

10.3.2. Philosophy of Religion. Part II, p. 166 to 335.

Beings that give the names (eponymism).

We read Cl. Lévi-Strauss, *Le totémisme aujourd'hui*, (Totemism today,), Paris, 1969, 25 / 33.-- In 1920 Van Gennep noted forty-one different theories of totemism! This indicates that our Western intellectuals simply cannot see the point! That is why we start the study of all that is called 'totemism' with just one sample, namely the totemism of the ojibwa (ojibwe) Indians who speak one algonquian language and are situated north of the Great Lakes in N.-America.

Eponymism.

Isokrates, e.g., mentions "hoi eponumoi hères", the eponymous heroes, i.e., the heroes who gave their names to the ten tribes of Athens. The so-called totem would better be called "namesake" or also "namesake primordial being". For in all cases - even the most diverse - this role occurs. The totem is always 'eponym'. Hence we prefer the term 'eponymism'.

The term 'totemism

According to Cl. Lévi-Strauss, the term comes from an ojibwa expression 'ototeman', 'ote' being the core and meaning 'name equality' (clan affiliation). The 'O' indicates the third person. The 't' is a vowel (epenthesis) to separate the 'O' from 'ote'. The 'm' is possessive pronoun. And the 'an' is the third person.

So the expression means: "he is of my kindred". If you like: "He is my namesake".

Thus Lévi-Strauss still quotes: "makwa nindotem" (The bear is my clan or namesake), where the term 'bear' is a collective name, and "pindikén nigwim" (Come in, clan brother).

Note:-- In order to avoid any prior confusion the following should be said.

The 'nigouime' (nigwim) is thoroughly different in the ojibwa language. It is the individual guardian angel or guardian spirit recommended to a boy or girl in the puberty years. It is acquired through direct contact with an animal, for example, and in a ritual manner such that, as a result of this initiation, life is similar between nigouime and protected.

Note: -- The totem also differs from the 'manido' or spirit. The ojibwa, for example, distinguish the great and higher spirits from lower spirits, as well as good and bad spirits.

An eponymous myth.

Relying on W. Warren, himself an ojibwa, in his *History of the Ojibways*, in: *Minnesota Historical Collection*, 5 v., Saint-Paul, 1885, Lévi-Strauss presents the following natural myth.

1. The present fact.

The ojibwa were organized in several dozen clans (patrilineal, patrilocal). Five of them were 'more considerable' than the rest.

2. The mythical interpretation.

"In the beginning (note: -- the origin or 'primeval time', better: ever present eternity) there were six human-like higher beings. They rose from the depths of the ocean to 'mingle' with the 'people' (ojibwe).

One of them did not dare to look at the Indians, although he would have loved to, and was blindfolded. But he could not restrain himself: he lifted the blindfold, let his eyes fall on a 'human being'. This one died instantly as if struck by lightning. Then his companions forced him to return to the depths of the sea.

The five other higher beings remained among the Indians and 'caused' many benefits. These five are the origin of the great clans or totem groups: fish, crane, diving duck, bear, Canada elk and marten.

Note:-- According to Lévi-Strauss, Warren gives a mutilated account of the myth (without saying why). Yet it is valuable:

- a. there is no direct contact of individual ojibwa and totem animal;
- b. the Indian dies because he was 'watched' and this by the singular behavior of one higher being.

In other words: the relationship between a clan member and the totem being is collective and indirect.

In other words: the relationship between a member of a clan and the totem being is collective and indirect.

In other words: Warren's assertions must be heard with reservations.

No worship.

The totem animal is not worshipped by means of a cult.-- More than that: the ojibwa said that the totem animal preferred to be hunted by clan members bearing its 'name'.

Consequently, it was appropriate to address it by its 'name' before killing it.

***Note:*-- no origin beings.**

The ojibwa never came across the belief that the clan members were 'descended' from the totem animal.

For comparison.

Lévi-Strauss cites R. Landes, *Ojibwa Sociology*, in: *Columbia University Contributions to Anthropology*, xxix, 1937. He notes that, although the caribou had completely disappeared in southern Canada, its clan members were at ease: “It’s just a name! Immediately the totem animal was freely killed ... and eaten.

Note: -- Of course not without respecting the ritual aspect that applies to all living creatures hunted or fished in primitive societies: one starts by asking the permission to hunt and kill the animal in question (the caribou for example) and an apology afterwards.

The respect for life, including the animal to be hunted (out of necessity to survive and live) - this also applied to the plucking, pulling out etc. of plants; - was different from Western, ‘rational’ man. Life’ always has a sacred character to one degree or another.

But this in itself has nothing to do with totemism as such. It may be, however, that totemism - even if limited to mere naming for classification purposes - springs from that type of reverence for plants or animals (or even inorganic realities). Why, for example, are sea creatures called ‘higher’ creatures in the ojibwa origin myth?

Lévi-Strauss says that spirits are distinguished into good and evil ones. He seems to insinuate that this is not the case with the totemic beings: how is it then that in the ojibwa myth one sea creature is disposed of as harmful by his fellow creatures and that the five others who act in groups cause beneficence?

In this the totemic beings clearly resemble the manidos or spirits! Lévi-Strauss does not even seem to have noticed this.--In addition, both totemic beings and spirits or manidos are higher beings in the eyes of the ojibwa. That ‘name’ says something.

Causers.

The fact that one does evil and the other five do good, shows that they are - to speak with N. Söderblom - causative higher beings. Precisely because they are higher. So that to bear their name as a clan is more than just a label.

Note:-- The five “mingle” with the ojibwa: could this not indicate “marriages”? So that the totemic beings resemble the ‘sons of god’ mentioned in the Bible (Gen. 6:1/4) who had sexual intercourse with “the daughters of men” and produced ‘heroes’.

The beautiful lilo-fairy

An unknown ballad poet has described to us, in German, a case of “strange flesh” (as the Bible puts it (Jud. 6/7)).

The ‘son of God’, i.e. the other-worldly entity, here is a ‘water man’ (as also in *Die schöne Agnete* (The beautiful Agnete), by Agnes Miegel (°1879)), i.e. a spirit of nature whose occult biotope is water).

The text.

Once, a wild waterman was courting in the castle, safely reaching above the lake: he had to have the king’s daughter, the beautiful young Lilo-fary.

Below, she heard the bells ringing in the deep lake. She wanted to see her father and mother again, the beautiful young Lilo-fary..

And, as she stood before the gate (....), foliage and green grass inclined,-- for the beautiful young Lilo-fary..

And when she came out of the church (...), there stood the wild waterman before the beautiful young Lilo-fary..

“Speak! Will you come down with me? (Your children below are crying for you, you beautiful young Lilo-fary..)

“And, before I let the little children weep in the deep, I bid them farewell to foliage and green grass,--me, poor young Lilo-fary.”.

Note. :-- Another version speaks of a “Nickelmann” (“Nickel” is “dwarf”; “Nickelmann” is “water spirit” apparently) who takes a young woman into his biotope (at night, when she is asleep and goes “down into her departed soul”, into occult subterranean “waters”): In this version, too, the love for the subterranean children, occultly conceived, at night, by the water spirit, prevails over the craving for the ordinary earthly life of men and Lilo-fary chooses exile.

Note:-- The Bible, in Gen. 6:4, mentions such occult ‘marriages’ of ‘nature spirits’ (‘sons of God’) with “the daughters of men”.

Also the book of Tobit (3:17; 6:8 (evil spirits sexually approaching, ‘possessing’ men or women); 6:14f; 6:17f; 7:11) mentions such occult practices of invisible beings.

Purely ‘critically’ (secularly), such ‘stories’ appear to be fictions. Religiously observed, however, it appears that - especially in nocturnal sleep - unscrupulous beings secretly commit erotic acts with men or women in order to conceive new spirits (‘children’) from them, for example, or also, for example, purely to tease. Or out of erotic envy.

Manism.

Ancestor belief becomes theoretical manism with Herbert Spencer (1820/ 1903).

1. Spencer was an evolutionist: in 1852 (seven years before Darwin's *Origin of Species* (1859)) he wrote his evolutionary creed (= The Development Hypothesis, in: *Leader* 20; 03. 1852).

2. Spencer was euhemerist. Euhèmeros of Messènè (-340/-270) was a Greek thinker-mythographer who, following in the footsteps of Leon of Pella (*On the Egyptian Gods*), postulated that what humans call 'deities' were in fact only deified remarkably gifted human beings. What in Greek is called 'apothe(i)osis'.

Spencer's manism.

It is a part of his sociological work, viz. *Principles of Sociology*, 3 vols., London, 1876, 1882, 1896.

The twenty first chapters of volume 1 contain a primitivology (theory concerning the 'savages') and this is concerning religion(s). As a sociologist (following in the footsteps of Aug. Comte, the positivist) Spencer of course pays first of all - not to say one-sidedly - attention to the social origin of the concept of 'deity' etc.

The twenty first chapters.

1. Just about all of humanity believed in "another self" when one died.
2. A group evolves from that and believes in another self that survives more or less long after death.
3. Within this group there are rites of reconciliation addressed to the deceased and at the funeral and at regular intervals thereafter.
4. One part - sedentary peoples and more evolved ones - clearly believes in the survival of the spirits of the dead and develops an orderly ancestor worship service.
5. Within the latter, there is a serious number who distinguish the "great" ancestors from the "small(er)".
6. This order of precedence becomes very clear when it comes to those ancestors who were leaders of a conquering race.

Note:-- One sees both evolving and reducing (reductionism) to purely human realities: all that is 'deity' is in the last instance purely human but with a distinctive sociological role that 'lives on' after death.

The following chapters.

From there Spencer attempts to prove that all other types of religion - nature religion, plant religion, animal religion, deity religion - 'evolve' from them.

(Red.: Euhemerism is a theory according to which the gods would be real characters, socialized after their death, their legend being embellished until becoming a kind of absolute and universal symbolism. It takes its name from the Greek mythographer Euhemere. (source: wikipedia 2018)).

Note:-- Spencer's theory found eager acceptance among intellectuals who were evolutionary or positivist in outlook. Ethnologists and historians of religion, however, on the basis of his very weak evidence, expressed serious reservations: they were much more in the field. In particular, the fact that he minimized the facts that contradicted his theory was blamed on him. For example, he neglected those facts that pointed to involution (downward evolution) instead of evolution.

Also the fact that every theory of evolution presupposes a progression from the lower to the higher, from the simple to the complicated, lacks serious foundation because the opposite cases are also known.

The judgment of Vl. Soloviev.

In his *Justification du bien*, Paris, 1939, 86, Soloviev's argument in its valuable nature boils down to the following.

Compared with the naturist theory.

Not in the guise of accidental fetishes or of man-made idols nor in the form of majestic and frightening natural phenomena does the concept of deity first arise in childhood. It does arise in the living image of providential parents that children have.

The 'religious' attitude of children toward their parents as if they were a living providence - it arises naturally within the framework of primitive humanity - comes to full consciousness when the children are adults. When the parents have died.

The worship of the dead fathers and mothers and of the ancestors indisputably occupies a prominent place, in the development of the religious, moral and social relations of humanity.

Soloviev's theory.

The 'wild' and civilized peoples of the world, without exception, honor their dead in one way or another.

The feeling of dependence as well as the concept of providence are transferred to the ancestors in time, when the child realizes that in turn the parents are dependent to one degree or another on the ancestors. Immediately the concept of providence moves from the parents to the ancestors.

Note:-- The couple "dependence/ providence" dominates Soloviev's theory.

Contacts with deceased.

Primitives - according to Soloviev - want to know the will of the deceased. Sometimes they do this by appearing in the context of faces (“visions”) or dreams. In other cases by divination (mantis).

The mediators between the deceased, revered as higher beings, and the earthly people are first the living father (note:-- or mother) or still the tribal elders, then -- within more complex social systems, -- a separate class: sacrificers, soothsayers, magicians, prophets.

In other words, although Spencer’s theory does not represent the whole truth, it is much more correct and thorough than the fetishist theory or the other theories which reduce all religion to the ‘deification’ of natural phenomena (sun, thunder, etc.).

The objects of worship

These have always been active humanoids or spirits - (note:-- who are spirits but never animated bodies as souls). It is indisputable that the prototype was the souls of the ancestors.

In Lithuania, for example, or in Poland, the general name for all spirits is “dzyady” (grandfather). Among the Russians the spirits are called ‘grandfather’: grandfather of the forests, grandfather of the waters,--also: grandfather of the house.

In *Metamorphoses* by P.Ovid (-43/+17; Roman poet), it teems with histories in which the dead or dying play a role by passing into the world of vegetable (phytomorphic) or animal (zoomorphic) deities. In which spirits also play a role. Things Ovid borrowed from the folk religions of the Greeks and Romans. Soloviev also refers to the stone spirits of rags, boeriaties and other peoples.

Among African and other peoples there is a type of magicians whose main characteristic is weather control (“weather makers”). Exactly the same power or life force is attributed in a higher and more direct degree to the spirits of these magicians, once they are dead. Whereby their living successors act only as summoners and mediators.

Well, in what would such a powerful spirit differ from a dead magician when controlling thunder and storm, from a “thunder god”? No rational reason is necessary to find any other explanation for the fact that e.g. the Greek supreme god Zeus is called ‘father’.-- Thus always Soloviev.

Tylorian animism.

Edward Tylor (1832/1917) is the proposer of a new theory of religion called “animism” (soul and spirit belief) in his *Primitive Culture* (1871).

1. Tylor was a Quaker by birth. The Quaker (‘beaver: ‘shaker’) is a person who is experiencing a Protestant revival, revival movement. The movement originated in England in the early XVII- th century and was organized in 1647 by George Fox (1624/1691). In 1681 it reached the USA. A revival is not so much interested in the established church as in living through it.

2. As an intellectual, Tylor was a (moderate) evolutionist. All religions evolved from a primal animism.

Body. Yes. But also life and shadow.

At a low cultural level, thinking people are deeply impressed by two types of biological problems.

1. What makes a dead body different from a living body? In particular, what causes wakefulness and sleep, rapture (“trance”), disease and death?

2. What are the human ‘shapes’ (forms, phantoms) that appear in dreams and faces (visions)?

“The ancient savage philosophers” (the old wild thinkers), starting from these two groups of phenomena, probably decided on the obvious proposition that every human being exhibits two aspects: a life (‘life’) and a phantom (‘phantom’).

Both, life and phantom, turn out to be separable from the body in experience because life can exit and the body as numb or dead. (Note:-- numb in case of strong exit of the soul; dead in case of final exit when man dies) and the phantom can also appear to people at a distance (from the body that remains behind)).

In other words: it can leave the body and appear elsewhere. Wild thinkers thus came to link life and shadow. This leads to the well-known theory of the “apparitional soul” or “ghost soul”.

This is: the soul, once exited, behaves like a (bodiless) ghost (and contains the life of the body left behind. which, at (strong) exit, becomes seemingly dead).

The wild thinkers went one step further: the “ghost soul” or spirit soul can enter the bodies of plants, birds, animals, creeping animals, can “possess” them and act through them.

Some higher developed wild races hold the theory of separate (from the body viz.) and surviving souls or spirits belonging to wood and stones, weapons, boats, food, clothes, jewelry and other things.

Conclusion.

Religion originated the day one attributed a “soul” - similar to the soul of man - to any type of inorganic or living reality.

Applicative model.

Religion is unspoken in the Negro African who experiences the following.

He wanted to deal with an important matter but in crossing the threshold he stepped on a stone and hurt himself, “Ha! Ha! Art thou there?” he said. Thereupon he took the stone and it was a help to him throughout his undertaking days.

Note: -- Everything depends on what exactly the negro-african understands by ‘thou’! If he addresses himself - via the stone - for example to an ancestor who is favorable to him, but draws attention to himself by making him pay attention to the stone, then this is a case of manism.

If he only says this in a scattered way, as a Westerner would dare to do (personifying), then this has nothing to do with religion.

This little example gives an idea of Tylor’s opinion: religion is based on a relationship between man and the spirits who, in his view, ‘possess’, pervade, inhabit all of nature.

Naturism and fetishism, manism, -- even monotheism were thus ‘explained’ by Tylor. And, of course, all polytheisms (many gods) as well. He backed up his claims with an enormous mass of data. The success was very great among ethnologists and historians of religion who adopted his theory almost without question.

Note:-- E. Rhode, H. Usener, A. Dieterich, H. Oldenburg, H. Hirt, L. van Schroeder applied animism to the “classical” peoples (Greeks, Hindus, Indogermans, etc.).

Yet Tylor’s theory succumbed to criticism. Preanimism, in particular, claimed that there were religious phenomena that did not presuppose the concept of the soul, namely magic (material preanimism) and the one supreme being (personal preanimism) of monotheism.

'Lopoulo', the 'inside. As a target of black magic.

Read J. Sterly, *Kumo (Hexer und Hexen in Neu-Guinea)*, (Witchers and witches in New Guinea), Munich, 1987, 23f. (Aufessen des Inneren), (Eating the inside). 'Black' magic means 'unscrupulous' magic, which is called 'black' because it mostly takes place at night and has to do with "black school" (sexual magic).

a.-- The true magician(s) exits.

The witch (note: here in the sense of black witch) is able to make her 'double' exit her body and move - with that double as if she were herself - to distant places.

Sterly

It is the soul or phantom, as they say in Melanesia. By this one means a kind of "spirit", a kind of "fluid" (note: thin or fine matter) in which the biological body is enveloped and on which man depends for his life.

b.-- The black-mage(s) eat out "the inner self".

All reports are unanimous: the witches and witchers eat out or "take out" the insides of a human being in order to prepare and eat it.

In doing so, the witch did not take possession of an existing organ (biologically speaking) but of its fluids. If the inner part or the life force is stolen, the human being declines.

A model.

Sterly cites B. Malinowski, *Argonauts of the Western Pacific*, New York, 1922, 243f. -- A woman on the Trobriand island of Boyowa told him how her insides (lopoulo) were robbed.

1.-- She was a little girl. One day a woman, Sewawela, came into her parents' house to sell a mat.

Sewawela was from the island of Kitava but had married in Wawela.

The parents did not buy the mat and offered her very little to eat. This aroused the grim displeasure of the woman because she was a known witch and thus used to being treated "with respect".

2.-- Night came on. The girl - said the mother - was playing on the beach in front of the house. Suddenly the parents saw a large light beetle (glowworm) hovering around the child. Thereupon it circled around the parents and flew into the house.

Note:-- Connoisseurs will tell you that that light beetle was the exited witch whose "soul" or "shadow" (her inner self) had taken on that "form

They recognized that something unusual was involved with that light beetle “somewhere”: they called their daughter and immediately put her to bed. Immediately she became ill. Couldn’t sleep all night. The parents and other relatives had to watch over the child. The next morning it was as good as dead: only its heart was still beating. The women who were present all sang the praises of the dead.

But the grandfather - the mother’s father - hurried to Wawela and sought out another witch, Bomrimwari, -- who took herbs and rubbed her whole body with them. She then appeared in “the form of ... a flying witch (mulukwausi) to track down the girl’s inner self.

She searched for it. She found it in Sewawela’s house: it was lying on a shelf on which the large clay dishes were placed in which taro pudding is prepared. That’s where it lay “red as alico (cotton cloth)”. Sewawela had put it away there and had gone into the garden with her husband. She wanted to “eat it” once she was back inside the house. If that had happened, the child could not be saved.

As soon as Bomrimwari found the inside, she immediately performed magical incantations over it. Then she went to the home, performed further magic over ginger and water and “caused” the return of the interior to the body.

Thereupon the girl felt better. The witch received from the parents a considerable sum for the rescue of their child.

Note:-- To complete.-- Sterly, o.c., 22 (*Reise in die Unterwelt*), (Journey to the underworld), cites G. Roheim, *Witches of Normanby Island*, Oceania 18 (1947 / 1948): 282 ff.

The witches go on a “soul journey” in the underworld: they take a bath, rub themselves with “oil,” and in that state are cunning and “beautiful as a bird of paradise. Lay down. Her soul or shadow (yaruyaruwa) goes on a journey in the numu (underworld). Thus, she can deliver souls of other people to the lord of the underworld.

The myth says, “He is pleased with this, calls them “my pigs,” cuts them up and divides them.”

Note:-- A mythical-symbolic way of saying that the Lord of the numu “eats” the inner self, the life force.

Witches also engage in sexual intercourse with male spirits, who appear as biologically real people in the process.

A virgin died/killed girl as a 'helping spirit!

Magic springs from the will to solve problems,--preferably as effectively as possible. Black magic does not shy away from any 'efficient' means.

We dwell on J. Sterly, *Kumo (Hexen und Hexer in Neu-Guinea)*, Munich, 1987, 23 (Doki)- Black magicians and black magicians are also known in eastern Melanesia. So the homosexual bwili on northeastern Malekula (in today's independent Vanuatu). So the kakalewa and talamaur on the Banks Islands.

Doki.

The term is derived from 'doketa', doctor.-- Doki is committed exclusively by men. Doki has spread on the east coast of la Nouvelle-Calédonie (French territory) since the beginning of the XXth century. The practice is said to have spread via the islands of Lifu and Maré.

The "witcher" has to acquire the pubic hair of a virgin girl who died. Presumably he kills it for that purpose. The soul (phantom, spirit) of the girl serves him as an auxiliary spirit (accomplice).

From the fine spikes of the woolen hair of the pubic he twists a cord ("rope") which he wraps around a bundle of cut sticks.

He lays two consecrated sticks on the doki bundle and takes it in his right hand. in this way he enters a state of lethargy (apparent death), whereby his 'spirit (soul, phantom, 'inner') leaves him. Or more correctly expressed: his body leaves him in a lethargic state.

Note:-- As the soul, actually: life-force or life-soul, leaves the biological body, any expression of 'life' diminishes and lethargy sets in whereby the body lapses into minimal activity.

With his exited soul he then travels to where he wants to kill someone. The exited doppelganger emits a glow of reddish fire in whose center a cat -- less frequently another animal -- can be seen.

Note:-- Sterly refers as a source to M. Leenhardt (1878/1954), who was a Protestant missionary for twenty years with the canons on Nouvelle-Calédonie. M. Mauss supported him and he became a prof at the École pratique des Hautes Études (Paris). He continues as a connoisseur of Melanesians.

Soul and soul substance (true animism).

Ch. Keysser, *Aus dem Leben der Kaileute*, (From the life of the Kaileute) Neuhausz (Neu-Cuinea), 1911, depicts the animism of the kai, mountain tribes in New Guinea.

The kai - he says - are “very religious” because their feeling, thinking and will is intimately connected with their belief in the soul(dust). The term “soul” the kai apply to all sorts of things (note:-- which confirms Tylor’s view). Thus, one’s reflection or his shadow is ‘soul’. One may not, e.g., step on the shadow that someone casts.

Three times ‘soul!’

Let us consider the three forms of “soul!

1.-- The soul within the body.

It dwells in the heart because one senses its movement. If someone jabs his friend in the side with his finger, the friend protests: “don’t jab me like that: you could drive my soul out of my body and then I would have to die”.

The soul lives in the eye, which shines as long as it is in it. If not, it seems “broken. The soul is in the head, in the foot.-- It fills the body as the (life) warmth fills it.

2. -- The soul outside the body.

She dwells in the saliva, the excrement. All that one touches fills the human being with ‘soul’.

The magician catches the soul in the magic drug and kills it, upon which the human being dies (because the magician has killed the soul beforehand).

3.-- The soul after death.

The soul of the dead person no longer animates the (dead) biological body but she lives on: one brings her sacrifices, speaks with her, seeks her benevolence to have hunting happiness. One fears her for her unwillingness and bitterness, -- gives her to eat, drink, smoke, chew betel.

Conclusion: The kai has to do with two types of ‘soul’.

1.-- The soul (after death).

This one resembles under all points of view the human being she animated on earth, but without his biological body.

However, she still possesses “a certain physicality” (note:-- the phantom).

2.-- The soul as soul substance.

Just as, for example, heat leaves the body, so the soul substance (note:-- fluid) dwells in the body, emanates from it and moves into all that comes into contact with it.

Soul and soul substance are distinguishable: they both depend on the body and vice versa. The biological body decays along with the soul substance. The “actual” soul lives on.

The soul after death and soul substance.

The surviving soul (“spirit”) in turn possesses its own soul substance. For the spirit magicians in the afterlife take from it and conjure the inhabitants of the afterlife to death.

By the way: the death of the body is not the last. This is followed later by the death of the spirit. This causes further decay: the spirit becomes an animal and finally decays into an insect. If that also dies, the soul metamorphosis has come to an end.

Omnipresence of soul substance.

Every being, every thing possesses soul substance which completely pervades and fills it. So not only human beings, animals and organic substances are ‘be-soul-d’ (note:- supplied with soul substance), but also all inorganic substances.

The soul substance as energy.

The world of soul substances surrounds the kai with mysterious forces so that he/she cannot consider any thing, any fact, ‘abstractly’: behind all that we, human beings, perceive with our senses, there are forces active that the human being does not see working.

Cohesion of part and whole.

In the wood chip is the soul substance of the tree. In the stone there is the soul substance of the rock from which it was broken down.-- As for man.-- In every member and in the smallest particle of man his soul substance lives even in the fingernail, in the hair.

The voice

Therein also is soul substance. That is why magic huts should be erected in lonely places where no children’s cries penetrate. The voice of children, and those children themselves would be enchanted with it otherwise. Even magicians should only murmur spells and speak to each other in a whisper, lest they themselves be endangered.-- With the voice, soul dust is drawn into the phonograph and held there. Hence the avoidance of that instrument.

The name

The name of a person or a thing contains soul substance: “Do not call my name so often” one can not infrequently hear a papua say whose name is in everyone’s mouth on account of a heroic deed.

That is why people have some nicknames that are most commonly used. People who are long dead,--who as spirits have already perished (note:-- see above) live and yet continue to be active in their names. Hence, names of long-dead people and spirits appear in many spells. Their mention revives the old power and causes what it is meant to cause.

Lifetime Equivalence.

Chr. Dedet, *La mémoire du fleuve (L'Afrique aventureuse de Jean Michonet)*, (The memory of the river (The adventurous Africa)), Paris, 1984, 174ss... -- Michonet comes, in South Gabon, a West African country, to the village of Tsinguépa, where Moundouli is head. There he gets to know the culture of the bavongo. Where, among other things, it buzzes with 'vampire histories'. "I soon began to see javelins in the ground near the village: they were dripping with blood. Who has come to sprinkle the spikes on them at night? The answer is unchanged: "the vampire" (better: werewolf). This is the malevolent outpouring of a hostile who at the same time pretends to sleep in his bed."(O.c.,180).

Note:-- The term "an equal life course" .

Because a part of the total soul of the one who has an out-of-body experiment, and that part enters into e.g. a gorilla of the region, a parallel life course is created. What the "nahual" (the Mexican word) experiences, that experiences - because of the rebound or reflection on the non-exited part of the soul of the exiting one - the exiting one also experiences it and does so simultaneously. We clarify: What happens to the gorilla then also happens to the man, what happens to the man also happens to the gorilla. There is an equal life cycle. What Michonet tells us happened at the time with primitives all over the globe. It is therefore a sample from an indistinguishable series or collection.

Michonet

It is easy to laugh at all these beliefs as I did at first. But what delusions do not arise in the mind when one lives in these forests full of howling cries,--where unexplained light phenomena (note:-- cf. Sterly's lights at night of the kumo people) -- neither lightning nor wandering lights -- move during the warm nights?" (Ibid.).

The village chief's complaint.

Moundouli complains that his youngest brother, head of Marumba, uses "evil methods." Like Moundouli, his brother is strongly gifted occultly. What he does most is to go out and enter into one or another gorilla from the region.

In that "guise" (of the nahual) he targets Moundouli's women whom he attacks in the plantation. Two have already been attacked. A third, Mousounda, was attacked one day: suddenly "the gorilla" came at her,-- worked her back, bit her shoulder, tore one of her breasts half off. (O.c., 193).-- Which Michonet, though a "métis" (half-breed) himself, tries to "explain" in a purely natural way: there may be dangerous gorillas in the area!

Hunting.

When Michonet, with Doukaga, wants to go hunting, Moundouli responds, “(...) Only if a gorilla attacks you, kill it. (...). No one will, in that case, be able to accuse me of having ‘destroyed my brother’“.

Note:-- One sees how far the identification goes: the gorilla, if it carries his brother within it, is “my brother”.

Whereupon Michonet goes hunting with Doukaga. “I notice a huge gorilla. From twenty meters (...). I have no time to think. I charge and shoot: at four meters he gets the charge in full chest. (...). Crying he runs away on his left leg. Against a tree he collapses. In the leaves he rumbles: he weeps. Bites off the bark”. (O.c.,199).-

Both dare not go to see.-- “In the evening I learn from the people that the gorilla is dead. I am going to speak to Moundouli about it”.(...). “I hope it is not the monkey that chose my brother’s soul to live in it” said Moundouli.

Less than an hour later, a worried Doukaga arrives:

(...). “The brother of the village chief! The one from marumba!” He was in full health that same morning. In front of his hut he was cleaning lianas. (...). A child found him plopped down on his bench. He is unconscious. He is muttering and spitting blood.

“I see the bullet wound in the gorilla’s chest. Plopped down on a tree trunk. These likenesses were more to me than an emotion”

Doukaga: “Moundouli only asked about the hour at which you shot the gorilla.”(...) Between ten and eleven”. The brother plopped down at the same hour.

Later.

Moundouli: “That’s it then. On the one hand, thou didst kill my brother. He was indeed “in the gorilla”. He crashed by the same gunshot. There is no doubt about that.

On the other hand, I cannot blame you: by killing him, ye did me a service. What you did, I should have done myself one day or another.

As for you, rest assured! My brother himself has wanted what has happened to him. Remember: going so far as to attack a white man! Who is my guest! Do you realize that? (...).

Note:-- Nahualism is a power: one can kill through a predator and so on. But the life force works even when the animal is affected!

Tiger man sect.

Chr. Dedet, *La mémoire du fleuve (L'Afrique aventureuse de Jean Michonet)*, (The memory of the river. The adventurous Africa of Jean Michonet), Paris, 1984, 67s... -- O'Saou, the chunky forty-year-old black wife of Phili Conaté, a Senegalese, is home alone one evening.

“Open up.” “Thou art not my husband. The door stays shut!”-- One lived in terror of the “hommes-tigres” the women who were alone at night boiled water indoors to wash themselves. “Open the door or I’ll break it down!” “Well, try it!” The tiger man pounded on the door with all his might. Meanwhile, O’Saou stirs the fire to a maximum and holds himself ready with a machete (large, slightly curved knife). “We know what ye do to women, ye!” She keeps her gaze on the dancing-boiling kettle of hot water.-- The villain gets through the boards. Immediately he gets the boiling water on him!

Actually it wasn’t even worth it to dress up like that with lion’s mane and panther’s paws: emitting icy cries he flees. With his thick painted buttocks burned to a third degree. -- O’Saou made him feel that he would not get very far: she almost finished him off with her machete.

This raid showed the incredible resurgence of the tiger people in Central Ugoúé (central Gabon) in the 1930s. The members of this “sect” terrorized their victims, and their whole “philosophy” amounted to eating the victims’ genitals “pensant ainsi (faire) accroître leur énergie vitale” (believing that by doing so they were increasing their life force).

The most notorious of these savages, Kombé-Niondo, thus skimmed the entire region. He was known as the leader of the sect. It is certain that he committed real massacres. Until the French colonial administration caught him.

Note:-- Michonet noted that man-eating was still common among some of the fang. Anthropophagy is partly feeding on human flesh partly appropriating someone else’s life force. Which, as in the case of the tiger people, makes it a rite of passage.

Note:-- Michonet, born in the jungle of a white man from Normandy, and a negro-African mother, lived in the jungle until his death was bwiti-initiated,-- knew region and culture through and through.

Religion and magic.

Frazer's view.

J.G. Frazer, *The Golden Bough*, 1900-2, 1912/15- 3, is formal: magic is certainly not a modern science, for the link “omen (cause)/ sequel (effect)” is not testable by the means of the present sciences. If there is causality at all, it is one that is situated in the mysterious life forces.

But magic, according to Frazer, is not a religion either, for “religion” he designates exclusively as relations with personal beings (spirits, god(s), God. - So what is magic?

Conclusion.

Everything now depends on how one defines ‘life energy’ (religious or not) and how one defines ‘life energy’ (with or without the participation of personal beings).

Determination:

Here purely individual or group preferences assert themselves among Western intellectuals. They therefore define contradictorily.

What do the religions say?

We exclude here the modern and postmodern - critical - religions for they have already decided before the data.-- P. Schebesta, *Origin of Religion*, Tiel/ The Hague, 1962, 63, puts it as follows.

If the magician derives his power from God, perhaps magic will acquire something like a religious character. Placied Temples, *Bantu Philosophy*, Antwerp, 1946, writes that his baluba could not understand why the missionaries wanted to forbid them magic: “Surely it cannot be wrong to make use of the means which God had given to man, to maintain and strengthen his life force.”

Note: for Schebesta, religion defines itself as “surrender and submission to ‘the divine,’” while magic is: control and disposition of “the divine.” Again: that is one of the ways in which one can define!

Religion includes magic.

Except for the “critical religions” all religions include the concept of “life force” (under different names and using different methods) as well as the concept of “soul, spirit” (as Tylor clearly saw at the time).

Consequence: why not define ‘religion’ as “both surrender and disposition with regard to the ‘divine ‘? That is an inclusive definition and not an exclusive one.

Primal mana (divine mana), folk mana, individual mana.

'Mana' is therefore 'life force'. -- Let us examine with the Maori (New Zealand) what the primal traditions say about this.

1.-- J. Prytz-Johansen, *The Maori and his Religion*, Copenhagen, 1954, 85.

Every species or being is defined according to its nature or that which governs its being as an activity. This is called "tika. But also the role or behavior of a species or being defines, secondarily. That role is called 'tikanga'. Now what brings about this double aspect?

That nature and that role are brought about by tupu, life force coming from within, and mana, life force coming from without.

Those two terms mean life, activity, development. Tupu refers to the nature of things and people as it appears from within. Mana means that which comes from outside in terms of life force. Mana is thus not bound to one singular being but is based on participation. --That is one testimony.

2.-- R. Thurnwald, *Die Eingeborenen Australiens und der Südseeinseln*, (The natives of Australia and the South Sea Islands), Tübingen, 1927, 35f.. - The author quotes Beattie, Mana, in: *Journal of Polynesian Society* 30 (1921).

This be to us a second testimony. And this is from the mouth of one Maori, named Tikao. Mana is "an indivisible concept": one could say that it was God whose power is unlimited; something like God's omnipotence (as the Europeans say).

Origin myth.

The sacred fire -- the ordinary fire contains no mana -- which no one can extinguish or control, is there from the world's beginning to the world's end (note:-- from the origin or eternity). It is the lightning fire (lightning strike, zigzag lightning, storm unleashing lightning). Such is a fire that has been active since world beginning and cannot be switched off. That is mana.

An earthquake is fire, for example. -- Mana can be found everywhere on earth.

The wind god(s), the earthquake god(s), the Maui, the culture founder and yet other beings are located at the center of the world circle: they appropriate that mana and control the elements. They make e.g. the weather.-- Through mana e.g. the members of the hine family control the winds.

Maui, the cultural founder, is not dead but the goddess of the underworld obtained his mana: that mana still exists.

These deities stand back to back: they have the fate of the world - for better or worse - in their hands. They can do so thanks to mana against which no one can stand: it lasts from the beginning of the world to the end of the world.

In passing: Beattie says another maori called hypnosis and telepathy “the result of mana.”

Individual mana.

Something else is the personal mana: that can be overwhelmed and destroyed. But not the mana of the deities.

The origin of the personal mana.

The mana of the maori people who received holy fire - without that fire, for example, they would never have been able to cross the seas in canoes - lay in the family trees,-- in the power of the ancestors.

That mana of the people consisted of sacred fire. But also the mana of various sacred places and dwelling places - in particular: also that of the great school of magic (wharewananga) - consisted of the fire that was ceremoniously (ritually) ‘lit’ there by the leader (spokesman), because ordinary fire contains no mana.

That personal mana is the reason why after birth the placenta may not be burned because then the mana of the child would be lost and that would destroy its soul (mauri).- Burning a corpse, however, does not destroy the personal mana since the soul has already left it.

Note:-- The soul seems to be the seat of mana which is the life force of it.

The west destroys mana.

If the missionaries required the maoris to abandon their rules and shunning (‘tapu’), i.e. taboos, and to stop respecting the old mores, the mana left the maoris: it has been weakened. If not it would still be as strong as before.

Note:-- Other “savages” also complain of the loss of vitality since the missionary movement abolished the rites for its generation and maintenance. For example, in Haiti and elsewhere. This indicates that non-Western cultures are approached with caution. Hence the success of revitalization religions.

The divine herald.

We read W.B. Kristensen, *Verzamelde bijdragen tot kennis van de antieke godsdiensten*, (Collected Contributions to the Knowledge of Ancient Religions), Amsterdam, 1947, 125/148 *De goddelijke heraut en het woord van God*, (The divine herald and the word of God).

Mazdeism (still adhered to by e.g. the Parsis) is a pre-Islamic Persian religion centered around the supreme god Ahura Mazda. The Avesta or Zoroaster is the set of sacred scriptures attributed to Zarathustra (Gr.: Zoroaster) (who was its reformer, -700/-600).- The Avesta has the type of divine messenger ('angel') and the power of its word or light.

The healing word.

Ahura Mazda sends his messenger to the human world to ward off the attacks of an evil spirit - in this case: a disease demon. The messenger is instructed to encourage Spento Mathro, i.e. the holy word, to save the life of the world. Which then happens.

In fact, the messenger is identical with this Spento Mathro: both are called "the messenger" (ashto), i.e. the herald or messenger of Ahura Mazda. The names demonstrate the being.

The scheme, then, is: the invisible origin sends a messenger who by his word - word of wisdom - causes something to happen in this visible world.

Divine messengers.

Kristensen mentions some of them.

1.-- Nairyō Sanho.

The name itself means "man's tongue," i.e., authoritative word. He is, after all, the spirit or god of words.-- One of his epithets is vyakhano, people's leader, in the sense of giver of good advice in the service of the people.

Note:-- One thinks of "Our Lady of Good Counsel" with us.-- Nairyō Sanho was the 'genius' (note.: inspirational or rather vitalizing spirit) of princes, the supreme people leaders, who -- we are in the sacred kingdom -- were inspired by the divine messengers so that they cause or at least co-cause the will of Ahura Mazda in this world.

2.-- Mithra.

This god is called "the strong and eloquent one." After all, he makes the waters flow, the rain fall, the plants grow. "The eloquent god thus creates life in this world" (o.c., 130).

Mithra, who as a very combative god represents the cause of the sky god Ahura Mazda in this world (note:-- world flight is thus far), is therefore called "the embodiment of the sacred in this world appeared. Where "appearance" actually means "establishment as a sovereign".

3.-- Sraosa.

A double of Mithra. He too is called “embodiment of the holy word”.

Note.-- Nairyō Sanho, Mithra and Sraosa overcome the enemies of Ahura Mazda in this world by “eloquence.

The End Time Messenger.

Astvatareto. This is the name of the savior at the end of time. His name means “the embodied (= made flesh) divine rule of law”. He will “appear” (make his regal entry) to cause the realm of Ahura Mazda in this visible world.

However, he does not work through his word, but through his light: “He will appear from the sea in the east and there he will direct his eyes of wisdom and prosperity (note: Knowledge traits of Ahura Mazda) to the visible world and thus make that world immortal”.

In other words: what causes the word, causes also, in this case, the light: “Both bring divine life to our world” (o.c., 132).

Sacred rhetoric.

‘Rhetoric’ (ancient Greek) means ‘eloquence’.-- The ‘eloquence’ or linguistic skill which we have just brought up is

- a. eloquence, of course,
- b. but -- from the wisdom and life force -- mana -- of the deities.

Such a linguistic word (light) had authority because it was felt that it revealed (revealed) a law of life, i.e. a code of conduct which makes life real, as a message addressed e.g. to a person afflicted with a disease demon or to a people in assembly.

That word or light was as irresistible and valid as the law of life itself (o.c., 129). For once spoken it maintained itself: it created (caused) a new state. It transformed itself into reality on the basis of divine charge with life force. It worked out what it said as thought content.

