says “Buddhism promises nothing, but actually fulfils; Christianity promises everything, but fulfils nothing” (Nietzsche 1888:117)?

That suffering is the problem, or at least the outflow of the problem, the Scriptures don't deny! Suffering is written all over the Scriptures. Adam and Eve suffered the loss of paradise, but most of all YAHWEH suffered the loss of His own place in His own creation through the fall of mankind. The most distressing words in the Scriptures are Genesis 6:5-6, when the Scriptures tell us that

“YAHWEH saw that the wickedness of mankind was great on earth and that every inclination of the thoughts of their hearts were only continuously evil. And YAHWEH relented that He had made mankind on earth, and He was hurt in His heart!”

YAHWEH, the creator of all relented that he created us, doesn't that sound like suffering?

No book in the Scriptures illustrates YAHWEH's mixed feelings and suffering more than the book of Hosea. On the one hand we see YAHWEH loving Israel unconditionally, tolerating their idolatrous prostitution, but on the other hand we see YAHWEH wanting to judge and break all ties with them. Imagine the mixed feelings and suffering you'll

experience should YAHWEH send you today to marry an active prostitute, if you're a man now, and you know beyond any doubt that you are not the father of your first two children since it's clear in their facial features, obvious to everyone around you? Can we blame YAHWEH for devising a new covenant heading for the New Heaven and Earth, giving up on this old heaven and earth?

Isn't Yeshua's story also about suffering? Through suffering the incarnated Logos became our Messiah, when

“during His life on earth, while he offered with a raised voice and tears prayers of supplication, to the One who had the power to deliver him from death, and he was heard because of his divine goodness, so that even though he was the Son, he learned obedience through his sufferings.” (Hebrews 5:7-8).

Suffering was central to the incarnation, and in this suffering we are obligated to share, since

“..when we are YAHWEH's children, then we are also heirs, heirs of YAHWEH and joint-heirs with the Messiah - provided we are suffering with him in order also to be glorified with him.” (Roman 8:17),

and actually rejoice in it (Romans 5:3). Is suffering not the reason the early church saw such miraculous growth?

But now you might say, “That's just suffering in the church, for Buddhism it's suffering in everything!” You're partly right, but is that not actually just the other way around; Yeshua's followers suffer exactly because they realise the temporality of this old heaven and earth, and those outside the assembly of Yeshua's followers don't; and when Yeshua's followers set out to expose their temporary and nihilistic abstract constructed sense making models, like democracy and capitalism and socialism and religion, etc., persecution is added to this suffering? Their deception is exactly the lie of Lucifer that they won't suffer through the humanistic provisions of the old heaven and earth, and so they suffer unnoticed (rhetorically they make peace with it in religion; remember secularism is also a religion). This lie will be exposed, however, and sadly followed by suffering due to opposing YAHWEH (1 Thessalonians 2:5-8).

The suffering by the followers of Yeshua, due to opposing the system, is promised to them when Paul says “*all who want to live the highest standard of Messianic observance and moral action united with the Messiah Yeshua will be persecuted,*” (2 Timothy 3:12).

I agree with liberation theology’s thesis, which also sees this underlying suffering, that the problem with the church of the last 1600 years is that theology was written by white middle class men who knew nothing about suffering (González 1994). They enjoyed this world way too much to want to give up on it! Actually they wished it not to be temporal!

Suffering is general. Why do millions play the lottery every week? They want to escape a form of suffering, if it is not financial obligations it is greed itself they want to escape. Prosperity and affluence is temporal in the best of times, like the quote in a newspaper article Bunn starts his novel *Drummer in the Dark* with:

Wherever businessmen gather the talk turns to the present prosperity in America; how long it will last, and what will follow it. Periods of prosperity like the present always have one accompaniment. Always it happens that a considerable number of people think this particular prosperity will not end, that there will never be another panic or another depression. They are always wrong. They will be wrong this time

- New York Herald, November 27, 1925 (Bunn 2001)

Every time I read this quote to someone, I don't give the date of the publication and let my hearers guess the date first. No one has ever been right. Doesn't this quote sound like it could have been only a few years ago, before or in the great recession?

Back at suffering, no one has ever enough and all suffer with an acquisitiveness; no one will ever say no to a million, will you? Be honest, don't we all suffer from a form of greed?

Old age as well as sickness doesn't come easy, anyway not in the west. Both my granddad and cousin died of cancer, and in Germany I had to experience how my father-in-law drowned from the water pushing up in his lungs due to cancer, that's now while I was caring for him in our house we're sharing with my parents in law - only one left today though. For my wife this had been emotionally loaded days since she lost her brother with cancer only six years before her dad.

Anyone that tells me that the grass is greener on the other side, I've got news for, suffering is also on the other side. If there's indeed a little green patch of pasture, like revival, it is

only temporary. Examples abound; after socialism's liberation during the first part of the 20th century, suffering soon followed for many with wide spread poverty in former USSR (King 2010:131); now, after socialism, at the end of the 20th century, capitalism's exploitation/suffering reins unchecked. Political freedom is short lived before inequalities of suffering kick in again, just like political bondage turns out to be suffering for the oppressors themselves - if it's not rioting, it's fear of being stabbed in the back as we've seen lately in Tunisia, Egypt and Libya (Middle East conflicts 2011).

No Scripture fits the picture better for me than Romans 8 where Paul states that

"...he reckons that the suffering of this present time are not to be compared with the coming glory to be revealed in us. For the eager expectation of the Creation awaits the heavenly unveiling of Elohim's children. For the Creation was subjected to decay, not willingly, but on account of Him who subjected it, in hope, because also the Creation itself will be set free from the slavery of corruption into the freedom of the glory of the Elohim's children" (Romans 8:18-21)

The key word is *decay*, that includes both creation, and us (don't we anyway turn old without doing any effort? We rather have to make an effort not to turn old that quickly); decay is temporality, it's suffering, *duhkha*. Because of this we

"..., who have the firstfruits of the Holy Spirit, groan within ourselves as we continue waiting eagerly for the legal adoption as sons and daughters - that is, the redemption of our whole bodies set free." (Romans 8:23).

Do you groan inwardly, pregnant with the hope of the New Heaven and Earth?

Because of this groaning, just like the Buddhist, we have to exercise meditation beyond this old world, and that prompts us with the next imbrication. Meditation plays a key role in Buddhism, actually it plays the role in Buddhism. Meditation is the path to nirvana, the heaven of peace, everything else hangs on meditation.

Keith Daniel (Daniel 1993), a renowned evangelist living in Cape Town, but travelling the world, says "You are as real as your quiet times". You are as real as your personal relationship with the Logos, the holistic Divine Logos, since *"...eternal life is this: to know the true Elohim, and him whom He sent, Yeshua the Messiah."* (John 17:3)

Eternal life is in knowing YAHWEH, having a personal relationship with the Logos, fellowship with the Logos, and not to just believe in Him. Take note, the know is not the Gnostic know, knowledge like currency, but the fellowship know of 1John 1:3 when John says that,

“What we have seen and heard, we are proclaiming to you; so that you too may have fellowship (attachment to YAHWEH) with us. Our fellowship/attachment is with the Father and with his Son, Yeshua the Messiah.”

The testimony of the gatherings of the 2nd century Yeshua followers was the direct presence of the Logos right in their midst; spontaneous miracles attest to that (Arnold 2007:6). In the last revival on the Hebrides Islands, on the west coast of Scotland, eye witnesses have told me how a cloud, YAHWEH Himself, came to rest upon their prayer meetings. The fellowship couldn't be more tangible. I'm a first person witness of these first hand testimonies, who am I to say these common people are lying?

Meditation, single or group/church meditation³⁷, just like in Buddhism, is to escape this old world of suffering, disjointedness, and temporality, to experience heaven on earth! Anyway, that's what it's supposed to be. For the Messianic people reasonable physics, and true heaven on earth, for the Buddhist only reasonable physics.

My wife was born in the underground church in the USSR, under persecution. My parents in law experienced the whole span of communism until they made it out of the USSR in the late 70s. I love to listen to my mother-in-law when she tells me about the underground church, which must have been the closest thing to the 2nd century gatherings of Yeshua's followers I can picture. The unity, in the face of the temporality of this old earth, in their

37 The definition quiet times, that I replaced with meditation, is a loaded definition with a lot of baggage, and has the significance, for many, as an individual time with YAHWEH, in a bracketed time and single space as if one is the only one on earth with YAHWEH in this moment. No need to say that contradicts my interconnectedness and depended arising and the unique person that is a diversified of the whole. In short, quiet times are events in the hologram that has all of the hologram in this event. In other words, it is not my quiet times, but our quiet times, since the other you-s have dependently arisen me, and are dependently arising me. Quiet time is like time I spend alone with my wife, but funny enough that is the time we talk about the children and other people and work colleagues and hardly about ourselves.

gatherings goes beyond comprehension, and of this unity one can only dream about in today's church. For them the (group) meditation, house gathering, was the real thing, not the suffering and temporality, outside these assemblies³⁸.

Today these Russian Germans are in their numbers (back) in Germany, but of this total undivided unity not much is left (Teaching Week 2006). Although they still have big churches, and are still a beautiful anthem to YAHWEH on Sundays, the suffering enkindled by materialism and prosperity, seeking permanence and for this world not to end, came unnoticed (Esau 2009).

If there is one thing we can't blame Buddhism for it's their ethics, their rigorous ethics, but how the ethics tie in with their meditation not everyone comprehends. For one thing, they aren't really two different things: when everything hangs on meditation, meditation is not for the ethics, but ethics for the meditations.

This is exactly the point where I see Siddhartha Gautama to have made the scientific breakthrough. Just as bio-resonance discovered that health hangs on the right oscillation of the frequencies in our bodies, so Siddhartha Gautama discovered that the health of our collective consciousness hangs on the right oscillation through ethics. The success of escaping temporality hangs on right ethics enabling meditation; when this isn't ultimately, and certainly not beyond death true for the Buddhist, then it surely is for us who know the YAHWEH of the eternal. Take note, no personal relationship with Yeshua is possible without right ethics, and in turn no Colossians 3:1-3 Messianic meditation allowing us to escape the temporal!

The meditation is that

“..if we were raised along with the Messiah, then we have to seek the things above, where the Messiah is sitting at YAHWEH's right hand. We have to focus our minds

38 This is only a virtual picture I have of this underground church (a narrative like the revival stories of the 19th century), and this apparent unity and heaven on earth - my mother-in-law is a good storyteller. Actually a good friend of mine, Jacob Esau (Esau 2009), has told me a number of times (again in May 2011) how their church, of who his dad was the pastor, actually split in 1966 in Kyrgyzstan when some didn't want to register the church with the government, while the rest followed his dad registering the church. Jacob shares the sad story of the antagonism that came about between these two groups, and between their children he experienced first hand.

on the things above, not on things here on earth, for we have died, and our lives are hidden with the Messiah in YAHWEH.”

Just like in Pure Land Buddhism our meditation must also take place in the practising of love and compassion with one eye on eternity and the other eye on the suffering around us, leaving no eye for the temporal enjoyments of this old heaven and earth! Be honest, how much of this Messianic meditation is left in a church saturated with the consumerism of late capitalism?

The rigorous ethics of Buddhism is part of the eightfold path leading to the end of suffering/cravings/temporality. The eightfold path consists out of three sections: wisdom, ethical conduct, and concentration. Each path is designated as right, but could also be translated as proper. They pan out as follows (it seems that the headings of the breakdown of this eightfold path is public domain in the undocumented varieties of wordings around, but for this discussion I'm going to use the eight ones used by Smith and Novak (Smith 2003:38-49)):

A. Wisdom

1. Right view - for the Buddhist the right view is about the real nature of the problem - suffering (Smith 2003:42). In the Messianic mission, confined to the last days, I don't see much of a difference, since our hope is for the New Heaven and Earth, while realising the decay of this old heaven and earth. The hope is,

"The residence of YAHWEH that's with humanity, and He shall tabernacle with them, and they shall be His people, and YAHWEH Himself shall dwell among them and be their YAHWEH. He will wipe away every tear from their eyes, and there shall not be any longer death, nor mourning, nor weeping, nor pain; the former things have passed away." (Revelation 21:3-4)

On the New Heaven and Earth there will be no more sin and no more suffering.

2. Right Intent - for the Buddhist right intent is about how serious he or she is about terminating suffering (Smith 2003:42). It's about will power. What do

the Scriptures tell us about intent?

"No one who puts his hand to the plow and looks back is fit to serve in YAHWEH's Kingdom." (Luke 9:62)

and

"Whosoever loves his father or mother more than me is not worthy of me; anyone who loves his son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me. And anyone who does not take up his cross and follow me is not worthy of me. Whoever finds his own life will lose it, but the person who loses his life for my sake will find it." (Matthew 10:37-39)

B. Ethical conduct

1. (3) Right speech - for the Buddhist right speech is all about truth, the whole truth, coupled with kindness and compassion. I know, the first thing that comes to mind is the rhetorical trap arguing that the whole truth can't always be kind or compassionate, just like it won't be compassion to reveal someone's entrusted, but confessed errors, when placed on the spot, when these errors actually have no real significance anymore, but embarrassment; however, on the half full or half empty glass scale, on which side do our intentions reside? Is truth how little we can say and still get away with it, or is truth how much we can say? Is rigorous truth and all of the truth, in the contours of compassion, our objective, or is a twisted or economic truth rather the norm? In Biblical terms, has our selfish desires perished with Yeshua on the cross, leaving us with no self-interest in justifying what truth entitles? When truth is a relational word, then truth is part of the quality of our interconnected network together with other people; when we lie we also lie to ourselves!
2. (4) Right action - for the Buddhist right action is also about selfless love and compassion in action. The egoistic self must vanish in the interconnected network that's being served with kindness. What does the Scripture say?

"...in humility, regard other as better than yourselves; don't just look after

*your own interest, but look out for the best interest of others. Let your mind be that of Messiah Yeshua: Though he was in the form/likeness of YAHWEH, he didn't regard equality with YAHWEH something to be possessed. On the contrary, he **emptied** himself, and took the form/likeness of a slave by becoming like humanity...". (Philippians 2:3-7)*

The bold word *emptied*, in this text, is strikingly similar to that of the Buddhist use: Yeshua emptied Himself of his YAHWEHness, while the Buddhist empties him- or herself of his or her (selfish/individual) earthiness. The only difference is Yeshua did it for our salvation, while Buddhists do it for their own 'salvation'. In our case what do the Scriptures command us?

"Therefore, put to death the earthly parts of your nature - sexual immorality, impurity, lust, evil desires and greed (which is a form of idolatry);"
(Colossians 3:5)?

In our case it's both for our own salvation, but then for others as well for who we'll be Bodhisattvas. I guess in principle it's the same with the Mahayana Buddhist.

3. (5) Right livelihood - for the Buddhist right livelihood is about filling our lives with work to better humanity. A contradiction for some might be the monastic movement, of say Theravada or Zen Buddhist streams, as the highest vocation. That might be the case except when the monastery really, and only, serves the good of the community. In the Messianic movement, the monastery for the good of the society will quote Paul, and might have a point:

"What I am saying, siblings, is that there is not much time left:... What I want for you is not to worry. An unmarried man concerns himself with the things of YAHWEH, with how to please YAHWEH; but the married man concerns himself with the things of the world, with how to please his wife; he is split in two. Likewise the woman who is no longer married or who has never gotten married concerns herself with the things of YAHWEH, with how to be holy both physically and spiritually; but the married woman concerns herself with the things of the world, with how to please her husband... However, in my

opinion, she will be happier if she remains unmarried, and in saying this I think I have the Holy Spirit.” (1 Corinthians 7:29-40)

In 2 Thessalonians 3:8-10 Paul sets the example of unselfish livelihood:

“Nor did we eat anyone's food for free, but by labouring and toiling night and day we had the goal of putting no burden on anyone of you; not because we do not have the right, but in order that we could set an example that you might imitate. When we were with you, this we used to command: if anyone will not work, neither let him eat!”

The interconnectedness, emptying, shines though in verse 33 of Luke 14,

“So no one who doesn't renounce all that he has can be Yeshua's disciple.”

coupled with Acts 2:44-45,

“All those trusting in Yeshua were together having everything in common; in fact, they sold their properties and possessions and distributed the proceeds to all who were in need.”

Our goods are the goods of the family of YAHWEH!

C. Concentration

1. (6) Right effort - for the Buddhist right effort is the determinism needed in pressing on, against all odds, to the goal of nirvana. Siddhartha Gautama said,

“Those who follow the Way, might well follow the example of an ox that marches through the deep mire carrying a heavy load. He is tired, but his steady gaze, looking forward, will never relax until he comes out of the mire, and it is only then he rests. O monks, remember that passion and sin are more than the filthy mire, and that you can escape misery only by earnestly and steadily thinking of the Way.” (Suzuki 1906:20).

Don't the Scriptures make the same call? If the Buddhist seeks nirvana with such effort, how much more should we?

*“so also the Messiah... will... deliver those who are **expectantly awaiting the arrival of him.**” (Hebrews 9:28)*

Yeshua says “Strive/do effort to enter through the gate of narrowness, because many, I say to you, will try to enter and they will not be able to. ”
(Luke 13:24)

2. (7) Right mindfulness - the first verse in the Dhammapada says:

All that we are is the result of what we have thought: it is founded on our thoughts, it is made up of our thoughts. If a man speaks or acts with an evil thought, pain follows him, as the wheel follows the foot of the ox that draws the carriage. (Kinnes 2009).

Yeshua says:

“But what comes out of your mouth originates out of your heart, and that makes a person unclean. For out of the heart come forth evil thoughts, murders, adulteries and other kinds of sexual misconduct, stealing, lies/false testimonies, slanders. . . .”

(Matthew 15:18-19)

3. (8) Right concentration - for the Buddhist right concentration is single mindedness on the task ahead. Repeating a single word or notion, over an extended time, sounds so foreign to us, but how many times have I not heard Messianic followers complaining that they just don't manage their quiet times/meditation since their thoughts are running all over the place, but on the Scriptures? Right concentration is the effort of blocking out distractions. What example can we take out of the Scriptures? Martha and Mary is a good one,

“And while they were on the way, Yeshua entered into a certain village. And a certain woman named of Martha received him. And she had a sister named Mary, who sat down at the Lord Yeshua's feet only listening to his words. But Martha was distracted with much to do. And having stood by, she

said, Lord, is it of no worrying you that my sister has left me alone to serve you? Tell her then to help me. And in reply Lord said to her, “Martha, Martha, you are anxious and worried about many things, but one is necessary. For Mary has chosen the right thing which will not be taken away from her.”

(Luke 10:38-42)

4. Radical inductive contemplation

The eightfold path leads from grasping the problem in physics, through the right ethics, into meditation; into right and single-minded concentration. Without the reasonable physics, although supplemented with right ethics, will fail right meditation. For the Messianic community the same counts. In the same way the reasonable physics, without the right ethics, will also fail meditation. Both reasonable physics and right ethics are needed for right meditation to succeed in any way.

Just like in Buddhism, meditation is also the goal of the Messianic community, an organic meditation, that's now to know YAHWEH personally, experiencing YAHWEH essentially in the New Heaven and Earth that broke back into the old heaven and earth; presence is the notion I would like to call it.

If there is something we can take from Buddhist meditation it is *koan* in Zen Buddhism's training. Koan means problem, and is what the meditation occupies itself with. One *koan* can take as long as a doctoral dissertation (Smith 2003:97). The thing about the *koan* is that it can't be solved with Euclidean 3D logic, it asks for multidimensional Riemannian logic (Smith 2003:98) and ties in with the physics we're talking about, since it was Riemannian geometry that unlocked quantum mechanics.

A typical *koan* is as follows:

*“A long time ago a man kept a goose in a bottle. It grew larger and larger until it could not get out of the bottle anymore. He did not want to break the bottle, nor did he wish to harm the goose. How would you get it out?” (an adaptation out of *Buddhism a concise introduction* (Smith 2003:97)*

This sounds absurd, in Euclidean logic, but not for the Zen Buddhist who has to really and logically solve this problem to finish his or her training. To solve such a problem one must obviously first know or assume it's possible, otherwise one won't even attempt to acquire

Riemannian logic, and by that replacing Euclidean logic. The first step is to reach the limits of Euclidean logic.

This is precisely where our meditation should also break out of Euclidean logic and embrace Riemannian logic. What's a more challenging task for logic to solve, the example of the goose *koan* above, or the logic needed to explain the fact that we worship One YAHWEH in three persons where Yeshua, who is one Person in this YAHWEH, called YAHWEH, Father, and contradictory states a different will when He said

"Father, if you are willing, take this cup away from me; still, let not my will but yours be done." (Luke 22:42)

When they are one YAHWEH, how can they have separate Wills?

You try to solve this problem in Euclidean logic! The best you can do is to contradict yourself! The Trinity can only make sense in Riemannian logic. Creation can only make sense in Riemannian logic. Salvation can only make sense in Riemannian logic. Euclidean logic soon hits the barriers and only relegates to rhetoric, to the modernist methodologies and categories. Modernism is stuck with Euclidean logic.

Now you can tell me, "It has all to do with faith? You just have to believe in the Trinity, in salvation, creation, etc.!" You tell me, what does faith have to do with it at all, it is either a fact or it's not. You say to me I have to believe Yeshua died on the cross and rose from the dead, why do I have to believe it? It has either happened, and it's a fact, and then I don't have to believe it, I just know it, or it hasn't happened and then my faith is a deception. Why *doxa*, the weak form of *episteme* (Mann 2005:6)? It's either *episteme* or it's not, it can't be halfway *episteme*.

The same applies to creation; why do I have to believe in *Ex Nihilo*, when it has happened? It's at this intersection that both liberal and fundamentalist theology shatters; liberal theology says the same about *doxa* and *episteme*, what does faith have to do with facts, but shatters with Euclidean logic and consequently can't observe the Scriptures more than just a human fabrication? Fundamentalist theology contradicts itself by residing in Euclidean logic while claiming a Scriptural worldview, they conveniently transfer everything that doesn't make sense in Euclidean logic to the category called faith. Faith

becomes the scapegoat for Euclidean irrationality.

To believe that the earth was created 6000 years ago, and in six days as some believe, is irrational, sorry to say that, but when I say I *know* the One personally who has created the cosmos, and therefore know that as a fact, not faith, that the cosmos was created, it's more than what both liberal theology or fundamentalist theology can say since this *know* surpasses Euclidean logic, just as love can't really be explained with Euclidean logic. Think about it, what's love really? As soon as love is subjected to reductive Euclidean logic, to the parts of love, it's not love anymore. All these parts can be conducted without love. When I give my wife flowers, it doesn't indubitable mean I love her. Nothing I 'do' proves I love her, because I can do all these things without loving her as well.

Love, and having children, following YAHWEH are all things that only make sense in Riemannian logic, since selflessness is illogic (in Euclidean logic) and can only make sense in another logic, Riemannian logic.

Back to faith; take Paul's use of the word faith out of the Scriptures, what would be left for such a scapegoat category? Not much! No other author in the Scriptures, except to some degree the apostle John, really attached salvation to faith. When Yeshua was confronted with the way to YAHWEH, He said to the rich young ruler, "...*But if you want to enter eternal life, observe the mitzvot (commandments).*" (Matthews 19:17).

But why has Paul then made so much of this notion? We have to see this in the light of the problem he had with the Judiasers in his ministry, the dogs (Philippians 3:2). In short, the problem was legalism, faith as a notion was not so much a category on its own (that would have been modernism), but rather what legalism was not in obeying the law. Faith is what the Scriptures tell us to do outside legalism, and that is love with hope,

"Don't be indebted to anything, except the debt to love one another; for whoever loves fulfils the Torah." (Romans 13:8)

To understand this legalism we have to understand what Judaism became during the Babylonian exile. Before the Babylonian exile the law was first a liberation for the runaway slaves from Egypt, but all in all did not really play that an important role though, since in their eyes YAHWEH's presence was guaranteed through the temple in their midst. When

YAHWEH destroyed the temple though, Judaism faced a core identity problem, and the Parush (Pharisee) sect came to prominence. They replaced the temple with the mitzvot (commandments) as the guarantee of YAHWEH's presence, and that was Paul's issue. That Paul was self a Parush is important to notice, and out of the diaspora Paul didn't centralise YAHWEH's presence around the temple by tradition, although for the other apostles that took a while (Acts 2:46; 3:1; 21:26).

With faith Paul popularised a new notion to centre YAHWEH's presence outside legalism, in the assembly/synagogue. That the apostle John only wrote his part of the B'rit Hadashah after 70 AD could be an explanation why he also uses believe in regards to outsiders (John 1:7), but when he turns to the inner circle he rather uses the word know (John 17:3), than faith, and also fellowship (1 John 1:3); these are the notions I'll abide with. That I know my wife is a fact, I don't have to believe it to make it a fact.

To come back to meditation; in Riemannian geometry time and space collapse, and therefore the crucifixion happens again/or still when I have my meditations. Don't we read

"...the Lamb has always been slain from before the world was founded."

(Revelation 13:8),

and we are still being slaughtered with Him in salvation? Paul states,

"Don't you know that those of us who have been baptised into the Messiah Yeshua have been baptised into his death? Through baptism into his death we were buried with him; so that just as, through the glory of the Father, the Messiah was raised from the dead, in the same way we too might live a new life. For if we have become grown together with Him in the likeness of death, we will also grow together with Him in the likeness of His resurrection." (Romans 6:3-5)

and,

"With the Messiah I'm nailed to the cross; so that I no longer live, but the Messiah that lives in me, and the life I now live in my body I live with the same trust that the Son of YAHWEH had, who loved me and gave himself over for me." (Galatians 2:19-20)

Our crucifixion with Yeshua is not figurative, or spiritual, or just something we have to take by faith, it's real, and so also our resurrection and life with Him in heaven right now³⁹. Do you remember Colossians 3:1-3?

At the Zulu mission station Kwasizabantu, that saw revival in 1966-7, and that I've visited many times I've never heard them preaching about faith; my experience is that black Africans have the same problem with the word faith as I do, since faith is also too ambiguous for them. That introduces us to the topic of our next discussion.

5. Dozing off the session

“Can you believe it, here we are again in Kings square! See you 4pm!”

³⁹ The crucifixion, resurrection and residing in Yeshua on the right hand of YAHWEH right now, and that simultaneously, are part of the implosion that depicts the dimensions of our experiences currently. Something like the economic Trinity, where the dimensions are the manifestations/the varied existentialistic expressions of Yeshua's atonement, although only part of the atonement as will become clear.

Chapter 4: Tanakh Theolosophy

“...African metaphysics is **holistic in nature**. Reality is seen as a closed system so that everything hangs together and is affected by any change in the system... African metaphysics is organized around a number of principles and laws which control so called vital forces. There is a principle concerning the interaction of forces, that is, between God and humankind, between different people, between humankind and animals, and between humankind and material things. These forces are hierarchically placed, they form a ‘chain of being’.” (Coetzee 2003:196) (Bold added for emphasis)

1. Contextual embedding of session

It's now 5 to 4, our tram is due in 7 minutes. You know what? I'm convinced there aren't going to be trams on the New Heaven and Earth, but heck we need them on the old heaven and earth, or what do you say? The Amish will say, “No need thanks!”, but in the need of green transport how can trams be reasoned away? Did you know there used to be 42 cities in Africa with tram networks? Today there are still a few networks left, but only in North Africa, and that's a different Africa than the one south of the Sahara.

It seems like trams came and left with colonisation, but I guess a lot of things came and left with colonisation. I just wish modernism would have also vanished, like trams, when the occupation seized, but that wasn't and wouldn't be the case anymore, anyway not until the New Heaven and Earth.

It's interesting that no one has noticed that the ubuntu philosophy, the philosophy of Africa, also derives from the reasonable physics, and not just the far Eastern schools of Vedism, Buddhism, Hinduism, Taoism, etc. Africa has always been seen, by so many, as the pathetic backward continent infested with poverty and misery, but behold Africa has actually proven lately that it has been superior to the apparent Westernised world in many ways. What Europa and North America are only discovering now, through quantum mechanics, Africa has already known and practised. No one has noticed that just as modernism was a problem for Siddhartha Gautama⁴⁰, so modernism is the culprit

⁴⁰ I've already touched this, but just to reiterate; actually Hinduism was Siddhartha Gautama's problem, and so times long before what the epoch modernism became, however, as I've pointed out I see a strong similarity between modernism and Hinduism, since all is god in one and nothing is god in the other. As simulacra they are on equal par: the historical that allegorically gets hidden in the proposed vertical and horizontal imploding lines of the proposed hermaneutics

ransacking Africa of its values⁴¹.

Did you know that the individual doesn't exist in traditional Africa? We say modernism has bypassed Africa, poor Africa, they hadn't even 'invented' the wheel yet by the time the Europeans arrived - I don't believe that though, but can't we rather count Africa lucky because it's better to be poor and know more about reality, than to be rich, and 'advanced', but don't fully know reality and are so deceived? Why are Africans in general, irrespective of such major totalitarian, political and economic issues and problems, such happy people? It's sad, really sad, that modernist infested Euclidean logic has been forced on Africa, sanctifying individualism and materialism, and that through a colonialist superiority complex.

Africa was made to think that Riemannian logic is inferior to Euclidean logic, but the truth is the other way round. It's funny, exactly the interconnectedness and nonlocality of quantum mechanics, and what we have discussed so far, are what ubuntu is! Ubuntu is closer to the truth than a modernist tradition that has reached it's logical conclusion in the words of Friedrich Nietzsche, "God is dead!" (Nietzsche (n.d.))

analogically solving the same crime.

41 The abstractions Europa, North America and Africa are the abstractions of dependent arisings, the same abstractness we use to call certain complex and unique things cats that are from a particular abstractness. The cat example argues that reductionism is a cardinal part of our cognition, in modernist terms, construing abstract (linguistic) metaphors, where the process is a metaphor of life. On the other hand, contrary to this notion, in the proposed virtual Hebraic worldview, it is rather what things can become together, how people used to become Americans together, and still are becoming Americans together (thus an inside-out cognitive relative reductionism). Maureen Dickerson (Dickerson 2011) told me in the autumn of 2011 how she is doubting the Americanism of Barack Obama because she once saw him not saluting the American flag and once not said "God bless America" in a speech. Is that what would make Barack Obama American? I'm convinced that George Bush jnr., his predecessor, has also at least once not saluted the American flag and even once not said "God bless America", but again proves that Americanism is not the list of attributes, but what people can become together. Somehow Barack Obama hasn't really become American together with Maureen Dickerson, and many other Americans. Is it too far fetched to wonder if Barack Obama can do anything, or not do anything, that would make him American in the eyes of these opponents? I guess if he becomes Republican it would help, an abstract Republican since he has already shifted so far right in his politics that he is where the Republicans were not long ago.

2. Wider theolosophy debate

What does ubuntu mean? Ubuntu means ubuntu, but to try to put it in English it's something like being human through other humans. In short ubuntu is humanness, all of us together one humanness. You don't exist without me, and I don't exist without you. It's Riemannian logic that defies the Billiard table; we're not two independent balls which can only influence each other from external causes-and-effects.

In ubuntu time and space implodes, or just doesn't exist! In ubuntu everything is interconnected, dependent arising as the Buddhist calls it; in ubuntu the community is the nucleus of existence, and the children still to be born are already part of the community, while the ones dead are also still part of the community. Linear time is an Euclidean logical invention; fortunately we had Einstein⁴² and so it is not anymore, but when time is space

42 I realise Einstein is not to be confused with simultaneity, however, accidentally Einstein was the first 20th century scientist to give up the invariability of time that paved the way for simultaneity in physics – Einstein divides history between static time and relative time, even if only in sentiment, but not linearity and simultaneity. In my MTh (Nortje 2005) I took the brave, but tunnel vision step to hang the modernist and postmodernist epochs on only two names, who I called the Newtonian worldview and the Einsteinian worldview. With Einstein this is more problematic than with Newton, since Einstein actually vehemently resisted the Copenhagen interpretation of the enigma (Beller 1993:243), and actually the full swing of quantum mechanics. On the other hand, it was Einstein that split the times, with his formula $E=mc^2$, to before quantum mechanics and then the full swing of quantum mechanics. The same applies to Newton; should I single the historical Newton out, and only hang a whole epoch on him, wouldn't I be somehow unfair to him? Yes, except if the simulacrum is rather an emotional (social) construction, only analogically related to the historical person, thus an abstract name tag of what causality and the billiard board metaphor became. Immanuel Kant could just as well served as a name tag, as Marius Herholdt says, “The Cartesian dualism which sustained the world as a vast machine opened the way for Newton to formulate his laws which apply for the falling apple [causality] as well as for the trajectories of the planet [the billiard board metaphor]” (Maimela 1998:458), but between the two Immanuel Kant was more 'fundamental' in doctrine than Newton, who gave up on the Trinity? However, do you see my detachment and simulacruming? A pattern should be evident by now; I'm creating abstract simulacra to simulations with notions like Riemannian logic and Euclidean logic where the simulation of the historical person gets allegorically hidden in the analogy; in this case Georg Friedrich Bernhard Riemann (1826-1866) and Euclid of Alexandria (floruit 300 BC). As a historical person Riemann was just a modernist as anyone before him, although it is his geometry that paved the

then 'linear' space is also only a Euclidean logical invention as well. We don't have to think too far to see how colonisation and globalisation has been, and is still drilling against ubuntu by robbing the land from the community, where the ancestors were buried who still are involved in the community in a timeless, spaceless paradigm.

For many that might sound very un-Scriptural, but not when I read the ground breaking book *Heaven* by Randy Alcorn (Alcorn 2004:69-71) that argues that the cloud of witnesses of Hebrews 12 is involved in our lives on earth right now praying for us - take note not like Catholicism where the living prays for the dead, but the dead for the living. He argues the praying of the saints in heaven from Revelation 6:10 where they pray for retribution on earth as an example (Alcorn 2004:65-7). Where Africa got it wrong is to offer sacrifices to the dead in order to gain the ancestors' favour and so manipulate their influence.

When the Scriptures tell us that the Holy Land was promised to the patriarchs, I don't think their involvement ceased at death. What significance would a promise from YAHWEH have when it's for this side of the grave but only comes into fulling once one is already on the other side of the grave? What encouragement or joy would that be? To put it in today's context, what joy would it really be should say a refugee, robbed of his or her heritage, receive the promise from YAHWEH that his or her children will make it back to their home land, but would not live to see that since the dictator is destined to live longer? Yes, I guess the refugee would be happy for the children, but I find it difficult to think that YAHWEH's promises are so one sided that death would rob one of seeing His faithfulness

way for quantum mechanics, and in a tweaked form became the geometry of quantum mechanics (Petersen 2006:21-2) and so the analogy to the simulacrum to a simulation. The simulacrum becomes a simulation again in the proposed hermeneutics of the vertical and horizontal lines of presence with myself, other people, the cosmos and YAHWEH. The sentiment of the historical getting allegorically hidden in the simulacrum is like the general excepted emotion that Shakespeare has written his plays, although serious questions concerning his authorship definitely carry validity (Ramsbotham 2004). What I'm doing is playing with emotions. The futurist Patrick Dixon argues that people evaluate things by emotions. The example he uses is the underground bombings in London in 2005. He says people asked him afterwards if he is still going to use the underground. Laughingly he said that even if there would be a bombing every day on the underground it would statistically still be safer than some other forms of transportation (Dixon 2007). These name tags, simulacra to simulations, are sentiments, emotionally loaded, even if it is only for me and my story and my memoirs.

in fulfilling His promises!

Why make a promise then in the first place when YAHWEH is anyway going to do His will, that's now if it's not about the relationship? It would be like promising my mum a car for after she is dead. What joy would that bring her? In the same way I'm certain the patriarchs knew when Israel had captured the Promised Land!

We know Yeshua's words:

"I am Abraham's YAHWEH, Isaac's YAHWEH and Jacob's YAHWEH? He's not YAHWEH of the dead but of the living!" (Matthew 22:32)

When we say truth, that also embraces all facts like creation, is a social construction in Africa (Coetzee 2003:194-9), which is true, we are in danger, however, of missing the core of the reasonable physics, since construction in this case doesn't mean nothing was there, and now it's been constructed. Nonlocality, in space and time, has difficulties with a social construction where individual parties are implied in the negotiating process. The individual doesn't exist, so mobility is the whole; nothing new is constructed, the whole has just gained or lost in contexture. Epistemology, ethics, ontology, and all these fancy words gain a completely different meaning in this nonlocality of one community. The best picture I can draw is that these things are like nutrition in one body, ethics and epistemology and even ontology are what has to be good for the community, they are not things that can be put on a table or exist in these watertight modernist categories. They are only the essential flow of energy for the well being of the community, and not necessarily something substantial - no billiard balls.

The thing is that the Ancient Near East precisely depicts ubuntu; the early Tanakh is a picture of Africa. It's not like I'd lived in the Ancient Near East, but I certainly have in the heartland of Africa and, in the implosion of time and space, they seem to be the same in my reading of the Ancient Near East. I see the same tribal, territorial, and hierarchical breakdown. I see the same elderly sitting at the 'gate' discussing all matters of the tribe. I see the same polygamy and promiscuous sex. I see the same status acquired through (many) children, and children swaying under the jurisdiction of their parents as long as they are not married - a young man of 35 who is not married yet is still a teenager. In both ubuntu and the Tanakh age brings respect, and death at a good age is an honour.

I also see the same Riemannian logic in both. Now I'm treading on thin ice I know. Africa is so riddled with sin and the abuse of power that I'm scared someone might think I justify these abuses. That's not the case. With the Ancient Near East I refer to the whole cultural context of which Israel was only a typical instance. By that I don't put Israel on par with the other nations, no, far from it, I am just saying I see how YAHWEH accommodated culture and intended to purge culture from sin.

The Riemannian logic I see in the Tanakh is that YAHWEH clearly forbids murder in the ten commandments, but then still takes Saul monarchy away from him after he hadn't killed all the Amalekites in 1 Samuel 15. YAHWEH even blessed the midwives that lied to Pharaoh in Exodus 1; isn't lying sin? Not to mention Holy Wars that completely contradict YAHWEH's prohibitions and personality of love and compassion, and which is not easy to understand, since, contrary to liberal theology that argues Holy Wars as purely a wrong human understanding, they were commanded by YAHWEH Himself, and certainly begs for Riemannian logic to understand⁴³.

The Riemannian logic to let the Tanakh make sense used to be only restricted to my meditations, but now this logic has merged into my whole worldview. Faith isn't a synonymous term for Riemannian logic, instead it seems to me that the fundamentalists, those who at least try to keep sanity rather than surrendering to liberalism, resorted to a kind of Marcion heresy by ascribing two different Deities to the Tanakh and the B'rit

⁴³ My first professor during my MTh (Nortje 2005) Adrio König (Professor Emeritus in Systematic Theology) challenged me on this one, and made it clear to me how problematic Holy Wars are in the Scriptures, but is that not exactly my point? In the billiard board causality Holy Wars can be nothing else but problematic, since comprehensive love and uncompassionate wars are unreconcilable. Sometimes I actually find it funny and entertaining to see how people grapple around with rhetoric trying to explain the unreconcilable and how theologians, renown theologians, find ways to make their theological models watertight. A book that has really assisted me in seeing this rhetoric at work is the study of Jonathan Potter, *Representing Reality: Discourse, Rhetoric and Social Construction* (Potter 1996) and the techniques people use to make statements and arguments believable. This assists my proposed vertical and horizontal hermeneutics where the text (the oral text) is before us and not behind us, since I don't deny that these techniques are part and parcel of our cognitive mapping, the world we invent, and concurs with what Potter quotes out of the Postmodern Manifesto, "The rationalists have only interpreted the world, the point is to [instead] invent it [now]!" (Potter 1996:232).

Hadashah, although they won't admit that. They don't know how to get to Riemannian logic, so for them YAHWEH underwent a personality change in the incarnating Logos (not two Deities like with Marcion, but one Deity with two personalities), but that certainly contradicts the Scriptures though:

“Every good endowment and every complete gift is from above, coming down from the Father of Lights with whom there is no variation or shadow of turning.” (James 1:17)

and,

“But the counsel of YAHWEH stands forever, the plans of His heart are from generation to generation.” (Psalm 33:11)

Back to ubuntu, the picture of a god/ELHOHIM is that “Together with the world, God constitutes the spatio-temporal ‘totality’ of existence” (Coetzee 2003:1998), but again means nothing viewed from the unreasonable physics. Firstly, ubuntu denies modernist dualisms of, e.g., the apparent objective ghost in the body, but also the dualism of the seen and the unseen as two different worlds. The spiritual and material dualism, like oil and water, is a modernist invention. Natural and supernatural dualism is the same invention, for ubuntu the events of the unseen is just as real as the events of the seen, the one is not natural and the other supernatural (Coetzee 2003:136). For modernism the dualism is actually real events versus myths, the supernatural is only a myth.

The contrast being African and European thinking is always best illustrated to me in sicknesses, I guess it's because I have learned to know so much about them from personal experience. It's funny, when we as Europeans get sick, we first of all ask ourselves what natural law caused this illness, what physical cause-and-effect set in motion the trajectory of the billiard balls, but the African, on the other hand, rather asks what 'spiritual'/unseen force is at play, or what lesson is there to learn, in this illness. For the African the seen is only a manifestation of the unseen.

Who's right and who's wrong then? Sorry to say, but I'm obligated to agree more with the African, since, as you remember the quantum enigma argues, all matter is actually information (waves are only information) and appearances/phenomena consciously arise

when wavefunctions collapse. This is precisely what ubuntu argues. Semantically *Ubu-* is the information and *-ntu* the phenomena (Coetzee 2003:271). Nonlocality and permanence is in the *Ubu-*, difference/manifestation is in the *-ntu*.

Once in England a fellow pastor asked me what's the difference between Africa and Europe; my answer was "The African sees god/YAHWEH in everything, the European sees god in nothing!" (Assemblies of God 2003).

It's really interesting to observe the similarities between Buddhism and ubuntu (Nortje 2010), these similarities are strikingly evident at close observation, but won't the same physics just do that? How the two relate is for me like how the Tanakh (Old Testament) relates to the B'rit Hadashah (New Testament): ubuntu is the Tanakh and Buddhism the B'rit Hadashah.

The similarities are:

1. No modernist dualisms (for ubuntu see Lebisa Teffo and Abraham Roux (Coetzee 2003:196), and for Buddhism see Huston Smith and Philip Novak (Smith 2003:115))
2. Both holistic in worldview; the seen and unseen are one world (for ubuntu see Lebisa Teffo and Abraham Roux (Coetzee 2003:196), and for Buddhism see *Encyclopedia of Buddhism* (Buswell 2004:430))
3. Interconnectedness (Nortje 2010a)
4. Experience verifies things (for ubuntu see Lebisa Teffo and Abraham Roux (Coetzee 2003:196), and for Buddhism see Huston Smith and Philip Novak (Smith 2003:29))
5. Reality is deeper and more than what we can experience – both ubuntu (Ikuenobe 2006:76) and Buddhism (Buswell 2004:269) make no real 'western' metaphysical claims concerning the single person
6. Meaning originates in the relationship with the total togetherness of the cosmos for ubuntu (Coetzee 2003:279), and Buddhism (Ford 1997:471)
7. Cause-and-effect is internal in interconnectedness and both with a teleological

- objective for ubuntu (Coetzee 2003:197) and Buddhism (Smith 2003:29)
8. Community or consciousness 'constructs' it all in ubuntu (Coetzee 2003:271) and Buddhism (Smith 2003:29)
 9. No acknowledged Ex Nihilo in both ubuntu (Coetzee 2003:199), and Buddhism (Smith 2003:53)
 10. No fear for death in both ubuntu (Coetzee 2003:278) and Buddhism (Hsing Yun 2005:47-8) (tranquillity is what's it about). Old age, is the prerequisite in Africa though.
 11. 'Western' time is an illusion in both ubuntu (Mbiti 1989:16-17) and Buddhism (Fagg 2003:165). In both the present moment is the only thing that counts.
 12. In both be-ing/*Ubu*- is not fragmented; Didier Kaphagawanit and Jeanette Malherbe say that for ubuntu "entities are the dimensions, forms, and modes of the incessant flow of simultaneously multi-directional motion" (Coetzee 2003:274). For Buddhism see Franklyn Sills (Sills 2009:87) chapter on *Self as Process: Buddhist Concepts*.
 13. In Africa "Epistemologically, be-ing is conceived as a perpetual and universal movement of sharing and exchange of the forces of life" (Coetzee 2004:275), in Buddhism it's dependant arising (Smith 2003:29).
 14. In both ubuntu (Martin 1995:187) and Buddhism (Tachibana 1995:224) respect comes with age, and turns the span of life the other way around where wisdom comes with experience, and not with formal education per se; in both old age is valued and respected (sadly in the Westernised mind the emphasis is always on future and education, passing on of currency, and therefore old people have no practical use anymore).

The differences are:

1. The *-ntu* concerns ubuntu, the temporal, the this-worldly concerns, which is like the Tanakh that is purely concerned about redeeming the old heaven and earth, while Buddhism intends to escape the this-worldly temporality with the Bodhisattvas' mission of taking as many as possible with them, in the same way the B'rit

Hadashah is the last days of this old heaven and earth motioning to take as many people as possible to the New Heaven and Earth.

2. In ubuntu death at old age is a patriarchal death with the appropriate respect (the elevation to ancestor (Martin 1995:187)), just like the death of the patriarchs in the Tanakh, but in Buddhism death at any age is good (Hsing Yun 2005:47), just like in the B'rit Hadashah.
3. Ubuntu is not really a counter culture/philosophy in principle, but a sovereign community with little dialogue (assimilation is only in one direction) (Shorter 2004:3); tribal wars were also like Holy Wars save guarding the protoplasm of a closed community (in the generality exceptions are always the case). Just like with ubuntu the Torah illustrates YAHWEH forming a sovereign Israel state in the Promised Land with Holy Wars curbing all outside influences. Buddhism, on the other hand, is for one thing a counter philosophy repudiating Hinduism, and religion in general (that's the irony of Buddhism that fell back into Hinduism); in the same way the writings of the B'rit Hadashah is countering Late Judaism, as well as the evil forces of the Roman Empire, and the spirit of the Antichrist on this old heaven and earth - Holy Wars are now ideological wars, not killing people.
4. A lot of Africa's lawlessness and inhumanity, ranging from tribal wars to male dominance to endless corruption, pretty much depicts the Tanakh in practice, while the love and compassion of Buddhism the B'rit Hadashah.

There are obviously more camps in the world than only ubuntu/Tanakh, Buddhism/B'rit Hadashah, and the Greek infested westernised mind outside the Tanakh and B'rit Hadashah. On the other hand can there indeed only be three camps that, to a certain extent, can be extended beyond ubuntu with the Tanakh, and Buddhism with the B'rit Hadashah? If that's the case, to what extent is there an overlap?

To some extent Dreamtime, the animist framework of Australian Aboriginal mythology, can be added to ubuntu/Tanakh, but soon runs into trouble with animism's metaphysics of incarnation and creation story (Harvey 2005:70). Maybe Jainism can be added to Buddhism/B'rit Hadashah, but also runs into problems with the metaphysics of the five ontological categories called astikāya and which are the building blocks responsible for the

maintenance of existence. The most important is the *jīva* translated as soul, but collectively all five form a category called 'non-soul' (Dundas 2002:93). The being and non-being doesn't fit the picture.

Nowhere I've found a closer philosophical fit to the Tanakh than ubuntu, and to the B'rit Hadashah than Buddhism (again the emphasis on the philosophies not the religions), that's now outside the Scriptural thinking itself (how YAHWEH as the guiding post and authoritative agent in the dialogues of the Scriptures is thinking by Himself).

With this 'parallelism' (assuming modernist categories) I obviously am not trying to substitute the Tanakh with ubuntu, or the B'rit Hadashah with Buddhism. No, far from it, but just as Greek mythology has been read into the Scriptures the last 1600+ years, so that the Scriptures have been interpreted with and through this methodologically invented classes, so I see two other philosophies that better read themselves into the Scriptures than this Greek tradition. On the one hand I'm saying that we aren't YAHWEH, thus divine, and so we have to bring something to the Scriptures to understand/illuminate the Scriptures; but by that I then also make a metaphysical claim that we can do nothing else but read a philosophy into the Scriptures, or read the Scriptures with a philosophy, or the reading is the Scriptures and philosophy that dependently arise as one.

By bringing different philosophies to the Scriptures, the Scriptures are being seen from different angles, and the best angles in my experience with YAHWEH have turned out to be ubuntu and Buddhism and the Scriptures that corrects ubuntu and Buddhism⁴⁴. To

⁴⁴ I realise this is a dangerous judgement I'm making. Why haven't Africa and Asia ever seen the kind of revivals and reformations and movements of the Holy Spirit as in the cohabiting Graeco-Roman philosophical worlds with Yeshua's followers? Why don't Buddhists then wholeheartedly and naturally accept the Scriptures if their philosophy is apparently so close? The thing is, when belonging comes before believing (suspected doxa in the apparent cognitive relativism, but episteme as far as narrative-marks). The problem with Buddhists and paynim traditionalist Africans is not the suspected believing (although episteme), but belonging. So their philosophical models may be 'more Scriptural', but without belonging. The Way of Israel (Berkhof 1986:253-70) has gone the way it has, with the remnant, because YAHWEH promised His mercy to the 1000's generation to those that love Him, and live Torah (Exodus 20:3). We can also call it the way of Abraham, and that has gone the way it has. I know Islam will also claim the same, but can Islam claim the same relationship, ubuntuing of belonging and through that suspected believing (although episteme)? Or is Islam rather another suspected believing

correct Greek philosophy has turned out to be futile, although we can't say YAHWEH hadn't tried in testimonies of the revivals in the previous modernist epoch.

