

## ***Course 6.2.1. Introduction to Hiëro-analysis 1984/1985 (120 p.)***

### ***Foreword : The lemmatic-analytic method (1/8)***

The term 'hiëro-analysis' has two components.

- (i) 'hiëro-' (from the ancient Greek 'hiëros' (Lat.: sacer), sacred);
- (ii) 'analysis' (from the ancient Greek 'analysis', dissection) together make up the main idea of this text, namely the analysis (further clarification) of the initially vague concept of 'sacred'.

The method followed in these pages is, indeed, the lemmatical-analytical method, named after Platon of Athens (427/347), who must have spoken explicitly about it first. Indeed, Diogenes Laërtios (between +200 and +300), 3:24, reports: "(Platon) gave, as the first, the examination by the analysis to the Thasian Leodamas".

(i) The starting point of the investigation - says Platon - is a lemma, i.e. a suspected, assumed idea (which, in the terms of C.S.S. Peirce (1839/1914), would be called 'abduction' or, simply, hypothesis).

(ii) The research itself is, then, the dissection of a structure (i.e. a set of relations), which further elucidates the lemma.

### ***First type of hiëro-analysis.***

The Belgian Count Eugène Goblet d'Alviella (°1846), in his *Croyances, rites, institutions*, (Beliefs, rites, institutions), 3 vols., Paris, 1911 (and, earlier, at the Third International Congress on the History of Religions, Oxford (190B)), proposed the following threefold scheme of analysis.

#### ***1. Hiërography.***

This first step describes, in a critical manner,

- (i) the religious ('hiëro-analytical') facts and
- (ii) their geographical distribution.

One can compare this with the purely descriptive phenomenology of Edmund Husserl (1859 / 1938).

#### ***2. Hiërology.***

This phase:

- (i) synchronic, classifies the facts (typology of the sacred) and
- (ii) diachronic, makes up the order of appearance, preferably from the origin.

Only typology can be compared, somewhat, with Husserlian eidetic (ideative) phenomenology, which analyses both being and types.

### **3. *Hiërosophy.***

This step dares to make a ‘metaphysical’ judgment both of the value of truth (theoretical, epistemological) and of the value of life (general axiological or value theoretic).

In other words, here phenomenology is transcended by an explanation which no longer lies in the facts (phenomena) presented. In ancient Greek terms: from the ‘fanera’ (the manifest facts) to the ‘adèla’ (the invisible, speculatively assumed interpretation).

#### ***Assessment.***

This method is solid, as a starting point. After all, it first of all dwells on what is given. This we call thematic (outlining the theme or subject well).

But there is, at least in the program statement, virtually no mention of the overall analysis as a reductive structure.

#### ***Second type of analysis.***

Father I.M. Bochenski, o.p., *Wijsgerige methoden in de moderne wetenschap*, (Philosophical methods in modern science), Utr./ Antw., 1961, 125/171 (The reductive methods), gives us a second scheme of work, which, on closer inspection, is merely the further structuring of the Platonic lemmatical-analytical one. -- We summarize it, somewhat in our way, but faithfully.

#### ***Applicative model.***

We give, first, the New Testament text (Matt 2:1/12). “And when Jesus was born in Bethlehem, in the days of king Herod, behold, there came magi (in Greek: magoi’) from the east into Jerusalem. They said: “Where is the prince of the Jews, who has just been born? For we have seen his star in the east. We have come, therefore, to worship him”.

When King Herod heard about this, he felt a shudder, which also ran through all Jerusalem. He therefore gathered together all the chief priests and scribes and asked them where exactly the Christ was to be born. They answered: “In Bethlehem of Judah! For by the prophet (Mik 5:1) the following is written: “And you, Bethlehem, land of Judah, you are indeed not the least among the chief towns (‘klans’) of Judah.

From thee shall come forth a prince, who shall be the shepherd (= leader) of Israel, my people”.

Then Herod secretly summoned the magicians and informed himself, from their mouths, of the exact time when the star had appeared to them. He sent them to Bethlehem, with the order:

“Go with care to inquire about the child. When you have found it, report it to me, for I will worship it in my turn”. After these words of the prince, they went on their way. And behold, the star which they had seen in the east went before them, until they stopped at the place where the child was. When they saw the star, they were beside themselves with joy.

They entered the sanctuary and saw the child with his mother, Mary. They prostrated themselves on the ground and worshipped the child. Then they opened their chests and offered the child gold, frankincense and myrrh as a gift.

After this, being warned in a dream not to seek Herod any more, they departed, by another route, back to their country”.