Says Kristensen: the linguistic competence of the good (note.: divinely given and therefore creative) council was “a creative force, a life energy in which the mystery (note : -- the secret life force that controls fate in downward and upward movement) of creation and life was active”. Such a council is both art and divine power.

“Mola salsa” (sacrificial grain) among the ancient Romans.

Do we read W.B. Kristensen, *Verzamelde bijdragen tot kennis der antieke godsdiensten*, (Collected contributions to knowledge of ancient religions), Amsterdam, 1947, 328v.. -- Yet another proof of the thesis that religion is essentially manaistic!

1.-- In ancient Rome, slaves / female slaves provided for the prosperity of the family. Thus they gathered “the wealth of the earth” in storerooms and granaries, prepared food for the family on the hearth.-- This is the private aspect.

2.-- The Vestal virgins took care -- for eleven centuries -- of the acts of worship which constituted the public aspect. For example, they prepared the mola salsa, a mixture of coarsely ground corn (mola) and salt dissolved in water (salsa) that served as the sacrificial grain.

1. According to strict ritual prescriptions (note:-- prescriptions religion), they picked the necessary ears of corn from the new harvest, dried and ground the grains into coarse flour.

2. Also according to precepts, they processed the salt.-- The mixture they brought to penus Vestae, the storehouse of Vesta, in her temple. With this mixture the sacrificial animals were sprinkled and thereby “sanctified” (note :-- charged with life force).

It is certain that the ancient Romans saw in the mola salsa the sacred prototype (note:-- primal model) of all foods.

1. Every food was “sacred” in that divine energy was at work in it,--”the energy of life renewing itself” (a term of Kristensen’s by which he designates the totality of all that is life throughout the cosmos).

2. The mola salsa, however, was the special bearer of this divine power. The method of preparation - outlined above - attests to the intention of allowing the divine energy to unfold unhindered in this food.

Thus it could serve the sanctification of other sacrifices.

Note:-- One cannot express it more clearly: the religion of the ancient Romans knew the concept of ‘energy’ and understood the rites as means to dynamize this energy, i.e. to make it develop fully.

It should not be forgotten that not a single meal, not a single prayer, not a single sacrifice took place in prehistoric Rome without the invocation of the goddess Vesta. As E. Lazure, *Etude sur les Vestales*, (Study on the Vestal Virgins), Montpellier, 1890, 28, says.

Marett's 'animatism' (preanimism).

R.R. Marett, in 1899 and in 1914 (*The Threshold of Religion*), severely borders on Tylor's notion of 'animism'. He does this after reading H. Codrington, *The Melanesians*, Oxford, 1891. Marett quotes him.

The concept of mana (life-force) among the Melanesians is "a faculty - clearly distinguished from gross material force - which in all kinds of ways produces good or evil so that its possession or control is of the greatest importance.

Indeed, if someone is a successful fighter, it is not the 'natural' strength of his arm, the sharpness of his eye or the available strength that works that success: he definitely possesses 'mana', originating from a spirit or from some deceased warrior so that he is provided with 'strength'.

This 'mana' is stored in a stone amulet around his neck or in a tuft of leaves in his belt, in a tooth (...) or in the form of words with which he summons a help beyond nature.

If someone's pigs multiply well and his gardens yield much, it is not because he is diligent and pays attention to his property but because of the stones full of 'mana' for pigs or for yams (...).

Of course a yam grows, once planted, but it will not turn out large (note:-- conspicuous) if no 'mana' intervenes.-.

Note:-- This view is called 'manaism'.

Marett's animatism (preanimism).

From this Marett concludes with regard to Tylor's animism as follows.

1. The primitive concept of life applies only to those objects that exhibit unusual or eccentric behavior (or behavior that appears so). The primitive tends to regard such an object as 'sacred', as charged with a special ability.

2. This striking vividness or capacity does not lead the primitive to ascribe to such things a soul or spirit, for 'vividness' and 'animatedness' are distinct.

Something can be alive ('living') or 'animated' (i.e., vitalized) without a soul or spirit in it.-- This view is called Marett animatism or preanimism ('pre.animism' because he thought animatism could be older than animism).

Note:-- Basically, this amounts to putting magical power first, because magic manipulates 'mana'. Other peoples have different terms for 'mana'.

Wakanda, manito and mana.

Actually, this theme belongs to magism or dynamism. But we dwell on it now to indicate its connection with the spirits, resp. souls.

Do we read P.Radin, *Religion of the North American Indians*, in: *Journal of Amer. Folklore* 1914 (xxvii): 355ss..

The winnebago Sioux use the term 'wakanda' and the ojibwa algonquins the term 'manito'.

1.-- Something is called wakanda/ manito insofar as it is rare, striking, surprising, unusual,-- powerful. Without explicit reference to a power in it.

2.-- In both tribes the term means well-defined spirits however different from views.-- When in a steamer the steam is denoted as wakanda/ manito, it is because a spirit has temporarily transformed itself into that steam. When an arrow possesses "a special power," it is because a spirit has transformed itself into the arrow or "temporarily inhabits the arrow."

When one sacrifices tobacco in honor of an object that has a distinctive appearance, it is because it belongs to a spirit or that spirit inhabits it.

Holy (sacred).

The term wakanda/ manito is often synonymous with the term "holy," "consecrated. When a winnebago says of something that it is 'waka' (holy, consecrated, sacred), and he is asked what he means to say, it reads that it belongs to a spirit, that a spirit somehow relates to it, that it "possesses a spirit" e.g..

Comparison with "mana".

Reading H. Codrington, *The Melanesians*, Oxford, 1891, we note similarity: there is a profane and a sacred use of the same terms.

1.-- 'Mana' is all that possesses a life force that stands out in terms of intensity or effectiveness.

2.-- 'Mana' is exclusively called that power which is peculiar to natural spirits or (to a small number) of deceased ancestors. Living people have this property only because they receive it from spirits or ancestors.

Note:-- So committing magic in those cultures is both dynamistic (controlling power) and animistic (not without souls or spirits).

The primal monotheism.

W. Schmidt, *Origine et évolution de la religion*, (Origin and evolution of religion,), Paris, 1931, 219/234 (*Le Grand Dieu des primitifs*), (The Great God of the primitives), sets out how the pioneer Andrew Lang, a shot, in his *The Making of Religion* (1898-1; 1900-2; 1909 -3), accomplishes the critique of Tylor's then prevailing animism

Lang was a convinced animist and Tylorist. Until one day he met a missionary whose testimony contradicted his theory.

Lang - reluctant at first - investigated the matter: he gradually discovered more and more facts that proved the missionary right, i.e. primitives know a supreme being.

Reception.

The ethnologists in France, North America, Germany hushed up the work! For years! To which Lang: "Like other blood-witnesses of science, I must expect to be treated as an annoying thing, as an uneducated, as a man of just one thought and then another incorrect one."

Thus proving that Lang did not value the objectivity of Western intellectuals.

Reception: 'Urmonotheismus' (Primal Monotheism)

When Lang died in 1912, the first volume of W. Schmidt, *Der Ursprung der Gottesidee*, (The Origin of the Idea of God), was published, a work which, by other - strictly historical - means, called Lang's notion of the "supreme being of the primitives" Urmonotheismus, primal monotheism.

As an aside, the last volume of Schmidt's work appeared in 1955. The total work contains eleven thousand pages! What M. Eliade, *La nostalgie des origines*, (The nostalgia of the origins), Paris, 1971, makes us say, "It is therefore not surprising that few historians of religion have read this enormous tract." W. Schmidt was strongly impressed by Lang's thesis but was also strongly annoyed with the flawed method of this brilliant Scot.

-- Thus Eliade.-- This does not prevent us from now briefly summarizing Lang's critique of Tylorian animism.

a.1.-- Tylor argues that the concept of the soul is the origin of the concept of God (as Supreme Being).

Note:-- With Soloviev we say, "How can one designate a soul as a Supreme Being, if one has not first and independently gained the concept of 'God' somewhere?"

a.2.-- Tylor argues that the concept of a soul -- through the concept of a natural spirit and a pre-parent soul (= naturism and manism) -- culminates in polytheism,-- polytheism which, over time, becomes centered around the one God (monotheism).

Well, in a number of cultures - Australians, Andamans - the Supreme Being is known but not some ancestor cult, and in a number of cultures - Australians, Andamans, Bushmen - the Supreme Being is known but is lacking.

In the cultural pact in which they live there is, e.g., not yet a chief who could serve as a social model to evolve the concept of the “one God” out of multi-theism.

b.-- Tylor argues that morality became linked to religion only late. The ancestor cult, after all, was merely warding off fear of the departed, and naturism was geared only to utility.

Well, a number of cultures - primitive ones - not only know a morality, in which e.g. self-sacrifice represents a high value, but they interpret this morality as the will of the conscientious Supreme Being who, on the basis of omniscience and justice, follows and sanctions the observance of it.

The degeneration of the one god into a fatherless god.

Eliade, o.c., 96s., notes that Lang observed that belief in the Supreme Being was not frequent, that its worship was rather poor (its role in day-to-day, practical life was meager). Lang sought the cause of the fact that God has become a deus otiosus, a God gone on vacation, in the course of cultural history

Eliade refers to the fact that Fr. Nietzsche (1844/1900), in his *Also sprach Zarathustra* (1883), established the death of God in Western civilization,-- two decades before Lang.

Nietzsche,-- Lang and Schmidt establish that process of degeneration. Each in his own way.

Lang thinks -- partly wrongly (according to Eliade) -- that the “comic, immoral, fantastic myths; -- which contrast sharply with the truly ‘religious’ (understand: reverent) essence of the Supreme Being faith -- are if not the cause then at least the symptom of this. The faith is rational and exalted. The myths are irrational and degrading.-- Thus Lang.

Note:-- Lang’s myth analysis must be supplemented by a corrective: there are also rational and elevated sides to the myths. But this has been demonstrated e.g. by the astral naturists (panbabylonism) and many other strains.

The causal religion according to Nathan Söderblom.

N. Söderblom (1866/1931), archbishop of Upsala (Sweden) and also professor at Upsala and Leipzig, wrote a masterpiece: *Das Werden des Gottesglaubens (Untersuchungen über die Anfänge der Religion)*, (The Becoming of the Belief in God (Studies on the beginnings of religion)) Leipzig, 1926-2.-- Let us consider his philosophy of religion

To begin with, three elements explain religion, animism, dynamism and causal belief ('Urheberglaube').

This last element interests us here.

We begin with an outline borrowed from another work, A. di Nola, *La prière*, Paris, 1958, 24. It is a prayer for blessing the weapons (of the hunt). "khwvoem, O Khwvoem! Thou art the master, O creator, the master of all.-- Master of the forest. Master of things. And we, the little people, we are thy subjects. O Khwvoem: give command, master of life and death, and we will obey".

Note:-- The pygmies, "fist people" (called by the ancient Greeks), are considered very underdeveloped in the modern sense of the word "development. But one thing is certain: their concept of God -- their concept of a 'supreme being' which they refer to by the term 'khwvoem' -- is anything but 'primitive'. -- What follows is immediately summarized in this pygmy prayer.

Urheber (causer, 'alfather').

The correct term would be 'omnipotent', 'causer of all' for all other active entities in the religions bring about results by means of their own life force - reinforced by what they derive from other realities or even by what they steal from them in terms of life force.

Only the omnipotent god accomplishes literally everything. Even the earthly magician/ magicianess is a causal person, because he/she works something out through mana, life force.

Söderblom, in the following excerpt, relies on Leo Frobenius (1873/1938, ethnologist, founder of the Kulturkreis school), in his work *Die Weltanschauung der Naturvölker* (The worldview of primitive peoples).

It is about the religion of the yoruba, a people in West Africa. The yoruba worship hundreds of deities. Thirteen of them enjoy general worship. Among these Olorun.

1.-- Two so-called “sky gods.”

According to Frobenius, the Yoruba distinguish two sky gods, namely Olorun and Obatala.

Olorun is “the divine heavens,” -- that type of God who is too all-encompassing, too ‘indifferent’ (note:-- exalted) and too great (note:-- grandiose) to concern himself in a direct way with human beings, for example.-- The name ‘olorun’ means lord of the heavens.

Note:-- Söderblom reproaches a certain Ellis for not having realized that Olorun is also the possessor of the sun in the eyes of the Yoruba, for ‘orun’ means both sky-space and sun.

Olorun does not possess holy (‘priests’). No statue is made of him. Temples in his honor are not there. “Only very rarely -- when all (note:-- subordinate) deities are found helpless -- does one invoke Olorun. It may be said that Olorun lives more in proverbs than in practical considerations or in cult”. Obatala, however, is the chief god of the Yoruba.

Note:-- Söderblom means “the chief god of polytheism”.-- He disposes of worship, women. “Thus he is “ein Gott” (a god) in the proper (note:-- polytheistic) sense beside many (note: hundreds) others” (according to Söderblom verbatim).

2.-- Two radically distinguishable ‘sky-gods’.

This extremely concise characteristic is abundantly clear: they are not of the same nature of being! Olorun situates himself “too far” (note:-- is too exalted) to be uninterruptedly “satisfied and nursed” by regular worship. Obatala needs such “satisfactions and nursing” again and again as a polytheistic god.

Conclusion.

Olorun is far above Obatala and the other thirteen or hundreds of gods/goddesses.

Note:-- Söderblom notes at the end that the features that make him a “sky god” or “sun god” are second-rate and confuse him with finite, polytheistic deities that are repeatedly situated in one well-defined part of the universe. Where Olorun controls the entire universe, as omnipresent.

Note:-- Another explanation is: the Olorun of the Yoruba is a powerful polytheistic god who (deceptively) adorns himself with the characteristics of the omnipotent one and with the characteristics of a sun and sky god.

Which is not so rare in all religions.

That this is so is shown by what Söderblom, immediately afterwards, says: “What K.E. Preusz, *Der Ursprung der Menschenopfer in Mexico*, (The origin of human sacrifice in Mexic), in: *Globus* 86 (1904,ii), among the (note:-- ancient) Mexicans has remarked, namely, that as a rule the ‘sun gods’ arose from other figures, is also established elsewhere. Only this: Preusz puts demons first. I would, in some cases, put forward the omnipresent one instead”.

Note:-- in other words

a. in most cases Söderblom assumes, with Preusz, that they are demonic beings;
b. in a few cases they are “Urheber,” Supreme Beings. Let us pay close attention to:

a. it is established that originally ‘other’ higher beings, usually demonic beings, are there first;

b. it is noted that later these beings begin to show the traits of omnipresent beings.

This ‘evolution’ relies on the testimony of documents that reflect the opinions of the populations. These opinions are based on the impressions, in particular: in many cases, the insights of “occultists” and “mythologists”. It is therefore these people who evolve with the perceptions and impressions emanating from the conscious ‘beings’. What could be more obvious than to assume that, on the sly, these beings are posing as supreme beings?

What, then, is our opinion on the matter?

a. That they are demonic beings (certainly in most cases).

b. That this does not exclude the pure concept and existence of a Supreme Being, called ‘Urheber’ by Söderblom. Quite the contrary: the caricature betrays the original. The eagerness and the high frequency with which ‘ordinary’ (polytheistic) deities adorn themselves with the traits of the Supreme Being, proves the necessity of this precisely for those lower ‘deities’ (‘idols’ says the Bible) who compete with the Supreme Being.

There is another evidence for our thesis.

O.c., 122 says Söderblom that “the Allväter (‘Urheber’) are situated in distant places. They have gone away to “another land”. They are therefore called “dei otiosi” vadi gods. The exaltedness of these beings contrasts with the minor importance (role) they play alongside the nearer, more active and dangerous beings - souls of the deceased, spirits, nature deities”.

The fact that the populations find that they do not intervene in their lives indicates anything but a true Supreme Being.

Heaven- or sun god or a god who causes everything? Or what actually?

We take up again N. Söderblom, *Das Werden des Gottesglaubens*, (The becoming of faith in God), Leipzig, 1926-2, 138 /141 (*Ein kultloser Urheber*). (A cultless originator), Immediately we see how Söderblom interprets testimonies.

Subject: the dsjagga negro-africans, in East Africa (Kilimanjaro region). There one finds:

- a. an elaborate solar mythology and solar worship and
- b. there is reason to see “behind the sun god a worshipless causer of all “. Thus states the author. The “highest being” is called (i)ruwa. The term means “sun” and “sky” but it is also claimed that (I)Ruwa “made everything”.

First testimony.

J. Raum, missionary, in *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* (1911).

A dshagga says what follows.-- Ruwa, the sun, has as his wife the moon, to whom he, the sun-god, gives his shield in the evening when he is weakening. Just as the dshagga woman takes the shield from the warrior when he returns from battle.

According to Raum, “Ruwa arose out of the attribution of a soul to the sun or to the sky space.”

Note:-- This is a typically animistic interpretation.

Söderblom’s interpretation.

Raum mentions traits of knowledge that are contrary to the mere concept of the sun god. For - says Raum himself:

“An actual worship is not consecrated to him. Ruwa is often in danger of volatilizing into a pure idea or conjecture without practical significance.

For the ‘actual’ (note.:-- day-to-day, directed at practical problems) religion is manism (ancestor cult). In which other spirits do receive sacrifices.

Ruwa however does not get sacrifices unless rarely. For Ruwa is great, unsavory (‘ungeheuer’) and he often -- amidst the poor always demanding spirits -- comes across as the rich, mild dispenser.

Note:-- The reason is: the Supreme Being possesses an infinite supply of life force (mana). The other - created - spirits do not. They are needy: this compels them to demand sacrifices (“do ut des”. I give in order that you may give,-- says the one who gives the sacrifice, i.e. life force, in order to obtain something).

As for prayer.

To Ruwa one prays in the morning and evening for protection and for the livestock. But more often one addresses the spirits.

Söderblom: Ruwa is ‘Urheber’, not an ordinary deity.

Second testimony.

Br. Gutmann, missionary, in his *Dichten und Denken der Dschagganeger*, (Dschagganeger poetry and thinking), Leipzig, 1909.

The term iruwa means sun and god. Gutmann: "This designation provokes the opinion that at least initially iruwa was a pure sun god.

For still today the rising sun is greeted four times by spitting in its direction, while praying, "O Iruwa, protect me and mine!" For - says Gutmann always - also the moon is still worshipped today.

However, the translation of "iruwe-u" i.e. "by God" by "on the sun" is strongly rejected by the population: "God does not live on the sun but the whole sky is Iruwa". Gutmann: "Worship of heaven is thus the very starting point of the God faith of the dshagga".

Note:-- Which is a natural mythological interpretation.

Söderblom.

1. Both missionaries say the same thing.
2. Their view is consistent with a common and connoisseurs' favored theory, i.e., the periwinkles are "sky gods.

Yet Söderblom indicates otherwise.

The population does not identify deity and sun without question as the name Iruwa insinuates. God does not simply situate himself in the sun, on the sun.-

1. The people use the term iruwa even without thinking of god.
2. Gutmann. -- "They call the whole heaven itself 'iruwa' and say that he is God who at once encompasses the whole human world.

The fixed celestial vault -- which in their opinion is of stone -- they call 'ngina.' The higher situated world, however -- as opposed to the world of earth -- is called 'iruwa' or, most, in the logicalis (note:-- place-indicating expression) "iruwe-u", i.e. "with God".

That the 'heaven' so named would function as the origin of the concept of God is already in itself improbable: such a thing is far too indefinite.

Note:-- Soloviev would say, "I cannot by mistake designate a cord as a snake, if I do not first and independently know the snake."

Already the oscillation between "sky" and "sun" raises doubts. Moreover, the people claim that "Iruwa's place is rather between the earth and the sky". Above all: Iruwa acts as a person through and through.

Note:-- One sees that Söderblom draws his arguments from the testimony itself (and from the assertions of the dshagga).

Soderblom points out.

The solution to the riddle of the name ‘perhaps’ lies in a prayer that accompanies the “great sacrifice” to prevent the transmission of infectious diseases. That sacrifice is addressed peculiarly to Iruwa: “Thou, man of heaven, chief, accept this bovine. We ask thee that thou wouldst make sickness that comes upon the earth pass far from us (...).”

Gutmann labels this prayer as thoroughly weighty: “God is called “nduf wo firuwa”: man of heaven. One thinks of Iruwa as a person who controls the heavens. From there the further step took place, namely, to call that being itself ‘Iruwa’“.

Söderblom.

With this we are far away from the sun or the sky as the origin of the concept of God.-- One must assume from a highly situated being the “celestial chief”, - “the man of the higher world” - who must explain phenomena in heaven and on earth: Iruwa is omnipotent and his connection with heaven and sun is a second-rate trait.

More so, Iruwa also created man. For this the term “igumb,” making, kneading forms,--a word also used for the potter.

The contrast.

1. Iruwa, the god and creator, is good and compassionate: for this very reason, perhaps, religious ceremonies play little, if any, role in his worship.

2. The spirits of the deceased, however, ceaselessly demand sacrifices in order to be “reconciled” and voted into benevolence. In some parts of the country this is the only form of worship addressed to a higher being. In other parts there is a sacrifice to Iruwa (as we saw). When the sacrifices to the spirits are unsuccessful, it says: “Now we want to offer a sacrifice to God. Iruwa is thus a kind of “last resort”.

Note:-- One sees it: God, as the source of life force (manistic interpretation of God), does not need sacrifices (life force gifts). The spirits and the ancestral souls are like emaciated people: they need life-force-bearing gifts all the time.

Conclusion.

Thus Söderblom establishes his theory concerning the omnipotent spirit, Urheber, who dwells “in the high places” and is thus associated with heaven and sun, but is clearly distinguished from the other “entities”.

The kingdom of the dead (underworld, sheol) in the Bible.

Let us take Philippians 2:10 as our starting point, where Paul says that Jesus plays a role “in the underworld, on earth and in the highest heavens”, in other words, in the entire cosmos. -- It is in this context that the doctrine of the “sheol” (“sheol”; Greek: hades) in the Bible is situated.

The tragic fate of Kore (Korach), Datan and Abiram and the two hundred and fifty.

Num. 16:1/35 provides us with the basic text.-- The self-aggrandizement of Kore, Datan and Abiram and the two hundred and fifty ‘princes’ leads to rebellion against Moses and Aaron.

Moses, however a very simple man, feels obliged to defend his position.

“By this shall ye know that Yahweh hath sent me to perform ‘all these works’ (note:- - largely aretalogical facts) and that I do not accomplish them of my own accord.

If these people die a natural death, struck by the fate that befalls all men, then Yahweh has not sent me.

If, however, Yahweh does something unprecedented (note.:- aretalogical), viz. if the earth opens her mouth and devours them,-- them and all that belongs to them, and they descend alive into the world of the dead, then you know that they have rejected Yahweh.”

Hardly had he spoken all these words or the ground opened under their feet, the earth opened her mouth and devoured them (...). Alive they descended into the underworld,-- they and all that belonged to them. The earth covered them, and they faded from the community(...). A fire flared up because of Yahweh that consumed the two hundred and fifty”.

Note:-- It does not matter if one dismisses this text as purely “mythical” or interprets it as a “miracle” believer: the idea is abundantly clear! It presupposes that people who die descend into an underworld. This belief is present - explicitly (very often) or not - throughout the Bible.

And it does so as a destiny whose severity is extremely great. No exegete, if sufficiently honest with the texts, can and will deny this.

It immediately appears that what “the nations” (the pagans) say on the subject - about underworldly beings (ancestors, deities, phantoms) - is also accepted and lived through in the Bible, albeit in a typically biblical way. What is striking is that in the Bible virtually no actual ‘deities’ are situated in ‘hell’ (the underworld). Sons of God’ and people who are estranged from God somewhere are.

The inhabitants of the 'sheol!

All those who, in the land of the living, i.e. on this earth, do not keep the ten commandments (Ex. 20:1/17; 34:10/38), taken substantially, i.e. with the elimination of all sophisticated “interpretations”, are not equally substantial, i.e. as a basic premise of practical life, and end up in the sheol.

This on the basis of the eternal covenant (Is. 24:1/6) or on the basis of the ‘law’ written in the hearts of the Gentiles (and certainly of the Jews) (Rom. 2:15) - both are one and the same - !

In other words: whoever neglects God and His Decalogue, is neglected by God and sent to ‘hell’. O.g. the ‘law’ or ‘laws’, i.e. the rules of conduct which apply to the whole of creation, God shifts the beings gifted with consciousness and conscience,--as Ekk1.kus (Sirach) 15:11 / 20 brilliantly says:

“Before men are situated life and death. According to free choice, one or the other is given to them (note:-- by God)). Or as Gal. 6:7/9 equally brilliantly says “What one sows, that one reaps”. “Whoever sows in the ‘flesh’ (without conscience) will, because of that flesh, reap destruction (note:-- one of the names for the underworld or kingdom of the dead). He who sows in the ‘spirit’ (note:-- God’s life force and his commandments), will by virtue of that spirit reap eternal life”.

In other words, it is not God who condemns. The free man condemns himself. This is the very explicit teaching of the Bible.

That “the keeping of the commandments” (So says Jesus) decides, is evident from the following Bible texts.

Proverb. 8:3/18, where it is said that the one who lacks God’s “wisdom” (the decalogue), the “unwise”, does not sufficiently realize that in the midst of his unwise life and environment there are “shadows” and that whoever dwells on unwiseness dwells in “the valleys of the sheol”. Cf. Spr. 2:16/19; 5:2/6.

Regarding individual commandments, see e.g. Ps. 49 48): 6/21 (the mammon, i.e. unscrupulously acquired wealth gives out on the sheol).

So Spr. 7:1/27 (engaging with the parakuptousa (the oblique prostitute) leads to the sheol).

So also Jud. 6/7 (cf. Gen. 6:1/4 (sons of God); Gen. 19:1/11 (homosexuality).

So Is. 14:3/21 (eastern bigot) and Ezek. 32:1/32 (pharaoh and other coercive nations).

Note:-- What is clearly associated with the sheol in the texts just quoted is present in a hushed manner in very many ethical texts. The sheol is the sanction that follows a life in which God is dead and His commandments dead.

The mode of existence peculiar to the underworld.

In contrast to “the land of the living” (this earth), “sheol” means the (sacred) depths of the earth (underworld).

Deut. 32:22 says it, “(Yahweh): Yes, a fire flared up out of my indignation. It shall burn to the depths of the sheol”.

Is. 14:9 says it in reference to the fallen Babylonian captor: “Below, the sheol leaped up for your sake. To meet you. Before thee the sheol has awakened the phantoms. All the potentates of the earth!”

Note:-- In the language of W.B. Kristensen: the underworld is the decline of (earthly and even cosmic) life.

The realm of the dead.

Taken collectively -- an exception is mentioned in Ps. 16 (15): 10/11 -- the dead go to the underworld which thereby becomes the kingdom of the dead.

Thus Jacob says in response to the disappearance of Joseph (he thought he was dead). “In mourning I want to descend into the sheol with my son”. (Gen. 37:34).

A dead existence.

The phantoms - refaim - lead a monotonous existence there.-- Thus Ekk1.kus (Sirach) 17: 27v. says: “Who will praise the Most High in the sheol if the living do not glorify him? With the praise of God the dead - as if they did not even exist - are unknown: he who possesses life and health glorifies the Lord.”

Note:-- The cause of the dead life (what a harmony of opposites!) apparently lies in the absence of (God’s or holy) “spirit,” i.e., Yahweh’s life force. As already explained by Gen. 6:1/4: “That my spirit (note: life force) may not be endlessly responsible for man (note: taken collectively) since he is ‘flesh’ (note:-- animated life but without God’s life force)” (Gen. 6:3).

God says this in response to the sins of the sons of God with the “daughters of men” (cf. Tob. 6:8; 6:15; Jude 6),-- sins which show how far removed from God the higher spirits of the time, co-responsible for God’s universe government (Job 1:6; 2:1), lived from “the laws” (Is. 24: 5/6).

By their neglect of God and His commandments, they compelled God to neglect them in turn, surrendering them to their “lusts” (prepositions), as Rom. 1:24, 1:26, 1:28 says. Whereby they became ‘flesh’, i.e. cosmic life without God’s Spirit (life force). Which gives out to deadly existence.

“The gates of Sheol”.

Matt. 16:18.-- Jesus to Peter as head of the church: (...) the gates of Hades will not prevail against the church (...). Here it is spoken of as if “the land of the living” coincides with (the domain of) the gates of sheol. In other words: the sphere of influence of the world of the dead extends to where we live and dwell.

Note:-- Jesus knew by his own invention what “the gates of hell” were. Matt 4:1/11 tells of the temptation - testing - by Satan. At the third examination “the devil - head of the sheol - shows him all the empires of the world with their glory and says ‘I give you all this, if you bow down and honor me. (...)’ -- This shows that all that is the great political systems (of his time) actually represent,-- better: visibly present, a part of “the gates of hell.” For Jesus does not dispute Satan’s claim to all that is “rich”: he says that “deeply condescending honor” is reserved only for God.

Ps. 88(87).

What the gates of hell mean was demonstrated long before Jesus was confronted with it politically, in Ps. 88(87). But there it is the inner, psychic effect that is interpreted.

Thus it reads, among other things, “My soul is saturated with evils and my life is on the brink of sheol. Already viewed as one who has descended into “the pit” (note:-- the grave as the way to the sheol), . I a human being who is walking dead. A freedman who belongs to the dead. Similar to murderers who lie in “the grave pit”. Beings whom thou hast forgotten,--who are cut off from thy hand. In the depths of the pit thou hast shown me home, in the darkness, in the abysses.(...)”.

Then follows the comparison, “Do ye perform miracles for the dead? Do refaim (shadows in the underworld) rise up to praise thee? Do they venture of thy love into the sepulcher? Of thy truth in the abaddon? Of thy righteousness in the place of oblivion?”

Note:-- Behold a “psychological” representation of the deadly life in the underworld! The gates of hell, apparently, do not only permeate the political systems: they permeate the soul life of people who apparently live in God’s friendship and cooperation like the psalmist who poems this psalm. Not to do poetry but to characterize an inner life soured by the hell powers.

Jesus' 'exodus!'

Luk. 9:30: Jesus' 'exodos', exodus, was discussed with Moses and Elias. He signified the (apparent) triumph of Sheol (and the other cosmic "elements").

Do we dwell on what "the gates of hell" were able to do against a powerless Jesus. The "auspicious moment" (Luk. 4:13) occurs when Satan enters Judas Iscariot (Luk. 22:2): he consults with the considerable ones "how to deliver him".

Jesus' exaltation ("glorification").

Luk. 9:51 calls it "analempsis" (lat.: assumptio), removal, exaltation to heaven.

This event includes the last days of Jesus' earthly life, i.e. his suffering and death on the cross. Our Eastern brethren in faith call this aspect 'cross-passes', But the same event also includes "the first days of his glorification" (John's term), i.e. the descent "into hell" (1 Pet. 3:19/21), the resurrection with the appearances on earth (1 Pet. 3:22), the ascension (1 Pet. 3:22), the sitting "at God's right hand" as judge over the living and the dead (1 Pet. 3:22), the sending of the Holy Spirit (John 7:39; Acts 2:1f.). What our Eastern brethren in faith call "resurrection passages.

Note:-- This exaltation (glorification after his exodus) was at the heart of the oldest creeds.

The judgment of "the prince of this world".

The scope of Jesus' exaltation is evident from John 12:31 (//14:30;16:11): "Now judgment is taking place on this world. Now the prince of this world is cast out".

The term "world" ("this world") is, in the Bible, "harmony of opposites. Sometimes it denotes - neutrally - what we understand by it today (universe, earth). Then again, he indicates - melioratively - "heaven and earth" as they emerged from God's creative hand, or - pejoratively (in many cases) - "the world insofar as it is controlled by 'the gates of hell'".

Which echoes 1 Jn. 2:16: "All that is in the world - the lust of the flesh (note: sexuality), the lust of the eyes (note:-- the deceitful seductiveness of beautiful appearances; Ezek. 24:15) and the pride of riches (note:-- as a result of (evil) mammon) - comes not from the Father but from the world (...)."

These three aspects typify "the power" of "this world" as the domain of "the gates of hell."

Jesus and the underworld.

In Matt. 27:45vv we learn:

- a. the darkness over all the land,
- b. Jesus' death,
- c. "the day of Yahweh" (veil in two, earthquake, rocks apart).

In that context, "The graves opened and many bodies of deceased saints rose. They came "out of the tombs" after His resurrection, entered the "holy city" and showed themselves to many."

The resurrection "from the graves" (whatever that means) is an element of Yahweh's day, i.e. of God's radical (end-time) intervention. With the Apocalypse or bloottrek-king that goes with it.

Note -- Ps. 16(15): 9/11 is fulfilled: "(...) My flesh shall rest in safety, for thou, Yahweh, canst not leave my soul in the sheol,-- thou canst not show thy friend "the pit" (op.:-- the underworld). Thou shalt teach me the way that leads to "life" (...).

Which brings to mind e.g. Job 19: 25/27; 33:23/30, where an afterlife other than that in the deadly underworld is discussed (in virtue of friendship and cooperation with God).

According to those in the know, Matthew is talking about Old Testament saints (friends of God). When he says "out of the graves," this is apparently in the broad sense because the graves of the oldest Old Testament saints had long since been sundered.

Note:-- This shows that in Jesus' exodus or act of redemption the sheol is central and that his descent into hell cannot possibly be minimized as a (false) "myth" or as a "literary process.

It is the counterpart of the descent into hell of Numbers 16:33ss. ("Alive they descended into the sheol,-- them and all that belonged to them").

It is also curious that Matthew says "They came out of the tombs after Jesus' resurrection." Jesus has thus "paved the way" and carried the "saints" along, as it were, with his glorification.

The term "holy city" does not refer so much to the earthly Jerusalem - where those "saints" in their risen state showed themselves to "many" (in other words: it is about eyewitnesses who have seen "appearances" and not about "sophisticated fables" (2 Peter 1:16), as Peter says about Jesus' transformation) - but about the "heavenly Jerusalem" of which Rev. 21:2; 21:10; 22:19 speaks.

Conclusion.-- Jesus' exodus leading him first to the underworld, after his proclamation of the Good News there, caused the deliverance from the deadly existence of "saints.

“Elements of the world”.

This term occurs in Gal. 4:3, 4:9 and Col. 2:8, 2:20.-- It consists of two partial terms:
a. world (with its threefold meaning of which the pejorative predominates here) and
b. what makes the(the)m world intelligible, i.e. its elements.

1.-- ‘Element’.

‘Stoicheion: lat.: elementum.-- Element is either copy of a set or part of a system (system) such that its understanding allows something to be understood (explained). In this sense it runs in tandem with ‘archè’, lat.: principium, premise,-- literally: something that ‘governs’ something and thus determines it in its reality.

“Elements of the(the)m world” thus means -- generally speaking -- all that governs the(the)m world and thus makes it intelligible, makes it transparent.

2. -- “Elements of the(ze) world”, Pauline.

Paul uses the term in reference to religious systems, insofar as they interpret “the world” as governed by “elements,” i.e., things to be put first.

2.1.-- Gal. 4:3/7.

“We too (note:-- Jews) were as slaves (...) in the service of the elements of the world.-- Yet, when the fullness of the time (note:-- end times) was coming, God sent his Son (note:-- Jesus), born of a woman (note:-- Mary), to redeem the subjects of “the law” (note:-- the total Jewish religious system).(...)”

Note:-- The “law” of the Jews contained, besides the Ten Commandments, a whole series of “precepts” (duties and taboos) which, according to Paul, were not caused by God but by the elements of the(the)m world.

2.2.-- Gal. 4:8/10.

“At the time -- in your ignorance of God -- you (note:-- Galatians) were as slaves in the service of gods who, in substance, (note:-- compared to God) are none.-. But now that you are acquainted with God - or rather, now that God is acquainted with you (note:-- deals confidentially with you) - for what reason still return to those elements without power or value, to whom, as at that time (note:-- before your conversion), you again want to be slaves in the service? Observe days, months, seasons, years”.

Note:-- This latest “observe” refers especially to “all those precepts which are peculiar to the pagan religion of Galatians. In other words: in order to assert themselves (“divine vanity”), “the elements of the world”, i.e. deities, ancestor spirits, etc., have imposed useless “precepts”.

The “elements of the world” in those in authority.

The fourth commandment -- “Parents, children shall you honor” -- is clear: “Remind all that one must submit to judges (magistrates) and those in authority” (Tit. 3:1).-- Yet, as soon as “authority” enters this world, it exhibits the “harmony of opposites” that the world itself exhibits:

- a. neutral (authority in itself, without more),
- b. meliorative (so in Tit. 3:1) or pejorative (so in Ps. 82(81): the judges as gods abusing their “prestige”).

The elements of the world.

Angels: dominions and powers (1 Pet. 3:22), lordship and power (Col. 2:10), principalities, powers, forces, exaltations (Eph.; 1:21), heavenly principalities and powers (Eph. 3:10): behold the names, which are at once ‘functions’ or ‘roles’ in the cosmos and on this earth, in the land of the living (not to mention the underworld)! According to Paul and the other sacred writers, there is no doubt: these invisible ‘numina’ (sons of God, higher beings) control - apparently under the direction of Satan - “the(the) world”. The earthly authorities are the visible manifestations of this.

We read 2 Sam. 14:15, 14:20: “His majesty the king (David) is like ‘the angel of God’ to see clearly what is good and what is evil (cf. Gen. 2:9; 2:17; 3:5;3:22)” or “has the wisdom of ‘the angel of God’ and therefore knows everything that happens on earth”.

Do we note that this language.

“Angel of God” means “visible presence of God” - in 2 Sam. 14 is still biblical. Outside the Bible, one can expect authority to be “the visible presence of the elements of the cosmos.”

Luk. 12:11.

“When they shall drag you before the synagogues, the magistrates, those in authority, do not anxiously endeavor to know beforehand how ye shall defend yourselves, or what ye shall say! For the Holy Spirit (note:-- divine life force) will at that moment give you input as to what should be said.

Note:-- Jesus - upon his arrest - to those who had come upon him (high priests, commanders of the temple guards, elders) : “When I was daily with you in the temple, you left me untouched. Yet this is your hour and the power of darkness” (Luke 22:53).

In other words: authority, in Jesus’ interpretation, is by no means always meliorative. On the contrary, he clearly insinuates that the authority of “the people of God” who arrested him, was anything but “angel(s) of God”!

Paul's enumerations concerning' elements of the(them) world.

Gal. 4:3 (Jewish); 4:8 (pagan),-- Col. 2:8; 2:20.-- That was general. Eph. 1:21.-- After Jesus - as "kurios," glorified son of man - exalted himself above every dominion (archè, principatus), power (exousia, potestas), strength (dunamis, virtus;-- here in a very special sense), majesty (highness (dominatio, kuriotès)), he was raised from the dead (note. :-- resurrection) and sits "at God's right hand" (note.:-- in the pre-eminent place of honor). With a "name" (note.:-- position of power, role) above every "name" that will be able to be mentioned not only within this "century" (note.:-- aiön, saeculum, encompassing era) but moreover in the coming "century.

Note:-- Jesus' 'exodus' (exodos), taking away, glorification, -- all names denoting the same process -- thus includes first of all the reckoning with the "elements of the(them) world" (including the gates of hell).

Note:-- In Eph. 3:10 Paul mentions only the dominions and powers. One can see that as an apostle he rather avoids going into them further. So as not to put "the believers" on the dangerous track.

Eph. 6:10/13.

Make yourselves mighty men "in the Lord (kurios)" (note:-- Jesus as risen and as judge at God's right hand) and "in the power of his strength" (...) to be able to resist the devil's pinches. For not against adversaries of blood and flesh (note:-- earthly men) but against the dominions, powers -- against the universe rulers ('cosmokratores') of this darkness -- against all that is spiritual and as such represents evil in the heavenly regions, we have to fight.

Note:-- The term 'heavenly' in - "heavenly regions" means a -cosmic sphere above our heads as opposed to the underworld below us. 'Heavenly' therefore does not mean 'glorified' (as e.g. in Jesus' Ascension as part of his glorification in the heavenly regions).

Note the summary term 'universe rulers' (at least until Jesus' glorification). So Paul does not underestimate the enormous role of those invisible beings. They retain much of their power until Jesus' second coming.

From there, the struggle that Paul declares to be the task.

1 Cor. 15:24.

Jesus "destroys" every dominion, power and strength.

Note:-- Again, a sloppy, partial listing.

The sons of god, respectively of the gods.