To look at it differently, my supervisor (Van Niekerk 2010a) once orally pointed out to me that John Calvin took Greek philosophy, and unashamedly just stuck it on top of the Scriptures and so constructed his theology. I want to turn it around and say that the rule is that we can do nothing but take the Scriptures and unashamedly stick our philosophy on the Scriptures, and from all the philosophies ubuntu and Buddhism are a closer fit than Greek mythology.

Now I know what you are saying, "How do you know they fit the best? For you to claim that, following your own reasoning, you first had to interpret the Scriptures yourself, and then it means you had already stuck a philosophy on the Scriptures, or the Scriptures on a philosophy, in the first place!" (the notorious hermeneutical circle as we'll see in the days to come). That's true, and therefore admit the ubuntu and Buddhism claim to be nothing else but experiential, as both my testimony of salvation and my experiences in Africa hopefully will point out.

I call no one to Buddhism or ubuntu, but what I know though is that the value of the Scriptures, in the first place, isn't what's written in the Scriptures, but what we bring to the Scriptures (pre-understanding as we'll also see in the days to come)! The world that we bring to the Scriptures is conditioning what we find in the Scriptures, and that world, remember no dualism, is our philosophy. (See my MTh for more). The philosophical worlds

(although episteme) striving belonging? I certainly belonged before I suspectedly believed (although episteme) as my witnessing will testify! YAHWEH is YAHWEH and I have no right to judge His accommodation of culture and so my judgement is not on times past, but the present crime of modernism. To look at it another way, the respective narratives (more than the philosophies) of the Buddhist world and paynim traditional African communities are then deceptions, like Genesis 3, since although their philosophies are no lies, like the snake's words, the narratives are without YAHWEH. This illustrates that I either understood the philosophies through the Hermeneutical circle, and so already had what I found in them, and/or the Scriptures are the last commentary, in the horizontal and vertical lines of the proposed Hermeneutic, where the historical is allegorically hidden in the present simulation of the resuscitated simulacrum. In other words, it is a fictive-narrative discourse that I am participating in in the second person narration in which I/we found/invented what I/we wanted to find/invent in Buddhism and ubuntu.

of ubuntu and Buddhism, in the reasonable physics, does a better job to understand the Scriptures than Greek philosophy, or modernism.

3. Pertinent cultural reflection

So, this brings us to the question of how do these two then, the Tanakh and the B'rit Hadashah, belong together? The first thing is to differentiate the three groups of people involved:

1. The first is the Tanakh people,
2. The second is the B'rit Hadashah people, or the Messianic Israel,
3. The third is the post-B'rit Hadashah people.

The thing is that for the first two the Scriptures were the Tanakh, and particularly the Torah.

For the second group the additional writings, that became the B'rit Hadashah, were in the beginning not even recognised as the Scriptures, only as additional writings to commentate on the Scriptures, although in due time were recognised as part of the Scriptures in fractions though; that the B'rit Hadashah canon was only fixed in the 4th century AD tells a story in itself of what came first, the Tanakh! Are the historical critics of the Tanakh not mostly those (modernist) theologians that read the Tanakh from the B'rit Hadashah, although the reading should be vice versa, the B'rit Hadashah from the Tanakh?

The third group, on the other hand, is what the Yeshua synagogues became during the first few centuries AD, and particularly after the liberation of the church in the times of Flavius Valerius Aurelius Constantinus (272-337) and the Edict of Milan in 313 AD. The third group is the Messianic people for who the B'rit Hadashah became the Scriptures par excellence, and actually more superior than the Tanakh. In this the Marcion tendency resided as I referred to already; suddenly the Tanakh became pretty useless, apart from being just history, because YAHWEH had a personality change when He became human; “wasn't He inhumane in the Tanakh?”

This third group is Messianic Israel which had being corrupted by modernism, or the

philosophies of modernism; they called themselves the church. In the middle ages the corruption was seated in the Platonic dualism with a clear-cut differentiation between the good spirit and the evil matter, and in modernism proper, after the Italian Renaissance, Aristotelian-Euclidean logic, although only another expression of the same Platonic dualism (this time the ghost in the body), led to liberal, fundamentalist and Neo-Orothoxy theology where the Tanakh is either not Divinely inspired/breathed, or is, but with secondary significance as purely historical in nature with no, or hardly, any instructional mandate.

The church was not B'rit Hadashah anymore, Israel in the last days, but a post-B'rit Hadashah church that wanted to somehow sanctify the old heaven and earth again. Suddenly the church didn't want to give up on the temporary anymore; the synagogue, the sign of temporarity, the sign of the assembly of Israel in a foreign land with a foreign tongue, was given up, and the temple, now called the church building, was brought back intending to mark the presence of YAHWEH. Somehow they mixed the synagogue with the temple and came to the idea that there can be many temples, church buildings, with its clergymen and hierarchies, which should mark the presence of YAHWEH in the new proclaimed Promised Land. Needless to say this was a deception.

The corruption goes even deeper. The B'rit Hadashah Messianic community used to be a counter cultural movement, but the post-B'rit Hadashah people assimilated the Socrates-Plato-Aristotle modernist infested culture, and so sanctified the devil himself. Praise Yeshua for the remnant at every stage of the evolution.

It was this post-B'rit Hadashah church that evangelised Africa originally, but fortunately many of the African Messianic people found little of this modernist logic appealing, and soon founded their own traditions, that's now in the circles I used to move in. I once met a pastor (Drews 2005) in Germany whose brother worked as a missionary in Africa for a year; it's funny, he says that in this whole year he was there he only heard two sermons from the B'rit Hadashah, and one of them he preached himself, the rest were all from the Tanakh. In most churches in Europe it will be just the other way around, one will rather hear almost all sermons from the B'rit Hadashah, and maybe one or two from the Tanakh in a calendar year.

I once lead a Bible study, as it is called, in a church in Germany, and I told them about the experience of the brother of this pastor's friend. Funny, they vehemently started fighting the apparent ignorance and bondage of Africa, and that they need the Messiah, but all I could do is just laugh, because according to the B'rit Hadashah Messianic followers, Yeshua the Messiah is written all over the Tanakh as we read in Acts 28:23 that

“...from the morning until the evening Paul (the B'rit Hadashah Messianic Jew), mightily testified about the Kingdom of YAHWEH utilising both the Torah of Moses and the Prophets to persuade them about Yeshua” .

This doesn't mean that Africans don't preach from the B'rit Hadashah, but when they do, they tell stories from the B'rit Hadashah, or with the B'rit Hadashah, as if it is the Tanakh, and is in a stark contrast with the systematic verse by verse exegesis some churches utilise.

My principal, Danie Drotsky (Drotsky 1993), in my first year in the Bible college of the Africa Evangelistic Band, called Glenvar, in Cape Town in 1993, erroneously used to say that the Tanakh is the illustration book of the B'rit Hadashah. Only the illustration book of the B'rit Hadashah?

Fortunately ubuntu has shown itself more superior than the Socrates-Plato-Aristotle philosophy in many assemblies in Africa, and I'm happy that they haven't succumbed to western irrationality. I'm so glad that many missionaries to Africa have discovered things to be the other way around; Africa has missionised them rather than them Africa. I'm glad Africa hasn't been receptive to their message, since modernist philosophy has no Biblical consistent message, only rhetoric. This is precisely the testimony I got from white American missionaries to Mozambique, when I was still back in Africa; they came to Africa to teach the Africans about the Scriptures, just to discover the Africans know more about the Scriptures, in practice, than them (Missionaries 2001).

Needles to say I don't group myself with the post-B'rit Hadashah church, but with the true B'rit Hadashah Messianic Israel. The Tanakh is my Scriptures par excellence, and the B'rit Hadashah the commentary how the Messianic hope is fulfilled. This in turn prompts my challenge to ubuntu, to Africa.

Although ubuntu is more Scriptural than the post-B'rit Hadashah church, ubuntu still clings to the temporary, to the old heaven and earth, and to the temporary *-ntu*. The *-ntu* can't be heaven on earth as long as the phenomena is still about the temporary. To look at it differently, the corruption, fuelled by the temporality of *-ntu* can be seen all over Africa in the love of money, materialism, the abuse of power, and plain common lovelessness, which is far from heaven on earth for the ones being trampled upon.

Although democracy and capitalism don't really exist in Africa, only by appearance, the powerful have found ways to use these Western *concepts* as ways to abuse ubuntu, to find new élite communities within the bigger communities. In short, democracy and capitalism have formed new tribes, within tribes, where the new tribe of the élite oppresses the others in the traditional tribe.

You might say that is because of capitalism; I'm not sure, socialism would do the same. It seems like the stress in ubuntu directly originates from the Fall of Mankind itself - Genesis 3; on the one hand Africans want to escape ubuntu, the interconnectedness, and become individuals/gods/modernist people, and want to break loose from the forced tribal equality and mentality that apparently hold them back, but on the other hand they don't want to lose the joy of tribalism, and to do that the powerful have created a new tribe of elites within, or between, the tribe(s).

There is nothing that illustrates this conflict more than when someone from the left overs, those that can't make it into the tribe of élites, makes it to the west, say Germany, and suddenly actually jumps to the élite in material and individualistic status. The conflict is that giving up ubuntu is not as nice as the gains individualism and modernism promise. The grass is indeed not greener on the other side!

I remember, when I came to Germany in 2004 I couldn't speak a word of German, and so my parents-in-law funded a three months language course with asylum seekers for me (VHS 2004). In this course were four African girls in their late teens, maybe even early 20's. Somehow they made it to Germany and applied for asylum, but about two months into the course they started singing a new song; now they wanted to go to the USA because they just didn't like the German mentality. "America is the place", they told me in English, but what was really their problem? The giving up of ubuntu for Graeco-Roman

individualism, the lone-ranger ghost in the body.

I know white South Africans, e.g., are also destined for a culture shock in Germany, but not because they won't find ubuntu. I once had a student from Ethiopia, who used to be married to a German and had been living in Germany for many years (Ethiopia 2007). The lack of ubuntu was precisely her problem with Germany, although she had to learn to coupé with Germany since her half born and bred German children were legally tied to Germany.

4. Biblical narratives as string succession

It seems like ubuntu needs the B'rit Hadashah manifesto - Colossians 3:1-3. Just like the Sinai covenant couldn't bring back heaven to earth, in the Tanakh, so ubuntu needs to give up the old heaven and earth for the new. Ubuntu has to still enter the last days. This I say with a reservation, however, because although ubuntu, Buddhism and the post-B'rit Hadashah people all in some way miss the plot, YAHWEH's plan is nothing else but the Tanakh, but just not for now, and because of this ubuntu is closer to the truth than all of them. The New Heaven and Earth will be like Africa without sin.

Buddhist philosophy, on the other hand, has partly the right worldview though, but with no Tanakh hope, thus not really with the right worldview. Although their philosophy has this rigorous ethic leading to tranquillity, they have sadly no New Heaven and Earth to follow the temporary; doesn't that explain why Buddhism could so easily fall back to Hinduism since reincarnation promises a heaven and earth, just the wrong one? The post-B'rit Hadashah philosophy, on the other hand, has the worst scenario, they have both the wrong worldview, a dualistic worldview, with no living Tanakh hope, they are just plain commonly corrupted to both want to follow Yeshua and still gather treasures on the old earth. Listen to what James says about them:

“Come on all the rich (treasure gatherers on the old heaven and earth): weep and wail over the hardships coming your way! Your riches have rusted, and your clothes have become moth-eaten; your gold and silver have rusted, and their rust will testify against you and will eat up your flesh like fire! This is the acharit-hayamim (last days), and you have been storing up wealth!” (James 5:1-3).

Take note of the words acharit-hayamim, the last days of the Tanakh; but praise YAHWEH though for His providence, otherwise there would have been no remnant left who hasn't been corrupted by prostituting with modernist philosophy and atheism. Therefore we can say with Paul,

"O the depth of the riches and the wisdom and knowledge of YAWHEH. How incomprehensible are His judgements and unsearchable His ways." (Romans 11:33)

Back to the message for ubuntu; it's important to note that although the Promised Land plays the all important role in the Tanakh (Von Rad 1963:42), and in all of Scriptures, the promise of the New Heaven and Earth is already to be found in the Tanakh. The continuation of the Promised Land in the Middle East, following through to the promise of the New Heaven and Earth, is first Tanakh teaching as second or third Isaiah says,

"For just as the new heavens and the new earth that I will make will stay in my presence," says YAHWEH, "so will your descendants and your name stay." (Isaiah 66:22).

It's not first B'rit Hadashah teaching. The B'rit Hadashah only explicates the full significance and magnitude; the B'rit Hadashah is the commentary of the New Heaven and Earth to be found in the Tanakh. The B'rit Hadashah takes place within the Tanakh, since even the change of covenant, from the Sinai covenant to the new covenant, is also promised in the Tanakh when Jeremiah says in Jeremiah 31:31-34,

"Look, the days are coming," says YAHWEH, "when I will make a new B'rit (covenant) with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah. It will not be like the B'rit I made with their fathers on the day I took them by their hand and brought them out of the land of Egypt; because they violated my covenant, although I was a husband to them," says YAHWEH. "For this is the B'rit I will make with the house of Israel after those days,"

The last days are also being prophesied in the Tanakh, for the Tanakh, when Joel says that

"After the beginning of the last days, I will pour out my Spirit on all of humanity. Your sons and daughters will prophesy, your old men will dream dreams, your

young men will see visions; and also on both male and female slaves in those days I will pour out my Spirit. I will show wonders in the sky and on earth blood, fire and pillars of smoke. The sun will be turned into darkness and the moon into blood before the coming of the great and terrible Day of YAHWEH." At that time, whoever will call on the name of ADONAI shall be saved." (Joel 2:28-32).

All of Scripture then play off in the Tanakh, and the B'rit Hadashah is only a twist of events within the Tanakh, but not the end or absolute transformation/metamorphose of the Tanakh. Is the new covenant not rectified with the house of Israel? All of Tanakh is about the house of Israel, and the world that should become the house of Israel! No Replacement Theology!

Actually the arguments for the B'rit Hadashah originates from pretty early in the Tanakh, and also confirms that the B'rit Hadashah is part of the Tanakh. The commentary that exposes this notion the best is the letter to the Hebrews, in chapter 11, particularly in the gallery of trust heroes. We read about Enoch,

"...was taken away from this life without seeing death, and that through trusting; "He was not there anymore, because YAHWEH took him away", for prior to be taken away he has been attested as pleasing to YAHWEH." (Hebrews 11:5)

Why would YAHWEH take Enoch away (Genesis 5:24) if the old heaven and earth were good enough? When the temporary was already evident from as early as Enoch, seeing it actually written all over the Tanakh is not too far fetched then, or? Places where it's not too evident, the cracks in the wall can certainly be seen.

The gallery of trust Heroes go on, just notice the temporality,

"By trusting, Abraham... lived as an alien, a temporary resident, in the Land of the promise,... For he was looking forward to the city with permanent foundations, of which the architect and builder is YAHWEH... All these people kept on trusting until death and that without receiving what had been promised. They had only seen it and welcomed it from a distance, while acknowledging that they were aliens and temporary residents on the earth. For people who speak this way make it clear that they are looking for a fatherland. Now if they were to keep recalling the one they left

(the old heaven and earth), they would have had an opportunity to return; but as it is, they long/desire a better fatherland, a heavenly one (presently still and unseen one). This is why YAHWEH is not ashamed to be called their YAHWEH, for he has prepared for them a city.” (Hebrews 11:8-16)

Take note of the words I underlined, it seems like the expectation for the Promised Land was pretty early exactly that of the B'rit Hadashah, and that there was no other one in the Tanakh. Didn't David say in Psalms 95:7

“for he is our Elohim, and we are the people in his pasture, the sheep under His care. If only Hayom Yom (today is the day) you would listen to his voice:”?

According to the writer to the Hebrews (Hebrews 4:7) the Hayom Yom (today is day) of the today, in these words of David, refers to the Sabbath rest/the Promised Land still ahead of them, that's now while David was already in the so called Promised Land of the Middle East. It seems like David also already had a B'rit Hadashah expectation, since he says

“..if Joshua had given them rest (in the Middle East), YAHWEH would not have spoken later of another "day.” (Hebrews 4:8)

Another thing to note is that should one take away just the first book of the Tanakh, the book of Genesis, what would the B'rit Hadashah have to commentate on? If the book of Genesis is taken away, what would be left of Paul's arguments in the letter to the Romans? Starting with circumcision,

“Therefore, one YAHWEH will consider righteous the circumcised on the ground of trusting and the uncircumcised through that same trusting. Does it follow that we abolish Torah by this trusting? Heaven forbid! On the contrary, we confirm Torah.”

(Romans 3:30-31)

progressing through Abraham in the next chapter,

“For what does the Tanakh say? "Abraham put his trust in YAHWEH, and it was credited to his account as righteousness.” (Romans 4:3)

and in chapter 5 illustrating his arguments with the first and second Adam.

Don't forget about Ex Nihilo also being referred to in Romans 4:17, when Paul says that Abraham

"... trusted YAHWEH as the one who... calls nonexistent things into existence."

The same applies to the book to the Galatians, take the Torah away and not much of Paul's arguments would stand. If one verse summarises it all it's Romans 7:25

"To sum up: with my mind, I am a slave of YAHWEH's Torah; but with my old nature, I am a slave of sin's Torah."

5. Radical inductive contemplation

Now the question is, when temporality is also written over the whole Tanakh, why is YAHWEH prolonging time? Why was there then a Sinai covenant in the first place, and then a new covenant, and why has the last days been prolonged 2000 years yet?

My answer is nonlocality and circularity, the implosion of time and space; temporality for each person on this earth is as long as the lifespan of this particular person, and nothing more or less. The last days are not longer for us than say the apostle John who became a hundred. That's the one side of the coin, on the other side of the coin is the fact that our culture is imprisoned by a linear perspective of time - we try to see everything in its history before and its history ahead (we call it the future). This coupled with individualism gave the notion of generations that come and go.

Sorry to say, ubuntu's got it right, we only have the present, the present one community with the circularity of births, lives and deaths of the regeneration and movement of the one community - something like the cells in a body that are being replaced every so now and again. To take it even a bit further, what if these circles of births, lives and deaths are nonlocal, in YAHWEH eyes, so that just one generation has ever been in the last days, since time is imaginary. If that is the case we can apply the same to the one generation before the Fall of Mankind, and one generation from the Fall to the Flood, and one generation from the Flood to Sinai, and one generation from Sinai to the last days.

When the B'rit Hadashah is actually part of the Tanakh, then the word Tanakh can actually have a name change since Tanakh is formed out of the initial Hebrew letters of the

Masoretic Text's three traditional subdivisions, the Torah (teachings/Pentateuch), the Nevi'im (prophets), and the Ketuvim called the writings (Richard 2005:60). The B'rit Hadashah could be added as another subdivision, but can also neatly fit under the last division call the Ketuvim, or the first called the Torah, or just evenly divided between all three of them. In short, the B'rit Hadashah is part of the Tanakh, and I'm convinced the B'rit Hadashah writers wouldn't have disagreed, should they have known they were writing the Scriptures, since I'm not sure Paul knew or thought such a thing, since, as he says

“all of Scripture (which was only the traditional Tanakh at that point yet) is YAHWEH-breathed and is valuable for teaching, convicting of sin, correcting faults and training in right living;” (2 Timothy 3:16)

So my message for the post-B'rit Hadashah people is, “Get back into the Tanakh, and out of the corrupted commentary of the Tanakh, the corrupted interpretation of the B'rit Hadashah!”. For Buddhism my message is, “Get to the Tanakh!”, and for ubuntu, who is already in the Tanakh, “Get into the last days of the Tanakh, the real B'rit Hadashah!”.

I guess many are convinced that the lack of technology is jeopardising Africa; only 42 cities with tram networks yet in the whole history of Africa only to vanish when European occupation left? Some would say Africa just doesn't have the innovation it needs, or what? Do you really think that's the case? I would rather say technology is a cultural phenomenon; why do Germans build such good cars? Why do German names come up the whole time in our discussions? Eliminate German names out of the intellectual world of the last six or seven centuries, what would be left? Martin Luther, Johannes Gutenberg, Immanuel Kant, our good friend Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, Karl Marx, Albert Einstein, and so we can go on and on and on.

What do the Scriptures tell us? When ubuntu is the closest thing to the Tanakh in our present day and age, is all of this technology, and this nice tram we're sitting in, really so Scriptural? From what or where does technology originate? The answer is in Genesis 4! (Take note again, the first book of the Torah).

Cities with their industries are the direct outflow of Cain that lost the presence of YAHWEH; this is now YAHWEH's provision and care lost after he killed his brother Abel, as we read in Genesis 4:16-22, and

“...Cain left the presence of YAHWEH... and built a city and named the city after his son Enoch. To Enoch was born Irad. Irad fathered Methujael, Methujael fathered Metushael, and Metushael fathered Lemech. Lemech took himself two wives; the name of the one was Adah,... Adah gave birth to Jabal; he was the ancestor of those who live in tents and have cattle. His brother's name was Jubal; and he was the ancestor of all who play lyre and flute. Zillah gave birth to Tubalcain, who forged all kinds of tools from brass and iron;” (Genesis 4:16-22)

Look at the industries founded in this first city. The contrast is paradise, which is Sabbath where Adam and Eve didn't have to work, and humanity that has to care for itself. Without YAHWEH-YIREH's presence humanity was and is destined to create its own economy and provisions through industry; humankind was and is destined to seek and construct its own paradiaditional provisions and care. Urbanisation, coupled with industrialisation, is not really a product of the English industrial revolution of the 18th and 19th centuries, but of the Fall of Mankind (Genesis 3)! The optimism and certainty of late modernism was the believe that this paradise has been regained through Greek mythology (the individual god); sadly both liberal and fundamentalist theology were children of their times and bought into this notion. All of them sanctified technology, industry and cities as part of a new paradise, not the Tanakh paradise, but the post-B'rit Hadashah paradise.

So where does this leave us? Should we get out of this tram as soon as possible? Not necessarily, but shouldn't we long for the times we won't need trams anymore?

I know what you'll ask me now, “What about technology that raised infant mortality, also in Africa, e.g., and technology that made surplus food production possible, and globalisation making it possible to share this surplus globally (and even with people living in the dessert)?” You're right, but couldn't these good things of this technology come to us in a different way, and not through Greek mythology?

That's the one side of the coin, but when technology is an extension of our personhood, philosophy and metaphysics (which are all one and the same thing in no dualism), then hardly any technology is an extension of ubuntu, so we'll have to be careful with what we say! To look at it the other way around, when technology leads to loneliness in the west, and when loneliness is the antonym of ubuntu, interconnectedness and one humanness,

then something is wrong with technology. In a ground breaking book called *Shades of Loneliness Pathologies of a Technological Society* Richard Stivers has the following to say:

“Given the blurring of the distinction between the normal and the neurotic, on the one hand, and between the neurotic and the psychotic, on the other hand, one is left with the sad and shocking thought that schizophrenia takes the technological personality to its logical conclusion. Today we are all lonely and suffer from the scourge of multiple selves, but [some] [f]amily and friends have tacitly resisted the nihilism of a technological society.” (Stivers 2004:143)

Nihilism can also be replaced by the synonym modernism.

To be honest, isn't this a catch 22? Yes it is. So what should we do? “Long for the New Heaven and Earth!”

6. Dozing off the session

So here we are in Baunatal on a Friday afternoon? It's almost weekend, I just have to see tomorrow morning through then its weekend. “See you in the morning.”

Chapter 5: Memoirs of a dream

“And Schopenhauer specifically designates as the trademark of philosophical talent the ability to recognize at certain times that human beings and all things are mere phantoms or dream pictures.

Now, just as the philosopher behaves in relation to the reality of existence, so the artistically excitable man behaves in relation to the reality of dreams.” (Nietzsche 1872: 644)

1. Contextual embedding of session

“Good morning!” Saturday morning, I’m sure there’ll be a lot of buzzing in town day. The tram is pretty empty still; obviously because people first enjoy a leisurely morning before facing the shops. The life in Europe is different from what we know in South Africa. In South Africa the buzzing is in shopping malls; in Europe it’s the pedestrian area of each downtown area. Kassel downtown is our big open air shopping mall, something I haven’t experienced in South Africa yet.

In a couple of weeks the Christmas market starts, that’s now after the first of advent, and then the pedestrian area won’t only be packed with people, but also with different size stalls selling all the beverages, snacks and food associated with Christmas you can imagine, and many more things. What comes to your mind when I say, “Christmas”? Glühwein (hot mulled wine), traditional Christmas cookies, or Christstollen (a sort of egg bread with candied fruit)? For Germans yes, but not for South Africans I think!

My wife loves Christmas, or the season called Christmas. Yes we all know Yeshua wasn’t born on Christmas day, but that’s beside the point. What she loves about Christmas is the mystique, the cold short dark days with foggy evenings strolling puffed up with winter clothes on Christmas markets. It’s like the abstruse Christmas Coca-Cola truck commercial where the magic is in all the lights, lighting up the whole truck, and lighting up the surroundings it cuts through. The magic is also in all the lights on the Christmas market where each light is being choked by the cold and foggy thick air so that even the thousands of lights together aren’t able to obtrude the mysterious nearsightedness, but the lights themselves! The lights are the only thing that can’t be missed.

Christmas has a dream-like atmosphere; anyway for my wife who dreams about a cosy

warm house with a bountiful decorated Christmas tree which can't cover all the presents, and a happy, joyful, singing family. It's a dream. Even the choice of movies every evening on television are only Christmas movies. The joy of Christmas is also in the Virtual Reality dream of Hollywood, but how real is the dream really?

2. Radical inductive contemplation

How real is this tram really we're sitting in right now? In Buddhism though the material world, the optical world, is unreal, but not an illusion. Take note of the difference! What possibility do we have to call this unreal a dream? This is the argument of the Tibetan Chögyal Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche (Wikipedia 2010b) , who say that "all appearances perceived during the whole life of an individual, through all senses, including sounds, smells, tastes and tactile sensations in their totality, are like a big dream. It is claimed that, on careful examination, the dream of life and regular nightly dreams are not very different, and that in their essential nature there is no difference between them." My proposed metaphysics is something along these lines, but in different terms.

Just to make sure I'm not misunderstood, I reject the animist Australian Aboriginal mythology called the Dreamtime that is apparently responsible for the initial creation and then a perpetual creation. Ellie Crystal says that "In the Aboriginal worldview, every meaningful activity, event, or life process that occurs at a particular place leaves behind a vibrational residue in the earth, as plants leave an image of themselves as seeds... The Aborigines called this potency the "Dreaming" of a place, and this Dreaming constitutes the sacredness of the earth. Only in extraordinary states of consciousness can one be aware of, or attuned to, the inner dreaming of the Earth." (Crystal 2010a).

The mystic worldview of the influential personhood of Ellie Crystal herself I reject, although she got a thread of the truth with a bit of reasonable physics, but got it all wrong with her transcendental mysticism. This is how she utilises dreams,

In truth everything is a dream/programmed illusion/virtual reality experience created by a consciousness source of light which set up layers/dimensions/grids/matrixes through which souls experience simultaneously. These [dream] programs follow patterns called Sacred Geometry and repeat in loops, creating the illusion of linear time. In the slower frequency movement of third dimension, one experiences linear time. As one moves their conscious awareness into dreamtime, released from the physical body, grid of experience, physical body, one experiences with time, and is

able to move from grid program to grid program, in what often appears as 'flying'. The soul is able to consciously view one or more grid programs at the same time, splitting the consciousness, moving in hyperspace, quantum physics, with a greater understanding of the dynamics of its total experiences. (Crystal 2010b)

This is certainly not my Riemannian logical meditations in Scriptures; I do agree that dreams are a Virtual Reality, but not an illusion, and not again the modernist dualism of the ghost in the body that can escape the physical body to experience another world. This doesn't sound like the interconnectedness, and dependant arising/ubuntu of quantum mechanics!

Back to my proposal; if the universe is information (remember waves) vividly experienced with cognition and consciousness as real (collapsing the waves), how real is the universe when it's purely information reaching out to information in this constituting consciousness? When dreaming is only information cognitively and vividly experienced just as real as the cosmos in the unconscious, then what would contradict the hypothesis of the metaphysics of a dream when consciousness and unconsciousness are one and the same thing?

To turn the argument around, why would the conscious and the unconscious be two different things? Couldn't that just be another (Platonic) dualism forced on reality? How realistic is a dualism between the consciousness and unconsciousness when a person has only one brain showing pretty much the same neural activity in both states, with a few exceptions, but still in one brain? But, most of all, why do they have such deep seated "influence" on each other except if they are actually one and the same faculty, just in different postures? Are we not sometimes walking or lying, and other times running or sitting? Is that a dualism? Yuval Nir and Giulio Tononi, from the department of Psychiatry at the University of Wisconsin, say that "...dream consciousness is remarkably similar to waking consciousness, ..." (Nir 2009:97)

When I opt for the word dream, I consciously know I'm doing two things:

1. Firstly, I know I put the cart before the horses, but why not if that's what everyone is doing, like already indicated how my professor stated that John Calvin took theology and just stuck his Greek philosophy on top of it? I don't think Thomas Aquinas falls much short in this effort of cutting and pasting, if he doesn't actually outdo John Calvin. What else is the *norm* of Paul Tillich?

“The discussion of the sources and of the medium of systematic theology has left a decisive question unanswered—the question of the criterion to which the sources as well as the mediating experience must be subjected. The necessity of such a criterion is obvious in view of the breadth and variety of the material and in view of the indefiniteness of the mediating function of experience. Sources and medium can produce a theological system only if their use is guided by a norm ” (Tillich 1967:47)

“This [norm] is the same thing as saying that there is a perspective from which the total theology is developed” (Dunning 1988:43)

2. Secondly, In Deleuzian terms, I would like to reinvent the notion dream to fit my use, and so extend the academic world.

My reinvented notion dream fulfils all my requirements to hold the Scriptures and (postmodern) physics (enigma infested quantum mechanics) together. What I like about dreams is that we get many different kinds of dreams, we get daydreams, we get fantasy dreams about the future, we dream in the “unconscious” state of sleep, we even relive moments of the past in instantaneous short dreams when reminded of something by something or some event. So we can go on, but one fact stays, we dream; we moonily work with information, and that’s metaphysics for me. So the key is that dreams are about moonily working with information, and so when we do just that in the conscious state outside dreaming at night, then working with information during daytime is then also dreaming?

In order to make that clear we first have to understand the moonily at night, and then compare it with the working of information at daytime. For the moonily at night I’m indebted to J. Allan Hobson (Hobson 2002) of Harvard University who spent decades researching the phenomenon of dreaming. A typical normal REM sleep dream has four characteristics (Hobson 2002:6-10):

1. Dreams are hallucinatory in things like rich and varied internal percepts, especially sensorimotor (movement), auditory (sound), and anti-gravitational (weightlessness), e.g.,
2. Dreams are delusional in accepting, e.g., the wild events as real despite their extreme improbability and physical impossibility,
3. Dreams are bizarre in things like discontinuity of events and character incongruity,

4. Dreams are emotional intensive and varied in things like fear, elation, and exuberance.

Contemplating on these 4 characteristics illustrates that it's no wild goose chase to see the correlation between these characteristics and the "conscious" experience we call awake. Starting with number 4, emotional intensity is the reason we don't question or rationalise our dreams while dreaming; we accept them irrespective of how absurd they are. Does this emotional intensity differ in any way from the emotional intensity utilised outside the dream? I don't think so! We never question life itself, although we might question many things in life.

If you question life itself, you can stop breathing to see if life really exists, but you'll suffocate. No one who wants to cross a tram line is just going to step onto the tracks without looking left or right, should a tram be coming, because they doubt life! Isn't that actually absurd, since only consciousness causes the wavefunctions to collapse, and when the pedestrian doesn't look left or right no consciousness can collapse waves, and so no tram can kill him or her⁴⁵?

Even the total idealist goes home at night and enjoys a nice plate of food, and a warm bed, and doesn't think of them apart of the full tummy, joy and comfort they give. At the end this idealist lives life emotionally intense in the same measure as a dream, going through the motions of eating, sleeping, relaxing and entertaining relationships, etc., even when his or her science might prove the world absurd in the never ending digging.

Take that lady in red driving that black Volkswagen Caddy over there; look at the concentration on her face. What is she consciously grappling with? I would say the purpose she has ahead, while trying to get through the Saturday morning traffic. The purpose ahead might be shopping, or picking up the children? Do you think for one moment she might be contemplating on things like time, that is pressing her, that it's only imaginary? Do you think that when her children might beg her to stop at MacDonald's, since they are really hungry, that she's going to tell them to shut up since this hunger is

⁴⁵ I also say this on purpose to illustrate that my apparently exclusive use of quantum mechanics rather, or also, fits my metaphysics of a dream, and that I will most certainly adhere to a conditioned/practical Newtonian cause-and-effect before I step unto tram lines, or jump off a ten story building.

only information, unreal? No, she's a mother who just lives life the way she thinks it to be real, emotionally intense; it's not always practical to ask questions about things like hunger, or is it? Welfare will take her children away from her if she doesn't feed them!

The moment we do start questioning the dream at night, is the moment we wake up. We might have such a dreadful nightmare that we start convincing ourselves, during the dream, that it's only a dream, but that's exactly the point that we wake up. That's the point where we pull ourselves out of the apparent "unconscious" to the "conscious" to rethink what we've dreamt.

So the correlation goes on; with science we have been questioning many things, and we're always busy dissecting every aspect of life, but have we ever asked ourselves if we might just be emotionally intense with something bigger than these questions, if we might just be dreaming?" O yes we have! A good example is the chain reaction set in motion through the catalyst we call the Italian Renaissance; during and after the Italian Renaissance Europe discovered that they were emotionally intense during the Middle Ages in the world of superstition, witchcraft and apparent ignorance, and therefore couldn't notice the unreal in dreaming. To put it another way, Europe was emotionally and intensely hallucinating superstition, witchcraft and mythologies, so that the delusional reality, although bizarre, went unnoticed.

Just look back again at the four characteristics of the REM sleep dream, and you'll see all four of them in the dreaming of the Middle Ages.

During the event called the Enlightenment, in the 18th century, Europe really thought they had woken up from this delusional residue of the dream of the Middle Ages, but was Europe not just waking up from a dream within a dream? I think so, since the dawn of postmodernism (the collective word for all that followed modernism) has illustrated that the certainty of modernism turned out to be just as delusional (as our discussions have illustrated so far). With the dawn of the postmodern, the modernist epoch turned out to be just as emotional and intense in its hallucination as the Middle Ages, and actually so bizarre that it's unbelievable that they couldn't even notice that the foundational principle of Newton's law of gravity couldn't be coupled to a static universe (Hawking 2001:3-4). They just couldn't notice that they were dreaming!

But now we who have been kicked out of bed again through all the posts, post-structuralism, post-architecture, post-literature, deconstruction, etc., how do we know that we haven't only woken up from a dream within another dream? I know what you think, you think I got this idea from the film called *Inception* (Inception 2010) with Leonardo DiCaprio, but that's most certainly not the case. It's pure coincidence, or is it collective consciousness? I guess we'll have to wait until waking up from the current dream to know for certain!

The ultimate waking up in the Gan-`Eden (paradise) Yeshua spoke about on the cross (Luke 23:43), is something like what Paul meant in 1 Corinthians 13:11-12 when he says,

“when I was a child, I spoke like a child, thought like a child, reasoned like a child; now that I have become mature, I'm finished with childish ways. For now we see indistinctly in a mirror, but then it will be distinctly face to face. Now I know only partly, but then I will know fully, just as YAHWEH has fully known me.”

The thing is we just can't know if we are dreaming or not, because if we are dreaming we are emotionally and intensely involved in the dream, and then we won't know we're dreaming otherwise we won't be dreaming; we just can't rule out the fact that we're dreaming, but then we're most certainly dreaming since one way or the other we are then hallucinating - either we think we might be dreaming and we're dreaming and then we do hallucinate, or we think we might be dreaming but we aren't dreaming then we've also hallucinated since we thought we might be dreaming⁴⁶.

The thing is no one in any epoch, Middle Ages or modernism or even the ones before them, thought that they were dreaming; what makes us better than them? To think we aren't dreaming is stating the same certainty that postmodernism condemns in modernism.

⁴⁶ Baudrillard says that “...everywhere the hyperrealism of simulations is translated by the hallucinatory resemblance of the real to itself” (Baudrillard 1994:23), and is admittedly a theosophical clue to my metaphysics of a dream, although in my case this hallucination is rather positive and something that should be acknowledged and not be denied – the certainty in the uncertainty. Before this statement Baudrillard says “That is why *today this “material” production is that of the hyperreal itself*” (Baudrillard 1994:23), and in his late Marxist endeavour this “material” is rather in Marxist materialistic terms. By analogically extending this material it is for me the (abstract) content/constellation each epoch produces.

To be postmodern is to reside in scientific uncertainty, and therefore I feel comfortable with the metaphysics of a dream. Dreaming is anyway nice, and should I be wrong I can always defend myself that I was just dreaming - daydreaming, or is it dreaming about a doctor's degree?

Dreaming is no illusion only unreal, exactly the same as our universe knitted together with particles in superposition states, and which are only noticeable through applied consciousness. So when would a problem creep in with the metaphysics of a dream? The moment a particular dream is being sold, not as an emotional intense hallucination, but as an ultimate scientifically explained reality⁴⁷. Wasn't that just what modernism did, and is according to my conviction the reason why YAHWEH's judgement came down on this idolatry of certainty? I don't see it as a coincidence that Germany was responsible for both World Wars, I rather see YAHWEH's judgement on certainty's idolatry, starting in the heartland of modernist intelligentsia by allowing that!

3. Wider theolosophy debate

This brings us to the next point; what do we dream about? J. Allan Hobson (Hobson 2002:30) states that when Sigmund Freud tried to size up the content of dreaming he resorted to speculative philosophy. That I don't want to do, but I think it's fair to say we mostly construct our dreams with what we bring to the dream, although not necessary in the context it has been borrowed from. I'm not so sure someone in the 16th century would have dreamed about flying a MIG-35 (actually still under development) from Toronto to Melbourne. Actually, who would even today dream about flying a MIG-35, except after e.g. an air-show with one being present? Who would dream about one without dependent arising? Dreams are related to past memories, fears, hopes, and desires.

Dreams about the future I would most certainly not rule out either; in Africa such a notion would certainly be unthinkable, and who are we to despise those that missed modernism altogether? Who would be the first to say that dreams of the future in Scriptures were only

⁴⁷ A dream being sold as a(n ultimate) reductionism. Take note, this exactly sheds light on my motive and energy behind my apparent rigorous deconstruction and that my effort is not about deconstruction and reductionism, but presence, me, my story, and the hallucinating of my radical induction of the metamorphosis of simulcara to simulations in the horizontal and vertical hermaneutics with myself, other people, the cosmos and YAHWEH.

myths, or post scriptumly added to the Scriptures? Won't that be modernist theologians?

So time plays a role in dreams, either by what we bring to the dream, or what we fetch with the dream; either we construct the dream with data we already have, or we fetch data with a dream about the future. In quantum mechanics time is also at stake, like in the Copenhagen interpretation; consciousness comes before the collapse of the wavefunction, but what if time turns out to be fractured and relative?

Although most scientists just "shut up and do the maths" with quantum mechanics, some do try to unravel the quantum enigma. The most popular proposals lately is the many-worlds interpretation (Duplantier 2007:4). This is the theory that every time the wavefunction collapses a new world comes into existence, and the old world goes on without the collapse yet. In principle there are then billions of worlds co-existing, and new ones are exponentially added the whole time. Sorry to say but that again sounds to me like a worldview that tenaciously clings to a static or linear time. Fortunately the Afshar experiment (Mitra 2008:63), in 2001, has given this theory a hard blow, and actually even the Copenhagen interpretation itself, but not the transactional interpretation theory of John G. Cramer (Suárez 2010:139).

This is the theory that makes the most sense to me, since I have problems thinking that some people are still alive and simultaneously dead, just in different worlds, and some are already in heaven but also still on earth, in different worlds, etc.

On the other hand I guess the many-worlds hypothesis could possible give my metaphysics of dreaming a real blow, but to me this hypothesis sounds like a dead tired man's dream, like a pipe dream, like modernism that wants to resuscitate itself. The thing is that neither the transactional interpretation, nor the many-worlds interpretation can really be verified or falsified, since both do the right maths for the same enigma, so again if I'm wrong "Sorry, I only had a bad dream", but if I'm right both can actually be wrong, which might just be the case, and I'll still be right.

So what argument does the transactional interpretation put forward? In layman's terms it means that time zigzags with some waves going forward in time and other waves going backward in time, and that simultaneously (as contradictory as that might sound). The waves are being transmitted by both the particle and the conscious observer. What

happens is that these zigzag waves cancel each other through interference and renders the particle atemporal - independent of time. To still put it another way, it means particles in the cosmos are simultaneously going forward and backward in time, but then in principle nowhere in time, which postulates that the time on our watches are imaginary time (our watches can't reflect zigzag time, but then actually no time, since time zigzags).

Imaginary time is not a flight of imagination, but a mathematically verifiable notion in physics. The most graphical picture is that of the test program on the Nebuchadnezzar in the first movie in the Matrix trilogy (The Matrix 1999). Remember when Neo was cutting with Morpheus through a crowd on a sidewalk in a busy city and Morpheus then suddenly asked Tank to freeze the time? The time froze for everyone but Neo and Morpheus; Morpheus could just go on talking and explaining things to Neo. During this time Neo and Morpheus were in imaginary time. It is time progressing, say vertically, when the real time progresses horizontally; the vertical time can progress an eternity before the horizontal time does anything.

Stephen Hawking and co. who proposed this imaginary time assert that the so-called imaginary time is really the real-time, and that what we call real-time is just a figment of our imaginations (Hawking 2001:110). According to Stephen Hawking this removes the need for a singularity, and thus a big bang to bring the universe into existence, but also no big collapse in the future either - the universe is eternal. I'm thankful to him apologising to Yeshua's followers who believe in creation, in a singularity, since this hypothesis proposes no singularity according to him; but on the other hand, when I read this the first time, I actually thought that it's great since that tells me that our new home, on the New Heaven and Earth, will be eternal. That means we won't need to live in an eternal and perpetual fear for when the universe is going to collapse back to its original state. Do we have to give up on Ex Nihilo when we believe in imaginary time? Couldn't Elohim have created the imaginary time itself?

So to come back to earth, when we live by imaginary time then the real-time is unreal, then our dreams can precede our actions and vice versa, or even more freaky they can happen simultaneously. When time is space, and traditional time vanishes, then traditional space vanishes too, and then the dream can be real life, and the real life the dream. Okay, Okay, I know, I know, here we go with speculative philosophy, and you thought I said I

denounced speculative philosophy about dreaming.

The point I want to bring across is that in the proposed metaphysics of a dream atemporality conflates the conscious and the unconscious, and that has huge repercussions. In short, reality is then indeed a HyperReality and Virtual Reality is not just a quasi simulation of reality, but is reality itself. Although this doctor's dissertation is only a Virtual Reality presentation of my life, I'm convinced I have become real to you in these pages, and I'm sure at least a bit of my presence has been touching you. Nonlocality is taking place within narrative, and is that not a HyperReality?

I started dreaming this dissertation since I knew what I wanted to write about, and had written parts of it over-and-over and over-and-over again in my head, and that even before I put any pen to paper. That was now a Virtual Reality world for you in my head, but how different is this from the Virtual Reality world that is playing off in your head right now? Am I right to say that the lines between Virtual Reality and reality have already blurred in your head? But what if all I said about myself is crap and I've never been to Germany and don't even know the city Kassel, would that change anything? No, I don't think so, except if it's crap Virtual Reality.

Some things in this Virtual Reality of mine are really fictitious, but how would you as the reader know the difference? So again, only the Virtual Reality is real, the dream!!! Is it important for you to know the difference? No I don't think so. How much of Plato's dialogues are fiction, and how much really happened, and still it changed the world?

The academic work that endorses my Virtual philosophical/theological effort is the book called *Philosophy: An Innovative Introduction: Fictive Narrative, Primary Texts, and Responsive Writing* by Michael Boylan and Charles Johnson where the authors elucidate the Fictive-Narrative Discourse, as opposed to the Direct-Logical Discourse (Boylan 2010:15-32). Along these lines, my proposal of the metaphysics of a dream, states that all is Virtual Reality, and therefore there's only the Fictive-Narrative Discourse; the Direct-Logical Discourse is consequently an instance of the Fictive-Narrative Discourse. The Direct-Logical Discourse, elevated above the Fictive-Narrative Discourse, is modernism's idolatry par excellence of certainty, which is also just fiction.

Although the Direct-Logical Discourse is an instance of the Fictive-Narrative Discourse,

and not the other way around, just for the sake of those who haven't jumped the modernist cliff to postmodernism yet, I'm going to use three Direct-Logical, or deductive logical, inferences to help you, but I want you to take note of the modernist presuppositions I'm destined to start with. Modernism shines through from the beginning⁴⁸:

One:

1. Arguments are being verified through research (modernist presupposition)
2. Research never stops (late modernist presupposition)
3. So when research never stops, arguments are open-ended
4. Virtual Reality is a creative metaphorical compound
5. Metaphors are being constructed on an endless recession backwards with no origin (late modernist presupposition)
6. Metaphors are then simulacrum, who are per definition without simulations lost in the same endless recession backwards
7. Simulacrum then have no definite verifiable arguments
8. When Virtual Reality is a metaphorical compound, then Virtual Reality is simulacrum with no verifiable arguments
9. The arguments of Virtual Reality are then open-ended
10. The arguments of my Virtual Reality metaphysics of a dream are then open-ended

48 Take note I don't infer a justification at the end of each premise – fact, assertion, inference -, except the one enthymeme, since that is exactly the point: providing such justifications would already be the fictive-narrative discourse at work in an apparent direct-logical discourse. Poststructuralism has pointed out that all possible meanings make such a claim redundant, although this claim is per implication then also redundant and therefore the best is to abstain from such justifications altogether, or is the apparent claim of the best then also redundant? The direct-logical discourse can't avoid backfiring on itself at the best of times, and although such a logical deduction might appear to be the case in my deconstructions, and then constructions, the fact that I've cast the plot narrating memoirs it argues the fictive-narrative discourse, even when the claim dominates the story.

11. Fictive-Narrative Discourse is open-ended (Boylan 2010:11)

The conclusive premise

12. I have a Fictive-Narrative Discourse that's open for you to interpret and to draw your own conclusions.

Two:

1. All claims have presuppositions as priories (late modernist presupposition)
2. Presuppositions can't be empirically verified, just believed, taken for granted (late modernist presupposition)
3. So presuppositions can't be verified beyond doubt
4. And then claims can't be verified beyond doubt (a theory or hypothesis can never be proven beyond doubt, since the next occurrence can just be an exception. Because the sun comes up every day, it doesn't mean beyond doubt it will happen tomorrow again.)
5. Doubt or no doubt are the weak forms of know or not know, and are thus to be believed or not to be believed
6. Then presuppositions are to be believed or not to be believed
7. Then claims are to be believed or not to be believed
8. Unverifiable presuppositional compounds, like history, like e.g. Ex Nihilo, are claims
9. These claims are then to be believed or not to be believed (isn't it a presupposition that the historian tells everything, or the (whole) truth?)
10. My Virtual Reality, in the metaphysics of a dream, makes claims
11. My claims, however, are embedded in Fictive-Narrative philosophy/theology
12. The authority of Fictive-Narrative philosophy hinges on the presence of the author
13. The presence is in the narrative itself (why else do we enjoy good stories?)

14. The author is then the narrative
 15. The narrative is what is real (if it's not real why do people spend hours playing computer games when they know it's only Virtual Reality?)
 16. If the narrative is real the author is present, and then the claims aren't based on beliefs, but on knowing the author
 17. Fictive-Narrative philosophy doesn't get hung up with unverifiable historical-critical claims, that sunk liberal and fundamental theology, since it's not based on belief systems, but knowing the author
 18. Presuppositions are then an instance of Virtual Reality, making Virtual Reality possible. The cart is before the horses. (The dream is then indeed before the physics and is then the metaphysics)
-

The conclusive premise

19. My Virtual Reality of the metaphysics of a dream has then no rhetorical historical-critical issues; it's up to you to make of it what you want (either my presence is convincing, or it isn't)

Three:

1. The world we know is the world we have experienced and learned (through tradition and culture) up until now (modernist presupposition)
2. We understand Virtual Reality through associations (modernist presupposition)
3. Virtual Reality is sampling the world we have experienced and learnt up to now in these associations
4. Virtual Reality extends the world beyond what is physically possible (superman can fly)
5. The association then regresses backwards to expand the world we have experienced and learnt up unto now
6. [The science-fiction of yesterday has turned out to be the science of today many times over] (see the volume *The Science in Science Fiction: 83 SF Predictions that*

Became Scientific Reality by Robert Bly (Bly 2005) in favour of this argument, although the hermeneutical circle, we'll still get to, can be a spanner in the works)

7. The regress backwards has then literally taken place
8. Virtual Reality (metaphysics) and physical reality are then one reality called HyperReality
9. My Virtual Reality becomes part of your reality in HyperReality
10. My Virtual Reality is a Fictive-Narrative Discourse
11. My Fictive-Narrative Discourse is part of a common HyperReality we experience together

The conclusive premise

12. In this enfolding HyperReality you're free to evaluate my Fictive-Narrative Discourse as you see fit, and just as no film producer would dare to tell you what to think of his or her film, so I'm not telling you what to think of my Virtual Reality.