**Note..:**

1. ‘Magos’, magician, among the ancient Greeks, means ‘priestly interpreter of dreams’ among the Medes (an ancient people, situated in present-day Iran, around Ekbatana, their capital) or, also, among the Persians (whose then territory, approximately, comprised that of present-day Iran);-- in the broad (analogous) sense, it simply meant ‘one, experienced in magic (‘magic’).

These ‘wise men’ (note: - ‘wise’ meant, in archaic cultures, ‘gifted with deeper insight’) were, on several occasions, versed in astrology (Is 47:1) and were also called ‘Chaldeans’ (Dan 2:2). They were, also in Israel, originally referred to as ‘from the East’.

2. Biblical-theological speaking, Matthew paints Jesus here as the salvation offered to the Gentiles, whom he attracts by his light.

**3A. Seeing' as a mantic (Greek term) and/or 'charismatic' phenomenon.**

(i) In ancient Greek, 'manteuo' is 'I act as seer(s)'; 'mantis' means 'seer(s)'; 'mantikè technè' (ars divinationis) is 'the ability (and, immediately, the 'art' or 'skill') to see (in the psychic or 'sensitive' sense)!

(ii) Biblically interpreted, this is what is called 'wisdom as divine charism (gift of grace with a view to communion)' (G. van Rad, *Theologie des Alten Testaments*, (Old Testament Theology), 1/11, Munich, 1961,-- I, 440 (in the context of 'Die theologische Weisheit Israels'), (The Theological Wisdom of Israel);-- II, 314 ff. (Daniel und die Apokalyptik)), (Daniel and the Apocalyptic).

### **1. God-given 'wisdom**

Characteristic of the apocalyptic (secrets-revealing) form of God-given 'wisdom' (here, in contrast to priestly, 'prophetic' and simply sapiëntial (wisdom-giving) functions) is, according to van Rad, among other things, the seeing of connections between 'cosmic' (i.e. taking place in extra-human nature) and 'human' ('historical') phenomena (cfr., II, 315;320 (footnote 12, where van Rad, an expert, expressly speaks of 'astral-geographic' representations (in connection with Dan 8:2)); 321 (where van Rad speaks of 'cosmological gnosis "esoteric knowledge"').

### **2. World empires ('imperia')**

Also characteristic of the apocalyptic wisdom form is the view of the world empires ('imperia') as interrelated powers, having an origin, a being and a goal (o.c.,II, 317). In other words, while the priests, the prophets and, in part, the 'wise men' (in the stricter sense) are situated within the 'chosen people' (the Jews), the wise men and, especially, the apocalyptic wise men are situated on a planetary scale: all peoples, especially all great political power formations ('empires'), make up the 'element' (the sphere of life and thought) in which they feel at home.

### **3. The evil that works itself out.**

It is particularly characteristic that, according to the apocalypticists, the evil which is potentially present in the 'realms' from their inception will work itself out, in a long process, i.e. a determined event), until it reaches its full measure, foreseen from the beginning, or, as Daniel, both prophet and sage and apocalypticist, says: "( ... ) until the end of their exercise of power, i.e. the time of the 'fullness' (understand: full measure) of their sins". (Dan 8:23; G.v.Rad, II,317).

**Note:** From the references:

1. the system of world empires and
2. the evil situated in all human beings, but especially in their 'kingdoms', as a process, we now understand why Matthew, who only becomes intelligible in this apocalyptic wisdom, after describing (Mt 1:1/25) Jesus' person as 'son of David and son of God', describes Jesus' mission to the Gentiles in particular.

**3b. The astrological aspect.**

1. *La Bible de Jérusalem*, Paris, 1978, 1416, n.m., says that the star (celestial body) was 'un astre miraculeux' (a miraculous star), "of which it would be useless to seek a 'natural' explanation". In other words, the 'seeing' of the star was a mantic (Greek) or charismatic (Biblical) 'seeing'.

2. (a) G.v.Rad, II, 320, n. 12, refers to Dan 8:2/27

a. The 'seeing' ('vision') of (the fight between) the ram (cf. Ezek 34:17f; Zak 10:3) and the goat (idem); b. The interpretation of the angel Gabriel).

The ram, i.e. the Persians and the Medes, is, astrologically, the fact that the country (and its population) is "gewissen Sternbildern zugeordnet" (belonging to certain constellations); so is the buck, i.e. the empire of Alexander the Great (the 'Greek' empire). Thus G.v.Rad, *ibid* .

This is one applicative model of seeing connections between cosmic and human phenomena, typical of apocalyptic wisdom, as G.v.Rad, I, 447, says.