In order to have some more concrete sense of what “the elements of the (them) world” are, among other things (insofar as sacred beings are sympathized with), we dwell on the concept of “son/daughter of god.”

To begin with, “son of” meant “gifted with the same or as good as nature of”. And by “nature” is meant both (biological descent (origin) and mode of behavior. “So the father so the son!”

Job 4:17/18.

“God does not even trust his servants (note:-- angels), and his angels (note:-- task performers) he provides the conclusive evidence of deviant behavior”. To which an a-fortiori reasoning fits: “Would (then) a mortal be ‘righteous’ (note:-- in order with conscience) in God’s estimation? In his Creator’s scale of values, would a human being be ‘pure’ (righteous)?”.

Note:-- From this comparison, which does not turn out so well for earthly man, it is clear that “a servant of God”, “an angel (of God)”, “a son of God”, “a son of the Most High”, “a saint”, “a prince”, “a god” (all terms designating higher beings), is in principle, as regards nature and behavior, a more godlike being than man on this earth.

Harmony of opposites.

The terms above, which in many cases are synonyms, exhibit:

- a. a neutral meaning and
- b. a meliorative (when Jesus has it said of himself that he is “son of God” e. g.) but also a pejorative (Satan, in Job 1 :6, 2:1, though son of God is evil) meaning.

The pejorative meaning is expressed very clearly in Job 4:18.

Note:-- This proves that even basically Godlike beings - higher beings - are ‘demonic’ in the religious-historical sense of “harmony of opposites”, i.e. admittedly ‘good’ but also ‘evil’.

Gen. 6:1ss. -- “When men became numerous on the earth and they had daughters, the sons of God found that they were beautiful and took to wife all those girls to which their choice fell.”

Note:-- This implies that eroticism is also present in higher beings and - even more so - can focus on earthly people. What the apostle Jude 7 (note: not the traitor Jude) - though in a partially different context - calls eroticism directed at “another kind of flesh”.

In another way: Jude is not tender with our “sons of God” burned on earthly girls:

“As for the angels who did not keep (op.:-- honor) their higher rank but left (op.:-- the heavens) the abode that was fitting for them, it is in view of the judgment on the ‘great day’ (note.:-- end-time intervention) that (God, the Father,) shut them up in the eternal shackles -- in the deepest of darkness.”

Which 2 Pet. 2:4 adds, “God did not spare the angels - who acted unscrupulously, but situated them in the tartaros (note.:-- the deepest of the underworld) and gave them up to the abysses of darkness where he stored them up - in view of the judgment (note.:-- end-time judgment).”

Note:-- And Jude and Peter emphasize, with very heavy terms, that such “higher beings” - angels, sons of God - belong in hell, as Jude 13 expresses it, namely, as “wandering stars (note.:-- another term for higher beings) for whom the dense darkness is kept ready.”

If the history of Gen. 6:1vv was merely a “sophisticated little story,” neither New Testament writer would spend such language on it.

Conclusion .

The sheol or underworld contains more than the ancestral souls in its deathly existence: also “elements of the(the) cosmos” of a ‘higher’ nature belong there. So that the terms “sheol” and “elements of the(the) world” merge. Or still: “the gates of hell” that reach into the land of the living, represent both ancestor souls and higher spirits (of a ‘fallen’ nature).

The rest of the story: Gen. 6:3f.

“Yahweh (note.:-- who sees the irresponsible behavior of (some of) the sons of God says, ‘That my spirit (note.:-- God’s own, supernatural life force) may not be endlessly responsible for man (note.:-- taken collectively) since he is ‘flesh’ (note.:-- cosmic life without God’s ‘spirit’). His life will only last one hundred and twenty years”.

Note:-- This clear condemnation by Yahweh -- present so early in scripture -- is apparently the reason for the harsh language of Jude and Peter specifying where such deviants belong: in the gates of hell.

Note:-- Gen. 6:4.-- “The nephim were on earth in those days and also afterward, when the sons of God became one with the daughters of men and gave them their children: they are the heroes of old, those famous people.”

Note:-- Whatever these nephilim were (a so called tribe of people or a type of ‘heroes’, gifted people), we will not discuss here.

Sarra's marriage drama.

That erotic demons were active even after that, the Bible attests in the book of Tobit. We dwell on it because we get a biblical and thus meager glimpse of what “the nations” (the pagans) elaborated in detail in their sexual magics and fertility religions. After all, the Bible, as a people’s education, systematically avoids further descriptions of what God disapproves of.

1.-- The stakes.

Demonic beings -- especially when they are misarchical (rejecting all higher values and authority) or merely “autonomous” (acting in their own right) -- take aim at God’s counsel (Is. 24:5), here regarding marriage.

Note:-- From Gen. 1:27 (“As man and woman God created man”), Gen. 5:1 (“As man and woman he created them”),-- Gen. 24:44 (“The woman (Rebekah) whom Yahweh has destined for you (Isaac)”) it appears that finding each other resulting in marriage rests on God’s counsel,-- at least when the parties involved succeed in fulfilling that high destiny.

Thus we understand Tob. 6:18: “Ask the Lord of heaven for his grace and shielding. - - Fear not, Tobias: she (Sarra) was assigned to you ‘from the origin (note:-- of all that is created)’”.

Note:-- The origin here is God Himself and His decree on the matter. One translates also: “from eternity”. Cf. Heb. 11:3.

Note: -- Demons engage in black magic..

As Ezek. 13:17/23 says, they “capture souls” (i.e., penetrate souls) and “kill people who should not die” (i.e., manipulate fate in their own right (misarchically, autonomously, seducing-and-culpabilizing after the fact). The demon in Tobit does this very tangibly.

2.-- The drama.

The calamity of Asmodeus, “the worst of demons” (Tob. 3:8), has as its target God’s destiny.

“The case may happen to a man or a woman who is ‘tormented’ by an unscrupulous spirit or demon”(Tob. 6:8).-- Tob. 6:14.-- “Seven times Sarra married and each time her husband was killed in the bridal chamber,-- the night he entered Sarra’s chamber. To her he does no harm because he ‘loves’ them(!) but as soon as someone wants to approach them, he kills them.” (Cf. Tob. 7:11).

Note:-- The black powers of Asmodeus are so strong that God sends the angel Raphael (Tob. 12:15; 12:19) to “heal,” i.e., exorcise (exorcise), as Tob. 12:14 (3:16) as well as 6:18, 8:2/3 say.

“In the Days of Noë”.

The text concerning the nephilim or heroes is to be situated in the framework assigned to it by the sacred writer. Thus it reads, “Yahweh saw that the wickedness of man (note:-- taken collectively) on the earth was extensive, and that his heart forged only unscrupulous plans for a long time.(...).”

Yahweh said, “I am going to wipe out the people I created from the face of the earth, and with them the cattle, the creeping animals, and the birds in the sky. For I regret having made them”.

Then follows the ‘toledôt’ (lineage) of Noë (Noah) in which the Flood story is embedded.

Note:-- The sacred writer structures the story concerning the apostate god-sons and that concerning the terrible divine judgment that follows the primal degeneration of humanity in such a way that they are interwoven: it is as if the god-sons, through the women they worked for, contaminated the rest of humanity.

The primal degeneration weighed heavily. Also in the New Testament.

Do we read 2 Pet. 2:5.-- “God did not spare the untimely (note:-- pre- noah) world, while at the same time he “saved eight men among whom was Noë, the herald of conscience (op.:-- Gen. 6:9/11).”

Note:-- Here one clearly sees the structure of every God’s judgment : it shifts! The basis was indicated in Gen. 6:3: only those who have both life-soul (cosmic life) and God’s spirit or (supernatural) life-force will survive catastrophes; those who have only life-soul, i.e., only cosmic life (and thus belong to the sphere of influence of the gates of hell), will not survive the disaster. That reality is the pre-eminent premise of the shifting that is every God’s judgment.

“As in the days of Noë”.

“As in the days of Noë, so shall the coming of the son of man (note:-- Jesus so entitles himself) be.”-- In the days leading up to the flood, one ate and drank, one married a mate. Until the day when Noë entered the ark and the people did not notice anything until the breakthrough of the flood which swallowed them all up.”-- So shall also be the coming of the Son of Man.”(Matt. 24: 37vv; 1 Thess. 5:3)

Note:-- A return of the primal degeneration thus awaits us! (Cfr. Dan. 12:4 (“Unconscience will increase”); Matt. 24:12; 2 Tim. 3:1/9 (the end-time people).

Thus, the gates of the underworld - since Jesus’ appearance - have not even diminished in strength.

Satan, the prince of this world.

Luk. 4:1/13.-- Jesus, since his baptism (Luk. 3:21v.), full of “holy spirit” (op.: divine life force), is, in that spirit, led through the desert “to be tempted by the devil” (Matt. 4:1).

1.-- The devil:

“If thou be “the son of God” (op.:-- 1 Sam. 7:14; Ps. 2:7; Lu. 3:22;-- Messiah), say unto that stone that it become bread.” Jesus: “Not of bread alone shall man live.” (Deut. 8:3).

2.-- Satan leads him into the heights.

Satan (Note:-- Ezek. 37:1; 40:2), shows all the kingdoms of the universe: “I will give thee all this power and the glory (Note:-- Habak. 2:5/8) of those kingdoms, for it is given unto me, and I give it unto whom I will. You therefore: if you prostrate yourselves before me in worship, it shall be all yours”. Jesus: “It is written: You shall worship the Lord your God and serve him alone”(Deut. 6:13).

Note:-- Satan speaks, in high truth: he is “the god of this world (2 Cor. 4:4), “the prince of the kingdom of the air” (Eph. 2:2), “the prince of the(the) world” (John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11). Well understood “world” as “gates of hell”(Matt. 16:18). He is the “element of the world” par excellence (Gal. 4:3; 4:9; Col. 2:8; 2:20) for he explains a great deal of what happens in our earthly world and even in the universe.

3.-- Satan brings Jesus on the superstructure of the temple at Jerusalem.

“If thou art “the son of God,” cast thyself down from this place, for it is written, “He shall command for thee his angels to protect thee,” and “On their hands they shall bear thee up, lest thou dash thy foot at a stone.” (Note:-- Ps. 91 (90):11v.). Jesus:” It has been said, “You shall not defy the Lord your God.” (Deut. 6:16).

Note:-- Luke: “With this the devil had finished the whole temptation and removed himself until the favorable moment.” Throughout his public life, Jesus faced Satan (the sick and possessed; even Peter (Lu. 8:33); unbelieving Jews (John 8:38; 8:44; 8:47)).

Decisively in Judas Iscariot, as Luk. 22:3 explicitly says, ènd in those in authority, as Luk. 22:53 explicitly says, “It is your hour and the power of darkness.” Where ‘darkness’ means the gates of hell and the elements of the(the) world. Satan was indeed: the prince of this unscrupulous world, as had already been shown “in the days of Noah”.

Jesus' descent into hell.

Matt. 12:40.-- "As Jonas abode in the bowels of the sea monster for three days and three nights, so shall the son of man (note:-- Jesus) be in the bosom of the earth for three days and three nights." This is repeated with emphasis in the early church: Acts 2:24; 2:27; 3:31; Rom. 10:7; Heb. 13:20. It belongs to the primal creed .

Jesus, the glorified one.

He became the quickened spirit (Paul) through His cross and resurrection passes (exodus, removal). Which is expressed very explicitly in John 7:37/39.

1 Pet. 3:18ss.

"Christ Himself died once for all for sin. As a conscientious man for unscrupulous people: to bring us to God. Killed though "according to the flesh" (note:-- under view of mere human life) he was nevertheless raised to life "according to the spirit."

Note:-- We see here, in New Testament interpretation, the opposing pair in Gen. 6:3, for 'spirit' here means "God's life force" of which Jesus overflows, once he is glorified ("life-giving spirit") .

The glorified one descends into the sheol.

1 Pet. 3:19.-- "In that spirit (note:-- divine life-force) Jesus even went about proclaiming the message to the spirits in the dungeon'-- to those who at the time had refused to believe when God's forbearance of evil gave respite,-- in the days when Noë built the ark (Gen. 7:14) in which a small number (...) were saved from the flood waters."

Note:-- Who are these spirits?

a. Some think they are the Old Testament "saints" (note.: conscience-followers) whom Matt. 27:52 mentions as risen and showing themselves to many "in the holy city. Which doesn't seem so obvious to us.

b. Others: the souls of those who perished in the flood as unscrupulous and thus obtain grace if they accept Jesus' Good News.

c. Still: the chained demons spoken of in the book of Henok.

Peter 4:6.

Peter speaks of the abyss between pagans and Christians concerning morality (1 Petr. 4:3): "(For their lack of understanding the pagans will give account before Jesus who is ready to judge the living and the dead. This is why the Good News was proclaimed even to the dead, so that although according to men they may be judged 'according to the flesh', yet according to God they 'live in the spirit (note:-- of God)' .

Religion: feminized.

As all that is is ambiguous (poly-interpretable), so is all that is religion. This is evident in e.g. Nancy Auer Falk/ Rita M. Gross, *La religion par les femmes*, (Religion by women), Geneva. Labor et Fides. 1993 (// *Unspoken Worlds*, Wadsworth, 1989).

The whole book attempts to show that if women engage in science and philosophy of religion, the religious phenomena and their interpretation (i.e. their axiomata) take on a partially different appearance.

To give one sample of this, we reproduce the main body of R. M. Gross, *Menstruation et accouchement chez les indigènes australiens*, (Menstruation and childbirth among indigenous Australians), in o.c. , 403/417.

Introduction.

1. The Aborigines (primitive people) of Australia are, materially speaking, pickers and hunters. Religiously, their world is much more complex than many Western “scholars” want to see.

2.1. The male Western scholars have worked out a simplified view “according to their prejudices” (understand: axiomata). This view is summarized as follows:

- a.** women and men have a strictly separated religion
- b.** such that the men, through myths and rites, are “sacred” beings while the women - if they have any religion apart - are “profane” beings.

2.2. Against which Rita M. Gross’ thesis stands:

- a.** the separation “men/women” is indeed a fact
- b.** but only in virtue of “imitative participation” in (the rites and myths of) female sexuality (menstruation, pregnancy, parturition) such that men only gain access to “the male sanctity” through “*imitatio participata*” (imitative participation) in the female world. Thus, among other things, explicitly o.c., 415.

Both the rites and the myths show that the biology of women (as well as of men but differently; has as its “origin” (sufficient reason or ground) all that the mythical primal parents (the female in the first place) have “in the beginning” presented. In other words: the women stand at the origin while the men, through the women, participate in that origin. That participation is biological (sperm) and ritual-mythical.

Let us go into that for a moment, because Gross’ text means a true revolution in the view of the religion of the Australian primeval inhabitants or ‘Aborigines’.

1.-- The main attraction of female religion. O.c., 405/410.

a. Apart from a few rites of sexual maturation there is nothing in this respect.-- Following the first menstruation the first initiation rites take place: the girl “becomes” (sacredly speaking) “woman” (fully).

Menstruation was indeed ‘instituted’ (caused) by the primitive sisters “in the beginning” (in the mythical primeval age which is always present in the myths and the rites). The women set the first or primordial menstruation visible today biologically-and-ritually, -- the men much more artificially.

Note:-- The later menstruations continue to be ‘sanctified’ to some extent by rites.

Note:-- This alone indicates that “the woman” among the Australian primitive people does possess a ‘sacredness’ and is not a ‘profane’ being.

b. The (first) parturition was also ‘instituted’ by the female primeval parents. The myths and rites relating to it are visible representations of it. The ritual seclusion from the camp of the parturientes, the dances and the songs on this occasion are called ‘narungani’, i.e. “emanating from the mouths of the first women (from the mythical prehistory)”.

And so those acts - biological and ritual - are power-laden. Which - in passing - involves a feminine dynamism or power belief of its own. Especially the blood of women is considered ‘dangerous’ (for men) because it is power-laden, i.e. loaded with life force.

2.-- The main attraction of male religion.-- o.c., 410 / 415.

Parallel to the female acts of initiation there are the male ones. Usually -- the radical separation faithful -- the women, especially the menstruating and the giving birth, are excluded from them. Sometimes, however, women who have gone through menopause (who thus no longer exhibit that “dangerous” event proper to female biology) are initiated into male rites. This seems to indicate that the woman, once outside her typically female activities, is no longer ‘taboo’.

a. The myths.

A first myth.

“In those days” (in the beginning) the djanggawul sisters fathered children. Her brother helped them to give birth.-- Later, however, her brother “steals” “the sacred feminine objects and rites”, namely during the - equally mythicized - “transition” from the mythical to the post-mythical (so-called historical) time”.

A second myth.

In prehistoric times (in the beginning) the Wawalik sisters (Wauwilak, Wauwalek) travel. The oldest is pregnant and gives birth but travels on and loses blood. They pitch their tent near a “holy well”.

The python snake living there “smells the blood”: it causes a tornado during which it comes out of the well to “devour” the sisters.

Note:-- *By the way:* this devouring involves getting hold of her (blood) life force.

By dancing the youngest keeps the python at a distance. Exhausted, she asks the elder to continue the dance. The eldest does not keep the snake at a distance’.

Finally the youngest gets her period: by dancing all the time. But she does not keep him at bay either. The python devours them both. Through dreams later both revealed this primal history (apocalyptic).

b. The rites.

In very varied ways throughout the populations, the male rites present the primal event.

1. Menstruation for men is performed by sub-incision (incisions made on the underside of the penis to resemble the bleeding vulva) or by forearm incisions. The blood flows from the cuts: dancers decorate their emblems with it!” This blood from the ritual vulvas (lower part of the penis or upper arm) is the blood of the monthly period of the ancient (note: mythical) Wawilak women”. Thus one of the interpretations.

2. The circumcision is the entry of young men into full (and biological and occult) manhood. Note however that the circumcised behave like mothers who give birth to a child! For example, they carry - ritually, of course - the boys just as a woman carries her baby. In other words, they imitate the wawalik women - the sisters of the primeval times - ... to participate in them in a masculine way.

Conclusion.

The men enter into their - for women usually closed - male world but both myths and rites reveal (apocalyptically) this world as belonging to the ‘other’, the female world.-- Thus says the author.

In other words: what men – savants - do not see, female scholars do see!

The many interpretations of a religion.

E. Faucompret, *Algerije (Het islamisme in opmars)*, (Algeria (Islamism on the rise)), in: *Streven* 64 (1997), 4 (April) 324/ 336, briefly but very clearly typifies two interpretations of the same religion, Islam.

The main axiom of Islam reads: “Men are the privileged slaves of the Lord” (according to M. Eliade/ I. Iouliano, *Dictionnaire des religions*, Paris, 1990, 206). See here how the moderates and the “fundamentalists” (extremists) interpret.

1.-- The moderate version.

1. God (in a more or less biblically diverted Arabic interpretation) is only sovereign, i.e. object of worship. Human beings or other beings - e.g. the ancient Arab goddesses - may not be worshipped. Certainly the jinns, the spirits that do both good and evil, fall outside any form of worship.

2. The Koran - six thousand verses - is one call to conscientious behavior, including mercy. Eighty verses deal with the law (criminal law, civil law, one article of commercial law): these are typical of the Arabian VII century (Muhammad: 570/632) and only give direction, not strict legal texts.

3. The Koran, the “word of God” passed on to Muhammad by the “angel Gabriel” (whoever that may be) for Allah, the name for the great Arabian goddesses revered in the pre-Islamic causer, puts the fundamental equality of all people first, so that dictatorship and theocracy (i.e. a state that has a religion as its constitution) are rejected.

4. The term “jihad” means:

a. elevation of the soul and

b. the peaceful winning of converts. The interpretation of “holy war in the name of Islam” as “Islam” (submission to Allah), as the duty of every Muslim (Muslim, i.e. the one who submits to Allah), is “nationalistic-imperialistic” and misunderstands the openness of Islam to every fellow man, to every people.

5. The “fundamentalists” (understand: extremists, about which later) see Islam as a social system that joins between Allah and the people, especially the believers of Islam, as an oppression. Following the example of the Catholic Church where it can “come to power”.

‘Mediators’ between Allah and humanity - all but Mohammed, “the prophet” - are rejected. What to religion of direct-individual contact with “God” seems to involve.

2.- The “fundamentalist” version.

“Men are the Lord’s privileged slaves”--see how, according to Faucompret, this is translated into axiomata.

a. only “God” is sovereign, i.e. has a right to worship.

b. only “the law of God” - the Koran and the “shariah”, i.e. “the divine law of Islam”, not without the “figh”, the legal interpretations over the centuries of “the law of god” - is guiding, indeed strictly binding, on the basically free conscience of every human being, especially the Muslim.

Note:-- “Muhammed introduced no distinction between religious law and ‘secular’ (‘secular’) law” says Eliade/ Iouliano, Dict., 214. In any Islamic country, the application of shariah depends on the degree of secularization (‘secularization’) of the state itself.

This shariah applies to the whole culture: family life, inheritance tax, taxes (‘zakat’: the 2.5% for the ‘poor’), ablutions, prayer, etc. included. Thus always Eliade/ Iouliano (ibid.).

c. There are only two ‘parties’: the party of ‘God’ (the Islamic one) and the party of Satan, the tempter of men, a fallen angel (‘Iblis’ in Arabic), who was driven out of heaven because he “refused to worship Adam” (Eliade/ Iouliano, o.c., 206).

Note:-- One sees it: self-serving interpretation of one’s own position demanding rectitude (orthodoxy) from “the others.” In discussion with “the others” it never comes to verisimilitude but only to preferentiality regarding one’s own position.

d. The present society is pagan, i.e. non-Islamic. Since only Allah’s law is valid, this pagan society must disappear.

e. The party of Allah, called “party of God”, will be victorious thanks to djihad, the holy war.

Conclusion.

People who, when it comes to their own opinion, are self-willed and, when discussing, only defend their own opinion preferentially and only demand righteousness from “the others”, are particularly susceptible to going through thick and thin to defend the foundations of e.g. Islam and act integristically, safeguarding these foundations against the rest.

Fate science: the tragedy of a masikini with likundu,

Tragic' and 'tragedy' are concepts from the science of fate, i.e. the science of "what happens to people" - fate.

Tragic" is everything that ends badly and has no prospect of success; the tragic man sees the given and the demanded (his fate and the way out of it), which together make up the task, but he sees no solution.

In Hegelian terms: he is 'unreal': i.e., cannot cope with the reality in and around him.

In existential terms: thrown into this world with its miscalculations, he has no design that can eliminate the miscalculations.

Paganism and Biblical religion.

1. Within pagan religions, more times than not -- perhaps always -- a situation is hopeless, "tragic" in that the supreme beings who govern paganism are, as W. B. Kristensen says, "harmony (understand: interlocking, alternation, of salvation and doom, -- more so of ethical good and evil) of opposites" such that they are unpredictable, incalculable.

2. In biblical Christianity, however, if man converts to it, the Holy Trinity has the last word regarding fate and destiny and a situation, however hopeless at first glance, is never really hopeless.

We read in this light J. Ch, Souroy. *Sorciers noirs et sorcier blanc, (La magie, la sorcellerie et ses drames)*, (Black magiciens and white magiciens, (Magic, witchcraft and its dramas), Bruxelles, 1952, 161/206 (Le likundu).-- We summarize the long chapter,

Makolopembe.

Makolopembe is a bearer of 'settled' calamity, i.e. his second nature or subconscious structure is such that he lives through calamity, as it were, 'by nature' (he is 'masikini') and spreads calamity around him (he is marked by 'likundu').

The two African terms actually belong together as expressions and in terms of fate, namely of the same causative factor. Likundu' can also be translated by "the evil eye" but with emphasis on the calamity of the evil eye and with minimization of the occult effect of the evil eye ('fascination' or 'captivation'). In ancient Greek: 'kako.daimonia: presence of an ominous (kako) life force or 'spirit' (daimon).

Souroy.

“Poor Makolopembe! The man whom people never refer to other than by the term ‘masikini’, poor bugger, clumsy idiot, failure”. Such is how the locals interpret him. It is the outward manifestation of what Temples calls the full degree of “bya malwa,” -- of “mischievous life force” hidden in the depths of Makalopembe’s personality.

Souroy.-- Of course he is ugly, pathetic. His x-legs fold under the feathery, hollow weight of his chest. And what is more : he is lazy, archly lazy.

Note:-- The last of the seven deadly sins is called “sloth” (inertia), i.e. lack of dynamism! The (visible) laziness is the external sign of it.

It has been so for ten years.

His father, Gilima, was a rather solidly built hunter, a noted man. But then as the biggest drunk in the village.-One day they brought him home from hunting after a buffalo - deep in the jungle - had ripped open his belly with its horns. The magician’s remedies had no effect on the nearly bled Gilima: he died in the course of the night.

This still happens and normally only the family would have suffered. But the magician was performing for the first time and there happened to be many people present with whom the prestige (note: the vanity) of the magician was at stake. So there had to be a reaction:

1. the live chicken that had played a role in the preparation of the means was healthy;
2. the words had been spoken correctly in the course of the rite. Consequence: whoever was wrong was the victim!

1. Gilima had wished to deceive the magician, for for hunting Gilima had asked him only for a cheap ‘kisi’ (magic remedy),--”just right for antelopes” But with such a thing he had attacked a buffalo. So it is only natural that the calamity happened. Such a mistake did occur more often.

2. So something else had been at work,-- something more dangerous. The poor Makolopembe indicated himself: from him, the mangy sheep, came the whole calamity.

The villagers, more afraid of the magician than of Makolopembe, agreed with this opinion: “Makolopembe shows the evil eye.”

What preceded.

Local myths say that a masikini is doomed to failure by an “unknown power.” Every now and then that “x”, the doom factor(s), surfaces and shows itself.

Thus in following “bad endings”. In particular, Makolopembe gets married to Tabo. One day, Tabo returned from the plantation with a foot that was badly swollen due to a snake bite. The ailment increased, affecting the leg. Makolopembe became worried: he heated water but the bath gave no relief. Then the magician was informed: he performed an incision in the wound, placed the prepared bandages on it but no result: the poison was already flowing through Tabo’s veins. She passed away in the course of the night.

Gradually the widower became aware of the general hostility against him: “Other inhabitants were bitten by snakes but the magician saved them. Why is it that he cannot cure Tabo?”

The worst among the evil storytellers recalled a certain Djiadjoko, who had died some years ago in the same circumstances: everyone knew that it was because of her husband who had wanted to get rid of her because he could not have children with her. That man had the evil spirit in him. Coincidence or not: like Makolopembe, he had a white spot in his right eye.

“Thou hast no luck.”

The conclusion is made one evening by his father-in-law.

1. “Makolopembe, my daughter has died at thy hands. I do know that a snake bite is serious but one still heals from it. What caused that bite to take Tabo’s life? Your father, when you were a child, was killed. Your mother left you an orphan (note:-- she fled the village).-- Thou art not lucky! Thou hast no luck! What hast thou done to the spirits?”

2. “And, if one has no luck, then those around thee have none either!”-- Never didst thou undertake anything to combat that fate. Do ye remember: even the chicken which ye gave to the magician six years ago on the occasion of the marriage with Tabo, died two days later. Something the magician undoubtedly never forgave you for!!!

Note:-- The father-in-law, who was basically good to him, summarizes: **1.** Masikini (“Thou hast no luck”); **2.** Likundu (“Thou spreads misfortune all around thee”).

The sequel.

Makolopembe moves out of the village. With family. To start “a new life.” Basa’s first son (he was a relative) falls ill. One evening, a second son of Basa, Makalopembe’s half-brother, falls ill. The child was clapping with fever. A severe cough ripped apart his chest. After a few days this child also died.-- This time the looks were full of hatred: threats were uttered. More than once the word ‘likundu’ was heard to be uttered.

Basa consults the village magician: “Since Makolopembe moved in with me, two children from my family have died. In mysterious ways. Thou who knowest all, canst thou tell me by what?”

The old magician closed his eyes. For a long time he remained silent. In the meantime he stroked his magic wand. Then he got up, grabbed some plants in a corner, threw them into a fire staring at the smoke that rose. Again silence.

Suddenly “Makolopembe exhibits likundu and so he will bring misfortune to all with whom he lives. Thou must therefore chase him away. When he is gone, bring me a young goat: the sacrifice will cleanse thee,-- thee and thine”.

Basa comes home. “Thou hast likundu. Thou hast brought upon us a fate. Go away, Makolopembe. If not, I must kill thee and thy little son”.

So Makolopembe set out on his way. At length he stepped. “I am a curse te. I radiate misfortune. Not even death will set me free. For it is well known that likundu prevents even the dead from sleeping”.

He takes his infant son in his arms. “We exhibit likundu. An evil spirit is within us that bites us in the belly. No magician can exorcise it.-- I have great pain in my heart but,-- to cure us, I must kill you”.

Suddenly he grabbed the child by the head, laid it on the ground, took his knife and weeping, cut its throat.

Note:-- The author: Belgian colonial law - a western product puts that “crime” in prison. It becomes a trial in its western way. Once convicted, Makolopembe behaved exemplarily in prison but grew into a “pathetic automaton,” a “zombie.”

Westerners with their ‘rationalist-axiomata’ interpret as ‘crime’ what within the axiomata of a primitive culture is interpreted as “a logical and conscientious act”. What axiomata do!

Santeria as a religion type.

Th. Achelis, *Die Religionen der Naturvölker im Umriss*, (The religions of primitive peoples in the region), Leipzig, 1909, 140, defines 'religion' as "worship of higher (usually transcendental, i.e. immaterial) 'powers' (understand: beings, energies, processes)". Let us now see if this definition fits a current religion that today - not in distant or remote archaic regions - is flourishing as never before, namely santeria.

Its name in Cuba is 'Lucumi' and that in Brazil is 'Macumba' and 'Candomble'. The name of the we men is 'santero' and of the we women is 'santera'.

Note:-- When the Yoruba (a type of negro-african) were brought to Cuba from West Africa (southern Nigeria, along the Niger River) as slaves/slaves by the white Christians, they preserved their religion by, among other things, hiding their 'orishas' (= orixas, deities) - syncretistically - as if they were Catholic saints, from their lords. In all secrecy, however, they worshipped them as if to perform. The result is "santeria" a hybrid of primitive religion and Catholicism. Some five million Spanish-American believers are its adherents.

Note:-- In Trinidad, that religion is called "Shango. According to Migene Gonzalez-Wippler, *Legends of Santeria*, St. Paul (Minnesota), 1994, 7, some over one hundred million people are said to worship the 'orishas' in some way in the New World.

Definition of religion.

Migene Gonzalez-Wippler, who was initiated into santeria from childhood as a white man and now passes as one of its most knowledgeable knowers, in her book *The Santeria Experience (A Journey in the Miraculous)*, St. Paul, Minnesota, 1992-2, 320, defines it as follows.

1.-- Dynamism.

The central belief of santeria is that every reality (note:-- it is thus an ontology or theory of reality) within the universe consists of a cosmic energy. The santeria name is "ashe.

2.-- Supreme Being Belief.

The first 'maker' of the universe and the source of this energy or life force is god, the creator,-- a mysterious being whose Yoruba name is 'Olo(d)dumare'.

Note:-- It is thus truly a monotheism, but in the sense of Nathan Söderblom's belief divine beings, called 'causers'. Also not without some Catholic influence in this regard.

3.-- Polytheism.

The orishas or deities ('deities') are Olodumare's messengers. They are also the repositories of his ashe or energy. Each orisha represents both a natural force and a human value.

Note-- According to P. Schebasta, ed., *Oorsprong van de godsdienst* (Origin of Religion), Tielt/Den Haag, 1962, 56v. (Polytheism - despite belief in God), in classical antiquity - India,-- Egypt, Phoenicia,-- Greece e.g. - the deities were immortal beings with great power (first of all with great life force, but not free from suffering and passions (of which many, many myths (also in santeria) testify). However, they themselves were under a "higher power", i.e. a kind of omnipotent power.

Furthermore, there is a pair of deities who "represent" heaven and earth (goddess and god). Also striking is the system of "good/evil deities" (devas/asuras,-- titans/ deities e.g.) who fight each other. In other words: a kind of dualism.

Furthermore: bringers of salvation that cause rescue from need. Finally also the 'trickster' or "(sacred) cheaters" (who fool the people "for amusement").

4.-- Magism.

Human beings need ashe (= ashé) to solve problems. In short: to survive. Thus literally Gonzalez-Wipller (which insinuates that one lives in a danger-filled universe.).

Sacrificial magic.

Now to obtain ashé from the orishas who possess ashé, it is necessary to make their /her 'ebbo', a sacrifice. The orishas accept 'ebbo' and - owing to their /her magical abilities they transform 'ebbo' into that kind of ashé necessary to solve the problem at hand.

The sacrifices or ebbos differ from orisha to orisha and must be brought taking into account the 'attributes' (essence traits) of each orisha individually.

Note-- Which corresponds to Usener's 'Funktionsgottheit' (each deity as specialized in one domain of 'causation' has its own 'function' or role. Something that stands out within all religions.

Note-- One also sees that Söderblom's general concept of 'causing' is applicable: 'causing' is a sacred type of bringing about an effect by means of a cause. Here: grasping a life problem and solving it by means of magical forces (life force (dynamism)).

An example.

Take Oshun (Oshun), a goddess. Her nature or cosmic energy domain is the water of rivers. Her human value (role, function, power domain) are eros, marriage, child wealth, gold, arts, enjoyments, underbelly.

Her “attributes” (meaning the essence properties concerning sacrifices) are the color “yellow”, the number “5”, products like honey, mirrors, fruits like pumpkins, animals like yellow chickens, further products like cinnamon, cakes and wine. These things are charged with life force and are sacrificed as such, i.e. for the reason of their life force. Oshun reacts with her energy merged with the sacrificed energy.

Oshun has - according to Gonzalez-Wippler - an ashé of her own that can be used to influence those domains that she causally controls. In her case: mainly erotic matters. An ebbo that one offers her, to invoke her help, must include at least some of her attributes (sacrificial attributes).

Thus e.g. in the ritual form of a. a hollowed out pumpkin, b. which one fills with honey and olive oil.-- A wick or kernel one lets float on the oil and lights. The flame must burn for five days (see above her number ‘5’. Often the name of the ‘beloved’ or ‘desired’ person’ (for whose or whose eros one is recruiting) is placed either inside or under the pumpkin.

The orisha YemaYa (YemaYa).

This goddess has as her cosmic power or domain the waters of the ocean (“seven seas”). Her domain of value is femininity and motherhood. Her sacrificial attributes are: as colors blue and white, as number “7”, as product sugarcane syrup, as plant watermelon, as animals ducks and female guinea fowls.

Definition of religion.

Achelis said: worship of higher powers. That definition does not situate religion in everyday life! The traditional pre-critical, premodern-religions always put forward a task (given and demanded or problem) - what Gonzalez-Wippler calls “human value” - where “worship of higher powers” is involved in the solution. Why? Because by virtue of higher life force or ashé those higher beings represent higher dissolving power. In other words, one does not “worship” for the sake of worshiping!

A godless and diminishing religion: Buddhism.

Luc Ferry, *Le bouddhisme vu d' Europe*, (Buddhism seen from Europe), in: Le Point (Paris) 29.03.1997, 95, literally says: "This religion without a god was only discovered in the West from the 1920s onwards." Let us comment on this.

"The 'Buddha' (in Pali and Sanskrit 'awakened' ('enlightened')) was most likely a historical figure." (M. Eliade/I. Couliano, *Dictionnaire des religions*, Paris, 1990, 71) .

The reason: in the jatakas (descriptions of life) the myth prevails to such an extent that "the Buddha" comes across as "the divine man" as it is found in very many religions (the Hindu, the Greek and many others).

I - An overview of Buddha's life.

His date of birth varies from -624 to -448.-- He is the son of a sakya prince.-- At the age of sixteen he marries two princesses and lives without care in the paternal (his mother was long dead) palace.

Note:-- This aristocratic bowl makes much clear in his life and teachings.

The aristocrat discovers the pains outside the palace.

Three times he leaves his palatial life and discovers three inescapable evils: growing old, suffering (illness) and death. At the fourth time the remedy becomes clear to him: he discovers the inner peace of a begging ascetic.

Note:-- The counter-model to the palatial life is the life of the mortified in India, a kind of people on the fringes of society who are as far removed from the everyday life of the "great masses" (on whom they sometimes look down smugly) as those who live in palaces.

In the course of a night he wakes up, sees the sagging bodies of his concubines wrapped in deep sleep: he discovers "the transience of this world" under that point of view but this time within his palace itself.

The founder of a religion.

Quickly he leaves the palace, now delivers himself to asceticism, mortification,-- adopts a new name: Gautama or Gotama.

He becomes a student of two wisdom teachers. One teaches him the then (Hindu) "philosophy" (a kind of metaphysics); the other teaches him the techniques of (Hindu) yoga (search for unification or yoga with deity).

Sakyamuni' (the ascetic sakya) as the Buddha is, he leaves both his wisdom teachers: with five contemporaries he now practices the extreme forms of mortification.

But that does not 'satisfy' him either: conscious of the futility of such a life, he accepts a portion of rice sacrifice and actually eats it. Annoyed by such evidence of weakness in self-flagellation, his five contemporaries leave him.

Awakening or enlightenment under a fig tree.

He sits under a fig tree not to leave that place until he attains awakening (awareness) or enlightenment. Mara, a being that represents both evil and death, attacks him. But towards the dawn, Buddha overcame Mara and became the blissful possessor of the four truths, which he taught in Benares to his five former contemporaries.

1. Truth.

Everything is suffering: "Birth is suffering. To grow old is to suffer. All that is impermanent is suffering.

2. Truth.

The cause of suffering is desire.

3. Truth.

The eradication of desire is the cause of the eradication of suffering.

4. Truth.

The eightfold path ("middle way").-- Mind, thought, word,-- deed. (karmanta), livelihood, effort,--attention, contemplation (samadhi).

Such is Buddha's first proclamation.-- He grows to be a successful preacher: the number of his contemporaries increases spectacularly. He even has to engage women as 'mortals' in a community. But ... all kinds of jealousies and quarrels disturb the inner peace.

Eighty years old he dies of ... indigestion!

Note: -- Historians believe that this humiliating story must have happened true because sacred literature in principle avoids such details in the lives of "divine men".

Note:-- When one compares this form of religion with e.g. the African religions, it is striking that the latter are emphatically situated in the daily life of working people. When one comes to many 'Eastern' religions, these are often situated outside the working people but in such a way that they live by begging.

Where, in Africa, the magician looks for plants, invokes ancestral souls, mobilises spirits in order to cure someone, to 'cause' fertile cattle and so on, the typical Eastern religious person seeks solitude - the non-economic life - and 'meditates'. The difference is very great. He/she remains on the margins of the economy.

II.-- The basic reasoning of "the Buddha".

Eliade/ Couliano, o.c., 73ss., briefly states. The avoidance of the strict-logical method is typical.

- 1.--** The monk Malunkyaputta establishes Buddha's contrary judgements.
 - a.** The world is eternal and non-everlasting,-- finite and non-finite (infinite).
 - b.1.** Body and 'atman' (soul) are identical and non-identical.

Note:-- "Atman" - in pre-Buddhist Hinduism - is the deeper, truly real and immortal self,-- in Western terms "soul. Buddhism reduces this belief.

b.2. 'Arhat' (the ideal saint) exists after death and does not exist after death. Yes, exists and does not exist.

Buddha's answer.

"It is like a man who is hit by a poisoned arrow: when his friends and relatives seek a doctor as soon as possible, he says: "Before I know whether the one who has struck me is a soldier, a brahmin, a vaisya (= 'provisioner' (merchant, farmer)), a sudra (= 'untouchable' (workman, servant)), -- what is his name and of what tribe he is,-- whether he is tall, medium or small in stature,-- whether he is black, brown or yellow, I will not let that arrow be taken out of my body (...)" -

Note:-- The haughty, indifferent 'controlling' of what deprives "the others" of their inner peace is typical. That is how 'sacred' inner peace is.

2.-- The wandering ascetic Vaccha also reproaches Buddha with the opposite judgements. Buddha's answer: "I am above any theory. Only within 'theoretical' (metaphysical, philosophical) thinking 'exist' thesis (affirmation) and contradiction (negation)".

Vaccha 'reasons' simplistically: "If A is true, then non-A is not true"! Buddha asks him - dodging strict logical reasoning - to answer the following question: "Where has the fire gone once it has been blown out?"