So in short the real importance is the three conclusive premises, and which in turn endorses the assertion that the whole academic world only tells stories. Actually I want us to turn these three Direct Logical inferences around, and start with the story that *conceptualises* all the other premises, and then deduct the other premises from there. This, however, begs for a change of logic, to the aesthetical logic of stories, but now I know what you'll say "This assertion that stories *conceptualises* all the other premises is then exactly your [postmodern] presupposition."

Your partly right, but you know what, I actually don't want to have a presupposition at all. Is that possible? Wasn't that exactly what the modernist philosophers/theologians also strove for and actually assumed? Can one side step presuppositions? Yes and no. No, since deductive reasoning can't be avoided even when it's reasoning to deconstruct deductive reasoning, but on the other hand yes it can be side stepped in the metaphysics of a dream, since what I might claim as my deductive starting point might be wrong, but then I can reside in the fact that it was only a dream, and when this statement itself turns out to be wrong then it was also only a dream.

In my "presupposition" narrative precedes logic, and is a logical unverifiable hypothesis

since logic can't scrutinise that which precedes, or transcends, itself. Nothing can be more postmodern than that, since I state that the ghost in the body is not god but is indeed being preceded by another God. The hypothesis that narrative precedes logic seems to be validated in the hermeneutics of how Virtual Reality has been consumed, or how Virtual Reality has been enjoyed and has actually shaped our world ethically and morally starting from Hollywood/Bollywood, through computer games to the internet, although I know such an enthymeme has all the ammunition for the modernist trap (see my MTh for apparent proof).

So turning these three inferences around also illuminates the modernist logic when the premises are taken right to the modernist presuppositions.

One:

1. Fictive-Narrative Discourse is open-ended (Boylan 2010:11)
 2. I have a Fictive-Narrative Discourse that's open for you to interpret and draw your own conclusions.
 3. The arguments of Virtual Reality are open-ended
 4. The arguments of my Virtual Reality metaphysics of a dream are then open-ended
 5. When Virtual Reality is a metaphorical compound, then Virtual Reality is simulacrum with no verifiable arguments
 6. Simulacrum have no definite verifiable arguments, since simulacrum are per definition simulations lost in an endless recession backwards with no origin
 7. Metaphors are simulacrum, because metaphors are being constructed on an endless recession backwards also with no origin
 8. Virtual Reality is a creative metaphorical compound
 9. Research never stops, so arguments are open-ended
 10. Arguments are being verified through research
-

The aggregate premise

11. Research story telling never stops, and so arguments turn out to be endless proliferating instances of stories. You're (positive or negative or neutral) criticism of my Virtual Reality is then just another story, about a story.

Two:

1. My Virtual Reality of the metaphysics of a dream has then no rhetorical historical-critical issues; it's up to you to make of it what you want (either my presence is convincing, or it isn't)
2. Presuppositions are an instance of Virtual Reality, making Virtual Reality possible. The cart is before the horses. (The dream is then indeed before the physics and is then the metaphysics)
3. Fictive-Narrative philosophy doesn't get hung up with unverifiable historical-critical claims, that sunk liberal and fundamental theology, since it's not based on believe systems, but knowing the author
4. If the narrative is real the author is present, and then the claims aren't based on believes, but on knowing the author
5. The narrative is what is real (if it's not real why do people spend hours playing computer games when they know it's only Virtual Reality?)
6. The author is the narrative
7. The presence is in the narrative itself (why else do we enjoy good stories?)
8. The authority of Fictive-Narrative philosophy hinges on the presence of the author
9. My claims, however, are embedded in Fictive-Narrative philosophy/theology
10. My Virtual Reality, in the metaphysics of a dream, makes claims
11. Unverifiable presuppositional compounds, like history, like e.g. Ex Nihilo, are claims
12. Then claims are to be believed or not to be believed (isn't it a presupposition that the historian tells everything, or the (whole) truth?)

13. Then presuppositions are to be believed or not to be believed
 14. Doubt or no doubt are the weak forms of know or not know, and are thus to be believed or not to be believed
 15. And then claims can't be verified beyond doubt (a theory or hypothesis can never be proven beyond doubt, since the next occurrence can just be an exception. Because the sun comes up every day, doesn't mean beyond doubt it will happen again tomorrow)
 16. So presuppositions can't be verified beyond doubt
 17. Presuppositions can't be empirically verified, just believed, taken for granted
 18. All claims have presuppositions as priories
-

The aggregate premise

19. Presuppositions are then instances of stories, but when the story is the author, presuppositions are rather characteristics of the narrator. When narrative precedes people, the characteristics precede people, and therefore rhetorical historical-critical issues are beyond both of us. A criticism on each other's convictions would then be futile; if we differ we just wouldn't be capable of sharing the same (Virtual Reality) presence infinitely.

Three:

1. In this enfolding HyperReality you're free to evaluate my Fictive-Narrative Discourse as you see fit, and just as no film producer would dare to tell you what to think of his or her film, so I'm not telling you what to think of my Virtual Reality.
2. My Fictive-Narrative Discourse is part of a common HyperReality we experience together
3. My Virtual Reality is a Fictive-Narrative Discourse
4. My Virtual Reality becomes part of your reality in HyperReality
5. Virtual Reality (metaphysics) and physical reality are one reality called HyperReality

6. The Virtual Reality regresses backwards into physical reality that has then literally taken place
 7. [The science-fiction of yesterday has turned out to be the science of today many times over] (see the volume *The Science in Science Fiction: 83 SF Predictions that Became Scientific Reality* by Robert Bly (Bly 2005) in favour of this argument, although the hermeneutical circle, we'll still get to, can be a spanner in the works)
 8. The Virtual Reality associations regress backwards to expand the world we have experienced and learned up until now
 9. Virtual Reality extends the world beyond what is physical possible (superman can fly)
 10. Virtual Reality is sampling the world we have experienced and learnt up until now in associations
 11. We understand Virtual Reality through associations
 12. The world we know is the world we have experienced and learned up until now
-

The aggregate premise

13. The world we know is a narrative world, and associations are instances of narrative. Your criticism on my Virtual Reality would then in fact be other narrative associations through narrative.

So to summarise, in the metaphysics of a dream stories and fiction are real for us, real in Virtual Reality within a HyperReality, real even when the model of physics would/could be bizarre and even illustrate that there's no physical world out there!! Dreams are unreal, not an illusion, and therefore the metaphysics of a dream side steps the rhetorical labyrinth of what's physical real - a good dream is just to be enjoyed (like Virtual Reality), and when it's a bad dream terminated by pulling one self out of the dream. The metaphysics of a dream argues that one might just be waking up within another dream; when one really wakes up from the last dream isn't to be known this side of the grave. Modernists' idolatry of certainty compelled them to think they woke up from the last dream, in which the other regressing dreams were only dreams.

This brings us now to the question why I titled today's discussion *Memoirs of a dream*? Why memoirs?

Easy, a memoir is an autobiographical literary genre, but which is not so much about a person's chronological life story from a-z, but rather how the person fits into, or experiences, a thematic context. For my use it's about what I said, had done and thought about the context at hand in the multi-D (like 3-D) HyperReality world, with others, I lived and experienced.

In the implosion of time the memoirs also extend into the other direction, into dreaming about the future. I'm dreaming that my presence will abide with many. I'm dreaming "... *that you... may have fellowship with me/us... while my/our fellowship is with the Father and with his Son, Yeshua the Messiah.*" (1John 1:3).

I think the metaphysics of a dream is a liberation, since that calls us to only live life emotionally intense, and not get hung up with what we can't understand or scrutinise. Science doesn't really know yet, beyond theories, why we dream at night, so why shall we worry if we are awake or not. Maybe the dreams at night are in fact the most important. The only thing is, let us just *be aware of* the temporality of the dream. Let us just focus on the New Heaven and Earth where we will know the facts apart from the dream, where we won't dream anymore.

4. Biblical narratives as string succession

When we turn right in Kings Street, just look at this industrial sophisticated industry that Late Capitalism has given us. High story, high tech, super highway connected buildings, underground parking lots. Just take one department store, the value of all commodities together in this one store, televisions, computers, books, clothes, food, etc., is more than what I'll earn in my whole life. Only the bare building is more in value than what I'll earn in my whole life, and then there are many of these buildings just in our city Kassel. All the cars together in only one parking lot is more in value than what I'll earn in my whole life, but some people in the world can almost buy the whole city at once. This raises the question what YAHWEH's dream was for this world, and what became of this dream? What does YAHWEH think of this late capitalism, and adapted communism in China and North Korea, and all the abuse of power everywhere? What's YAHWEH's dream, period?

Isn't that what's really important? Whose dream are we living? Think about that!

5. Dozing off the session

This brings us to the question of sociology, and this is where I'll have to leave you. I first need to jump in at DM (DM 2010) to buy floss. I guess without industry there wouldn't have been floss, but on the other hand I wouldn't have had a bridge that needed to be cleaned with floss.

Chapter 6: Psycho-logic lost in Social-physics

“All psychology hitherto has run aground on moral prejudices and timidities, it has not dared to launch out into the depths. In so far as it is allowable to recognize in that which has hitherto been written, evidence of that which has hitherto been kept silent, it seems as if nobody had yet harboured the notion of psychology as the Morphology and DEVELOPMENT-DOCTRINE OF THE WILL TO POWER, as I conceive of it.” (Nietzsche 1886:262)

1. Contextual embedding of session

“Hi, am back. Now it’s weekend!” The clock just struck one. It’s interesting that the Germans have an extra salutation for noon. Like good morning or good afternoon or good evening, they have *Mahlzeit* and means meal time, but it’s only being used for the time around lunch. So, “Mahlzeit.”⁴⁹

I got myself a nice big Bratwurst for lunch. Bratwurst is as German as you can get, but is nothing else than a type of a hotdog, a sausage in a bun. The difference is the sausage, the veal, pork or beef sausage that’s been grilled, and many times on an open fire. Bratwurst also differs from region to region and I obviously had a Nordhessische Bratwurst (from Northern Hessen); needless to say because Kassel is the city of the north of the state of Hessen. A Nordhessische Bratwurst is made from coarsely ground pork, heavily seasoned, and grilled over a wood fire. “Doesn’t it sound yummy?”

I guess this is the closest thing to a boerewors role you’ll get in Europe, anyway that I can get in middle Europe. I guess I can make my own boerewors, and biltong, and all these nice South African delicacies, but won’t that be simulacrum since the food of a country is part and parcel of the culture, habitat, and even language. I’m sure some boerewors roles, somewhere in South Africa, would taste just like a Bratwurst somewhere in Germany, so why bother with boerewors roles when I can eat Bratwurst?

As you can see the city is alive with people, and looks like an ant colony. Sometimes I just wonder where all these people live? And then I start wondering about the unique and interesting story each person can tell. A good author, with enough effort, would be able to write a bestseller, or at least a good seller, on each person’s life, don’t you think? Actually

⁴⁹ That’s regionally conditioned though, I’ve learned in the state of Bavaria *Mahlzeit* can also be used for supper. In northern Hessen I’ve never heard *Mahlzeit* being used other than for lunch, or noon.

a good established world renown author can write anything and his or her books will sell; even when it borders rubbish, the name will sell. The good author's presence isn't in the narrative anymore, but in his or her name.

The sun is shining, and the joy of the weekend is bubbling from everyone, or is it the joy of the sun? That's the one good thing about living in middle Europe, one appreciates the sun. The gloomy mood back in South Africa, incepted by crime, fraud, and I guess purely the disdain of change, impels many to dream about fleeing South Africa and impel some to even dream about middle Europe as a destiny. I've got a surprise for them, they have taken the sun for granted, and the SAD syndrome is awaiting many of them.

The tram will be packed today and we might have to stand half the way to Baunatal; the second half will be less populated. Anyway today you won't see anything of the SAD syndrome in Kassel; the sunny radiance doesn't just have an optical clarity, but also a clarity of mood, a sense of freedom, a sense of holiday.

2. Pertinent cultural reflection

Freedom is now a thorny topic for you; it's interesting, we say we are free, but then we are so susceptible to outside influences. The weather certainly tunes the mood in Europe; in North East England, in the town called Hartlepool where I used to live (Hartlepool 2004), this was even more noticeable. The people there say that if you can live in North East England you can live anywhere in the world; such gloomy English weather, the whole year around, makes one wonder how this place could get inhabited in the first place?

When weather tunes our moods, beyond our freedom, aren't we just as susceptible and controllable by other outside influences? I'm certain if Germans would learn to be extravertive and laugh and chat away with everyone that crosses their paths, it would certainly change their sombre extreme individualistic mood - I almost want to call it the modernist mood of numbers and equations. But why are Germans so stereotype? Why are Americans so stereotype? Why are the English so stereotype? Why are the Boere in South Africa so stereotype?

This one is our jammed tram. We first have to let the masses out, before we can squeeze in. I don't care too much about a seat on a day like this anyway, I don't want the older

people to stress now, do I?

The German sombre mood is in stark contrast with black Africa, and that's what I love about Africa, the black Africans; they are all friends with everyone, and I find it difficult to notice barriers between them, although I know they certainly do exist. Has that got something to do with missing modernism?

When a typical African goes on holiday, the prerequisite is not what he or she will see, but who her or she will meet (Boysen 2000). I remember, back in South Africa, the American denomination called The Church of the Nazarene, whose Bible college I was attending (NTC 2001), used to organise an assembly for the whole of Africa every four years in Muldersdrift Johannesburg; this is now for all their churches scattered over the whole continent.

The assembly was always down in South Africa, and I guess made logistical sense, although South Africa is on a limb in such a big continent. When the head quarters of the whole of Africa are on a limb, in Johannesburg, the assembly being on a limb I guess is not more augured than the head quarters. On the other hand it was most noticeable that the Americans that organised the assembly, lived in Johannesburg and worked in the head quarters. To be fair, Dutch and Germans were also involved in the organisation.

However, to the dislike of the Americans, Dutch and Germans, and sadly the white South Africans too, the black Africans, who were coming from all over Africa and some flown in at a great cost through the sacrificial tithing of the lower middle class church members back in the States, would poorly attend the well structured and varied seminars and just sit under the trees and chat away with others from different countries.

This is now typical African for you, my Boere volk will say, but before you judge, why is that? Is it really that wrong? Doesn't Africa better understand the value of the hidden curriculum, as opposed to the well thought out seminars with Newtonian currency knowledge, the westerners compassionately desire to donate to poor Africa? Does this systematic theology of the West make sense to Africa?

To state my insight and how I grasped all of this, the Bible college I was attending was a real multikulti college, and pretty much representative of the whole of South Africa. I was

only one of three white South African students, but the only one from the Afrikaans speaking community; the other two were of English speaking decent. The rest of the student body consisted of coloureds, and a number of South African black tribes, ranging from Zulus, Xhosa, and South African Shangaans, Southern and Northern Sothos, but also one South African Indian (with ancestors originally coming from India). The non-South Africans were two Mozambican Shangaans, one Ugandese and one Eritrean, but also one non-African altogether, a Chinese.

Just to avoid confusion, the designation coloured has an altogether different meaning for South Africans than to Americans; the coloureds are a mixed-race and some have a substantial ancestry from Europe, Indonesia, Madagascar, Malaya, Mozambique, Mauritius, Saint Helena and obviously southern Africa.

I carefully chose this Bible college when I had to get off the road due to my dire health state. The Bible college didn't only endorse my theological experiences, but also offered me the multikulti composition I wanted to prepare myself with to become a lecturer-missionary to black Africa in some Bible college somewhere in the outback's of Africa. Ironically, modernism, my problem, could have been marginalised in such an endeavour, but now I'm living in the heart land and centre of Europe and the European Union, struggling through the death pangs of modernism.

Have I ever told you that since not too long ago Kassel was not just almost the dead centre of Germany, but actually became the dead centre of the European Union when the European Union became a 27 member union on the 1 January 2007. *Hercules* is then indeed the patron saint of Europe, and ironically I have to live in the shadow of *Hercules*.

Anyway, the Bible college was a satellite college of a University in Canada, and thus with a North American curriculum with the most lecturers coming from North America. However, it didn't take me long to realise that this curriculum was pretty useless in an African context. The numbers and equations in all the theologies weren't making sense to the Africans.

My one lecturer, and one of my most revered lecturers, and principal of the Bible college, Dr. Enoch Litzwele (Litzwele 2001), summarised it the best; he said that, let us use the American word, a Caucasian looks for a new church, he or she will base the choice pertinently on what a church believes, that's now doctrinally; the African, on the other

hand, will attend different churches and the church he or she socially enjoys the most, he or she will join and then ask them, “What do I have to believe now?”

That was the bottom line of the problem. All these theologies, systematic theology, biblical theology, historical theology, pastoral theology, were taught them, but were they reflectively, editorially writing these books into their worldviews as they were reading them? The trouble was not even that they were not reflectively reading these books, they didn't even literally write anything into their worldviews; they just learnt the currency for the examinations.

That's why two students made their girlfriends pregnant, and one married student committed adultery by making the daughter of one of the black lecturers pregnant; she was also by the way a student. That's why the Bible college was such a contradiction; the chapel services and midweek prayer meetings were almost heaven on earth, and according to a world-wide delegation, the best services they had ever experienced (Delegation 2000). This irrespective of lying and stealing and all these other things going on in the college.

The thing that dawned on me was that the major value this Bible college had for the Africans was the hidden curriculum, not the lectures or the formal curriculum and certainly not the numbers and equations in philosophy and theology.

Here in Germany we started a ministry for the Filipinos in a town 30km outside of Kassel called Fritzlar. My wife loves the Filipinos and actually her best friend is married to one. It is amazing how these Filipinos can socialise and lose themselves in time bubbling around food.

The thing is they were looking for someone who could share the Scriptures with them in English and that's why they approached me. As a Rabbi my inclination is to build relationships with them, and not to supply them with currency. One weekend though, when we were due to gather I fell sick with a tummy flue my daughter brought back home from kindergarten and so I couldn't make it to the meeting. Two days later the one Filipino lady called me to tell me how the meeting was; she told me that they had a great time just talking trash (in her words) the whole evening.

That's the point I want to make; I'm always surprised when I see all this inflation talk, waste of time, and that it gives such joy to people. The content they won't remember a bit the following day, but that's beside the point. What were they talking about? I'm convinced nothing revolutionary like Einstein's theory of relativity, or something that impresses others because of superior intellect? No way! They were just having fun with something they co-owned, or is it something that owns them?

The picture that comes to mind is that of gurgling, they were gurgling the joy, the belonging, the interconnectedness of their culture and sense making. Gurgling makes a sound, like talking, but it's not about the sound, it's about the gurgling. The content, the sound, is something of the existential production of the gathering, but the gurgling itself is something of the Hegelian dialectical history.

Only 'something' of the Hegelian dialectical process, since "Hegel's primary objective in his dialectic is to establish the existence of a logical connection between the various categories which are the constitution of experience." (McTaggart 2005:1), but as you know by now these categories are modernism's ruin. The same categorical criticism can be raised against the existentialism, and therefore only 'something' of the existential, since pure phenomenology (Cooper 1999:46) misses the Riemannian geometry.

So where am I going with this? The more I've moved around in the world and, mixed with other cultures or groups, the more the individual has disappeared in my eyes; I came to see the apparent definition of individualism as only a close proximity experience; I talk to you, but what we talk about, or use in the conversation, belongs to us both and the people around us - no one can claim individual ownership.

3. Radical inductive contemplation

But what about all these nobel prize winners, are they not individuals that made these breathtaking breakthroughs? I'm not so convinced about that; I say the society made the breakthroughs. You know the saying, "It takes a whole community to raise a child". Sure they had some bright ideas, but in no private language, or cognition. There are no small businesses manufacturing knowledge, only corporate companies. Their shared profit is that of society.

I think ubuntu's got it right when it says, "It is the community which makes the individual, to the extent that without the community, the individual has no existence" (Coetzee 2003:252). So the community resides in the single person, and that includes the nobel prize winners. The single person is an integral part of a hologram, where all the information is at each single place (Kirkpatrick 2007:395), and the whole community is in each single person.

This is then again where physics meet metaphysics. Say I take a shower, and come out of the shower and rejoice in my cleanliness, don't I praise the water, the thousands or millions of drops of H₂O molecules that cleansed me? But if I praise the molecules then I have to praise the protons and neutrons and electrons that constructed the H₂O molecules; but why shall I then stop with the H₂O assembly and not praise the quarks? If I praise the quarks then I also have to praise the virtual-energy behind the quarks, and the information in the waves of the H₂O molecules.

I know I'm playing with words, but the whole can't be separated from the parts, just as the parts in turn can't be separated from the whole, but when the parts are one and the same thing, what's the difference between whole things? If virtual-energy is information, then there's no difference. Information is one thing, there's no plural, and when information, the waves are behind all, what's the difference between all things? It's a hologram where big things are only instances of the one information, so that the difference between things is more about perspective, the angle, than about substance. The nobel prize winner is only a perspective, an angle, when all are actually the nobel prize winners⁵⁰.

One more example; a good mechanic, say in a BMW workshop, has to undertake, and will continue to undertake, some serious training to know the bimmer under the bonnet. Now one day this same mechanic discovers a real good shortcut to fix a problem (like a miniature nobel prize winner), isn't this just learning to swim better in a pool that doesn't belong to the mechanic but to BMW? Without all the serious training, and years of fixing cars, he or she wouldn't even have known how the bimmer looks under the bonnet, so I think it's fair to say BMW has actually produced this better swimmer in the perspective of

⁵⁰ The choice of "all" that is diversified into unique "perspectives" is flirting with idealism, but that is just due to the choice of the words, the analogies. The word angle is better and attempts to indicate something like a prism which deviates light differently on different angles.

this one pool of information.

Don't we say that of top schools, and universities, that produce these outstanding candidates? Take the top schools and universities away, what would be the perspective on some of these candidates then? They will be nobodies out side the hologram.

At the break of the new century we are in a zapping culture. We are zapping from one technological novelty to the next, and I must admit it's pretty impressive. New smart phones are flooding the market, and these tablets; I wouldn't mind having one though; but the most impressive are these new 3-D televisions and the latest that don't even require these annoying glasses for someone like me already wearing glasses. The work accomplished by one good engineer in the development process of one of these televisions would have been worth a nobel prize a millennium or two ago.

Should Artificial Intelligence (A.I.) ever really materialise, are we going to award nobel prizes to computers as well?

Give that a little bit of thought! That's now ubuntu for you!

4. Wider theolosophy debate

The institutional father of sociology is Emile Durkheim (1858-1917) (Lukes 1985:66-85), and although he also worked with the unreasonable physics (Platonic dualism), and was what we call a modernist, he still made a groundbreaking study on suicide (Lukes 1985:191-225) and established sociology; and that's praiseworthy. Who would think that suicide can be sociologically explained? I guess these current suicide bombers from Islam would have given Emile Durkheim a ball of a time! That's now sociology in practice.

According to Anthony Giddens, Mitchell Duneier and Richard P. Appelbaum (Giddens 2007:17) from the time of Karl Marx to the present day, many sociological debates have centred on the ideas coined by Marx. The current so called postmodernist definition of sociology, on the other hand, cogitates with the language games of Ludwig Wittgenstein, where each "society" has it own unique compilation of language-games (Wittgenstein 1958:4). Each "society" is an intratextual unit. In this definition society has a real loose meaning, it can be a church or a town, and I like it, but it partly still has a modernist intonation now with apparent individual societies, and consequently I don't see the

postmodern physics in its full extent yet in these games.

Without wobbling around too much, I want to jump straight to social-physics! This term owes its dues to Auguste Comte (1798–1857) (Comte 2009:30), but I'm certain not in the way I'm going to use it. Where I actually want to pick up the thread is with Carl Gustav Jung (1875-1961), and take note, another German. What would we have done without the Germans? I mean they can play good soccer as well and have entertained us in all the soccer world-cups this millennium so far!

He came up with the *concept* called *collective unconscious* (Shelburne 1988:28-34), but although it has fallen out of favour with psychologists, I think he has a point when the dualisms are removed, the watertight compartments of consciousness versus unconsciousness and the physical versus the spiritual. When the conscious and unconscious conflates, as we spoke about this morning, then he conflates with Emile Durkheim whose work is also collective, but collective consciousness (Lukes 1985:4) and not collective unconsciousness (Emile Durkheim just turned the words around and said *conscious collective*).

The collective of the reasonable physics is the transpersonal coherence of Ervin Laszlo, the philosopher of science, in his book *The Connectivity Hypothesis Foundations of an Integral Science of Quantum, Cosmos, Life and Consciousness*. He says that most consciousness investigators agree that the phenomenon of mind is present both in the individual, and in the sphere of information and communication created by intercommunicating [people] (he uses the word individual I don't like). He goes on to say that both the mind and consciousness are personal and transpersonal (Laszlo 2003:28).

Actually it can be pretty scary, but no alarm bells; Ervin Laszlo actually does make a Hindu connection later in his book, but as you know I flatly reject that though, as well as the esoteric mysticism it empowers. All it says is that when matter is also waves, unreal not an illusion you remember, with nonlocal superstate properties, then an interference between matter can occur, they are not billiard balls, and then an interference between our brains and bodies, can take place!

How did the tensor move in the case of Randolph Bitter? Somehow there must have been a transperonal connection between us if he asks me a question and my body responds and

moves the tensor (or did the tensor move itself because of the consciousness?). I experienced no wind moving the tensor, and I don't even think that has anything to do with sound, otherwise how would my body have understood the question in Arabic when I don't know Arabic? Who knows how our waves interfered?

When we read in Ephesians 2:1-2, that we

“...used to be dead because of our sins and acts of disobedience, since we walked in the ways of this old heaven and earth and in the ways of the Ruler of the Powers of the Air, who is at work in the disobedient right now,”

how do you envision these demons/forces to influence those who are disobedient? I've never heard them talking with an audible voice! Do they communicate via the conscious or the unconscious or somehow else still?

Karl Pribram the psychologist (unbelievable, another German), and David Bohm the physicist, came up with the holonomic brain theory that argues cognition in terms of quantum mechanics. In a radio interview with Dr. Jeffrey Mishlove, Karl Pribram made the following statement:

“... if indeed we're right that these quantum-like phenomena, or the rules of quantum mechanics, apply all the way through to our psychological processes, to what's going on in the nervous system -- then we have an explanation perhaps, certainly we have a parallel, to the kind of experiences that people have called spiritual experiences. Because the descriptions you get with spiritual experiences seem to parallel the descriptions of quantum physics.” (Thinking Allowed Productions 1998).

Karl Pribram sees the connection, and so do I. The holonomic brain theory, with Dave Bohm's right maths, proposes that the brain is like a hologram, a matrix of neurological wave interference patterns. I would like to take this notion one step further and propose the influence, interaction with the Holy Spirit, angels, but also demons, as the interference of waves.

Unfortunately this is speculative philosophy; we can't attach an EEG machine to someone and ask an angel to talk to him or her and monitor his or her brain activity! This can't be tested in a laboratory, but as I said before, that actually renders all philosophy and theology speculative, except if we come up with a different definition of truth or facts. Something of that I hope will simmer through as we progress in our discussion in the

following days!

To come back to the communication, it indeed seems like there's a collective wavefunctioning (un)consciousness. I don't think that 'spiritual talking', YAHWEH talking to us through the Scriptures i.e., is really in English or Afrikaans or some other language! What language are we going to talk in heaven one day? What language precedes all languages? What language did Elohim use when He said, "Let there be light" in Genesis 1:3? (see my MTh for an explanation of how the Genesis 1 six-day creation story could have been a pure linguistic event and nothing else).

There is certainly, by definition, a language in heaven, but couldn't that be a universal, a primordial language? How else would "... YAHWEH's undeserved favour, which brings deliverance,... appear... to all people." (Titus 2:11)? I think it's plausible to say YAHWEH's gracious words, or notions, or compelling, conscious or unconscious or both, are wavefunction interferences in the holographic brain!

What does John 1:1 tell us?

"In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with YAHWEH, and the Word was YAHWEH."⁵¹

In the beginning was the Divine Consciousness, YAHWEH's Informationing, which is YAHWEH itself (I say YAHWEH's Information with great reservation, since what's Divine is Divine and I'm only human). Can't the Divine Logos be the primordial "Language", Informationing, that underlies all languages and explains how the Logos holds creation together, the waves (Colossians 1:17), and how we, as a new humanity in the Messiah, "*participate in the divine nature*" (2 Peter 1:4)?

⁵¹ The respected young creationist scientist Werner Gitt (Gitt 2005) calls his classic book *In the Beginning Was Information*, and specifically (reciprocally) paraphrases John 1:1 with his title. Werner Gitt, however, places information on equal footing with matter and energy (Gitt 2005:11), but as we've seen the major breakthrough to quantum mechanics came when matter was recognised as pockets of energy; so the equal footing can be replaced with equivalent/synonymous, and since the next breakthrough also discovered the wave characteristics of matter, information can also equivalently/synonymously be added to matter and energy.

Isn't there somehow a hierarchical breakdown, with the primordial "Language" at the top followed by wavefunctions, that explains why I responded to an Arabic question I don't understand? To bring it back to earth, is it possible that the presupposition of poststructuralism and the language philosophers, that all cognition is confined to language outside which we can't think, so off track? No, I don't think so, although nihilism when the primordial "Language" at the top of the hierarchy is not recognised. For many of them it would be pure irrational speculative philosophy, but not when truth is grounded in relationships and not in a laboratory.

I guess the German Carl Jung's archetypes, the properties common to all humanity, might hold some value. Institutions like mother and the marriage commitment are rather instinct than pure social or cultural constructions. But now you'll ask, "Can't you see that these institutions are vanishing in a postmodern [disintegrating] society?" My answer is "Have the underlying needs for these institutions really vanished with?"

I don't think so! Not if there's some truth in Abraham Maslow's (1908-1970) proposal of needs (Maslow 1999). I think these needs, even in transformed/corrupted institutions, are instincts, even when expressed and fulfilled in a transformed way! What I want to come to though is the question of how these instincts are being 'transmitted'? You might say "Obviously through the genes!", but I'll say "They are being 'transmitted'/known in a collective (un)consciousness!" Genes have turned out to be very controversial where mutations deviates from genetic imprints. Biophysics, biology utilising postmodern physics, argues that genes play a subservient role in a specie and, like Lev Belousov states, the fundamental developmental events don't occur solely in genetic control. He illustrates an underlying uncertainty principle, like Heisenberg's uncertainty principle, where the single cell shows a lesser probability to produce the final organism than several hundreds of cells (Belousov 2002:68-83) .

"Now what about cloning?", you might ask. Even in cloning the scientists are obligated to reprogram the embryo nucleus, but is this cloned organism then really the same as the 'original' since the length of the chromosomes might be inconsistent and the organs might be too large? Why do identical twins have different finger prints if they share the same DNA? Identical twins even have a variation in DNA sequence that couldn't be accounted for during conception. So what comes first, in both cloning and identical twins, the chicken

or the egg? The DNA or the DNA that plays a subservient role? I certainly think it's the second option.

Back to the collective (un)consciousness; in the ground breaking study of Grinberg-Zulberbaum J, Delaflor J, Attie L, Goswami L., called *The Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen paradox in the brain: The transferred potential*, the scientists illustrate that when two people have meditated together, with the objective of reaching direct communication, in one Faraday chamber and are then separated in two Faraday chambers, their EEG patterns correspond on only the stimulus of one person (Grinberg-Zulberbaum 1994:422-8). There you have it, quantum nonlocality or interconnectedness.

A real good friend of mine (Janse Van Rensburg 2010), back in South Africa, is a high-profile engineer and these things are scary to him since the communication branch, he used to work in, is seeking telepathic avenues to revolutionise telecommunication. I am not too concerned about that, since a study like this just mentioned is still far removed from replacing a telephone call or revolutionising the internet, but what it does tell me is what close proximity is doing and actually how the hidden curriculum starts in the womb.

A few years ago, a friend of mine and his wife (Van der Merwe 1995), who was pregnant with their first child and daughter, were watching an action packed film; she shared the next day how their unborn daughter was affected by this film, she was apparently kicking the whole night.

I guess one could say that the unborn baby heard the film, and could construct the plot and therefore was so excited that she couldn't sleep and rather did some exercise to relieve the excitement in her mother (like we used to play Tarzan after a Tarzan film when I was a boy), but I don't think anyone would imagine that? No!! The unborn baby picked up the waves, the real waves, from the mother, the hidden curriculum, or could it even be the waves of the television? Don't studies show that unborn babies pick rejection up when their mothers contemplate abortion (Archer 2004:106)?

The scope of collective (un)consciousness goes deeper; in the in-depth study of Ignazio Masulli (Laszlo 2003:43) he found a striking resemblance in the basic forms and designs in the artifacts produced between civilisations, that lived far apart in space and even time, but who had no conventional contact with each other. It seems like monuments and tools are

fashioned according to a pattern.

Something like this can be used for the defence of a Platonic dualism and the eternal world of forms, but not when collective (un)consciousness holds. Then this tram we are sitting in right now is indeed not just a mould of a blueprint in the world of ideas!

I already mentioned the golden philosophical age, \pm 500 B.C.; that was the time when all the major philosophical schools of Buddhism, the classical Greek age, and Confucianism, etc., were born. These are the philosophies that shaped all dominating worldviews up to date. Is the close proximity of time a coincidence? No, I think it was collective (un)consciousness in action.

How big is this information, this collective (un)consciousness, or what does it entitle? About the quantity, I guess no finite being can answer, but what I know is that it's not confined to the materialistic vice alone which has dominated the philosophy of the late Newtonian worldview. That's the view that only matter exists, in philosophy called materialism, and that metaphysics is somehow the other parallel track of the modernist dualism but still grounded in this same matter. Those that negate metaphysics altogether, on the other hand, are also feeling about in the dark since such a claim is exactly a metaphysical claim. For me it's easy, the quantity includes us and nature and angels and demons, but most of all the Primordial Divine Logos. My worldview includes everything, seen and unseen.

Using analogies can be dangerous, as you would affirm, but how else can we then construct new hypotheses and initiate negotiation? Dr Aldo Saavedra, a particle physicist at the University of Sydney and the European Organisation for Nuclear Research (CERN), near Geneva, says that "[i]t would be really nice if nature actually provided some very puzzling thing that theories haven't actually thought of." (Salleh 2008)

The analogy I would like to draw on is the internet, the information on the internet that we know right now is unmeasurable, and anyway it changes every second as people turn personal computers (PCs) on and off. Let us say that the internet is like the collective (un)consciousness, or the collective (un)consciousness is like the internet - you make the choice.

On the internet other computers, apart from the one the internet is being accessed from, are essentially oblivious, at least psychologically: the browser is a window into one pool of information. In the same way the individual disappears in a societal pool, except in close proximity. Close proximity on the internet can for instance be a small LAN at work or home, or peer-to-peer file-sharing network with neighbours, and through that there would be an awareness of other computers. On the WAN (Wide Area Network), however, the individual computer actually physically disappears; the information is not being viewed on the remote computer, but being fetched from the remote computer and being observed on the local browser.

It's again (like) a hologram, where all the information is everywhere. I know when calling up a website we are more or less able to know where we're fetching it from; I guess by looking at the BBC website we can guess that we are calling up a website from the UK, and even when out of the cache of a close by server, or even the local computer, it was originally coming from the UK (although even that can be a wrong assumption). The thing is that there is only one internet pool of information, the original geographical locality is actually of little importance and is only the entry point into this one pool of information, like the senses of the body for the whole body, or the maternity wards in a hospital for the whole cultural or intratextual pool.

To reiterate, we might meet a single person somewhere, and might pretty soon realise that this person is not from here when his or her language skills or appearance or both, or even something else, would disclose the fact; but how else could we place this person without stereotyping? Take note of the difference; when we discussed modernism I used the fanciful example of my wife growing up in the country side of Germany and how the metaphor German was only born when a Chinese visited their town and her mum pointed out that being German is what it is not, it's not being Chinese. I want to contrast this modernist vice with stereotyping, with all it's clichés, since stereotyping is not about what something is not, but what it is, and is for me closer to the truth of what things can become together (Hebrew thinking versus Graeco-Roman thinking).

How do we know when a group of Dutch people are close by? You hear them before you see them; they don't keep the content of their small talk, or socialising, a secret, but exuberantly share it with everyone. Anyway it's like that in Winterberg.

Winterberg is the largest ski area north of the Alps in Europe, and is a 100km west of Kassel. Winterberg is like little Holland; there you can get along with Dutch just as good as with German, if not better. I guess coming from Holland, on the way to the Alps, this is the first big mountain and the Dutch might have just been so taken by a mountain (something they don't know much about) that they thought it's as good as the Alps, or even the Alps, while not too far from home, and thus 'borrowed' it from the Germans. The thing is when I'm in Winterberg and I see and hear the Dutch people, no individual stands out in any group though, they're just all typically Dutch.

Back to the analogy of the internet; although each single PC on the internet, is connected to the whole wide world internet and is free to make use of online services and games and even customise certain websites, etc., the freedom is conditioned by the server, firewalls, the quality of the internet connection, the location, or even restrictions by the country, but most of all the will of the content creators. Absolute freedom is an illusion, just as privacy. Any customised website is still the ownership of the company providing the service, and they can change or terminate services at their own discretion. The scope with which one can customise the website is also decided on by them. Everything we can do on the internet is what someone else allows us, or makes possible for us, or provides us with and is a service based on their own terms and conditions and potential scope, but they in turn are in the same way restricted by what others allow them and make possible for them. The internet has indeed a corporate ownership.

What's privacy worth when the moment a photo is being uploaded onto a social network and the ownership is also turned over to the social network, and those that can access the photo. All photos in private profiles on Facebook, literally also belong to Facebook (they can sell it if they want to)⁵². Actually the private profiles themselves belong to Facebook, so that the only thing private means is that one profile is not the other.

How private are emails when every email is being dropped into a POP mailbox on a server that's being designed and maintained by programmers and administrators we don't know

52 In the meantime the European Union has been fighting for the privacy of their citizens and so the exclusive and apparently (how shall we really know) unconditional ownership by social networks has been partly curbed for us in Germany. We have to believe this simulacrum! (take note I use *doxa* because we don't really know!)

from Adam? But then you'll ask, "What about encrypted Blackberry emails?" What do you think when the encryption runs over the servers of RIM (the developers of Blackberry)? They have access to the emails, and again we don't know them from Adam either?

I guess the only real freedom would be to encrypt some of this information ourselves (unfortunately when I have to do it, I'm obligated to use encryption software I haven't developed myself), but the freedom will be lost when an outsider deletes it from their server. In this way I guess a hacker is also using some form of freedom to sabotage other people's storage of information, or access to information.

In the same way, in the collective (un)consciousness, we have some appearance of freedom, but are constrained by a collective narrative pool of information (in due time we'll give ample time to discuss narrative).

Still at the internet, what if cloud computing really kicks off and the single PC has no other purpose than accessing the internet? Cloud computing is software as a service, like Google docs or Zoho, where nothing else but a browser is needed on the local computer. That's exactly all the new Google Chrome OS (Operating System like Windows) will offer end users. Cloud computing brings us closer to the analogy I would like to sketch. In cloud computing the internet as a whole is all there is, the individual PC, laptop, netbook, tablet, or even smart- or cellphone is only the terminal accessing the one pool of dynamic information.

Interesting that's exactly like the mainframe model I used to program for in 1991-1992, which seems like it has made a staggering all-consuming and imperialistic comeback. At Central Statistical Services each person had his or her own terminal by which the mainframe was remotely accessed; the mainframe now is the whole world wide web.

In cloud computing the only individual thing is the unique documents, but which might be a collectively written, or drawn up, document with real time interactive changes on all participants browsers simultaneously. In short, many people can write one document simultaneously, irrespective of the distance apart, since they are nonlocal in the one pool of information. Who knows where this Google doc is I'm working on right now? For all I know it's somewhere in China on a server!

O, yes, Google left China⁵³, I almost forgot, but how would I have known the difference?

Collaborating in cloud computing creativity is a mutual effort so that the individual really becomes obscure. This collective real-time and creative innovation is like the collective language we use with cognition, Latin *cognitiō* from *cognōscere*, where *co-* stands for together, like in cooperation, and *gnōscere* to know, thus to know together. The cognition in language is to cooperate.

At this point I see it necessary to point out that I am unique, and you are unique, and we all are unique. Everyone is unique, like this story I'm telling, and inevitably probes the question "Is the unique not the individual?" No, anyway not in terms of the billiard ball unreasonable physics. The unique is the ubuntu unique, the holographic unique. In short, everyone is the whole hologram, but no one alone is the hologram; in ubuntu language, each one is the community, but the community is no single one. The community is not an assembly of parts, individual parts, but the compilation of the parts, the unique parts, where the compilation is what each unique part became together – exclusively dependently aroused. The single unique part, like you and me, only exist through the other unique parts and compiled together is the community⁵⁴. The barriers, contours and size of the community, the Virtual Community, you decide; for me the determining agent is cognitive relativism – *cognōscere* relativism, know-together relativism, dependent arising relativism.

53 That was still the case at the time of this writing, but not anymore at the time of adding this footnote; that said, even when Google was evicted out of China, Google could still be (partly) accessed in China and so also illustrates the one pool of information.

54 This is not supporting popular democratic thinking as valued by so many in the West, like in Germany e.g. Does democracy exist, or is democracy itself not just an expression in the hologram, rather than of or for the hologram? In short, is the countering streams of movements in democratic multi party politics independent political parties that debate in parliament? Or do they indeed exist dependently aroused and function day-to-day as dependently arising? It is interesting that the opposition always has to criticise what the ruling party/coalition is doing, almost every evening on television, but is the 'dialectic' then not rather just the movement of one body – one parliament, one country? In this critic I hardly hear anyone who wants to leave Germany, pull out of the body. (Dialectic in ' ', since again it's not the Hegelian dialectical of the interrelationship of the Cartesian categories, but the dependent arising of nutrients in the one body).

So what am I saying? I say diversity in unity, and not unity in diversity – take note of the difference. Is YAHWEH not capable of creating one unity/hologram, that is diversified so that parts/points/particles/instances, call it whatever you want, are unique, but not individuals, since they don't just only exist through the others, they are also – contradictory - the others. It is something like the archaeological unearthing of a few, or even one, single person in an ancient society utilised to reconstruct something of the whole society: the whole society is in the single unique person. The single person has the whole hologram.

5. Biblical narratives as string succession

The death of the individual, however, in both Buddhism and ubuntu, begs the question about culpability and where the single person then fits in? What's with freedom of choice? In order to love YAHWEH aren't we granted freedom? Who's the "...everyone who calls on the name of YAHWEH shall be delivered." (Romans 10:13). What do we make of Ezekiel 18:20,

"The person who sins is the one that shall die; a son is not to bear his father's guilt, nor is the father to bear his son's guilt; the righteousness of the righteous shall be his righteousness, and the wickedness of the wicked will be his wickedness."

but then on the other hand we hear Yeshua saying in Luke 11:48-50,

"So you testify that you completely approve of what your fathers did -- they did the killing, you do the building!... so this generation will be held responsible for all the prophets' blood that has been shed since the world was established,"

What about holy wars? Why do babies have to suffer for adults?

Is this a riddle for Riemannian logic only, or not? Some would say this is exactly the problem with the Tanakh, and therefore the B'rit Hadashah replaced the Tanakh; others would say it only proves that the Tanakh is only a human fabrication, a flight of imagination, YAHWEH hasn't commanded these holy wars in the first place.

The question is, "What do I say?"

The problem with individualism is the same to me as that of fatalism. In fatalism YAHWEH's infallible foreknowledge causes many irrational issues: when YAHWEH knows

infallibly what's going to happen in the future, how can we make free choices? In short, the problem is that YAHWEH's infallible foreknowledge would then be the cause of the effects of the future; it couldn't have been different when YAHWEH already knew it, right? As you all know, theology came up with some impressive and nice ideas of how this infallible foreknowledge can be reconciled with freedom of choice, they are:

1. Firstly, asymmetrical time or,
2. Secondly, just timelessness of YAHWEH's 'world' (Mann 2005:3-25)

In both cases YAHWEH sees time different to us, and even like an open book in the second instance, but I still don't see how they resolve the contradiction of how a Divine Being of love can allow bad things to happen untouched. O, yes they have taken care of it though, but with another rhetorical manoeuvre altogether I'm not sure I like either. I can't imagine how a Divine Being of love can endure the killing of millions of Jews in gas chambers, for the sake of a moral world only. Is a moral world only the highest good for YAHWEH? Is a moral world more important than millions of people who will be in hell one day? If the moral world is the highest good, because YAHWEH wants us to love Him freely, then YAHWEH would rather appear like a love depraved psychopath, or is YAHWEH then rather fatalistically subjected to a moral? Then He's not omnipotent!

My proposal is, why don't we just give up on fatalism altogether, without giving up on infallible foreknowledge, and still preserve the Scriptural prophecies, etc.? Now you'll say, "That's exactly the issue at hand!" The problem I have with the asymmetrical time and timelessness proponents is their Newtonian perception of time, thus the unreasonable physics. The rhetorical blunder in their proposals are apparent variables that they had to create to keep linear time, with a constant trajectory, the way we know it - apparent real-time. What if Stephan Hawking is right about imaginary time (Hawking 2001:110) so that the time on our watches is rather only an appearance? What when we see infallible foreknowledge in terms of a quantum interconnectedness where YAHWEH is interconnected with everything, in a multidimensional model of imaginary time with a past, present, and future, but which in reality could be the same moment in real-time.

To make it practical, it would mean the Scriptures, e.g., are being written as things happen, although they were written thousands of years ago. This would mean YAHWEH's

infallible knowledge is foreknowledge only as far as imaginary time goes, but in real-time YAHWEH knows experientially and influentially simultaneously.

The death of the individual in quantum interconnectedness is not only the singularity in real-time, but also the nonlocal interconnectedness where we interconnectably have an influence on each other. This is ubuntu also in the material sense, since when there's no dualism of a ghost in the body, ubuntu is also humanness through the influence of the body of others together on us on others. You know the saying, "Show me your friends, and I'll tell you who you are"? In ubuntu that also has a material dimension of material interference between waves so that physical presence is not just 'psychologically' understood, but also physical.

In no dualisms the seen and the unseen merges so that neural brain activity is both the seen and the unseen merged; memory and cognition are both in the seen and the unseen so that when we have major head injuries we could lose memory and/or cognition, but when we die to go to paradise, as an intermediate state before our resurrections, we go with a memory and cognition. We are like holograms, the amputation of the body doesn't terminate memory and cognition.

Collective (un)consciousness doesn't imply a material-non material dualism, but rather collective material that can be added to the collective sharing. The thing I want to come to is that in this collectiveness we are not what we are not, but we are what we are together. Is Hebraic thinking not again what we become together? How much of the individual does YAHWEH see when we walk the talk and talk the walk in the same comprehensive language of signs, symbols, body language and words as those around us? Doesn't the Trinity work on the same principle? Don't we say that our YAHWEH is One, but three persons? Would we say three individuals? No, because the three are collectively walking and talking the same walk and talk? Or what is your definition of individual?

The Trinity's walk and talk, and our participation in the divine nature (2 Peter 1:4), is to me like the walk and talk of the old diamond anniversary couple, but still in love, that so much became one that the death of the one is half of the death of the other. That was exactly the testimony of an old lady in my parish in England; she testified that when her husband died, half of her died with him. (Louw 2002).

This collectiveness runs into problems with things like altar-calls that actually have a completely different significance in Africa, and which is very difficult for evangelical Messianic followers in Europe and America to understand. An altar-call is this Billy Graham style invitation inviting people to the front of the church, or tent, or whatever, to accept Yeshua the Messiah as their personal saviour through a sinner's prayer. The Europeans and Americans think it's a felony when the preacher makes an altar-call, say in rural Mozambique as I'd experienced, and everyone gets up for the sinner's prayer when one gets up, or one gets up when everyone gets up (you can decide which way around, since the individual doesn't exist). What personal choice for Yeshua is in that, when everyone gets up?

For the Europeans, who have invented the individual, the imaginary individual, this is difficult to understand, just like imaginary time is difficult to give up. Concerning time, Caucasians are always going somewhere, they are always projecting progress on a time line, they always have a goal somewhere in the future. One African (Canine 1991) preacher once said in a sermon, "The white man looks at his god the whole time", and then he was looking at his watch.

We love our imaginary time, just as we love our imaginary individualism.

OK, your right! I know the things we have discussed so far can contravene the "down-to-earth" issues sociology is facing, so sociology might argue, but I'm pretty sure we're also down to earth and actually in a tram right now, although I can understand that some would think our arguments are far removed from the real hard currency⁵⁵ issues of racism, gender issues, globalisation, and is actually only speculative philosophy, and not what theolosophy is good for.