3. Now we fully understand the structure of what Matthew, in his account of the visit of the magi (or astrologers), says. There is a connection between the cosmos (here: the star) and Jesus.

**Regulative model.**

Only now - after the above remarks - can we grasp the reductive reasoning, which the magicians, apparently, carried out. We summarize its phases as follows.

**(a) Perception.**

'Perception' - in reductive reasoning - is the description of:

- a. the given (theme) and
- b. The demanded (problem), i.e. the initial situation.

**(A)I.-- Theme.**

The subject (theme) is:

- (i) at some point in time (diachronic situating),
- (ii) somewhere ‘in the East’ (synchronic setting),
- (iii) the magicians (acting persons),
- (iv) who, in the firmament, ‘see’ a star (‘appear’) (observation, action),
- (v) which they interpret as the image (‘model’), in the starry cosmos, of the birth of the prince of the Jews, somewhere in Israel (interpretation, i.e. lemma (hypothesis), of the phenomena observed).

Expressed in antique, princely terms: the rising star ‘signifies’ the ‘epiphania’ (showing oneself in power) of a prince). This evokes the astrological birth moment.

**(A)ii.-- Problem.**

The question, already answered in the interpretation, is (but now more clearly stated): this observation, with its interpretation, is a lemma. Can this lemma (assumption, hypothesis) be confirmed (verification)?

**(B) Reduction.**

According to Fr. I.M. Bochenski (see H.-A.2), the reductive method proceeds in the following “steps” (phases of reasoning).

**(B)I.-- The regressive reduction.**

Using a term of C.C.S. Peirce (1839/1914), the American Pragmaticist, one can speak of ‘abductive reduction’ (abbreviated to abduction). “The regressive reduction is called ‘explanation’” (Bochenski, o.c.,126).

(i) The great regulative principle of all explanation (interpretation) of something is: “If I accept the interpretation (provisionally, yet, a hypothesis), then, at least for me, the phenomenon (the thing stated) becomes meaningful (understandable, intelligible, -- intelligible, as one says in tradition)”. This is also called principle of (necessary and) sufficient reason (ground, condition). The interpretation (lemma) is, after all, the collection of the (separately) necessary and (jointly) sufficient conditions (reasons, grounds) of what appears (= observed phenomenon).

(ii) The application here: If, according to the rules of play of (mantic-charismatic) seeing, there is, indeed, in Israel, an epiphany (incipient appearance) of its sovereign, then this observed phenomenon (with its interpretation) makes sense (understandable)”.

**(B) II --The progressive reduction.**

“This progressive reduction is called ‘verification’”. (Bochenski, o.c.,126). ‘Checking’ is another name.

(i) The regulative principle of the “test-on-the-sum” reads as follows: “If our hypothesis is correct, then it is worth designing a test”. This can be called the principle of the meaningfulness of a test design.

(ii) Here: “If the star we have observed really is an astrological model of the epiphany of the Prince of Israel, then it is worthwhile to go on a journey, to check our lemma, on the spot, with new observations”. - This step is called deductive reduction (from probability one deduces the meaningfulness of the test).

(iii) The second stage of progressive reduction is called peirastic (testing) reduction. This can be two-fold: verification (if the prospect comes true, then there is confirmation) or falsification (if the designed validity comes out to be false).

### ***Explanation***

P. Bochenski, o.c., 77, explains what “verification” is.

He follows Hans Reichenbach (1891/1953), one of the members of the Wiener Kreis (Logical Positivism). He distinguishes four types.

#### **a. *The logical verification.***

“If  $a + b = c$ , then  $b + a = c$ ” contains no logical or thought contradiction (incongruity, absurdity). Consequently, on examination, under that point of view, one concludes to its correctness (= logically verified).

#### **b.1. *The physical verification.***

If a hypothesis does not conflict with the laws of physics, it is ‘physically’ verifiable. For example, the temperature of the solar nucleus.

#### **b.2. *The technical verification.***

E.g. the solar core temperature is physically verifiable, but, with the present techniques, impossible to verify. Reason: the heat is too great!

#### **b.3. *The transempirical verification.***

The physical and technical verifications are empirical. However - as Reichenbach points out as an applicative model - the verification of a statement like “The cat is a divine being”, is either physically or technically unverifiable.

Yet - and Bochenski points out the logical inconsistency with his positivist attitude of mind (which, normally, accepts only either logical or physical and/or technical verifications) - the logical-empiricist that is Reichenbach somewhere accepts a type of verification that goes beyond his personal philosophy.