To the east or west, south or north?”. Vaccha: “I don’t know”. To which Buddha replied: “Arhat is like a blown out fire and so any statement about its existence is a guess, nothing more”.

Note: -- Buddha haughtily plays on the analogy that is not the absolute identity - between model (fire) and original (arhat). As long as there is no absolute identity, Buddha’s reasoning is not absolute either. But that will not worry him.

The deconstruction of the Hindu atman doctrine.

“There is only suffering but no sufferer. There is no culprit but only the deed”. Such is the similarly evasive reasoning of Buddha.

Indeed, the doctrine of the brahmins (the brahman is the sacred man; he is situated at the top of the four castes) reads: “Atman, the soul, is the essential constituent of the whole man”.

Buddha deconstructs this.-- But logically he is cunning: he denies atman without fully pronouncing it! Arhat, the ideal sage, does he weaken by death?

Buddha: “What ‘one’ (op.: the unenlightened and unawakened masses) calls ‘arhat’, is - like any other reality (op.: or what ‘one’ calls reality) - nothing except a linguistic convention or agreement. ‘Arhat’ (note: in that sense) is in no way real (note: in Buddha’s sense). After all, the only realities that cause the universe are suffering and its eradication.

Note:-- Thus one understands the assertion that there is only suffering and no suffering (atman or soul), -- that there is no doer (an atman acting) but only a doing!

Note: -- Buddha’s reasonings -- for they are indeed reasonings (and thus applied logic) -- recall the ancient Greek sophists. Not surprisingly, that kind of thinking and living attracts more than one uprooted intellectual: it is that ‘deconstructive’!

The ‘arhat’ (arahat).

Arhat’ is all those who, within the oldest or Hinayana Buddhism, attain the highest stage of ‘holiness’ and thus have acquired ‘nirvana: liberation from the incarnated earthly life’.-- “Nirvana is the utmost. unprovable, irrational on message that Buddhism attains” (J. Naudou, *Le Bouddha*, Paris, 1973, 202).

Note:-- As might be expected, Buddhism evolved from hinayana to (much more earthly oriented) mahayana and to (Tibetan-magical) vairayana Buddhisms. Which again proves the multiplicity of religion.

A 'philosophical' and therefore 'perfectionist' faith.

Let us read J. Derrida, *Foi et savoir*, (Faith and knowledge), in: J. Derrida/ G. Vattimo, *La religion*, Paris, 1996, 77ss.

Derrida's text, in its entirety, is Heideggerian, and here is how it can be summarised.

1.1.-- Heidegger, in a letter to K. Löwith (1921) says: "I am a Christian theologian".

1.2.-- At the same time it appears that Heidegger, from the beginning, states that "philosophy, in its principle, is without god". 1953: "Der Glaube hat im Denken keinen Platz", (Faith has no place in thinking). In other words, (dogmatic) belief (in a religious authority, for example) has no place in Heideggerian thinking about being or reality.

2.1.-- Nevertheless, as a philosopher, Heidegger puts "die Zusage", the affirmation (of all that is), first. It is the philosophical form of "Glaube" (faith) and "Frömmigkeit" (piety). This affirmation, faithful and pious in a purely philosophical way, is the condition of possibility for all questioning of reality, "das Sein" (as Heidegger sees it).

2.2.-- The "Faktum" (fact) that being is, the object of assent, provokes in him the central positioning of man: as "existence", i.e. as "Ek-sistenz": as "at home in being". As that being which takes account of reality and thus founds philosophy (ontology). This is evident from his "Existenzial-analytik".

3.1.-- Confirming his being involves one's own "Verhaltenheit" (diffidence) and one's own "Aufenthalt" (situating oneself) in "die Scheu" (the shudder) for "das Heilige" (the holy).

3.2.-- This philosophical religion makes it possible to situate all actual, 'empirically' determinable, religions around the globe and to assess them according to their real, philosophical-ontological value. For it is the condition of possibility.

4.1.-- The philosophical assessment of the actual religions shows the enormous gap between the 'real' (authentic) philosophical religiosity of Heidegger and the actual religions, especially the Roman Catholic ones (which Heidegger hates in some way).

4.2.-- This did not prevent Heidegger from being a member of the N.S.D.A.P., the Nazi party, and never having revised it.

Note:-- Heidegger thus formulates a perfect religion that is always real but leads to no actual religion. Such perfectionism needs a perfect religion which commits to nothing but judges everything.

Witches' torches.

Sterly, *Kumo (Hexer und Hexen in Neu-Guinea)*, (Witches and Sorcerers in New Guinea.), Munich, 1987, 113/125 (Hexen-fakeln), (Witches-Torche).

'Kumo' is:

- a. the act of eating out the life force ('soul: 'phantom') of a fellow human being,
- b. the ability to do so. The simbu is called 'life-force' also 'inner'.-- The result is getting sick and dying. Cfr o.c., 142 and 127ff.

Out of body experiences with light phenomena.

What Carlo Ginzburg says of the European witches/ witchcrafts, Sterly says of the kanaakse.

1. Model. ---- If you go out in the Simbu Valley at night for a longer period of time, you will make yourself a torch from "ken", the tall sword grass (*miscanthus floridulus*), if you do not have modern lamps. Such a torch is called 'ken gailkwa' (literally: 'they burn sword grass').

2. Original. -- In the summer of 1980, Sterly pays attention to what the locals call "kumo ken gailkwa", i.e. a kumo torch. Gande, a kanaak, tells him "the history of Dindongo (a woman)". Above her house in 1977, a strong light had been noticed, "ready as a coalman lamp". It had come from Keman and settled on the roof.-- Dindongo's sister, Taindi, and her husband had also seen it up there from the other bank of the Simbu. It had also been noticed from Kama mambuno.

"I knew those people and knew they were not telling me fairy tales. They called the light phenomenon "kumo ken gailkwa". Witch's torch' (O.c. 114). From that moment on Sterly goes deeper into it

A conversation.

His neighbor, Gamba Gona: "Witch's torch exists. That is true". Gande: "The light comes from the index finger". Sterly's question as to whether kumo people go out by themselves (note: an out-of-body experiment) or whether they act like spirits is answered: "They go out by themselves".

Sterly: "Umba told me that they lie down in their homes and sleep". "Yes, that is true. They are in their dwelling and asleep. "Is it 'ye kuiano' (note:-- kuia or kuiano is the life-force that animates the (biological) body and so can be stamped as 'life-spirit' or as 'phantom') that is stepping out?"

Gamba: "They themselves exit and their soul goes with them." "Do they have a body so that one can address them?" Gamba: "Certainly. When Miugle up there (...) stepped outside his house at night recently, he saw "a man" standing next to his house.

He wanted to hold him and grabbed him but “the man” had such strength that he could not hold him. Who it was, I do not know. He claims it was a kumo man”. “When such a kumo man lies and sleeps in his house, how can he go out?” “That is different with the kanaks than with the whites,” Gande mused. “The kumo man lies at home but he is like dead.”

Note:-- Sterly first identifies this out-of-body phenomenon as imaginary, as mass hallucination but from then on he studies it. The facts will convince him.

From his diary.

Here are a few excerpts.

07.07.1980.

Around 9 p.m. in overcast sky. Several reddish and whitish lights above Kama mambuno, on the other side of the Kuman stream. They a. move forward, b. stand still, c. suddenly rise rapidly upwards, d. float back down again. My neighbor Gamba Gona: “Those are witches’ torches. Yesterday a man from the avaglekane died”.

12.11.1980.

Between 10 and 11 pm. A collection of six, later nine witch lights above Kama mambuno. They dart about. The three lights that usually follow the Kuman stream downstream, come at a goose’s pace along the stream and uphill. When they approach the assembly, they line up next to each other and approach in a straight line.

They must be kumo lights: people with lamps or torches cannot move so easily through the undergrowth at night. What would they be doing in the cemetery at this time?

Note:-- Cemeteries are of particular interest to kumo people.

25.11.1980.

Witch torches at the inauguration above the Simbu stream. One of these lights - slightly yellowish - a. rises, b. floats back and forth with angular movements, c. returns to the house in a circle,-- d. to resume its flight.

Sterly’s work contains a whole list of ‘phenomena’ noted. -- For example: “Evening. Late into the night. Two playing witches’ torches on the Kuman stream. They bundle together and produce a great shining light”. (03.11.1980).

By the way: the weather conditions sometimes seem to play a role that Sterly cannot define. It must have something to do with energy processes both in nature and in the out-of-body experiments.

Western thinking - rationalistic - is limited.

‘Western’ in the sense of:

- a. empirical, i.e. bound to our ‘gross’ senses,
- b. conceptual, i.e. forming notions (‘concepts’) independent of any perception of the senses,
- c. experimental, i.e. trying out empiricism (sense perceptions) based on concepts.

This is what Francis Bacon (1561/1626; known for his *Novum organum scientiarum* (1620), a kind of axiomatics of the Western positive sciences) calls ‘Western’.-- How much this type of reality is limited to contact reality (and thus in a sense ‘ethnocentric’ (limited to the white population)) is shown by J. Sterly, Kumo (Hexer und Hexen in Neu-Guinea), Munich, 1987, 289ff .

Catholic and Lutheran missionaries came to the Simbu Valley (New Guinea) and became the witnesses of “witch hunts” (these are the people who, by means of a magical ability called “kumo”, can make a fellow human being die). People accused of kumo, who after sometimes lengthy investigations (carried out by seers, witnesses and the community) were found to have killed a fellow human being in a ‘kumo’ way, were killed in one way or another. The mission tried to assist these ‘victims’ - as if they were being persecuted as innocents - ‘in their distress’. This was in accordance with the Christian commandment of charity, the application of which was also expected of other whites who were not part of the mission.

Sterly’s evolution.

It could have come straight out of a textbook on ‘metabletics’ (the theory of mentality change) -- “I gradually realized that the mission does not know what is happening here, in the Simbu Valley. I therefore changed my attitude: I realized that ‘Christian charity’ - by a kind of reversal to the opposite, - with its ‘good will’ protects killers from being punished and refuses to help victims” (o.c., 289).

“I had - before January 1984 - dismissed as non-existent all phenomena that do not conform (note.:-- axiomatic) to our (note.:-- western) understanding of the concept of fact”.

Note:-- In the West, ‘fact’ is “all that can be empirically, conceptually and experimentally observed, conceptualized and experimentally tested”. Anything beyond that “does not exist”, “is delusional”.

Only in the event of an unusual - non-natural - death do the simbu steeds kumo people suspect that they have ‘affected’ and ‘killed’ the deceased. (O.c., 290).

Note:-- In other words, only when necessary and sufficient reasons or grounds are present do the simbu suspect.

Wisdom.

The religion of the simbu is not (modern) science but ‘wisdom’ based on observation (including paranormal or occult observation) and interpretation (‘explanation’).

They express that wisdom in sayings (‘spells’). Thus: “When kumo takes hold of a person, kumo is permanent” because “a kumo person does not have the power to eradicate kumo”.

Just like a dangerous disease.

They give Sterley models of the original that is kumo.-- The simbu compare kumo to the most dangerous diseases they know: leprosy, framboesia tropica, liver and spleen tumours. These diseases also easily infect other people, especially close relatives and friends, and these diseases too are considered incurable.

Note:-- It should be noted that to compare is to see analogies (similarities/differences).

Like a dangerous disease: eradicate it.

The elimination of kumo - always says Sterly - , at least as it used to be practiced (before Westernisation), corresponded in every detail to the killing and elimination of dangerous diseases. If one was sure that someone had caused mischief with kumo witchcraft, one would lure such a person under some pretext or other to the place where one wanted to kill him/her and throw his/her corpse into a stream or a cave.-- The simbu did not have any other means to protect themselves against the dangerous supremacy of kumo.

The main reason.

Every person who has kumo is a potential killer for the simbu. A “bad man” (yagl kinde), a “bad woman” (ambu kinde). Reason: the kumo (usually assuming the form of an animal) in him/her drives one so far as to kill blood relatives.

Note that the simbu have no other term than “evil strikes” (kinde sungwa) to indicate illness.

Consequently, the elimination of kumo people is a cathartic or cleansing act,--as a teacher tried to make clear to Sterly.

The Western misunderstanding of the mission.

Sterly admits it: he arrived on New Guinea with a western mentality (understand: axiomatic). But confronted with the facts, he changed that mentality -- open as he was to other cultures.

What is the situation with the mission now? O.c. 293.-- “It is a sign of unheard-of innocence and naivety when the Catholic and Lutheran mission, which has years of experience of life in the country -- some mission members experienced “the court” of the simbu as a punitive power -- sees in it “a gruesome murder of innocent people.”

Always Sterly.

O.c.. 293.-- “Missionaries are ‘enlightened’ (note:-- rationalist-western thinkers) people. Thus they deny that ‘witches’ can kill other people, and they become passionate about witchcraft and fear of witches. One of the results of their efforts is the fact that today the kumo-being in the Simbu valley is flourishing in an unexpected way.

The nocturnal agitation of the kumo people takes place in secret and not at the mission posts. The missionaries never seem to have observed the phenomenon of witches’ torches (i.e. the light phenomenon that accompanies the activities of the kumo people at night, which is observed by anyone who cares to look). But they did hear again and again that people - mostly women - were accused of kumo crime and were beaten and killed”.

Not complicit?

“For the missionaries of the churches in the Simbu province, kumo is a delusional belief that gives rise to “nameless misery”. But the same missionaries do not think of the victims,--on the contrary, they think of the persecution and killing of condemned kumo people”. (O.c., 294).

“Amazingly, the faith messengers spent many years of their lives in the country without perceiving and understanding what kumo means to the simbu”.

“For the missionaries, kumo being cannot be a work of the devil because the devil as the adversary is reality in their eyes, while they interpret kumo as unreality and the persecuted kumo people as innocently persecuted”. (O.c., 295).

Note:-- One sees that - according to Sterly - the mission lacks multicultural awareness. Typical of the established rationalist(s)!

The term 'new religion(s)

Reading J. Derrida/ G. Vattimo, *La religion*, Paris, 1996, it appears that the theme of the philosophical conversation - on the island of Capri in February 1994 - , in which J. Derrida, G. Vattimo, M. Ferraris, H.-G. Gadamer, A. Gargani, E. Trias and V. Vitiello, was “the rebirth of religion”.

In passing: - o.c., 7 and 13 - Vattimo and Derrida claim that the term was used “wrongly” or “hastily”. We leave these statements to both, of course. For it seems that the interlocutors at Capri discovered somewhat belatedly - after “the death of God” (the motto of secularism on religion) - the phenomenon of “religions are back” (the motto of the new sacralism or New Age). Not to mention the very poor and very one-sided view that Derrida shows of it in his long exposition of the (extremely) abstract concept of ‘religion’ (in connection with reason).

We say “a bit late”. Indeed: J. Needleman, *De nieuwe godsdiensten*, Amsterdam, 1975 (// The New religions, London, 1972), clearly shows that already the fifties and sixties saw “the rebirth of religions”... for those who wanted to see and did not remain stuck in a narrow ‘enlightened’ rationalism.

Needleman’s work dwells on the fact that Eastern religions - in the USA, mainly in California - were absorbed by native ‘gurus’ (wisdom teachers). Rejection of Western ‘intellect’ (i.e. the intellect insofar as enlightened rationalism makes use of it) and commendation of repentance via meditation(s) and other ‘exercises’ of all kinds - not without a more or less large dose of occultism: see in two or three lines “the new religions”.

Needleman goes over Zen Buddhism, Meher Baba (who claims that he is ‘God’), Subud, Transcendental Meditation (Maharishi Mahesh Yogi), Krishnamurti, Tibetan religion (vajrayana Buddhism; tantrism),-- G. Gurdjieff etc..

Subud.

O.c., 135/166.-- We take one instance of ‘new religion’ viz. ‘subud’ ‘Su.Bu.D’ is the contraction of three Sanskrit terms: Susila (conscientious living, i.e. according to the will of ‘God’ (whatever ‘God’ may mean), Budhi (life force in man himself), Dharma (submission to the ‘power’ of ‘God’). Immediately we have a summary.

By the way, at the end of the 1950s, Subud grew into a world movement (up to western countries). Its axiom “something in man emanates from ‘the highest will in the cosmos’ and is also the expression of it” (o.c., 136).-- Let us dwell on that for a moment.

1. - Sukarno Subuh.

In a Muslim family on Java, Subud’s ‘father’ was born in 1901.-- As a baby, he became ill. A wandering beggar said that ‘Sukarno’ was the wrong name: “The child should be called Muhammad”.

The name was changed: the illness suddenly subsided. A prediction was made that the child would die at the age of twenty-four (other version: thirty-two). In time Muhammad Subuh sought out a number of wisdom teachers, both Islamic and non-Islamic. All of them concluded that he was ‘different’ and that they could not teach him anything. “Everything that would come to him would come directly from ‘God’”. -- Meanwhile, he became an accountant and worked for the government.

2.- ‘Latihan’ (1925/1928).

In 1925, on a dark, moonless evening, a brightly-lit orb descended “from on high” above Muhammad Subuh and entered him through his crown: light and vibrations emanated from him. Many have observed this phenomenon (aretalogy).

For three years he experienced ‘latihan’ (the pre-eminent experience of Subud):

- a. he opened himself directly to ‘God’ (whatever that term means);
- b. found that a divine energy (dynamism) bubbled up in himself. This allowed him little sleep but enabled him to cope perfectly with his daily work.

One problem.

He did not understand a thing! Moreover, in order to escape from these “energetic” states, which bored him, he went to the cinema and so on. But while he was watching a film, the energy continued to soak in with its contents of consciousness: in other words, he was living in a continuous latihan or energy state. In 1928, such states ceased.

3.- Contact’ (transfer of energy).

Meanwhile Muhammad Subuh was married and had children. Just like everybody else. On his thirty-second birthday, he received a revelation (apocalyptic): From him would emanate a movement that would pass on the energy through contact on a very large scale through latihan beneficiaries.

And indeed! Students of a Javanese sufi wisdom teacher (sufism is an Islamic mystical movement) came to ask him for that contact! That was the beginning of the Subud. Thus Muhammad became the 'bapak' (Javanese for 'father') of Subud.-There ends a brief overview.

Subud as harmony of opposites.

Apocalypticism, aretalogy and dynamism! These are the three main features of Subud! Which points to the fact that it is really about religion, albeit a new one.-- Immediately we have one sample of the general concept of "new religion". For the other religions show, mostly, analogous features.

Note:-- Needleman, at the end of his exposition on Subud, points out "the possibility that all sincerely religious ideas are experientially based and anchored in a method which enables man to examine them.

Note: -- testing - and making use of them.

Note: -- problem-solving character -- ". (O.c., 166).

This is why we dwell on the infamous "harmony of opposites" (W.B. Kristensen) that can also be found in subud. As in all empirically determinable religions. Only the absolutely abstract concept of 'religion' is 'perfect'! But it exists only in the minds of scholars.

A variety of terms.

Most of the new religions refuse to be "a doctrine" a system of thought (with a logical slant), "a prophetic message" or even "the discovery of a special individual". Subud too. But, if one examines the data, all these terms turn out to be perfectly appropriate!

Thus, Subud only wants to be; "a new and especially easy method to capture the highest energies in the cosmos". Correct: Subud is indeed that but it is also "a teaching", "a system of thought (with very much applied logic)", "a prophetic message" and even "the discovery of a special individual"!

Only that we, in this assessment, interpret the terms somewhat more broadly than e.g. Bapak Muhammed, who sees them as too narrow and pejorative (where we interpret them more melioratively). Surely, there is no shame in harboring "a system of thought" or in experiencing "a discovery" as an individual!

The soul and the powers.

This dual term summarizes a great deal when one examines the results of Subud. That is what we are doing now.

Latihan.

“Twice a week people gather in a large room or hall where they stay for half an hour. During that time they make an effort to individually receive “the power of God” and submit to it.

They may stand or sit, walk or jump, dance, sing or shout. There are no ‘rules’ or ‘regulations’ except the advice to patiently strive for a state of receptivity and surrender to whatever one receives. -- whether there are hundreds or just a handful! There is no discussion, no leader -- when the half-hour is over, each one “goes his way” and returns to his daily life. (o.c., 135).

Yet this “absolute freedom” is relative.

1. Beginners are not allowed to participate immediately. They usually wait three months. To get all kinds of information. However, they are allowed to sit in front of the latihan and hear what is going on.

2. There is a strict distinction between ‘complete’ (the whole human being) openness-and-submission and ‘intense’ (one part of the human being) openness-and-submission. The merely ‘intense’ form of latihan allows the inflowing divine energy to pass only in the direction of the open part of the personality. This impedes the desired harmonious inflow.

Something in man: the soul.

The universe or cosmos is full of energies: animal and divine. Thus o.c., 139.

Note:-- This somewhat corresponds to what the Bible says about “the distinction of spirits” (“spirits” means “life forces”).

The ‘something’ that receives such energies, especially in such an opening as in the latihan, is called by Bapak Muhammad ‘the soul’ (o.c., 150;--149; 161; 163).

So that a soul teaching lies at the basis of Subud. That soul can receive and give off both animal and divine energies. So the ‘contact’ with it can be two-fold.

Cleansing.

The ancient Greek word for this is ‘catharsis’, lat.: purificatio.-- ‘Full’ latihan - not merely ‘intense’ latihan is therefore both receiving and passing on cleansed energies. It comes down to a cleansing process, which works in a different way and does not just let all energies do their work. The ‘higher’ energies are the ones we want.

The 'expressions' of the energies.

The “harmony of opposites” can be seen in the “higher” and especially the “lower” reactions of the members in latihan.-- Needleman: “Animal noises, groans, perhaps wild and shrill screams” but also “reverberations and beautiful singing without words” (o.c., 137).-- “Thumping and sound of running feet” (ibid.).

Note: -- Reminiscent of what the ancient Greeks called ‘goëteia’, goëtie! Except, of course, for the reverberations and the beautiful singing. That is no longer ‘goëtie’.

a.-- At full volume, the sound of the latihan is most like that of animals in the jungle or of insane wild rites or of an eerie gathering of demons and witches. Thus o.c.,137v.

b.-- On other occasions it resembles a deep religious chorus or a merry, raucous celebration, -- an ecstatic frenzy or a madhouse. Sometimes there is suddenly a breathtaking harmony and a lovely piece of melody. Or a sob rising deep from the throat. (O.c., 138).-- But: the half hour has passed and everyone looks (again) normal! They drink coffee together, talk, go home. (Ibid.).

Note. - One could say that animal and divine exist together! It is in this bizarre, ballad-like way that one experiences the energies. It reminds one of parties. Parties of people who, outside the atmosphere of a party, look ‘normal’.

The results of energies.

Again, “harmony of opposites”.

(1)-- A lot of healings take place.

A famous example is that of actress Eva Bartok: she was pregnant but because of illness the doctors insisted on immediate surgery, but the baby would not survive.

Bapak’ (Muhammad) admitted her to latihan: first through his wife (contact 1) and a few days later through himself (contact 2). The bedroom was charged with a force that erased all personal feelings and created a state of consciousness in which all involved shared the experience of the sick Eva Bartok (as if she were theirs). In time, the actress healed and gave birth to a healthy baby girl.

Note:-- The energies here are unmistakably ‘aretalogical’ and beneficent.

(II) -- The exact origin of the energies

Many other phenomena, however, raise the question of the exact origin of the energies.-- For example, the phenomenon of sensitivity which becomes hypersensitivity.

For example, the phenomenon of sensitivity which has become hypersensitivity. By the way, “sensitive” is one who, in addition to ordinary perceptions (external) and sensations (internal), experiences extraordinary perceptions and sensations.

Dutch: “helderwaarend/ heldergewaard”. -- Thus: many men and women who have afterwards turned away from Subud, give as one of the reasons: “We became terribly ‘sensitive’ (op.:-- sensitive, hypersensitive) to the negative (op.:-- emanating) ‘vibrations’ (op.:-- emanations or ‘auras’) of others as a result of these contacts and energies.

More often than not, these negative impressions are so strong that such people who have become sensitive “can’t stand it (any more)”. It attacks such people at their work, at home or anywhere else. During the day and at night. When a fellow human being is walking around angry or ill, the same “sensation” enters such hypersensitives and spoils the pleasant feeling of life. One feels angry or sick!

Note:-- Energies are exposed and are “apokalupsis”.-- One girl, in response to the energies in Subud, fell into a schizophrenic ‘disintegration’ which lasted much longer than a high of LSD (a drug) ever did. Three years later she was still in a mental institution: when she first came in, the doctors thought she had swallowed LSD!

Note: -- Defenders of Subud will say: “That proves that she was un(der)consciously harbouring some kind of psychotic (soul-sick) soul in her depths”. That may be very true. But the exposure is such that it really creates serious problems. (Part of) the remedy is worse than the disease! “An apparent breakdown - also called ‘crisis’ or ‘state of abandonment’ - can indeed occur in Subud. This can range from a single episode to a prolonged period of apparent or actual psychosis.

An important task of the helpers is to detect in time when someone is losing control of his/her latihan and to help end the latihan”. (O.c., 151).

Bapak Muhammad gave the crisis the Javanese name ‘zadab’, i.e. wrath of God.

Note:-- Such ‘crises’ do occur more often in “the new religions”. This calls for very great caution.

A hallucinogenic plant: iboga.

Phytolatry is the hallmark of bwiti, the male secret society so common in Gabon. The purest type is bwiti disomba (from the mitsogho, a people of southern Gabon). A variant is bwiti bakowa (of the pygmies).

The initiation includes a (successful) test of strength (to test the life force),--among other things by swallowing decoctions of the bitter root or the bark of iboga, a shrubby, whose active ingredients or 'substances' cause (delusional) imaginations which the initiate has to process.

Note:-- The elombo - also open to women - is a secret society that has been in competition with bwiti since 1935 (with the myéné n' komo) but is more clearly a revitalising religion that counteracts the disenchantment caused by modernisation.

Let us read, in summary, Chr. Dedet, *La mémoire du fleuve (L'Afrique aventureuse de Jean Michonet)*, (The memory of the river, The adventurous Africa of Jean Michonet), Paris, 1984, 255 / 260.

Initiation begins with a ritual challenge: "You, bwiti-initiated, if you are men, you should initiate me. If not, you are ridiculous jokers".

1.- Immediately three or four members accept the challenge: they lock Michonet up, hands tied behind his back, in a straw hut. No food, for he must ritually 'fast'. A chilly night passes. The following morning, an initiator enters, places a table and puts a gourd with the iboga extract on it. With the order to swallow a whole series of spoons of the iboga plant in the course of the next few hours.

The initiate, increasingly drugged, occasionally cries out. If he wants to scold the initiator, he is, as it were, gagged. If an ant suddenly appears on the mat, then he sees it - hallucinatingly - enlarged many times so that it seems to come at him like a monster from a horror film. To which panic reactions. Reactions that one has to overcome.

2.- In this drugged-up state, the initiate is taken to a room where there are others on beds or benches.

Meanwhile the initiator with the gourd obliges again and again to swallow iboga in apparently along to more concentrated form.

In the meantime, the initiator ascertains the acquired degree of resistance to pain (painlessness in fact) by inserting a sharp object into the skin of the initiate. The initiate reacts as if he “feels nothing” except the stab itself.

The musicians of bwiti come and perform their melodies almost everywhere. Although the initiate feels like an animal - he could just as well be a pig - he sometimes weeps and above all - perhaps under the dual influence of the drug plant and the music - new “hallucinations” occur.

a. The initiator, apparently in the name of some ancestor (soul) - (note:-- èn some higher spirit) -, at some point begins to speak softly of “two roads.” He advises choosing the most difficult one : “In life the best road is the one that forces you into seemingly impossible efforts” (o.c., 258).

b. At one point, the iboga influenced “sees a lake” in front of him. A woman stands happily beside him. On closer inspection it turns out to be his long-dead mother who looks happier than during the last - painful - years of her life. She helps him get through “the lake” (where others apparently fail).

c. Then the initiate “sees” the white (understand: snowy) mountain. Something that - in a tropical country - initiates talk about again and again.

He must go on - dead on - to “a totally deserted village”,--enter a hut where from terminals (those who are about to die) an unbearable stench emanates. They lie on the ground or wallow around. The initiate goes from one to another, as one of the dying shouts “Me!” To which other dying people shout, “Me!” Among others, there is an old woman whose belly is one teeming with “creatures” jumping around on the stumps of their legs and arms. Like madness, the initiate goes up to the others: “Are you sometimes bwiti?”. One looks at him with fear: “Bwiti?”. To which they reply: “Bwiti, that is nobody!”. This answer repeats itself endlessly.

Until he takes hold of a stick old man and shakes him with rotting flesh and a ridiculous penis, who says: “What more do ye want to know? Hast thou seen it already? Well: ye have seen bwiti”.

So much for Michonet’s account of his iboga experiment.

Magic as causative soul substance.

Similarity magic

(“Similia similibus”, literally: the equal by means of the equal).-- The kai says: a movement involves soul substance. If directed to a point of aim, it evokes in it the same movement.

Mimic depiction.

For this reason the magician depicts his victim mimically: how it wriggles in sorrow and anguish,-- how it struggles with death and dies.-- These “prefigurations” should not mean just anything.

Contact magic.

They must directly cause the depicted anguish and death of the victim. The transfer is made through the magic that the magician deals with in the matter.

Magical formulas.

The utterance of a movement or an action includes the causal force (energy) inherent in that movement or action.-- On this insight rests the many passwords or magic words in the spells of the kai.

Applications.

For example, a magic formula involving the yam contains the password “drill your way in.” After all, the root must drill itself deep into the soil and grow very long. In doing so, one lists all the types of yam - always two together - and adds the magic word. Immediately the formula reads: “Kuzi bâlong, drill into it. Mae animaka, drill into it. sâ zâkolo, drill into it. Hengnung buhe, drill into it. Gupang kwânde, drill into it. Etc.

So for the (fertility magic of the) banana. -- One says, “Quickly!” One enumerates all kinds of bananas, calling out “Quickly!” After all, the trunk must work the bloom quickly so that the owner does not have to wait long for the fruit.-- Similarly for the lobster: “Clap your tongue!”. For the hunting net: “Hop in!” For children’s wealth: “A series!”. Always with the repetitions, of course. Such spells are endless in number. For everything the experienced kai has his formula. One man listed no less than forty-six different formulas for me.

The soul substance as ‘aura’ (sphere of radiation).

From the foregoing it is clear: the faculties and qualities which a person or a thing possesses are also completely peculiar to its soul substance.-- Thus the soul substance of a good person is good, of a bad person bad.

The evil eye.

The soul substance of an evil man is his limbs and eyes is also evil in that way. His gaze is dangerous. Purely by being gazed upon by an evil spirit one can become sick or blind. Hence the horrible fear of many kai who see for the first time a white man in whom they see - according to the circumstances - an evil or a benign spirit. Hence also the ominous appearance of many - usually strange - animals. The kai calls such animals 'sowie': a snow-white bird of prey, a half-yellow snake very nicely drawn in brown, an owl are 'sowie'.

It is also because of this that the mere sight of spirit places in the forest is 'taboo': it is best to make as large a detour as possible or at least not to look at them when passing by. Hence the fact that one may not peep at a person with the eyes: a kai will not sustain such a gaze directed at him. It is felt to be particularly painful to stare at the opposite sex.

Transfer of soul substance.

The transfer of soul substance - and immediately of energies and properties - to another being or object exists.

Directly.

The transfer is usually effected through touch (note: contact magic): whatever comes into contact with a human being absorbs something of its soul substance and vice versa. This is the basis of the impulse when the opposite sex is touched: an exchange of soul substances takes place.

Indirectly.

The man who picks up a little stone from the ground and with it pushes for a woman (op.:-- wants to gain her favor), also touches her: purely indirectly, because through the stone he has transferred something of his soul substance to the woman.

Fetishism.

The transfer is the basis of fetishism.-- A fetish is an object which in itself has no value. But since it comes from a human being, a spirit or other beings, it contains the soul substance of it. This soul substance is the energy working through the object, which - with or without a special magic formula - is put into action.

Applicative models.-- Fertility fetish.-- Such fetishes are the yams and taro-stones with which the cuttings of these plants are touched.

Hunting fetishes.

Game stones with which one obtains hunting happiness are fetishes. They must come from spirits or from game hunted with the help of spirits.-- The same purpose is served by the forearm bone of a dead person who, when alive, was a great hunter. The soul substance present in this bone helps its possessor in hunting.

Weather fetish.

With the help of rain stones one 'makes' (note.: causes) rain. With the help of earthquake stones one 'makes' earthquake. With the help of others one 'makes' thunder and lightning.

Wound Fetish.

Wound stones cause wounds. Warrior amulets strengthen the courage and energy of its wearer and protect against dangers.

Two-sided causation (harmony of opposites).

The serpent said to Eve, "If thou eatest of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt be as the deities." The magic, as Keysser discovered it with the kai, clearly exhibits the duality of "knowing" (i.e., making oneself at home) good-and-evil.

We read further. The soul substance transferred to an object or living being can increase or decrease the soul substance already available,--according to the fact that that substance is similar or opposite.--Such is the spiteful man, the enemy. He may, if he wishes his neighbor a crop failure -- by sheer touch (transfer) of a yam stick in the field -- cause the fruit to wither. While the friend or owner - by lightly plucking a leaf - promotes the ripening.

Seclusion.

'Isolation'.-- One can isolate soul substance by non-soul substance conducting means.

The 'soul' (note: -- either a part of the soul or the soul substance in any case) of someone who is the target of magic -- an 'enchanted one' -- is made impossible to escape by wrapping the casing ('magic pipe') in which the 'soul' is contained in well-defined leaves.

Those who wish to protect themselves against such an enchantment rub their bodies with the juice of certain creepers or drink that juice. The intention is not to defuse the approaching magical power (of the attacker). Rather, it is the will to hinder oneself in his soul substance -- in the outflow -- outflow -- of it,-- to close it off.

Magic stones - a rain stone for example - are wrapped with great care to seal off the energy in them from the outside world and to prevent any unwanted provocation by the stones. For already the uncovered rain stone provokes dark clouds from all directions, and whoever "sees" an uncovered wound stone runs the risk of receiving wounds.

Undoing (returning).

Transmitted soul substance can be sent in the opposite direction.-- By e.g. a husband touching a 'strange' woman -- directly or indirectly -- he causes in her that she desires him. If the husband notices by the changed behavior of his wife that she is unfaithful to him and he discovers the man she is seducing, he can make him take back his soul substance.

The latter first touches the woman with a cigarette. With it he rubs his own legs, arms and body. He spits on the cigarette to indicate that he is now repelling the woman. Then he forces her to smoke the cigarette: with the smoke she draws in the seducer's repulsion, causing the attraction towards him to die down. Finally he steps over the - sitting on the ground - woman to signify his contempt.

Mutual attraction.

A white leaf of the size and shape of the egg of the large-footed hen has - as it reminds one of the egg by its appearance (note:-- association) - also one and the same kindred soul substance.

Just as relatives among men are devoted to each other, attracted to each other by similar soul-matter, so also in the rest of nature -- that is why the kai uses that leaf of a tree when he goes into the forest to look for eggs: that leaf must lead his steps to the eggs. Even if he does not count too much on the attraction of that leaf, he believes that he will get results with it rather than without it.

The possessor and his belongings.

This is a further type of weather-bot. -- Since the kai leaves something of his soul substance behind in everything with which he comes into contact, he is in danger - and this perpetually - of causing harm to an enemy through the misuse of that soul substance remnant. Hence the great fear of the papua.

Attributes

He is on his way in the thicket, and a tuft of hair or a fiber of his girdle fabric keeps snagging on a thorny vine: he will not move a step further until every trace of it is eliminated.

Food scraps.

He does not throw anything away: even when he is a guest in a friendly village, he collects all the leftovers - every betel nut dish - in his net bag which he always carries with him, or he throws the leftovers into the fire.

Seat

This, of course, includes his soul substance. This he expels himself before leaving either by stamping his foot or by thrusting his stick. If he has a gourd of water, he can sprinkle the seat with some water. Even with 'cool' leaves that he puts in its place when he leaves, he can 'cool' it (expel the soul substance from it).

Admittedly, these also quickly weaken by themselves, but one wants to proceed as surely as possible! For if a magician takes possession of his soul substance before him, then it is very often too late to save him.

Death and killing by (black) magic.

According to the kai, no one dies a natural death - even old people have black magic as the cause of death.

Whoever falls on the road and - as often happens - mortally hurts himself on a chopped-off bamboo reed, is 'bewitched'. The magician, in fact, is the culprit:

a. he has pinned the soul substance he was treating to a wooden spike inserted into the earth (contact magic);

b. at the same time, he has "pre-empted" the injured person with his pains and complaints (similarity magic).

One who is attacked by a wild boar on a hunt and badly wounded, thereby reveals that his soul substance has been worked by "the magician" with a boar's tooth.

He who is bitten by a poisonous snake thereby reveals that he is dealing with a magician who has put a snake's teeth or a piece of it into the soul bit (pipe in which the soul substance is enclosed).

By appropriate means and by gestures which he transfers to the soul substance, the magician can cause a woman to die in childbirth -- by hanging the soul substance on a cord and by accompanying mimicry he can cause the 'enchanted one' to commit suicide by hanging.

Note:-- This is a pure example of animism.

A “prima donna” among your nature spirits.

G. Hodson, *Les fées*, (The fairies), Paris, 1966, 108s ... -- We are surrounded by a bunch of adorable dancing fairies: they laugh and are brimming with joy.

The leading lady is (...) a fairy of 0.65 m. size, swathed in a broad drooping and billowing translucent robe. On the forehead is a star. Both wings sparkle in all sorts of soft shades: from pale pink to pale lavender. But, if the wings are moved quickly, they turn a brilliant white.

The hair is brown with golden reflections and, unlike those of the smaller fairies, it waves behind her mingling with the power strands of her aura (note.-- radiance). In the right hand she holds a stick.

Although the face expresses purity and artlessness, her features also betray a remarkable power. This is particularly evident in the clear blue eyes that sparkle like fire. The forehead is broad and distinguished. The facial features are small and round. The miniature ears are a poetic example of physical finish. No angularity is detectable in this appearance of a transcendent (note.-- transcending all) beauty: the posture of head, neck, shoulders is regal and the whole allure is a model of grace and beauty.

The aura.

A pale blue aura surrounds this delightful little creature adding to its brilliance. Golden flames of light spring from the cup and play around it. The lower part of her radiance is like a pink shell irradiated with white light.

The contact.

She was aware of our presence. She kept herself impassive to make this description possible. She holds her wand in the air: it is about as long as her forearm. It is brilliant white with one end radiating yellow. -- With a gracious bow -- like a prima donna -- she salutes.

Music.

I hear music. Almost inaudibly soft and as if coming from afar. Too delicate to be expressed in words. It reminds one of dangling, mini-thin needles which are attuned to each other with subtlety,-- plucked with hammers. It is more a series of knocking sounds than a flowing melody. Perhaps it is because I am unable to hear everything as it should be. Suddenly, the whole group has risen into the air and swooned.

Note:-- To briefly illuminate the balance of power in this world the following. Hodson, o.c., 105s.. A fairy dance. Cottingly, August 1921. A newly arrived group of fairies wobbles up and down above treetops and a field.

Two minutes later, a vivid radiation shines above the field up to sixty feet high. It is caused by the group of fairies. These are under the leadership of a higher fairy. This one acts very self-willed and demanding in her commands. Commands she does. No one asks questions.

They form a circle that gradually enlarges around the leader. Meanwhile, soft light shines above the grass. A little later, that circle (...) has reached a diameter of 3.90 m. and shines with glorious light. Each member of this fairy group is connected to the leader, who is in the middle and slightly above the fairies, by a stream of light.

These currents consist of different shades of yellow and orange. They converge at the center of the circle and merge into the aura of the leader. Through these currents of light there is an uninterrupted flow of rarefied matter (fluid, soul matter) in both directions.

Note:-- We mention the power relation “Leader/ guiding” because we have the impression that we have here at least one of the possible explanations for the rigid forms of authority displayed by archaic religion: after all, whoever is not tame in his obedience, interrupts the flow of light with the leading beings. The contact is no longer there and the individual loses his necessary life force to be able to maintain the role within the whole. To the detriment of the rest!

Initiation (telestlek) through the dance of the witches.

Telestikos' (Platon, *Faidros* 248d) meant, in ancient Greek, 'what initiates,--what is capable of initiation'.