What value does the reasonable physics have when it says that food is unreal, but many

⁵⁵ I use currency on purpose, because social issues have also become simulacra that can be traded for money. It is like the CEO (Berle 2009) of a welfare organisation one Sunday evening around a dinner table told me that he exactly looks for the skinny dirty black boy sitting on his half naked mum's lap, covered with flies, to take a picture of, since that sells the best in Germany, but he admits this is not the totalitarian picture of Africa, and actually far from it. He agrees that Africans are predominantly happy people where functional societies are different compilations to what we would get in Europe. So such a photo is indeed only a simulacrum that sells good.

people throw more leftovers away than what they can eat while others don't know how to put the next plate of food on the table? When pollution is only information why must poor countries suffer more under global warming than rich countries? What value does the knowledge of this information have for the poor farmer that has to fight a drought and the other one a flood? How is this dissertation going to help counter the widening cliff between the privileged and the underprivileged in South Africa, in Germany, and actually all over Europe and North America and the world?

I understand the issues at hand, but I'm convinced that when a dialogue is being taken up again, by everyone, with the Divine Logos, primordial Life-giver, Narrative and Language, all these issues can be addressed and will be taken care of. These are the down-to-earth issues I'm wholeheartedly concerned about, and the reason for my particular interest in sociology, as opposed to psychology. The American dream, the dream that promises prosperity through hard work, is a psychological pipe dream. Anthony Giddens, Mitchell Duneier and Richard P. Appelbaum illustrate that in the USA, during the last quarter century of the 20th century, the rich have become much, much richer, while the middle class stagnated, and the poor have not only grown in numbers but also became poorer than they were in the 60's (Giddens 2007:230)

I'm actually too young to really remember the apartheid of South Africa, or the full significance anyway; all I know is the steady decline of apartheid, and then the change to full democracy. What I know much more about is post-apartheid, which raises many sociological issues.

No one can ever say I'm a racist, I studied for four years in a multicultural Bible college and every single room mate I had was a black African. I lived with them, ate with them, socialised with them, and wouldn't have had a problem tying the knot with one should love and compatibility compelled me/us that way. The point I want to make is that we once had a black African lecturer from an outside institution, and he was most certainly a racist through the accusations he made towards my/our white people's way. It was also evident in the purposefully bad marks I got for his class. Funny, the subject he taught us was sociology and I realise today he himself had no clue what he was teaching about.

On the other hand, I guess he was also just the sociological product of his society.

The accusations he made were that all white farmers are racists, and all farmers in South Africa are treating their black workers badly. I'm sure that's the case with some, but I haven't met any of those farmers. What rubbish! When I was an evangelist-missionary I stayed with many white farmers all over South Africa, and surrounding countries, and not one I met were treating their farm workers badly, actually right the opposite⁵⁶.

One example is my fellow student's dad in Zimbabwe (Janse Van Rensburg 2003), he built 200 apartments for his workers on the farm at no cost to them; to be honest they hardly had any expenses in those days, all food was all-inclusive. Every single day a whole cow would be slaughtered for everyone on the farm; it was the task of two dedicated butchers to supply everyone with meat every day⁵⁷. If they as white people would have lived an

56 This is again where I have to add my virtual experience, like with vegetarianism, where I know the accusation can be thrown at me that I see what I wanted to see. When I deconstructed doctrines, like e.g. capital punishment in the chapter *The muddy mess of modernism swept clean*, am I not stepping into the same rhetorical trap? Maybe I just haven't seen the racism, or maybe it hasn't been racism but paternalism. Is paternalism not just a form of racism? Or is it none of these, but tribalism? A great (virtual) perspective I've gotten on this is from a very good friend of mine, Rev. Jim Smith (Smith 2000), that used to be a missionary to black Africa for 35 years from the States. He so lived with the black people that his best friend became a black man; he told me once that he would rather spend time with black Africans than with his own American people. Jim Smith pointed out to me how the blacks look at the white people of South Africa and how they see them/us as a tribe. In short, they see us in African terms (why would they comprehend us differently?) The oppression, or paternalism, or whatever you would like to call it, was thus not individuals on individuals, but one tribe on another in the eyes of the blacks. According to Jim Smith the democratic victory of the ANC, in 1994, was not a democratic multi party victory, but a tribal victory. This tribal accusation that this professor of mine has made is very one-sided; what about the (simulacrum) tribal apartheid between the black tribes? One professor in Bible college, a South African Shangaan, Kaleb Matabula (Matabula 2001), married a Zulu girl, and after they had been married more than 20 years (if I measure that on the age of their two children) her parents still had issues talking to him because his is not a Zulu. Is (simulacrum) tribal apartheid not also racism?

57 Am I saying anything? The Marxist image of the battery in the Matrix movie (The Matrix 1999) can be applied here as well. Is the building of the 200 apartments for the good of the workers, or for the profit of the farmer even if he lives a simple life? He was certainly a rich man that could buy what his heart desired when I was on the farm, but what about his workers; should one, e.g. really get sick and have no use in the (capitalist) system anymore? What would he do? To be honest I don't know.

exuberant lifestyle of holidays and fancy cars, etc., yes I could have had issues, but they were living so simple themselves, and used to work 12 hours days six days a week.

When we were there it was the 12th birthday of his brother, and all his brother had of his birthday was sitting on the tractor the whole day.

Actually it seems like more and more sociological issues arise in South Africa each day. Eighty white squatter camps have sprung up around Pretoria, the capital city of South Africa, the last number of years, that's now according to the Sunday Times newspaper (O'Reilly 26 March 2010). I was in India (Bangalore 2010), streaming a South African radio station, when this social condition struck a sour note; I could do nothing but weep.

If post-apartheid was to rectify inequalities then no one should have dropped from sustainable conditions to below the breadline, anyway not in these numbers; in post-apartheid the only economic flux should have been the poorest moving into sustainable conditions, and not the other way around. This article states that 10% of the white population of South Africa find themselves below the breadline, and in context, would be unbelievable for most Germans to even reckon the breadline ten times lower than that of Germany to be called sustainability⁵⁸.

58 Do you notice my own tribalism raising these issues? Am I not from the white tribe of Africa? Sorry to say but I can have nothing for it. That was not my choice, but is my given ubuntuing and belonging and dependent arising. My post-apartheid has also an European dimension. How does Europe see the white tribe of Africa today? To put it in context, is there anything wrong with tribalism? Does tribalism have to be racism? If I have been promoting ubuntu, Africanism, what is wrong if I put it in context of what I feel on my skin? (Doesn't Africa feature well in my dissertation?) Remember, although I profited from apartheid, I didn't grow up with a favoured apartheid and legal apartheid has always been wrong in my eyes. After we have thrown each other with stones, and done all the blaming, how can we go one from here? The right perspective of tribalism (that I learned living with black Africans), intratextualism, I want to depict is localisation versus globalisation. A post-globalisation is an emerging localisation that ties in with what the media guru of the 60's, McLuhan, calls an oral tribal mentality in an acoustic space (Donald 2001:150). In terms of media, that McLuhan was interested in, he was ahead of his time and actually and conclusively predicted what developments like Facebook and social networks, etc. would give us. Social networks have given us a localisation, as contrary as that might sound, since the internet rather sounds like globalisation. But is that not exactly the issue at hand? When I promote a tribalism, that some might call a negative boere positivism, although I disagree, I'm

If it's post-apartheid movability should only be up for everyone, not down for some, otherwise it's a new apartheid⁵⁹, or a tribal war, or whatever you'd like to call it! In short, it's a sociological issue⁶⁰.

Leaving South Africa, and coming back to Kassel, another direct concern of mine is the death of Messianism in Kassel, in Europe; this is a shocking sociological tendency. If the problem is sociological, the cure would also be sociological, or what? Europe needs a

starting with a localisation, that which I feel on my skin, to ask how can we dependently arise from here in a radical acoustic/oral/localised inductive endeavour of my synagoguing dissertation. My bit of criticism on this professor then only shows what he thinks of my tribe ("I know the history and baggage!"), although I have said nothing bad of his tribe. In short I think I can conclusively say I condemn racism in tribalism, but not tribalism. If we ditch tribalism with (acoustic) localisation, we have to ditch ubuntu (no one conclusively apprehends Africa without apprehending tribalism)! I've lived many years between Africans and love them and I'm pretty sure they have had no issues with me (since today, mostly on their request, they populate most of my Facebook profile and also today, joyfully, I'm teaching again at NTC for Africa), but I always stayed a white African in their eyes and they black Africans in mine. Actually when I started off in Bible college, my first intention was to become one with them by mirroring the typical liberal thinking associated with integration within globalisation, but it was only when I made peace with my tribal identity, and not wanting to become another tribe, that I truly integrated and became a 'proud' African. It was only then that we could dependently arise together so that they, the blacks themselves, begged me a number of times to be the head of the SRC (Student Representative Counsel), which I turned down every time, but also begged me to help them with their studies, which I gladly and honorary did by teaching extra classes, like e.g. biblical Greek, and computer literacy.

59 This time also black (simulacrum) apartheid on blacks.

60 I know the issue is multidimensional with the 2008 great recession that contributed a lot to the sluggish growth of the world economy, and directly affecting South Africa and other developing countries. By saying this I know I can be contradicting myself, didn't I say that technology is not so important since it's more important that Africa misses modernism? I have to be careful now, because it is modernism that brought wealth and moveability up to everyone in Europe (and even controversial human rights that parts of Africa still need to implement), and so by that I can actually be justifying modernism, and then apartheid that I also see as the same modernist idolatry of certainty. So what am I doing then? I'm setting the stage for the proposed dialogue in the virtual Hebraic Hermeneutics in the virtual horizontal and vertical lines with myself, others, the cosmos and YAHWEH where the dualisms are removed of apparent categories of the metaphysics we might call sociology, or theology, or psychology, etc. I'm also referring back to

change of culture, worldview, for their eyes to see all the hats of YAHWEH again - YAHWEH-YIREH, YAHWEH-RAPHA, YAHWEH-SHALOM, YAHWEH-RO'I, etc. -, or even YAHWEH at all. I couldn't even show you an organised church in Kassel yet?

So what would I like to drive home? The sooner we realise the death of the individual, death of modernism, no ghost in the body, the sooner we'll realise we are in it together. We are interwoven in a quantum interconnectedness; real sociological, social-physical, issues affect us all. When we turn to the Bible we see YAHWEH dealing with nations, both blessing and punishing nations, and actually commanding holy wars. Weren't these wars because of pressing sociological issues with the purpose of eradicating the injustice and unrighteousness that were breeding in these societies?

Individualistic humanism, human rights, and modernism, obscures the sociological issues at hand so that many just can't understand YAWHEH's dealings anymore. This let theology to either go the liberal way and just destroy the Scriptures as a human artefact. Although liberal theology is partly responsible for dealing with sociological issues, liberal theology was also part of the force propagating nihilism, modernism, and in turn ruined Messianism. Theology also went the fundamentalist way and only got grounded in a different individualistic humanism; this time no sociological issues are being dealt with at all in the obsessed focus on the future, against all irrational contradictions of the past, and is consequently a social-physical problem itself. Neo-Orthodoxy, that shows signs of breaking loose from modernism, tries to resolve the apparent paradoxes by both clinging to individualistic humanism and YAHWEH, by centralising everything in the humanity YAHWEH took on Himself in the Logos that became Yeshua the Messiah. Sorry to say, but I don't see any social-physical solution with them either.

I rather like the liberation theology norm of fighting the sociological issues in Tanakh terms, but by that I don't mean taking up arms, but by 'ideologically', worldviewly fighting the abstract nihilistic construction of godless meaning in the power play of Late capitalism, democracy and materialism of a temporal illusion (2 Corinthians 4:18). In short, we are to

the statement I've made a few paragraphs back "I understand the issues at hand, but I'm convinced that when a dialogue is being taken up again, by everyone, with the Divine Logos, primordial Life-giver, Narrative and Language, all these issues can be addressed and will be taken care off." Is this a modernist certainty? No, it is a trusting in YAHWEH.

fight all evil things that won't survive the New Heaven and Earth.

6. Intermediary flip side addition

This is our stop. On a beautiful day like this I would like you to walk with me the few minutes to my house. You would think Baunatal is a dead man's town compared to the buzzing city we just exited, but isn't that more reason to enjoy a nice walk with me to our humble abode?

So where does psychology come into the picture? Let us first ask the question, "What's the underlining difference between sociology and psychology?" In brief, sociology asks the question why a society does what it does, while psychology asks why the individual does what he or she does. Almost at the end of our discussions today I trust you'll agree with me that psychology is rather a branch of sociology, and not really a discipline in its own right (not that such thing – categories - exist), or sociology a branch of psychology.

Psychology, and psychiatry, do have value in a sociological context, for instance depression, as the phenomena of depression illustrates that people from developing countries experience depression different from people in developed countries; in developing countries some won't even notice the depression. Actually it might indeed be the case that depression classifications are being forced on developing countries, like J R Soc in the Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine argues (Summerfield 2006), since the one clear-cut beneficiary would be the pharmaceutical industry. Shame on them! That's another pressing sociological problem.

I grew up in a house with serious depression problems; my mum suffered from depression as long as I can remember. That there might be an underlining sociological, social-physical, etiology problem, maybe assisted by a biological weakness, is so obnubilated that probing the issue would be like asking the single German why Germans are so obsessed with security at the cost of always postponing dreams, and therefore not enjoying the present; in both cases the sociological short-circuit would be rationally justified.

Although classifying psychological disorders can be controversial, as some argue it rather imposes the diseases (Horwitz 2002); for them it's like reading about the symptoms of

various illnesses on the internet and confusing all the normal aches and pains with these diseases. On the other hand, psychology is necessary to take care of antisocial personality disorders. My late cousin (Van Aardt 2005), who died at the age of 36 of cancer, was classified as a psychopath. The interesting thing was that it was always great fun to be with him; he was always bubbling with life, but had no moral conscience.

He could lie and steal with an ear to ear smile and a straight face, and he was always out to beat the system, which he managed time and again at whatever cost. Even the most rigid disciplinary system we had in South Africa, the compulsory military service in those days, gave up on him after he had been in jail a couple of times and prolonged his service with more than double the normal time due to leaving the military base without permission. The military classified him as a psychopath that couldn't be disciplined. The last time he left the base without permission, and had been at home longer than his mum expected, she called the military to ask when they were fetching him, they informed her that he was released of all duties as a lost case - he had indeed beaten the most intolerant system.

Psychology could also possibly have helped my mum's brother (Van Aardt 1996) not to commit suicide in the last moments of his despair alone in a hotel room after he was suspended as a top classified assistant-director in the Government of South Africa. Apparently the main culprit was the secrets of South Africa that drove him to alcohol, and ultimately suicide.

Psychology could also maybe have helped my dad's brother (Nortje 1999) who died at the age of 49 on the 31st of December 1999 when he stubbornly refused to go to hospital after some young dissidents smashed the one side of his skull to a pulp with a stone outside the local store. After three days at home he collapsed and went into a coma and died.

The long and the short is that psychology and psychiatry have their place, but with a few reservations. What I find most lacking in the history of psychology, squarely rooted in modernism, is the absence of original sin (Nortje 2011), but also the Renaissance humanism that puts humanity in the centre of everything, just like Neo-Orthodoxy. Why not YAWHEW? Is this not Elohim's cosmos? Why are we in the centre of everything, even when we're on the limb of the universe? Is it not because modernism had an axe to grind with the superstition of it's previous epoch that we apparently know we are on the limb of

the universe?

The fields of psychology, psycho-logic, I personally find interesting are:

1. Social Psychology
2. Community Psychology
3. Gestalt
4. Biological Bases of Psychology

As an example of a South African produced introduction to Psychology that introduces these fields see *Introduction to Psychology* by Lionel Nicholas (Nicholas 2008).

7. Dozing off the session

Here we are! The white two-story house on the left, with the red tiled roof, is our place. As you can see we also have a basement, almost protruding a meter above the ground; we had to include a basement while planning the house, bank's dictate, in order for a government grant that serves as collateral should we default on our mortgage.

The basement is necessary for the cutting edge heating system we had to install for the government grant. The heating system efficaciously burns little compressed wooden capsules to produce warm water for both heating in winter and normal domestic use. Wood is CO₂ neutral, and that's the reason for the government grant. We had to go green for the grant.

The contraption is actually nothing else than a glorified donkey though (which is an outside oven also fuelled with wood); it's water being heated in a kettle; but the trick is the control of oxygen at the burner with a minimum amount of capsules, as well as the insulation to keep the heat inside. I only clean the system once a year, and interestingly enough a whole 3.5 tons of capsules only leave one small pamper/nappy/diaper box of ashes behind.

I think that's also bleeding edge sociological forces working for us.

Anyway tomorrow I don't have to go to work, so I'll see you on Monday! "Tchüss!" O, you

don't know what that means? "Bye!"

Chapter 7: The Narrative Container

“Narrative is both the minimal unit of meaning and the cognitive process which makes meaning possible.” (McQuillan 2000:11)

1. Contextual embedding of session

Morning! Monday morning! Today I have to take the tram to Melsungen, about 30km outside Kassel, although not even in the same county as Kassel. Now I know what you’ll ask, “How can you take a tram so far out of Kassel? I thought trams only ran in cities?” That’s the story about trams in Kassel.

Not long ago they came up with a new type of tram, or is it a train, you tell me? This new regional tram, as it is called, is a hybrid train tram. What they did was to create an underground hub in the old downtown main train station that joins the tram lines with the train lines and then adapt a tram that can run on train lines as well. These regional trams even go as far as 60km outside Kassel, to Treysa south of Kassel. In the city they function like normal trams, but out on the train lines they run like trains. They actually discontinued the regional trains for these regional trams.

This is now a story to tell. As you can see these regional trams are white, while the normal/traditional trams are blue. The thing about the regional trams is also that they can both run with overhead electricity, which the blue trams can only do, but they also have diesel engines for train lines without overhead grids. That’s a story now of innovation, compatibility and convenience.

So this is the tram we’re in right now!

2. Radical inductive contemplation

Yesterday my family and I were in a synagogue, you might just call it church or house church. What comes to mind when I say church? For the most Messianic followers a lot of things. If I tell you that the Rabbi spoke/preached about sin, what comes to mind now? I’m also sure many things. The word sin is a loaded word now. What’s sin? I’m sure the most would think the Rabbi who spoke yesterday was against sin, but even that’s questionable today.

In our second discussion last week we pointed out the rhetoric such a word is encumbered

with, and that that is exactly the modernist problem. The thing I want to ask is what these notions like church, and sin, and even Sunday are? How can we label them? We call them narrative-marks, whose meaning is embedded in a narrative-context. What is sin for the one is not necessarily sin for the other, it depends on the narrative-context. Love and affection in Africa is not the same as love and affection in Germany. The rhetoric is the narrative possibilities each narrative-mark can have.

I once read a joke, but for the life of me I don't remember where or how long ago; I think it was in a Reader's Digest if I have to guess. The translated joke from Afrikaans goes something like this...

Fred's teacher once asked her class to bring something medical to school the following day. The following day some children came with bandages, and others with thermometers, and others with cream or something, but Fred got to class with a heart-lung machine. Fred's teacher was surprised with this big and expensive appliance that he got hold of, so she asked Fred, "Whose heart-lung machine is this?" "My granddad's", Fred replied. "What did you granddad say when you took it?" "Ugh, ugh, ugh...."

How many narrative-marks are there in this joke? Actually I think a better question is, what is not a narrative-mark in this joke? Starting the joke with Fred, such a common name and a well-treaded place holder, tells us that Fred isn't real, it's fiction. The fact that Fred is a school child, and assumed a primary school child since such a task would normally or exclusively fit primary school projects, convey the story of ignorance or innocence or even mischief with innocence. The narrative-marks of bandages and thermometers and cream narrates the story of the ordinary, while a heart-lung machine seriousness or something of the extraordinary. The last narrative-marker "Ugh, ugh, ugh..." tells the sad story of choking and death. Is that really funny?

Once when my mum was visiting us in Germany (Du Plessis 2009), I told this joke to both my mum and wife while we were sitting together one day; the funny thing is while my mum was crawling on the ground with laughter my wife was shocked and disgusted and couldn't find anything funny in this joke. Why's that? The narrative-context! The fictional suffering of others is no joke to my wife, but isn't it ironic that suffering can be a joke to South Africans

when real suffering is part and partial of life in South Africa? I guess without the narrative-context of the apparent innocence and ignorance of a school child it won't be funny to most South Africans either. If this would have been the actions of a corporate executive or a politician, the narrative-context would have been something of a psychopath or a merciless dictator.

The narrative-mark of "Ugh, ugh, ugh...." functioned in different narrative-contexts for my mum and my wife. In the one context it's a joke, in the other not. The narrative-matrix, the narrative-marks and narrative-contexts intertwined, is the whole meaning, while the narrative-contexts are relativism realised - the communal narrative-matrixes; in this case a white Afrikaans community and the other a Mennonite German community.

Long before I told this joke to my spouse and mum, this contextual differences had been most noticeable to me in humour when the English used to laugh about things I couldn't find funny when I used to live in their country; that was when they told each other jokes, although my jokes weren't funny to them at all. Sometimes though I would do something, and they would comment that that was funny when I had no intention of doing anything funny; it's just funny that they didn't laugh to tell me it's funny, they had to say or spell it out in words to tell me it's funny, so maybe it wasn't really funny, just a nicety to do something good to me.

It's no fun when no one laughs at anyone's jokes.

So what is funny about jokes? I guess the aesthetics of the joke narrative, where what is funny is the narration of the communal-narrative of what's funny; the joke narrative as a whole then stands as a laughable narrative-mark in the communal-narrative.

When I moved to Germany I faced a new problem. As I was learning German and a German told a joke, when he or she got to the punchline, like the last narrative-mark "Ugh, ugh, ugh...", he or she would increase the tempo and I couldn't get the punchline. The whole joke they spoke slow enough to understand them, or when not I would slow them down, but when they got to the punch line they would double the tempo and I could do nothing but miss the narrative-mark in the unintelligible words. When I asked them to repeat the punchline, they would eagerly tell it again but again in the increased tempo; even after the third or the fourth time they would still keep up the high tempo so that I

would just give up, or laugh, so that I could change the subject. I never got the jokes in the first two years in Germany.

3. Wider theolosophy debate

Enough about jokes; I want to take narrative one step further and say that “Narrative is cognitively all that there is”, coupled with this staggering statement “We are being lived by narrative.” The reason is easy, it’s all because we can’t escape narrative to tell anybody about narrative; to tell anything about narrative is to narrate a narrative itself - that’s then a narrative about narrative. The verdict is obvious, when we can’t transcend narrative in order to objectively comment about narrative outside narrative, we are being lived by narrative.

For instance these words, sentences, and sentence structures I’m using right now, are narrative embodied; should I spell narrative as näretif my spell checker tells me it’s wrong. Why is it wrong? It’s wrong because it’s a narrative-mark of what’s wrong in a narrative-context of what English should be, that’s all. The discipline called literature is an embodiment of narrative; dictionaries are narratives; all we have discussed so far is narrative.

I once wrote a book I sent to my best friend’s wife in Germany to proofread. She’s a Canadian. She narrates the story that at first she felt I used weak English, because of my sentence structures and choice of words, etc., which my best friend in South Africa confirmed when he also got a copy; he said I used too much Afrikaans English, if you know what I mean. On the other hand, who are they to tell me what’s the right narrative? Who has the patent right on the narrative called English? If it is anybody, it is the community, the ubuntu compiled community! To finish my story, my best friend’s wife in the end enjoyed my book when she started to appreciate it (or is it to just endure it), that’s now my different English language narrative.

I guess the right of narrative has also something to do with meaning, since, as Martin McQuillan says, “The narrative-matrix makes the entire field of human cognition possible” (McQuillan 2000:13). Part of the aesthetics of communication is to use “good” language, but that’s just it, it’s the narrative of aesthetics; the meaning starts with the medium of the narrative itself, the container, even before the content. We all know the famous dictum of

the media guru Marshall McLuhan “the medium is the message” (McLuhan 1964:7). The whole discipline of rhetoric proves this notion; what tiresome effort don't politicians invest in sampling words or sentence narratives before using them in public?

As we said, when we can't elucidate narrative without a narrative, because narrative lives us, it takes a narrative to define narrative, and so it'll take another narrative to define that narrative, and a narrative to define that narrative, endlessly probating backwards. In short, cognition is then metaphysically subjected to narrative, since narrative presides over cognition, and so we can only dream about that which we bring to the dream; we can only live life with what we bring to life. Narrative is then always about reliving the past.

Should we attempt to overcome the endless probating in defining narrative, what comes to mind? Metaphors! In our discussion on modernism we said that metaphors also propagate from a bottomless pit, but how true is that when such a statement is a narrative, an undefinable narrative? In the mechanics of logic, should one premise be uncontested or incontestable, in this case narrative itself, the best such an argument can lead to is a theory, or a hypothesis. That metaphors propagate from a bottomless pit is thus only a theory; but then the fact that it's a theory is also only a theory, since it's also a narrative. Do you see the labyrinth?

How can I get a doctor's degree then if I only tell stories? Easy, it's nice to tell stories; it's nice to dream, while hiding the fact from my university that I'm dreaming, although that's easy since my university is also only dreaming while they're also trying to hide it from me. Their evaluation of my story can be but nothing else than a story itself, a theory, so let us go on dreaming!

So let us assume/dream narrative precedes metaphors; interestingly enough exactly that which shattered modernist's cognition of metaphors, due to the absence of the individual, would then also shatter the modernist notion of narrative due to the same absence of the individual.

In the modernist economy of the narrative-matrix, meaning is the exchange of narratives, with their respective narrative-marks, in the narrative-matrix, but on closer observation reveals the illusionary presupposition of the subjective individual that has a privately owned, or unique, narrative(-mark) to exchange, and again illustrates the unreasonable

physics at work. That the narrative-marks are commonly owned, modernism is right about, but what if the narrative-matrix as a whole is actually commonly owned, or better stated, dependably aroused? Then the exchange is not between individuals, but the narration of one narrative (confirmed by the reasonable physics, since being transcendently objective is insurmountable).

The problem with modernism is modernism's narrative structure itself; in modernism all narratives are being narrated in the first or the third person and that's where the illusion/deception resides. This is the Platonic dualism reverberated. The third person narration portrays the independent objective observer, the ghost in the body that can privately and objectively scrutinise others and the world from outside the world, while the first person narration portrays the individual language, the unique narrative, the nobel prize contribution to cognition that the apparent individual can come up with. Needless to say when modernism is being rejected, the first and third person narratives are also rejected. What does this leave us with? The second person narrative.

The narrative-mark of the second person I took from Eleonore Stump in her essay called *Second-Person Accounts and the Problem of Evil*; she in turn took it from Avishai Margalit in one of her lectures (Yandell 2001:86); but just as the last narrative-mark in my joke to my mum and wife has been utilised by them in two different communal narrative-contexts, so I'm using this narrative-mark of the second person in a different narrative-context than Eleonore Stump, just as she uses it in a different narrative-context than Avishai Margalit.

The thing about the second person is that the second person is emptied of the first and third person, and consequently of the modernist illusions we just mentioned, necessitated by the first and third person. The second person illustrates to me how all narratives are dependent arising, the fabric of an interconnectedness in the reasonable physics. The second person tells me why I should take note of what the spell checker suggests as correct aesthetical narrative cognition and how narrative-marks will be received by my audience.

Witblits is such a narrative-mark. Do you know witblits? Who outside South Africa really knows what witblits is? If you don't know, it's a home-distilled brandy, boasting about an 80% alcohol content, distilled from wine, and thus with a real kick. Even the most

conservative South African, anyway in the Afrikaans community, knows about witblits and conveys a narrative of a deadly shooter mostly associated with an inner-circle of an exclusive men party of farmers.

You know what, I've never tasted witblits in my life, and I've only once in my life seen a little bottle at a wedding before, although consumed by none at this wedding though, but I know the narrative. It's a loaded narrative-mark for everyone I know in the Afrikaans community; we all know about witblits from early childhood. Why's that? Even while I see myself as one of those moderate conservatives in South Africa, who condemns hard liquor, I'm part of a second person narrative to know what I condemn. To turn it around; is the fact that I condemn it not because I'm part of the moderate conservatives in South Africa, since I haven't even tasted it yet? How do I know it's not just a pack of lies and no such thing as witblits exists? When I saw it that time at the wedding, it was as clear as water, so how do I know witblits is not just water? So what really comes first? The chicken or the egg? The narrative or the witblits?

How do you know the earth is round? Maybe that's also just a pack of lies? I've never been in space to confirm that? It's a second person narrative to know the earth is round. It's a second person narrative to know that a virus causes a flue, anyway for 99% of the world's population who has never seen a virus yet; even if we should be put in front of a microscope that can see a virus, it'll take a second person narrative to believe the microscope sees what it says it sees. It's a second person narrative to know the Divine Trinity, and to know Lucifer.

The second person tells me how narrative lives us, and so illuminates the temporality we also spoke about last week. The first and the third person is temporal, but the second person is eternal. Narrative will go on even when none of us will be there. So, if one and one is two it argues that YAHWEH resides in the second person, the eternal Primordial Language. The second person is where narrative breeds.

I came across a nice narrative-mark in the book called *About Time Narrative, Fiction and the Philosophy of Time* by Mark Currie (Currie 2007:12); the narrative-mark is *narrative consciousness*, and the longer I pondered on this narrative-mark the more I came to the conclusion that that is exactly what collective consciousness and collective

unconsciousness together is as we discussed on Saturday. The minimal meaning of narrative consciousness is shared consciousness; the collective (un)consciousness is part and parcel of the fabric of the dependant arising of the reasonable physics in the narrative consciousness that lives us. The collectiveness is in the narrative, the narrative with physical properties in the interferences of waves. When all is informationing, in the reasonable physics, all is narrative, and when YAHWEH created all Ex Nihilo then when "... *we live and move and exist*" (Acts 17:28) in Him, we live, move and exist in His narrative; the narrative that lives us.

Okay! Okay! Okay! I know some will now protest! What about evil? Why isn't everyone then going to heaven if it's one narrative from one Primordial Language? Why must some go to hell? Where is hell? What about our personal choice in the matter? What about freedom, etc.? Can it all be that easy?

Even before we can entertain some of these issues, the most pressing issue is the issue of time in narrative. The thing about time and narrative is that narrative is always in the past. Narrative is always in block time, where the future is actually already in the past, just not revealed yet since the events are not past the bookmark yet - they're still to the right of the bookmark.

To start the narrative discussion on time I would like to tell the story of how time has always been an obsession to me, I guess my whole life, to the extent that I've never really worn a wristwatch as I can't stop looking at the time when I've got one on. Before cellphones, which today foremost serve as my watch, I had a real old fashion pocket-watch that flipped open on the click of the bottom on the top. I had to do this to hide the time, but not so far out of reach that I couldn't get to it when really needed.

When I was a teenager I started pondering on time, and came to the conclusion that time doesn't exist, because it can't exist. My reasoning went as follow: when you divide a second in half, you have two half seconds, if you divide a half second in two quarter seconds you have two quarter seconds, if you divide the quarter seconds in two eights of a second, you have two eights of a second and so you can infinitely divide time in smaller parts without ever getting to a unit. If time has no unit it can't exist.

This is simple teenage reasoning, and part of my philosophising exercises in my long

sessions on the toilet everyday, but until today I still think it holds⁶¹. The same is then with matter: matter can then also be infinitely divided into smaller parts, until you get to information only, but is that not exactly the spacetime continuum argued? Time in narrative could then also not have a clear cut continuum, anyway not in imaginary time, the time on our watches!

I know what you'll say, "How about inventing the narrative as you go along?" In turn I'll ask you, "With what can you invent this narrative with when what you have, narrative-marks endowed with meaning through a narrative-context, are only inherited through a narrative consciousness?" You can claim to have mixed a new cocktail, but then you'll have to admit you've done it only with the ingredients given to you. If you claim to have mixed a new cocktail, I want to challenge you to mix the same cocktail again the second time. Will the second one be 100% the same as the first? Can a laboratory confirm 100% of the quantities of each ingredient used in the mix, and that at the same velocity and even at the same temperature? No, you can't!

But now you'll say, "That exactly proves the point, each mix is unique!", but again if all is unique, none is unique since they are all similarly unique. The thing is that the unique is not the cocktail, since all possible outcomes are latent right of the bookmark; what is going to be in the cocktail has been decided before the cocktail has been mixed and therefore all the possible outcomes.

Don't all these possible outcomes sound like the wavefunction we discussed, that's now where a particle is at all possible places simultaneously? What was the theory again, the one I opted for from the cul-de-sac of the quantum enigma in the reasonable physics (remember the notion of narrative enfolding all of creation above)? It's the transactional interpretation theory where time zigzags; the future breaking into the past, or better stated the past and the future conflates in the present, a point of zero movement in real time, but not in imaginary time.

⁶¹ Can you see what I am saying? What I am saying is if a reductionism is not possible, something doesn't exist! Am I contradicting myself? No, but that argues how I contextualise reductionism to be a narrative-mark with different meanings in different narrative-matrixes, like the example of time illustrates: when time indeed does exist, but can't be reduced to a minimum, reductionism is relative, since two complex and unique cats are still cats, and not dogs.

I postulate narrative to be something like that, a zero movement in real block time, but the movement of the bookmark in imaginary time, so that from hindsight the narrative turns out to be an antitype in imaginary time, while in real time the antitype happens simultaneously with it's prefiguring type. The analogy of the cocktail with all possible outcomes is then in real time, although with only one possible outcome in imaginary time; real time and imaginary time together is then the narrative of narrative that's always in the past.

Isn't this now a good example for you of how a narrative-mark is being reapplied in a different narrative? Fatalism is this narrative-mark, if you remember our discussion on Saturday; in fatalism we conflated time to a single dot and argued that YAHWEH's infallible knowledge is foreknowledge only as far as imaginary time goes, but in real time YAHWEH knows experientially and influentially simultaneously. If my argument holds I am saying that the foreknowledge also works the other way around, backwardknowledge, so that all narratives are narratives re-narrated, although paradoxically contain a future unrealised aspect with regards to imaginary time.

Real time is something of the existential and imaginary time, something of the Hegelian dialectical, and together they cut through each other with Riemannian logic in Riemannian geometry. It's an enigma, but that's quantum mechanics.

In what way does this bring us closer to why narrative lives us, even when we make them up as we go along? Am I not just forcing something on reality that doesn't really fit? The fact that the individual doesn't exist, coupled with the second person dependant arising, states that *"What has been is what will be, what has been done is what will be done, and so there is nothing new under the sun."* (Ecclesiastes 1:9). The thing is the Scriptures themselves are set in a block time, from creation to consummation, although Yeshua the Messiah has already been *"...slaughtered from before the world was founded."* (Revelation 13:8) and who *"...chose us in love before the creation of the universe to be holy and without defect in his presence."* (Ephesians 1:4). The whole Scriptural narrative is in block time in the past, even though the bookmark is only somewhere in the B'rit Hadashah today, but definitely not in the last few chapters of Revelation yet - that's now in imaginary time.

To say that narrative lives us is to state interconnectedness and nonlocality also in terms

of time: what lives us now lives us because it has already happened simultaneously with us now.

4. Biblical narratives as string succession

In Genesis 37 we read the story of Joseph that was sold to the Midianites as a slave, this was now after Joseph shared two dreams with his family that his brothers didn't like. The two dreams had the same thing to say about who's lord and who's not, and that they didn't like: in the first one Joseph was tying up bundles of wheat with his brothers in the field. When his bundle stood up straight the bundles of his brothers bowed down to his bundle; in the second dream the sun, his father, and the moon, his mother, and eleven stars, his brothers, bowed down before him. The thing to notice is the block time; the bookmark that moves through the narrative. It's easy to see the realism from the author's perspective, the one that put the pen to paper, and that the end was known even before initiating the narration, but what about the real story, the real history?

I guess this is where the narrative-mark of inspiration enters the scene, the multilevel of inspiration. Let us look at the story first. Joseph was not the oldest son in his father's house, but the oldest son of his beloved wife. Privileges to Joseph could then somehow be justified in the communal narrative-context of the day; in polygamy such things are inevitable. In our communal narrative-context today, anyway in Germany, the conflict would not be the age or rank of Joseph, but the unfairness of treating children with unequal yokes, and that within polygamy (Joel 2000).

The next narrative-mark is the dreams; in the communal narrative-context of the whole of Genesis dreams as messages from YAHWEH features again and again, so in this there's nothing extraordinary. In the communal-context of the one that put the pen to paper I would assume also not, just as it would be no problem in the communal narrative-context of ubuntu, but will certainly run into problems in the communal narrative-context of modernism.

The narrative-mark of human trafficking, which is shocking to say the least in today's communal narrative-context, is softened by the outcome of the narrative. Who would imagine human trafficking to have something good in it though, that's now without knowing the end?

The block time is the fact that Joseph needed to have these dreams because of something installed for the future, a famine. Without these dreams his brothers would not have despised him to the point of selling him as a possession to merchants going down to Egypt, and then no one would have been there to look after them when the famine struck and then the way of YAHWEH would have been jeopardised. Actually the block time is even larger, these dreams were needed to get Israel to Egypt, so the famine was actually only a ploy to fulfil a promise to Abraham that they'll be held captives for 400 years before they would return to the Promised Land.

The size of the narrative-matrix is even larger than that, Joseph's Paradise lost into slavery is the antitype of the narrative-mark of Genesis 3 where humanity was sold into slavery. Joseph is thus not the type but the antitype of the *"Lamb that has been slaughtered before the world was founded."* (Revelation 13:8) to keep humanity alive. Paradise lost, in Genesis 3, already foreshadowed Paradise gained in the proto-evangelium of Genesis 3:15 where YAHWEH says,

"I will put animosity between you and the woman, and between your descendant and her single descendant; he will bruise your head, and you will bruise his heel."

(Genesis 3:15)

The author that put this story of Joseph on paper, say Moses, also had occasion to antitypically allow this narrative to live them in the real exploitation of Egypt in his day. What's the narrative? YAHWEH's Providence. The antitypical providence continues, in Philippians 2:6-11, as a new narrative-mark, when Paul says that

"though Yeshua was in the form/likeness of YAHWEH, he did not regard equality with YAHWEH something to cling unto by force. On the contrary, he emptied himself, in that he took the form/likeness of a slave by becoming human. And when he appeared as a human being, he humiliated himself still more by becoming obedient even to death – the death penalty on the cross! Therefore YAHWEH raised him to the highest place and gave him the name above every name; that in honouring Yeshua's name, every knee shall bow - in heaven, on earth and under the earth and every tongue will admit that Yeshua the Messiah is YAHWEH - to the glory of YAHWEH the Father."

The signifier of the new narrative-context is the preceding obligation,

“Let your attitude toward one another be this one which is that of Messiah Yeshua.”
(Philippians 2:5).

More narrative-contexts, with this antitypical providential narrative-mark, are

“When the Messiah was executed on the cross, I was too; so that my depraved ego no longer lives, but the Messiah lives in me, and the life I now live in my body I live through trusting in YAHWEH's Son, who loved me and gave himself up for me.”
(Galatians 2:20)

where the life/soul of the Messiah is Paul's life/ soul, and

“Therefore, just as you received the Messiah Yeshua as Master, keep living united with him. Remain deeply rooted in him; continue being built up in him and confirmed in your trust, the way you were taught, so that you overflow in thanksgiving.” (Colossians 2:6-7).

So this brings us to the issue of evil! When narrative lives us, Scripturally either a good narrative or an evil narrative is living us, but what could this good or evil be? As I illustrated in my MTh, Walter Moberly (Moberly 1992:1-27) rightly argues in his essay *Did the Serpent Get it Right?* that the serpent told no lies in Genesis 3. YAHWEH's prohibition was that they should not eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil in the garden, because the day they do that they will certainly die, however, when the serpent came to Eve, in the Genesis 3, how did he challenge YAHWEH's prohibition? Not with lies, but with another narrative.

First of all when the serpent said they will certainly not die, although YAHWEH's said they would die, no one lied since although death is the same narrative-mark both YAHWEH and the serpent used, they endued the mark with different meanings in different narrative-contexts. In the narrative-context of the serpent, death is the death followed by a funeral, and this certainly didn't happen to Adam and Eve before a few hundred years down the line, but death in YAHWEH's narrative-context meant excommunication from His Shekinah. Wenham points out that the “significance of this death lies in the history of Israel when being expelled from the camp, where God was present through the tabernacle, was

seen as death” (Wenham 1987:74).

Secondly the serpent said their eyes will open when they eat from the tree, and this happened when they discovered they were naked, and thirdly the serpent said they will know good and evil when they eat from this tree and this also happened when they realised the wrong they had done and hid themselves from YAHWEH. So the serpent told no lie, he just narrated a different narrative.

This is the workings of narrative, Adam and Eve chose in real time to be lived by the narrative of Lucifer, but in imaginary time they were destined to make this choice. In real time everyone chooses to be lived either by the narrative of YAHWEH or by the narrative of Lucifer, but in the imaginary time we are being lived by the narrative of YAHWEH or the narrative of Lucifer - evil. This is the Johannine dualism, we are either children of YAHWEH and do His will, or we are children of Lucifer and do his will. John says in 1 John 3:8-9 that

“The person who keeps on sinning is from the Adversary (Devil), because from the very beginning the Adversary (Devil) has kept on sinning. It was for this very reason that YAHWEH's Son appeared, to nullify the doings of the Adversary (Devil). No one who has YAHWEH as his Father keeps on sinning, because His seed resides in him or her. That is, he cannot continue sinning, because he or she is delivered by YAHWEH.”

and Paul in Ephesians 2:1-3 again when he says,

“ you used to be dead because of your sins and acts of disobedience, since you walked in the ways of this old heaven and earth and in the ways of the Ruler of the Powers of the Air, who is at work in the disobedient right now. Indeed, we all once lived this way, when we followed the passions of our old nature and obeyed the wishes of our old nature and our own thoughts. In this natural condition we were children of YAHWEH's wrath, just like everyone else.”

“What about the grey areas? Those followers of Yeshua doing wrong things?” you might ask. I think it’s fair to say that that is because of the residue of the narrative of Lucifer that remains after changing the narrative that lives us (Colossians 3:5-10), or the rhetoric of

Lucifer's narrative that's turning out to be convincing again (1 Timothy 6:10).

So what's the narrative of Lucifer? Temporality. That which can't stand or won't survive the Shekinah of YAHWEH, that which won't survive the New Heaven and Earth. The difference between YAHWEH's narrative and Lucifer's narrative is not the narrative-marks per se, since e.g. when Saul was commanded by YAHWEH to wipe out Amalek in 1 Samuel 15, and he spared Agag the king of Amalek he lost his monarchy. The narrative-mark of murder, however, is condemned in Exodus 20, but now in another narrative-context not. Is capital punishment not such a narrative-mark today?

Although Cain built the first city in Genesis 4, as we already indicated last week, he did so because he lost the presence of YAHWEH (Genesis 4:16), and this city became the type of all cities that personifies humanity's effort to be its own sustainer, in stead of YAHWEH-YIREH. The narrative-mark of a city though, although only later, got a different meaning in the narrative-context of Jerusalem and the New Jerusalem.

The narrative of Lucifer is obviously also a direct rebellion against YAHWEH, but with a huge spectrum of expressions ranging from the outright cursing of YAHWEH to "*Whoever loves his father or mother more than he loves Yeshua...*" (Matthew 10:37), but in principle it's all about temporality, the temporality, or even total absence, of YAHWEH's presence in Lucifer's narrative. YAHWEH's presence is in His narrative that should live us as Paul indicates in Romans 8:5-8 that

"for those who identify with their old nature set their minds on the things of the old nature, but those who identify with the Spirit set their minds on the things of the Spirit... But you, you do not identify with your old nature but with the Spirit, provided the Spirit of God is living inside you, for anyone who doesn't have the Spirit of the Messiah doesn't belong to him."

"So how come Lucifer is not lived by a narrative himself, or is he?", you would rightly ask now. The typical ready-made answer I can give is (because I'm also being lived by narrative) that YAHWEH created the capacity for evil so that the temporal narrative can exist in the primordial narrative, and Lucifer and his followers had the capacity to choose this possible evil narrative. But what happens with this narrative after the consummation? Does it continue to exist in the primordial narrative so that hell is still in YAHWEH's world?

Yes, because it's an eternal damnation by YAHWEH from His presence.

So what am I saying? It's like a king who hands part of his kingdom over to bandits to do as they please. This part of the kingdom soon deteriorates into the worse possible state so that the king vows never to enter this region. Does this region cease to be the king's possession? No, but it's abandoned by the king's presence.

So what's the inspiration of the Scriptures? The inspiration of the Scriptures is not only a second person narrative, but multi-dimensional person narrative. The Scriptures as a whole is a book narrated by the Holy Spirit so that we, in the second person, can be lived by the narrative of Scriptures now. On the other hand the Scriptures are also an assembly of second person testimonies of this same Holy Spirit ended narrative that used to live the separate authors that put their pen to paper, and therefore the variety of nuances in Scripture. The Scriptures as a whole is a second person narrative in the nonlocality and interconnectedness of real time, while the inspiration of the different authorial and editorial parts of Scriptures are narratives that live us in imaginary time now; we are bookmarks in this narrative of imaginary time, while being inspired by distinctive narratives of the variety of multi-dimensional person nuances.

When I brought the narratives of ubuntu and Buddhism to the Scriptures, the best I could do was to bring second person stories to the Scriptures, but, take note, as a non black African or Buddhist. I don't think I'll ever become black, and don't see any reason to abandon the community of Yeshua's followers and become a Buddhist monk. They're just stories, but stories that found nuances of the right antitypifying I assimilate in the Scriptures; that's how I see the Scriptural narrative living me; something of this I hope will become clear this afternoon in my witness.

So we started our discussion on relativism, the relativism of the narrative-mark in respective narrative-contexts. Postmodernism is also about relativism, relativism acknowledged, cognitive relativism, but take note, not ethical or cultural relativism. When cognition is confined to narrative, multiple narrative-contexts imply cognitive relativism, then it is the relativism evident in the Scriptures itself. That's why the world of the Scriptures, even through the second person inspiration of the Holy Spirit in the second person narration of the respective authors, don't condemn polygamy in the Tanakh, but in

the B'rit Hadashah (1 Timothy 3:2 & 12; Titus 1:6) and nowhere slavery in the whole of the Scriptures, although both can be rightfully condemned by the Scriptures today.

The thing is, were they wrong institutions in the days when the Scriptures were put on paper? No, I don't think so, they were institutions in another cognitive narrative-matrix, but which aren't accessible to us through our cognitive narrative-matrix today. The illusion is to think we can objectively scrutinise these cognitive narrative-matrixes in the first person, as if we could understand them, and report about them in the third person; that's what both liberalism and fundamentalism thought they were doing, but they were deceived.⁶²

So, what should we make of this relativism today?

1. First of all, just to understand that the Scriptures are an assembly of second person narratives in a multi-dimensional person narrative should liberate us from the historical-critical method, since that's an effort beyond our ability - it's a relativism.
2. Secondly this implodes the narratives into the present so that they become a second person narration in our narrative-contexts where physical and literal holy wars are wrong, and slavery and polygamy condemned. These institutions are incompatible with my meditations though, and, remember what we said, meditation is not about ethics, but ethics enabling meditation; ethics should prioritise the eternal above the temporal.
3. Thirdly, the inspiration is in the second person narration with the Holy Spirit where the narratives of the Scriptures should live us today; in short that means we should be canonised. The question is not how the story of Judah, that unashamedly went in with a prostitute in Genesis 38, could be canonised, but how our story is being canonised, and where it should be placed in this canonisation.

⁶² The same can then be said about my treatment of modernism and historical events that I so vehemently deconstructed! Who gives me the right to treat the Scriptures differently? The thing is not in the treatment, but in the belonging before suspected believing (although episteme). If I could find YAHWEH in the Newtonian causality of the billiard table, then belonging would have been there. That modernism sought the history outside the Scriptures to find the cause of the events in the Scriptures, is a causality narrative, driven by an objective agent, in which I couldn't find YAHWEH. Again, my cognitive relativism states though that the issue with modernism is not a century or two ago, but today.

4. Fourthly, the face value of the historical doesn't need to be questioned since the Scriptures are in the end the single one narrative written by the Holy Spirit that's in the second person with us right now. Just like the second person lets us know the earth is round, so the second person confirms the historicity of this single narrative of the Scriptures.

The problem with the narrative-mark faith, or belief, I exuberantly expressed last week is exactly the ambiguity exposed in the first and third person. What the word *doxa*, faith, became to mean in modernism is nothing else than a rhetorical bridge between the exclusive categories of the first and the third person; I have to believe someone since I'm obligated to autonomously translate the third person data to the first person interpretation where the static interference in this translation inevitably causes data lost and turns *episteme* into the weak form *doxa*. In the second person there's no static interference, and thus truly *episteme*.

Just to confirm the flaw of the historical-critical method I want to leave one quote from Gallie in his book *Philosophy and the historical understanding*:

If it is true that in the physical science there is always a theory, it is no less true that in historical research there is always a story. In the former case there is always a provisional theory which guides experimental researches, even though these will lead to its replacement; in the latter case there is always an initial or provisional story that acts as guiding thread to the successive assessments, interpretations and criticisms which lead the historian to his final judgment as to what the story really was, or as to what actually happened. (Gallie 1964:72-3)

The presupposition and norm of the historicist is a narrative, a narrative the historicist has apart from the narrative that's been scrutinised.

"Look, out the window! There's Melsungen."