Indeed, as Bochenski, o.c. 78, says, there are types of observation. One could speak of a sensory (and that is Reichenbach's empirical), an introspective (or 'reflexive'), a phenomenological (i.e. containing insight into beings) and a - what Bochenski calls - 'transnatural' ('nature' exceeding and/or transcending) assessment. - So much for the regulatory model of review.

**(iv) *The review, here, is as follows.***

**a.** The finding of the child, with his mother, Mary, is apparently a physical (sense-perception) verification.

**b.1.** The fact that the prophetic writings of the Old Testament do, indeed, foresee the birth of a prince - and this in Bethlehem - is a transempirical verification. Only those who believe in mantra (prophecy) will accept as verification the assertions of the chief priests and scribes (H.-A. 2), who base themselves on a scriptural text. Cf. 2 Peter 1:16/21.

**b.2.** The fact that the mantic or charismatic sighting of the star, once they went from Jerusalem to Bethlehem, becomes perceptible again, is, clearly, again, a transempirical test,--only plausible to those who assume mantic or charismatic sighting. Cfr. Matt 2:9 (H.-A. 3).

***Conclusion.***

It is quite clear - at least to those who read the text without prejudices of enlightenment - that the magicians carried out a reductive reasoning by setting out to verify (test) on the spot whether a prince had indeed been born in Israel at the very moment when a star appeared.

Immediately we have a structure: the reductive analysis.



## **I.-- *The sacred as lemma (working hypothetical idea).***

### ***Introduction.***

P. H. Pinard de la Boullaye, *L'étude comparée des religions*, (The comparative study of religions,), II (Ses méthodes), (Its methods), Paris, 1929-3, 50/57, adopts the threefold method of E. Goblet d'Alviella (H.-A.1v.).

If we use the structure-typological language of Wilhelm Dilthey (1833/1911), the founder of the science of understanding, and of Eduard Spranger (1882/1963), his comrade in understanding, then we can say that Pinard de la Boullaye distinguishes structure types, as follows:

1. Basic phenomenon is the religious or religious man.
2. Related phenomenon is the occultist (spiritist, magician, etc.) and, more recently, the neo-sacralist (hippy, etc.).
3. Opposite, but without contradiction, is the profane man (layman; e.g. the industrial worker, the manager, the university professor, the politician, the syndicalist, etc.).
4. Opposed, but not without a moment of contradiction, is the agnostic (who claims "not to know").
5. Opposite, but with (if need be aggressive) contradiction, is the atheist (godless, god denier).

Both of the latter types come, regularly, from what is called Enlightenment (Enlightenment, Lumières, Aufklärung) or Rationalism.

P. Wilhelm Schmidt (1868/1954), S.V.D., once the director of the Pontifical Ethnological Museum (Rome), in his *Origine et évolution de la religion* (Les théories et les faits), (Origin and evolution of religion (Theories and facts)), Paris, 1931,18s,

(i) does not hide the fact that he is not very fond of d'Alviella's hiëro-analysis (apparently because he prefers the Supreme Being - and even then in a strongly biblical sense - as the main theme of religion research),

(ii) yet explicitly admits that "there is, indeed, much to be said in favor of d'Alviella's study of the sacred". This, -- apparently, because the sacred -- however it may be (for there are many interpretations of it) is and remains undeniably central to all religion.

**Note** -- Human scientists especially have, in recent decades, introduced two terms, which are meaning related:

- (i) 'Sacred' is the 'sacred' insofar as it is the product of sacralization.
- (ii) "Sacralization" is the act of ascribing some kind of "sanctity" (so-called projective sanctity) to a profane reality;--i.e., when, in a left-wing terrorist group, whatever the person in charge says or does is considered "absolutely serious" by the others. In that case, the commander is 'sacred' (but not 'holy').

**Note** -- Scottish Philosophy (Common Sense Philosophy), with as its forerunner Claude Buffier (1661/1737), S.J. (with his *Traité des premières vérités* (Treatise on the First Truths), (1717)) and as its founder Thomas Reid (1710/1796), with his *An Inquiry into the Human Mind on the Principles of Common Sense* (1764), has, in full Enlightenment-Rationalist times, drawn attention to common sense. -- Not to be confused with common sense (which means the ‘healthy’ use of common sense).

Indeed, the average person (‘the man of the street’ or, more to the left, ‘the man in the street’) has insights that are worth their weight in gold. Also, and not least, when it comes to the sacred. Reason: he or she has not absorbed too much of the ‘criticism’ of the Enlighteners.