Instead of selling much theory on this, we dwell on Michaela Denis, *Un léopard sur les genoux*, (A leopard on your lap), Paris, 1956, 127ss., a text by someone who was initiated in Central Africa. Author is a pagan.

I thought the dance would take place in the village center, the usual dancing area. But the three very young dancers who came to fetch me escorted me, right through the whole village, right through the gardens and plantations that surrounded it, up to a narrow forest path straight into the jungle.

The impression of 'mystery' increased as we made our way into the dense vegetation (...). For a moment I felt a desperate panic (...) but I controlled myself and went on. About three kilometers into the forest I suddenly heard the beat of the tam-tams. The sound increased with every step we took.

Until we found ourselves in the middle of a conveniently hidden clearing. (...). We had to wade through a stream whose water reached up to our knees. (...). While wading through, the three dancers held my hands. On the other side of the stream, the narrow forest path continued in the midst of a mass of wildly growing lianas (...).

I suddenly found myself in the clearing. My first impression was one of strong light. It came from a fire around which were gathered seven large forms. At first I thought they were men. But I saw that they had shapely female breasts. With their masks on, they looked like giantesses in their enormous hairstyles. All had a wreath of large seeds. These dangled behind her. Around her waist they wore several skins of African forest cats (servals) that hung down like a skirt.

My eyes turned to the light: I could distinguish the characters. Some of the women were very young; others were of middle age. At that moment I saw the old muganga.

Note:-- 'Muganga' means 'magician(s)', 'healer(s)': to be distinguished from 'msjut' ('mchout'), the unscrupulous form of muganga. M. Denis had been invited by the muganga several hours beforehand.

The muganga.

The old muganga wore a strange cone-shaped hairstyle that was adorned with plumes on its spire as if with a large tassel. The poor, poorly dressed old lady who had paid me a visit in my hut had been swallowed up. It was obvious: she was rich. She wore copper jewelry and at least fifteen kilograms of fetishes and amulets spread over her whole person. In her hand she held a gourd bottle which she shook while muttering magical words.

A wild, elongated cry was raised by the women when I appeared. I went up to the old woman and, kneeling before her, I clapped my hands in accordance with the manners in vogue among Negro Africans when they approach a character who is important or venerable.

At that moment one of the women approached in my direction. Her hair was smeared with red clay. She knelt down and made a sign to another of the women who then brought two gourd bottles.

A circle was formed around the old muganga. Also around the woman with the gourd bottles and myself. The circle began to sway and to sing in unison women to the rhythm of the tamtams. I watched: they were women playing them.

The old woman raised the antelope ear she wears suspended on a string and closed with a metal lid, opened one end and shook out a powder. She signaled me to open the mouth. I obeyed. The thought that it might be poison flashed through my mind, but disappeared immediately. I was without fear and at the same time burningly curious. The powder was shaken on my tongue. I closed my mouth and swallowed it. It had a slightly astringent taste.

The women looked at me with a stern gaze. Without flinching. As if they were checking my reactions after that powder.-- Meanwhile, the circle around the old muganga, the woman with the gourd bottles and myself continued to dance and perform undulating movements. For about five minutes.

One of the women told me later - she was proficient in Swahili (note:-- East African language used in Kenya and Tanzania) - that ingesting the powder is normally followed by vomiting. The fact that I did not vomit meant that I deserved to witness the remainder of the ceremony.

For a few minutes I was aware only of the silence and the stares that weighed upon me: the tam-tams no longer pounded but the eyes of the women did not let go of me.

Then the tam-tams resumed and the eyes went down. The old woman gave a sign: immediately the woman with the gourd bottles shook them above my head. Another woman - shaking an animal's tail to and fro - came up to me: she touched my face with it for a moment, let it go in front of my breasts and between my thighs; finally she laid it slowly on my forehead and my mouth.

Again she shook the gourd bottles above my head and let them go repeatedly above my head. The woman with the gourd bottles placed them at my feet and painted a V on my forehead. I felt the shape and moisture of it. -- All this time I had kept my eyes open: this was -- as I learned later -- a good sign. I myself, however, simply did not want to miss a second of the fascinating ceremony.

The cry.

After this painting of my forehead I stood up and in rapture I uttered a cry. Again and again I cried out the word. It was repeated, in an enchantment caused by that word.

I do not share that word here: it would have no meaning except to those who have also gone through such an experience. It escaped me without my conscious effort. The women cried after it until the whole jungle seemed to be full of it. A necklace was imposed on me. One of the long wreaths was attached to it. At which the women seemed to be competing a little for who would hang it around my neck.-- Finally, the dance began. I joined in by imitating her steps.

The rapture.

My normal, earthly "I" had left me whole and well. The universe, as far as it lay outside that circle of light, had ceased to exist. I had lost all sense of identity and was only one with the circle of dancers. It was a time of rapture, of ecstasy. Such is the impression that remains in me. Certain details, however, stand out powerfully in my memory.

Note: -- The American actress - Michaela Denis - who gives this account, gives only the perceptible, rather psychological effects. The actually sacred at that moment remained hidden from her.

For example, the memory of a dance. We formed a narrow circle. We bent down so that the head of each woman touched that of two other women next to her. Then the circle became even narrower with two dancers caught in a ring of heads close together. When it was my turn, I danced with my head against the woolly head hair of one of my Negro-African sisters.

The end.

It lasted until the light of dawn began to glow softly through the trees of the jungle. Returning to everyday reality, I stopped dancing. I went up to the old woman, bowed, and explained to her that I must return to my husband.

An unidentifiable instinct made me fidget awkwardly at my necklace to take them off. Women came to and untied them. But now another curious ceremony began. They made a small opening in the earth with a stick and, always mumbling, they buried the necklace and carefully covered it with earth.

Once outside the circle, I still felt no fatigue after all those hours of dancing. The old woman tripped in front of me with quick strides.

Epilogue.

I was sure that I (...) would never be the same again. When we came to the vicinity of the village, there was a halt: a young woman who acted as interpreter between the old women me, translated what she said,--slowly and word for word: "Look: now thou art become one of us forever. On earth there are many peoples but those like us are few in number. We have given thee a special power and a special strength. With that, you shall not do evil, for you shall never abuse it. Which I translated on my account as follows.-- I would not wish to abuse my power -- whatever power it may be.

The young interpreter continued "Thou shalt be active. Thou shalt not work for thy own plantations. Thou shalt not work for thy own children, for children thou shalt not have. Thou shalt, however, work for all children because all children are "thy children". Thou shalt not work for thyself" she repeated - "but for all thou shalt work.

With that power thou shalt not deal wickedly: thou shalt use it for good.” -- “I love the people” I replied. “I love the animals. I love all races”.-- They looked satisfied. Nodded approvingly as if they had always known which creed would be mine. At his European, I pressed her hand.

Mine was as warm and oiled as hers. The old woman I pressed both hands.-- When I arrived at the camp, my husband was still asleep. I fell on my bed: exhaustion was now making itself felt.

Afterword.

Many years have passed since that extraordinary adventure. (...). Sometimes I become aware of the power the old woman was talking about.

Usually in difficult moments. That power gives me peace and strength. More and more I cherish the desire to help my fellow men and - on a very small scale - I hope to have done so. This power draws the animals to me and dispels any fear in their presence. Of this I am utterly convinced. But to the many people who asked me about the secret of my rapport with the animals, I replied, “love.” In fact, it is a love that has been strengthened by that power.

Perhaps people will find ridiculous the fact that an initiation was done through the mediation of some Negro-African women. And yet! Thanks to that initiation, I received proof of the fact that - behind the unmerciful and disdainful face of this world - there is an elevated reality.

“Some Negro-African women?”. And yet! I believe that her belief, her way of approaching power and the way she achieves it, is part of a general-human effort to find life valuable in all its beauty and truth. In her spirit these women are one with the noblest and clearest men and women who ever existed.

By the way: I believe in a world consciousness that the negro-africans call roho or soul. From that world soul bubbles the power to do good. That power extends from century to century, from people to people. (...). In this way every spiritual enlightenment proceeds, no matter what religious form it takes. The dance of the witches is only a ceremony to extend power (...) That dance is related to all other forms of elevated experience.

The dance of the ngil.

Bibl. sample: H. Trilles, *Chez les Fang (Quinze années de séjour au Congo français)*, (Among the Fang (Fifteen years in the French Congo), Lille, 1912, 178ss. (La danse du ngil), (The ngil dance).

To clarify that and how (existence and essence) black magic, i.e. the ‘autonomous’ (detaching itself from God and his commandment) manipulation of life forces,

- a. idiosyncratic (proceeding only from personal-own axiomata)
- b. pro-choice (in discussing only one’s own views) and
- c. orthodox (imposing one’s own opinions on others,--authoritarian), we dwell on the account given by the missionary, H. Trilles, for many years at home in West Africa, of a curious scene.

The ngil.

In the regions where he stayed, Trilles found that the populations--no matter how “primitive”--made very clear distinctions between the morally good and the morally bad male and female magician.--The ngil, as an evil magician, was abhorred but feared. This we shall now see. Immediately we have a flavor of what “authoritarian” religions can be (and God knows how many there are like that).

The ancient Greeks left us the concept of ‘chorea’: dance, music and poetry together. Choreia is untranslatable. Every Dutch word drops one of the three elements! What Trilles describes is choreia!

Trilles first shows how the ngil and his company, the fellow initiates, have crisscrossed the village like a tyrant before whom everyone trembles. In the icy silence that his journey leaves behind, he gathers the initiates around him.

1.-- The beginning.

The ngil starts a dance with a lively and hurried step (a bit like our polka). While dancing, he tells of his life force and his miracles (which is literally the Greek ‘aretologia’, story of acts of power). The narrative rhythm is somewhat monotonous. Each melodious sentence ends in a refrain of sorts.

Note:-- The paleopythagoreans spoke of choreia, dance, music or word art, as the access to the essence of the universe and being.- Now, this leaves one to suspect that Pythagoras was, as E.R. Dodds, *The Greeks and the Irrational*, Berkeley /Los Angeles, 1966, 143, says, a shaman.

The refrain.

“By the consecrated ashes of the proffered victim, -- Of the spirits that wander by night,-- Who pass through the gloomy-threatening forest, -- Without falling silent. -- Never!”. The chorus the initiate replies, “Ye ye.-- Never!” Meaning, “He lives! He lives! -- Never! “.

Note:-- For Trilles it is certain that the ngil has more than one -- at least one -- human sacrifice on its initiatory conscience. In other words: both the radical submission to his authority and the transfer to the other world (the forest especially, but in fact everywhere the ngil goes, is the visible representation of the hereafter) such that the sacrificed souls of the victims accompany him day and night in his immediate (though invisible) environment, as his serving spirits, just as unscrupulous as he, is the basis of his magical position of power. That very thing is sung out, danced out, melodiously uttered and mused out. That is the choreia of the ngil.

This is also evident from the rest of the words of his magical song. “Spirits of the dead who have not seen the burial sacrifices.-- Dead who are not yet over it,-- Over the river of tears.-- The river of tears and of sighs.-- The river of great rest.-- Spirits of the night, gloomy -threatening spirits, -- Our protectors.-- Thou, my son, be kept -and -protected, thou, my son,-- Be always kept -and -protected.”

Note:-- This shows how the black magic of the ngil in West Africa literally lives from the dead world, the underworld, the “sheol” (as the Bible says,-- the underworld into which Jesus descended immediately after his last breath with his glad tidings). But then from a subdued underworld. But then further from a very near, day-and-night available underworld.-It is in other words a chthonic or telluric magic.

Trilles notes that stamping feet the entire group accompanies the ngil with the frenzied refrain “yo. yo. ngil é yo” (He lives. He lives. Long live the ngil).-- He notes that the lyrics are ancient and sometimes contain almost incomprehensible words. Which points to the very archaic nature of the ngil tradition.

As an aside, it is as if the oldest of mankind initially came to a religion based on contact with the dead. The magic of the ngil literally mobilized the deceased in brutal ways.

Fifteen years in the Black Country

Song of incantation of the ngil

By the consecrated ashes of the offered victim, of the wandering spirits of the night, who go by stream the dark forest. Never stop, never. yo yo. never.

Spirits of the dead who have not seen the funeral sacrifices. yo yo. never.

The dead who have not yet passed the river of tears. yo yo. never.

The river of tears and sighs. yo yo. never. The river of the great rest.

Spirits of the night, dark spirits, our protectors.

You, my son, be kept, you, my son, be kept always.

CHANT D'INCANTATION DU NGIL

The musical score is written in a single system with two staves per line. The top staff is the vocal line and the bottom staff is the piano accompaniment. The lyrics are in French, with English translations provided below each line. The score is divided into sections for 'Le NGIL' and 'Le CHOEUR'.

Le NGIL.
Par les cen-dres con-sa-crées de la vic-ti-me of-fer-te, Des es-prits er-rants
de la nuit, Qui vont por-cou-rent la som-bre fo-rêt, Sans ar-rêt, ja-mais.

Le CHOEUR.
yô yô ja-mais.

Le NGIL.
Es-pais des morts qui n'ont pas vu les sa-cri-fi-ces fu-né-rai-res.

Le CHOEUR.
yô yô ja-mais.

Le NGIL.
Morts qui n'ont point en-co-re pas-sé, Pas-sé le fleu-ve des lar-mes.

Le CHOEUR.
yô yô ja-mais.

Le NGIL.
Le fleuve des lar-mes et des sou-pirs.

Le CHOEUR.
Le fleuve des lar-mes et des sou-pirs.

Le NGIL.
Le fleu-ve du grand re-pos.

Le CHOEUR.
Le fleuve du grand re-pos.

Le NGIL.
Es-pais de la nuit, som-bres es-prits, nos pro-tec-teurs.

Le CHOEUR.
Nos pro-tec-teurs.

Le NGIL.
Toi, mon fils, sois gar-dé, toi, mon fils, sois gar-dé tou-jours.

Note.-- It was noted that the unity of melody, text and dance, i.e. the choreia, is a power-laden act. We are in full dynamism.

2.-- A recitative.

The second part is a recitative, i.e. a spoken melodic narrative, which is lengthy. The ngil then goes slow for the initiates.

3.-- The skull and the weasel.

Then he approaches each initiate individually, touches them with the human skull, a remnant of the human sacrifice.-- He returns to the first initiate,--embraces him, -- moves the skull from the right hand to the left hand so that in doing so he surrounds him with a magic circle. While he exclaims, “Be with my life-force--as with a garment that surrounds you whole and all,--that surrounds you and preserves you--and--protects you. Thou art mine”. While saying this, the initiate raised both arms heavenward. Then the ngil steps back a step, shakes a little of the white ash powder from the skull into his hand and presses it on the initiate’s forehead. As he does so, he chants - like a psalm - the words of the magical song.

“He comes and stands before me (Trilles). For a moment he hesitates. I keep my arms crossed. He limits himself to touching my forehead with the skull. He does not want or dare to do more. Goes on to the next one. Evidently we are not ‘friends’.

Note:-- This part of the account shows that Trilles, despite being a Catholic missionary, has succeeded in penetrating to a certain extent into the magic group and especially into the sphere of trust of the ngil.

4. -- The end.

The ceremony ends as it began: in the greatest silence.-- The slightest cry, for example, is punished in the most merciless manner.-- Someone from the company carried a small child on his shoulders,-- his son. The unexpected arrival of the ngil had not allowed him to shelter the child in the hut and give it to his mother.-- The ngil comes for the father. The baby suffers an attack of fear at the sight of the impending darkness and begins to emit violent screams. Without uttering a word, the ngil takes it by the feet, throws it to the ground, hits it violently on the head, and beats it everywhere.

Without anyone - not even the father - daring to comment. For that matter: such a thing would have meant immediate death. Fortunately, the child - perhaps at the end of his strength - stopped ranting and lost consciousness. He looked at it for a moment, as if he didn't know what, then snapped at it fiercely and continued his intercourse. The girl escaped death. By the way: the next day it was dying.

An unfortunate dog, barking at that moment, immediately receives a poison dart in its body and dies convulsively. Had the little child been a little farther away but in the range of his arrow, he would have perished like the dog.

Note:-- Now what difference is there between the ngil religion and the Jewish religion when John 5:1/18 tells us that Jesus - on the Sabbath - heals a man who had been infirm for thirty-eight years and says to him, "You arise, take up your bed and go"? The man healed immediately and took up his bed and went. Now there was a Jewish taboo at the time: one was not allowed to wear such a bed on Sabbath, a holy day. When Jews learned that Jesus was behind the behavior of the healed man, they "sought to kill Jesus more than ever" among other things because he violated the Sabbath! The healing left them cold. The violation of the Sabbath hounded them! -- The merciless authoritarianism of the Jews is already present in the "strict regulations" or "law" of the ngil which one does break but at the cost of his life.

5.-- The final dance.

Then the dance resumes. To the ever quickening, ever shortening and saccaded sounds of the tamtams. The ngil spins around and wriggles, gets convulsions. From its eyes one sees only the white. From the lips slips whitish foam that spreads on his chin covered with rare beard hairs. He is epileptic.

All that world spins and spins around, wriggling to the tones of the wild melopee. "Like a scene from hell. Illuminated by the white gleam of the moon. One weeping, out of control crowd" (according to Trilles).- Suddenly, one long cheer resounds : "Yo!Yo!".

The ngil jumps up, moves through the circle of his admirers. A beat of the tamtams: utter silence.-- It is done and everyone retreats into silence.

Note:-- The ancient Greek term ‘goêteia’ (e.g. Platon, *Gastmaal* (Guest meal), 202+: meant

- a. the crying out of magical, lugubrious spells,
- b. magic, witchcraft (which employs such methods).

We believe that, especially in the last scene, we have something like ‘goetry’ -- (the term still does).

Note:-- Peculiarly, one contrasts ‘goetie’ with ‘theürgie’: as if the latter were the ‘higher’ form, the more civilized form, of magic. For more information on theurgy see e.g. E.R. Dodds, *The Greeks and the Irrational*, Berkeley/Los Angeles, 1966, 283/311 (Theurgy).

A late antique author, Ioulianos (“ho theourgos”), who lived under Emperor Marcus Aurelius (121/180), passes as the pioneer of late antique theurgy. His work was in due course called *Oracula chaldaica* in Latin. The evocation and mobilization of “divine” beings (this term can mean many things in the terminology of the time) is one of the basic aspects of theurgy. Whether it is always and in all circumstances so much ‘higher’ - more ethically lofty - than goëtic is highly questionable. Higher and lower regarding religions and magics easily intertwine. Those who are sometimes acting goëtically (the ngil and his group do so), may then be acting theurgically (the ngil and his group do so as well).

“Altum silentium”.

That the roaring and howling alternates with absolute control and thus silence is clear from Trilles’ account. In any case: after what we just heard, we know once and for all what “altum silentium” (the high silence) is in the context of an African magic and religion.

So much for Trilles’ account.

The local Christians were praying for Trilles’ peace of soul when he came back to them from this goëty-and-theürgy: such was their certainty that an intrusion into his domain not desired by the ngil would be punished with death as a human sacrifice! By the way: during the three days that Trilles stayed in the village, the ngil killed an innocent man and mutilated a curious woman. Without anyone protesting.

Magism (dynamism).

Bibliography. W. Schmidt, *Origine et évolution de la religion*, (Origin and evolution of religion), Paris, 1931, 157/212.-- At length Schmidt dwells on the various and intricate theories which place magic at the center of religion or which seek to make ready its origin. We shall confine ourselves to the two founders of this line of thought.

The pioneer.

J.H. King, *The Supernatural (Its Origin, Nature and Evolution)*, London/Edinburgh/ New York, 1892. -- A work that initially went unnoticed.

1.1.-- *Two ‘energies’*

King distinguishes two ‘energies’ or ‘forces’: The mental energies peculiar to animal and man, from which primitive man concludes to the existence of spirit, and the material energies impersonal and of physical and chemical nature e.g., impress the primitives. From the material energies the primitive decides on the existence of magic or sorcery.

1.2.-- Both energies were combined in different ways throughout history.-- According to King, magic is the oldest form of “religion.

2. -- *Origin of magic.*

Magical judgments and practices arise when the ordinary course of things within the human subject or outside, in the surrounding nature, is interrupted by something unusual.

This unusual thing is sometimes advantageous, edifying, or sometimes disadvantageous, calamitous. So that man cannot remain indifferent to it. The ominous is more frequent and more profound: man has the impression he is facing the unknown, the unfathomable; moreover, he experiences humiliation due to the fact that he has no control over it. Fear and anxiety thus arise as one of the main feelings.

3.-- *The first germ of religion.*

The experience of salvation and calamity as a result of mysterious energies is for King the first germ of all religions.-- When primitive man - by association “omen/continuation” - thinks to have discovered the cause of salvation and calamity as regards energies, the will to control them arises in him/her so that the unfavorable working is excluded and the favorable working promoted. That is the work of magic.

Just about everyone tried to use the energies but a special class emerged who were more adept at manipulating 'power': the male and female magicians (including e.g. the shamans).

4.-- Magical techniques

King emphasizes again and again that magical techniques do not require the intervention of e.g. spirits: the magic is based on the material realities themselves. Animism, for example, is not involved.

The systematicist.

J.G. Frazer, *The Golden Bough* (1890-1;1900-2; 12 ,vol., 1912 / 1915-3), can be considered the first theorization based on an enormous collection of information.

The basic axiom.

To understand magic, one must put the law of sympathy first. Sympathy' here means "the fact that realities can interact, even at a distance ('actio in distans') by virtue of an invisible fluidum (thin or fine matter), smug substance".

Two types.-- The 'sympathy' works in two ways.

1.-- Law of similarity.

This is the basis of 'imitative' ('homeopathic') magic. One imitates in order to achieve a result.-- Thus: acting on someone through an image (photograph, wax statue) in order to kill him. Or one imitates in a dance the lovemaking or the sexual intercourse (think of the Arabic belly dance) to be able to have children.

In Java: the arable farmer and his wife commit sexual intercourse at night (to have a child as a fruit) when the rice has bloomed, in the rice field itself: to conceive rice as a fruit The village women in drought pee in the barren fields at night to provoke rain.

2.-- Cohesion Law.

The basis of 'contagious' ('contagious') magic. One uses the part to activate the whole. Things that are cohesive remain fluid one even after separation.-- For example: a gout sufferer transfers his ailment to an oak tree by inserting nail trimmings and leg hairs (a portion) into the bark to free his body (the whole) from the ailment.-- A young man rubs hands with mint spice (an aphrodisiac) and touches a girl with it (without her sensing it) to make her fall in love with him,-- as he is.

Behold a brief sketch of what magic is all around the globe. Frazer's work demonstrates this in massive ways.

The prayer of the magician.

We quote Alf. di Nola, *La prière (Anthologie des prières de tous les temps et de tous les peuples)*, (Prayer (Anthology of prayers of all times and all peoples)), Marabout, 1958, 29 (Invocation du sorcier), as an exemple.

Note -- We do this all the more gravely because many a present male and female magician as well as a number of theorists of magic claim that magic is not a religion among other things because it does not pray in deep submission.-- The text is situated in Gabon (W.-Afr.).

Oh, thou that hast mastered the power. Thou the spirit of masculine energy,-thou canst do all things, and without thee I can do nothing,-- I can do nothing.

Note!-- Speaking of religious, “schlechthinnige Abhängigkeit” (Schleiermacher’s absolute dependance)!

I who am devoted to thee,-- I who have given myself to thee, O spirit : from thee I receive my strength, my power. -- thou hast given me the gift. Spirit of power, to you I cry. With mercy respond to my magical song.

Note!-- Still the radical dependence -- which calls for prayer -- resounds perfectly.

Thou must obey me! For what thou hast asked, I have given thee, O spirit. The victim was delivered,-- victim delivered in the forest.

Note!-- Here religion shows itself insofar as it does not honor the pure -- incidentally, only found in the Bibles -- Supreme Being and adheres only to spirits, ancestors, deities who without gift can deliver no counter. What is laid down in the Latin “do ut des” (I, magician, give so that you may give). Within the profound religious dependence is situated a kind of pact, a type of contract that represents mutual rights. What the term “Thou must obey me” expresses.

This demand does not contradict the profound religious dependence but is an expression of it, an application in response to an (emergency) situation in which the magician intervenes, - with the power (might) bestowed by the spirit. Human sacrifice, however, creates a right to grant power because of the invoked spirit.

Spirit, I am thine; thou art mine. Bowl.-- This concluding section underscores the deep conviviality between spirit and magician that includes and dependency and contractual mutual rights.

Note!-- It should not be said too easily that magic “cannot be a religion”!

Sacrificial Magics.

A traditional religion without sacrifice is almost inconceivable. Let us check with G. Welter, *Les croyances primitives et leurs survivances (Précis de paléopsychologie)*, (The primitive beliefs and their survivals (Précis of paleopsychology)), Paris, 1960, 86 / 92 (La magie sacrificielle), (Sacrificial magic).

Basic axiom - “do ut des”

(Lat.: I give that ye may give). Specifically, “I give (a portion of my life force) that you may give (a portion of your life force).” What I give is called “the sacrifice.” The sacrifices are inorganic matter (e.g., a supper under a tree to appease the ancestors,-- in Brazil), especially, however, organic matter (plant, animal, human). What one actually sacrifices is not the natural and chemically tangible but the mysterious energy or life force in it.

The axiom is always: letting go of a part to save the whole. A first sheaf to make the whole harvest succeed. A lamb to make the whole livestock succeed. A firstborn to save the whole clan.-- It is clearly coherence magic, with exchange.

Applicative models.

Fertility sacrifices.

Were widely practiced in ancient Mexico, where, at the conquista, a Spanish soldier discovered +- 136,000 skulls piled up in an Aztec temple. In ancient Ecuador, one hundred children were throttled on the occasion of the harvest. - Always to !

Founding sacrifices

A Canaanite ruler sacrificed first his first and last born sons: on their corpses (full of life force) he built the city of Jericho.

In India - in 1952 - a boy was beheaded in order to “anoint” a new altar to the god Shiva with his blood (who responded with benefits, the result of his life force).

Afterlife sacrifices.

On the death of her husband, the widow is sacrificed: in India, she is burned on the funeral pyre that consumed her husband’s corpse. In the Fiji Islands, missionaries wanted to eradicate this “barbaric” custom: the widows protested for they were “terrified” of the vengeance from the other world of her husband.

Note:-- Human sacrifices are replaceable if necessary.-- By mutilations (circumcision, clitoridectomy, castration), deformities, indentations, inlays,-- by animal or plant sacrifices.

In the extreme: a child sacrifice.

Difficult to control but somewhere undeniable: children have been sacrificed since ancient times and are still being sacrificed.

Gustav Falke (1853/1916) depicts the atmosphere in which this happens in *Das Opferkind. Marginals* (The sacrificial child), (here: gypsies) are prepared for anything.

The text.

At Heiligenstedten it was (...) the dike that gave way. A gaping hole could not be closed (...). If the dike failed, the land would be flooded. An old woman knew what to do: you could buy off the devil! ‘Voluntarily’ a child must be in it that helps! Voluntarily the grave will.-- “A child! A mother’s child!” Every mother holds hers even more firmly to her heart. “When the whole marching country is drowning, can a mother spare her child for it?” There was need. The breach must strike!

“Hey, Tatersch, (note:-- gypsy woman) listen: are you begging? Here: a thousand thalers! Does that not ring well?”. The gypsy’s eyes twinkle. “A thousand thalers? Takes the rotten boy! Surely he can only ever thrive for begging! So schilling (note:-- Austrian coin) after schilling scurries but poorly together.-- Gives here! Who likes to be the servant of hunger?”.

They put a board over the breach and a white bread in the middle. The hungry lad waddles over it with small, hasty steps: he extends a hand to the bread. The plank tips over and throws it into the wet bed.

Not a scream. Everything stares dumbfounded at the churning and boiling (of the water). There the child emerges: a pale face. From the loamy waves speaks a simple word: “Nothing is so soft as the mother’s womb.” It surfaces a second time and says, “Nothing is so sweet as motherly love.” The word seizes all and scorches them. “If only the child would stay under at last!”. Yet a third time (...) it says again, “Nothing is so firm as motherly love”. Then it sinks in.-- they breathe: now the work must succeed after all! The horses pant. The carts grind. The spades groan: earth and stone in the breach! An expensive dyke. But now it stands.

Note:-- Even today, in remote places, people prate that old sacrificial magic: the life force of a victim (preferably something marginal) gives evil spirits the life force to control a disaster. The “dynamism” is the background to the ballad.

The “royal sins”.

“Every new scientific streak passes through three stages:

1. one attacks them by declaring them absurd;
2. then one accepts it as true but without any scope;
3. finally, one resigns oneself to its real scope and its opponents claim the honor of having established it.” (W. James).

One cannot sketch the mentality history of the Western intelligentsia better than the American psychologist James does! When a new “paradigm” (Th. Kuhn) emerges, one sees this three-phase scheme repeated again and again. Certainly with regard to religion where it happens that one gets stuck in phase 1 or 2 out of pure prejudice, i.e. in the name of a previous paradigm.-- What follows now illustrates beautifully what James says.

Do we read a new paradigm (basic doctrine) in Patrick Tierney, *The Highest Altar (The story of Human Sacrifice)*, New York, 1989, 24/41 (*The Inca Child*). Or how the Inca monarchs had their sins (in those of their families) expiated by select victims of human nature.

1.1.-- An Indian boy as ‘capacocha’ (princely sin).

We are 1954. February. On the snowy, icy summit of the Plomo, a mountain in the Andes of Chile. Two men discover - at an altitude of 17,716 feet - a buried child, which they take for a girl because of its beauty, with all the regalia of the inca. Later it became clear that it was a boy of 8 to 9 years old and then a colla india from around Lake Titicaca, far away north. Two specialists, Grete Mostny and Alberto Medina, did not know how to interpret this at the time and stored the mummy in a freezer.

1982.-- Under the auspices of UNESCO, Canadian necrophysicist Patrick Horne, as a paleopathologist, resumes research. Turns out that the degree of preservation is unique,-- that it must be a human sacrifice (around 1470/1480) buried alive in a walled depth as a sacrificial space,-- perhaps made drunk by chiché (a beverage).

A new paradigm.

Horne’s thesis regarding the boy is a challenge to the scattered premise that the Inca Americas were a peaceful system,-- an eldorado with “socialist” traits. That was the “previous paradigm.”

1.2.-- A new view of Inca culture as method.

Tierney.-- Historians either denied that the Inca committed human sacrifice or dismissed it as an admittedly regrettable but merely incidental aberration.

Tierney.-- Today, however, scholars who have thoroughly explored forgotten Spanish accounts believe that human sacrifice played a crucial role in the social, political, and economic control the Inca exercised over their vast and varied “empire” that stretched from Ecuador to Chile.(O.c., 29).

Note:-- From all this it is clear that the narrativists who claim that scientific historiography is a mental construction following a dose of factual material (and not the most faithful representation possible of what appears from the facts as reality) are not so far from a part of the science of history.

2.1.-- Cristobal Molina.

An abbot, Cristobal Molina, in XVI-th century Cuzco (in South Peru), north of Lake Titicaca, had conversations with Inca magicians (shamans): the Inca, according to the content of those conversations, victimized large numbers of carefully selected children. Preferably children of around ten years of age, of noble descent, in good health and exceptionally beautiful.-- Tierney: “Which is an almost exact reproduction of the Plomo boy.”

Note:-- A bit of mental history.

Tierney.-- Until the discovery of Plomo, many specialists thought that Molina was biased regarding the Inca! Instead of testing his thesis against the facts!

The capacocha system.

Twice a year, at the June and December solstices - satanists still celebrate these two dates - the best crops, the most praised animals, the most refined clothes, the most precious works of art, the most beautiful children were ‘collected’ - from Ecuador to Chile (the Andes), from the Pacific to Amazonia - so that they arrived in Cuzco, the capital of the Inca. In view of four glorious processions. Each represented one of the four regions “south/north and east/west.” Cuzco was dotted with shrines to Viracocha (the “causer”) and Illapa (the thunder god).

The children.

These were given a religious message: the sacrifice of their lives establishes well-being and prosperity of the entire Inca empire and legitimizes after death that they count as deities.

A prayer.

“O Causer who gives life to all things, since thou hast said ‘That there be day and night’ while thou didst cause dawn and light to shine, say to thy son, the Sun, that when the day dawns, emerging in peace and safety, it shine upon all those who wait for thee. Let no one fall ill. Keep everyone cool and healthy”.

Note:-- Sun and moon. as deities, were worshipped.

The name.

The children were called “capacocha” or “capa hucha”: i. e. “royal sin”.

The princes and rulers - all that was ‘considerable’ - were the visible presence of the deities on earth. But when they - and their relatives - sinned, disasters came over the Inca empire.

Note:-- That is the sacred interpretation of all that is significant. Van der Leeuw did a splendid job of explaining this. The basis is dynamic: the substantial is the life force of the rest.

Crops, animals, clothes, works of art, children were sacrificed to the deities in Cuzco as ‘capacocha’, (expiation of) royal sins.

2.2.-- Hernandez principle.

1621.-- We have the record of Hernandez Principe, Spanish inquisitor, “extirpador de idolatrias” (exterminator of idolatry). He dealt confidentially with Andean shamans, -among others with Xulca Rique, who converted from his shamanism. Thus, Saint Principe had information about a human sacrifice in Ocos, a Peruvian village.

Tanta Carhua.

The villagers worshipped as a goddess Tanta Carhua. Originally, she was the daughter of Caque Poma, a significant man who wanted to rise (one thinks of Kristensen’s theory of the rise and fall of cosmic life) to power.-- His daughter was ten years old at one point, -- exceptionally beautiful.

Note:-- It is striking that in the archaic interpretations of religion all that is “exceptionally beautiful” and conspicuous is interpreted as charged with exceptional vitality. Even the arid-scientist Aristotle said that all that is (exceptionally) beautiful is “divine”! We have a wonderful example of this in the Bible: 1 Kings 1:1/4.

King David -- a ‘considerable’ -- grew old, could no longer warm himself,-- in the mentality of the time which was thoroughly ‘sacred’: for lack of life force or fluid.

The sacred writer says that the courtiers said, “One seeks for his majesty the king a girl who will serve and care for him. “She will sleep in your lap and that will give warmth to his majesty the king.” It is no coincidence that Abishag of Shem was brought to the king because “this girl was exceptionally beautiful”! .. So that the Inca simply applied a dynamite rule.

Principles further report.

As soon as it became clear how beautiful Tanta Carhua would become, her father destined her to become a human sacrifice to the sky god, the Sun. He went to Cuzco: there, within a few days, he was granted a position of power for the sake of his daughter (o. c., 34). He sent them to Cuzco as he was ordered: after she had experienced the celebration there, they celebrated it as the custom dictated. “The ancients” say that according to a tradition the girl said, “Thou canst end it with me now for I could not be more honored than by the celebrations that went on in my honor in Cuzco.”

They brought the girl to this place on Mount Aixa, a high mountain about five kilometers from here (Ocros), in the Inca border region. The grave was already prepared: they lowered them into it and walled them in alive.

The “emperor” of the Inca honored Caque Poma with the power over Ocros in exchange for the sacrifice of his daughter.

Note.-- One sees that Principe’s account agrees with the previous one. Which might have given the ‘scholars’ in the matter pause for thought.

The goddess consulted.

Ancient Greeks and Romans knew the process of ‘the(i)osis’, lat.: deificatio, deification. This inca process amounts to that! For, in Ocros, Principe encountered believers who consulted tanta carhua’s spirit or phantom concerning agricultural or health needs. Of course through mediums, shamans, who in trance, transported, imitated the girlish speaking of the spirit, revealing her presence. Which gives us the structure of the apocalyptic.

Note.-- The Bible, Gen. 22:1/19 (Abraham sacrifices Isaac) - where the high god of the Bible prevents this - and Law. 11:29/40 -- where “a spirit of Yahweh” does not prevent it --, mention the victimization of children but with reservations.

Isis. The “wise one!”

C.J. Bleeker, *De moedergodin in de oudheid*, (The Mother Goddess in Antiquity), The Hague, 1960, 54/74 (Isis), elaborates rather extensively on Egypt’s “divine lady”.

1.-- Isis. the throne.

The hieroglyph indicating Isis is ‘s.t.’. Normally, that sign means pedestal, throne, seat.-- Indeed, Isis is depicted with this hieroglyph containing a high seat with a short, straight back and a small footrest. On the head.

Elevation to the throne.

The ritual of the appointment of the monarch included the fact that he took his place on the throne to “sit” there because from that seat rises a life force that makes him a monarch (causal process).

1. Thus, on a relief on the temple at Abydos, pharaoh Seti 1 is depicted: he sits on the lap of Isis who sits on the regal - princely - chair.

2. Since the first Egyptian dynasty, the Egyptian princes label themselves as sons of Isis.

Note:-- “Son of” means “of the same cosmic (occult) nature as”.-- Thus it read, “Isis gave birth to the king, suckled him with her milk, cared for him as his mother.”

Note:-- So that the term ‘mother goddess’ is valid here in a very concrete sense.

2.-- Isis, the “wise one.”

She was called “great on magical power”.

The myth in question.

1. Isis as the cause of decline.

When Re, the sun god, grew old, his mouth trembled and he lost saliva. -- Isis took that saliva from the earth, mixed it with earth, and from it created a serpent, which she put away on the side of the road along which Re used to walk with his retinue.

As Re passed, the snake bit him: he cried out in pain, his limbs trembled. He said, “Something vicious has stung me. My heart does not know it: never did I feel such pain! Fire it is not. Water it is not. But my heart burns and my body shivers.” The gods and goddesses complained to him.

2. Isis as a cause of rising.

When Re told her that a serpent had bitten him, she in turn lamented him. But she offered to heal him with her magical power. But on one condition: that he would tell her his true name.

Note:-- “He who inflicted the injury, heals them” said the ancient Greeks, indirectly pronouncing the demonic nature of the one who causes both evil and good (down and up).

The fact that Isis wants to know the name of the supreme god is due to the fact that the (true) name “expresses the occult, demonic nature of someone and the role that this nature plays in the universe”.

Immediately it also shows what the ancient term ‘wisdom’ actually meant:

- a. what we mean by it (knowledge of things and people);
- b. the hiding causes that control things and people from the unseen, control (which is the essence of magic).

Re, himself a demonic being, lists a whole series of names, all revealing some aspect of his act of creation. But Isis, as a demon, saw through the demonic in that series: “Your true name is not among them! Name it and the poison will depart!

The poison burned brighter than fire. Re: “Lend me your ear so that ‘my name’ passes from my body into your body”.

Note:-- Here it is clearly shown that the name is (part of) the creative power of Re that is transferred.-- Thus Re got cured of the bite. He gave a portion of his life force (do, I give). She gave a portion of her deified life force (ut des, that you may give). The formula of sacrifice: one gives something of one’s own life force in order to obtain that the recipient gives something of his life force, strengthened by the one received! Do ut des! I give that you may give.

Notice.

For the ancient believing Egyptians, myth was no mere story. It was mystery wisdom. ‘Mystery’ here means “the structure of demonic life in the cosmos and in humanity.”

One who ‘knew’ this secret structure (was at home in it thanks to the favor and grace of some higher being who possessed superior life force) was called a sage. In this sense, Isis was a sage. By virtue of her knowledge of the occult.

Not surprisingly, over time the regal sage Isis grew into a universal goddess. Not only was previous myth read when one cured a snake bite or scorpion bite. She was identified with Hathor, the great mother goddess.

As a result, her worship became a mystery religion that spread throughout the Roman Empire.

Cursing and also de-cursing.

A “curse” is an adaptation of one’s life force as the source of one’s destiny. Michaela Denis, *Un léopard sur les genoux*, (A leopard on your lap), Paris, 1956, 303/309.

The Denis couple build a house at Langata, about fifty kilometers from Nairobi, capital of Kenya. Madame owned a small suitcase “for dry cookies”, -- in fact several millions worth of jewels which she had earned through hard work or received through gifts (including from South America). Suddenly the case was lost.

The Mganga.

The Criminal Investigation Department did what it could. I was petrified when the police gave me the list of people from Nairobi suspected of handling stolen goods.

I was desperate.

I decided to consult a mganga (op.:-- magician, healer).

1. I knew that the mganga rarely fails in tracking down a thief and forcing him to give it back. Now, I wanted my jewelry.

2. To explain the peculiar power of the mganga: that I cannot do! Perhaps there is an occult basis. Perhaps it is the result of an unerring knowledge of mankind.