Do you still remember the autopsy on modernism last week? Do you still remember the story of me being an alien from outer-space and the cat I don't know how to distinguish? How could you tell me what a cat is? As we saw, with modernism's tools you can only tell me what a cat is not, not what it is. Now think of this regional tram; what is a regional tram? Is it a tram that runs on train lines, or is it a train that runs on tram lines? That's a good question now ? They do look more like trams, but then they didn't replace any trams,

when implemented, only trains.

To add to this, in France you get trams on tyres, that's right, trams that run on normal air inflated tyres. I once saw a documentary on a tram they're working on somewhere in Germany; an unmanned electrical tram that also runs on air inflated tyres. To be honest this tram rather looks like a bus, like an unmanned trolleybus. Why a tram then? I guess only because it will replace a tram, not a bus. When it's a tram, because it's not a bus, or trolleybus, the properties really blur in my opinion; let's be honest this tram they're working on shares more properties with a trolleybus than a tram. What if they now drop the electrical grid, like the regional trams that don't really need outside electricity, are we still going to have a tram which, just like a bus, runs on tyres with diesel engines? What will it take for a tram to become a bus?

Do you see the problem with defining things by what they are not? So what is a tram then? It's a narrative-mark in a narrative-context, and combined they become a narrative-mark. In a narrative things aren't what they are not, but what they can become in the narrative; the cognitive meaning they can elucidate. The history of a tram is of little interest to the commuter, but we can't say that of the narrative of commuting itself; the tram has certainly meaning for the commuter to make a living.

Should my wife and I only define our marriage on the fact that we are two individuals being defined by what we respectively aren't (the first and third person duality), what would be the future of our covenantal vows? Not much I'm afraid, since only gazing on the things that individualise us, the things we differ on, and that the whole time, must inevitable lead to frustration and incompatibility and to divorce at some point. No, but if the unity is being defined by a narrative, thus not by what we are not, but what we are in a single narrative, then we are narrative-marks in one narrative-context, and then the unity is in the aesthetics of the one narrative that should be in the Divine Image. Is the Trinity not such a narrative? The narrative is then what we can become together?

All these trams, and trains, and regional trams, and buses, and taxis are all narrative-marks in one narrative called public transport, in the narrative called labour, in the narrative called economy, in the narrative called 'making sense of life', in the narrative called 'Divine institution'.

5. Dozing off the session

So here we are in Melsungen! If you want to take the time to go down into downtown Melsungen you'll notice the most beautiful half-timber buildings so typical of Germany, and so well maintained in this medieval town called Melsungen. Typical? Type and antitype? Type derives its meaning from the Greek word mark; do you see the narrative-mark in the narrative-matrix in the duet of type and antitype?

These half-timber buildings my wife calls gingerbread houses with their square blocks, marked off by wooden beams, and filled with cement, or mud in the olden days. Hardly anyone is willing to live in them anymore, although government benefits intend to preserve this renowned German heritage and narrative. But, on the other hand, can the German narrative ever be eradicated? Did you know that the English monarchy is actually German, and they still used to speak German at home only a 100 years ago? The surname Windsor is only an invention to Englishes the branch of the German House of Saxe-Coburg and Gotha (Wikipedia. 2010c).

So will the German narrative ever cease to exist when it also perpetuates in the English narrative, in the commonwealth narrative, in the South African narrative that's part of the commonwealth, but also in the monarchies of Belgium and Portugal and Bulgaria that are also branches of the German House of Saxe-Coburg and Gotha (Wikipedia. 2010c)? Where does one narrative stop and the next one start? I guess they really turn out to be just one narrative, one history, His-story, YAHWEH's story!!! My memoirs of a dream, but His memorandum of esteem!!!

See you this afternoon on the way back to Kassel, or is it Baunatal, or is it just a story, or is it just my dissertation for my doctor's degree, or is it actually your enjoyment of being an academic? What's the story again? O, yes I was just dreaming.

Chapter 8: Witnessing my witnessable, not yours!

"All theology, like all fiction, is at its heart autobiography." (Buechner 1982:1)

1. Contextual embedding of session

How was your day in Melsungen? Have you seen the breathtaking half-timber city hall, called the Rathaus in German, in the centre of downtown? This masterpiece was constructed in 1556, after the previous city hall was destroyed in a fire in 1554; but to be honest, how long do you think this city hall is going to last? Forever? No war, or fire, or natural disaster ever? I'm not so sure.

2. Radical inductive contemplation

Let us make this personal, how long do you think am I going to be around, or how long are you going to make it before you kick the bucket? Have you ever heard the saying, "In a 100 years you're going to be dead!", that's a fact except if some totally extraordinary scientific breakthrough awaits us. The increase in life expectancy in the last century has more to do with the increase of the life expectancy of infants, than anything else. The oldest recorded lifespan, outside the Scriptures now, is 122 (Wikipedia 2011b). So if you're younger than 22, you might still be living in a 100 years time, but don't count on that!

Temporality is the name of the game! My temporary walk on this old heaven and earth started on the 16th of August 1970, that's the day I was born. This is my story:

My parents were living in Pretoria South Africa at the time, in the suburb called Queenswood when I saw light the first time. In the first eight and a half years of my life we lived in three different houses in three different suburbs of Pretoria, and they were happy days (Silverton 1979). They were, as Frederick Buechner says, "Childhood's time is Adam and Eve's time before they left the garden for good..." (Buechner 1982:10). The biggest part of those eight and a half years is lost to my memory, but I can remember my first day in kindergarten though, and also how I cheated with a treasure hunt on an open day in kindergarten when I observed from a tree how they hid the treasure in a sandpit.

I also remember once attempting to smoke under the caravan when my mother saw me

and scolded me from an open window of the house.

I remember the first love of my life, the vicar's daughter, Estel, and how my best friend (Pieterse 1977) and I had to each share a hand during a movie on the last day of school; it's funny the little bit of rejection I still remember until today because I had to hold her left hand casted in gypsum plaster, and my friend the good hand.

I remember, Willie Slabbert, the naughtiest boy in school, but who was diagnosed with cancer at the age of 21; today I've got no idea if he's still alive or not. He probably didn't even make his 22nd birthday (I hope I'm wrong).

I remember how someone in class one day gave my best friend and I each a bus ticket and how we just caught the first bus outside the school gates and how we had to walk kilometres back home when the bus reached its last stop. I remember my mum's worried face because I was rather in time for supper than lunch.

Of the eight and a half Adam and Eve years of my life I was at home for three and a half years, three years in kindergarten and two years in primary school, but then I lost paradise, when I was sold into slavery through the human trafficking of divorce and rejection.

The thing is my dad was an alcoholic, probably still is, but too poor to buy alcohol anymore. My mum says that my dad used to be my hero in those eight and a half Adam and Eve years, but when he kicked us out of the house for good, after so many times, the rejection penetrated at last and for good. The last nail in the coffin was though when my mum got married again a year later. That interposed the rejection not only from my dad's side, but also from my mum's side – that was now in the experience and perspective of my little world; I experienced my mum rejecting us for another man who I could see as nothing else as an intruder.

As if this wasn't enough, he was a government accountant and was sent all over the country dragging us along. The longest stretch in one school I had the privilege to enjoy was three years, but also as little as three months in the first school after they got married (Sunnyside 1980). All and all I was in eight schools in my school career (School 1989), and that coupled with the divorce, inflated the rejection even more, since leaving each

school was leaving dear and treasured friendships behind; every new school meant starting the tiresome process of making new friends all over again. The fuel on the fire was the fact that because I felt abandoned by my family I confined myself to my peers and friends, but had to leave them behind each time. The rejection was destined to escalate.

It's funny, when I went back to some of these friends years later, some of them couldn't even remember my name (Alfie 1995). The confinement was only one-sided.

To add to the adversaries, my mum fell into a serious depression soon after she got married again, and when I say serious I mean serious. I remember between the ages of 12 and 14 (Sabie 1984) she was in hospital more than at home, and so we were left in the care of my stepdad.

I have to say something about my stepdad; today I think his a wonderful man and actually my rightful dad, but in those days I hated him with a passion. This was not only because I saw him as an intruder, but also because he was a tough man to live with. He himself had his share of a raw deal in life growing up in poverty on a farm on the outback's of the Freestate, the prairies of South Africa. He is squint with only a few percent eyesight, and because of that was the object of mocking in school. Irrespective of his adversities, out of sheer determination and a strong personality he made his way up to become assistant-director in the government of South Africa, but that didn't make it easy for me as a child to live with him. For one thing I remember one day when the box of cereal, called ProNutro, got full of ants, he made us eat it not to waste food.

I remember when I was about 11 or 12 (Amsterdam RSA 1982), how I one night cried myself to sleep because of loneliness, and how I was begging YAHWEH for a wife, can you believe it, a wife at the age of 11 or 12?

Every school holiday we had to go to my dad's, my genetic dad, but I also remember how ashamed I was of him and how I wished no one would see him coming into town in his drunk and/or pathetic state. The last day of school was not only feared and despised because of this, but also because on the last day of school we could go to school with casual dress (no school uniforms), but because our suitcases were already packed by my parents, ready for my dad to pick us up, we had to go to school with the oldest and most worn out clothes in our closets. I was almost too ashamed to go to school.

Those holidays at my dad's were also something not worth remembering. I remember once my dad was working at a dam, he was an electrician (Nortje 1982), and we were staying with him in a caravan in the middle of winter on the high-veld with temperatures dipping to almost double digits below zero degrees Celsius at night. As if this wasn't enough, I got yellow-fever. No small disease, but my dad didn't even take me to a doctor. He didn't even have a painkiller to give me. I was freezing with fever at night, but because he had no extra blankets I just had to endure the suffering and obviously also had no sleep for a week. Fortunately my grandmother joined us after a week, and she got my dad to take me back to my mum's immediately (Dam 1981).

I guess I could have died next to that dam on the high-veld and my dad would have just apologised to everyone and thought they would just forgive him. It's funny how this addiction made my dad think the world owed him something⁶³.

It's also funny how drunk people always feel compelled to go for a drive when they are very intoxicated and actually not far from passing out; so many times my dad then wanted to get behind the wheel, but as if this wasn't petrifying enough, dragging us as children along. How many times had we skipped death on one of those crazy drives? I remember as if yesterday how my grandmother once sobbingly begged my dad not to take us with him, but he still did.

I'd never once heard my dad telling me that he loved me, and he has never ever bought my brother and I anything for our birthdays or Christmas. To be honest he would sell things that we would leave with him between holidays. He once even sold my bicycle that I left there on purpose for the next holiday, and our Atari computer games we earned from my grandmother through good marks in school. I can't even remember once that he called us on a birthday.

Back at my mum and stepdad, when I was 14 it was time for us to move again. We were never asked, we were just informed we're moving again. This time we moved to a coastal

⁶³ My dad never physically abused us and if I have to profile him I would say that his addiction has consumed him, rather than neglecting us. In different circumstances - no addiction - I'm sure my dad would have been a good father, and irrespective of all the neglect, when we were laughing together in a good moment it was fun being with him, that's now only when there were no demands, or he hadn't humiliated us or put our lives in danger.

city of South Africa called Durban (Durban 1985), also called the last outpost of the British Empire. In Durban the wheels came off in my devastated life. I didn't only fall into a depression myself that year, but that was also the year that I got introduced to pornography at the Wild Coast casino on the south coast of Natal. Pornography and parties were also the trademark of the circle of friends I chose to mix with.

It's funny, actually sickening, when I saw that first blue movie, I fell in love with those naked women. I thought they must love me to appear naked before me. I somehow knew that that wasn't true, but my life was so empty, and I was so lonely, that I could do nothing else but to reach out to this perverted form of love, erotic love. I desperately needed love, irrespective of what love.

In this 15th year of my life the narrative of despair that was living me reached it's climax. If someone would just have been there with the gospel of YAHWEH, Yeshua and the Holy Spirit, things could have been different, but there was no one, so I opted for Lucifer's narrative, for temporality, for hedonism.

At the age of 15 I left my parent's house to go and live with a friend of mine in Pretoria (Pieterse 1977), the capital city of South Africa, 50km north of Johannesburg, the biggest financial centre of Africa. In Pretoria (Pretoria 1986) I embraced temporality and hedonism (Flocker 2004:21) with a vengeance; I threw every standard or morality overboard and latched on to every possible sin and enjoyment I could think of. My motto was to enjoy every moment of everyday, a moment not enjoyed was a moment wasted. The past I wiped out of my memory and the future I couldn't care about; I just wanted to live for the moment and enjoy the moment.

Needless to say, my life turned into parties, and parties and more parties. Every Friday and Saturday night I got inebriated; we would at least finish a case of beer between two of us, and I only passed out twice at a party. I was almost always still standing when the last drop of alcohol was consumed, and that even with whisky or hard liquor.

Life became synonymous with parties, alcohol, girls and sex, and that with the purposeful intention of blocking out the past and future. I was still attending school, whatever that meant, although school was a disaster, since I even bunked 64 days in one year.

Somehow the alcohol even followed us into school; somehow we found a way to hide that

from the preying eyes of the teachers.

You're right, how could school children keep up such habits? We couldn't, so we turned to drugs, and I/we hit rock bottom.

I had a motorbike, and I remember attending one of our renown night clubs, Lime Light (Pretoria 1986), the Friday evening of the third of July 1987. As the night progressed, one of my friends (Kruger 1987) came to me and asked me if we could swap motorbikes until the next evening, he needed to go to town the following day but had no licence for his bigger bike, but had one for my small one. Obviously I was a good friend to say yes, or was it to enjoy his bigger bike? In short, he went home with my small bike, and I stayed at the club with his bigger bike.

Just after midnight another friend (Acquaintance 1987) asked me if I could take him back home by bike. I can remember sitting on the bike in front of the nightclub, while he was getting on, the rest was told to me.

Apparently I dropped him off at home in Silverton on the mountain, and on the way back to the nightclub, in Val-De-Grace suburb, I drove into a lamppost around a steep bend I was apparently negotiating too fast. I hit the lamppost so hard that my helmet cracked open so that one could actually see through this crack. Providentially it was a borrowed helmet, and one of the best on the market, otherwise I would have been gone today (Stone 1987).

After I hit the lamppost the motorbike went about two meters high through a tree, and I through a flower garden stopping a few centimetres from a big rock with my head in a pool of blood. Again, providentially it happened in front of a policeman's house, and while his wife panicked he stayed calm and 20 minutes later the ambulance was there to take me to hospital (H.F. Verwoerd 1987).

In hospital I was admitted to ICU (intensive care unit) with a broken right arm, broken ribs, a broken collarbone, and a broken jawbone. I had bleeding in my right lung, from the penetrating ribs, with a pipe under my armpit draining the blood from my lung. I also had a pipe draining the blood out of my skull and a screw in my head to release the tension on my brain. A ventilator was breathing for me, and there I was lying with machines keeping me alive.

The following morning my mum and brother flew up from Durban, but my brother says they actually couldn't recognise me when they entered the ICU, my head was so out of proportion. Until today this is the impression he shares with everyone when we talk about this accident.

That was the Saturday morning the fourth of July 1987. The Thursday the doctors said to my mum I'm showing no response, and according to them I'm brain-dead and so they're going to turn off the machines. However, because I was so young, one and a half months before my 17th birthday, they said they would give me one more day, and providentially I started to show a response that Friday. Needless to say the life support wasn't turned off.

After two weeks I came out of the coma, and had to learn to walk all over again; I first had to crawl like a baby again and from there take my first steps. To get to running or sport only came months and years later. I even had to learn to write all over again, and therefore got evidence of two completely different handwritings, one pre-accident and one post-accident. Actually I never really learnt to write again, only typing - type and antitype writing on a keyboard.

The hospital was a horrible experience; for one thing I had this spasm in my neck and every day when I had to sit in a chair I could hardly keep my head up because of the pain. The more I tried to explain this to the sisters, the less they listened to me, they thought I was just another squash rotting in the vegetable garden, like the most in this ward. This, however, wasn't the only reason why the hospital was so horrible; the craving for a smoke was killing me. My grandmother said that the day or so before I came out of the coma I already started begging for cigarettes.

It was the craving for smoking that made me begging them to release me from hospital. After a month in hospital I was released, although I couldn't walk yet and although my bottom jaw was still wired to my top jaw so that I still could only take in fluids for food, they released me to shut me up. Their argument was that my mum could teach me to walk again, like she used to do when I was a baby (they obviously also thought I was close to a vegetable case and my mum would anyway have to look after me for the rest of my life). They weren't reckoning with a Higher Hand though!!

So I was pushed out of hospital in a wheelchair, and the following day my mum and I were

on a flight down to Durban to start the tiresome journey of recovery; that was the beginning of August 1987. An accident takes a moment, but the recovery the rest of one's life; in my case the emotional recovery even more than the physical recovery. Today, after more than two decades have lapsed, I still battle with physical handicaps, like a brain getting tired after only a short period of concentration, but emotionally just telling all these stories again also rocks my boat.

The physical recovery was not only the walking and writing, but also the eating. Once my bottom jaw was released from the top jaw, and I could eat again, I couldn't eat because my brain got so tired that I couldn't plan how to eat a normal plate of food. I couldn't decide if I should first cut off a piece of meat and then take a fork of rice, or first a fork of vegetables, or how I should get this food down my throat.

The emotional recovery, on the other hand, had actually many dimensions. Although there was the crushing negative emotions that persisted a long time, the eclipsing good thing that came from the accident was the fact that I became a follower of Yeshua.

It was a Tuesday evening, I don't remember the date, but somewhere in the middle of August, I was watching a journal program on television that evening called Pot-Pourri. In the program they had an interview with Dr. Christiaan Neethling Barnard (Chris Barnard) who did the first successful human-to-human heart transplant in the world down in Cape Town in 1967. At the time of the interview, after his retirement, he was in the USA working on anti-ageing research; all I really remember about the program is that the research had something to do with growth hormones and about postponing natural death (I can't confirm anything, but that's what I remember).

That evening in bed, out of the blue, as we would say, I started thinking, "What does it help that they are trying to postpone natural death, but they can't postpone the second coming of Yeshua?" Where that came from I can only ascribe as the interference of waves, YAHWEH that was probing my thoughts. I hardly knew anything about the Scriptures, and couldn't even quote one verse from Scriptures even at gunpoint. The only point of reference I could think of was when my friends and I, in my hedonism days, once discussed the topic of babies going to heaven or not. What an absurd topic to be discussed among a bunch of rebels, criminals and dropouts, but that's the closest to such

a topic I can remember I had in the years before my motorbike accident. I also had been to my granddad's funeral the year before, but I can remember nothing the minister said.

Somehow the idea of a heaven and hell came into my head, but after this first question an even more mindbogglingly question followed "What if I had died in that motorbike accident, where would I be?". My own honest answer was "In hell!". There and then, in my simplicity, knowing nothing about the gospel, or 'sinners prayers', or how to get to heaven or anything, I just decided I'm going to become a Yeshua follower, and there and then the Shekhinah/presence of YAHWEH flooded my room, and for the first time since my Adam and Eve days I experienced a love and an acceptance and a joy that replaced all rejection. I experienced heaven on earth. For the first time, since my Adam and Eve days, I experienced I had a dad and a mum and a family, a YAHWEH family, an ubuntu belonging.

The experience was so overwhelming, and out-of-character with what I knew, that the next morning I didn't know how to cope with these emotions, emotions I had forgotten, and so this time I didn't have a nagging desire to smoke, but to get waisted on booze (alcohol) to the point of passing out just to forget about them. That's the only narrative(-mark) I knew how to handle wayward emotions. It's funny how even good emotions can become wayward emotions due to negligence.

A month later I was back on the plane again to Pretoria, and although I could hardly walk or eat or certainly not write yet, I needed to get drunk. I was like a druggie that would burn on the stake for a shot, and when I got to Pretoria my three best friends (Bezuidenhout 1987) were waiting for me, with a case or two of beers.

I couldn't get the first beer down my throat. YAHWEH changed me, I fell in love with His presence, His belonging, but also the ubuntuing of the interconnectedness in YAHWEH, and so the beer was throbbing against a new-found conscious, consciousness, belonging, I couldn't or wouldn't override.

In short, I stopped drinking, quit smoking and had to move out of my friend's house. Fortunately my grandparent's best friends took me in, but for a whole year I had no friends. The thing is that my friends kicked me out as if I was rubbish, they even used my name mockingly 'in vain', like they used to use YAHWEH's name in vain. As if this wasn't

enough, because I used to be a leader of the 'crimi' pack in school, the other real Yeshua followers were not only walking physical circles around me, but I also knew none of them to introduce myself and tell them what had happened to me.

To be honest, because I found Yeshua outside theology or a methodology or the church, on a Damascus road experience of my own, I thought I was the only Messianic follower in the whole world, or at least the first generation Messianic follower in school. Because I had no friends, which funny enough didn't really bother me too much, I kindled my new and deep relationship with YAHWEH that I found. Those were still the days before cellphones and internet and chat rooms and all those things which could have brought me in contact with someone somewhere that would have known something of my experiences.

After school, and homework, I would thrust myself into the Scriptures, and meditate on the Scriptures, and only the Scriptures; I don't remember even once watching television for more than a year or two or even more. That's the thing, this year without friends had laid the foundation, and chiselled the norms that became the spectacles of all my theosophising until today. The whole story I've told up until now has been filtered through these norms, and therefore I don't feel ashamed to admit that I've read the Scriptures, although I'm convinced in the second person, into my norms with this story, or differently put, I stuck my norms on the Scriptures in this story. I'm not ashamed to admit that I've done eisegesis, but I'm also adamant enough to convincingly state that all theologians are also only doing eisegesis, and I'm no exception. I'm convinced that in the second person narration we can only do eisegesis.

3. Middle script as postscript

I would like to just mention a few things in this middle script that is actually part of a postscript.

I would like to point out that there are no hard feelings between my real genetic dad and I today. I have thoroughly forgiven him, and know that it was purely an addiction that made him so selfish. I honour my dad today as the Scriptures command me to do.

In addition, I want to add that there is no hard feelings evoked by my situation and context in the present towards my wasted lifestyle and beer drinking shenanigans before my eyes

were opened and my life turned around when YAHWEH's presence entered my life, and/or I entered YAHWEH's presence in a way that I can still not describe and account for today, apart from my testimony/witness/memoirs.

4. Biblical narratives as string succession

I remember one day in school I somehow got talking about YAHWEH with the boy sitting in front of me, and I mentioned something about obeying YAHWEH's law on salvation and he reprimanded me that we get saved through faith alone. Thinking about it today he could have been a Yeshua follower, but an MI5 secret service follower since he never reached out to me in any way. The point I want to make, however, was that this reformation declaration he made of faith alone I thought was a heresy.

In short, the reformation dictum of salvation through faith was a new thing to me, and not according to my norms though, since I didn't see my Damascus road experience as having anything to do with faith. It wasn't *doxa*, it was *episteme*. I had come to know YAHWEH, I had met YAHWEH that evening. Who would question/weaken the fact, the know, the *episteme*, through believing/*doxa*, that someone exists when conversing with this person, even when it's a total stranger? To say you only believe, you have spoken to someone, when you had a face-to-face encounter, sounds to me like keeping the backdoor open that you might have hallucinated⁶⁴!

My gospel was simple, we obey the laws of YAHWEH as good we can, and where we fall short of obeying the laws of YAHWEH, Yeshua takes over and tops up what is lacking. Years later nothing in principle has changed with regards to this gospel of mine, I only refined and extensively developed it with the theosophy tools I've learnt. To summarise, YAHWEH wants a 24/7 burnt offering from us, a 100% perpetual full-surrender to Him (Romans 12:1), to re-establish and maintain fellowship with Him (Leviticus 1:4). This couldn't be reached in the Sinai covenant since the offerings of the Sinai covenant weren't

64 Do you notice what I'm doing? I've used hallucination in regards to reasonable physics, but now when it comes to my relationship with YAHWEH I argue no hallucination. Relationships are the postmodern epistemology and ontology I'm arguing. When my mum told me as a boy I should brush my teeth otherwise the little bugs were going to destroy my teeth, I obeyed her in an ubuntuing/dependent arising with no incentive to verify the apparent fact, and boy how did I not depend(ently arise)/draw on her epistemology and ontology?

all enduring (Hebrews 10:11), proven by the fact that they had to be perpetually sacrificed again and again (Hebrews 10:1-2). This misfiring the sacrifice of Yeshua tops up.

5. Wider theolosophy debate

The important thing to notice is the significance of the offerer laying his or her hand on the animal, not to transfer sins onto the animal (that's the reformation-Calvinistic substitutionary/satisfaction theology (Dunning 1988:336-7)), but to transfer the offerer self; in short the offerer is the burnt offering unto YAHWEH. Salvation is in the perpetual burnt offering unto YAHWEH. To see the atonement as the transfer of sin, in these modernist categories, is to see these sins as existing apart from us, but in quantum language the laying on of the hand is to bring the offerer and the animal in the same quantum state so that the offerer becomes the burnt offer.

I call this the *victorious interconnected/dependent arising/nonlocal atonement* as opposed to the,

1. Satisfaction theory of Anselm in the 11th century (Burkhof 1941:385),
2. The governmental theory, to make the satisfaction theory an Arminian version by Hugo Grotius (Dunning 1988:337),
3. The moral influence theory (Burkhof 1941:386),
4. The example theory (Burkhof 1941:387),
5. The mystical theory (Burkhof 1941:389),
6. The vicarious repentance theory (Burkhof 1941:390).

My victorious interconnected/dependent arising/nonlocal atonement is not in odds with the ransom theory (Dunning 1988:335) of the early Yeshua's followers per se though, since the dominator is not Satan per se, but the evil narrative humanity is sold out to and has to be redeemed from. The key in this interconnected/dependent arising/nonlocal atonement is reconciliation, just as reconciliation is central for H. Ray Dunning (Dunning 1988:340) in his relational theolosophy. The loss of paradise by Adam and Eve is the loss of Shekinah, and the atonement reconciliation back into the intimate relationship of this presence. The

key offer is the umbrella burnt offer to work this atonement in the Tanakh and the B'rit Hadashah.

The victorious in the atonement was certainly hailed by the early followers of Yeshua in the first few centuries AD., as Arnold says about them,

When Christ's death is proclaimed at this meal it means that his resurrection is given substance and life is transformed. His victorious power is consummated in his suffering and dying, in his rising from death and ascent to the throne, and in his second coming. (Arnold 2007:5) (underlined my emphasis).

In contrast to the Tanakh, in the B'rit Hadashah Yeshua became the all enduring, once for all, burnt offering though (Hebrews 10:12), and that through the $\pm 33\frac{1}{2}$ years, cradle to grave, 27/7 100% full-surrender unto YAHWEH. The thing about the burnt offer is that the burnt offer is the only offer where the whole animal is placed on the altar (Leviticus 8:21), apart from the skin (Leviticus 7:8): the whole animal is being sacrificed unto YAHWEH, which indicates the full-surrender.

The Orthodox Jewish Bible says of Leviticus 1, when describing the bunt offer that,

“OLAH (WHOLE BURNT OFFERING); MOSHIACH [Messiah] IS OUR OLAH, HAVING OFFERED HIS ENTIRE PERSON TO BE ACCEPTED INSTEAD OF US AS OUR WHOLE BURNT OFFERING UTTERLY CONSUMED; SEE YESHAYAH 53:8,11-12; IN HIM WE ARE ACCEPTED BEFORE HASHEM [YAHWEH] (SEE VERSE 1:3) AND HAVE OUR KAPPORAH [atonement] (1:4) "THE WORLD WAS ONLY CREATED FOR THE MOSHIACH [Messiah]" (SANHEDRIN 98B) "ALL THE PROPHETS PROPHESED OF NOTHING BUT THE DAYS OF THE MOSHIACH [Messiah]" (SANHEDRIN 99A); MOSHIACH [Messiah] OFFERED HIMSELF TO HASHEM [YAHWEH] AS A RE'ACH [aroma] HANNICHOACH [pleasant] (SEE EP 5:1 OJBC) ” (Goble 2003:1214)

and endorses my victorious interconnected/dependent arising/nonlocal atonement through the burnt offering.

The two verses that capture YAHWEH's redemption in my Damascus road experience the best is Hebrews 5:8-9, since

“Although Yeshua was the Son, He still had to learn mishma'at (obedience/submission/being a burnt offering) from His sufferings, and having been made shalem (complete; completely the sufficient perpetual 24/7, 365¼ days burnt offering), to all those with mishma'at (obedience/submission/burnt offering status)

toward Him, He became the producer of eternal salvation,” .

Yeshua victoriously worked the presence of YAHWEH back to us by beating evil's narrative, so that, in quantum interconnectedness language, in salvation (Romans 1:17-18), when we lay our hands on Yeshua, our burnt offering, we're being offered with Him in these 33½ ± years burnt offering unto death on the cross (the sufficient burnt offering), so that we rise with Him in the resurrection (Romans 6:3-5), and with Yeshua enter the Most Holy and fellowship with YAHWEH reconciled, because

“... we have now confidence to use the way into the Holiest Place opened by the blood of Yeshua. The way He inaugurated for us through a new and living way, through the parokhet (veil) which is His flesh.” (Hebrews 10:19-20)

and so that we can chant our B'rit Hadashah mantra of,

“...being raised with the Messiah, and therefore we have to seek the things above where the Messiah is sitting at the right hand of YAHWEH. We have to focus our minds on the things above, not on the things on the earth, since we have died and our lives are hidden with the Messiah in YAHWEH. When the Messiah, our life, is being disclosed, then we too will be manifested with him in glory!” (Colossians 3:14).

The switch between the Tanakh and the B'rit Hadashah aren't binaries like law and grace, or law and faith, or intolerance versus tolerance, etc., but the switch is from the temple/tabernacle and Most Holy here on earth, in the Tanakh, to the Most Holy and temple in 'heaven'/above right now. Actually in the switch from the Leviticus priesthood to the Melchizedek priesthood, nothing structurally has changed, salvation is still through sacrifices, or a sacrifice, with a priesthood and a temple; not even the Most Holy that was off-limits for all but the high priest has changed, since in the Tanakh, in the interconnectedness, the whole community entered the Most Holy. In the B'rit Hadashah the interconnectedness is in Yeshua's body that has once and for all entered the Most Holy, so that, as our B'rit Hadashah creed states, our lives are *“...concealed with the Messiah in YAHWEH”* (Colossians 3:2). The conceal is the picture of an ubuntu quantum interconnectedness where the head of the family/tribe is the face of the whole family/tribe.

In interconnectedness, dependent arising, we literally walked the Via Dolorosa with Yeshua (the Via Dolorosa is the whole $33\frac{1}{2} \pm$ years of suffering), and rose from the dead with Him, although we are also between times, sojourners in a tent (2 Corinthians 4:10), so that *“We always carry in our bodies the dying Yeshua, so that the life of Yeshua may be manifested in our bodies too.”* (2 Corinthians 4:10), so that we can *“...complete in our bodies what has been lacking of the Messiah's afflictions, on behalf of his Body, the B'rit Hadashah Community”* (Colossians 1:24). Eberhard Arnold says that the Yeshua synagogues held that “[f]or what [the Messiah] has done he does again and again in his [synagogues]” (Arnold 2007:5).

I'm sorry to say, but this verse in Colossians 1:24 is a deathblow to the modernist categorical doctrines of the atonement. This verse flatly rejects the watertight category of the perfect atonement nailed down in history 2000 years ago that we only look back to in time. I reject the doctrinal category that says the cross and resurrection, in this event of 2000 years ago, is a closed off event that split time in two. No, the cross and resurrection is the revolutionary earthshaking event literally of the whole B'rit Hadashah, and has already been so for 2000 years going into the future, until the *parousia* of the Messiah, and not just 2000 years ago. The tabernacle (YAHWEH's localised/Shekinah presence) in the Torah was already supposed to be this revolutionary earthshaking event; in the B'rit Hadashah, in the whole B'rit Hadashah, the same tabernacle event is Yeshua *“...that tabernacled with us...”* (John 1:14) and still, interconnectedly, tabernacles with us through the Holy Spirit that took His place (John 14:16). This is what Paul calls, the body of Yeshua (1Corinthians 12:12-13), which synonymously means the synagogue/community (Levine 2005:1). The atonement is the continuing 24/7 $365\frac{1}{4}$ days burnt offering (Leviticus 6:12-3), through the whole of the B'rit Hadashah until the *parousia*, although Yeshua is the first one that has already bodily risen from the dead and who we'll follow later in the same bodily resurrection.

The only two real and significant differences between the Tanakh and the B'rit Hadashah are, firstly, the completion (as sufficiency) of the burnt offering, and, secondly, that the B'rit Hadashah heralds the last days of the Tanakh, which could be called temporality. The significance of the tearing of the temple veil, in the gospels, indicates that the temple/tabernacle of the Tanakh became absolute, but not the institution of the

temple/tabernacle itself; the temple/tabernacle is in 'heaven' now (Hebrews 9:11-12), but has also broken back (in imaginary time) in the heavenly deposit, the Holy Ghost (Ephesians 1:14), who defines us as "...YAHWEH's temples..." (1 Corinthians 3:16) (not the individual though, but the assembly/synagogue/body of Yeshua).

In both the Tanakh and the B'rit Hadashah the same 24/7 burnt offering is required in observing the Shema (observance), first in the Tora

"and you are to love YAHWEH your Elohim with all your heart, all your soul and all your might" (Deuteronomy 6:5)

and then commanded by Yeshua in Matthew 22:37, and contextualised in the following verses, when he says,

"This is the greatest and most important mitzvah... All of the Torah and the Prophets are dependent on the love... mitzvot." (Matthew 22:38 & 40)

In the Torah the representative enactment of the burnt offering had to be perpetually repeated, since the offer proved to be inadequate due to the lacking interconnected depth, as the Hebrew writer points out when he or she says "...it is impossible for the blood of bulls and goats to take away sins" (Hebrews 10:4), since apples can't take care of pears. What follows is that because the sacrifice was inadequate, the work of the high priest also; the high priest was a pear, who had to take care of pears, but couldn't with apples. The inadequate sacrifices prevented the high priest to adequately reside in the Most Holy and do the work of a priest - perpetual intersession.

In the B'rit Hadashah though, although the burnt offering teleologically stays the same, it's completed since the 'animal' is now also a pear (Hebrews 2:11), interconnected, a second Adam, one of the really guilty ones before YAHWEH and so a burnt offering that could really once and for all reverse the lack of dedication, since

"... what the Torah could not do by itself, since it's weakened through the fallen nature of mankind, YAHWEH did by sending his own Son in the form/likeness of this sinful nature. YAHWEH did this to take care of sin, and so executed the death penalty on the sin of the fallen nature," (Romans 8:3)

and so the High Priest is now “*completely empowered to deliver those who approach YAHWEH through him; since He is alive forever now and so forever able to intercede on their behalf.*” (Hebrews 7:25)

My simple gospel was that we should be sold-out, 24/7, burnt offerings unto YAHWEH, and where that’s not enough, Yeshua will top-up through intercession.

Louis Berkhof rightly says that, “The priestly work of Christ is not limited to the sacrificial offering of Himself on the cross” (Berkhof 1941:400), but then I disagree with him on his view of the general atonement. Devotionally this intercessory motive of the Messiah re-occurs a lot in regards to things like prayer, as in the book *With Christ in the School of Prayer* by Andrew Murray (Murray 2008:116), and also assurance of salvation in John Bunyan's book *Christ a Complete Saviour: Come and Welcome to Jesus Christ Justification by Imputed Righteousness* (Bunyan 2007:53).

I'm the last one to say anything bad about the exemplary life of John Bunyan or Andrew Murray, but I guess in a cognitive relativism, in different intratextual contexts, I see too much Newtonian physics in this, that, according to them, Yeshua objectively, apart from us, worked the atonement, and objectively, apart from us, intercedes for us. If the atonement was a once off completed act 2000 years ago, the intercession of Yeshua then doesn't really have salvational significance, but rather significance in things like prayer and assurance of salvation.

On the other hand when we have to “*complete... what has been lacking of the Messiah's afflictions...*” (Colossians 1:24), then the Priestly intercession of Yeshua is assisting us in what's lacking, cooperatively, until we enter eternal bliss. H. Ray Dunning correctly says that in the B'rit Hadashah reconciliation is both a completed act [because Yeshua as our forerunner (Hebrews 6:20) is already resurrected] and a yet-to-be-actualised reality [because we aren't resurrected yet], and that both dimensions are present in the classic periscope of 2 Corinthians 5:16-21 (Dunning 1988:341).

In my no objections to the ransom theory of the atonement, coupled with the yet not yet, I adhere to the vivid war that the first followers of Yeshua experienced in their battle with Satan and his evil forces that are controlling this old heaven and earth (Arnold 2007:15-17). In this war we need an intercessory Helping Hand, to help us to

“...strengthen our drooping arms, and steady our tottering knees; and make a level path for our feet; so that what has been injured will not be thrown out, but rather be healed.” (Hebrews 12:12-13)

so that we can fight as fit soldiers! Temporality has a deadly sucking force; the apparent joy and self-actualisation of temporality chokes the right view on the seen.

The scripture that defined the battle for the early followers of Yeshua on the old heaven and earth was Luke 4:5-6 (Oakes 2002:27-28), when Satan

“...led Yeshua up and showed him, in a moment's of time, all the kingdoms of the whole world, and said to him, “I will give you all this power and glory, because it has been given to me; and I give it to whom I want”.

The satanic rule is a narrative rule, it's a temporality rule.

Apparently scholars see that

[w]ithin the New Testament there is a range of views of the state, from Paul's apparently positive and 'submissive' view (Rom . 13:1—7) through Peter's concern to witness by being ready to suffer for doing right (3:13-17; cf. 2:13-17; 4:12-15) to the seer's vision of the same Roman state as the beast that rises from the sea to oppose the people of God (Rev. 13). Presumably these varying approaches reflect the various situations of the writers and their readers. (Oakes 2002:1-2),

but I find it difficult to see Paul's view deviating that much from Luke, his doctor friend and close companion. I would rather see Paul as purely and practically exploiting opportunities given to him as, e.g., a Roman citizen (Acts 22:25) to work for the New Heaven and Earth, but not to justify the old heaven and earth.

It's difficult for me to see the other B'rit Hadashah authors differing from the late B'rit Hadashah Johannine dualism, when John depicts Yeshua's words in John 18:36, when Yeshua says,

“My kingdom is not of this old heaven and earth, because if My kingdom were of this earth, my servants would not have hesitated to free me so that I'm not given over to the Jews, but now My kingdom's not from here.”

To add to this, my gospel has never been a cheap gospel, since the B'rit Hadashah is in

the Tanakh and not something categorically new, and so

“...if we deliberately and purposefully continue to do sin after we've learnt what the truth is, there remains no longer any sacrifice for sins (Yeshua's burnt offering is then nullified), but only the terrifying prospect of Judgement, of a raging fire that will consume the enemies, just like someone who violated the Torah of Moshe was put to death without mercy on the word of two or three witnesses, how much worse will be the punishment not be to someone who violated the YAWHEH's Son, and the soul of the B'rit that sanctified us unto YAHWEH...?”

(Hebrews 10:26-29)

but also not a cheating gospel.

Back to my testimony; after a year things changed when other Messianic followers discovered me at last, but that also challenged my simplicity. Suddenly my simple gospel was exposed to theology, to modernism, to Greek rationality. Suddenly I realised that although many might agree with me about being 24/7 burnt offerings, they had no clue what this burnt offering entitled. Sadly I couldn't find in the church what I, in the second person narration, learnt. Sadly I discovered that a wrong philosophy has been stuck on the Scriptures.

What I discovered is that the church was not in the last days of the Tanakh; but in a new book they also called B'rit Hadashah. I discovered that they didn't understand the temporality embedded in the B'rit Hadashah they read. I realise though today that I had an advantage, I had a near death experience, and because of that alone I was seeing this old heaven and earth in a different light, but I also realise today that they lacked the right theolosophy because of deeper underlining issues.

Just like Siddhartha Gautama temporality was what's in my face; I discovered that overcoming suffering, disjointness, what they called sin, resides in understanding this impermanence, temporality, and which has to be overcome with meditations fed with right ethics. I again realise my single advantage of the time I had to cast myself into the Scriptures every afternoon after school. Unknowingly I was treading Siddhartha Gautama's eight fold path backwards in these meditations. It started with the third group call

concentration, and first with undisturbed single mindedness (number eight in the eight fold path), followed by right thoughts (number seven), and right effort or determination (number six). The next group called right ethics inevitably followed; meditating on the Scriptures can't sidestep ethics, so right speech followed next (number three), as well as right action (number four), but number five, right livelihood, rather meant to me doing my best in school, although I think that could somehow be seen as the same ethic in principle.

The last group was then the breakthrough, or maybe even the breakthrough I started off with in the first place. The last group is called wisdom, and is the heading for the right view and right intent. The right view is to notice the temporality, the unreasonable physics, in contrast with the dependent arising, the second person narration, the ubuntu, the reasonable physics, while the right intent is to want to know, or being willing to know the temporality. Right intent is the willingness to sacrifice the independent individualism on the cross with Yeshua.

The right view, however, also meant to notice the limits of both Buddhist philosophy and ubuntu philosophy and that both together is closer to the truth, but not the one or the other alone. The meditations in Buddhism lack the single seen and unseen community of ubuntu, and so the second person narration with YAHWEH when reading and meditating the Scriptures, while ubuntu lacks the full view of temporality necessitating right meditations and right ethics. Ubuntu got what it takes to have the right relationships emerging out of dependent arising, but lacks the perspective on the temporality that interacts with the right relationships on the old heaven en earth. Buddhism got what it takes to notice the temporality, but lacks the most important and defining relationship, the one with YAHWEH. U-nkulu-nkulu in ubuntu is also not necessarily YAHWEH, since it's neither definable nor describable, or even knowable (Coetzee 2003:278).

I got knocked over by a hard reality, a sad reality. The church of my fathers, the Dutch Reformed Church, had nothing to say to me, they were just plain common boring me so that I also thought at first that I'm the only Yeshua follower in this whole congregation I was attending now (Dutch Reformed 1988). On the other hand, with my new-found friends, the pentecostals wanted me to speak in tongues (Pentecostals 1988), the charismatics wanted me to do wizardry (Charismatics 1988), the Baptists got me baptised again (Baptists 1991), others said I had to get of my high horse (Detesters 1989).

The pentecostal theology that came my way is the speaking in tongues as the first sign of the baptism with the Holy Spirit as it sprang out of the Azusa Street experience in L.A. under pastor W. Seymour in 1906 and spread all over the world in three decades (Lacoste 2005:1223). Although pentecostalism has this thing with this one doctrine, I do appreciate the emotionalism they bring to the debate. From 1906-1916 the pentecostal movement expressed something of the interrelationship dynamics of the assemblies of the synagogues that I whole-heartedly adhere to, however, in the follow-up period the Pentecostal movement became a typical church as could be seen in the USA and other parts of the world.

I do have issues with the charismatic movement, starting in the 60's, going to the third wave in the 80's. I agree with McConnell that something fundamental is wrong with the theology of the "granddaddy" of the charismatic movement, Kenneth Erwin Hagin, who plagiarised Essek William Kenyon's writings, who in turn got his story from Christian Science (McConnell 1995); the fundamental error is the platonic idealism of the world of ideas in which health, wealth and prosperity and wizardry are right ideas, and the lack of these things wrong ideas. For them sin is confined to ideas.

I realise everyone wanted to disciple me, with good intentions I hope, but little did they know they were doing it with categorical denominationism, their self-identity, their identity through which they are not, their modernist classification; but providentially I kept the upper hand in the guiding norms of my second person meditations with YAHWEH and others, and so even when I had my little relapses at times, the way back was easy. The pattern I got into, even when 'normality' kicked in and I didn't have these excessive amounts of time anymore, was an hour quite-time with YAHWEH (meditations) in the mornings and then another half hour intercessory prayers in the afternoons⁶⁵.

65 In terms of the Johannine dualism, what has been Lucifer's narrative attacking me in these circles I moved in? As I've said the (Johannine) dualistic narratives, although interspersed on the old heaven and earth, can't be disassociated from presence, rather than content (relational epistemology and ontology, rather than currency). As we've noticed, in my reciprocal dialogue with Genesis 3, Lucifer's narrative was not a lie, but rather the absence of presence in rhetoric (thus true, like no lie, simulacra), and so Lucifer's narrative that has been carried over in the residue, and per implication attacked me in the theological struggles, was the rhetoric with YAHWEH's absence in the mystery of presence. The indicated mysticism is particularly meant

In broad terms this is the pattern that persists until today, and the norm of the second person narration of reading ourselves into the Scriptures, canonising ourselves. Just like Siddhartha Gautama these meditations became the engine of life so that the virtual isn't the meditations, but that which is outside the meditations becoming the virtual/the unreal/the temporary, so that the real outside the meditations is that which I took from the meditations to the outside. To put it in other words, it isn't that which is outside the meditations that are enfolding the meditations, but the meditations that are enfolding that which are outside the meditations. The meditations define life, my ubuntu interconnectedness with YAHWEH, and not the other way around⁶⁶.

My meditations are a closed circle, it is my meditations that inform the right view (reasonable ubuntu physics), the right ethics (that which ubuntu lacks), but also the right

in the Jewish meaning, as pointed out by Elliot Wolfson, who says: "Mysticism can be seen as the quest, ..., to experience the presence of God directly. The yearning to know God sometimes takes the form of an effort to recover such experiences believed to have been given to earlier figures in the tradition—Moses, the prophets—who were granted direct access to God. It can also be an effort to "see" the imageless God without the aid of images, in keeping with the commandment that God may not be represented by any image. Finally, the goal of this quest is sometimes the direct experience of God, while remaining oneself; sometimes, however, it is the [single person's] effort to return to the source of being to reunite with the Godhead even to the point of subsuming one's [singleness] in the infinite being of God." (Wolfson 2009). To turn it around, the question is not, per implication, what the content/currency of the narrative is, but rather the degrees of presence or absence of YAHWEH in the narrative; it's not the rhetoric that qualifies the narrative, but the presence. Until today, and even more so, I have good friends in all of these streams, and as long as we can ubuntu/synagogue with YAHWEH together, we can dependently arise in this exclusive essential norm as put forth.

66 At first glance this might seem as if I'm conforming to the inside outside Platonic dualism I've condemned in the Aristotelian mirroring of perhaps a modernist phenomenology, or even the modernist pragmatism where the theory is apparently reduced from the practical. I don't see it like that, since for one thing narrative lives us and so the apparent inside outside narrative conflates, or is just one narrative in my proposed horizontal and vertical hermeneutics with myself, others, the cosmos and YAHWEH and so it is a virtual experience of looking through a window from both sides – a second person narration. Another way of putting it is, as we've seen, just like Ubu- is semantically the information and -ntu the phenomena (Coetzee 2003:271), so the meditations are the nonlocal irreducible information of the outside phenomena – the information and phenomena are nonlocal, thus not a dualism.

concentration; but in the same breath it's the right view, right ethics, and right concentration that empower the meditations. My meditations can't function without the right view, right ethics, and right concentration, although the right view is born from the meditations, the right ethics inspired by the meditations, and the right concentration desired through the meditations.

The lighthouse of my orientation became temporality, the last days of the Tanakh, and for some I might have been 'too heavenly minded, to be of earthly use', but the opposite was what I experienced in the church where 'they were so earthly minded, to be of any heavenly use'. In short, the church had a lot of talk about faith, a lot of contemplation on love, but nothing of hope, but when I read Hebrews 11:1 then "*...faith is the substance/core of things for which we have hope for...*" then faith is actually, par excellence, the substance of hope, where this faith isn't *doxa*, but *episteme* in the second person narration of Riemannian logic. The episteme is the knowing of the block time of the narrative: what's after the bookmark has already happened just not apprenticed yet, thus not *doxa* but *episteme*.

Hope parents faith; hope defines faith.

So in my meditations I came across Luke 11:13, where Yeshua says that "*...how much more shall the heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to those who keep asking Him!*" and in my simplicity I asked YAHWEH to fill me with His Holy Breath, Holy Wind, Holy Power - YAHWEH's narrative workings of the invisible, and one evening when I gave my testimony from birth until that moment, for the first time ever, exactly that happened (Holy Spirit 1988).

This event has many angles, the psychologist might say that the reason why I experienced such an empowerment and a 'second blessing' is because I got the guts to bring the skeletons out of the closet. Until that evening I had never ever really shared the pain and the rejection of my slavery years yet.

The sociologist might say I experienced this empowerment because this was actually the evening when I found my first new friends after my accident. The sociologist might say that this was just my personality exposed in group dynamics.

The reformed theologian might say I got my theology wrong, the Holy Spirit fills us at justification, and not somewhere after justification. The Pentecostal will ask me if I started speaking in tongues, and the charismatic, if I could perform miracles then.

I have a surprise for all of them, I didn't speak in tongues, I couldn't perform miracles, I don't think it was part of a group dynamical force since I was facing too much opposition from too many people afterwards. The psychological angle could have played a role, but then again I had already no problem with my past when I got there that evening. When I spilled all the beans it wasn't the typical counselling session of loaded emotions and sopping and weeping; right the opposite, it was a great joy and an empowerment from inside, it was already the *Ruach HaKodesh* at work.

What happened that evening was the empowerment of 1 Peter 4:10,

“As each one has received a spiritual gift, he or she should use it to serve others, like good managers of YAHWEH's many-sided grace”

and in my case the gift of evangelism. When I spilled all the beans that evening I was so filled with joy and shalom that I couldn't sleep that night, I just wanted to do things for YAHWEH. Actually even before I spilled all the beans I had already asked my school's headmaster if I could share my testimony with the whole school, but that only took place after that evening though, although he only allowed me to share my testimony with one year group.