Yet one observation must temper the appreciation of the common sense, namely that the common man is characterized by linguistic imprecision. One looks at the language use of the common man regarding the sacred.

### **1. *The Objective Sanctity Phenomena.***

**1.a.** All phenomena that command reverence, yes, veneration: “A holy silence hung over the Christmas landscape, with its white snow”; “Marriage as the indissoluble bond of the married was ‘holy’ to her/him”;

**1.b. (i)** Anything that, by virtue of an ordaining act, commands reverence or veneration: “The sacred vessels, in the sacristy, are surrounded with care”; “The priest administered to her/him the holy oil of the sick”; “The newly ordained priest”;

**(ii)** Everything that, through contact with what is ‘holy’, commands reverence or veneration: “The ancient Germanic people did not enter their sacred groves without shuddering”; “The Christians venerate the holy places in Jerusalem”;

**1.c.** Everything which, whether by reason of charisma or canonization, commands reverence or veneration: “Saint Joan of Arc was reviled many times in her day, but can be canonized by the Church in the twentieth century”; “The saints of the liturgical year are, nowadays, less esteemed”;

**1.d.** Everything which, by virtue of its essential (the essence inherent in it) quality, commands reverence and veneration: “The Most Holy Trinity is the center of the New Testament religion”; “The Holy Virgin Mary is called ‘the Mother of God’”.

## **2. *The subjective phenomena of holiness.***

Anything so 'mean' ('motivated') that it appears or behaves as if it springs from reverence and worship: "She/he was holy indignant ('annoyed')".

### ***Conclusion***

Relying on the commonsense philosophy can at best be accepted as a lemma (and then a lemma that is canned in sometimes confusing language). That is all.

The rather desacralizing language of the human scientists, who see too many 'projections' at work, without any real perception of the sacred, cannot be taken as an indisputable fact, either.

### ***The phenomenological approach.***

C.J. Bleeker, *De structuur van de religie (Hoofdlijnen ener fenomenologie van de godsdienst)*, (The structure of religion (Main lines and phenomenology of religion)), The Hague, s.d., 20v., summarizes the phenomenological method as conceived by Gerardus van der Leeuw (1890/1950), *Phänomenologie der Religion*, (Phenomenology of Religion), Tübingen, 1956- 2, 768 /777.

#### **1. *Linguistic moment.***

The phenomenologist gives names to the phenomena ('phenomena'); for example, 'the sacred'. In doing so, he starts, as good as ever, from common-sense language, of course.

#### **2.a. *Moment of understanding***

He brings the phenomenon, by the term of language, provisionally, designated, into his own, intimate life (what, since especially W. Dilthey and E. Spranger, is called 'verstehen' (understanding). This implies that one does not try to process the phenomenon - here: the sacred - in a merely detached-critical, nor merely naive-religious way, but with an open mind and spirit (with the necessary 'sumpatheia', 'sympathy', the ancient Greeks would have said).-- This is the understanding moment.

#### **2.b. *Eidetic (ideative) moment***

From the empirical data, which, in that intimate contact with the phenomena (here, e.g. the seeing of the star of Bethlehem), show themselves, he expels all that is non-essential, i.e. not peculiar to the phenomenon as such,-- leaving only the generally occurring essentials (common characteristics). This is the eidetic (ideational) moment.

Thus, for example, a recurrent characteristic of the sacred - at least in its true form - is that it is “something real”.

Rudolf Otto (1869/1937), *Het heilige (Een verhandeling over het irrationele in de idee van het goddelijke en de verhouding ervan tot het rationele)*, (The Holy (A Treatise on the Irrational in the Idea of the Divine and its Relation to the Rational)), Hilversum, 1963, (*Das Heilige* (1917-1)), 16, quotes the great psychologist of religion, William James (1842/1910), *The Varieties of Religious Experience* (1902-1):

“William James, for example, says, in this book, when he discusses, in passing, the origin of the Greek representations of the gods, almost naively: ‘On the question of the origin of the Greek gods, we cannot, here, enter. But the whole series of our examples leads us, more or less, to the following conclusion: it is as if, in human consciousness, there is a perception of something real,-- a feeling of something actually existing,-- a representation of something objectively existing’. This is deeper and more general - more valid than some single or particular sensation, which - according to the view of present-day psychology - proves reality.”

### **2.c. Structural typological moment.**

The phenomenologist - at least in the form given to it by van der Leeuw - tries to understand the meaning, i.e. the value of life, of the **(i)** understood and **(ii)** eidetically regarded being.