Two of my negro-African boys went to see the mganga. It was a woman. Seated under a large acacia she was just meditating. She was beautiful. With fine features. She had almond eyes. - Solemnly we shook hands. Although I prefer to see Negro Africans in their native costumes, this woman with her European white, purple-embroidered dress had a majestic appearance. A white veil - like a toga - was thrown around her shoulders.

A strange object.

She signaled me to wait and went into her hut from which she returned with her helper, a younger woman carrying a strange object: one would have said something like a bow wrapped in the skin of the African tiger cat.

The revelation.

Packed into the car we drove to the house under construction at Langata. When the Indian and Negro-African workmen noticed the mganga, the work fell silent and their faces betrayed fear.

Note:-- This is the shudder of “the sacred” in more primitive cultures.

I escorted the mganga into my toilet room. “You put the case here! she confirmed while placing her hands exactly where I had indeed placed it.-- Then she opened the bundle containing the bow-shaped object. She spread the skin of the African tiger cat on the ground. Then she took a second gourd bottle and shook it back and forth as one does with a dice cup: pearls and seeds rolled on the ground. Then she began to chant.

Full of interest I crouched down by her side. Soon curious faces appeared at the windows and looked into the room. With a gesture she signaled to those faces. One of the boys translated what she said: “It’s a Hindi. (Note:-- ‘Hindi’ in Swahili is ‘Indian’). Five hindis work here. One among them took the suitcase. It is the biggest among them, the one who gives the orders”. -- My husband who had joined us in the meantime confirmed that there were indeed five Hindis and that the foreman was the biggest one.

“He is the thief”.

One went to fetch him.-- Meanwhile, the mganga took the bow in whose center a gourd bottle was attached around which a cord was stretched. With a long knitting needle she made it vibrate: a strange sound and a melodious note resounded.-- On the vibrating cord she stuck one end of the knitting needle. The other end she brought up to her ear. “He is the thief!” The big hindi entered the room,-- pale but with dignity. The mganga looked at him indifferently and without embarrassing him, “He is the thief!” she repeated.-- The hindi did not protest. As if paralyzed, he remained in place. With white face.

The curse.

I took the floor: “I want you to pronounce a curse on the man who committed the theft if he does not return my Jewels to me for at least three days.” Such was the good Negro-African tradition: if the hindi believed in magic praxis, he might return my jewels to me; if he happened not to be guilty, he would suffer in nothing from the curse.

The mganga put my hand in his and turned the palm of my hand toward the sky: she spat saliva into it and dropped a little yellow powder into it.--Then she took the hindi's hand and put it on mine: it was as if all my life force left my body to coalesce in my wrist joint. Impossible to withdraw my hand: it was like an invisible bond that united us, me and the hindi.

The mganga waited. Then she gave me a little pat on the back: our hands parted. i felt exhausted .

Note: -- This shows that the mganga worked - caused - both with her life force (in her saliva) and especially with that of Michaela Denis. Hence the actual exhaustion of Michaela Denis.-- That dual life force is used by spirits who know the mganga (interact with her intimately) and are summoned by the ritual and acquire by the same ritual the necessary information (they know who, what), to lethally strike the hindi in his life force (which was very great: as evidenced by the exhaustion of Michaela Denis) so that he is "out of luck".

The hindi raised himself essentially. He resumed his work.-- The mganga gathered seeds and pearls in one gesture, threw them into her gourd bottle, and wrapped the strange bow-shaped implement in the skin of the African tiger cat.

The third day.

The following day I came to the house: stealthily Negro Africans and Hindis looked at me. The accused hindi was passing just as I came out: I saw him turn pale. The second day I found his appearance hounded and exhausted. The third day I had not recovered my jewels: on my arrival at the house I found the workmen silent and startled. Their foreman had taken an unfortunate fall : from the roof to the ground. He had been carried home with a broken leg.-- The kikuyiu's (note:-- a Kenyan livestock and arable people in Kenya) were whispering among themselves: I only understood the word 'mganga'.

The surprise: curse.

I felt pity for the Hindi. I imagined his family and the frightened woe that had greeted him when they had returned him to his home.

Somehow I felt responsible for his accident. My jewels - I said to myself - were not worth the life of a man and the grief of his family members.

Suspension of the curse.

The following day I sought out the mganga who immediately realized the purpose of my visit. I began by delivering to her the gift of wisdom. Through an interpreter, I said that I wanted to suspend the curse. With squeezed eyes she looked at me and shrugged. "I will therefore have to accompany you as far as the Hindi's house" she said. - The house was full of friends and relatives who swooned at our arrival.

The Hindi's wife begged me,-- first in gujerati (note:-- neo-Indian language), then in English, to withdraw her husband's curse. From on his bed, with splinted leg, the Hindi looked at us. "I realize perfectly well that my husband was wrong" said the wife and began to sob.

The de-cursing.

I signaled the maganga to come forward. She put a little powder in my hand, spat saliva into it and made me press the Hindi's hand. Then they brought a gourd bottle filled with water and the powder was solemnly purged away.- With a look the Hindi thanked me. His wife bowed deeply and went away. Returned with incense which she laid at my feet. Offered me a chupatty which I accepted as a sign of reconciliation.

"They would kill me."

When I turned to the door to leave the house, the Hindi shouted, "I must not tell you where your jewels, memsahib (op:-- address of a woman), are. They would kill me". Exhausted and gloomy, he fell back into bed. I personally think that "they" were the healers, the resellers of stolen goods.

Immediately I knew: no chance of ever seeing my jewelry again. But I had become aware that in the hierarchy of human things, my jewels were not so important after all. The moral lesson of this history is that a woman going on safari had better keep her jewelry at home.

Note:-- E. Durkheim from 1896, H. Hubert/ M.Mauss in *Esquisse d'une théorie générale de la magie* (Outline of a general theory of magic), in 1902 / 1903, emphasize the social character of religion and magic. The foregoing confirms that.

An adept occultist on conjuration (exorcism).

Dion Fortune (Violet Firth) was a skilled occultist years ago. In her book *Psychische zelfverdediging* (Psychic Self-defense) - note : 'psychic' here means 'occult' - o.c., 67 / 77, she describes the self-induced rise and fall of a revenge elemental.

The presentation is worthwhile because D. Fortune breaks the process down into its phases as thoroughly as possible. Immediately the reader will gain a clear insight into the fact that sacredness and occultism cannot be kept apart.

By the way: the pope and the episcopate of the catholic church warn with the regularity of a clock against the committing of incantations ('exorcisms') by inexperienced people. Our report will make clear why.

Projection of the (etheric) soul body.

The mana or life force, peculiar to man, is his soul body. 'Body', because it has the form (appearance) of the (biological) body. 'Soul body', because it is a fine or rarefied, fluidic, body or 'phantom'.

Note:-- In occultist circles one distinguishes - not without serious reasons - between 'etheric' (better: low-subtle) and 'astral' (better: high-subtle) soul bodies. The etheric body namely is situated between the immaterial soul and the biological body as long as this biological body is biologically alive.

In other words: with death it slowly (or sometimes quickly) weakens and hangs around the corpse (from the house of the dead to the cemetery). The incantation of the coffin, for example, was originally intended to drive away the sick and pathogenic etheric soul-body that wanders out of the coffin (during the worship service and afterwards).

The astral body is situated between the incorporeal, immaterial soul and the etheric soul-body as the vivifying 'soul(dust)' both of the etheric body and immediately of the biological body.

Note:-- To make it even more difficult for outsiders, some occultist schools simply reverse the terms (they call 'etheric' what others call 'astral').

The context in Fortune's book deals with the projection or exit (whether or not controlled by conscious will) of one or both of the soul bodies described.

The context further deals with “artificial elementals” - ‘Elemental’ means, in occultist circles, “being connected with some natural element” (elements such as fire,-- air, water, earth count as sources of energy from which these occult beings draw life force).

Artificial’ means that they are not simply found in the surrounding nature but are literally “created” by people - very magically gifted (either unconsciously (because they possess the ability to do so as a second nature) or consciously).

Usually such beings - natural or artificial - are ‘lower’ i.e. infrahuman: both intellectually (lower intelligence) and especially ethically (demonic modes of behavior) they are below (modern) humanity. Hence the arch difficult contacting of such beings.

The human being - e.g. an exorcist - who wants to approach them (in order to come to terms with them or even more to exorcise them), has only one choice: to lower himself below the level of consideration (intelligential and ethical) (without renouncing his higher nature of being).

To be very concrete: there where an eminent priest of the Catholic Church ‘treats’ a ‘possessed person’ (whatever one may understand by this) in vain, a prostitute, with a minimal knowledge of occult things, will get through with it while playing, because she speaks at least the language that such beings understand, namely a demonic language.

That is to say, such an ‘efficient’ prostitute binds herself all the more to her world, already strongly demonized by her business. This is the price she pays for her easy contact - at once the concept of “lower” is somewhat clearer for the uninitiated (we think).

The concept of ‘thought-form’

Translation of the English ‘thought-form’. The inner life of man consists of two elements:

- a. mind (intellect and reason, spirit and will) and
- b. imagination (fantasy).

For example, whoever wants to cast a spell works both with his mind and his imagination. This will be clear from Dion Fortune’s story.

1.- Mind-and-imagination.

When Fortune ‘causes’ an artificial elemental, it responds to an understanding (mind) and a reasoning (if, then), to a state of mind (e.g. resentment), to a well-defined act of will (“I will avenge myself”),-- to ‘fenris’, the mythical wolf (thought to be vengeful).

2. - The fluidic creation.

The contents of consciousness (spirit-and-imagination) take on “form” or “shape” in the fine or thin matter (etheric and astral) by virtue of the surplus of life force (this is the main condition, for people who are below their level of life force cannot cope with this). That calculated is the thought form. Better true: the thought and fantasy form.

Note:-- It should be noted in passing that this shows how important the (control of) thought and imagination life is.

This is not innocent because only inner thought and imagined contents of consciousness (concepts and fantasies) may create entities, elementals, invisible!

The structure of an artificial elemental.

1. A consciousness content - e.g. “I am going to avenge myself” - is brought to the mind and imagination as clearly and concentrated as possible.

2. This consciousness content is “charged” with mana or life force matter (of a subtle nature: etheric and astral) originating both from one’s own life force supply and from a similar (corresponding) force or mana from the environment.

Note:-- This recharging takes place either unconsciously (in people who possess this magical ability as a second nature) or definitely consciously (because whoever possesses the unconscious ability must at least have the consciousness-content very clear in mind-and-imagination). Those who do not possess the unconscious ability lose much more energy (mana) to it.

The Disengagement of an artificial elemental.

D. Fortune rightly emphasizes that the difference between a thought-form and an artificial elemental is that the latter is first of all an out-of-body experience of its cause, which remains connected with the cause, the one who creates it, by means of the silver cord (cf. Ecclesiastes (Qohelet, Ekklesiastes) 12:6), i.e., a subtle umbilical cord (rooted in the heart and stomach area).

Once such an out-of-body experience lasts long enough and is even reinforced by the environment (by like-minded people radiating such energies), the umbilical cord or silver cord becomes so thin that it breaks off. From that moment on, the thought-form wanders independently like an artificial elemental,--able to draw in like-minded people and make them “possessed.”

Note:-- resonance within occult space.

When a tuning fork vibrates, a nearby tuning fork vibrates with it (resonance, reverberation). Likewise through fluidic pathways. D. Fortune learns afterwards that a housemate:

- a. experienced a restless sleep,
- b. has dreamt about “wolves”.
- c. Yes, woke up in the night and ‘saw’ the firing eyes of a wild animal - in the corner of her bedroom.

Note:-- When an artificial elemental misses his (first) target, he looks for a replacement target in the immediate vicinity (in this case, a woman who shows signs of low life force). He searches until he returns, undeterred, to his ‘origin’.

b.-- Second phase.

D. Fortune, thoroughly troubled, seeks advice from her teacher of occultism.

The lesson

1. The structure.

The artificial demon is a thought and imagination form, brought to hallucinatory life from its own “substance” (note: mainly life force) by resentment. The elemental is a real, via the subtle (= fluidic) umbilical cord, emerged ‘part’ of D. Fortune himself. He is the longer he lives, the harder to ‘kill’ (conjure up). Yes, he gives the impression that, once the ‘impulse’ (streak) proper to the wolf (dog), has been transformed into action (note:-- the radical elimination of the one who has so much troubled D. Fortune), then he will tear himself free from the ‘psychic’ umbilical cord that has so far bound him to her plexus solaris, and will at once cease to be absorbable into herself.

2. Descending or ascending.

The mythical beast can be killed by moral reversal (Biblical: metanoia), i.e. not only by ordinary regret of frustration, not even by remorse (moral regret) but only by repentance. In this hypothesis it must be recalled at all costs and especially absorbed (and not expelled somewhere) into D. Fortune’s own life force or mana.

Note:-- One sees it: the teacher fears that, if not absorbed, the dreadful animal will wander “in barren places” and in time, reinforced by like-minded people, will “return: worse and more dangerous than before.

Should D. Fortune fail to do so, she will enter “the left path” (note:-- the name for immoral, unscrupulous, ‘black’ magic, where the creature belongs in).

“Fortunately for all concerned, I still had enough common sense (op.:-- conscience) to see that I was at a crossroads.”

Her prospect was not exactly pleasant: she had to,-- convert into praxis an axiom already held by ancient Greeks, namely, suffer rather than commit injustice. That was the ethical aspect. The magical aspect consisted in swallowing up a wolf or dog demon whole again via the umbilical cord, whereby she could not, coincidentally, count on much sympathy or any help from her fellow men.

Conclusion.

It had to be faced, however (o.c., 75).

c. Third stage.-- the absorptions-exorcism.

1. She recalls Fenris when dusk falls.

Note:-- In full daylight or even in full artificial light such an operation is much more difficult.

Through the northern side of the room he returns. He stands in a friendly and even tame position on the hearth rug.

2. By further effort she obtains an excellent materialization: “One would have sworn that an alder dog was watching me. It was even such a tangible appearance that even the scent of the alder dog was not lacking”.

And now that which it begins to come to.

“From me to the guise ran a shadowy ectoplasmic line” (note.:-- the silver cord).-- One end of the silver cord emptied into Fortune’s solar plexus. The other end disappeared at abdominal level in the shaggy fur of the alder dog, however, in such a way that the exact point of the outlet could not be seen.

The absorption.

This exhibits two aspects.

1.-- The manaistic aspect.

Just as one swallows a glass of lemonade through a straw, D. Fortune sucks the life (o.c., 76) out of the self-made demon through the silver cord under the effort of thought and imagination. Whereby it fades away. At the same time the silver cord inflates and becomes more massive.

2.-- The perseverance aspect.

“In my inner self, an emotional storm began to rise violently. I felt the fiercest impulses to go out and tear apart everything and everyone, all that came before me,--”
“With a tremendous effort I overcame those impulses. After which the storm calmed down”.

The final absorption

Again, the two aspects.

1.-- Manaistic.

The demonic form disappears - 'fades away' - gradually. So that, on regaining inner peace, a formless, grey haze remains: "I swallowed it up too, along the silver thread, inside me".

2.-- Psychological.

"The tension diminished. Finally I was myself again,-- only bathed in sweat.

As far as I know. this was the end of history".

So much for Fortune's story. Let us note that a certain suspicion remains: "As far as I know, this was the end". Indeed: D. Fortune works only with the "occultist means". Of any appeal to e.g. the Supreme Being one finds hardly any trace. If one knows that, in the distant background, some satanic presence is always possible, her method raises questions. She must therefore have realized that there was perhaps no end to it yet. For that she had too much experience of the demonic in all that is occult.

Note:-- One more psychological remark.

Today it sounds just about everywhere: don't suppress the tendencies consciously, don't repress them unconsciously! When one begins to gain some insight into the occult or sacred mechanisms of the soul life, hidden from most people, when it expresses itself -- that was a main point above, after all -- the maxim "Do not suppress! Don't repress!" serious reservations and the moral taboos of religions in this regard become quite understandable and, after all, one must not now engage in anti-taboo propaganda. Is oppression and repression possibly a demonia, the opposite we now see at work in our permissive society is also one.

Occultism and morality.

What is also evident from D. Fortune's story is that ethics as a choice between good and evil plays an essential role.--Why? Because all inner life (mental and imaginary life) with its "thought-and-imagination forms" in the akasha, i.e., the totality of all that is mana or soul substance, is depicted and plays a subcutaneous role there. Even so that one must speak of resonances within a mana space. We are co-responsible for all that is mana or soul substance in and around us.

The Story of Dion Fortune.

Now that all the main concepts are available, we can, with sufficient understanding, read the story of D. Fortune. With some commentary, of course.

Starting situation.-

1. Incentive. -- Someone she had helped at the cost of considerable financial sacrifice does her a great injustice.

2. Response.-- She was upended by attack instincts. Her frustration takes an aggressive form: a strong temptation to “make it pay” animates her mind-and imagination. “I sunk to revenge”. Hallucinatory type of phantasm: a revenge demon.

1. “While I was not far from dozing off one afternoon, the thought (note:-- imagination) came into my mind (note.: and phantasm) to abandon all self-control and strike”.

2. “In my (op.:-- mind and) imagination the ancient Norse myths rose up: I thought of Fenris, the horrible wolf”.

Note: -- We just said that, apart from one’s own input regarding thought - and - phantasm and energy (mana), something from the environment (nature and myths) is useful, yes, necessary that corresponds to one’s own input.

Note:-- Hrodvitnir or Fenris, the wolf, is caused in Nordic mythology by the god Loki. This “wolf child” was raised by Tyr, the god of war, and became so strong that the deities feared him. He was bound, thanks to the dwarves, by ‘gleipnir’, a magical rope.

Note: -- Now it becomes clear - we think - to those not familiar with the sacred in its occult degree what important role the myths play.

Immediately afterwards I had the peculiar ‘feeling’ (note:-- occult perception) that at the level of the plexus solaris (note:-- solar plexus; in the heart and stomach area) something was coming out of my body. Yes, next to me, on the siesta bed, a large wolf materialized. It was a shapely, ectoplasmic (note:-- situated outside the “plasma” or soul body) form. Its color was gray. I perceived its weight through the sense of touch”.

Note:-- ‘Materialization’, literally ‘matter-formation’ is the process by which the mere thought-and-fantasm form takes on finer material form. In the case described, the fluid was so ‘heavy’ that it was almost coarse-material and thus perceptible with the senses.

At that time I was totally ignorant of the art of conceiving elementals. Yet now I had - by a coincidence (note:-- D. Fortune was apparently naturally gifted) - discovered the correct method.

She summarizes them as follows.

1. The state between waking and sleeping (note:-- i.e. the state of being as thoroughly relaxed as possible).
2. 'Thoughts', i.e. intellectual and phantasmatic contents of consciousness,
3. charged by the strongest possible emotion (here: revenge) and
4. hatched ("I sunder revenge all the time" (o.c., 73).
5. 'Evocation: summoning, of a force of nature (here: Fenris),
6. who "qualifies" (i.e. who gives contact via likeness).

The ethical fork in the road (dilemma).

Suddenly D. Fortune is filled with horror at what she had done. Not - what psychanalysts call "the (demonic) Ueber-Ich" (rules of conduct imposed by society) - but her conscience - D. Fortune was Christian Science by birth (an occultist movement inspired by some degree of Biblical insight) - "spoke"!

She presents the ethical reasoning as follows.

a. If she does not destroy (i.e. rise) the creature she has conceived again, then in time it will become independent and -- as she picturesquely puts it -- grow into a frankenstein monster.

Note:-- This refers to Mary Wollstonecraft Shelley (1797/1851), an English "gothic" (horror literature writing) author. She gained fame for her *Frankenstein or the Modern Prometheus* (1818). In that novella, a professional scientist possesses the ability to cause (bring to life) "a human being" with the horrible outworking of that type of "human being", in fact a demonic creature.

b. However, if D. Fortune wants to "kill" the mythical creepy creature (i.e. bring about its demise), she should fulfill the following conditions.

1. The most necessary: not to be "confused" by panic (note:-- a form of Diel's "nervousness").

2. To have sufficient occultist praxis to carry out the killing (= exorcism) in such a way that she -- and not the vengeance wolf -- prevails.

Note:-- Already Herakleitos of Ephesos (-535/ -465) said that the struggle ('polemos') which controls all being causes deities/ men, freemen/ slaves', where deities are 'lords' and men are 'slaves'.

In other words: the law of demonization! Either the demon subdues D. Fortune or she subdues him.

3. The disempowerment or decline should happen as soon as possible, because ‘mythical’ (meaning fluidic or mana) beings become more powerful the longer they can live in an environment that includes like-minded people.

Note:-- Expressed in plain terms: D. Fortune must be both lower (= demonic) and higher (= conscientious) if she is to overcome the demon of revenge. In terms of what is higher above: in order to be attuned to the demon she must be a ‘prostitute’ (having a demonic dimension); in order to conquer him definitively she must want to be a ‘priest’ (as an exorcist). He who lacks one of these two aspects loses out,--according to the law of occult relations concerning “power” (life force).

The incantation.

D. Fortune decides on the recall into herself (decline) of what she, in vindictiveness, has ‘caused’ herself.

a. First stage.

She moves -- very carefully -- toward the mythical creature, which apparently objects to being disturbed, for it turns its snout -- the long snout -- toward her,-- growls,- - shows its teeth. She gives the creepy creature a stomp in the side. Commanding, she says, “If thou dost not behave properly, thou shalt have to lie down on the floor!”

Note:-- One sees it: she does not ‘preach’ or ‘moralize’. She lowers her ‘language’ (means of understanding, signifiers) to the level that the wolf understands.

Calm as a sheep, Fenris gets off the bed. As he does so, he changes his appearance: to her great relief, he becomes a dog.

Note:-- From ferocious animal to pet. More to the point, the creature moves away through the northern part of the siesta room.

Note:-- As D. Fortune himself says, o.c., 76, “the north” (in the mythical sense) passes - in an ancient interpretation - as “an evil region.” New sense of relief. But at the same time a sense of tension arises in her:-- “It is as if this is not yet done”.

Note:-- With inner reservation (= mental restriction) the wolf turned into “dog” and left “obediently” (harmony of opposites). Unpredictable are such creatures: ‘lying’ and ‘outsmarting’ are deep in their blood.

The young gypsy woman: her effective - intervention.

Do we now dwell as attentively as possible on one type of magic that frightens millions of people: gypsy magic.

Marguerite Gillot, *Des sorciers, des envoûteurs, des mages*, (Wizards, sorcerers, magicians), Paris, 1961, 19/21. Gillot was a nurse, even the director of a hospital, but very interested in all things occult, without being very active in them (she was too gentle in character). What we are now bringing into translation, she has, she says, directly experienced herself. A girl she knew well was severely disadvantaged in the settlement of an inheritance by a cousin.

The notary had informed her that any recourse to the courts would be useless: everything had been so finely crafted by the cousin that he was not liable to punishment. Desperate and distressed, she betrays the affair to a young gypsy woman to whom she donated some money or clothes almost every month when she knocked on the door.

The gypsy woman heard the story and offered her services: she was prepared to settle occultly what could no longer be settled legally, according to all justice. Provided a certain fee was paid, she would inflict scorching remorse on the unjust cousin.

As the day of processing they chose the full moon. However, the girl had to provide her with a new dishcloth and an egg laid by a chicken within twenty-four hours.

Note:-- The chicken egg is a common tool in occult operations ('causations').

The 'causation'.

The brown-skinned gypsy woman -- proud and self-aware of her key role -- was dressed in a long skirt of red silk. Wore silvered sandals. A vest of spina green color was stretched form-fittingly around her small but erect breasts. The jet-black hair had been carefully caught in a red and gold veil. A necklace and earrings with zecchinos adorned her.

Note:-- One does not think that the mostly illiterate Gypsies/Gypsy women do not know perfectly well that, when performing magical operations, they must be dressed "like the priests at their liturgies." She took her seat with her face turned to the east. Recited a prayer in an unintelligible language.

Then she spoke in a voice rising from the depths: mani padme om.

She took the egg on whose shell she wrote three times with a pencil the first name (note:-- occultly speaking this one represents, i.e. states today, the person himself and namely this one in his occult being) of the unjust cousin who served as the target of the 'volt' (note:-- French name for object charged with life force or 'power'). Then she murmured a few more words (note:-- like the words of her prayer just now, these words are carriers of her terrifying life force). Concentrated silently for a while (note:-- this is the meditative phase that belongs to every magic act worthy of the name: non-meditatively well-formed people simply can never make any magic act succeed).

She folds the cloth in two, places the egg in the middle, folds the linen while crushing the egg (note:-- which bears the name of the target) as if driven by anger between her two hands.

The cloth was unfolded: amazed, we both - the girl and I - saw in the disintegrated egg yolk a chestnut-brown lock of hair.

Afterword.

The gypsy woman: "It has been done. Thou hast observed that in thy presence I have crushed the egg in the cloth thou hast delivered to me. Thou canst see for thyself that thy cousin's hair is in it In three weeks I shall be back: I give thee confidence". And away she went.

Note: -- I had observed everything with a dose of suspicion: I was sure that no lock of hair could have been embedded in the egg. The girl was formal: the lock of hair was exactly the same color as the wronged cousin's hair.

The result.

Five days later, the niece was deathly ill in bed. She made a phone call: the night before she had had a strange dream. Thief! Your punishment is coming! You will not escape our grasp!". They grinned. Mocked them.-- Awakening, she became anxious and resolved to right the wrong. She begged the girl to accept half of her inheritance. Afterwards she recovered.

Bwiti man-eating.

Bibl. st.: Chr. Dedet, *La mémoire du fleuve (L'Afrique aventureuse de Jean Michonet)*, (The memory of the river, The adventurous Africa of Jean Michonet), Paris, 1984, 268 / 271.-- Apart from bwiti disomba, the real one of the mitsogho, and bwiti bakowa, peculiar to, the pygmies, there is n'déa, a degenerate bwiti which is actually man-eating.-- Michonet, the patron of a lumber business, was himself a member of the disomba.

Guilanda, a worker, foam on his lips and eyes glassy, falls out of his truck, goes through a few convulsions and dies.

A very suspicious death.

Indeed the whole yard catches a fever: the bavongo workers pull out one after the other; the tam-tam in the evening is "to go crazy." Guilanda, as a bwiti member, had boasted, "To have "my secrets" (op.:-- the occult power as a bwiti), you will have to eat my liver."

Michonet learns that n'déa is going to take place.

Secretly, at the risk of his life, he goes up to the palm trees, near the cemetery, to catch his n'déa workers - the face rubbed with kaolin.-- The "n'ganga" (here: sorcerer, leader) - the knife between his teeth - works on the corpse that had been put away under leaves of ferns. Suddenly he rips it open with the butcher's knife: he wants to pull out the liver and possibly other intestines. -- The sight was so distasteful that Michonet left at that moment.

Meanwhile, it reads that "one had eaten only the liver". He calls a few days later the n'ganga and the accomplices he had recognized.

"I know what took place in the cemetery: did ye eat Guilanda's liver?" he says in an imperative tone as a patron.

"Thou must understand: he always said that 'his secrets' were in his liver" said one.

Another: "We ate him as a bwiti member".

Michonet: "Is that bwiti? You cut up the liver and grilled it.

One replies "It could not be otherwise."

"And after the liver: what hast thou eaten?"

"The heart."

"And after the heart?"

Thereupon he threatened them and they chose to run away for fear of having to deal with the authorities. He was never bothered by them again in his yard.

Note:-- Dynamism, belief in occult life force, is the true background of all archaic religions. Here this "faith" takes a raw form. Barbaric.

“Human Justice”

Job 4: 12/16:- “Upon me came inconspicuously - a word (op.: an event). At the moment when dreams - in a confused way - sweep around the mind -- when deep sleepiness (note: Gen. 2:21 (Adam); Gen. 15:12 (Abraham)) overwhelms men, a terrifying fright takes hold of me and fills my whole being with terror (note: Dan. 4:2; 5:6).”

A breath slid across my face -- made the hair on my flesh rise. Someone came up. His face I did not recognize. The image, however, appeared to hang before my eyes. -- silence.

Then a voice came through “Is a mortal ‘righteous’ (op.: w=witted and therefore in order with God and His commandment) in God’s eyes? Would a human being, faced with his maker, be ‘pure’ (note.: not only ritually but especially ethically)? For even his servants (note.: the sons of God, the angels) he provides the convincing evidence of aberration. What then to say of those who inhabit our mud dwellings? Of those who themselves are “raised up on the dust” (note.: arose from mother earth (dust))? One crushes them like a moth: one day is enough to pulverize them. Forever they weaken for no one delivers them back (note.: among the living). Their tent peg is torn out and they die without the (note.: necessary) Wisdom (to have acquired). - So much for the consecrated text.

Note.-. He recalls what more than one person today can still experience in his way.

It is very difficult to determine whether the occurrence of the ‘word’ - which is recounted above - is an actual night dream or a perception (i.e. both face (vision) and voice) experienced at night but in full consciousness.

What is certain is that Job 33:15/18 says: “In dreams, in nocturnal visions (...) God speaks in their hearing, he frightens people with apparitions. This is to make man turn away from his (op.: wrong) behavior and to put an end to his own self-esteem. In this way he preserves the soul for the pit (note: the way to the underworld), -- his life for the passage through the corridor of death”.

Note. -- This “corridor of death” recalls the tunnel that people with death experiences keep talking about.

God speaks to people through angels.

Job 33:44ss.--"God speaks sometimes this way and sometimes that way -- without regard to it. - An example of this follows Job 33:19/30. This proves that God's universe government ("realm") employs mediating beings (as pagan religions also assume in many cases).

1. -- Disease and other miscalculations. - God also raises man through suffering when man is bedridden,--when his bones tremble incessantly, his "life" turns away from food and his appetite from sweets. When his flesh is visibly withering away and the bones that are normally unnoticeable are exposed, -- when his soul is approaching "the pit" (note: leading to the sheol) and his life the "abode of the dead. - Behold the situation. And now God's answer.

2. - The role of an interpreter. - If in such circumstances an angel accompanies such a person, - an interpreter chosen from among thousands, - one who makes the person aware of his duty, has compassion on him and says "(God), release him from the descent into the pit! I have found the ransom for his life: then his flesh regains youthful freshness, -- he returns to the days of his youth.

He prays to God who returns his favor because God comes to see him in joy -- to others, too, he proclaims his justification (note: the fact that God puts him back in 'order with God and his commandment). He lets the people hear the following song: "I had committed sin, I had broken the law (Is. 24:5). But God has not dealt with me according to my transgression: he has dismissed my soul from going into the pit,-- has made my life enjoy the light." -- Behold what God does -- two times, three times -- to remove man from the pit and make the light of the living shine upon him. - So much for the consecrated text.

Note.- The "angel" ("saint" (Job 5:1; Sack. 14:5); "ever-waking" (Dan. 4:14); "angel of God" (Sack. 1:11v.) acts as interpreter or interpreter to the sick person concerning the by God's counsel (Is. 24:51; the "origin" (Tobit 6:18)) caused miscalculation. 'Caused' for the reason of the deviation from God's council decree or, in Christian-platonic language, "divine idea," which is the origin in God of all that befalls us.

The concept of God in the Bible.

In the terms of N. Söderblom, where he speaks of 'Urheber', causer, the Biblical deity can be typified as omnipotent. --. We present extremely briefly the main features.

1. -- *The creative power*-- "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." (Gen. 1:1). "The heavens and the earth" stands for "all that exists outside of God." For "the creation" or "the (created) universe".

In other words, "heaven and earth are the work of God" (the term of Exod. 34:10, where it is used in the aretalogical sense). Cf. Is. 48:7; especially Is. 65:17 ("I, God, am going to create new heavens and a new earth"); Jer. 31:22 ("Yahweh is creating something new on earth"). Notable is Ps. 51(50): 12 ; "God, create for me a pure heart."

Note - The overall initial creation is constantly - creatively - "updated" by later partial creations.

2.1 . - "God of gods". Dan. 3:90. - "Blesses (note.: speaks praise to) the Lord, the god of gods". In other words, though the term "divinity" is still applied to "the deities of the nations," yet the meaning coalesces in Yahweh (in the New Testament "Father, Son, Holy Spirit" or "Holy Trinity") in whom is deity as the absolute origin of all that could even remotely be "divine.

Note:- - The nations around Israel speak of the sky god.-- So Tobit 5:17 (6:18: "the lord of heaven"); 7:12. So Dan. 2:18. But note: "heaven" means, on the Biblical view, "transcendence" i.e. that part of all that is, which is radically inaccessible to all that is created. Such an exalted or high ("the Most High") God is.-- The 'heaven' in the cosmological sense is only a figure of speech, a figure of speech suggesting the 'highness'.

Note-- ***Visible presentment***.- One also paid attention when God communicates with his creation. As radically inaccessible and invisible he then 'materializes'. Thus as "the angel of God." This expression sometimes means a created son of God or higher being who represents God (as a task performer), then again God himself in a mode of appearance (He shows himself as if he were an angel). Likewise as "lordliness" (think of the vision of Isaias 6:1/5, where "materializations" make the invisible visible).

Note -- God. in the Bible, creates “out of nothing.” -- The term “nothing” here means “(from) nothing outside God”.

In other words, God creates purely out of Himself, i.e., out of His infinite realm of reality.-- When Christianity is said to stand or fall with “Grace (understand God as active in the Christian form)

a. sets forth,

b.1. purges in

b.2. elevates to higher, supernatural, plane what is pre-Christian,” it is so that God updates his creations with ‘later’ creations, creating the new out of himself. That’s why it’s called “grace,” i.e., a gift. -- God, for example, does not require ‘sacrifices’ like the pagan ‘deities’ who must apply the “do-ut-des” formula out of impotence. For they do not possess God’s inexhaustible wealth.

2.2. -- The omnipresent. -- Ps. 139 (138):1/18. -- “Where - beyond the reach of your spirit, Yahweh would I get? Where - beyond the reach of thy countenance (op.: immediate presence) shall I flee? Do I climb the heavens: thou art there! Do I lay me to rest in the sheol (underworld): thou art there”.

The concept of the kingdom of God. - God, in the Bible, is not a “deus otiosus” (a fatherless god)! He reigns. ‘Realm’ here means, first of all, “workaday as creator, administrator in judge”. Only then does it mean the domain of that industriousness, i.e. all of creation.

In other words: government of the universe. -- God’s presence is not an inert, slow presence.

It is true that it respects the profound autonomy of creation and its laws,-- so it appears not only from Job 1:6f. but on every page of the Bible that God has a court council of God’s sons (angels, higher beings including demons) with whom he governs the universe. These ‘helpers’ possess - certainly until the second coming of Jesus - a very great deal of autonomy. For example, Satan controls all the “empires” (political systems) of the earth (Matt. 4:8; Lu. 4:5) and delivers Jesus to death to the Jewish authorities (Lu. 22:53). Thus, God puts the choice between eternal life from God (spirit) and underworld life from wayward behavior (flesh) in the hands of his spirit-gifted creatures as Ekk1.kus (Sirach) 15:11/17 says plainly and clearly.

Note-This explains why Biblical man is not exasperated by the existence of evil (physical in ethical) in creation: not God is immediately responsible for it. He does, however, tolerate it out of respect for creaturely autonomy.

Note - And heavenly deity and universe government together: see what Godhead is in the Bible. Both together make God central (and not, like the vague supreme beings of the pagans (dei otiosi), to whom one appeals only in exceptional circumstances). “I have set thee, Yahweh, before thee without ceasing” (Ps. 16 (15):8) means that the biblical man “lives in God’s constant presence.” And that constant prayer is like the breath of life of Biblical piety. We are far from any “God-is-dead theology.” God lives and does live.

Note.—“How difficult your thoughts are to me! God, how impressive is the number of them! I count them: more than the grains of the sand there are (...)” (Ps. 139 (138) 117v.)-- This is Christian Platonism in Biblical terms.

The book of Tobit gives a splendid example of this. Tobit 6:18 says that Sarra and Tobias are meant for each other “from the beginning” (other translation: “from eternity”). That and not anything else is the rule of conduct of a biblical person. He/she is constantly thinking, “What idea does God hold now as far as I am concerned?” What idea or higher standard does God have for my life? Praying, constantly praying, living in God’s presence, as Ps. 16 (15) says, this divine idea becomes clear to him/her.

Note: In this the Ten Commandments (Ex. 20:1f) play a leading role, but only of a general nature: each person individually should grasp his/her own role within this general framework of behavior. This succeeds only when one takes Ps. 16 (15) seriously.

Note - The constant but also and especially the final judgment. -- Ps. 139 (138) says it: “In your book, are written all the days that were already laid down beforehand: each of those days has its place in it”.

Indeed: a stylistic figure. Dan. 12:1 mentions “the book (of life, of the predestined). 1 Sam. says it folksy-pithy: “the bag of life”. In it are listed God’s friends/friends. In other words, God follows extremely closely all that is created, -- especially his friends-and-collaborators.

Even when his creatures disappoint him: “Thou spare all because it is thine, Lord, friend of life. Your incorruptible ‘spirit’ (note.: life force) is in all things.” (Wis. 11:26/12:1). Precisely because God is omnipotent, he endears himself over all (Wis. 11:23)

God's judgment on "false prophetesses"

Ps. 16 (15): 2/4 stigmatizes Jewish syncretism, this means:

a. worship of Yahweh ("My Lord, thou my happiness. Not (do I enter into what would be above you)

b. but at the same time veneration of e.g. telluric beings ("Directed to the 'saints' (note.: higher beings), -- those in the earth, who therefore, and those who are shudder: all my pleasure is in them"). Immediately such Israelites lapse into pagan religion.-- One example: Ezek, 13: 17/23, where there is talk of seers ("prophetesses") who manipulate the destiny of men single-handedly.

"You, son of man (op.: man, i.e., the prophet), address the daughters of your people who 'prophesy' (op.: act as seer(s) or prophetesses) willfully (...)" - "Woe to her who sew ribbons around the wrists and make veils to wind around the heads of men -- great and small -- to catch souls".

Note -- The seers referred to are actually committing "black magic," for they are targeting soul(s), i.e., that in man which determines life, with or without God's spirit or life force. They "capture" them, i.e. control them so that they become subject to higher beings who commit both good and evil.

"Thou captures the souls of men, and thou wouldst save thy own souls in the process? Thou dishonorest me, Yahweh, with my people for a few handfuls of barley and a few lumps of bread (note: the sacrifice for which they render service according to the "do-ut-des" axiom).

a. By causing people to die who should not die (note: Tobit 3:8, 6:14v.),--by sparing those who should not live.

b. By lying to my people who listen to lies".

"Look: I, Yahweh, am going to deal with your ribbons (...). I will free the souls that ye catch like birds. I will tear apart your veils and deliver my people from your grasp. (...). Ye shall realize that I am Yahweh".

Note.- The proper name of God is "I am" (Ex. 3: 14; Deut. 32:39; - John 8:24), i.e. "I am active as the one God". Which expresses the "kingdom of God" as a proper name.

"Because thou hast terrified the hearts of the conscientious by lies, just when I, Yahweh, have not afflicted them with an evil. Because you have strengthened the hands of the unscrupulous so that they will not repent and so find life (note: God's life) again (...)"

God, the friend of life.

Very many people hear people speak of “the terrible god of the Old Testament.” This is because they have only heard bits and pieces of it. Let us just read the Old Testament, Wisdom 11: 15ff.

The Wisdom (note.: axiomatics) of God at work in sacred history. This is how chapters 10/19 of Wisdom can be called. This is a portion of God’s universe government or “realm.

The section we quote is about God’s patient waiting for the conversion of the Egyptians. They had been His people, treated according to the Egyptian religion, in which the element of ‘animal(s) worship’ played a curious role. In time, the prophet Daniel will see God replace the animals as deities with what he calls “a son of man”, i.e. a being that has the nature and behavior of a human being and is assigned a substantial role by the Most High, God. Wisdom thinks in a similar sense.

“For the reason of their foolish and guilty notions by which they were deceived - by making them commit a worship aimed at creeping animals (note: crocodiles, snakes, lizards, frogs) without spirit (note: insight) and at worthless little animals (note: scarabs) - you, God, have sent as a punishment upon them a crowd of animals without spirit (note: insight). That they might come to the realization that one is punished by that with which one acts unscrupulously (note: cf. Wisdom 12:23; which is called ‘lex talionis’ the law of the retribution of the like through the like).