To summarise a long story, I was empowered to share my testimony in churches, at youth camps, on the radio more than once, and I was empowered to invest my time every weekend evening to go out on the streets of the inner city of Pretoria and reach out to the desolate, and homeless, and prostitutes, and just those from the suburbs looking for a good time. I was a bodhisattva, a true Bodhisattva, who had tasted nirvana, the true Nirvana, and was calling the people to the hope of this true Nirvana, the hope of the deliverance from suffering, the hope of the deliverance from a disjointed, and an impaired relationship with YAHWEH.

This hope and right view, however, got challenged when I left school and had to start the big life; temporality got challenged when I had to choose a career and how I'm going to

make a living. Actually I had no idea what I was going to do; even the ambition of becoming a missionary to China I experienced as a handicap for my meditations since it was an ambition for the temporary - although partly something for YAHWEH it was a career choice under pressure of making a career choice, something I just had to do.

This paralysed me and so I thought "Let me just get the compulsory military training behind me and then we'll see!" (Military 1990). After one year of military training I was no closer to what I would do next, but I had to do something and with the help of a friend started working at Telkom South Africa; but three months down the line I just knew that that wasn't for me (Telkom 1991).

Through my aunt I got my next job at Central Statistical Services in Pretoria, South Africa (CSS 1991), and although I started off as a data capturer I was soon sent off to train as a mainframe computer programmer. Through a combined program of theory and praxis I officially gained the status of computer programmer a year and nine months later, but resigned the same month to start my first year in my first Bible college down in Cape Town.

How I got to the Bible college was that half a year before I resigned I was invited to a conference of the Africa Evangelistic Band (AEB 1924), called the Faith Mission in the UK and Canada, and there I found something of what I was looking for when I had no idea what to do after school. On the surface I found the right view, the right temporality I was looking for. On the surface, that was what their simplicity and sincerity convinced me of, and therefore I had no doubt in my mind to join their Bible college as soon as possible.

In January 1993 I started a two years mission diploma with the Africa Evangelistic Band's Bible college called Glenvar (Glenvar 1994), and the journey into Wesleyan theology I have principally never exited, but soon realised that Wesleyan theology could also be divided between what John Wesley said and what his tradition has come to say. The double barrel gospel of Wesleyanism, salvation and sanctification, is the gospel I have personally witnessed, but I soon learnt that the second barrel had a variety of meanings within the Wesleyan circles, and even more when the Pentecostal circles were added, and even more when the charismatics branched off.

Just to use words to try and differentiate these two barrels is an impossible task; every

binary couple runs into rhetorical problems. To say the two barrels are justification and sanctification is to imply there's no sanctification in justification, and that's not right (Philippians 3:10-15), but if justification and sanctification overlaps, why two barrels? To say the two barrels are salvation and filling with the Holy Spirit also encounters the same problem, since that would remove the Holy Spirit from salvation (Romans 8:9), not to mention that the Scriptures actually picture salvation as an enduring process until glorification (Philippians 2:12) at the parousia, or our personal parousia at death? The two barrels are also being pictured as salvation and full-surrender, but how can salvation be without full-surrender (Matthew 19:27-29)? Can we purposefully keep things away from YAHWEH and expect salvation?

The thing is that the longer I've been in the Wesleyan theological circles the more I noticed that most in these circles don't really believe this second barrel anymore. The doctrine of the second barrel appears on paper, but that's where it stops. Some congregations I have even seen taking on pastors who hadn't done their theological training in Wesleyan schools at all, and who I'm sure don't even adhere to this doctrine. The Church of the Nazarene even organised a seminar for all their Bible colleges and universities world-wide to come to a universal agreement about this doctrine, but only to come to the point that they actually don't know what they believe (Brouwer 2002).

The thing I've discovered is that although the second barrel wasn't at all doubted a century ago, it's hardly believed a century later and certainly not in the same way (Quanstrom 2004:180) although still retained on paper. In this I actually notice the modernist-postmodernist contrast of certainty and uncertainty. The uncertainty is not to really believe this doctrine anymore, but is also the same uncertainty not to know if it should be scrapped as a doctrine or not. The uncertainty is to have no *doxa*, opinion, at all.

This, however, has been contrary to what I experienced. I'm convinced of the double barrel gospel, but I'm afraid not the same double barrel I've seen in the Wesleyan theological circles I've moved in though!!!

To me the first barrel is pretty much the same, that's the barrel where ownership/redemption from Lucifer's narrative to YAHWEH's narrative takes place, that's what we call salvation, but with residue retained out of Lucifer's narrative that's been

dragged along into YAHWEH's narrative (Colossians 3:5-11). On this point not many Wesleyan theologians would differ, but asking what this residue is, is throwing the spider in the crowd. This is where the unreasonable physics can't come to grips with the metaphysics of temporality.

The residue is the temporality of Lucifer's narrative. Until a century ago the real double barrel Wesleyan theology was mostly the good news for the poor and the outcast (Queen 2009:268), and so temporality of the seen was good news, that was hope for a better world, and was well received. Something of the reasonable physics was unknowingly coming through, but during the last century Aristotelian philosophy sanctified the temporality for Wesleyanism⁶⁷.

To use an analogy, Siddhartha Gautama had sanctification without justification, while ubuntu has justification without sanctification, but because sanctification can't be separated from justification and justification from sanctification both are a mission field.

⁶⁷ If I have to be honest, this line has been the original thesis of my issues with modernism, and why I got engaged in the virtual deconstruction and (social) construction endeavour of this story in the first place. What I feel Wesleyanism has lost, and so inevitably succumbed to doctrinalism, has been due to an amnesia of revival, as we'll still entertain in the following chapters. I want to compare my endeavour to a typical Tatort on Sunday evenings on German television. A Tatort is a suspense and detective story following a murder. The timeline goes in two directions, one the history that is being reconstructed before the crime that led to the crime, but then also the detective timeline in the other direction deconstructing the resuscitated history. My effort follows this pattern: the crime is the YAHWEH scarce, almost desolate, Europe and actually all ill issues world-wide, the first timeline backwards is the resuscitation of the cognitive relative history of modernism, and the second time line the deconstruction of this resuscitated simulacra to simulations in the horizon and vertical lines of the proposed hermeneutics in a second/multi person narration. The thing is emotional for me, and just as emotional reactions are over reactions, so my emotions work with sentiments and illustrate why I'm so radical in many areas. I know clinical academic work should not be emotional, but is that not just an illusion? Just as in Tatorts, where the detectives' emotions regularly get entangled with the investigation, so I see the same thing in e.g. poststructuralist works of people like Jean Baudrillard with a late Marxist tendency (Kellner 2009). The (social) construction endeavour goes beyond the Tatort metaphor of putting life back together after the bereavement; countering the amnesia is like finding presence again (finding another partner), and although it is not the same presence, it is the historical hidden in the allegorical simulacrum to simulation.

What am I trying to say? Just as ubuntu is “Being human through other humans”, so salvation is having YAHWEH’s nature (2 Peter 1:4) through YAHWEH’s nature; but also just as Siddhartha Gautama escaped disjointedness (the temporary residue) through the right view in meditation, so sanctification is obtaining the right view on temporality with meditations.

6. Dozing off the session

So here we are back in Kassel, now I have to make it back to Baunatal still.

Chapter 9: The Virtual of Hermeneutics' Reality - the experiential story of Hermeneutics!

“Everything is hermeneutical; everything requires interpretation.” (Thiselton 2009:226)

1. Contextual embedding of session

Morning! So I made it back home yesterday, a long day in trams as well as working. It has been four trams to be exact: from Baunatal to Kassel downtown, from Kassel downtown to Melsungen, and from Melsungen back to Kassel downtown and then still back to Baunatal. That's now tram hopping for you.

How do we understand all of this? What's the meaning of all of these trams, I mean practically? Who's really the boss in all of this? The answer is, the timetable, or shall I say time? What's the first thing everyone does when he or she gets to a tram stop? They look at the timetable, that's now when it's a trip outside the normal commuting, where everyone knows the times by heart. Planning a trip, like me going to Melsungen yesterday, one needs to know the arrival times of the trams in order to be in time for whatever reason the trip is undertaken for.

Planning a trip entitles hermeneutics, hermeneutics of the timetables, but also of the map of all the tram lines, and even the bus lines when the destination is outside the parameters of the tram lines. Hermeneutics is central to public transportation, but at the end it's the timetable that's the converging abstract notion of the whole spectrum of public transport vehicles, ranging from trains, to trams, buses and even taxis; anyway that's the case for the business commuter.

I remember twice I had to criss-cross two cities with public transportation, one city I didn't really know that well and the other one I'd never been to. That was Frankfurt in Germany and Zürich in Switzerland. Two friends of mine (Motorbike 2006) were starting motorbike safari trips from South Africa to Lesotho, Botswana and Namibia and they asked me to get involved in the marketing for them by dropping of flyers at motorbike stores in these two cities. That was now a hermeneutical endeavour to first find these stores on the internet, and then to find them on a map, and then to work out a way to get to them with public

transportation, while avoiding zigzagging too much across the cities and in so doing waste time and energy. To start with, for Frankfurt I first had to take a train the morning from Kassel, and for Zürich first from Büsingen, where I stayed, by bus to Schaffhausen, close to the German border, and from there by train to Zürich. It all took quite a bit of hermeneutics.

To be honest, hermeneutics turns out to be central to life; how we understand all of life and in turn what actions flow from it. Tomorrow it'll be a week since we're together and all we've done is hermeneutics. You've been listening to my story until now, but what does it mean without hermeneutics? The way I've narrated my story is the hermeneutics of all the data in my head. What would we do without hermeneutics? Wasting our time? O yes, just the notion of time is a hermeneutical event.

2. Wider theolosophy debate

However, the place to take up the story of hermeneutics is with the B'rit Hadashah assemblies founded by the apostle Paul and the hermeneutics that channel from there through to us today. Traditionally these assemblies came to be called churches, but I don't like this designation because of two reasons: one, because of the baggage associated with church, but secondly also because the apostle Paul didn't establish something new, he founded synagogues after he had first went to the Jewish synagogues; only after they had kicked him out of the Jewish synagogue, he founded a new synagogue 'next door' for his 'New Gospel' (e.g. Acts. 13:5, 14; 14:1). Did you know gentiles were actually welcome in the Jewish synagogues, so the problem was rather Paul's Gospel and not the gentiles? When Paul became a Yeshua follower, the Parush pre-understanding wasn't taken from him and certainly not the place of the synagogue, as we specifically read in Acts 17:1-2, when *“Paul and Silas came to Thessaloni'ca, where there was a Jewish synagogue, and Paul went in, as was his custom, and for three weeks he debated with them from the Tanakh”*.

The synagogue already featured favourably in the ministry of Yeshua, in contrast to the temple, where the same custom was ascribed to him, when he walked the streets of Palestine, like Luke says *“... when Yeshua went to Natzalet, where he had grown up, on Shabbat he went to the synagogue as was his custom...”* (Luke 4:16).

The first thing to notice about the synagogue is that it had nothing to do with the building, anyway not until much later in history (Levine 2005:1). The word synagogue can also be translated as assembly or community and better captures the meaning of synagogue, since it has no reference to a building. The synagogue was a *treffpunkt* (meeting point) not only for worship, but also for study, court, to administer punishment, to organise sacred meals, to collect charitable donations, to house the communal archives and library and to assemble for political and social purposes. As a communal institution, the synagogue was fundamentally controlled and operated by the local community (Levine 2005:3).

Secondly the contrast between the synagogue and the temple is well illustrated in the following quote from Lee Levine,

In addition to the communal dimension, the congregation was directly involved in all aspects of synagogue ritual, be it scriptural readings or prayer service. This stands in sharp contrast to the Jerusalem Temple setting, where people entering the sacred precincts remained passive and might never have even witnessed the sacrificial proceedings personally unless they themselves were offering a sacrifice. In many cases, visitors to the Temple remained in the Women's Court without being able to view what was transpiring in the inner Israelite or Priestly Courts. Moreover, non-Jews were explicitly banned from the Temple precincts under penalty of death (warning inscriptions were set up around the sacred precincts), whereas the synagogue was open to all; in many places, particularly in the Diaspora, non-Jews attended the synagogue regularly and in significant numbers. (Levine 2005:2) (the underlining added by me for emphasis).

The fact that the congregation was directly involved in all aspects of synagogue ritual illustrates Paul's picture of Yeshua's body we participate in (1 Corinthians 12) and by serving each other with our gifts as Peter adds (1Peter 4:10).

Thirdly the synagogue was universal in nature and not confined to any one site (Levine 2005:2); synagogue could take place anywhere and missionally went everywhere, and for Yeshua's synagogues when two or three gather in His name (Matthew 18:20).

Fourthly, "[t]he functionaries of the synagogue were not restricted to a single caste or socio-religious group. In principle, anyone could head the institution." (Levine 2005:2), and illustrates how the Yeshua synagogues could duplicate and infiltrate the whole Roman empire without an educated laity or a typical church organisation. Don't the typical educated laity and church organisation of today confuse gifts with talents in the church?

Fifthly, and that brings us to hermeneutics, the understanding of Scriptures were embedded in a communal reading and studying (Levine 2005:3), even with a Parush like Paul present, everyone was on a level playing field (Levine 2005:2).

To understand Paul, and the hermeneutical legacy he has imparted into Yeshua's synagogues, we have to understand him as a Parush, coupled with the communal reading and studying of the Scriptures that took place in these synagogues planted by him.

The first thing to notice is that Paul was a Parush from the school of Hillel, and this had particular meaning in his fallouts with the Judizers, like in the book of Galatians and the book of Philippians where he calls them dogs (Philippians 3:2), who, although they were fellow Parushes, were not from the school of Hillel, but from the school of Shammai. The same was the case with Yeshua whose negativity towards the Parushes was particularly directed towards the school of Shammai, while the school of Hillel was viewed with tolerance (Garcia 2010:11). In turn the tolerance of the school of Hillel towards Yeshua's followers can best be seen in the words of Gamaliel, the Parush from the school of Hillel and grandson of Hillel himself, who in Acts 5 advised the Sanhedrin not to act against the apostles since when their actions had a human origin it would perish, but when from YAHWEH they would find themselves going against YAHWEH.

The school of Hillel was tolerant towards gentiles, and even welcomed them in the synagogue assemblies, while the school of Shammai wouldn't want anything to do with gentiles, and even to the extent that Shammai had passed 18 edicts to force separation between Jews and Gentiles (Garcia 2010:8).

A major expression of Paul's roots and causes of conflict with the school of Shammai is given to us in Acts 15, as Vince Garcia illustrates (Garcia 2010:16). The Judizers from the school of Shammai expected Paul's converts to become *Ger tzedeks*, which means full converts to Torah-based Judaism called proselytes, but the verdict of the counsel of Acts 15 was that of the school of Hillel and that it was good enough for Paul's converts to become *Ger toshavs*, which means gentiles who chose to worship YAHWEH without becoming Jewish proselytes and thus weren't necessarily circumcised or obligated to keep the full Torah. They were, however, obligated to observe the Noachide mitzvot. The seven Noachide laws were given to Adam by YAHWEH, and affirmed to Noah (Clorfene 1987:7-

10), as the law for the whole of humanity and is good enough for the school of Hillel to ensure salvation for non-Jews. Vince Garcia (Garcia 2010:16) has a nice little table illustrating the comparison between the Noachide law and the mitzvot of Acts 15,

Mitzvot given in Acts 15	Noachide counterpart
Abstain from meats offered to idols	Abstain from idolatry
Abstain from fornication	Abstain from fornication/incest
Abstain from blood	Abstain from murder
Abstain from eating things strangled	Abstain from eating a living animal
	Abstain from theft
	Abstain from cursing God
	Establish courts of justice

In regards to the three mitzvot not included in Acts 15, he states that they were unquestionably consistent with Messianic living even if not specifically stated. He goes on to say that even the law of establishing a court system may actually have been put into practice by the Yeshua synagogues in 1 Corinthians 6 when Paul rebukes them for using pagan courts instead of being judged by “the Saints”, which may refer to such a court system within the synagogue.

The next important thing to notice about our heritage through the school of Hillel is the seven hermeneutical rules of Hillel and how Paul utilises them; of specific importance is rule six and how he devised his defining principle of salvation through faith (anyway the devising principle in the reformation, which has stayed with us ever since). To explain the seven rules of Hillel I used the exposition of Rabbi Halahawi (Halahawi 2007:394-8), although he has no intention of illustrating how Paul used it per se, he still has a good exposition and he gives examples of how they were used in the B'rit Hadashah in general; for a more Paulinian application I used the exposition of James Trimm, where indicated (he wrongly assumes Paul as the author of the book of Hebrews – as I've noticed the most

Messianic Jews do; but let us say Paul had a direct contribution to the book of Hebrews, or the letter to the Hebrews is a framework of a summary of Paul's main convictions (Gibson 2010:246-57), or let us just acknowledge the widespread Rabbinic influence in the Yeshua synagogues):

1. Kal Vahomer (light and heavy) - what applies in a less important case will certainly apply in a more important case

Rabbi Halahawi says Yeshua often used this form of argument, e.g. *"If a man receives circumcision on the Sabbath, so that the Law of Moses should not be broken, are you angry with me because I made a man completely well on the Sabbath?"* (John 7:23)

Examples of Paul's use of this rule is Romans 5:8-9, 10, 15, 17; 11:12, 24; 1 Corinthians 9:11-12; 12:22; 2 Corinthians 3:7-9, 11; Philippians 2:12; Philemon 1:16 (Trimm [c.a.]

2. G'zerah shavah (Equivalence of expressions) - an analogy is made between two separate texts on the basis of a similar phrase, word or root

The example James Trimm (Trimm [c.a.]) gives, is Hebrews 3:6-4:13 compared with Psalms 95:7-11 (the first example of how Trimm wrongly states Paul as the author of the letter to the Hebrews)

3. Binyan ab mikathub echad (Building up a "family" from a single text) - a principle is found in several passages: a consideration found in one of them applies to all

Hebrews 9:11-22 applies "blood" from Exodus 24:8 (Trimm [c.a.]

4. Binyab ab mishene kethubim (Building up a "family" from two or more texts) - A principle is established by relating two texts together: The principle can then be applied to other passages

In Hebrews 1:5-14, James Trimm (Trimm [c.a.]) states how Paul sites the following to build a rule that the Messiah is of a higher order than angels:

1. Psalm 2:7 = Hebrews 1:5
2. 2 Samuel 7:14 = Hebrews 1:5

3. Deuteronomy 32:43/Psalm 97:7/(Neh. 9:6) = Hebrews 1:6
 4. Psalm 104:4 = Hebrews 1:7
 5. Psalm 45:6-7 = Hebrews 1:8-9
 6. Psalm 102:25-27 = Hebrews 1:10-12
 7. Psalm 110:1 = Hebrews 1:13
5. Kelal uferat (The general and the particular) - A general principle may be restricted by a particularisation of it in another verse – or, conversely, a particular rule may be extended into a general principle
 6. Kayotze bo mimekom akhar (Analogy made from another passage) - two parashot may seem to conflict until compared with a third, which has points of general, though not necessarily verbal, similarity

Paul used this rule to resolve a conflict between two Tanakh parashot and so came up with salvation through trust

1. Habakkuk 2:4 - *“The just shall live by faith”*
2. and Psalms 14:1-3 - *“There is none righteous, no, not one”*

Paul resolves the conflict with Genesis 15:6 - *“Abraham believed Elohim, and it was accounted to him for righteousness/to be just”*. Take note faith/belief can also be translated as trust.

It's really interesting, almost every time I ask someone to tell me what faith is, for one thing they say it's trust, but when it's trust, why not use the word trust, why use faith? Every time a definition of faith is given to me, I ask them “why not use the definition instead, especially if it's only one word like trust?”

Rabbi Shalomim Halahawi (Halahawi 2007:397-8) also illustrates Paul's similar resolution with two other conflicting Tanakh parashot:

1. Psalm 62:12 - *“Elohim will render to each one according to his deeds”*

2. Psalm 32:1-2 - *"Blessed are those whose lawless deeds are forgiven, and whose sins are covered; Blessed is the man whom YAHWEH shall not impute sin"*

The same Genesis 15:6 is the resolution.

7. Davar hilmad me'anino (Explanation obtained from context) - The total context, not just the isolated statement must be considered for an accurate exegesis

The example James Trimm (Trimm [c.a.]) gives is Romans 14:1, *"I know and am convinced by the Lord Yeshua that nothing is unclean of itself; but to him who considers anything to be unclean, to him it is unclean."* He says Paul is not abrogating the kosher laws, but pointing out to gentile believers in the assembly at Rome (within his larger context of Romans) that:

1. things are unclean not of themselves but because YAHWEH said they are unclean, and
2. they must remember the higher principle, that their "freedom to eat what is unclean" is secondary to the salvation of unsaved Jews who are observing their behaviour, as they are looking for "gentiles coming into the faith of Israel" to be acting in an "appropriate manner" as a true test of Paul's ministry (and Yeshua's Messiahship).

Paul most definitely confined in these seven rules for his hermeneutics, as he was *geprägt* (shaped) through his education, although we also see him using a Philo (ca. 20 BC-50 AD) like⁶⁸ extreme allegory a few times, like e.g. in the case of Hagar and Sarah in Galatians

⁶⁸ The question is what Philo are we talking about, since the Christianised Philo of the allegorical tradition that utilised him is one, but then there is also the Philo, a devoted Jew, that was a contemporary of Paul? Hava Tirosh-Samuelsan, in *The Jewish Study Bible*, has the following to say about Philo, who apparently "... rejected a radical allegorical reading of the Bible and argued that those who advocated it merely wished to assimilate into Hellenistic Roman society and abandon Judaism." (Tirosh-Samuelsan 2009). The extreme Philo like allegory I'm referring to is then rather the tradition, the historical Philo allegorically hidden in the resuscitated simulacrum to a simulation, since the deeply-seated Greek philosophically educated Philo did use allegory for an analogy to be made in the first place. The sentiment of Philo is the extreme allegorical. Am I right to say it is easier to stomach this sentiment than that of Newton, Einstein and

4:21-31. Let us say for now Paul used a mixture of a literal and allegorical methodology, although, contrary to what people like Anthony Thiselton (Thiselton 2009:49-51) says, I rather believe the allegorical is all that Paul could do since he was caught in the same hermeneutical dilemma of no real access to history – everything was interpreted with an application as the teleology. The literal was most definitely also there, in what Hans Frei calls, the realistic narrative (Frei 1974:14), but that's the realism under the allegorical guardian.

A definition of the allegorical I would like to go with, on the surface, is that of John Battle (Battle 2007:7.1-7.2) which he uses in his course called *Biblical Interpretation* at Western Reformed Seminary:

1. Allegory - an extended metaphor (an implied comparison)
2. Allegorical interpretation - treating material which is not evidently an allegory as though it were an allegory; giving a new, often arbitrary meaning to a text without sufficient basis; “spiritualising”

All hermeneutics are extended metaphors in the search for a teleological application, and so an allegorical interpretation. In this extension of metaphors I would like to include typology and analogy in allegory, since they are also particular forms of extended metaphors. By that I would like to render allegory the antonymous umbrella term of the literal. Somehow taking deconstruction and poststructuralism seriously, that all are perpetual metaphors without a singularity, we can do nothing but agree everything is allegory.

So back to history; the hermeneutics of the Yeshua synagogues of the first century AD was passed on to the second century AD, and there the obvious allegorical interpretation certainly had the upper hand. In the school of Alexandria, founded by Clement of Alexandria (ca. 150-215) through Origen (ca. 185–ca. 254), that followed Clements of Alexandria, the allegorical or spiritual, as it was also called, championed in Scriptural hermeneutics. Diodore or Tarsus (ca. 330-390), that founded the Antiochen school, countered the allegorical with a literal or historical hermeneutics, but “we should not suppose that the Antiochenes were wooden literalists who rejected metaphorical,

Riemann as I've also done? Do you see the relativity?

figurative, or typological reading. By “historical” meaning, Diodore meant that texts and authors are conditioned by their situations or settings-in-life. Diodore describes this as a guiding principle in exegesis” (Thiselton 2009:109).

Augustine of Hippo proposed an intermediate way between the two schools, but “[i]n practice Augustine forsook most of his own principles and tended towards excessive allegorising...” (Virkler 2007:55). It was John Cassian (c. 360–435) who put forward the four senses of Scripture (Lacoste 2005:19) that trademarked the medieval hermeneutics, although subservient to tradition. These four senses are (Lacoste 2005:663):

1. A literal or historical sense
2. An allegorical sense
3. An anagogic sense (prophesying eternal life)
4. A tropological or moral sense

George Eldon Ladd says in medieval times “the Bible as interpreted by church tradition was the source of dogmatic theology” (Ladd 1993:1). What it means in practice is that the four senses were utilised, but only the last commentary, building on the previous commentaries, was authoritative and so the Scriptures, as the first commentary or source of all commentaries, almost lost significance. It was such a dire state that “[i]n the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, dense ignorance prevailed as to the contents of the Bible. There were doctors of divinity who had never read it through” (Berkhof 1969:25) and “Rome had come heavily to rely on the Church Fathers and Aquinas virtually in place of the Bible (Thiselton 2009:129).

In the Reformation a paradigm shift started away from the allegorical to the literal sense of the Scriptures, although the allegorical wasn't ditched by the reformers yet; Luther's reservation about allegory only grew progressively (Thiselton 2009:129). The progressive shift to the literal sense, the history behind the text, reached it's peak in the rise of Biblical Criticism in the 18th century when even the inspiration of the Scriptures were ditched. Anthony Thiselton attributes J. S. Semler as the real founder of biblical criticism who argued that the text and canon of the Scriptures owed their origin entirely to historical factors and conditions, and disregarded arguments about divine inspiration or doctrine

(Thiselton 2009:139).

The thing to notice is that the reformers, although moving away from the medieval four senses to only the first literal sense, didn't question the historical and realistic narrative of the Scriptures. Hans Frei (Frei 1974:1-3) points out three things that were held dear in the historical and realistic narrative of the Scriptures by the reformers, but which served as the foci for the rebellion in the Enlightenment. The three things are:

1. It seemed clear that a Scriptural story was to be read literally, it followed automatically that it referred to and describe actual historical occurrences.
2. If the real historical world described by the several Scriptural stories is a single world of one temporal sequence, there must in principle be one cumulative story to depict it where the several Scriptural stories narrating sequential segments in time must fit together into one narrative.
3. Since the world truly rendered by combining Scriptural narratives into one was indeed the one and only real world, it must in principle embrace the experience of any present age and reader.

The modernist historical-critical decimation of the Scriptures reached its apogee in the 20th century when hermeneutics fragmented the interpretation of the Scriptures to say whatever the pre-understanding is. Looking back at this Enlightenment endeavour until the meaninglessness of hermeneutics in the 20th century, the first thing to notice is that they did exactly the same hermeneutics as the catholic church in the medieval times by acknowledging only the last commentary as authoritative. The last commentary for them was first Kant and then Descartes and then Hegel and then..., while the Scriptures were so low down the list that it had no authority. Secondly they didn't notice that exactly this allegory they were rejecting is what they were doing; they couldn't notice that they were not going back in time to scrutinise the historical, they were bringing the historical to them in the conditioning of a pre-understanding. In short they couldn't notice that they didn't understand anything in its original historical context, only in the allegorical transplantation to the present pre-understood context, while this pre-understood context was purely inflated by the last authoritative commentary for them.

In the metaphysical we speak of presuppositions, in hermeneutics we talk about pre-understandings, the same thing in different contexts.

In the 20th century deconstruction and poststructuralism again did us the favour, this time in hermeneutics, by illustrating that in modernist hermeneutics the text can say anything or everything, so no conclusive hermeneutical interpretation is possible. Modernism destroyed itself once again, since without conclusive hermeneutics the premises of modernism itself is unintelligible – it's a bubbling in tongues no one can understand.

So again this is where we are again, from where we have to construct the right hermeneutics from this rouble. The first clue, in constructing this postmodern hermeneutics is in the works of Hans-Georg Gadamer (a German). Anthony Thiselton says “Gadamer has done more than anyone to dethrone Descartes and the Enlightenment as arbiters of meaning and truth. We can never put the clock back before *Truth and Method*” (Thiselton 2009:226). The clue from Gadamer is that hermeneutics is rooted in art, as opposed to science. Gadamer says:

My thesis, then, is that the being of art cannot be dened as an object of an aesthetic consciousness because, on the contrary, the aesthetic attitude is more than it knows of itself. It is a part of the event of being that occurs in presentation, and belongs essentially to play as play. (Gadamer 1989:115)

In short the meaning is in the play itself and not in the parts of the play. To couple that to what we said yesterday, narrative is thus a play since meaning is central to narrative. When narrative is a play it's also a Virtual Reality, and when its a Virtual Reality the understanding of Virtual Media enlightens us on the understanding of a play, that's the second clue to take in constructing a postmodern hermeneutics.

However, before we can draw these parallels we first have to discuss the Gadamer-Habermas debate (two Germans) and Paul Ricoeur that chose the middle way. In the Gadamer-Habermas debate Gadamer defends the hermeneutical circle, while Habermas states the possible transcendental escape from the circle (Hoy 1978:118). The hermeneutical circle comes from Heidegger and argues “[a]ny interpretation which is to contribute understanding, must already have understood what is to be interpreted” (Heidegger 2001:194). In short Gadamer says that the pre-understanding conditions all understanding, while Habermas argues that ideology conditions understanding so that we

can call it explanation. Ricoeur goes the middle way and holds onto both in the first of his colossal trilogy *Time and Narrative* (Ricoeur 1984:361-2).

In the second person narration I tend to agree with Ricoeur, and precisely recognise this middle way in the modernist hermeneutical endeavour to eradicate myth from the medieval and modernist traditions⁶⁹. On the one hand they were utilising the last authoritative commentary in understanding, as we said, but then they were also existentially forcing an

⁶⁹ While I tend to agree with Ricoeur, am I placing myself in a long interpretationist tradition of an object and subject dialectics, or am I doing something new with interpretation? I would rather say the second, that analogically extends Ricoeur, as much as that is possible, with his philosophical anthropology that concurs with Lakoff and Johnson's *Philosophy in the Flesh* (Lakoff 1999). For Ricoeur “a religious text is only properly understood when it leads to action (Maimela 1998:301) – which I call the teleological application; the mechanics of this action, for Ricoeur, is in discourse where the action is interaction and where the interpretative activity proceeds by way of a dialectic between guessing and validating from which understanding is derived (Dauenhauer 2011). I am sorry to say, in Ricoeur I still see a first and third person hermeneutics, and thus (an) individual(s) doing the interpretation (even if it is a group). My reserved and analogical agreement is the action/reaction in narrative/discourse that lives us, with new metaphors in narrative expansion, but this is pretty much where it stops, since my reciprocal is not subject-object, but second person informationing. The hermeneutics I propose, with its dynamics of exegesis and eisegesis in an allegorical interpretation, is a nonmediation and nonlocal interaction/interplay/ubuntuing/dependent arising between Virtual Identities. In nonmediation the Scriptures are an oral tradition in a nonlocal hologram (all information everywhere) of Virtual Identities (the apostle Paul that I know is my/our virtual identity of Paul) where belonging (with YAHWEH) comes before suspectedly believing (although episteme), being before knowing, having before understanding. The understanding is in ubuntuing/dependant arising, in becoming together in the community dynamics of belonging (the hidden curriculum). The (new) metaphors (simulations as resuscitated simulacra) are nutrition for the community to become – the explanation. Interpretation is not in an idealism, but a becoming together. What is the text then that we call the Scriptures that disappear in nonmediation? Why this book and the scope of this book (remember the Omnisignificance I revered to when I defined my use of Rabbinic), and no other? Because this book is the personification of the Torah, and this Torah is Yeshua the Messiah. Ariel and D’vorah Berkowitz point out that Yeshua the Messiah was called haTorah by Yeshua's followers after the apostles (Sawyer 2002:16). For the early church both the written and oral realistic narrative was the personification of the Messiah Yeshua. David Stern says that “One of the most surprising discoveries I made in the course of preparing the Jewish New Testament is that the New

ideology on the explanation, one that purposefully alleviated the ghost in the body to godlike status. Modernism is both a tradition and an ideology.

The middle way is the allegorical embodied: on the one hand there's (the (social) construction of new) metaphors (of life), which is the tradition, but because it's a new metaphor (of life) by what it's not, it's an ideology because when it's what it's not it's not tradition⁷⁰. An ideology is then an extended metaphor and then an allegory as we stated in the definition of an allegory to be. We ideologically read meaning into things, but because it's narrative it's a communal heritage we bring to it, thus pre-understanding. Narrative is both a force and a tradition: a force because we are being lived by narrative, but a tradition because narrative is in block time and we are moving with the bookmark.

Take note, by highlighting myth in the medieval and modernist traditions I don't exclude the reformation tradition that is rather a tunnel vision in a single dimension.

To be fair to Gadamer I think he is correct with his *sensus communis* when he says,

it appears that *sensus communis* is not primarily a formal capacity, an intellectual faculty to be used, but already embraces a sum of judgments and criteria for judgment that determine its contents. (Gadamer 1989:28)

and is something of the narrative that lives us. For Gadamer community is central to hermeneutics.

Just like narrative-consciousness is both collective consciousness and collective unconsciousness, so narrative-hermeneutics is both (pre-)understanding and explanation/ideology. Understanding a movie then is both a communal understanding, a

Covenant itself has actually been given as Torah... The verse which hides this extremely well kept secret is Hebrews 8:6” (Stern 2009:Location 842-8), which was according to him obvious for the first audience. How do we know it is Yeshua the Messiah? Because we are (vertically and horizontally) ubuntuing with Him in and through the Ruach HaKodesh and therefore we know/yada/intimately encounter the Person that is being personified – the chicken before the egg. Bryan Hollon says “the bible is to the church what memory is to the mind ” (Hollon 2003), in the Yale University post-liberal tradition. This is current and active memory, but psychologically virtual in selective memory and narrative charting. To adopt Bryan Hollon's words for my use I would say the Scriptures are the block narrative holographic memoirs of the one (interspersified) community.

70 Am I not just saying the same thing, so that tradition and ideology actually conflate?

narrative one enjoys or dislikes in its sense making, but also the explanation of the movie is a narrative that ideologically changes us⁷¹. After no movie we can go back home exactly the same, even if we detested the movie; if that wasn't the case why does the advertisement industry spend so much money on television commercials?

Why is this the case?

This brings us now to the narrative-hermeneutics I want to propose. My proposal is that we don't have to look far to think how Scriptural hermeneutics should be conducted, the hermeneutics of Virtual Reality around us is already the narrative-hermeneutics of the allegorical embodied. My proposal is that there is only one hermeneutics, because there is only one HyperReality in which both the Scriptures and Virtual Reality play off, and so narrative-hermeneutics of HyperReality embraces all⁷².

For my definition of HyperReality I'm going to use the one I coined in my MTh (Nortje 2005:66):

HyperReality is the all embracing description of the constructed abstract body of metaphors/meaning by which the overall human language is negotiated and consequently by which (more than) reality is understood by - it is a map of the

71 The change is the ubuntuing, dependent arising of the community. Although the one watching might be a single instance of the hologram, the unique in the diversified, the change is strangely enough still the moveability of the community. It is like after the hype of The Matrix (The Matrix 1999) movie's box office weekend, it was the talk of the town and it is amazing the lay philosophising that took place in this event. The common census moveability of consensus was most noticeable in the understanding/ubuntuing/dependent arising of the movie in these circles that I, e.g., moved in: I could talk to my friends about this movie with the same consensus we do during or after a rugby match. I have to say this movie had been the most realistic Sci-Fi movie I've ever seen.

72 Is this again a reductionism, or rather just a simplification? I opt for the second, or is there no difference? I think there is, as it almost takes a doctor's degree to really try and understand the Cartesian idealism/cognition (a contradiction since cognition means knowing together), but ubuntuing is easily understood in Africa by most (due to dependent arising). Or differently stated, does the apparent single arising of the Cartesian idealism really make such exclusive sense, or does the dependent arising of ubuntu not make more common sense, a community sensibility? Do you see how I play exclusive sense off against common sense, *sensus communis*? Sadly to say, the apparent single arising of Kant is only an illusion of an apparent expression of or for the hologram, it is indeed an expression in the hologram, but a fickle expression.

abstract 'more than the real'.⁷³

In short HyperReality is the reality more than the sum of its parts; HyperReality is the meaning invested world I/we have moulded from virtual-energy, thus from the physical to the metaphysical to the physical⁷⁴.

The thing is, in this HyperReality we are construed with a Virtual Identity, everything is construed with a Virtual Identity so that the lines between 'realities' vanish: the identity of Rambo in the Rambo movies is just as real as the identity of you and I. How real has my identity not become to you in these discussions to date? I'm sure pretty real. Do you see the mechanics of Virtual Identities at work⁷⁵?

I'm a lover of novels, suspense novels. If I have to list all the novels I have read, just the last ten years, the list will be pretty long. The thing is, what I like about novels is that exactly the narrative-hermeneutics of art, on the face value, is being utilised: every novel is a message, and novels from the Yeshua followers even intentionally more so, that's now when the theology is most apparent. Sometimes the theology blurs the aesthetics of the narrative, and then my narrative-hermeneutics can rather turn into a distaste for the plot

73 The word *description* is the ubuntu/dependent arising narrative of what the community has been becoming.

74 Don't confuse this zigzag with modernist pragmatism. The physical is not apparently dualistically differentiated from the metaphysical, like oil and water, but rather what they become together. Again, it's not the unity in diversity, but diversity in unity.

75 Do you see what I am doing with my story? The same hermeneutics of dependent arising I propose for the synagogues in the vertical and horizontal lines, with the accompanying oral Scriptural voice, is what I'm expecting of my story. My doctor's dissertation is my proposed synagoguing in action. Jeffrey Goh says that George Lindbeck claims that “the primary function of the canonical narrative” is to render an “identity description” of God as an active Agent, centred on Jesus Christ” (Goh 2000:228); for me, however, the whole (ha)Torah, since my overlapping with the Postliberal endeavour claims “The Hegemony of an Exclusive and Comprehensive Narrative-Genre” (Goh 2000:230) that comprises the Tanakh, with the B'rit Hadasha in the Tanakh. That's now if we want to counter the critique of, but also draw on, the “Jewish scholars who argue that the Christian account of the unity of the biblical narrative and the identifiability of the God of Jesus Christ is achieved only through a misunderstanding of the Jewish account of God in the Hebrew Scriptures. Their work strengthens our context-awareness that Scripture readings are inextricably community – and tradition-relative.” (Goh 2000:229), a cognitive relativism.

and characters. On the other hand, when it's a good novel, which is fortunately most of the time, all the Virtual Identities converge into a single space, narrative virtual space, so that I become part of the narrative world of the novel and narrative-hermeneutics happen from the inside out, in other words, dependant arising takes place.

In an essay called *From Cyber Space to Cybernetic Space: Rethinking the Relationship between Real and Virtual Spaces*, by Ananda Mitra and Rae Lynn Schwartz at the Department of Communication at Wake Forest University, the authors argue a rethinking of space. In summary they state the perception of one space, which I call narrative virtual space, to be the place where the negotiations are the sum of the behaviours, and where the behaviour in the real can become influenced by the discourse encountered in Virtual Reality (cyber is the word they use) (Mitra 2001).

In another extensive essay published in the *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* (Lombard 1997), Matthew Lombard and Theresa Ditton (affiliated with the Department of Broadcasting, Telecommunications, & Mass Media at Temple University) argue that media is not only mediated to the individual, but a realist barrier is rather being crossed. They refer to the perceptual illusion of nonmediation and continue to say that the "illusion of nonmediation" occurs when a person fails to perceive or acknowledge the existence of a medium in his or her communication environment and responds as he or she would if the medium were not there. The illusion of nonmediation can occur in two distinct ways:

- a) the medium can appear to be invisible or transparent and function as a large open window would, with the medium user and the medium content (objects and entities) sharing the same physical environment; and
- b) the medium can appear to be transformed into something other than a medium, a social entity.

This nonmediation is exactly what takes place when I get into a nice novel. A good example of this nonmediation was when I decided to switch to ebooks, rather than reading paper books due to both financial reasons and the availability of books online. What happened is I picked up a fancy smartphone on a contract in Germany from a third party cellphone provider that in no way could cover the costs of the smartphone. According to a

first party cellphone provider I asked about this, he said that the only way this third party provider could offer this phone at this ridiculously low price was through reimporting; whatever the case may be, I got a fancy Nokia N95 8GB smartphone on which I could read ebooks, and that for the price of an average phone⁷⁶. In summary, I accidentally got drawn into ebooks.

Back to the ebooks; everyone wonders how convenient it could be to read a book on such a small display, but do you know what, one to two minutes into reading a book, I don't even recognise or notice that I'm reading a book on a cellphone. The principle of nonmediation takes place. Even with a normal paper book, just think about the words and letters used to mediate the written language, not to mention the language itself, don't they get lost in the same nonmediation? O yes, once you're in a good novel you don't even notice the printed words and letters anymore, the one narrative virtual space enfolds you⁷⁷.

In this one narrative virtual space the narrative-hermeneutics of art takes place. The one narrative virtual space is the only space that there is, that's now if quantum mechanics prove to be right, since when all are waves, information, what's the difference between the different informationings? Nothing! HyperReality is then literally cocooning everything with one hermeneutics serving all.

As a defining example I would like to highlight one novel I have ready by Randy Alcorn; the name of the novel is *Deception* (Alcorn 2008). *Deception* is the third book in a trilogy. I've read the whole trilogy, but it's the third one that really crawled under my skin⁷⁸. The

76 This was still a fancy smartphone at the time of this writing, but who would care about a Nokia N95 at the time of writing this footnote? It would be annoying to say the least, after I had a Samsung Omnia II and lately a Samsung Galaxy Tab (so I got a Tablet).

77 The same principle is a keyboard: if you would ask me to draw a keyboard on a piece of paper, I would not know where to start and certainly I won't be able to draw a keyboard faultlessly. I type intuitively and somehow the keyboard is lost in a nonmediation of what I want to type – my fingers do the walking of what my brain is thinking. My brain and fingers are nonlocal, but diversified instances of the whole me/us.

78 The mechanics of the Virtual Identities are illustrated by the fact that when I bought the same book for my mother, she got annoyed by the preaching she experienced in the book, and so rather than the Virtual Identities of the characters that came alive, like with me, the author's Virtual Identity stood out for her and annoyed her.

trilogy is nothing else than (dependently aroused) Randy Alcorn preaching/explaining/ideologuing, but in the third book most effective in my case. It had been so effective that it even influenced my diet in imitation of Ollie Chandler, the main character, for a time after I closed the ebook. The hidden curriculum was effectively at work, like the typifying of my parents and culture and milieu that chiselled me to be a typical South African (remember typifying is an instance of allegorising). A few properties are most evident in this experience I had with the book *Deception*:

1. There was no mediation; I shared the one narrative virtual space with Randy Alcorn's figurative characters, plot, stage and scenery. The scenery was partly his words and partly my imagination, but still to me it was nothing else than sharing/shaping a narrative virtual space.
2. The Virtual Identity of Ollie Chandler and the other characters were as real as the people I rub shoulders with everyday, like Rambo is real in the character of Rambo, although I'm certain Sylvester Stallone is a different personality outside this character – like Rocky Balboa is a different character than Rambo, but both are Sylvester Stallone.
3. Ubuntuing took place: my humanness was shaped through the humanness of the characters of the narrative virtual space. Ubuntuing constitutes associations/assimilations/nonlocality and in turn constitutes understanding/dependent arising leading to explanation/hidden curriculum, in hermeneutics, and in this case certainly ideologuing – new nutrition.
4. Narrative virtual space mediates temporality. The space of the novel *Deception* I will never enter again, although I still have a memory of it, but should I read this novel again the space will certainly be constructed differently in the more details I'll pick up and the 'more matured' [like meat] collective (un)consciousness I'll bring to it. Narrative virtual space is consequently relative, like time, and so temporary.
5. Leaving the narrative virtual space of the novel *Deception* left me empty and longing for a couple of days, and thus with a wish to go back into this space. I felt something like a Bodhisattvas that had to leave one space and go back to another space, the space of going on with 'real' life again. The thing is though the temporal

space of *Deception* had a missional incentive on me, once I was back in the space of normal chores and errands I longed to bring the *Deception* space to the space of running errands and doing chores.

As with this event *Deception*, I want to bring these five properties to our Scriptural narrative-hermeneutics. Before that though I just want to point out that Ubuntuing is then a synonymous term for narrative-hermeneutics. Ubuntuing has to do with experience, but when “experiences are [somehow] only psychological phenomena” (James 2002:492), experience decomposes in a collective (un)consciousness, as we discussed Saturday afternoon in our topic *Psycho-logic lost in Social-physics*. Ubuntuing is the collective interconnectedness of dependent arising in narrative that lives us. Narrative-hermeneutics is thus part and partial of the dynamics of narrative and bring us to community, and back to synagogue, and so also to Scriptural narrative-hermeneutics.

Preliminary I also want to ask where things have gone wrong in modernism with regards to these five properties of narrative-hermeneutics in the narrative virtual space? Easy, things have gone wrong in the choice of the narrative virtual space, namely that of the last commentaries over and above the Scriptures. The ubuntuing was in the narrative virtual space of the authors of these commentaries; the second/multi dimensional person narration in this narrative virtual space was not with the authors of the Scriptures and Holy Spirit, but with the authors of the last commentary, and with science. The same thing went wrong with Catholicism, and even with some of the Reformers like Calvin that evidently stuck Greek philosophy on the Scriptures as an educated humanist lawyer, as we already indicated.

But now you'll ask, what do we do differently? Nothing really, it just boils down to the synagogue/assembly we belong to. Do you remember point five, in listing the attributes of a synagogue, where we said that the understanding of Scriptures in the synagogue was embedded in a communal reading and studying (Levine 2005:3)? Isn't that exactly the thing about the modernist theologians that were part and parcel of the “...synagogue of the Adversary/Satan” (Revelation 2:9)?⁷⁹ The dimensions of narration are horizontal and

⁷⁹ I know this is a radical generalisation, but again this has to be seen in the light of the modernist crime right now – the resuscitated simulacrum to a simulation. The generalisation is only the theologians in relation to the crime and not their relationships with YAHWEH per se – we might

vertical in time, embraced by the primordial language – the Logos and Holy Spirit in the interference of waves.

4. Biblical narratives as string succession

So the first thing in bringing the five properties to the Scriptures are to notice the horizontal and vertical time lines of the *sensus communis* of the community we belong to; the community with YAHWEH should be the horizontal line, while the Scriptures the vertical line, and both together the one synagogue of narrative virtual space. The second thing, enclosed in this notion, is the nonmediation in this one narrative virtual space. This means the scenery and characters of the Scriptures become part of this space, just like the scenery and characters of the horizontal line. Thirdly, from this follows that the Virtual Identity of all the characters, vertically and horizontally, are equally real and tangible. Fourthly, in this tank/space ubuntuing can take place in the hidden curriculum, constituting understanding, which in turn can lead to explanation, and so to ideologueing⁸⁰. Fifthly, this synagogue conveys temporality, because when it's earmarked, with the deposit of the Holy Spirit (Ephesians 1:14), as a tank/space of the New Heaven and Earth, it's temporary on the old heaven and earth. Lastly, the contrast of leaving the synagogue to run errands and do chores on the old heaven and earth should be the mixed feeling of a Bodhisattvas, like Paul, who's "*...deliberating, because his pulled between two ways in a happy dilemma, on the one side he desires to depart and be with the Messiah Yeshua, for this is much better, but on the other side to remain in his body is more necessary for... the Philippians' sake.*" (Philippians 1:23-24).

In this synagogue the Scriptures can be nothing else than the realistic narrative of Hans Frei (Frei 1974:14), in other words the event of taking the Scriptures on face value, and subsequently the 'last' commentary (don't we naturally take the latest commentary on face value, like the latest movie in the theatre?) George Lindbeck rightly argues that pre-eminently authoritative texts that are canonical writings of religious communities, for those who are steeped in them, no world is/becomes more real than the ones they create (Lindbeck 1984: 117), so that Scriptures are not simply a source of precepts and truths, but the interpretive framework for all reality, like it used to be in pre-modern hermeneutics

even be sharing heaven with Immanuel Kant one day (again I hope so).

⁸⁰ I would be lying if this ideologueing is not the missional motive of this dissertation.

(Lindbeck 2002:204).

If the Holy Spirit constitutes the synagogue, the synagogue is the Shekhinah (dwelling place) of YAHWEH, which in turn should be the hermeneutical norm – how this Shekhinah can be taken into the world! Hans Frei says, “...the central persuasion of Christian theology, not so much to defend as to be set out, is that Jesus Christ is the presence of YAHWEH in the Church to the world...” (Frei 1992:8).