Eduard Spranger, for example, describes the soul structure as a type of religious man:

**(i)** The believer, in the healthy sense, has as his pre-eminent value, for and from which he ‘lives’, God; all other values of life - economics, social life, politics, science and the like - have, for the truly religious soul, a value only in so far as they resemble or go together with (structure, Gestalt) God as the highest value.

This, according to Spranger, occurs in many forms, as exemplified by the well-known saints: Francis of Assisi, Ignatius of Loyola, Theresa, Thomas Aquinas, Vincent a Paulo.

**(ii)** The superstitious - in Spranger’s eyes: a degenerate - is also, in his soul or I, so structured: he ‘lives’ to serve his superstitious practices or to ‘live’ from them as if they were the ‘only’ or, at least, ‘highest value’.

One sees it: in the Sprangerian sense, the ‘sense’ is the answer to the question: “Tell me what you value - here; under religious point of view - this is: tell me what and what you live for, and I will tell you who (type of soul structure) you are”. -- This is the structure-typical moment.

## **2.d. Reductive moment.**

The phenomenologist compares the insight he has gained (eidetical and structure-typological) with the historical (e.g. archaeological) and philological (= linguistic and literary) factual material, with the aim of testing (verification, falsification (H.-A.7v.)) his results. E.g. the philological method specifies the Latin term 'religio'.

(i) Some - already in Roman antiquity - see in it the term "re.linquo" (I forsake, I leave), so that "religio" would mean the reservation observed with regard to sacred or sacred phenomena; others - e.g. Saint Augustine of Tagaste (+354 / +430), the greatest church father of the West - see in it "re. eligo" (I choose again), so that 'religio' would mean 'return (conversion) to God'; still others see 're.ligo' (I bind), so that 'religio' would mean 'binding (obligation, relationship) to the sacred (i.e. God).

(ii) Strictly linguistically, 'religio' is the noun of 're.lego' (I treat reverently, circumspectly), so that 'religio' means "circumspect treatment (ranging from reverence and worship to fearfulness) of the sacred".

Only this last explanation is scientifically justified, whereas the previous ones are based on (pious) imagination. (H. Pinard d.l.Boullaye, 11, 156).

It is clear that the etymology - but the scientifically justified one - involves a verification of the idea "sacred", as was shown by the experience (the understanding moment; H.-A.11) and the ideation (the eidetic moment; H.-A.11v.).

In this sense philology is an auxiliary science and (understanding) phenomenology becomes interdisciplinary.-- This is the reductive moment.

### **Conclusion.**

1.-- It is clear that Van der Leeuw's phenomenology, besides pure phenomenological description and ideation, also combines understanding with structure-type understanding of the mind.

2.-- It is also 'bearing witness to what shows itself' (according to van der Leeuw himself, o.c., 777), i.e. verbalizing (pronouncing) the phenomenon as purely as possible.

## **II.a.-- *The analysis: the four moments of Christianity.***

O. Willmann (1839/1920), the great Catholic educator, in his monumental work *Geschichte des Idealismus*, (History of Idealism), 3 Bde, Braunschweig, 1907-2, II (Der Idealismus der Kirchenväter und der Realismus der Scholastik), (The Idealism of the Church Fathers and the Realism of Scholasticism), 9, sketches the essence of Catholicism in masterly summary terms.

Says Willmann: “The four great activities - in particular: the four forms of openness of Christian consciousness (= self-consciousness) - are determined by the four moments of Christianity:

- a1.** the predestination of salvation in the history of salvation preceding Christianity,
- a2.** the historical entry of this salvation into time,
- a3.** the uninterrupted continuation of that same foundation of salvation,--
- b.** together with its root in the super temporal sphere”.

### ***In other words:***

**(i)** there is this “historical” (i.e., earthly, visible and tangible) side, -- now also called the “secular” side, and

**(ii)** there is the ‘transcendental’ (meaning: transcending this earth with its visible and tangible realities) side, now also called the ‘sacred’ side.

And, in the first, the historical-earthly dimension, Christianity extends both into the past and into the future.

What interests us now, in this context, is the dimension of pre-Christian and extra-Christian religions, which can be placed precisely in those times situated before Christianity. In Willmann’s view, these religions belong to Christianity in a particular sense.