Note -- At the time of Ptolemaic Egypt, the cult of “sacred animals” (op.: as divine beings or even as deities) was held in high esteem. To Israel, this was an “abomination.

Note -- - The “lex talionis” is and remains God’s “stick”. By what means? Because someone who violates the eternal covenant (Is. 24: 5/6) in a transgressive way (think of the deadly sins, the vengeful sins and especially the sins against the Holy Spirit in traditional, Catholic theology), is deprived of God’s “spirit” (Gen. 6:3 (God’s supernatural life force)) in such a way that he/she becomes “flesh” (living being without God’s life force or “Holy Spirit”) and is given up to the demonic forces, processes and beings (about which higher in this course) without any prospect.

The other side of God's universe government.

When God, neglected in a transgressive way by his spiritually gifted creature, neglects the latter in his turn (also according to the *lex talionis*), it is because he is forced to use “the stick, however, the door”, i.e. the last solution. But - and Wisdom underlines this very strongly - this is not God's first reaction to evil.

Wisdom. 11:20. -- “Even without that punishment they could be felled in an instant But Thou hast arranged all things according to measure, number, and weight (op.: as a responsible being). For Thy supremacy is always subject to Thee! (...) The whole world is to thee as a nullity on the scale. (...). But precisely because you can handle everything, you endear yourself to everyone. You close your eyes to the unscrupulous behaviour of men: that they may come to repentance”.

The reason for God's patient waiting -- “For all that exists, you love. Of all that thou hast created, thou hast no aversion. For if thou hadst hated a thing, thou wouldst not have brought it into existence. Then how could anything have existed if ye had not wanted it? Or how could what you had not brought into being have survived?”. -- This emphasizes God's omnipotence, which concerns the very existence of created things.

“But thou spare all because it is ‘of thee’, Lord, friend of life. For thy incorruptible spirit (note: Life-force: cf. Gen. 6:3; 2:7; Ps. 104 (103):29v.; Job 34: 14v.) is in all things.”

Note - God thus as life-giving omnipotence identifies himself with his ‘work’. He empathizes, with what the (deviated, guilty, cynical) creature experiences when it turns away from him and his ‘law’ (the eternal covenant; Is. 24: 5/6) in a boundary-crossing way.-- “Also: only gradually do you punish those who do wrong. You warn them first (...) so that loosed from evil they may come to faith in you, Lord”.

Note--“Thus you teach us the lesson, when you chastise our enemies with measure, so that, in our turn, when we judge, we may remember your goodness and, when we are judged, count on your mercy.” (Wis. 12:22).

Thus in a few chapters an outline of what ‘God’ is in the Bible,--also already in “the Old Testament with its terrible God.”

Biblical wisdom.

The Bible does not rely on (modern) science but on wisdom. What is Wisdom? Wisdom is

a. experiential knowledge, where ‘experience’ includes mantic (seer(s) own) experience,

b. processed according to two premises:

1. the axiom of identity (“All that is, is”) which refers to the experienced ‘evidential(s)’, and

2. the axiom of necessary and preferably sufficient reason or ground that concerns the ‘explanation’ or ‘understanding’ of the experienced (“All that is has either in itself or outside itself a reason or ground”).

1. -- 2. Pet. 1: 16/21.

“Not by following complicated myths have we made known to you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but after we were eyewitnesses of his glory (note: Jesus’ transformation).

He received honor and glory from God the Father when the Glory full of exaltation (note: God as the source of all that is divine life force (“holy spirit”) in its splendor) spoke to him: “This is my beloved son, who is the bearer of all my good pleasure (note: “son of God” is prince, Messiah).-- This voice we heard: it came from heaven. We were with him on the holy mountain”.

Note.- A ‘myth’ is a sacred story depicting some sacred (occult) event. At least ‘myth’ in the religious sense.

Late antique philosophies used such myths as a source of inspiration for philosophical explanations which were sometimes extremely sophisticated (we think of the Gnostics).-- Peter radically opposes this: he has experienced it himself, even if the transformation of Jesus has ‘aretalogical’ (miraculous) aspects. An experienced fact is an experienced fact! Also when it is unusual.

2.1. The value of the Old Testament.-- Peter continues.-- “With this we hold even more firmly to the word of the prophets (note: the texts of the Old Covenant). Ye do well to regard the prophetic word as a lamp shining in a dark place (...).”

Note - Illuminated by his own experience regarding perception of God’s “glory” (kingdom of God), Peter understands even better the proper scope of the Old Testament as “prophecy”.

2.2. Interpretation. -- Always Peter, -- “Above all realize the following: no prophetic word of Scripture permits arbitrary interpretation, for it is not a human intention that is the origin of a prophetic word, but through the Holy Spirit (note: God’s inspirational life force) prompted, men have spoken in God’s name (note: ‘name’ here as source of life force).”

Note - In other words, whoever wants to interpret such texts must have something of this nature at his disposal! Otherwise he may be interpreting God’s intentions.

The sufficient reason or ground. -- It is clear that Peter is applying the principle or axiom of sufficient reason: he is talking about the origin or ‘cause’, resp. causative power (in this case God the Holy Spirit).

Note -- Hermeneutics of Scripture. -- “Hermèneutikè,” ancient Greek, means “skill of interpretation. Peter lays down the main rule regarding the interpretation of biblical texts: not arbitrary, certainly not misarchical (i.e. with disdain for high values and for those in authority) but ‘prophetic’. This is : from the very axiomata of the Bible.

Note.- This does not prevent any modern-scientific study of the Bible: quite the contrary. The eternal covenant (Is. 24:1/6), the law of the Gentiles (Rom. 2:14v.) - contents peculiar to the Bible exceed the narrow Jewish or even narrow Christian point of view. This is evident from our exposition of the pagan religions.

Natural, outside nature (extra-natural), -- supernatural.

Do we read Num, 16:28f. -- Moses, though living in the XIIIth century B.C., makes a very clear distinction between natural causation (‘explanation’ from a reason or ground: “natural death”, peculiar to human destiny) and extra-, resp. supernatural causation (‘explanation from a reason or ground: “God does something unheard of”). One does not claim, therefore, that a Moses, although living in a pre-modern culture, with its religious axiomatics, made no distinction between what is natural (and thus a natural explanation of facts) and what is non-natural (and thus an extra- or supernatural explanation). In other words, that distinction is not a moderns or even an antique Greek culture acquisition.

Remains of pagan dynamism in the Old Testament.

“In the years 1975/1976, at Kuntillet Ajzrud, located in the north-eastern part of Sinai (a mountain range), remnants of a caravan stop which would date from the first half of the VIII century BC (-800/-700) are found.

This also uncovers a number of inscriptions that mention “YHWH and his Ashera”. These and similar discoveries lead to a particularly lively debate within Old Testament scholarship about the origin and extent of Israel’s monotheism (note: one-god belief), a discussion that continues to this day (April 1993).

Add to this the increasing attention paid by theological women’s studies to, among other things, the mother goddess and the religious life of women in ancient Israel, and you have a particularly topical issue.

Thus Panc Beentjes, *Goddesses, gods and god symbols* (Goddesses, gods and god symbols), in: *Streven* 60 (1993): 4 (April), 373v.. when he talks about O. Keel / Chr. Uehlinger, *Göttinnen, Götter un Gottessymbole (Neue Erkenntnisse zur Religionsgeschichte Kanaans und Israëls aufgrund bis lang unerschlossener ikonographischer Quellen)*, (Goddesses, Gods and God Symbols (New insights into the religious history of Canaan and Israel based on until now unexplored iconographic sources), Freiburg L. Br., 1992.

P. Beentjes: “The official national cult - the worship of the one god JHWH - appears to have had to compete for a very long time against more private practices such as the worship of one’s own gods and goddesses in the household, the clan, the village or the small town.”

Note - Syncretism, i.e. the combining - against Yahweh - of pagan worship with elements of Yahweh faith, is a long-standing phenomenon. However, works that cite more and more evidence reinforce the impression of a tough paganism.

Note.- Beentjes also refers to M. - T. Wacker / E. Zenger, Hrsg., *Der eine Gott und die Göttin (Gottesvorstellungen des biblischen Israël im Horizont feministischer Theologie)*, *The One God and the Goddess (Conceptions of God in Biblical Israel in the Horizon of Feminist Theology)*., Freiburg i. Br., 1991.

Note - Beentjes, in: *Streven* 55 (1987): 2 (Nov.) 183, discussing Kl. Berger/C. Colpe, Hrsg., *Religionsigeshichtliches Textbuch zum neuen Testament*, (Religious history textbook on the New Testament), Göttingen, 1987. New Testament scholars are familiar with references to Jewish, Gnostic, or Old Christian parallels. This work emphasizes pagan parallels.

The foregoing serves as background to what now follows. We base ourselves on A. Bertholet, *Die Religion des alten Testaments*, (The religion of the Old Testament), Tübingen, 1932, 1/9 (Dynamistisches), which we reproduce at random.

Bertholet.-- Well-defined objects were considered “particularly” (note: for sensitives and mantically gifted especially) power-charged. Thus: parts of the body (hair, eye, hand,-- blood, saliva, breath). Thus: the spoken and written word (word of blessing or curse). Thus far: the name. But also implements, garments jewelry,-- staff, weapon. -- Also water and fire, plants, animals.

Note - All these ‘cosmic’ or belonging to the universe things can (note: can) be power gels.

Lev. 17:11v.-- “The soul (note: nefesh, the life principle of the body) of the flesh is in the blood. In this sense I, Yahweh, have permitted it to you (op.: the Israelites) as an offering on the altar such that it atones for your souls. For by its life force the blood works atonement. Therefore I commanded the Israelites, “No one among you may take blood as food (...)”.

Note.- The ‘nations’ before and during Israel’s period knew very well the life force or soul(dust)’ present in blood. This thus truly pagan fact is apparently integrated into the system of Yahweh religion. What amounts to a by Yahweh tolerated ‘syncretism’, because it is since Gen. 6:3 (“That my spirit (op.: typically divine life-force) not endlessly be responsible for man for he is ‘flesh’ (op.: from Yahweh estranged reality)) clear that not (the life-force of) the blood in itself but God’s ‘spirit’ in and through (the life-force of) the blood ‘works’ (e.g. works atonement).

Song of Songs 4:9. - “Thou hast robbed me of my mind, my sister and bride! With one of thy eyes, with one of the chains of thy necklace”.

Bertholet: this is to be connected with Gen. 30: 14vv, where there is mention of ‘love-apples’. Dudaïm, alruin or mandrake fruits, were indeed used as aphrodisiacs.

Note - This biblical imagery betrays, as a testimony, the pre-Israelite belief in the magical life force inherent in the mandrake plant. - Not surprisingly, the average Jew sometimes lingered in syncretism with ease.

Remnants of demonism in the Bible.

The Bible, Old and New Testament, is one religion among many previous and simultaneous ones and yet, in its own interpretation, it is the judgment of God (Yahweh, H, Trinity) over those religions. More than that: she is the continuation and re-establishment of the eternal covenant (Is. 24:5; Rom. 2:14f; Acts, 2:5; 19:5f; especially 10:34f; 10:44f; 15:7/9) with its universal scope. Its main task, indeed its only task, is to make the spirit of Yahweh (Holy Trinity) permeate the flesh (i.e., the creation alienated from God). As Gen. 6:3 insinuates.

The Israelites were sticking up to their heads in “the flesh,” i.e. in extra-Biblical religion. Let us examine this briefly on the basis of A. Bertholet, *Die Religion des alten Testaments*, (The religion of the Old Testament), Tübingen, 1932, 9/14 (Dämonistisches), from which we take a few samples.

Gen. 32: 25/32.-”Jacob remained alone on the spot. - There someone wrestled with him until the dawn. When the latter realized that he could not handle him, he grabbed him against the hip so that it was dislocated. The 'other' said “Let me go, for the dawn is already here”. But Jacob: “I will not let you go until you have blessed me”. He: “What is thy name?”. “Jacob.” “Not Jacob shalt thou be called henceforth but Isra.el (note.: “The numen (spirit) fights”), for thou hast fought with elohim (nota : God or a spirit; - 1 Sam. 28:13; 28:28) and with men and it met”.- Jakob begged “Make known unto me thy name!”.

Note - The knowledge of the name (person and role of someone) gives “power” over person and role or function of someone; Ex. 3:13f.). He: “Wherefore dost thou ask for my name?”. He blessed him on the spot. - Jacob called that place Peni.el.

Note.- Literally, “Face of the numen or invisible being: “For - so he said - surely I have seen an elohim face to face and survived.”

Note:- It was believed that seeing a higher being (el, elohim) was deadly (Ex. 33:20; Law, 6:22; 13:22),

As an aside: That seeing means death indicates that “higher beings” are demonic and, for no reason, cause death to people who approach them “from too close”. Which Yahweh, normally, does not do but still keeps alive. So that he preserves “demonic” features.

Deut. 2:17-- “They (note : the Israelites) sacrificed to demons (note : shedim; cf. Ps. 106 (105): 37: “They had sacrificed their sons and daughters to demons”),-- to non-gods, -- to divine beings they had never known, -- to newcomers who had just arisen, -- to whom their forefathers had paid no reverence.

Note--This text reports that the Israelites had, at least in part, either abandoned Yahweh worship or “mixed it up” with worship of what the Bible calls “demonic” beings. Up to and including the sacrifice of “sons and daughters” (as holocaust or burnt offerings). This then is the crass form of paganism within Israel's culture.

1 Sam. 16:14vv, -- “The spirit of Yahweh departed from Saul (note: the king) and an evil spirit from Yahweh came to torment him.”

Note -- “The evil spirit of Yahweh” is a figure of speech. It means that the working in Saul who was apparently occultly gifted somewhere, of a non-conscientious being of a higher nature was tolerated by Yahweh. All that happens in the universe is in some way (not in an unambiguous way) the will or occurs with the permission of Yahweh. Hence that expression “an evil spirit of Yahweh”. This shows that even the monarch was not simply protected from wrong-working, demonic beings. By the way, this is evident in the whole history of King Saul.

Is. 34: 1/17. -- Connoisseurs of scripture designate this little chapter as a “little Apocalypse,” i.e., revelation of the balladic end of a pagan, Yahweh-rejecting culture (Edom).-- The harsh presences of all kinds of demonic creatures is the sanction exhibited by the ruin of a “carnal” (alienated from God), deprived of “God's spirit” (life-force) culture.

“(…). Wild cats will meet hyenas there. One satyr (note: boucs; Is. 13:21) will summon another there. There of all places Lilith will implant herself: she will find a resting place there”. (Note: Lilith was originally a Babylonian tribal demon; cf. Soph. 2:14, where likewise wild beasts appear as punishment; there in the midst of the wilderness the demon Lilith is at home).-- The will of Yahweh as judgmental power, stands behind that mess and its wilderness, the demonic creatures included.

Remnants of pagan worship in Israel.

Biblical revelation takes root in the midst of “the religions.” Does not remain aloof to it. Commits itself to:

- a. an acceptance,
- b. a (sometimes very radical) purification ('catharsis'),
- c. an elevation on a supernatural (not only extra-natural) level of what she finds in the field of religions. With as axioms two main truths:

a. The typical Biblical monotheism (which in the New Testament does not shrink from a three-person deity);

b. The Decalogue (“ten commandments”).

Doch we dwell with A. Bertholet, *Die Religion des alten Testaments*, (The religion of the Old Testament), Tübingen, 1932, 24/33 (*Vormosaïsche Kulte und ihre nachwirkungen*), (Pre-mosaic cults and their aftermath), on religious remains of a pagan nature.

a. -- Deaths and ancestor worship. -- Gen. 35:19f. - “When Rachel had died, she was buried on the road to Ephratah (that is, Bethlehem), and Jacob (note: her husband) erected on her grave a holy stone (note: in the text, 'massaba'). That is the holy stone of Rachel's grave “to this day”. - Cfr. Deut. 26:14 (speaking of “sacrificing to a dead person”); 1 Sam. 28:5/25 (where King Saul, in utter distress, consults a seer (note: 1 Sam. 9:9; “clairvoyant = prophetically gifted”) who summons an elohim, rising from the earth, namely the former prophet Samuel).

Note: - Non-ordinary, conspicuous, i.e., charged with special life force, dead or ancestors remained very near to the living who consulted them on occasion.

b. - Astrological worship.- Amos 8:4f., -- “Listen, ye that oppress the poor, and would have the lowly in the land disappear, -- ye that speak, 'When shall the new moon (note : Lev. 23:24: the new moon was a taboo for trade-practices) yet be past so that we may sell grain, and the Sabbath, (note : Ex. 20:8: this holy day contained a taboo for trade-practices) so that we put up wheat?’“

Note. - “Sabbath-and-new-moon” occur repeatedly (2 Kings 4:23; Osee 2:13; Is. 1:13): would they originally have been a monthly worship service? Thus Bertholet asking the question.

Note - Job 38:7 insinuates “the heavenly bodies” as “sons of God” i.e. higher beings or even as 'heroes'. This is a residue of astrotheology, i.e. astrology that thinks heavenly bodies and “divine beings” in one.

c. -- Stoner worship. -- After the cosmos (astrologically) now parts of the cosmos: the stoner service. -- Jer. 2:26f. -- “As a thief is ashamed when he is caught, so shall “the house of Israel” be ashamed. They, their princes, their princes,-- their priests and prophets who say to the wood (note : tree) “My father art thou,” and to the stone “Thou hast begotten us.”

Note--Compare with the dynamism pronounced in Spr. 17:8: “A lucky stone is a bribe to him who works with it: whither he turneth, it shall be lucky to him.” Cf. also Gen. 35:20 (tombstone). - 1. King. 19. -- “Adonijah slaughtered sheep, cattle, and fattening calves by the serpentine stone that lies beside the fountain of the volder”. Bertholet: “Apparently an ancient place of worship (cf. Neh. 2:13)”.

d. -- Source worship. -- Gen. 14:7. -- “They made a detour and came to the source of justice. That is Kadesh”. -- Bertholet: “Already the name 'kadesh' (the holy one) shows that this is a holy place: court proceedings take place near a holy water or under a holy tree.”

Gen, 21:22ff. -- Abimelek and Pikhol demand an oath of allegiance from Abraham who swears an oath. He raises seven lambs. “These lambs ye must take from me: they must prove that I have dug this well.” That is why this place is called Beerseba because they both swore an oath there”. Bertholet: “This name means 'seven wells' (shaba (swearing)/ sheba (seven)). Beerseba, in the extreme south of Palestine, remained a popular place of worship for a long time, even in the north.”

Gen. 21:33 adds, “Abraham planted a tamarisk there and called on the name of Yahweh - “El olam” (note : El (God) of eternity, -- long-lived God) - at that place.” -- Bertholet: “Again, a Yahweh-believing affirmation of a tree perhaps labeled 'sacred' in pre-Israelite times.”

e. -- Tree worship -- We saw it just now in Gen. 21: 33. -- Osee 4: 13. -- “On mountain tops they sacrifice and on hills they burn incense, -- under oak and poplar and terebinth because their shade is precious. Therefore your daughters deliver themselves up to fornication and your daughter-in-law commits adultery”.

Note.- Which seems to indicate erotic-sacred rites committed under the - sacred because connected with cult - trees.

f. -- Animal worship - The purity law (Lev. 11/18), in the wake of Gen. 7:2 (Noë (Noah) takes up couples of the clean and unclean animals to survive in “the ark”), returns at least in part in Deut. 14:6ff..

Thus it reads e.g. “All animals that ruminant and have cloven hooves” may be eaten (Lev. 11:3), Deut. 14:6: “Of the ruminants and of the animals with cloven hooves you shall not eat the following: camel, hare, clipper, for although they are ruminants, they do not have cloven hooves. These animals should be unclean to you.

Furthermore, the boar, for although it has cloven hooves, it is not a ruminant. It should be considered unclean. - The flesh of these animals ye shall not eat, nor shall ye touch their carcasses. (...). -- *La Bible de Jérusalem* says at this point:

- a. clean is all that God - Yahweh - may approach;
- b. unclean is all that makes unfit for Yahweh's worship or excluded from it.

Cfr. Gen, 7:2.-- The clean animals fit the framework of Yahweh 's worship. The unclean animals are those which the pagans designate as “holy” or seem repulsive or harmful to man and thus “not in Yahweh 's taste.

Note: It seems certain, at least among pagans, that those animals that fit into a fertility religion are called “clean” while the other animals are rejected as “unclean. Of course, such a thing was 'seen' and 'sensed' only by sacred men and women and escaped the great masses who accepted the taboos and recommendations 'just like that' on authority. Hence the 'irrationality' of the cleanliness laws among the peoples, all the more so that sacred men and women introduced this distinction under inspirations of all kinds from 'demonic' and - Biblically speaking - satanic holy beings (sons of God, daughters of God), who never adhere completely to purely objective data,

Num. 21:6/9. -- That animals are a power-laden reality is evident from this text. -- Yahweh sends upon his 'rebellious' people “poisonous serpents” (note: serpents - saraphs, - indicating higher beings in those serpents). Moses is instructed by the same Yahweh to make “a saraph” and to put it on a (holy) pole. “When thereupon a serpent bit someone and he looked at the brass serpent (saraph) (note: in faith to its life force), he remained alive”.

Note- Once again we see Yahweh faith affirming what was previously pagan.

'Origin history' in the Bible.

Looking back at A. Bertholet, *Die Religion des Alten Testaments*, (The religion of the Old Testament), Tübingen, 1932, 14/18 (*Mythologisches*), ((Mythological)), -- 21/24 (*Ätiologische Sagen*)., (Etiological sagas).

Note - Bertholet distinguishes between myth and saga. With reason. And yet: his texts cited as sagas are usually very mythical unless with regard to a small part that is strictly 'saga'. Let us be ready:

a. the saga is bound to time and place (a historical-geographical fact), while the myth and the fairy tale are not;

b. the myth is essentially a universally meant origin story about a pictorial act or event (a primal act or primal event) which - later, in the course of the history of the cosmos and/or culture - gives life force to all that lives and its environment.

The Biblical concept of 'toledot' (history of origin). - The Hebraic term 'toledot' (Greek: genesis; Lat.: generatio) meant

a. origin, - creation;

b. origin or creation history or origin or creation story.

Note - In fact - even within the Bible - toledot amounts to genealogical story; biological origin (in the broad sense because adoption also counts as 'biological' origin) prevails. This is probably due to the fertility religion(s), which after all - one thinks of the origin stories in Sumeria or Egypt - are generation -or reproduction histories in which deities (male and female) are 'fertile' and which are visibly presented in fertility rites. - From here the following will come across much more clearly.

1. -- Old Testament. - The text of the texts is Gen. 2:4: "This then was the toledot or genesis of the heavens and the earth when they were created." And indeed Gen. 1:1 reads, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth."

Note - What are they created from? From "the spirit" ('ruah' Gr.: pneuma, Lat. : spiritus) of God. Not from what the Bible calls "the flesh" (or: "flesh and blood" (John. 1:13)) as the pagan myths represented it, fundamentally: God in the Bible is "origin" o.g. ruah, i.e. life force inherent to him, i.e. divine spirit or "holy spirit".

Note - The genealogical meaning appears from what follows. -- Gen, 6:9: “Behold the origin-history of Noah (Noë).” Gen, 25:19: “Behold the origin history of Isaac, 'son of Abraham.” Gen. 37:2: “Behold the origin history of Jacob.” What characters follow is the history of descent.

The sovereign as “begotten”. -- Ps. 2:7. -- The psalm is a description of the struggle around (Yahweh in his) 'Messiah' (anointed one) or prince Yahweh says: “I, I have anointed him, my king on Zion, my holy mountain! The prince thereupon: “He (note : Yahweh) has said to me, “Thou art “my son.” I, this day, have begotten thee”.

Note -- Not surprisingly, Matt. 17:5 says, “This (Jesus) is my well-beloved son in whom I have all my pleasure.” In the transformation, Jesus shows his glorious radiance (aura) and is told that he is truly the prince, i.e., the son of God (in the language of the day).

Note - Pilate had also heard it, “Art thou the king of the Jews?”. Which Jesus, in His way of course, confirms.

2 -- New Testament. -- Let us look at how Matthew, 1:1, begins the Good News: “Book of the 'genesis', genealogy, of Jesus the Christ (anointed one), “son of” David, “son of” Abraham”. That, after what we saw above, speaks for itself. - Especially Mary's role (and Joseph's sideways) gets Matthew's attention: “Whatever was conceived in her (Mary) had its origin in the Holy Spirit”.

In other words, what Luke, 1:35, says, Matthew confirms: “The angel to Mary (note: who responds incredulously a.k.a.): 'The holy spirit will come upon you and the power of the Most High will overshadow you. For this very reason the holy being who will be born (note : Jesus) will be called 'son of God’”.

Note- The 'mythic' way of thinking looks first and foremost at genealogy (in the mythic sense)! For, as in the Greek 'genesis', origin, intertwines with 'fusus', (Lat.: natura), nature (in the mythic-wide sense), so also in the Bible: so e.g. it has all the importance which origin Jesus has because that decides his nature in his 'name' (function, role, ability to act). After all, the 'name' (“son of God”) is, in biblical parlance, the person himself in his role within a context.

The concept of origin as “creation” (defined in more detail)

The myth reveals a paragon that provokes imitation and participation.-- Where and how does this occur with the act of creation “in the beginning” among other things?

Ps. 51(50):12/14.-- The psalmist - repenting of the “flesh” (i.e. god-forsaken and Decalogue-forsaken life) - asks, very humbly by the way, to be “reborn” - “re-awakened”, “recreated”: “God, create me a pure heart. Restore in my 'breast' (note : inner, heart and kidneys) a lively spirit (note : life force). - Do not remove me, - far from your face (note: direct context; cf. Ps. 16(15) 11; Ps. 27(26): 5/9),-- Do not deprive me of your spirit (note: Life Force) of holiness (note: cf. Wisd, 1:5; 9:17; Ps, 143(142):10). Grant me again the joy of your salvation: secure in me a magnanimous spirit (note : Life-force).” -

Behold where in the process of being recreated by God exists! It is the same “spirit” (power, life force) that “in the beginning” “begot” heaven and earth, “created” them. In the one who converts to God and His commandment, that origin act is visibly present. The creation of “in the beginning” is still both present and manifest: in our conversion from flesh to (divine) spirit (as Gen. 6:3 insinuates), For “God's spirit is not infinitely responsible for that man who wants to be 'only flesh' (nothing unless alienated from God and His commandments).” One sees how “the myth” of the Bible is central in the beginning and now and always and throughout the ages (= eras) of ages! God, as the originator of heaven and earth, is and remains - in an eternal present or now - originator and creator.

Note.- *La bible de Jérusalem* notes that the term 'create', (in Ps. 51 (50) is only said of God, specifically: when he brings something new (and wondrous) into being as its origin.

So in Gen, 1:1. -- So also, in different words but within the same term, in Ex, 34:10.- - “Yahweh answered (in a conversation with Moses asking forgiveness), 'I want to make a covenant with you: for all your people I will perform miracles All the people will see with their own eyes the chilling works that I, Yahweh, am going to do for you”.

That concept of '(re)creating' returns: Is. 48:7; 65:17: Jer. 31:21f.; 31:32/39; Ezek. 36:25f..

The concept of “father” in the Bible.

We begin with Eph. 3:14. -- Paul prays. His prayer is “mythical,” i.e., it appeals to origins. “I kneel down in the presence of the Father from whom 'pasa patria', all 'fatherhood' - in heaven and on earth takes its name”.

Note- 'Patria', eponymous group. Is 'patria' everyone's group that derives both origins (origin) and cohesion from the same ancestor. So we are in the sphere of 'tôledot' (origin history)!- Paul wants to say that every eponymous group - in heaven or on earth - has as its origin the father, God the father, the procreator, as 1 John 5:1 says.

Prayer Biblically (mythically) is nothing more than turning to the origin of everything. As Heb. 11:3 puts it in connection with believing: to believe is to 'see' that origin and to agree with it.

The real 'father' of unbelieving Jews.

Do we read in the light of God's fatherhood, John 8:31/59. A fierce discussion is dramatically staged by Johannes between those Jews who want to eliminate Jesus by killing him: “You seek to kill me” (8:37; 8:40; 8:44) and Jesus who defends himself in a way that is very fascinating for us here and now.

“I (note: Jesus) say what I have seen with my Father. And you do what you heard from your Father”. In other words, Jesus is inwardly enlightened by holy spirit through which he has seen what is with his Father (concerning his task). The reluctant, yes, very hostile Jews however become inwardly “enlightened” (one would, Biblically speaking, better say “darkened” as Luk. 22:53 says (“Your hour and the power of darkness”) by their “father”, i.e. giver whom they hear in their inner being by inner voice. “Thou performest the works of thy father”.

In other words: this by which the mysterious and occult father in the unbelieving Jews reveals himself (apokalupsis), are the works, Specifically: their unbelief, their will to kill.

In summary.

“Ye are “of the devil” (note: as the origin), your father and the lusts of your father ye seek to carry out. In other words: they live out of “the flesh” (God-fearing), lack God's “spirit” (life force), belong to another eponymous group.

Myth and saga in the Bible.

A. Bertholet, *Die Religion des alten Testaments*. Tübingen, 1932, 14/18 (*Mythologisches*), -- 21/24 (*Ätiologische Sagen*), dwells on a number of examples from which we quote a few.

Gen. 1:1f. -- “In the beginning -- when God created heaven and earth -- the earth was desolate and empty, and darkness was over the primordial sea (note : tehom). And the spirit (note : life-force) of God brooded over “the waters.”

Note.- The “primordial sea,” tehom, clearly recalls “tiamat” from the Babylonian creation or at least order creation myth, in which tiamat, the “divine” primordial sea, loses in a primordial battle with the supreme god Marduk.

Note.- The “brooding” of God's spirit may recall the world-eg-myth (according to Bertholet). -- In any case: the non-Biblical myth, in the countries around Israel, assumes that - before the supreme god (whoever that may be) establishes order - disorder, called 'primeval disorder', exists.

In other words: this primal disorder is not created by the supreme god; it is only found as 'matter' to be ordered. Not so in the Bible: God creates everything, -- including the primal order if it exists at all. For God's creating is orderly from the start: “ordo ducit ad Deum” says the proverb (“Order leads to God”).

Gen. 2:2f. - “When God had done with the work that he had done, he rested on the seventh day. (...). God blessed the seventh day and designated it as holy. For on that day he rested from all his work which he had done creatively”.

Note.- -- This myth amounts to a kind of 'aitiologiea'; declaration of origin. Since it is a historical fact that the Sabbath, the seventh day, was holy day, the 'explanation' is actually a saga and not a true myth.

Gen. 3:13ff. -- “Yahweh said to “the woman” (note : Eve), “What have ye done?” She: “the serpent has outsmarted me so that I ate (note : of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil)”. God to the serpent: “Since you have done this, you will be cursed among all animals and among all the animals of the wilderness: on your belly you will crawl and eat dust all your life.

Hostility will I create between thee and “the woman” and between thy 'seed' (note : tôledôt, offspring) and her 'seed': she shall tread on thy head, and thou shalt strike them in the heel.”

Note.- Mythical is the fact that sin which is evident in a universal way (exceptions notwithstanding), has as its origin the temptation of Eve by “the serpent” (who thereby became her “father”, i.e. her inspirer (John 6:38; 8:41; 8:44) and incites her to good-and evil),

Sage is:

a. the natural crawling of the serpent (in the biological sense) - “the serpent” tempting Eve is a mythical serpent - 'explained' as a result of the mythical serpent's crime,

b. the hostility of man (woman) and serpent when one steps on the (biological) serpent, 'explained' as a result of what the mythical serpent did.

One sees how the ordained writer confuses the biological animal 'snake' with the mythical 'animal' 'serpent' (note: apparently a saraph that denotes evil good and evil as 'even': Kristensen's “harmony of opposites”).

Original Sin. - We now make a digression and no digression, for the point is to situate the myth of Eve's Fall into sacred history.

1. -- Wisdom. 2:23f. -- “God created “man” with a view to immortality (note: which is a typically divine trait); he made it an image of his own nature (note: Gen. 1:28).-- Through the envy of “the devil” (note: apparently the mythical serpent is meant) “death” entered the world (note: first of all humanity): those who belong to “the world” experience it.”

Note- Whoever proceeds from the Biblical concept of “tôledôt” (descent history) that the author of the book of Wisdom holds, knows immediately that the primal or first sin (Eve, Adam) “reproduces” (not biologically as some still believe but mythically) through the descendants, the “patria” (Eph. 3:14: the group that has the same ancestor(s)).

2. -- Rom. 5:12f. -- (...) Through a single human being (note: Eve) “sin” entered the world and through “sin” “death”. And so “death” has passed upon all men: by the fact that all have sinned (note: viz. in that first man).”

Rom. 5:18. -- “The fault of one man involved condemnation for all men”.

Rom. 5:19. -- “Through the disobedience (note : to the ten commandments) of one man, 'the multitude' became sinners.”

Note- When one puts the concept of “tôledôt” or descendant history (patria) first, then one is on the way to understanding how Wisdom and Romans letter come to the so controversial concept of original sin.

The myth - not the saga - speaks of “the hidden” (call it “the occult”): man consisting of

a. flesh that is

b. is brought to 'life' by the soul (nefesh) in a natural way and by God's spirit (ruah) in a supernatural way, and commits sin, meaning unscrupulous behavior, is struck in the three aspects (flesh/soul/supernatural life) and in a mysterious way this passes into and through the (never merely biological but always also 'psychic' (nefesh) and especially 'supernatural' ('pneumatic')) acts of procreation in these three areas.

The Bible does not tell us how this is to be achieved in practice. It does say, however, that with the sin (unconscionability) of a first ancestor pair, an after-effects mechanism was set in motion that obeys Gen. 6:3, where it is said that “God's spirit (note: supernatural life) does not want to be endlessly responsible for man insofar as he wants to be 'flesh' (note: mere biology and natural soul).”

What now immediately follows receives its sense from what we just said concerning the tôledot of sin.

Gen. 6:1/5.-- “When men multiplied on the face of the earth and their daughters were born, and when the sons of God (note : higher beings) saw the beauty of men's daughters, they took all those who appealed to them to be wives.-- But Yahweh spoke, “Not shall my spirit (note.: supernatural, typically divine life force be present in men in the long run since they are after all but 'flesh' (note : merely earthly, alienated from God and his commandment). Thus, their lifespan will be one hundred and twenty years.

The 'nephilim' (note: 'giants'), however, came to the earth at that time - and also later - when the sons of God had sexual intercourse with the daughters of men and these had children: these are the 'heroes' of the past, -- those infamous people.

Yahweh saw that the unscrupulousness of “man” (note: collective term) was great on the earth and that man's heart (note: seat of free decisions, among others) forged unscrupulous plans day-in and day-out. Yahweh regretted to have made man on the earth (...).

Note - Jude 6 - like 2 Peter 2:4/5 indicates the sons of god as 'angels' (indeed sons of god) who became unfaithful to their high standard of heavenly existence, were cast into "deepest darkness" until the (final) judgment.

La bible de Jérusalem notes among other things that the nephilim were somewhere "Übermenschen" who by their misarchic (all authority and higher values disregarded) behavior reinforced the degeneration "in the days of Noe" (as Jesus says (Luk. 17:26/30), this degeneration will occur again before his return) and thus helped provoke the Flood as God's judgment.

The fact that Peter and Jude, as well as and for \neg Jesus, remarkably comment on Gen. 6:1/5, indicates that we are dealing here with a myth of decisive importance. And certainly not with an ordinary saga about historically-geographically described data.-- She gets by the way by Tobit 3:17, 6:8, 6:14/18, 8:3 a very concrete confirmation.

Gen. 19:25f. "Yahweh destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah and the whole region and all the inhabitants thereof and the crops of the land.-- Lot's wife, however, looked back and turned into a pillar of salt (cf. Deut, 3:11)."

Note-- Bertholet identifies this as a "geological saga." Yet, while perhaps initially true, this does not seem so simple.

1. Wisdom 10:6/8 notes that the "saga" contains a testimony rest of moral degeneracy ("flesh," as Gen, 6:3 says),--that "the pillar of salt as a memorial to one unbelieving soul" reaches upward. In other words: unbelief is central.

2. Jude 7 notes that the sodomites desired "another flesh," i.e., the angels (visiting Lot). Which led to "eternal fire" as God's judgment. Which 2 Pet. 2:6/10 concurs with. And ... Jesus, in Luk, 17:28/30, speaks of "the days of Lot" which will recur in the days of the returning son of man, Jesus thus.

In other words, the saga that talks about a geographically defined phenomenon reaches into the mythical! The mythical that notes a recurring disquiet of conscience, which provokes a judgment of God, i.e. a direct intervention of God.

In which the 'tôledôt' of the proliferating evil in mankind invariably forms the background. The repetition of the same thing betrays the still lingering first evil, the fact that Eve accepted the unscrupulous proposal of "the serpent", her inspirer.

“The laws” of the eternal covenant.

Whoever does not practically live up to “the laws” - the decree of counsel (which summarizes them) - of “the everlasting covenant” “profanes the earth” and provokes a curse. Thus Is. 24:1/6. Do we dwell on these “laws”.

The great theophany. -- Ex. 20:1/17 and Deut. 5:6/21 give us two articulations of the ten words (Ex. 34:28) or Decalogue. Ex. 20 situates the great ethical theophany on Mount Sinai, -- with much “display.

The first three commandments. -- They are the theological (directed at God directly) commandments.

1. Thou shalt, except me. Yahweh, have no other god(s). **2.** Thou shalt not utter the name (note : the being and role) of Yahweh in vain (note : unwarranted). **3.** Thou shalt keep the Sabbath day in honor to “sanctify” it, (note : strictly reserve to God).

The seven last commandments. - They are the strictly ethical (especially society governing) 'laws'. **4.** Honor thy father and mother. **5.** Thou shalt not kill. **6.** Thou shalt not commit adultery. **7.** Thou shalt not steal. **8.** Thou shalt not make a false statement against thy neighbor. **9.** Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife. **10.** Thou shalt not covet anything of what thy neighbor possesses.

Note- It is seen that the values that found the radical sanctity (inviolability) of all created things are mentioned sample by sample: **4:** authority; **5:** life; **6:** sex life; **7:** property; **8:** truth; **9:** sex life; **10:** property. Commandments 6/9 and 7/10 are formulated through to the inner life (“coveting”).

The holiness law. -- Lev. 17/26.-- “Be ye holy for I, Yahweh your God, am holy” (Lev. 19:2). “I, Yahweh your God, am I. You have sanctified yourselves and become 'saints' (note: o.w. dedication approaching God) for I am holy” (Lev. 11:44). The text continues: “You shall therefore be holy because I am holy.”

The entire text of the 'holiness law' in Leviticus teems with samples from the Decalogue: **1/3** (do not engage in 'nothingness' (idols); do not make metal images of Yahweh; 'sanctify' the Sabbath); **4** (honor parents); **5** (let the poor and the stranger live by releasing harvest surpluses); **6/9** (do not profane a daughter by making it a prostitute); **7/10** (do not commit theft); **8** (do not act underhandedly or deceitfully).

Paul's "flesh/spirit contradiction:

Gen. 6:3 says it, "That my spirit (note: Yahweh 's life force) may not be indefinitely responsible to man (note: collectively) since (as far as) he/she is flesh (note: alienated from God and his Decalogue." Do we read in this light Gal. 5:13f.

1.-- "You, my brothers (and sisters), were called to freedom.

But that this freedom may not turn into a pretext for the flesh". In other words: freedom of may (which limits the possibilities of a situation) differs from freedom of can (which exploits the possibilities of a situation). 'Permission' stands or falls with the limits of conscience.

2.1.-- Flesh, darkness (Eph. 5:11). Foolishness (Eph. 5:15). The old man (Col. 3:9; 2 Tim. 3:1ff.)....- Prostitution, unchastity, indulgence, -- idolatry, magic, -- hatred, discord, envy.-- fits of anger, quarrels, dissensions, partisanships, -- lusts, orgies, parties and the like.-- "Flesh" in the strict sense is behavior that testifies to the death of God and to the Decalogue as dead letter.

2.2.-- Spirit (of God), light (Eph. 5:8/9), wisdom (Eph. 5:15), the new man (Col. 3:10). Love, joy, peace, patience, service, goodness, trust in fellow men, gentleness. self-control.-- All this Paul calls "fruit of the spirit (of God)."