When Erasmus Van Niekerk calls the church the golden calf in history (Van Niekerk 2006), I want to make sure that no one confuses church with synagogue. I want to draw a stark contrast between the synagogues Paul planted, and which duplicated/multiplied and spread all over the whole known world of the day, and the church that emerged from these synagogues, say after the Edict of Milan in 313 AD. That some traces of transformation were already evident before 313 AD could be possible, but has no bearing on the contrast I would like to depict. For me the shift rather took place after 313 AD when the Church (through the act of Constantine) formally entered the political realm (Lacoste 2005:303), but also when paganism was accommodated from the *basilica* to church. Van Niekerk (Van Niekerk 2006:20-1) illustrates how the very mundane idea of a *templum* was taken into what became church. The *templum* was as a measured spatial surface, and enclosure or room in ancient Roman society, and this allocation was mainly used for a site on the ground or in a part of the sky distinguished by an *augur*, a person reading and interpreting signs and omens, where signs and omens, *auspices*, from the gods could be received and voiced. The function of these separate sites or spatial enclosures in the Roman world was strictly connected to the gods that were dedicated and allocated to a particular *templum*⁸¹.

In short, the church became a cop-out of the Tanakh temple as the house of YAHWEH.

The contrast in worldviews between church and synagogue is most evident in their

⁸¹ *Pagan Christianity?: Exploring the Roots of Our Church Practices* by Frank Viola and George Barna (Viola 2008) is a real shocker on this issue, and a must read I think, but such a confrontation that the only conclusion I could come to is that YAHWEH indeed accommodates culture. For one thing I have seen and experienced myself how YAHWEH has worked in and through sermons, and I'm convinced of all the precious life/blood, peasant life/blood, that has been pored into church buildings, a lot of it has indeed been true devotion/ubuntuing with YAHWEH in their respective contexts.

respective *concepts*/notions of temporality and space. The Yeshua synagogues from the first to the second century held that YAHWEH's "new order can break in with all its splendor only after cataclysmic judgment" (Arnold 2007:4), because the "present world-age is doomed" (Arnold 2007:4). This cataclysmic judgement was eagerly awaited by them since "[d]eath must come before the resurrection of the flesh... No wonder that Celsus, an enemy of the church, was amazed at the centrality of the resurrection among the Christians" (Arnold 2007:4). Temporality this side of the grave was on the *Tagesordnung* (daily agenda) for these early Yeshua followers. The church, on the other hand, was from the beginning, in its roots, politically and economically motivated on the old heaven and earth as a cop-out of the Sinai covenant.

Concerning this synagogue space, of these early Yeshua followers, in this vertical and horizontal lines, Arnold says,

Whenever the believers found unity in their meetings, especially when they celebrated baptism and the Lord's Supper and the "Lovemeal," the power of [the Messiah's] presence was indisputable. Sick bodies were healed, demons driven out, sins forgiven. People were assured of life and resurrection because they were freed from all their burdens and turned away from their past wrongs... At these times the gathered [Yeshua synagogues] heard the apostolic confession of faith, and readings from Jewish prophetic writings, the Lord's Sayings, and the gospels. Spirit-filled witnesses gave testimonies, the believers called upon [the Messiah] in prayers, gifts were offered and hymns sung in praise of [YAHWEH] and [the Messiah]. (Arnold 2007:6)

The Yeshua followers in these synagogues were truly horizontally and vertically Rabbinically taught, by the Messianic anointing, about all things (1 John 2:27), and that's the narrative-hermeneutics I propose. About the church's hermeneutics, and the heaping up of commentaries, I don't have to repeat anything, deconstruction and poststructuralism literature abound if anyone has doubts about its futility.

The hermeneutics of the anointing of 1 John 2:27, that teaches us all that we should know, is the way to go; my proposal is to stop worrying about how to do right hermeneutics and to trust YAHWEH (other might call it faith) that YAHWEH knows what we should know⁸².

82 In this sense the Reader Response hermeneutics is implisively and predominately what I'm interested in (although analogically by definition): the community in and of the oral Scriptures as we have them today. What the Scriptures are is what YAHWEH has interconnectedly given us in real time cutting through imaginary time. What we have is what YAHWEH wanted us to have.

A notion that is going around lately is called house church; house church is an incentive intending to take church back to what it used to be in the times of the Yeshua's synagogues of the first few centuries. One evening I had a discussion with my mum (Du Plessis 2011) about these house churches and her first question, like so many people, was "What about erring and heresy? Who's going to guard against that?" My answer was simply, "What about all these theologians that were erring, the policemen of the church, that should have protect 'the church' from getting where it is today? Who's really erring?"

Maybe we should just turn the tables around! The thing is, "How can we err in a Shekhinah investing (on purpose a present continues) synagogue?" My norm states that that's impossible. If we err we lose the Shekhinah!

Coming thus far, it is now the time to illustrate the reciprocal translations I've set forth in our discussions so far. You must have been wondering what translation of the Scriptures I've been using; the news is that you won't find such a standard translation anywhere. I'm using, what I would like to call, a reciprocal translation, and is exactly the narrative-hermeneutics I'm proposing at work. These translations are the vertical and the horizontal cutting through each other in my encounters with these passages/people; in other words, these translations are what I have taken out of these passages/from these people in a multi dimensional narration in my intratextual narrative-hermeneutics. Reciprocal is a give and take, an ubuntuing/dependent arising, isn't that exactly the mechanics of the extended metaphor of the allegorical deep down?

There are two translations I've drawn on to assist me, or started off with, authors I have been ubuntuing with on the horizontal line, and so some of my wordings are due to them, and so I want to give them their rightful credit⁸³. They are:

83 In one of my first classes, at the start of my MTh module in Manchester, I came to class with my Greek Bible. On one occasion, after I had quoted from this Greek Bible, Dr. Brouwer (Brouwer 2002) made the comment that ancient Greek is a dead language. He might have a point, but I've come to think that this language is alive and kicking as a resuscitated simulacrum in a present reciprocal ubuntuing with intra- and/or apparent intertextual language scholars. The same pertains to the Hebrew and Aramaic of the Scriptures. My choice for this reciprocal ubuntuing has been with these (ubuntued Virtual Identity) scholars, in these two translations in their respective ubuntuings, as the basis, point of departure, since I'm working from and in the present (can we reinvent the wheel?) Choosing them has been obvious due to the ease of tweaking these

1. The Orthodox Jewish Bible (OJB)
2. Complete Jewish Bible (CJB)

Such a notion of reciprocal translations obviously again opens the can of worms with regards to inspiration, as we already touched on yesterday. It's easy, the norm is the Shekhinah invested synagogue, not the printed letters, remember nonmediation, and so I share Shekhinah invested space, and in that dependent arising is the core of inspiration. If an attempt has to be made to argue a theory I'll overlappingly go with the *dynamical theory* H. Ray Dunning puts forward, following H. Orton Wiley, following John Miley and many other Methodist theologians, who states his theory "as an attempt to mediate between the two extremes and hold proper, if paradoxical, balance between the divine and human factors in the inspiration of the Scriptures" (Dunning 1988:69).

I've used the word dynamic myself in our discussions, but we must just be careful not to use the word in the same ambiguous meaning as faith, as a magic balm to want to cure illogic insanity. Hasn't the word inspiration stepped into the same trap the *concept* of the Trinity has stepped into? O yes I think so. Let us get a way from the modernist categories, this time human and divine, and rather see the Hebraic unity of e.g. "*man and women that shall become one flesh*" (Genesis 2:24), and from that one humanity. To bring that to the inspiration of the Scriptures, it's one vertical and horizontal time space in which YAHWEH is present and actively participating/ubuntuing.

Isn't the Trinity the same Hebraic One YAHWEH and Elohim, outside these modernist categories now? How are our hermeneutics if we don't see it as a Hebraic One? Is it an erring Greek hermeneutics of watertight compartments? Then we can't and won't grasp the Trinity, but also not marriage and humanity and sin and so the list goes on and on and on! Messianic Judaism calls the Trinity, Tri-unity (Cohn-Sherbok 2000:171), which might sound like playing with words, but is marriage not a due-unity and with the children a tri-unity, and with our culture a multi-unity, and with humanity a Adam-unity, and in turn the mechanics of depravity of how the loss of paradise by our first parents meant the loss of

basis translations for the nutrition needed in the intended ubuntuing of this dissertation.

Reciprocal, in this case, is a simulation from the resuscitated simulacrum called paraphrasing: the reciprocal, in this tweaking, is ubuntu paraphrasing imploded with many scholars.

paradise for the whole humanity (depravity is not what we gained, but what we lost, the Shekinah of YAHWEH)?

Mildred Bangs Wynkoop (someone who had a huge influence on me) rightly says, in my reciprocal quoting of her, “The Hebrew... concept is completely different. Man [(a person), but also a married couple, the Trinity, etc.] is a unity, not a union of parts. Sin is something wrong with the whole man, not just the body or human nature. Salvation is the redemption of the whole man, lifting his entire being into the orbit of grace. The body is not sin-bearing but essentially good. Sin is not a substance but rebellion” (Wynkoop 1972:49).

5. Radical inductive contemplation

The reciprocal has also been at work in my hermeneutics of the 'commentaries' I've read in regards to Buddhism, ubuntu, and Greek philosophy. In the synagogal narrative virtual space with YAHWEH I have no intention, per se, to promote Buddhism or ubuntu, just as I have no intention to promote Greek philosophy; actually exactly the contrary, in the second person narration I just want to eat the meat and spit out the bones. In the Shekhinah investing synagogue, and the Shekhinah as norm, why should I worry about erring?

Do you remember our discussion we called *The muddy mess of modernism swept clean*, last Thursday morning? Do you remember the bit about colours, on the lines of Wittgenstein's arguments, and the paint store? The way that I've described it is reciprocal from what I've taken from Wittgenstein as well. The whole thing of deconstruction and poststructuralism, and things that exist by what they are not, and the death of the individual is reciprocal hermeneutics of these schools. That's the ubuntuing that has ideologued me by sharing narrative virtual space with them. Contrary to modernism though, they weren't the last commentaries, the Scriptures are and stay the last commentary. The same applies to Buddhism and ubuntu.

The narrative virtual space with its vertical and horizontal time lines is nothing else than Riemannian logic! The relativity of time and space is Riemannian logic! The fictive narrative discourse, as the medium of this doctor's degree, is space with Riemannian logic.

To bring things to a close, the hermeneutical full circle we have made from the allegorical

to the allegorical, from the second century AD, through the medieval ages, the reformation and modernism, is how the authoritative text, the Scriptures, is taken from one intratextual context to another, that's now from when the original authors put pen to paper to us today, and so a definitive historical setting is lost, only an interpretive one is left – that's the acknowledged and admitted allegorical. The allegorical is also the typological application of us reading ourselves into the Scriptures, and so canonising our own narratives, as we have already indicated yesterday⁸⁴.

The allegorical in the narrative virtual space is also the metaphysics of a dream I set forth: in the allegorical participation in narrative virtual space we are so emotionally intense involved that we know nothing more than this space, this act, with its stage, scenery, characters and plot. We know nothing more than the intratextual/cognitive. In listening to me in these discussions you've entered such a narrative virtual space and you are doing hermeneutics, face value hermeneutics, but you're dreaming, don't you? How do you know you're sharing the same intratextual context than me? How do you know you're doing the narrative-hermeneutics I intended? You can never know that! You can only know the hermeneutics of the narrative virtual space of your dream, your emotionally intense dream that inevitably blocks out all other intratextual contexts.

On the other hand ubuntuing is taking place, because you've radically and inductively carved out my Virtual Identity and now 'we' are ubuntuing, dependent arising. Still on the other hand, we might just accidentally indeed share the same intratextual context, because

84 Like I said in the story, type derives its meaning from the Greek word mark, and so typology is a narrative plotting of the narrative-mark/type in the narrative-matrix in the duet of type and antitype. In the block narrative holographic (interspersified) memoirs typology is the ubuntuing/dependent arising of canonising our instances of narratives that play off today. To put it in other words, the same YAHWEH presence synagoguing in the oral memoirs is the presence that should canonise our narrative instances today where all are dependent arising. To turn it around, can we find ourselves in the Scriptures, or is it like the González couple (González 1994:103-4) argue what happened after the Edict of Milan when typology died out because when the persecution stopped the people could not read their stories in the Scriptures any more? Is this part of the reason why the Scriptures got lost under a pile of commentaries and why a history outside the Scriptures began to be sought after in higher criticism? The first ubuntuing, in the proposed synagoguing, should then be the ideologuing of familiarity – family resemblance, the haTorah as the face of the family.

we're in the same synagogue, and then there's no quotations (' ') around the we!

6. Dozing off the session

Coming into Kassel, how do we understand all of this capitalism, the splendour of this city, the secular/atheist authority in politics and administration and the worshipping of the economy by Europeans? Something tells me there's something wrong with the synagogal ubuntuing in Europe. The thing is, how do we understand YAHWEH's dream for this city and this country and continent, and South Africa and Africa?

That brings us to our discussion this afternoon!

As you can see it's drizzling hard, so I'll have to run. See you this afternoon.

Chapter 10: YAHWEH's memorandum of esteem - His dream!

Neither revolution nor reformation can ultimately change a society, rather you must tell a new powerful tale, one so persuasive that it sweeps away the old myths and becomes the preferred story, one so inclusive that it gathers all the bits of our past and our present into a coherent whole, one that even shines some light into the future so that we can take the next step.... If you want to change a society, then you have to tell an alternative story.

—Ivan Illich, Austrian philosopher (Viola 2009:22)

1. Contextual embedding of session

It's pouring this afternoon. Can you see all those people hiding under any piece of overhang on the rim of King's Square? Just like I used to do today, like all of us who forgot our umbrellas at home, waiting for the right tram to pull into King's Square and then make a run for it when the tram doors open to jump in without waiting.

Timing is of the essence⁸⁵ because when the tram door opens, others first have to get out of the tram, and you don't want to wait for that either and so spoil your hairstyle; cutting the chase to the tram door too closely, on the other hand, can have the unfortunate consequence that one has to run back to the overhang and wait for the next tram and then most likely also spoil your hairstyle. I guess that doesn't happen too often, since appearances rank lower down the priority list in things like this – especially for Germans who are notoriously punctual.

Actually it's interesting to see the ladies giggle about their wet hair once they're in the tram, especially when two or more are grouped together. I guess it's not difficult to share misfortune, but fortune we don't want to share, especially when it gets to money.

2. Wider theolosophy debate

Rain is a picture of growth, but also of YAHWEH's abundance and blessings (Deuteronomy 28:12), He's YAHWEH-YIREH. In the B'rit Hadashah this abundance is the living water from above, the New Heaven and Earth that broke into the old heaven and

⁸⁵ You might say by using essence I'm flirting with the Aristotelian essence *to ti ên einai*, on the other hand, since it is a proverbial saying, I rather utilise the ubutuung of the *volksmond*.

earth in narrative virtual space, and quenches the inner need (John 4:10-14; 7:38) and bestows the Sabbath's rest (Hebrews 4:8-9) of the year of jubilee (Hale 2007:324). The perpetual year of jubilee started with the new B'rit with its complete victorious interconnected/dependent arising/nonlocal atonement. In this year of jubilee of the synagogue, the Shekinah is nonlocal in the interconnected nonlocal body of Yeshua in the perpetual burnt offering – we're the unremitting Messianic (anointed) burnt offering unto YAHWEH.

The merged apprehensions of the burnt offering and year of jubilee together actually shed a different light on the understanding of offerings altogether. That means offering and party, joy, celebration, and abundance turn out to be synonymous. An offering unto YAHWEH is a joyful offering, and the ultimate self-actualisation in the whole of humanity, if we can use a contemporary definition. The year of jubilee is heaven on earth, it's Shalom, it's Nirvana. Didn't we say Nirvana is the heaven of peace on Friday morning? When Sabbath is rest, and when the Hebrew word *m'nuhah*, rest, also means peace, then the Sabbath year of jubilee is Nirvana, but the path to Nirvana is the emptying of self-love and self-devotion, which is nothing but a sacrifice, a sacrifice to interconnectedness! This is our burnt offering, the emptying of self-love and self-compassion to an interconnectedness with YAHWEH and all those who are interconnected with Him. This is Nirvana, the year of jubilee, the year of love and compassion in Shekinah.

But let us be honest, do we see the year of jubilee around us? Is that the typical church experience today? I'm not so sure! Randy Alcorn testifies of many conversations he had with people who had issues with heaven, and who pictured heaven to be an endless church service (Alcorn 2004:6). What's the problem here? Church is boring, and inapplicable, and not a place people want to stay longer than what is needed. Church is dubbed with something like the platonic dualism of the space in the church too other-worldly for people to associate with; it's space they would like to leave behind as soon as possible in order to live life again.

Theologically the church lacks Shekinah, Nirvana, Shalom (total well-being). This tells me heaven is not in church: it's not the horizontal and vertical narrative virtual space shared with Shekinah, opposed to space outside the Shekinah. Church isn't the Sabbatical party (don't confuse the day with the event), it's not the year of jubilee, and not B'rit

Hadashah then!

What were the characteristics of the year of jubilee in the Torah?

1. Firstly, it's a Sabbath year where all slaves were to be set free (Deuteronomy 15:12)
2. Secondly, also part of the Sabbath year, all debts had to be cancelled (Deuteronomy 15:1)
3. Thirdly, also part of the Sabbath year, no one was allowed to work, instead everyone had to share, on an equal footing, the yield and livestock of the land (Leviticus 25:5-7,12)
4. Fourthly, the year of jubilee was what the name says, a jubilee since all family property had to go back to its original owner

In short, the year of jubilee was where Israel had to reboot and start all over again. This was the measurement for the old heaven and earth, because “...*the land is YAHWEH's and they were only strangers and tenants on it*” (Leviticus 25:23).

The year of jubilee is typologically appropriated by second or third Isaiah in Isaiah 61:1-9 (Cosby 1999:74), picturing the return from exile and restoration of Israel, and in turn is the typological message of Yeshua in Luke 4:18-19 in the Nazareth synagogue. This message is indicative of the whole B'rit Hadashah where the year of jubilee perpetually persists in both our deposits of the Holy Spirit, but secondly also in the inheritance of the New Heaven and Earth this deposit guarantees (Ephesians 1:13-14). The message is indicative of the narrative virtual space of the Shekinah invested synagogues that perpetually nonlocally and interconnectedly typify Yeshua who ceaselessly proclaims Isaiah 61:1-2.

The year of jubilee is what we see in Acts 2, and the lifestyle that followed the day of Pentecost, when Luke says,

“Everyone was filled with awe, and many miracles and signs took place through the apostles. All those trusting in Yeshua stayed together and had everything in common; they even sold their property and possessions and distributed the proceeds to all who were in need. Day after day they faithfully and with singleness

of purpose met in the Temple courts; breaking bread from house to house, they shared their food in joy and simplicity of heart,” (Acts 2:43-6)

This hasn't stopped in the book of Acts, the year of jubilee spilled over to the early followers of Yeshua in the second and third centuries, and was the core of their *Kerygma*, of the victorious conquering of Yeshua, the forerunner over death, Satan and the bondage of the old heaven and earth – in short, temporality had been conquered, and was continuously being conquered through the victorious interconnected/dependent arising/nonlocal atonement in the narrative virtual space of the assembly until each one's respective *parousia*. True Sabbath, Nirvana, was the nature of these synagogues.

So let us look at some of the trademarks of these early synagogues:

1. Firstly, just like the year of jubilee was the setting free of slaves in the Tanakh, so salvation was for the early Yeshua followers deliverance from slavery of serving under Satan('s narrative) and sin. The emphasis, and joy, was, however, on the jubilee of being set free. James Kugel and Rowan Greer say that,

It is important to note that Justin [Martyr] does not distinguish the cross from Christ's resurrection. Indeed, the cross stands for both Christ's death and his resurrection, regarded as a single event. And the cross is a sign of victory, not an instrument of torture. In this respect, Justin's view is characteristic of the attitude of the early church toward the cross. It is a sign of deliverance. And so stories of deliverance in the Hebrew Scriptures are a way of speaking of Christ's death and resurrection. Noah and Jonah (*Dialogue 107*) are used by Justin in this typological fashion... Here we are at the heart of the early church's reading of the Hebrew Scriptures. (Kugel 1986:148)

2. Secondly, the eradication of debt and the communal sharing of YAHWEH's provisions were literally practised, as Arnold says,

“The practice of surrendering everything in love was the hallmark of the Christians... Urged by this love, many even sold themselves into slavery or went to debtors' prison for the sake of others... In fact, everything the church owned at that time belonged to the poor. The affairs of the poor were the affairs of the church; it supported bereft women and children, the sick, and the destitute.” (Arnold 2007:11)

but the most mind-boggling is,

“According to Christians, the private ownership of property was the result of

sin.” (Arnold 2007:11)

and illustrates the surrogate family model (Hellerman 2001:59-91) they had. How far has the church not deviated from this model, that's now after the church sanctified capitalism, which is by nature private ownership coupled with maximum profit through vehemently opposing all competitors? Nothing can be as far removed from this surrogate family model than capitalism, although the preceding feudal system didn't do much better.

3. Thirdly, the Sabbath year prohibits work and that's exactly the Sabbath rest/party the early followers enjoyed in their narrative virtual space of synagogue. Michael Card puts it beautifully,

“The concept of party was important not only to Jesus but to the early church as well... They enjoyed the favor of all the people as the pagans witnessed the joy of their gatherings.

The climax of the history of this world will take place at a party. It is the Marriage Supper of the Lamb, and it will quite literally be the party of all times.” (Card 2007:133)

The party in the narrative virtual space of the synagogue was already depicting the party to come.

Party in the west sounds like sin, and party as synagogue even worse, but is that not all due to the resurrection that got lost in the sole emphasis of the crucifixion on the cross, as Erasmus Van Niekerk indicates,

The events of the cross and the resurrection had their fair share as major players in people's sense making approaches through the ages. Even in the most questionable instances the lone cross on the roof of the church had the overbearing and reductionist impact on the butchery theologies of blood and guts, passion and suffering without joy and celebration of new life and empowerment and liberation to this life characterised by the resurrection. (Van Niekerk 2006:29-30)?

The partying of the early followers of Yeshua was the true Nirvana/Sabbatical celebration of the new life and empowerment and liberation in Shalom, which is in a stark contrast with the church today where church is nothing but labour for the active 20% (Hirsch 2006:46); on Mondays the clergies need a Sabbath which tells me they've missed the real Sabbath, but then the whole congregation has also missed it!.

The Eurasian Regional Director of the Church of the Nazarene, Gustavo Crocker (Crocker 2005), who's Guatemalan by birth, says that before they, as Latin Americans, turn to Yeshua for salvation they just know one thing, that's how to party, and once they have turned to Yeshua they also only know one thing, that's how to party, partying without sin. The western culture only knows how to take the business world, and its efficiency and growth, seriously⁸⁶. To draw a parallel, is this not the same mentality taken into the church today, coupled with the wrong theology of the crucifixion only, that made church so boring and inapplicable? Is the efficiency syndrome not the reason why gifts are being confused with talents, and why the fellowship has been taken away from the Holy Spirit and put in the hands of rationality, business like rationality?

I think it's evident that the year of jubilee got lost to the most of YAHWEH's followers somewhere in history. We already indicated this morning how church and politics got mixed up after the Edict of Milan, and that's where it all started. Provisionally this tendency had been reversed a number of times in the narrative stories we call revival.

3. Radical inductive contemplation

I've always been fascinated by revivals, the stories of revival, and has actually become a defining principle in my ministry: what will it take for the next revival to come? It's even a defining principle for my doctor's degree⁸⁷: to tell a different story that'll change society, as the quote says we started our discussion with this afternoon, and not to just tell another stereotype academic story, in form and content, that just adds more commentaries, but

⁸⁶ Again a sentimental and emotional over generalisation.

⁸⁷ I've already indicated that part of my thesis is the crime of what modernism inflicted on the Way of Israel, this is the other side of the coin, what would bring revival back? To relativise the crime of modernism, like George Lindbeck says, "As I grew older I conclude that modernity is not unique in either its goodness or badness, but is just one epoch and culture among others, in some ways better and in some ways worse" (Lindbeck 2002:3). To repeat, the crime is not the simulation, which happened more than a century and longer ago, since we only have a simulacrum, a second hand souvenir of this simulation today. To bring this relativising to my thesis, without analogies alongside the allegorical how could I reasonable and analogically define revival? If I put revival analogically forward, as we narratively learned to know them from the 18th-19th centuries, don't I somehow have to admit I found something good in modernism, even if it is only allegorically? The same I'll have to admit about technology.

does nothing substantially to change any preferred myths.

To start with, I see revival different from the vibes I've picked up from the other followers of Yeshua I'm rubbing shoulders with everyday. The vibes I pick up are that revival is a religious consciousness that returns to society and is directly related to church growth and church intensity. Revival is also being seen as society getting healed, and although that's right, it's only the fruit of revival, it's not revival itself; even the effect it has on church is only the fruit of revival, not revival itself. The general feeling I get is that most (historically) see revival as something to do with church, but is that not again humanistic theology as if our churches are important?

No, revival has to do with YAHWEH and YAHWEH alone! Society that gets healed is the interconnected society that radiates the nonlocal Image of YAHWEH again.

A definition I can concur with, or want to start with, is that of Selwyn Hughes in his book *Why Revival Waits* when he says that,

In the truest sense of the word, *revival* is an unusual and extraordinary movement of God's spirit that mark's it off as being vastly different from the normal sense of God's presence in the church. It is not just a spiritual trickle, a rivulet, or even a river; it is an awesome flood of God's Spirit, a mighty Niagara that sweeps everything before it. (Hughes 2005:2-3),

but sadly it has to be unusual and extraordinary. Why's that?

The thing that made revival such a defining principle for me was that Tuesday evening when in August 1987 the Shekinah flooded my room after I had decided to become a Yeshua follower. If you've been in this Shekinah once, nothing else is good enough anymore. That's the same testimony I've heard from Mary Peckham (Peckham 1992), unmarried Mary Morrison, who got saved in the last revival on the British Isles on the Isle of Lewis, off the west coast of Scotland. The revival has been labelled to have lasted from 1949-1952. Mary Peckham says that she and her friends from the islands are in union that nothing is ever again as satisfying as the revival fires they'd experienced.

Once in Germany I approached the head of a Bible school not too far from us; the principal at that point was Echard Bevernick (Bevernick 2008) and somehow our conversation deviated to revivals. His opinion was that revival will never come back to Europe again,

since Europe had its chance.

I could almost not believe my ears! How can he just give up on Europe like that? For one thing I realise that he doesn't understand revival. Yes, I'm also certain that the next revival won't look like the revivals of the past, of the previous epoch, of the stories we like to tell about them, but how can we say the Shekinah is not possible in Europe anymore? Who are we to say what YAHWEH should do and where He's allowed to go or not to go? Isn't this again the idolatrous modernist certainty of thinking we can understand YAHWEH with numbers and equations?

The biggest problem with these stories about revival is that the notion revival has become a narrative-mark of the supernatural, like for Echard Bevernick. I think many of these stories rather gained a romantic touch with a superhero in super events, like superman, that sounds too good to be possible (there was certainly the 'too good to be true', but also 'the true that was not good'). Two things surface for me:

1. The same allegory of this morning applies to the hermeneutics of these stories, namely the transplantation of the real events from one intratextual context to another cartographing this endeavour an allegorical seizure: the true event is lost in interpretation, while the historian that tells the story, tells the story from a story that determines what's been included and what's been left out and what's been important, etc. (there's inevitably an ideology behind the historian's explanation). We only hear the story of the historian, and therefore many of these stories become superhero stories that are 'supernatural' like superman.
2. Secondly though, on the other hand, although these stories need to be seen as sometimes 'romanticised' stories, people like Echard Bevernick rather illustrates the ironical influence of modernism to cling to certainty, and that certainty is the natural, like for liberal theology, as opposed to the supernatural. On the other hand is revival really the supernatural intervention of YAHWEH?

The word supernatural now opens a can of worms for you. Science and supernatural don't really go together, but fortunately I can also say I have an issue with the word supernatural, just like ubuntu for who it's the "...superimposition of Western categories..." (Coetzee 2003:26). For the black person in Africa, that which would be labelled epistemic

supernaturalism by liberal theology (Griffin 2004:63) is just as natural as the dropped stone that comes to rest on the ground due to what's being called the natural law of gravitation. In the one interconnected world of the seen and the unseen in Africa (Ògúnjimi 2005:12), in the one ubu- and -ntu (ubuntu), the things of the unseen, which can't be scientifically and observationally proved, is totally natural – it's the natural of one seen and unseen world. This even includes the intervention of the unseen on the seen and vice versa.

The closes to a distinction I'm willing to make is ordinary and extraordinary, but even that's again a dualism that's being refuted by Paul when he states that those who are being led by the Holy Spirit are children of YAHWEH (Romans 8:14), thus through the extraordinary unseen, while those who are not children of YAHWEH are being led by extraordinary unseen evil forces (Ephesians 2:1-3), and so the extraordinary is not extraordinary if it is the perpetual and current given. The unseen is continuously interconnected with the seen, and the seen with the unseen, even when much of this leading Paul talks about is the unseen of narrative, but still it's the unseen. By that, however, I reject the liberal redefinition of the supernatural belonging solely to meaning and value, as opposed to the natural belonging to cause at the beginning of the 20th century (Dorrien 2003:58); no, narrative is a force that lives us, and these unseen forces are physical wave interferences on us, and we on them, and so narrative is more than just meaning and value.

With revival I'm willing to make this distinction of ordinary versus extraordinary, purely because practically humanity has lost paradise at the fall of mankind, and that's the ordinary now. The extraordinary is YAHWEH tabernacling with us, but which had sporadically reached recognisable levels and instances of the paradise lost by Adam and Eve, and that's what we call revival. That's the extraordinary narrative virtual space on the old heaven and earth, but would be the only ordinary on the New Heaven and Earth.

Revival is the extraordinary of the Shekinah that broke into the old heaven and earth, but is natural in the one seen and unseen world. If Echarad Bevernick was not seeking the extraordinary, what was he doing in ministry? The extraordinary is the redemption of YAHWEH through Yeshua. The year of jubilee was the extraordinary in the Tanakh, although that was what paradise was before the fall of mankind, it's now the extraordinary of the New Heaven and Earth on the old heaven and earth, but only until the

consummation when we'll be back in paradise in the new Jerusalem.

I had the privilege once to make it to the Isles of Lewis and Harris, off the west coast of Scotland, myself; because of that I had the opportunity to experience something of the residue and testimonies of the last revival on the British Isles. My contact persons were Colin and Mary Peckham (Peckham 1992), as I already indicated Mary Peckham came from the islands, and through them I could meet a number of other people also from the islands and had long discussions about the revivals.

It's difficult to say, but the more I spoke to them, the more I felt I could associate with them, since the core of their experiences matched something of what I experienced in my Riemannian meditations, and specifically that evening when the Shekinah flooded my room.

What I've discovered is that my norm is the testimony of these revivals.

4. Wider theolosophy testimony

Colin Peckham has written a number of books in his ministry, but it's in one of their last ones that he and his wife carefully noted down the events and testimonies of this revival on the Isle of Lewis. They called their book *Sounds from Heaven*, due to the heavenly music sporadically heard by some (Peckham 2004:106) – the seen and the unseen indeed merged physically.

The Peckhams say under the heading they call *The Consciousness of the Presence of the Lord* that,

Without question, this [presence] was the outstanding characteristic of the revival in Lewis and particularly that of the 1949 revival. Without exception everyone to whom we spoke mentioned this as the outstanding feature of the movement. (Peckham 2004:90)

The *exceptional outstanding feature* of everyone is my norm, the presence of YAHWEH.

This presence manifested in magnificent ways on the island, magnificent because they were extraordinary for this old heaven and earth. On Friday morning I already indicated how a cloud used to come and rest on each prayer meeting held during the week, and this visibly indicated the Shekinah YAHWEH tabernacling at each meeting, which is something

like the tabernacle of old when the Torah says,

“Then the cloud covered the tent of meeting, and YAHWEH's glory filled the tabernacle.” (Exodus 40:34)

In the B'rit Hadashah, though, the synagogue is the tabernacling of YAHWEH with us today on the move in synagogues duplicated as many times as needed, and so these prayer meetings on the island were literally like the duplicated Tanakh tabernacle of old, filled with Shekinah. They were revival synagogues. Actually the whole island turned into a Shekinah synagogue when John Murdo testified, “Now, if I were to tell you the outstanding features of the revival it is this. There was a universal consciousness of the presence of God – a sense of the Lord's presence was everywhere. On the streets, in the shops, in the school – wherever people gathered [synagogueing/meditating] revival was the topic of conversation.” (Peckham 2004:91)

This presence was the guiding norm of many manifestations (Peckham 2004:83-110):

1. The first was convictions, something like first Isaiah experienced in Isaiah 6, when Isaiah encountered the Shekinah and proclaimed,

“Woe to me! I am doomed! since I'm a man with unclean lips, living among a people with unclean lips, because I have seen with my own eyes the King, YAHWEH-Tzva'ot (YAHWEH of the hosts)!” (Isaiah 6:5)

Testimonies of convictions abound in the Peckhams' book (Peckham 2004:88-90), but one by Catherine Cambell, graphically says: “The meeting was mighty and I was overwhelmed with conviction. As I came out of the meeting, I just fell on my knees outside the door. I didn't care who was around. That night I came to Christ.” (Peckham 2004:89)

2. Second prayer, Margaret MacLeod says: “Christians met often and would pray and sing in the homes. That is my abiding memory of that time; in fact I do not remember the children of the Lord behaving in any other way... *It was a community at prayer.*” (Peckham 2004:86).
3. Thirdly singing, the Peckhams say,

Singing was a mighty instrument in the revival. They were singing the Word of God and this, filled with the presence of God, made the singing mighty in the Holy Ghost. The people sang with all their hearts and meant every word they sang. The words became arrows in the hand of the Almighty and many were slain of the Lord as His Word penetrated the heart of the people with enormous power in song. (Peckham 2004:93)

4. Fourthly, joy, they say joy "...was one of the outstanding features of the movement-joyfulness. The spirit of joy was infectious. In the gatherings of the saints there were spontaneous and exuberant joy. When they met at the roadside or in the meetings, there was always the evidence of God's thrilling presence and their joy knew no bounds." (Peckham 2004:95-6)
5. Fifthly, phenomena like trances or faintings, house shaking, light, visions and dreams
6. Sixthly, other things like love and unity, no age gap, witnessing, song writing, etc.

A characteristic I would like to highlight is the fourth one, the exuberant joy, the joy of the year of jubilee infested with equality, love and unity, and of enjoying the thrilling presence of YAHWEH. Prayer meetings/meditations were nothing of the boring prayer meetings in so many churches today where the deafening silence, and long breaks between prayers, rather provides one with an hour of solitude to work through a few drifting thoughts of the day past or the errands to run the following day.

Only in Africa have I experienced something of a parting prayer meeting yet, neither in England nor in Germany yet. Every Wednesday evening at Nazarene Theological College we had our chapel prayer meetings, and what joy they were. Like in Africa we first started with singing, African style singing and dancing where one wishes the singing won't stop. The singing was then followed by a short sermon, which in turn was followed with the reason we were there, that's to pray. The thing is that after prayer requests had been raised, we all got up, or some on their knees, and simultaneously fired away praying aloud. No one waited for anybody else. Some would even walk around and get involved in a serious conversation with YAHWEH using hands and feet to express emotions.

Once or twice I didn't pray with, I just observed the joyful spectacle from the side line. It was amazing to see how the Spirit of YAHWEH was moving like a wave through the

crowd. It's as if everyone simultaneously raised their voices and then simultaneously lowered their voices like a Mexican sound wave. Even an uniformity in topics waved through the prayers, and interestingly enough, just as the praying fired away simultaneously the praying stopped instantaneously as if everyone at the same moment felt that they had said what they wanted to say to YAHWEH. It seemed as if Quantum principles were at work in a homogeneous, spontaneous, extrovertive prayer meeting of enjoying YAHWEH's presence. The picture that comes to mind is a school of sardines simultaneously changing direction and moving on without a leader.

5. Biblical narratives as string succession

So to bring revival to the last commentary, the Scriptures, the place to start is in the book of Exodus. The first thing to take note of is that YAHWEH's presence is relative, relative in regards to space. Jacob Neusner in his book *The Social Teaching of Rabbinic Judaism: God's presence in Israel* states that YAHWEH is a landlord in the Torah Israel (Neusner 2001:3). The picture is then that of a feudal system, a kingdom, with the king's direct presence and rule in the palace, but then also a lesser direct presence in the rest of the kingdom although the image of the king's political and economical rule can be seen everywhere; those outside the borders of the kingdom have no contact with the king and is seen as outside the king's presence⁸⁸.

The same picture emerges in the Torah with YAHWEH's seat, direct presence, Shekinah, in the temple/tabernacle (Exodus 40:34), with His most private quarter, the Most Holy, His bedroom, off-limits to the most and most of the times (Leviticus 16:2; Hebrews 9:7). Looking YAHWEH in the face is off-limits to all (Exodus 33:20). The whole

⁸⁸ Do you remember the metaphor I used to justify hell's narrative originating from YAHWEH, and that it is only a part of His Kingdom abandoned by Him but still His property but not His presence to justify the Ex Nihilo of narrative? This time around I talk about the presence outside His Kingdom altogether. How do I reconcile the two? For one thing, I'm convinced YAHWEH can totally annihilate hell if He wants to, which defends the first metaphor I have given. On the other hand the Johannine kingdom wars in Scriptures argue the second picture and rather argues a breakaway kingdom, Lucifer's kingdom, that used to be part of YAHWEH's Kingdom. The breakaway kingdom can then retain characteristics of the first Kingdom which can be narrative itself. What is the abandoned part of the Kingdom in the first metaphor other than a breakaway kingdom?

palace/tabernacle is restricted to only a few, the priests (Exodus 29:1), but the courtyard is for almost everyone in the Kingdom (Jeremiah 19:14), except for a few vagabonds like the ones trapped in cities of refuge due to manslaughter (Numbers 35:25). All in all the whole Promised Land resides in YAHWEH's presence under His political and economical rule.

The important thing to notice is that the burnt offer altar plays the key role of what constitutes YAHWEH's presence in His kingdom. In fact it seems like as if the whole kingdom is being substituted by the altar in Exodus 21:14 when the Torah says,

“... if someone purposefully kills another after deliberate planning, you are to take him or her away from My altar and put him or her to death.”

In the open spaces of the Promised Land, away from the tabernacle and the temple, someone killing someone else most certainly hardly happened at the altar; so taking the person away from the altar means out under the kingly rule of YAHWEH.

In the nonlocal interconnected atonement, the whole nation is present at the continues 24/7 365¼ days burnt offer altar in the ministry of the priests. In the victorious interconnected/dependent arising/nonlocal atonement of the B'rit Hadashah, Yeshua is in us and YAHWEH in Yeshua (John 17:21-3), and so YAHWEH in us, which means we're all one in the Most Holy, in the bedroom (Ephesians 3:1-3).

The feudal space has changed with the break from the Sinai covenant to the B'rit Hadashah, from the Promised Land in the old heaven and earth to the Promised Land of the new heaven and earth. The narrative virtual space is the synagogue now, and the rule and seat of YAHWEH is in the synagogue; the synagogue is, however, only the tent of meeting, not the courtyard anymore. Is the courtyard not the typical church today observable in the instructions the angel gives John when the angle says

“... the courtyard outside the Temple, leave that out; don't measure it; because it has been given to the nations, and they will trample over the holy city for forty-two months.” (Revelation 11:2)?

The seeking for revival rightfully bids for synagogues to only become the tent of meeting synagogues, overlapping the courtyard won't do anymore, not even mentioning those totally outside the courtyard. Sorry to say but that's where I think denominations are right

now.

The defining parashat I would like to come to is Exodus 29:38-46, the daily priestly instructions for the burnt offer. The point of these instructions is verses 45-6 when YAHWEH says,

“Then I will dwell with the people of Israel and be their Elohim: they will know that I am YAHWEH their Elohim, who brought them out of the land of Egypt in order to dwell with them. I am YAHWEH their Elohim.”

The point is my norm, the Shekinah, and consequently even defines the reason for the Exodus, redemption, salvation, “... *in order for YAHWEH to dwell...*” with us in the synagogues. The norm is then not only the guiding principle, but the constitutional principle of all the Scriptures.

I love to start a sermon or a devotion with a question and then really drag answers out of the listeners. That really gets them thinking and present if they haven't arrived yet. One such question is, “If you have to summarise all of Scriptures in one word or abstract notion, what would that be?” For me it's Sabbath. The abstract notion Sabbath captures all of the Scriptures for me; again, I am not saying the day called Sabbath, but the event or abstract notion Sabbath.

Isidor Grunfeld says that,

Our Sages call the Sabbath *yesod ha-emunah*, the very foundation of our [trust]. This is no exaggeration. For the loftiest thoughts by which Judaism has ennobled the human mind, the highest ideals for which our people have been striving for thousands of years at the cost of innumerable lives, all are centred in the Sabbath (Grunfeld 2003:15) (Grunfeld used faith, I exchanged the word with trust)

The thing is, did Elohim create the world, and because He was tired He had to rest on the seventh day? Was the seventh day an afterthought because He was tired and exhausted? No way! I rather think the whole cosmos was created for the seventh day; the seventh day was the reason for the creation. The garden of Eden was the reason for the creation. What's a garden? It's a place of fellowship where one can enjoy companionship with others. It's a place to party.

Forget about the work going into gardens, that's not what Sabbath is about, but imagine

sitting outside with friends in a garden having a nice barbeque, is that not a recipe to forget about time? Yes, most certainly it is.

This experience I'm most familiar with; a few friends of mine own a plot together (Plot 1991), to be exact it used to be four families, now only three as one family immigrated to Australia. On the plot they also currently have three additional bungalows, and more in planning, which are always occupied with missionaries returning temporarily to South Africa for whatever reason. The great thing about the plot is that every Sunday they have a joint barbeque at lunch time where everyone sits under the trees, and just chats away about this and that and whatever. They would even invite outsiders to join them for this event.

These barbeques are one of the greatest Sabbathings I've ever experienced. Sometimes we would sit and chat away until eight in the evening, when we have to tear ourselves away to get ready for the week to start.

You remember when we said that rest can also be translated as peace, and therefore Sabbath is the heaven of peace, nirvana? Sabbath is the goods of the Scriptures, in contrast to the curse on work due to the fall of mankind (Genesis 3:17-9). Sabbath is the oriental recycling of the Shekinah parties every week, three feast parties every year, and then every seventh year and again every 49th year. Hebrew thinking doesn't go past this recycling, like the recycling of generations in genealogies.

Black Africans know how to enjoy Sabbath, they know how to socialise, sitting together chatting away until who knows what hours in the night, and that night after night. Many black Africans are so into Sabbathing that they are earmarked as unproductive and wasting time, but is that not the reason why they are of the happiest people in the world? Anyway someone like Chidi *Asika-Enahoro* says that a recent international study has found that Nigerians are the happiest people in the world (Asika-Enahoro 2004:93), and Julian Wicksteed says that some of the happiest people he's met in the world are in parts of Africa (Wicksteed 2007:270).

Hebrew thinking, and ubuntu thinking, doesn't really go past the present recycling of Sabbath in the YAHWEH-YIREH. This isn't easy for us a westerners to imagine since we are always going somewhere; some expectation always awaits us in the future, something

must always still be actualised. Westerners always have to plan for the future. Hebrew thinking, however, doesn't live past the next party, the Sabbath party.

A good example of Hebrew thinking is these trams we've been using the past week; everything about trams are being recycled, the trams themselves, the routes, the timetables, etc. As you've noticed the trams are all doing a yo-yo route, to-and-fro, from downtown Kassel and back, but in the evenings return to the overnight garage, and so complete the circle just to recycle the whole schedule again the following day. The trams can be exchanged, the drivers can be exchanged, but the event stays. In exactly the same way, in Hebrew thinking the Sabbath party stays, even when generations come and go.

The Torah says that at one of these recycling feasts, as is the nature of the party, the Israelites have to

“... exchange their money for anything they want - cattle, sheep, wine, hard liquor, or anything that pleases them - and they are to eat there in the presence of YAHWEH their Elohim, and enjoy themselves...” (Deuteronomy 14:26)

That sounds like a holy party to me, without sin, since it's in YAHWEH's presence. Even hard liquor?

Don't understand me wrong, I am not promoting the use of alcohol now; instead I am saying like Paul,

“Don't get drunk with wine, because it makes you excessive. Instead, keep on being filled with the Spirit -” (Ephesians 5:18)

The party I am promoting is the one being 'drunk' with the Holy Spirit. Warren Wiersbe says about Acts where the apostles were being accused of being drunk,

It is interesting that the mockers should accuse the believers of being drunk, for wine is associated with the Holy Spirit (Eph. 5:18). Paul relates the two in contrast for when a man is filled with strong drink, he loses control of himself and ends up being ashamed, but when a person is filled with the Spirit, he has self-control and glorifies God. Strong drink can bring a temporary exhilaration, but the Spirit gives a deep satisfaction and a lasting joy. (Wiersbe 2007:327).

The contrast is the party of temporality that's about sin and excess, versus the party that's

not about alcohol per se, but the presence of YAHWEH and fellowship by promoting relationships, instead of excessive hampering behaviours which breaks or terminates relationships; it's about fellowship in the eternal space. The locomotive is the drunken fellowship in Holy Spirit joy, not alcohol joy or anything else.

The Torah also says in Leviticus 10:9,

"Don't drink any wine or other hard liquor, neither you nor your sons with you, when you enter the tent of meeting, so that you will not die. This is to be a permanent regulation through all your generations,"

after Nadab and Abihu, the sons of Aaron, intoxicated offered strange fire before YAHWEH. I know the fire was inappropriate, more than the alcohol, but it's exactly the alcohol that let them make this fatal arrogant judgement. Would we ever want to make such a fatal judgement?

The B'rit Hadashah addition is 1 Corinthians 11:21-27 when Paul says,

"because as you eat your meal, each one starts eating before the others; so that one stays hungry while another gets drunk!... Therefore, whoever eats the Lord's bread or drinks the Lord's cup in an unworthy manner will be guilty of desecrating the body and blood of the Lord!"

and indicates the boundaries of the love meal party.

O, but even knowing these boundaries, how have we not gone astray with the Eucharist that used to be a weekly love meal party for the early followers of Yeshua? Jude calls these love meals, love-feasts (Jude 12) where feast accurately conveys something of exuberant joy and the abundance portrayed. The designation love-feast was constantly used in postcononical literature (Bromiley 1979:66), although I know that the Eucharist and the love-feast soon got separated and even as early as the second century (Bromiley 1979:66). The thing is, although this break did take place, the party of the love-feast persisted and I would insist that the love-feast is only an extension, a continuation, of the Eucharist in one party.

To take it literally we can go with what Anselm Grün says, "Anyone who takes the

Eucharist seriously will also eat his or her meals in a totally different way. Some part of the mystery of the Eucharist shines forth in every meal.” (Grün 2007:86), and also in the love-feast. The allegorical is in each meal we enjoy!

In the B'rit Hadashah this Sabbath party has to perpetually stay the 49th year in the narrative virtual space of the Synagogue, the squatting of the citizens of the New Heaven and Earth on the old heaven and earth.

Back to our Scripture of Exodus 29. The priestly instructions that precede the defining norm and constitutional principle of YAHWEH's presence is the perpetual burnt offering that the priests have to administer 24/7 365¼ days a year. In verse 42 of Exodus 29 the Torah says that

“Through all generations this is to be the continues burnt offering at the entrance to the tent of meeting before YAHWEH. This is where I, YAHWEH, will meet with you to speak with you.”

The word *continues* is the Hebrew word *tamid* and Janzen says means the continuity of going on without interruption (Janzen 1997:216). That's the thing, the burnt offering is the perpetually 24/7 365¼ day complete devotion unto YAHWEH, and the other offerings, like the sin offering (Leviticus 4) or the guilt offering (Leviticus 5) or the trespass offering (Leviticus 6), are mixed with the burnt offering on the altar that is obviously already burning. These offers are then only an addition, an extension, to the burnt offer, and therefore the burnt offer is the umbrella offer that works our atonement.

The atonement is fellowship with YAHWEH, with revival as the motive of the atonement!

In Exodus 29:38-46 parashat I would like to point out the distinction between two words, meet and dwell. The word meet is in verse 42, where we've read that YAHWEH will meet with the priest to speak with the priest. This word meet means to come together at an appointed time and place, while dwell, as we've read in verses 45-6, means to temporarily camp at a given spot before moving on (Janzon 1997:217). The word dwell entitles the picture we get in Exodus 40:36-7 when the cloud, the Shekinah, moves away from the tabernacle, prompting the Israelites to break up camp and follow, but when the cloud comes to a halt, they would set up camp and stay. In short, they stuck to the cloud, and

not the cloud to them.

The dynamics between these two words are what revival is about. The meet, at an appointed time and place, is based on specific conditions given by YAHWEH and comprises the dwell. The meet hinges on what we do, and the dwell hinges on what YAHWEH does. The perpetual burnt offer is what we do at the given place of the Shekinah, the synagogue. The synagogue is the body of Yeshua, and as a whole is the burnt offering, and that's where YAHWEH meets us in the vertical and horizontal lines of Virtual Identities with those around us and the characters of the Scriptures. That's where spiritual gifts serve us through prophets, apostles, teachers, shepherds and evangelists (Ephesians 4), and all the other gifts of 1 Corinthians 12 and similar parashot. The dwell is where the synagogue has to go to stay with YAHWEH. This is what Rick Warren calls *Surfing Spiritual Waves* (Warren 1995), which means that we're to go – surf - where YAHWEH makes waves; we're to stick with the waves of His barucha (blessings) and Shekinah.