### ***Historical verification (1): Augustine of Tagaste***

Augustine (H.-A.13) holds an analogous (partly identical partly non-identical) idea. In his famous work *De civitate Dei* (On the State of God (begun in 413 and finished in 426)), Saint Augustine distinguishes three historical and also salvationist types of Rome:

#### **(i) *The ‘ancient’ (‘aloud’, archaic) Rome, which:***

- a.** was gifted with sound qualities and
- b.** had not without God’s permission founded an empire which became the center of humanity;

#### **(ii) “Decayed” (pagan) Rome, which;**

- a.** turned the Christians into blood-witnesses and
- b.** relied on demonic deities as its ‘last refuge’.

### **(III) *Christian Rome,***

of which Augustine saw the beginning and which:

- a. elevated the solid qualities and the salvific role of the 'ancient' nature of being
- b. elevated to the higher plane of Christian salvation.

Willmann specifies: "Just as Augustine did not deny Greek 'wisdom' (meaning primarily Greek thought) the fact of having prepared Christian truth through its thought work, so too he could not deny the natural solidity and energy of the Roman people the fact that they had somehow been attuned to 'the fullness of times' (meaning Christianity)". (O. Willmann, o.c.,306).

#### ***Conclusion:***

Augustine, the great Church Father of the Christian West, saw, both in ancient Hellas and in ancient Rome, not only what was contrary to Christianity, but also (and not in the least degree) what either went together with or resembled it (i.e. a structure (H.-A.12)).

It is this structure, which Willmann just summarized and which we take as our guide, in our hiëro-analysis, as far as it concerns non-biblical or, better, non-Christian religious phenomena.

By their (i) similarity and (ii) coherence - with the Christian mystery of salvation they belong to one and the same coherence or gestalt.

#### ***Historical verification (2): Agostino Steuco (= Steuchus)***

Agostino (+1550) was born of poor parents and was a deformed man who, with the Conventuels of Gubio, his native city, was admitted to the Latin School after long begging. However, after seven years of hard study, he often mastered Hebrew, Syriac, Arabic and Greek by night, under the light of the church lamp.

This achievement led Pope Paul III to appoint him both bishop and custodian of the Vatican library.

Among his many works, his *De perenni philosophia*, Lyon, 1540 (On the 'eternal' philosophy) interests us.

***By the way:*** This is also a title (*philosophia perennis*'), which G.W. Leibniz (1646/1716) took for his account, because its basic idea "answered a need". (O. Willmann, o.c., 172f.).

O. Willmann, O.c.,174, quotes from the opening chapter, *De successu doctrinae ab exordio mundi* (On the progress ('successus') of doctrine, from the world's beginning): "Just as there is only one principle of all things, so there was and is, from time immemorial, only one knowledge of that one principle of all things; - at least, so it appears from the written legacies of nations".

The content of those legacies is the truth. Traces of this truth content can be found everywhere: "We find that 'veritatis vestigia', fragments of truth, are spread among all peoples" (ibid.). (ibid.).

What is needed is

(i) the detection (heuristics) and

(ii) to work out the analysis of their consonance and similarity. Hence the other title of *De perenni philosophia*, namely *conformationes*, i.e. conjunctions (of apparently divergent data). In other words, the tracing and demonstrating of that one structure which Willmann typifies as 'the four moments' of the Christian self-concept.

In doing so, Steuco follows what both the Greek (Klemens of Alexandria (+215), Eusebios of Kaisareia (265/340)) and the Latin (Augustine of Tagus (354/430)) had already done. In this sense, he is traditional.

However, in more than one respect, Steuco goes further than these illustrious predecessors. Thus, for example, they had already taken as their task among the heathens the 'logos spermatikos' (literally: the Logos (here Christ, the Son of God, is meant, as the light of thinking spirits)) tracing.

Thus, for example, Ioastinas, a philosopher born of Greek parents and living in Palestine around +150, had already asserted that:

(i) all truth - at least in its deepest root - derives from the logos, Christ, and

(ii) it was already at work, a seed like (spermatikos), in people like Pythagoras of Samos (-580/-500) or Platon of Athens (-427/-347), as in Moses. Which Steuco adopts.

**But** - and here he exceeds his predecessors - Steuco distinguishes, more clearly, Eastern sacred wisdom from ancient, Greco-Western philosophy as a forerunner of Christianity. In this sense he is innovative.



### **Conclusion**

Steuco's position, which could not have come about without the active collaboration of the Pope of the day - *De perenni philosophia* is dedicated to Paul III - has Willmann writing:

(i) In this way he keeps himself free from the one-sidedness of traditionalism, as it appears in the XIXth century, where it considers all philosophy and science as processing the heritage.

(ii) Still further away from him remains the even worse one-sidedness of enlightened rationalism, which has lost all understanding of the religious-traditional moment of thought". (o.c.,177).