The final outcome. -- Silently God's judgment -- the final judgment included -- is at work in the course of history.

1. "Those who commit the transgressions of the flesh will not inherit the kingdom of God (note: God's universe government insofar as it rejects wrongdoing)."

2. "Those who belong to Christ Jesus have crucified "the flesh" with its urges and lusts. And, seeing that the spirit (note: God's life force in us) is life, that spirit also inspires us".

Behold the shifting that the judgment of God (Gal. 6:7/9 : sow harvest lawfulness) silently carries through the course of history. "What one sows, one will reap: he who sows in the flesh will reap corruption by reason of that flesh; he who sows in the spirit (note: of God) will reap eternal life by reason of that spirit."

Behold one of the reasons why we maintain that Gen. 6:3 is and remains the basic text of Old and New Testament, -- of the eternal covenant (Is. 24: 1 ff., Rom; 2:14 ff.).

The elements of the(them) world.

This Pauline term occurs in Gal. 4:3 and 4:9, in Col, 2:8 and 2:20,--"Stoicheia tou kosmou", Lat.: elementa mundi, elements of the world, we now explain,

1. The general meaning. -- 'Stoicheio'(Lat. : elementum) means in ancient Greek - like 'archè', Lat. principium, premise -- either a specimen within a collection or a part within a whole (system) whose understanding allowed the collection or system to be understood. For an element, as a specimen or part, governs its collection or its system and makes it intelligible.

"Elements of, the world" thus means, generally speaking, all that governs the world and makes it immediately intelligible. Thus the governments in our world are things that govern life - in part: if one wants to understand that life, then knowing the governments is a necessity. The governments, therefore, are among the elements of the world.

2. -- The paulinic meaning. -- This is limited, to a great extent, to religious systems within our world. Thus the pre-Christian Galatian religion as a system or the Jewish law system. If one wants to know the pre-Christian Galatian life, one should understand its religious system. Likewise if one wanted to know the Jewish world from which Paul partially descended. - Let us explain briefly.

1. -- Gal. 4:3/10 -- "We also (note: Paul speaks as a Jew) were as slaves (...) in the service of the elements of the world. -- Yet, when the fullness of time (note: the end times) was approaching, God sent his son (note: Jesus), born of a woman (note: Mary), to redeem the subjects of "the law" (note: here: the entire Jewish religious system with all its precepts). This in order to procure for us the adoption of children (note : those born of God)".

Note - One paid attention to the systechie "slavery/ freedom" that governs Paul's rendering of the elements of this world: the elements "control" (and make intelligible) but in ways that are subjugating, addictive to Paul's Christian sensibility.

Against which the religion he advocates comes across as freedom: instead of being children of the elements, one becomes children of God, -- of God who does not enslave but sets free.

Also the Galatian religion.

“At the time, in your ignorance of God, ye were as slaves in the service of the deity’s (note : the pagan numina or higher beings) who are basically (note : compared to the God of the Bible) - there are none.

Yet, now that you are acquainted with God -- or rather, now that God is acquainted with you (nota : deals with you confidentially) -- why still return to those elements without power or value, -- to whom you want to be employed as slaves again as you were at the time (note : before your conversion to Christianity)? Days! Months! Seasons! Years! Observe all the time! (...).”

Note - Again the relationship between “unfree slavery and free association with God”, (“unfree slavery/ free God-childhood”). With at the end that which is one of the signs of slavery par excellence: the scrupulous observance of the liturgical calendar with its days, months, seasons and years.

In other words: addicting not the general law of God but the strict, submissive prescriptions of the Galatian religion. Prescriptions that are “the will” of higher beings, the elements of the world par excellence (as the background of the prescriptions), make for unfree beings. -- Speaking of criticism of religion!

2. -- Col. 2:8; -- 2:16 ff. -- Paul repeats his criticism. -- “That no one should get it into his head to make remarks to you in the style of “What may be eaten or drunk?” or “What annual celebrations, new moon feasts, Sabbath days are prescribed?” (...). That no one should take you by the nose who is absorbed in self-flagellations (literally: humiliations, severe self-treatments) in the context of a religion of angels (note: another name for the higher beings who are also the elements of the world), because such a person is completely absorbed in things he has “seen” (note: in visions or according to his own thinking mechanisms). (...). What is the point of folding yourself under prescriptions as if you were still living in this world?

“Do not take it into your hands”. “Do not taste”. “Do not touch.” All such things which, by their use, are doomed to perish! Such precepts may indeed present the appearance of “wisdom” by their excessive piety or self-flagellation which does not spare the body: in fact they have no value whatsoever (...).

Note.- Again Paul's fierce criticism of religion which in the religions exposes the subjugating - forcing to fold - precepts to their real value.

Jesus: his true being.

Beginning with the title ('name', i.e. role) “new Adam” for with that we situate him in consecrated history, i.e. the 'tôledôt' or origin history. Jesus is the new origin.

Rom. 5:18: “As the fault of one man (note: Eve/Adam) cast a condemnation over all men, so also the work of righteousness (note: Jesus' conscientiousness) of one man provides a justification (note: to be brought in order with God and the Decalogue) to all which gives life (note: that kind of life which springs from a God spirit (Gen. 8:3)).”

In other words: the first sin that proliferates in original sin and, as it were, continually regenerates itself, is nullified. For Jesus' “father” (John 8:38) is the heavenly Father, the First Person of the Holy Trinity, and not “the serpent” who inspired Eve/Adam.

In other words, Jesus sets in motion a new tôledôt or lineage history, which relies on “faith”-so typical of Abraham (Gen. 22:1/19)-in “generating,” i.e., causing to be reborn, “out of God” (John 1:12f.).

Jesus, the son of man. -

This term, which Jesus himself regularly applies to himself, dates from Dan. 7:13, where the world judgment is previewed: “I 'saw' during the night visions and look; with the clouds of heaven came one who looked like a man (...). To him was given power and honor and dominion over kings, and all peoples (note: Daniel as an end-time apocalyptic situates himself “in the midst of the peoples” and no longer in the too narrow framework of Judaism), nations and languages serve him (...)”.

A. Bertholet, *Die Religion des alten Testaments, Tübingen, 1932, 131*, puts it briefly but definitively: “Son of Man. -- 'Son' means only to be classed as a human being. To a man the kingdom of God resembles as the realms of the world (Matt. 4:8/9 (where Satan presents them to Jesus)) resemble animals.”

As a historian of religions, Bertholet must have known that the pagan religions, as demonic structures, exhibit something “animal-like”, which is transformed, re-established, re-created, into something human, especially from Jesus onward (the Old Testament anticipated this somewhat). In baptism namely, man escapes the animal realms and becomes a member of “God's realm” which is “human” as the son of man born of God, the father.

Jesus: the suffering and glorified servant of the Lord.

Philippians 2:9/10 says that “God has given Jesus a 'name' (note : roll) that exceeds every 'name' so that everything - in the 'name' of 'Jesus' - may kneel down: in the highest heaven, on earth, and in the underworld.” If there is one title that lives up to that pass of Philippians' letter, it is the Old Testament title “ebed Yahweh,” servant of the Lord.

Luk. 22:37: “It is a necessity that in me be realized what is written, 'He was counted among the transgressors' (Is. 53:12).” Thus Jesus about himself. Thus Luke's text refers to Deutero-Isaias (42:1/4 (5/9); 49:1/; 50:4/9 (10/11); -- especially 52:13/53:12).

The dual structure.

1. There is a transitional structure from humiliation (to an unprecedented degree even) to glorification (to an equally unimaginable degree. This is summed up in the term 'exodos', exodus (of Jesus who dies on the cross (crucifixion) but immediately reigns in full power (resurrection).

2. There is also, in conjunction with this, a solidarity structure. -- “Our ills he took upon himself. With our sorrows he bore himself (...). The punishment that brought us peace is his. Thanks to his thongs we found healing (...).” The ancient Roman Easter liturgy says it in the wake of this text: “(Jesus) by dying destroyed our death and by rising he restored our life.”

Eastern theologians and liturgies in particular endlessly repeat this basic structure: a mysterious destiny similarity (but with a reversal to the contrary) governs Jesus as “head of the (note: mystical) body” that is his church, 'Church', i.e. those who underwent baptism (holy spirit and desire, holy spirit and blood testimony, holy spirit and (ritual) water).

Tôledot.

Is, 53:10/12. -- “He shall see his offspring, -- see his days become long”. One sees it: already deutero-Isaian the twofold structure of above is historically indicated. If one wishes, but in the religious-historical sense (as we do throughout): “mythically interpreted”. When one puts oneself outside the more recent rationalism, only then does one become open to the (applied) logic of the sacred texts which only then, incidentally, exhibit a very strict logical (and not “prelogical”) style.

Jesus' exaltation

Gen. 5:24: "Henok lived in unity with God. Then he disappeared for God took him away." 2 Kings 2:9f, tells the same of the prophet Elias. -- Mark. 16:19 "Jesus was taken up to heaven and seated at God's right hand. - we take a moment to consider

Finished. -- Luke 13:31 -- Some Pharisees come to Jesus: "Depart and go away from here for Herod wants to kill you (cf. John 8:44)." -- Jesus: "Go and tell that fox, 'Look: I am chasing out demons and performing healings. Today, tomorrow, the third day (note: about short) I am finished'". But today, tomorrow and the day after, I must continue my way because it is the fate of a prophet that he does not die outside Jerusalem."

Note: -- In a short time - Jesus means to say - my work will be "finished". This refers to his removal from this earth, -- his "glorification," as S. John chooses to say.

Jesus' clear but misunderstood predictions. -- We sum up.

1. -- Luk. 9:51. -- Since the moment when Jesus was to be "exalted" (note : lifted up) was approaching, he went on the road to Jerusalem with determination.

Note: -- Jesus as a clairvoyant 'sees' it!

2. -- Luk. 9:22. -- "The son of man must suffer much, -- be rejected by the elders, high priests and scribes. To be put to death and resurrected the third day".

Note -- Here the "ebed Yahweh", the Lord's humiliated and glorified servant comes into play. And this is in the form of crucifixion and resurrection. Both, humiliation and resurrection are one and the same uplifting event.

3. -- Luk. 9:43f.. - "Ye, knot it well in your ears: 'The Son of Man is about to be delivered into the hands of men.' But his disciples did not understand this word. - Jesus "saw" into the future. The disciples did not.

4. -- Luk. 18:31. -- Jesus to the twelve: "Look! We are ascending to Jerusalem. All that the prophets have written (cf. Luke 24:25/27; 24:44) will have to be fulfilled with regard to the son of man. He will be delivered to the Gentiles (note: the Romans), -- mocked, mistreated, spit upon. After scourging him they will kill him and the third day he will be resurrected". But they understood none of this.

The sign of Jonas.

Matt. 12:40 (// Luk. 11:30). -- “The son of man shall dwell in the bosom of the earth for three days and three nights.” Some of the Scribes and Pharisees asked Jesus for “a sign.” A sign by which they, though “an evil and adulterous generation” (sic Jesus), would know with certainty that he was indeed “sent from God.”

For, unlike a certain portion of “the crowd” who saw in Jesus a prophet, i.e., a seer sent from God, -- unlike even some possessed people who -- inspired by their father (the devil) recognized Jesus as “the son of God,” those scribes and Pharisees did not “see” that.

As John 12:37 says among other things, “Although, Jesus had performed such great signs in their presence, yet they did not believe in him.” He had “healed” the sick and possessed several times and in public. But Jesus harbored no illusions in this regard: “If they do not listen to Moses and the prophets, neither will they be moved even if someone rose from the dead.” (Luk. 16.31).

As just mentioned, “An angry and adulterous (note : an unscrupulous and alienated from God) generation asks for a sign, And no sign shall it be given except the sign of Jonas the prophet; He left them standing and went away.” (Matt, 16:4).

Miracles do not convince skeptics.

For these are always open to an opposite interpretation. Since those Scribes and Pharisees in question saw themselves substantially and thoroughly threatened by Jesus in their “name” (understand: person and role), they interpreted Jesus' miracle works (aretalogical aspect of his action) differently than they were objectively, in themselves.

If need be, they interpreted Jesus' miracles, springing from God's creative power, as being caused “by Beelzebub, the prince of the devils” (Matt. 12:24).

In other words, as they thought they should interpret it, -- inspired by their father (John 8:43): “Why do you not understand my language? Because thou art not able even to listen to my word, thou hast the devil for a father (note : inspirer), and the sense of thy father thou chooseth to doom; “Thou believest not in me just because I saw the truth (note : as it comes from God)”. (John, 8:45).

Behold the proper meaning of Jesus death and resurrection as the sign of Jonah.

Stricken by the sheol, the underworld.

“From the womb of the sheol I cried out: thou hast heard me. (...). From the pit of the grave thou hast raised up my life (...).

Thus Jonah prays 2:3; 2:7. -- What precisely “the deadly life in the sheol” is, however, as far as it sometimes penetrates God's elect, we learn from Ps. 88 (87). We quote the main one.

Yahweh, God of my salvation when I call to you by night, that then my prayer may penetrate to you. Hear my tears for my soul is full of afflictions and my life is on the brink of tears.

Already viewed as one who has descended into “the pit,” I am a dead man, -- as a freedman who belongs to the dead (note: slaves/slave women belonged to the realm of the dead), similar to murderers who lie in the grave pit. Beings whom thou hast forgotten,--who are cut off from thy hand (note : life force).-- In the deepest of the pit thou hast pointed out to me home,--in the darkness --in the abysses.

Upon me apparently weighs thy fury: thou letst loose all thy waves. Those who were with me, thou hast removed from me, -- made me for them a figure of horror, -- a detained one who cannot go outside. (...).

All day long I cry out to you, Yahweh. (...). Do ye perform miracles for the dead? Do refaim (note : phantoms in the underworld, without any “spirit” (life force; Gen. 6:3) from God) rise up to live you? Are we told of thy love in the sepulchre? Of your truth in the abaddon (note : place of lostness)? Does one know of thy miracles something or in the darkness? Of thy righteousness (note : thy gracious intervention) in the place of oblivion?

Me: I cry to you, Yahweh, in the morning my prayer is already there for you (...). Unhappy - dying from my childhood I have endured your terrors: I am at the end (...). Your creeps have made of me 'nothing'. They choke me like water: all day long. (...). Friends, near relatives ye remove from me: my company is darkneff.

Note.- Behold what the Old Testament believer thought when in deepest misery. Indeed, the afterlife - first clearly identified as God's judgment Num, 16:28/35 - was the place where “God was no longer responsible for man insofar as he was (mere 'flesh' (alienated from God and His prayer) (Gen. 6:3)).

Jesus: descended to hell (sheol, underworld).

As a “servant of the Lord,” Jesus goes so far as to die! But, as Ps. 118 (117): 19f. provides for every “righteous” (conscientious), he enters “the gates of righteousness,” or still “the gate of Yahweh” the counterpart of “the gates of hell” (Matt., 16:18), as the glorified servant of God. Which does not prevent him from visiting “the underworld gates of hell”.

1 Pet. 3:18ff. -- “Christ himself died once for all for sins: as a conscientious man for unscrupulous people! To bring us to God. Though killed “according to the flesh” (note: Gen. 6:3), he was raised to life “according to the spirit” (note: of God; Gen. 6:3).”

Note - Paul says that Jesus even became a vivifying spirit: such that immediately after his death he possessed God's life force (as John 7:37/39 so clearly predicts).

Peter continues: “In that spirit (note : new life-force) he even went on to proclaim that message to the spirits in the dungeon (note : sheol),-- to those who had refused to believe at the time, when God's patient action granted respite, -- in the dough in which Noah built the ark (Gen. 7:14), in which a small number (...) were saved from the flood waters.”

Note.- One sees here again how “the days of Noe” (Luk. 17:26f.; Jud. 6) weigh on New Testament thinking.

The spirits in the dungeon. -- According to some, those spirits in the dungeon would be the saints that Matt. 27:52 mentions as risen and showing themselves to many (in apparitions, -- coming out of the tombs with the “body” (note : soul body) after Jesus' resurrection). Of these, however, Matthew says “they entered into the holy city,” with Jesus apparently entering “the gates of righteousness” (cf. Rev. 21:2; 21:10; 22:19: the heavenly Jerusalem). Well Jesus descended into the sheol.

Others, however -- with much more reason -- interpret “the spirits in the dungeon” as the souls of those who died as “flesh” (unscrupulous and without faith) following the Flood and thus ended up in the sheol -- because God no longer felt responsible with His spirit (life force, ruah), as Gen, 6:3 -- it can never be repeated enough -- clearly says in that context.

Note: Another opinion: it is the souls of the chained demons that the book of Henok is talking about,-- “Chained demons” is a term vague enough to be accurate.

1 Pet. 4:6. -- First the context. -- Peter outlines the abyss between the Gentiles, -- in their extreme deviations especially, and the Christians of the day. “Time enough has already passed with doing what the heathen want by indulging in excesses, indulging in urges, indulging in drunken orgies, indulging in drinking bouts, in idolatrous worship that is rejected by God, As for that, they find it strange that you no longer run with them on that excessive life without hope of salvation (note: God's salvation). Consequence: they overflow with insulting statements”. - So much for the context.

“They will have to give an account of this before Jesus, who is ready to judge the living and the dead. That is why the Good News was proclaimed even to the dead, so that although according to men they are judged (note : cit.) 'according to the flesh' (Gen. 6:3), yet according to God they live 'in the spirit' (Gen. 6:3)”.

Note.- It is again clear from Peter's text that Jesus, having proclaimed the Good News on this earth, in the narrow Jewish framework, also proclaimed the Good News of God's salvation in the sheol where the dead reside.

Note -- Whether those “dead” are the unbelievers who persecute the readers of Peter's letter (as some interpreters claim) is nowhere directly apparent but can be, of course.

The primordial Creed. -- 1 Cor. 15:3. -- “I have passed on to you (...) what had been passed on to me, namely, that Christ died for our sins, -- according to the scriptures, -- that he was laid in the tomb, -- that he rose the third day, -- according to the scriptures, -- that he appeared to Cephas (note : Peter), then to the twelve (note : apostles) (...).”

Paul skips one very decisive salvific event here, namely the descent “into hell” of Jesus as soon as he, having died on the cross, had been glorified and had full power.

The confession of faith which omits the descent into hell - interpreted in a rationalistic sense as a “myth” (i.e.: a product of prelogical thinking) - singularly disregards the texts of the New Testament.

Jesus “sits at God's right hand.”

Jesus proclaims the Good News on this earth, in the underworld and in the heavenly realm. Peter is clear: “Having subdued the angels (note: sons of God, 'saints' (in the archaic sense), -- the powers ('lexousiai', potestates), the powers ('dunamis', virtutes), Jesus, as risen, penetrates to heaven and sits at God's right hand.”

Note -- To “sit at the right hand (of a prince e.g.)” means to dispose of the power of the one at whose right hand one sits; Thus 1 Pet. 3:22.

The origin of 'names' -- It is clear that terms like 'powers', 'forces', etc. mean 'names', i.e. persons and their role, in God's creation, especially in that part of creation called heaven(s).

Note - The term 'heaven(s)' (and 'heavens') is ambiguous.

When he designates “the gates of Yahweh” (“the gates of righteousness”) as in Ps. 118 (117): 18/20, he means that which we Christians, now mean by “heaven” of the blessed. But, when it is used in a purely cosmic sense, it means the domain of the beings who have their sacred biotope in the heavenly space above our heads.

One thus sharply distinguishes between the salvific and the merely cosmic meanings. For example, beings who belong in hell can, by chance, find themselves in the heavenly space above our heads. The salvation-historical meaning stands or falls with conscientious living; the merely cosmic refers to a part of creation. The “gates of hell” (Matt. 16:18) are the creatures that belong in the underworld as refaim but permeate our daily earthly existence, especially in the “kingdoms of the world” (Matt. 4:8).

Origin of names. -- The origin of e.g. the term 'angel' is clearly Biblical. - But according to those in the know, the term 'kuriotes' (dominatio, majesty or highness) would refer to sacred beings who control political power and especially all that is judicial. To speak with Söderblom: as 'enablers'. To speak with Usener: as function deities.

Cf. texts like Luke 12:11 and 20:20 (magistrates). Cf. Gen. 3:5, 1 Sam. 28:13,-. Ex. 21:6. Ps. 82 (81):, where judges are called “gods” (elohim).

Names lists.

Ephes. 2:1ff. -- “Ye who by your errors and your sins (note : unscrupulous acts) were 'dead' (note : deprived of divine life-force ('spirit'), in which ye once lived according to the god of this world, the ruler of the dominion of the air, the spirit which is still at work in those who resist him (...))”.

Note - In other words, the course of this world and beyond us and within us springs at least in part from Satan, who is also called elsewhere “the prince of this world” (John 12:31), The atmosphere we breathe is his biotope, -- better: is also his biotope.

It is precisely this “prince of the world” who was “cast out” by Jesus' exodos or removal. After all, according to the Bible, he is the head of the higher beings and in that sense the first intended when Jesus sits at God's right hand.

Eph. 6:10ff.

“Make ye livable “in the Lord,” in the power of his might ... to resist the cuckolds (= manipulations) of the devil.”

Note - Paul again means Satan. But this time he situates him in the totality of the “elements of this cosmos”: “For it is not against adversaries of blood and flesh (note : cit.: men on this earth) that we have to contend, but against the lordships ('archai'; principles), the powers ('exousiai'; potestates),--against the rulers ('cosmokratores', mundi rectores) of this world of darkness (cf. Luk. 22:53),--against the spirits (“ta pneumatika”, spiritualia, literally: the spiritual powers and influences) of evil who are in the heavenly (note : in the cosmic sense) spaces”.

Eph. 1:21f.

“Having exalted himself above every dominion ('archè', principatus), power ('exousia', potestas), strength ('dunamis', virtus, -- here in the sense of beings “on high”), majesty (highness: 'kuriotes', dominatio), he was raised from the dead and sits at the right hand. With a name above every name that will be able to be called not only within this 'century' (note: encompassing era) but moreover in the coming 'century'“.

Since the higher beings apparently take a stand against Jesus, with or without Satan, “he destroys every dominion, power and strength” (as 1 Cor, 15:24 says.) Not surprising: we saw that they are demonic (in the religious-historical sense).

The peoples.

Gen. 6:9/10:32 speaks of the “tôledôt” (descendant history) of Noë. With whom Yahweh - within the framework of the eternal covenant (Is. 24: 5; Rom. 2:14f.) - decides the Noahic covenant (Gen. 6:18; Matt. 5:44f.).

Noë thus becomes the “father of nations,” who are his “patria” (Eph. : 3:15), i.e. his “fatherhood,” better: descendants.

As (Gen. 1:28) in the beginning God commanded mankind to multiply, so also he says to Noë and his 'sons': “Be fruitful.(....). Populate the earth. (...)”.

The languages of nations and their 'confusion'.

Postnoahic humanity evolves into “flesh” (Gen. 6:3), i.e., humanity alienated from God and His commandments. -- Which according to one biblical writer is visible in 'Babel' i.e. God's judgment on “the nations”.

Gen. 11:1ff. -- “The whole world used the same language and the same words. (...). The people found a valley in Shinar (nota : Babylonia) and settled there. -- One to another: “Come! Make us stones and bake them in the fire.” (...). -- They said “Come on! Build us a city and a tower whose top reaches into the heavens (cf. Dan. 4:18). Do we make ourselves a name (cf. Ekk1.kus (Sir.) 40:19) and be not spread over all the earth!”

God's judgment.

“Well, Yahweh descended to see the city and the tower (...): 'Look! All make up one and the same people and speak one and the same language, and that is only the beginning of their plans! Now, however, no plan will prove feasible for them, Come! We will go down and confuse their language so that they will not understand each other. Yahweh spread them over the face of the whole earth and they stopped building the city.

Consequence: they were called 'Babel', because there Yahweh confused the language of all the inhabitants of the earth and from there he spread them over the face of the whole earth”.

Note:- God's “spirit” (life force; Gen. 8:3) drives apart “the flesh” for which he does not wish to be further responsible.-- Note: “Babel” meant “gate of the god(s)” (cf. “gates of hell” in Matt. 16:18), i.e., the place where the pagan deity “reigned” as an element of the(the) world. Of these, the tower - ziggurat - was “the holy mountain,” i.e., the point of concentration.

Spirit outpourings.

“Holy or God spirit”, as in Gen. 6:3 or Ps. 51 (50) :12vv, is the purely divine or rather supernatural life principle (sanctifying grace) added to the soul (nefesh). But “holy spirit” also means “charismatic spirit”, i.e. God's life force insofar as it also creates in man, gifts of grace - giftedness.

'Prophecy'. -- 'Clairvoyants' was the older term for “prophets” (1 Sam, 9:9; John 4:19). -- Listening to what Balaam says: “The eye that is unfailling. Hearing God's words. Seeing what Shaddai (God) shows. Getting through the divine answer (note: when the prophet consults God). The opening of the eyes. -- Knowing the knowing of the Most High”. (Num. 24:3f.; -- 24:15f.; -- 23:3f.). -- Behold what “the coming of the Spirit of God” works out about Balsam.

Prophecy as a general gift.

Num. 11:24/30 tells how Yahweh extends Moses' very special prophetic spirit (note : giftedness) to “seventy elders.” In which Moses, who was a very simple man, lets slip, “Ah, could the whole people of Yahweh be prophets by Yahweh giving them of his spirit”! (Num. 11:29).

Joël.

Moses' wishful thinking is resumed by the prophet Joël. In 3:1 it reads, “(Then) I (Yahweh) will pour out my spirit upon all flesh”

Note.

In light of Gen. 6:3, which remains the basic text of old and new covenant, it sounds surprising for there it reads, “That my spirit may not be indefinitely responsible for man (note: as a collective concept) since (better: inasmuch as) he is flesh.” -- “Flesh” is all that God considers “dead” and disregards the Decalogue as dead letter, as Jesus parable so brilliantly puts it, “A judge who did not respect God and did not bother with men” (Luk. 18:2; 16:4).

But Joël:

“Your sons and your daughters will 'prophecy' (note: be prophetically gifted). Your old people will see dreams.--your young people faces. Even over slaves and slave women -- in those doughs (note: in a later phase of sacred history) -- I will pour out my spirit.”

Note.- That includes that God is going to “pour out” “wisdom and revelation” (Eph. 1:18), “wisdom and miracle power” (Matt. 13:54) on a planetary scale over time

Moses and the other prophets.

Reading Num, 12:1ff. -- Miryam (a prophetess (Ex. 15:20)) and Aaron take issue with Moses for the reason of the kusitische woman (cf. Ex, 4: 24/26) whom he had taken to himself, “So Yahweh would speak only to Moses? Has he not also spoken to us?” Whereupon Yahweh said to both: “If there is a prophet among you, I reveal myself to him in a face, -- speak to him in a dream. -- So it is not with my servant Moses. -- All my house is entrusted to him (note : he deals with me confidentially): with him I speak from face to face (nota : directly, intimately),-- in a ready way and not in enigmatic utterances. And he sees the appearance of Yahweh (note : Yahweh 's glory) (...)”.

Ex. 33:11 (“Yahweh spoke to Moses from face to face”). -- ¬Ex 33:18ff, (“You cannot see my face for 'man' cannot see me nor survive”) among others show that, among the seers or prophets, Moses was first-rate. Moses will remain, in the long series of prophets, “the greatest” (Deut. 34:10).

Other prophets. – Clairvoyance is a multiform phenomenon.

For example, there are the seventy prophets who share Moses' gift (Num. 11:24f.), They “speak,” i.e. possess a gift that makes their words directly constitute God's words. In this sense one can already speak of a certain 'glossolalia' (speaking in tongues). Specifically, not speaking in a 'foreign' language, but speaking in such a way that the spoken language is not that of the visible and tangible human being, but of that human being as a mediator ('medium', we now say) of e.g. Yahweh.

1 Sam. 10:5/6 -- “As soon as you go into the city you will see a group of prophets coming from the sacrificial heights,--preceded by harp, tambourine, flute and zither, and they will be in rapture. Then “the spirit of Yahweh” (note: a spirit or force of life by him patient) shall seize you: with them shall ye also be enraptured, and turned into another man.” Thus the prophet Samuel to King Saul.

That type existed long in Israel (1 Kings, 18:4; 2 Kings 2:3; -- 1 Kings 22:10). It requires caveats because music and gestural play (1 Sam, 19:34: ritus paganus) do induce rapture, but do not guarantee “the father” (the inspirer) of inspiration.

The first spirit outpouring at Jerusalem.

Acts 2:1ff. -- All (Mary, the twelve, some other disciples: Acts 1:13) were gathered on Pentecost. About 9:00 a.m. (the third hour).-- Suddenly from heaven came a sound as of a violent wind which filled the whole house in which they were. They saw tongues appearing -- one would have said tongues of fire --: these spread out and one tongue set down on each of them. -- All were filled with the Holy Spirit (note : God's life force) and they began to speak in “other” (nota : foreign) languages as the spirit gave them interpretation.

Note: This is the glossolalia at Jerusalem (cf. 1 Cor. 14:2).

1. -- *The Pentecostal language miracle* is the counterpart of the “languages” of the Babylonian language confusion begotten by Yahweh (Gen. 11:11 11:6; 11:9): the pagan god-gate (domain of pagan entities) - Babylon - became by a God's judgment language confusion - Babylon -. Here the opposite occurs: mutual understanding.

2. -- *From heaven.* -- Jesus, after his last breath, descends into the subterranean regions to proclaim the glad tidings there also. Then he ascends into the heavenly regions to proclaim the same glad tidings there also.

Ps. 68(87):11f. says: “Do you perform miracles for the dead? The shadows: do they rise up to praise you? Do they speak in “the sepulchre” of thy truth (note: what thou revealst as truth) in the place of abaddon (destruction)? Does one know in the darkness thy wonders and in the land of forgetfulness thy righteousness?”.

In other words: in the final point of all that is 'flesh' (Gen 6:3), the underworld, there is absolute silence concerning God's miracles! Not so in the world of God's 'spirit' (Gen. 6:3) from heaven, from by the sky-god (Tobit 7:12; 7:16; 10:13), a glossolalia, the uttering of God's wonders (aretalogy), descends!

Note- The miracle of tongues and other gifts of spirit (charismata) are the effect of “holy or God's spirit” but e.g. in John 16:13 the third person of the Holy Trinity comes through in that “holy spirit”: “When he shall come, the Spirit of truth, he shall lead you into all truth; for he shall not speak of himself, but what he hears (note: coming from the Father and the Son) he shall say.”

“All peoples”

Acts 2:5f.

There were pious men living in Jerusalem from all the nations under the heavens. In response to the sound that occurred, the crowd ran and was amazed: each one heard them speaking in his own language! (...). Parthians, Medes and Elamites, inhabitants of Mesopotamia, Judea and Cappadocia, of Pontus and Asia, Phrygia in Pamphylia, Egypt and that part of Libya which borders on Cyrene, Romans residing here, both Jews and proselytes (i.e. non-Jews who had been circumcised), Cretans and Arabs: “We hear them proclaiming in our language the wonders of God”.

Note- As later in Cornelius' house, the content of the language spoken by the Holy Spirit (the Holy Spirit) is thoroughly the opposite of (the silence concerning God's wonders in) the sheol or underworld.

The essence of Christianity.

“Kèrugma” is, in ancient Greek, “message. “Christian kerugma” then expresses the essence of Christianity, i.e. that by which it is distinguishable from the rest. That kerugma exhibits two hatches.

Peter.

“Nay! These people are not drunk (...). But it is what the prophet Joel said, “It shall come to pass in the last days (note: in the end times) - so the Lord speaks - that I will pour out of my spirit (Gen. 6:3) upon all flesh (Gen. 6:3) (...).” Follows then the whole citation of Joel (see above), in which the “politically correct” (in Biblical language: knowing no respect for persons) stands out: men and women, old and young, even slaves and slave women are considered and this among all peoples.

1. - Jesus, sent by the Father.

Peter.-- Jesus was the man who made God credible in your midst by “dunameis” (powers), “terata” (impressive divine signs) and “sèmeia” (signs). (...). As ye yourselves know. This man who was delivered up according to a well-defined decree of counsel and God's foreknowledge, thou hast slain (...). But God raised him up ... from the torments of the underworld.--of this we are the witnesses (cf. 2 Pet. 1:16):

2. -- The Holy Spirit, sent by the Father and the Son. –

“Now, exalted by God's right hand, he has received from the Father the Holy Spirit -- as promised -- and poured him out. This is what you see and hear!

Caesarea: second spirit outpouring.

The painful transition from “narrow” Judaism to “the nations.

Peter, “the first pope” (according to the Catholics), struggled with it. For he was still stuck in “the precepts” of the world's elements.

1. -- Acts 10: 1ff.

Cornelius, Roman soldier, God-fearing (sympathizing with Judaism but uncircumcised), experiences an aretalogical moment. And this in the form of a “face”, (one of the forms of “spirit” predicted by Joel): “the angel of God” enters him around the ninth hour (15 h.), “He saw it clearly” (says Luke). The apparition calls out, “Cornelius!” The latter looks on and becomes anxious. “What is it, Lord?” “Your prayers and your generosity have gone up before God (cf. Tobit 12:12), and God remembers you. The latter lives by the sea with a certain Simon, a tanner:-- Cornelius carries out: the very next morning his messengers approach Joppa.

2. -- Acts 10:9ff.

Peter went into the grounds about the sixth hour (12 h.). To pray there. While one was preparing his food, an ecstasy overtook him: he sees heaven (note: not what e.g. rises from the earth and its underworld realms) opened and something - like a large sheet hung at the four ends - descending to earth. In it: all kinds of four-footed in crawling animals and all the birds of the heavens. A voice: “Come, Peter! Slaughter and eat”. “Ah, no, Lord! For I have never eaten anything defiled or unclean”.

Note - One reads e.g. Lev. 11 (Precepts concerning 'clean' and 'unclean' animals) or Col. 2:16 (Matters of food and drink) or even Col. 2: 21 (“Do not take hold of it! Do not taste it! Do not touch it!”). In other words: the precepts of “the elements of this world”! Peter is a right-believing Jew.

The voice: “What God has purified, do not call it tainted!”. This occurred three times. Immediately thereafter, the sheet was raised to heaven. Peter was perplexed.

Peter is “transgressing the precepts.”

We are faced here with a synchrony similar to that in Tobit 3:17: at that very moment Cornelius' envoy arrives. “The spirit” (“the angel”) said, “Behold: there are men coming to see you. Go and descend and go with them without hesitation! It is I who have sent them”.

The following day Peter leaves. A day later he arrived in Caesarea. With family members and intimate friends, Cornelius was waiting for him. Peter said, “Ye know it: for a Jew it is utterly forbidden to associate with a Gentile or to come to his house But God has just made known to me that one should not call any man defiled or unclean.”

Peter's exposition. -- “I note that God really knows no regard for any person (cf. Mal. 2:9; Matt. 22:16) but that in every nation the one who 'fears' God and lives conscientiously is pleasing to him.”

Note- This is apparently the eternal covenant (Is. 24:5) active in the law written in the hearts of the Gentiles (Rom. 2:14f.).

As Peter himself, Acts 15:9, says, “God purified their hearts by faith viz. the hearts of the nations. What in ecclesiastical language is called the baptism of holy spirit and desire.

The essence of Christianity. -- Trinitarian in two parts.

1. -- The Son.

Peter. -- Thou knowest what took place in all Judea: Jesus of Nazareth. His beginning appearance in Galilee - after the baptism proclaimed by John (the Baptist) -: how viz. God anointed him with holy spirit and power (cf. Matt. 3:16). He who went about doing good and healing all who had fallen into the power of the devil (cf. Matt 4:1/11; John 8:44). For God was with him. We: we are the witnesses (Acts 1:8; 2 Pet 1:16) of all that he did in the land of the Jews and in Jerusalem.

The servant of the Lord. -- He whom one dared to kill by hanging him on the cross-roads. But God caused him to be resurrected the third day. (Note: Is. 52:13/53:12: ebed Yahweh). - And made him appear not to all the people but to witnesses whom God had chosen beforehand,--to us who ate and drank with him after his resurrection from the dead. (...).

2. -- The Holy Spirit.

Peter was still expounding when the Holy Spirit (Gen. 6:3) descended upon all (Joel 3:1 “all flesh” (Gen, 6:3)) who heard the word. -- All the circumcised people who had come with Peter were horrified to see the gift of the Holy Spirit poured out on the Gentiles as well. -- Christianity knows no regard for the word and is therefore “politically correct.”

The miracle of tongues.

Indeed, they heard them speaking in tongues and praising God.-- To which Peter said, "Can one refuse the water of baptism to those who have received the Holy Spirit as much as we have?" He ordered them to be baptized "in the name of Jesus Christ."

Note.- Spirit baptism or outpouring here precedes ecclesiastical ritual baptism! In other words: the baptism of holy spirit and desire, typical of conscientious and God-believing pagans, was necessary and sufficient condition for the Holy Spirit with his gifts to descend and show the way to the typical ecclesiastical baptism that ecclesiastically "valorizes" the baptism of holy spirit and desire.

Also about the 'Johannites'.

Acts, 19:1ff. -- Ephesus, third largest city of Roman empire, after Rome and Alexandria.

Multicultural venue.-- Paul meets some disciples there: "Have you received the Holy Spirit when you have accepted the faith?" "We have not even heard that there is a Holy Spirit!" "What baptism then have ye received?" "The baptism of John (the Baptist)." Paul: "John baptized with a baptism of repentance while also telling the people to believe in him who would come after him, that is, in Jesus." Thereupon they were baptized "in the name of the Lord Jesus," and, when Paul had laid hands on them, the Holy Spirit came upon them and they began to speak in tongues and to prophesy. -- In all, these men were a dozen.

Note.-- The Johannites were no longer true Jews. Were not Christians either. And were certainly not Gentiles. --Then the judge over the living and the dead who is Jesus poured out the Holy Spirit over them! Without many "formalities," Paul, inspired by Jesus, goes about his business.

It is remarkable: we know that Paul was rather reserved about charisms (spiritual gifts) (as 1 Cor 13:1/13 makes clear). But look: such is Paul's association of ritual baptism with the gift of the Holy Spirit that his question reads, "Have you received the Holy Spirit when you have accepted faith?" Faith, i.e., what characterized Abraham, the "father" of believers, seems to go hand in hand with Holy Spirit. Have we, present-day Christians, not forgotten this connection a little too much so that Joel's prophecy concerning spirit over all flesh is dwarfed?

The prompted speaking.

The spirit of wisdom and revelation has at its disposal, in addition to actual, highly irrational glossolalia, another type of “language speaking.

1. -- *The son speaks in and through the believer.* -- “The hour is coming (and it is here now) when 'the dead' (note: all those who lack God's spirit or life force) will hear the voice of the son of God” (John 5:25). -- Luk, 20:14f.: “Remember it well: you must not make your defenses preliminary, for I (Jesus) will give you a language and a wisdom to which none of your opponents will be able to resist (...)”.

Jesus hears within himself the voice of the Father “(...) me, a man, who told you the truth which I heard from God” (John 8:40). “I judge according to what I hear (note : from the Father; Jn. 5:30).

Note- “When ye (note: unbelieving Jews) shall have lifted up the son of man (note: on the cross), then shall ye realize that 'I am' and that I do nothing of myself but say what the Father hath taught me” (John 8:28f.).

Note- “I am” (Ex 10:2; Is. 43:12) denotes the very 'name' of God (the Father), i.e., God as eternally present who asserts Himself again and again in His government of the universe (“kingdom of God”). Jesus is thus, with the Father, the eternally present one who is active.

2. -- The Holy Spirit speaks in and through the believer.

Matt 10:17f: “When they shall deliver you up, do not seek as anxious men how to speak or what to say. What you have to say will be given to you at the moment. For it is not you who shall speak but the Spirit of your Father who shall speak in you.” Mark, 13:11 and especially Luk. 12:12 affirm : “For the Holy Spirit will teach you at that hour what must be said.”

Note - “The assistance (speaker) - the Holy Spirit - whom the Father will send in my name, he will teach you everything” (John 14:26). “When the assistance I will send you from the Father, the spirit of truth that comes from the Father, he will testify for me” (John 15:26) -- “The spirit of truth: he will lead you into all truth, for he will not speak by himself, but what he will hear he will say” (John 16:13).

Behold the teaching on the inner voice and word of scripture.