In these two things I see where the church has lost the plot and why we need revival:

1. Firstly I don't see the right atonement in the church, not the right theolosophy or the right sacrifice, and therefore the right atonement is out of the question. The church is not even at the reasonable physics to get to the full atonement.
2. Secondly, due to this dire state, the voice of YAHWEH has gone silent, or actually it has become so versified that the Scriptures can say anything or everything – the modernist hermeneutical pandemic as we pointed out this morning.
3. But then thirdly, because the voice went silent, the church has gone where it wanted to, it's not going with YAHWEH, it's not riding the waves. It's cooking its own pot, with its own god of rationality, the ghost in the body.

Exodus 29:38-46 is YAHWEH's memorandum of esteem, and revival His dream. Revival is also my dream, but what's it going to take for revival to come in measures like the one on the Island of Lewis? It's going to ask for a meeting with YAHWEH, through the full atonement, in the multidimensional Riemannian group and single meditation, while taking the synagogue where YAHWEH is going.

6. Pertinent cultural reflection

To elaborate on this necessity of meeting with YAHWEH, for one thing I can't see revival coming apart from electronic media in the west today; the space of Virtual Reality. Just as the printing press was instrumental in the Reformation leading to the nice stories of the revivals, so electronic media would be instrumental in the next revival. Geoffrey Dickens says,

Between 1517 and 1520, Luther's thirty publications probably sold well over 300,000 copies... Altogether in relation to the spread of religious ideas it seems difficult to exaggerate the significance of the Press, without which a revolution of this magnitude could scarcely have been consummated. Unlike the Wycliffite and Waldensian heresies, Lutheranism was from the first the child of the printed book, and through this vehicle Luther was able to make exact, standardized and ineradicable impressions on the mind of Europe. For the first time in human history a great reading public judged the validity of revolutionary ideas through a mass-medium which used the vernacular languages together with the arts of the journalist and the cartoonist.. (Dickens 1966:51)

The thrust was the available Scriptural access in the vernacular, coupled with a Reformation hermeneutic of the realistic narrative. You remember nonmediation? So the thrust was not the printed pages, not the medium alone, but the narrative that was participated in through narrative virtual space with the respective Virtual Identities horizontally and vertically. The printing press brought a new world to people, and that swept away the old myths and became the preferred story and so changed society, like our quote states we started our discussion with this afternoon.

In the same way I trust we have to translate the Scriptures into electronic media if we intend to see wide spread revival again! To tell a new story we have to do it through electronic media, since that's the world people are in already. To make my point, I'm going to give an extensive quote out of my MTh:

The website of the University of Michigan Health System (University of Michigan Health System 2005) highlights some interesting facts: they say that in a typical American home the TV set is on for more than seven hours a day, the average child spends more time watching TV than in school, an average kid spends about 20 or more hours each week watching TV which is more time than is spent in any other activity besides sleeping and the average person will have watched 7-10 years' worth of television by age 70. The Entertainment Software Association (Entertainment Software Association 2005) states that in 2004 eight Computer and

Video Games were sold every second in the USA and that the best-selling title, Halo 2®, raised more revenue on its first day of sales than any movie has ever taken in its opening day. These statistics and more illustrate how the experience of VR [Virtual Reality] is busy replacing the experience of physical reality and in turn emphasises the seriousness of why theology needs to be done on VR should the church desire to stay contextually relevant. Should physical reality completely disappear in VR (in a Matrix hypothesis) what significance would a statement like 'All have sinned and fall short of the Glory of YAHWEH' have if theologians don't know what sin is in VR? Would the disappearance of the experience of physical reality imply that sin has been eradicated? No. Should all brothels and prostitutes disappear and only appear in VR (the Cyborg motive of the human experience interwoven with technology (Biocca1997) - something like in the movie A.I. Artificial Intelligence by Steven Spielberg where prostitution is being practised with machines) would that mean the end of such sins? No. Should the complete prison system be confined to VR, because of a possible Freudian psychology combined with a sociological apprehension of the criminal desire having a valid place in society, where someone with this desire is sentenced to express this act in VR and consequently to eradicate the physical act by confining it to VR and so protect society? Would that really eradicate the sin and what the act really means? No, certainly not. At present evangelical sermons don't need, per say, to use the experiences of VR to illustrate to someone that (s)he is a sinner, but would the time come for such a sermon? This may come sooner than expected and in turn places the obligation on the church to be ready and conveys both a theological and missiological motive. (Nortje 2005:22-3)

Graham Houston says "We affirm that [Virtual Reality] is part of total reality, objective and subjective, and that virtual environments have a temporal and psychological existence. [Virtual Reality] should not be treated like a figment of the imagination" (Houston 1998:98).

If you remember HyperReality is all of reality, so Virtual Reality is in the one reality that's also the enfolding reality of the printed book. Actually I don't see much of a difference between the two, both are media, the one is just hotter media than the other. The distinction between hotter and colder media is the amount of senses involved. Electronic Virtual Reality is hotter since more senses are being fed with data, that's now the senses of hearing, seeing, and even feeling in computer games; the printed book is colder media since only one sense, seeing, is being used. In both, however, the same Virtual Identities are being constructed.

The translation into electronic media I propose, is something like the epoch change from the medieval times to the Reformation. In the medieval times media was the voice, the sermon the parish heard on Sundays when the priest used to preach the interpreted Scriptures and tradition; a bit of seeing was also involved in the stained glass and

paintings in the cathedrals and churches depicting the Scriptural stories, but the core was just hearing – localised hearing in the ubuntuing of Virtual Identities. In the Reformation, in the translation of the Scriptures coupled with the printing press, the media got hotter in a new world that was opened in the expanded sense of seeing in a globalised experiencing and imagination of more Virtual Identities.

In the same way the change of epoch to the electronic age and media, the next possible world has opened, the Virtual Reality world, and it's into this world that the Scriptures should be translated using more senses than just hearing and seeing, since it can give more 'flesh' to the Virtual Identities; this is the flesh a new and upcoming generation is expecting and taking for granted as my quote from my MTh illustrates. A Scriptural computer game would do just that. It would be to (socially) construct narrative into the Scriptures and so render them Scriptural typifyings – narrative-marks in the narrative-matrix. A Matrix hypothesis-like experience of the Scriptures would actually be the ultimate: a total and radical immersion and participation in the world of the Scriptures.

By that I don't imply sidestepping an apparent explaining or ideologueing, if a passive experience could be possible. No, that's not possible, but that brings us back to YAHWEH's feudal system. The norm is Shekinah, since Virtual Reality can both be the narrative virtual space of the New Heaven and Earth or of temporality. The technology itself is amoral, and although it's a spin-off of modernism⁸⁹, it's a present medium, not of the future or the past, but the now to recycle Sabbath with. The moment it can't be used to recycle Sabbath with, it has no real use anymore.

The present given technology and its amorality is the possibilities of all narratives it can communicate, although it's a narrative itself and therefore not amoral, but can we have anything for it that it's there? So intratextually technology can be amoral.

From the start the intention of this doctor's degree has been to read my narrative into Scriptures, and render it narrative virtual space of the tent of meeting, although the medium is not as hot as I would have wished it to be. I honestly considered asking if I could write a computer game for a doctor's degree, but the mountain seemed too high to

89 The same as light that we attribute to Thomas Edison.

climb⁹⁰. That would have been another dream come true, but in the metaphysics of a dream this printed page dissertation is also a holographic memoirs of a dream (all the memoirs everywhere in the years of dreaming this dissertation). The temporality is anyway the physical printed pages itself that will decay, but not the memoirs I'll carry with me into eternity.

Virtual Reality inherently testifies of temporality: movies end and become outdated, computer games end and become obsolete, books decay, etc. Narratives though, don't decay, we might just forget them, but they are so recycled in new blends, in e.g. Hollywood movies, that we can't really forget them. The content of the narrative party stays pretty much the same: the joy of the narrative never wavers. The medium is consequently not what it's about, but the presence in the narratives, the eternal valuable Shekinah presence.

What will bring revival to South Africa and eradicate the social-physical issues we discussed last week; that's now in things like inequalities, squatter camps, crime, social injustices and system dependant unemployment? The answer is the feudal system of YAHWEH. The political parties outside the tent of meeting are temporary. The answer is to bring politics, economics, and all spaces to the tent of meeting, or make them the space for the tent of meeting. The same applies to Germany, and is the only recipe that'll bring something of the year of jubilee, the party, to everyone.

Is this possible on the old heaven and earth? Sporadically yes, as mighty revivals have indicated in the past, and some with still ever present effects. This is what T. William Boxx has to say about the Wesleyan revival,

Wesleyanism was remarkable in several respects. From the beginning, it was as much a movement for moral as for religious reform – as much an ethic as a creed. And the ethic itself had two aspects: the old... Puritan ethic of work, thrift, temperance, self-reliance, and self-discipline; and a social ethic of good works and charity. The Wesleyans established societies for the care of abandoned children, destitute governesses, shipwrecked sailors, and penitent prostitutes; they founded schools, hospitals, and orphanages; they led the movements for prison reform, the abolition of the slave trade, child labor laws, and factory and sanitary regulations. And they did all of this as a religious as much as a moral obligation. (Boxx 1996:71)

O how would such a widespread ethic and moral, out of (or in) the right Shekinah

90 I couldn't find a way to justify the resources, and the strain that would place on my family.

synagogues, not revolutionise Germany and South Africa; that's now the Siddhartha Gautama (Buddhist) ethic of love and compassion, in the burnt offering of self-emptying to interconnectedness/dependent arising, but also with the B'rit Hadashah creed of Colossians 3:1-3 where we only seek the Shekinah invested narrative virtual space where we are hidden with Immanuel in YAHWEH? All of this so that we can have the YAHWEH ubuntuing of being community in the *Imago Dei* – the year of jubilee, Sabbath.

7. Dozing off the session

Okay, this is us then. We're back in Baunatal, and we've reached the end of our discussions. Now you can answer me as to what you think I think postmodernism is! Now I trust that you can be the Rabbi for the next disciple! Now you can invent your own hopping, after a week's tram hopping and take someone into your world and holographic memoirs. My dream is that your memoirs will make an 'existential' ubuntuing difference; that's my only metaphysical dream beyond my doctor's dream!

Thank you for sharing this narrative virtual space of a dream on these trams with me; I trust something of the space called Kassel has also elicited an anticipation and an appreciation. Now you can dream about Kassel, and make an effort to populate this dream with leisurely research, or just come and explore Kassel in depth yourself; that's now if you're willing or ready to wake up from your current Kassel dream!

“Auf Wiedersehen, my friend!”

Off-the-record

The response from my supervisor in the following Director's Cut is truly his uncut response; I have no intention to hide his critic, and alternative perspectives, and certainly appreciate his honesty, otherwise I'll be shooting myself in the foot and contradict the whole argued narrative-philosophy (like Plato actually intended (Boylan 2010:10-2)). I truly rejoice in this live dimension and negotiations as a first hand illustration of the open-ended discussions expected of fictive-narrative discourse, where I moonily argue white or black, only to let the reader mix his or her own colour shading.

I've made only two minor edits to support the flow of the dialogue, but no content changes whatsoever. The intent is uncut life journalism, and even to such an extent that the flow between his response and mine might sometimes seem unnatural. What I expect of the reader is to anticipate what he or she thinks my response to his response would have been according to the Virtual Identity the reader has (socially) constructed/dependently aroused of me. How does the reader response bounces of against my memoirs (that's now also according to the Virtual Identity constructed of my supervisor)?

Director's cut:

1. Contextual embedding of session

“So Professor Rabbi Ben Kahal Hadashah tomorrow this time you'll be back in South Africa!”

“Rabbi Yôḥanan my episodic sojourn in Kassel with you as part of my European diaspora finally draws to a close with the ICE to Frankfurt, the regional train to the airport and my arrival in Johannesburg after an overnight flight.”

“I'll at least have these last few minutes with you on the tram to Kassel-Willhelmshöhe train station!”

“Rabbi Yôḥanan, sharing of presence with you makes wonderful sense to me. Thank you for calling me a Rabbi. Take note I am not a Rabbi, just an ongoing negotiating wrestler taking up a clue from Jacob's wrestling in the Jabbok with the messenger of God (Genesis 32). Everyday is a negotiating wrestling match of celebration of blessing and prevailing (Genesis 32:28). I prefer that you don't call me Rabbi but if you want to I can't stop you.

“Today is a beautiful day again, after all the rain yesterday, and a nice day to be on the train. Soon after lunch Rabbi will be in Frankfurt, and then it's only the 15 minutes by train to the airport.”

“The episodic sojourn at the airport provides ample time to share presence with people in all sorts of ways.”

“Back to these two weeks, how was our guest room down in the basement Rabbi Ben Kahal Hadashah? I've worked extremely hard to build the walls and do the floors. When we moved into our new house (New House 2006) it was only a cold concrete basement, but just like the earth was without form and void before Elohim made something of it (Genesis 1), so I had to make something of our basement”

“For me the basement is as base, warm and cosy, and extremely quiet amidst all the liveliness of the house, very similar to the ‘meta’, the basic conical measuring stone

in the Circus Maximus of Rome from where our term 'meta' as in metaphysics comes from."

"I made sure that there would be a connection to the heating system from the guest room when we were planning the house. But guess what? Because the basement is underground, it never really gets that cold. I don't think it will really drop below 16°C. The only thing is, that I haven't gotten the bathroom in the guest room done yet."

"Going up from the basement to the toilet during the night is a reminder of ongoing episodic sojournings to smallest rooms."

"The reason why the bathroom is not done yet is because the connection to the sewer pipes is not that simple since it's underground, and it'll cost money we don't have right now."

"I really don't understand but it It makes a lot of sense to me."

"The reason for the guest room is to serve others. We want accommodation for others, we want to be Yeshua/YAHWEH for others, we want our sacrifice (Romans 12:1-2) to be practically/teleologically the *parakletos* for others."

"To me you have been the parakletos, a co-server of the Spirit of God."

2. Pertinent cultural reflection

"Thank you for coaching me these last two weeks Rabbi. That has been invaluable. Thank you for sitting in trams listening to how I practised being a Rabbi all these long hours."

"It is a privilege to have shared presence with you."

"I'm sure Rabbi could see quite a difference the second time around?"

"Yes, certainly, through challenge from my side and empowerment from yours you have travelled further but stronger away from me in the sense making sense of the word."

"Thank you Rabbi for being there."

"So Rabbi Yôḥanan I think it's time for us to reflect again on this week, first, I want

you to tell me what your impressions regarding the first and the second time are, and second, I will give my impressions as we proceed.”

“To start with I think I have to tell Rabbi first what I've actually intended with this whole endeavour and then we can reflect on it!”

“Sure.”

“As I've indicated in these discussions I've experienced a cognitive clash in Bible college with western theology being taught to Africans, as the numbers and equations just don't add up for them. One desire I've ever since had was to somehow be involved in rewriting theology for Africa. A number of years, to be exact nine years later, of which all nine years were in Europe, I think Europe needs Africa. The intention of this dissertation is something along these lines. The thing is in Africa the curriculum is about telling stories, and the content embedded in stories. Jacqueline Copeland-Carson quotes a Sara who says,

In the ancient African tradition, we find our spiritual center through storytelling. Africans teach through stories. This is in part the function of what's called old wives tales. Writing in our journals becomes a way of documenting our experiences – our own stories – so that we can learn from them. The stories help to teach us the old practices in the African tradition. To connect our real-life stories to the stories of ancient Africa. [The stories] – the old practices – will give you clear instructions so that you can make the right decisions (Copeland-Carson 2004:152)

My intention has been to be a matured African, with a white skin, sitting on a stone and Rabbinically teaching/coaching the next generation the things of life through stories. I just wanted to tell a story.”

“It makes some sense to me. Please proceed”

“This is now where the conflict emerged, since good academic practice in universities is not just telling stories! No, universities want deductive reasoning in a mathematical grid that goes from A to Z, and reaches an aggregate conclusion of certainty.⁹¹”

“The statement about universities are too generalised but about some of them you

91 What I'm doing in the Director's Cut is to contrast the Graeco-Roman inherited academic tradition/practices with Africa. Obviously I don't have a problem with universities per se, otherwise what am I doing right now? In ubuntu terms my intention has been to remove the toxic waste from the one organism, the community.

have a point.”

“My wish was to tell a story without any references, apparent deductive proves, just a story of how I've digested the material and incorporated them into my story. That's what I like about all introductory books, that's now books like 'The Introduction to psychology', or 'The Introduction to philosophy', or 'The Introduction to cooking', or golfing, or swimming... etc., since they are mostly good digested material introduced in a way that most people can understand. The proof of how good the author has understood the material is how simple the authors can explain it.”⁹²

“The two notions you use about authors namely good ‘understanding’ and simple ‘explaining’ are well known modernist tools that are usually replaced in a differential and integral approach with ‘making sense’ and ‘clues dissemination’ of something to others. I said a while ago you have to work on your references which meant working on enough overlapping ‘clues’ for your story from experiential packages and pockets that ‘make sense’ in your own life and other people’s lives which include their writings, experiential ambiances, discourses, micro histories and micro herstories.”

“Yes, thank you and that's what I've done, but somehow it feels like that which I said I didn't want to do, quote hopping, is what I set out to do, especially in the last few discussions. On the other hand, what I've actually done was to add references, not to violate my digested story, but to second my thoughts.”

“Not to be hopping up and down, here and there and back and forth nonsensically like a kangaroo on a trampoline you have to contextualise where and when your and other people’s sense making and clues disseminating ambiances occurred – that is part of referencing.”

“This is exactly at this point where I think the university system misses Africa, and

⁹² My use of *understanding* and *explaining* is again ubuntuing umgangssprachlich (volksmond in Afrikaans), contrasted with the Cartesian idealism with its exclusive sense. Many of my friends and acquaintances enthusiastically expressed their desire to read this dissertation, and so my intention is that they could, with a simulacrumised existentialism, integrate within a simulacrumised Hegelian ubuntuing, with me, in this HyperReality/Virtual Reality.

therefore a cognitive clash, or even a total irrelevancy of the content, as I experienced in Bible college⁹³. Africa wants the story, needs the story, thinks in terms of a story, not in terms of the stacked up commentaries; not that anyone else understands anything apart from stories, only different genres of stories. Traditional academic work is also a story, only an apparent deductive system story.”

“Traditional academic work contrary to populist beliefs is a discursive complexity of deductive, inductive, abductive, reductive and conductive stories told from a myriad of sense making stances. This is also true of a myriad of stories from Africa and Europe connecting the past and the present as well as the here and the there. I hope your story as a zigzagging of different stories make sense to many.”

“Thank you.”

“You're welcome to recognise that at crucial points we really differ.”

“As Rabbi probably also noticed, a lot of my references are dating from this century. The reason is simple, if I'm promoting the use of digital media with a present space, why not predominantly use digital ebooks and google books, etc.? In the seconding of my thoughts, that I've constructed and assembled in the 30 years before this century, and the first decade of this century, the digested mentation can just as well be seconded with the present, since it's more likely that we are on the same page in the dream than those long gone. Haven't we had some miniature awakenings already just in the last few decades; not epoch changing awakenings, but little ones none the less like the collapse of USSR communism?”

“In a differential and integral sense a human mind not only serialises, concatenates and weighs thoughts and cognitions over a period of time but over a period of time also serialises, concatenates and weighs feelings and fears, angers and contests, beliefs and doubts, formations, constructions and informations, love expressions, dislikes and rejections, evolvments and devolvments, imaginations, visions, figments and dreams, social encounters, engagements and skirmishes, language and stories, sentences, words, symbols and lingual traces and many more.”

⁹³ And also currently experience teaching Systematic Theology and Philosophy for undergraduates with online teaching for Africa as an alumnus at Nazarene Theological College.

“Yes, but not when it's a seconding of my thoughts in the collective (un)conscious dream of the now, the present! The present is what we are saying together now, we're not just trying to translate things from the past.”

“Again in the differential and integral way we say things now in the present that is a genesis and a history of a serialising, concatenation and weighing of 30 or 40 years of thoughts, feelings and love expressions and many more of each of us and many more of other people. I refrain from the collective (un)conscious notion because it stands in the way of a genesis and the now of your and my uniqueness and excellence. We are not ‘saying in this encounter the present together’, as you put it, but say from our respective geneses and our sharing of presence now in the overlapping sense some things similarly and other things quite differently.”

“What I'm saying is actually the corporate hermeneutical circle⁹⁴ at work in this seconding, and in my case indicates how good I've digested the material to circle back to myself to tell an African story! Remember it's about the story.”

“We are saying things differently precisely at the point of the hermeneutic circle, circling back the digested material to yourself. The hermeneutical circle in the modern era is like a driver of a miniature train in the children's park trying to understand and explain why the train goes around and around and around without adding real value and meaning. This is Calvin, Newton, Einstein, Bohr and Ricoeur's problem. The hermeneutic circle's closest modern friend is the hermeneutic spiral who is like a friendly snake sailing through many holes trying to understand and explain why it has to sail through so many holes until it bites itself in the tail – again without adding value and meaning. This is Foucault, Derrida and Deleuze's problem. ”

“The next thing is that Rabbi indicated that I have to put things like *existentialism* in my discussions, and particularly with regards to things like the Filipinos in Fritslar that lose

⁹⁴ I'm hijacking the hermeneutical circle with the adjective corporate to the dynamics of ubuntuing, and the collective (un)consciousness, where circle is not a static circle but an inflatable circle, like a balloon, and thus the cognitive relative balloon that becomes bigger in more metaphors/nutrition in narrative. Although I don't add the adjective corporate to the hermeneutical circle in all cases, in the Director's cut, that's what I say.

themselves in inflation conversations, but still thoroughly enjoy them. This is the next bit of a issue I have with the traditional university system, the creation of vocabulary or *concepts* as the source of rhetorical debating⁹⁵. Paul Patton indicates how

For Deleuze too, the creation of concepts is inseparable from the elaboration of new vocabularies... Rorty abandons talks of truth and falsity in philosophy in favour of the degree to which new vocabulary is interesting, where 'interesting' philosophy is usually 'a contest between an entrenched vocabulary which has become a nuisance and a half-formed new vocabulary which vaguely promises great things'. Deleuze and Guattari's account of the utopian vocation of philosophy is similarly linked to a pragmatic response to the question of the value of philosophical concepts. (Pisters 2001:39)

I understand the system wants me to use vocabularies, and like Rabbi told me once (Van Niekerk 2010b) that you exactly ask your disciples to get a number of opposite vocabularies/*concepts* and see how they intersect and cut through each other and construct the dissertation around these intersections; but my question is 'How much of this is only rhetorical manoeuvres?' In principle I agree with Rabbi and agree that this is an excellent way to construct a plot, but I just want to leave the story, the narrative, to blend all apparent *concepts*/notions, without necessarily naming them, and so ensure a fluidity for each respective intratextual context: if ideologueing does take place, it's inevitably passing on the way I've been *geprägt*."

"I have never been in the business of making disciples or followers. Very early in

95 By contrasting educational traditions, could many of these vocabularies not be seen as purely academic jargon, that's now for the other tradition where it could be seen as the unbunting of an exclusive club, where theologising is the creation of vocabulary in an academic act? The thing is should Deleuze be somehow (creating) right that "...philosophy is theatrical (as Foucault famously said [about Deleuze]), its theatrics and dramatisation rest on its performativity, on what it embodies. And this embodiment is creation, the constant creation of new concepts, of new vocabularies, one that will, in their transversality across categories, subtend and subvert old dichotomies" (Mullarkey 2006:17)? (underlining for emphasis), then at least the subtending and subverting of old dichotomies should occur on the pattern of the bottom up hierarchy of liberation theology (Petrella 2004:12) for the intended missional endeavour I have in mind – let us just say, just as YAHWEH accommodates our (cognitive) variabilities, so academics that don't accommodate the other end (call the bottom if you want to), or start at the other end, are not the academics I'm interested in since then it tends to much towards a Cartesian Idealism to my liking.

my life I took up the clue from my father not be a disciple or follower of anyone, not even Jesus or God. What I do as co-actor, co-writer and co-worker of the Spirit of God in the Kingdom of God is to be in constant negotiation with God, with myself, with fellow human beings and the natural surrounding environment in a modern day wrestling match like Jacob in the Jabbok. In this sense, although respected by you of being a Rabbi, I am not a Rabbi but a negotiating wrestler. I negotiate and wrestle with students to challenge and to stimulate them to lifelong empowerment processes in terms of their sense making approaches that are continuously shifting as they go.

As you know modernity has set God on ice as ineffectual in many instances of daily life including philosophy and the sciences, thereby leaving the space open for a struggle between human beings and nature as to who or what is the all-initiating agency and meaning-giver of all there is. With God out of the modern picture, one of the ways of subverting and relativising the remaining illusionary oppositional struggle between humanity and nature with its hundreds of oppositional derivatives such as subjective and objective, cause and effect, is and ought, individual and community, immanence and transcendence, etc. is to ask a student to intersect, to interrogate and to rhetorically manoeuvre the modernist illusion of space and time that is forcibly inserted between humanity and nature with God out of the way. In my own view God, human beings and nature overlap and differ as a mystery that could only be accepted and not narratively, theoretically or in what ever way solved and worked out, not even in a dream.

Now closing in on the illusionary modern stuff of your story. The problematic part is the strategy of just leaving the story, the narrative to blend all apparent concepts, without necessarily naming them and thereby ensuring a fluidity for each respective intratextual context with the added rider that if “ideologueing does take place, it's inevitably passing on the way I've been geprägt.” Firstly, nearly everything of your views thus far is only a blending of concepts, not a blending also of feelings, beliefs, imaginations, dreams, proportions, words, traces, molecules, atoms and microparticles but only a blending of thoughts. Secondly, your overt view of time as simultaneity of past and present occurrences means that “the way I've been

geprägt” is the hermeneutic spiralling of the friendly snake trying to understand why it has to travel through so many holes and then is confronted in the biting of the tail with its face.”

“When I dealt with the atonement I omitted rhetorical *concepts* like *propitiation* versus *expiation*, since I think it's obvious that I lean to *expiation*, but the moment one says this *concept* it becomes what it's not, and that with a lot of baggage. This *concept* has the baggage of sin being concrete, and not relational, and that I don't like. The *concept* must then be redefined should I want to use it, but why not just leave it out then? Then there's the vocabulary word revival that I've used extremely one-sided, and actually so narrow as if I've indicated nothing else is possible. The thing is, a *concept* itself is a whole narrative, and inevitable meanders with other narratives. But if I say that, how can we communicate if we don't use vocabularies? In short, omitting vocabularies, is also a narrative! Some vocabularies though I wanted to use, due to the baggage and narrative it speaks, that's now vocabularies like deconstruction, fundamentalism, and liberal theology. The word party I also gave a meaning quite contrary to its use in our day-to-day language, but I intentionally wanted to use this word since the analogy is the same as Paul's use in Ephesians 5:18; irrespective of the inherent conflict in the word I intended to bring the baggage of party with although in a new appropriation. Is the drunkenness party not actually the allegorical of the true Sabbath's need implicit in the human nature, and so the analogy is actually the other way around, from Sabbath to party? What's the first thing someone does when he or she wins the Lottery? Throw a party, because an apparent Sabbath has materialised.”

“In the differential and integral academic debate in which I am engaged in, someone cannot slip away by denouncing and fighting against modernity as humanity's biggest sin in history while modernity's biggest sin of reducing every narrative, every word, every new appropriation to thoughts and concepts and thinking creeps back into the narrative. To say a concept itself is a whole narrative is implying modernity's grand sin, to say that it inevitably meanders with other narratives softens it a bit but let it autodeterminatively still continue.”

“What I meant is that no *concept* can be understood apart from a narrative, and thus inevitably reduces to a narrative. Due to (all) possible narrative-matrixes I want to reside in

a propositional uncertainty, that coupled with the fictive narrative discourse that also resides in this uncertainty (Boyland 2010:26), which serves me well to curb the dilemma and write theolosophy for Africa.”

“With your provisional home in Germany your theolosophy for Africa will be a bit of a generalised gospel hitting pass the hearts of Black Africans. I believed you said somewhere along the line that you are God’s (YAHWEH’s) roving missionary in Europe?”

“Yes, I know and therefore I planned these discussions as a hybrid exposition, although I wish to challenge the Greek/Western invested component. Implicit vocabularies, necessary for an academic debate, are hidden in the narrative itself, and intentionally eliciting the reader to bring them to the story and debate with me.”

“Go on to challenge the Greek/Western invested component but do the same with Ubuntu as philosophy.”

“I realise there are a number of things Rabbi won't see they way I do, but the fact that we could be friends, more than just being in a Rabbi-disciple relationship, and even spent time in coffee shops and eating out, tells me that we are postmodern. I guess being a professor at Unisa is something like unity in essentials, liberty in non-essentials, charity in all things, but in our case I trust it has gone even further than that. Actually it was seeing Rabbi caring for me when I wasn't doing so well, that's now when Rabbi bought me a good amount of vitamin supplements; it was seeing Rabbi caring for someone like Sarah who was dying of AIDS related diseases that taught me more than words (Van Niekerk 2011). That's how a Rabbi should teach.”

“Thank you! Small actions as disseminated clues and traces of a non-rabbinical negotiating wrestler sometimes change lives, sometimes not.”

“I'm not so sure that Rabbi would agree with how I cut the line with temporality through the old heaven and earth versus the unseen – the ubu- through the -ntu. My inference comes from Rabbi's emphasis on the *theanthropocosmic principle* (Van Niekerk 2009:36-7). In the formula of the *theanthropocosmic principle* I only see YAHWEH outside the physical-organic world or universe, not the comprehensive unseen as I see it, but, on the other

hand, I see Rabbi in a different endeavour than me, and that asks for other appropriations in another cognitive and intratextual context.”

“I have said in the past I could not get under your skin (Van Niekerk 2011a). This meant nothing more than that the way you make sense is unique and excellent and while there is overlapping between us I do not want to play the modern interpretationist game of interpretatively looking into someone’s mind or looking under his or her skin while pretending to explain what is happening there. A good example of not getting under your skin is that your post-late modernist annulment of the unique warm-blooded individual human being which is you, me and others around us, does not make sense to me while you let the warmblooded individual human being which is you, play an overbearing role in your narrative.

The theanthropocosmic principle is an outline portraying the mystery that the presences of God, human beings and the natural environment are closely connected and radically different in each an every field, mode and dimension of reality and in each an every discourse, encounter and conversation of reality. The word ‘reality’ is according to the Dutch Christian philosopher AE Loen one of the most slippery words in our vocabulary. Why? The word Reality with a capital letter should actually include the realities of God, human beings and the natural environment as closely connected and radically different. Do not say in one word when two words or three words are necessary. Barth said that God is the ‘totally other’ to which he did not add that God is also the ‘totally near’ to us and the natural environment. That is why Barth had to use analogies to build a bridge between God and human beings through the mind powers of Barth the theologian.

Your slight accusation that in the theanthropocosmic principle you see YAHWEH outside the physical-organic world or universe and not the comprehensive unseen as you view it. My reaction to that is not to create one term or phrase such as the comprehensive unseen for God. I for my part do not know whether God is the unseen or the seen. God is present here and now, I am present and you as fellow human being are present and the natural environment is present. While there is a correlative slotting into each other of the presences they are in each others company not the same. The problem with the Graeco-Roman tradition and the whole

Christian theological tradition is that they pull God's presence and human being's presence apart and then want to glue it back again with human mindpower of thoughts, beliefs, words, imaginations or feelings. Modernity does the same with human beings and the natural environment: pull apart and then with the powers of the human mind glue together. Plato bridged the gap with theoretical (theoria) mirroring, Aristotle with analogising theoretical (theoria) processes. God is just very closely connected but very different from us as human beings and the physical environment. That is the mystery I am prepared to live with."

"I want to concur that I can also not get under Rabbi's skin."

"Are there other things of the non-rabbinical negotiating wrestler troubling you?"

"Rabbi once or twice said that you have a problem with Buddhism due to the lack of a god consciousness. I realise Buddhism outside some other religion, like Hinduism or animism, is atheism and then secularism that I vehemently oppose, and therefore I tried the impossible to differentiate philosophy from theology, but is that not endemic of the whole problem of modernism that thought they were purging theology with philosophy, just to do a theology, an egology (ego- -ology)? What I've then done with Buddhism is not to separate the philosophy from the tradition, that's impossible, so (admittedly) I've rather simulacrumised/adapted the philosophy to fit the Scriptures⁹⁶; although that's impossible due to the hermeneutical circle as indicated in my hermeneutical discussion yesterday."

"Your exposition here seems very convoluted but is actually following the interpretationist route of the friendly snake through many holes while biting its tail sees its face in its tail."

"The same applies to ubuntu where my underlining motive has only been to read the philosophy of ubuntu with the Scriptures into the Scriptures, if that's possible due to the hermeneutical circle. Both ubuntu and Buddhism are also about reading the reasonable physics into the Scriptures."

"Your interpretationist approach of "reading into the Scriptures" what you are "reading out of the Scriptures" is simultaneously acted out as selectively "reading

⁹⁶ Buddhism as a metaphor (as a set of metaphors).

into physics” what you are “reading out of physics”.”

“One thing we know so far is the death of the individual!”

“I reiterate that modernity elevated the warm-blooded individual human being to the position of a collective mega all-initiating meaning-giving agency to play God’s role that has seemingly been taken away from God. You surely do not continue in this modernist trajectory with the illusion of the death of the individual with Foucault, Derrida, Deleuze and others, or do you? Nietzsche’s death of God, Adorno’s death of man, the bunny huggers and tree huggers’ death of the natural environment and Foucault, Derrida and Deleuze’s death of the individual is a bit boring to say the least. What about celebrating the interlinkage of the foursome of presences in daily experience with mounts of wellbeing and wellness?”

“I realised Rabbi could maybe disagree with me, on the hand of your work called *Faith, Philosophy and Science. TL 501/2009* (Van Niekerk 2009) for Unisa, but maybe not! What I've picked up is that Rabbi's sense making is fluid with single persons' sense makings overlapping like Olympic rings in the faculties of faith, thinking, feeling, speaking, loving or socialising, etc. The individual is not pioneered, but rather a unique Point of Presence, a ring, between the many overlapping sense makings of the community with every sense making in every part being overlapped by another sense making. I trust my arguments illustrated my *personal* verdict on this (with personal in italics, because don't I just say exactly what Rabbi says?), although that's the thing about fictive narrative discourse, the verdict is actually for the reader to make. Seeking a certainty beyond the radical inductive of becoming (one) together is to step back into the modernist trap⁹⁷.

Let us just say I see the difference domicile in the respective audiences between Rabbi and me. I see Rabbi working against psychology, while my emphasis is the sociology that embraces the psychology. Now this is exactly the point where Rabbi could somehow disagree with me with what comes first psychology or sociology, but would solely depends

⁹⁷ The certainty I argue concurs with what Potter says, “One of the interesting and paradoxical features of fiction is that it is a major domain for fact construction” (Potter 1996:3), and so my story indeed intends to invent the factual/relational epistemological and ontological presence I'm arguing, with the Virtual Identity I have of myself. The boundaries of my intended outcome is set by my cognitive relative balloon; other intratextual contexts will be other outcomes.

on the definition of psychology? Let us just say practically it has to do with the nature of the debate we respectively stand in, and therefore I go with the verdict of Martin Trow, quoted in Norman Denzin's book, who says, "Let us be done with the arguments of "participant observation" versus interviewing – as we have largely dispensed with the arguments for psychology versus sociology – and get on with the business of attacking our problems with the widest array of conceptual and methodological tools that we possess and they demand" (Denzin 2009:297).

With psychology I mean a very narrow definition of the things pertaining to the ghost in the body, and therefore we aren't far from each other in fighting this same heresy in or for different audiences!"

"You have seen the overlapping Olympic rings of different fields, modes and dimensions of experience regarding the individual but what you miss time and again is that the Olympic rings, one at a time emphasises the correlated presences of 'God', 'me, myself and I', 'other human beings' and the 'natural surrounding environment' within the ambience of the particular characteristic field, mode or dimension. Why should I follow Foucault, Derrida or Deleuze while they term what I am doing as psychology, subjective or relationlessness just because they efface the warmblooded individual and continue to efface God as cumbersome subjective drivers of an event, happening or process. Their accusation only makes sense against the background of first, their continuous keeping of God on the ice as in high modernism, second their effacing of the warmblooded individual, and third their newly late-post modernly elevated all-describing mega subject which is differently constructed in each of their philosophies. In Foucault for instance it is Foucault himself elevated to the position of a discourse analytical mega-describer continuously engaged in discourse analytic fragmentising of power-relations. The warm blooded individual and God is operating as traces in Derrida deconstructing mega subject driven movement of an autodeterminatively differing and deferring zigzag movement on the surface of the text. In Deleuze's philosophy the mega subject describer and steerer of the unstable and eccentric 'deterritorializing' trajectories of minor particles and minor flows is the 'machinic phylum' or 'virtual robotic historian' taking over from the individual subject and the mega objective

subject of high modernism.”

“Rabbi also talks about three testaments, as Rabbi says,

The term Third Testament follows the traditional sequence of Testaments. The era of the Third Testament, the era of renewal is inaugurated with the day of Pentecost. While the canons, the benchmarks of the First/Old and the Second/New Testaments are closed, the canon of the Third Testament is still open. (Van Niekerk 2006:80).

I would like to stick to the two covenants, but I don't think I'm far from Rabbi when I propose that we should, or actually already do read ourselves into the Scriptures, and through that should canonise our narratives⁹⁸. The thing is just that my direction is the other way around. I say it's impossible to translate the intratextual context of the Scriptures to today, we only incorporate/interpolate the Scriptures allegorically in the second/multi person validating narration into our narratives. If you wish you can call it a third testament, but then actually every intratextual context is a new testament from the second century on, arguing an indeterminable number of testaments; that's now when intratextual contexts are the cognitive relativism I claim explaining how Jacob of old could have had 13 children (which we know of), with four wives (which we know of), and not doing sin, although that would be sin today.”

“The Three Testament story is amongst others a subversion of the Reformed and Evangelical, Pietist and Quiet-time traditions that stop at a personal relationship with Jesus while in actuality de-emphasising the Holy Spirit as God, the renewing mobile actual presence amongst us and in the natural environment..”

“I realise I've been very brave with the metaphysics of a dream I've argued, but is this whole dissertation not just a dream?”

“Yes, you are!”

“Certainty died with modernism!”

98 Actually it can be argued that everyone's narrative is by default already being read into the Scriptures, since the Scriptures delineate everyone's relationship with YAHWEH – either good or bad -, and so everyone already features in the Scriptures. Reading ourselves into the Scriptures has then just as much to do with plotting ourselves in the Scriptures.

“If you are right with all the deaths of mega subjects in modernity, why a dream then?”

“Because a dream is a certainty, but with hallucinatory characteristics! On the other hand a dream is a narrative, irrespective of how absurd, and narrative lives us.”

“Okay, a convolution I could live with!”

“The certainty of the narrative is the relationships that furnish the content. The certainty of postmodernism is the confection of relationships as the epistemological principle. The ontological is the dream; anyway the medieval times used to be a dream for modernism, and modernism a dream for postmodernism, and postmodernism maybe a dream for someone else.”

“Your concatenation of mega dreams seems to me the thesis that you have attempted!”

“Narrative is the only narrative-mark that eludes them all.”

“You have added the serialising of narrative markings!”

“The thing is that the narratives I see in Germany and South Africa I don't like; the collective (un)consciousnesses I don't like. In the one social justices are not so much an issue, but the YAHWEH consciousness has vaporised, in the other one social injustices prevails. The only narrative-mark that'll make the difference is revival.”

“The notion of revival you use does not make sense to me! Are you promoting church growth, spirituality or religiosity? Along which routes are social justices coming into your picture?”

“Like I said in the discussions, I don't mean church growth per se, actually I think the time of church is over. I think it's time for house churches now, synagogues, as Rad Zdero says,

There is currently a global shift going on in the church. There is a new Christianity on the horizon. The Spirit of God is birthing the global house church movement. This phenomenon is sweeping across many parts of our planet in places like China, India, and Cuba to name a few, and is gaining momentum in North America.”

(Zdero 2004:1)⁹⁹,

since,

It can also be argued quite soundly that to form a denomination is to commit heresy. Denominations are formed when some Christians split off from the larger body of Christ to follow their favorite doctrines or practices and create a movement with them.

The sin of heresy [Greek: *hairesis*] is the act of choosing to follow one's own tenets. So a person can be a heretic with the truth if he uses it to fracture the body of Christ. A person can be technically "orthodox" and yet be a "heretic" by using a orthodox belief to divide Christians from one another. (Viola 2008:235)

Church, by being what it's not, is a heresy! House church/synagogue is what it is, the *parakletos* for and to the outsiders as the sacrificing body of Yeshua. They become insiders only when they join the sacrifice."

"The ongoing daily diasporia of happenings and eventualising of the presences of 'God', 'me, myself and I', 'fellow human beings' and 'the natural surrounding environment' in encounters, situations and contextual settings of everyday life – including the church as a happening of every day - is sufficient for me. Micro annunciations of us being created, being reconciled in the cross and the

99 On the church planting conference I attended in Hamburg, Germany, in August 2011, one of the seminars was with Jonathan Fokker the research coordinator of Simple Church Europe who gave us an overview of their Status Report 2010 (Van der Woude 2010). In this report, at the time of writing, they estimated the total number of simple church networks in Europe at 1,417 across 45 nations where these networks make up a total of 12,757 small groups, in which 140,327 people are involved. The staggering bit is that in many nations in Europe the membership of institutional churches is declining. In the Netherlands, e.g. where Jonathan Fokker is from, the decline of the mainline protestant and catholic denominations hover between 1 and 3% annually. According to them the free evangelical churches are doing a bit better with an average growth of 0.5% annually (some are growing, some are shrinking). Compared to this, they say the simple church [house church] networks in Europe are doing quite well with an average growth of 22%. They say the comparison of simple church groups with rabbits (often heard on simple church conferences) might be true for China and India, but it's certainly not (yet) the case in Europe. In 2009 the simple church networks planted on average 2.5 new churches. This represents 30 new members per network of which seven come from a non-Christian background. So 23% could be considered 'real harvest' and 77% a 'recycling of the saints'. In 2010 they found a higher real conversion percentage of 34%.

resurrection, under renewing construction on our way to the New Heaven and the New Earth are enough to carry us into tomorrow, next week, next year and into the next life after death.”

“My story of how I came to Yeshua, actually how I became acquainted with YAHWEH in the Shekinah, is the story of revival for me. The thing is it has nothing to do with the what of, the church or building or organisation, but with the who, that's YAHWEH. I long for the essence¹⁰⁰ of my story to become normative for some, and that's the revival I have in mind:, this acquaintance/relationship with YAHWEH!”

“Okay.”

“In this acquaintance/relationship is hidden my hermeneutics and the way I've gone along with the (oral) Scriptures. Rudy Boyens once said that if one spends an hour a day reading about one specific subject, one will be a world authority on this particular subject after 5 years (Boyens 2000). I don't know if he had any scientific evidences, or empirical studies, and I'm not sure where he got it from, he didn't say, but one thing I know, if something of this is true I'm at least four times over a world authority on the Scriptures. Let us be conservative, say only the last 20 years I've been practising my meditations as I've indicated in our discussions. That means mostly more than an hour a day the last 20 years in which I've been through the Scriptures a number of times from cover to cover; I've studied the Scriptures in their original languages, I've gone through the Scriptures accompanied with commentaries, I've done comparative studies between parashot. All and all I've done thorough Biblical theology, if I can burrow this loaded notion and narrative-mark. Included in this 20 years are six years full-time in Bible colleges, and another five years for my MTh and doctor's studies. To what number of hours do we get to then?”

“Humbling!”

“So, this is part of the paradigm shift I've been facing. I wanted to tell a story, only a story with the Scriptures as the last commentary over all other commentaries. Because of the Scriptures being the last commentary, this story could only have been a *Biblical theological* story, as much as I have a problem with this word, but now the story has to

100Umgangssprachlich

include more than just the Scriptures to repudiate the baggage of tradition that choke(d) the Scriptures.”

“This is an excellent opportunity to demonstrate how we overlap and disagree... I am in continuous paradigm shifts and turns as co-actor, co-worker and co-writer of the Spirit of God. I wanted to tell a story, only a story with God, the Holy Spirit as the last commentator over all other commentators and commentaries, even over the commenting I am engaged in now. Because the Holy Spirit is the last commentator over the Scriptures as commentary and every other commentary of the tradition including my own tradition, this story could have been only a story espousing the ongoing and dynamic mystery of the connection and the difference between the ongoing repetitive but differing presence of the Spirit in the presences of myself, other human beings and the natural environment in the story. As much as I have a problem with the term mystery of connected and different presences the story is a negotiation with as many as possible commentaries including the Scriptures as commentary which sometimes opened up and sometimes choked the active presence of God in many of its stories and storylines.”

“Isn't it possible to also see it the other way around as well, that is now not to take things to the Scriptures, but the Scriptures to things in the second/multi person narration? When YAHWEH is present He narrates the Scriptures that are *“... alive! The word of YAHWEH is at work and is sharper than any double-edged sword - it cuts right through to where soul meets spirit and joints meet marrow, and it is quick to judge the inner reflections and attitudes of the heart.”* (Hebrews 4:12). Some might call it an *existentialism*, but for me it's more than that, it's an *existential-hegelianism* in a Riemannian geometry.”

“Taking up the clue of God’s presence as double-edged sword means that it cuts my ambience here and now in which his presence is being there, being thus and thus and being actual to pieces as well as any ambience of the Scriptures where God’s presence was being there, being thus and thus and being actual. Out of the pieces, the clues and the traces are meanings resurrected by the Spirit of God. I do not work with the principle of simultaneity of all time but with time as simultaneous, linear, circular, cyclical, zigzagging and pendulum inclined. ”

“That brings me to the next thing. I've heard Rabbi once mentioning an issue with the burnt offering: something of my use Rabbi had something to say about. Rabbi didn't elaborate on it, so it might be that the issue has solved itself otherwise Rabbi would have mentioned it again. On the other hand I think there is still something I need to add to the atonement though, and that's the goat for Azazel in Leviticus 16. In Leviticus 16, on the Day of Atonement, the high priest has to confess the sins of all of Israel over the goat for Azazel. The significance of this act is not so clear, but Oesterley and Robinson rightly say that Azazel doesn't mean the goat, it is a personality the goat is given to (Oesterley 1930:66). It's difficult to see this as a sacrifice to a demon or Satan though (Bromiley 1979:375).

What I see is the fact that the goat is being sent outside the camp, and tells me the goat is being banished from the presence of YAHWEH. What I see is that this act indicates that the evil narrative, or the things of the evil narrative, are being banished from the presence of YAHWEH. This is a transaction of separating narratives, and even if it's maybe only symbolic, it tells the Israelite what belongs outside the kingdom in YAHWEH's feudal system and what not. The real significance is the confession needed to admit that.

It's exactly this necessary and inevitable confession I would like to point out. The perpetual burnt offering alone is not good enough without confessing our sins to YAHWEH and each other (1John 1:9; James 5:16). Confessing our love is the other side of the same coin and both together are the instrumental gage indicating the quality of the relationship. ”

“It makes sense that you have included that!”

“I trust Rabbi has noticed that I've prepared my discussions like a funnel: I started with the broad spectrum of inherited philosophy climaxing in the 20th century in deconstruction and poststructuralism. From there I pulled the debate closer by narrowing down the philosophies that can embrace the Scriptures, or being embraced by the Scriptures. Slowly but surely I was pulling the dream into the neck of the funnel by narrowing down the narrative to how I got to my norm through my testimony of my encounter with YAHWEH. The whole aim was to bring the dream to the dream of revival, YAHWEH's memorandum of esteem, supported by the narrative virtual space's hermeneutics involved in such a Shekinah revival. This whole funnel climaxing in revival is the thesis of my whole doctor's

dissertation.¹⁰¹”

“I have to complement you, you've put in a lot of effort and planning to demonstrate the hermeneutical circle of narrating it the way you've done it!”

“The thing is the thesis is also the narrative itself, the story, and the medium. Just as revival has no meaning outside a story, so my thesis is not separated from the story. Postmodernism is a new story, but still only a story, so I confine only in a story. Ubuntuing doesn't happen apart from a story. My thesis is thus not only the content, but also the vehicle, and together they're one story.”

“While I view post-late modernism as the old gospel of modernism in a new garb I am glad that you have at least succeeded in combining content and vehicle into one story.”

“If Plato is the cornerstone of Western philosophy, how much of Plato don't I have in my discussions? With good rhetoric someone would most certainly prove such a notion.

Frederick Copleston says,

That there is much to be said for this interpretation of Plato's thought, I would not deny: moreover, it is naturally attractive to all those who desire to discover a tidy system in Plato and a theistic system. But common honesty forces one to admit the very serious difficulties against this tidy interpretation. (Copleston 2003:191),

which on the other hand also indicates that Plato has become a simulacrum and that a lot can be read into Plato which we won't know if he would have approved of or not. The thing is should (simulacrum) Plato be ever present, let us rather dilute him with YAHWEH's narrative so that Shekinah's ever present.”

“Do not forget about Aristotle's presence in the sciences competing with God's ongoing presence! So what platform is my train on again?”

....

101Just saying the word revival gives me goosebumps; so should I ever be blamed for being modern, let it be a reductionism to revival, or the absence of revival.