### **Historical verification (3): Baron Friedrich von Hügel**

Von Hügel (1852/1925), was a Catholic thinker, a forerunner of the revival of realism (i.e. the doctrine that our ideas have real value), in philosophy, and of the theological analysis of religious life ('feeling').

He was the son of an Austrian diplomat, Karl von Hügel (1795/1870), who was married to a Scottish woman. In 1867 the von Hügel family moved to England. Friedrich's interest in religious questions set in with a deep crisis, in Vienna, in 1870, where he had to give up his studies for reasons of unstable health. In 1873 he married Lady Mary Herbert and, immediately, went to live in London until his death.

Religiously speaking, von Hügel was a deeply religious Roman Catholic. He also combined a rare sanctity of life (H.-A.10) with an equally tolerant attitude to life. This meant that he had friends among thinkers of all creeds and ideologies.

Because of his friendship with A. Loisy (1857/1940), once condemned by the Pope as a 'modernist', and G. Tyrrell (1861/1909), also a modernist, von Hügel was sometimes suspected of 'modernism' (a far-reaching 'natural' explanation of all religion, including the Catholic Church, which emerged at the beginning of this century). Which was completely untrue.

Friedrich Heiler (1892/1967), *Die Religionen der Menschheit* (in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart), (The religions of mankind (past and present), Stuttgart, 1959, 729, quotes the following text by von Hügel:

“(1) Admittedly, we Catholic Christians never wish to surrender the high truth and lofty ideal of religious unity in worship and faith, embodied in a unique, worldwide Church.

(2) However, in our eyes this, our indestructible faith in religious unity, is only feasible when we are able - and this with a happy heart - to absorb the germinal and relative educational truths and values (H.-A.12) in other religions as our own.

Moreover, at least as far as the truths and values contained in (i) Judaism (the Old Testament) and (ii) late antique Hellenism (i.e. that Greek way of thinking which, in addition to its own autochthonous, specifically Greek truths and values, also included other cultures’ own (not least the Near Eastern ones) as its own) are concerned, it can be said that the Church of Rome has never ceased to use and proclaim them”.

***Conclusion:***

Von Hügel articulates, in his own way, what S. Augustine with regard to Rome’s culture especially, what Steuco, on a clearly broader information basis (and pontifically confirmed), advocated: the one, worldwide structure of the Roman Catholic Church, before which all truths and all values, insofar as tested and verified, according to the standards of thorough analysis, such as not so much the science of religion as theology (i.e. the strict dogmatic analysis of the sacred) can manage, come through as its own.

It seems unmistakable: everything that is sacred, -- everything that is similar or coherent (structural identity), is ‘Catholic’.

***Note -- The antithesis ‘biblicist’ (‘antireligionist’) / religionist.***

Fr. Heiler, o.c., 727/731, speaks of ‘religionism’ as that attitude of Christians who too much and too easily fall in with the other ‘religions’ (hence the name) - one thinks of the ease with which, today, in the Neo-Sacral circles (Hippies and the like), the Eastern religions are sucked in, as it were, uncritically.

‘Biblicism’ is, then, just as easily the all too easy prepositioning of the Biblical religion as the only true one, as opposed to an inclusive one. Which leads to ‘anti-religionism’.

## **II.b.-- *The analysis: the cosmos of the archaic community.***

Mircéa Eliade (1907/1986), professor in Chicago, in his solid hiëro-analytical work *Het gewijde en het profane (Een studie over de religieuze essentie)*, (The Sacred and the Profane (A Study of the Religious Essence)), Hilversum, 1962,18v., sketches us the structure (i.e. the fixed set of relations) of the cosmos (i.e. the material universe) as the primitive, antique and middle-aged human beings conceived and lived it.

-- **1.** Starting point is, always, some kind of hiërophany (i.e. some form of manifestation of the sacred).

-- **2.a.** This hiërophany is always situated in one place or another (hence the local, local character).

-- **2.b.** The hiërophany always connects, either this earth with the underworld (“hell”) or this earth with the upper world (“heaven”) or this earth with the underworld and the upper world; -- the so-called “three levels”, about which e.g. Rudolf Bultmann, the demythologiser, speaks again and again, in order to write it off as “myth” (i.e. in his interpretation, as “unscientific” and, thus, “imaginary”).

-- **2.c.** Hiërophany may -- but never must -- be expressed, made visible by means of the cosmic axis (‘axis mundi’), which is, e.g., a column, a ladder (Jacob’s ladder),-- a mountain, -- a tree, a liana, etc.

-- **2.d.** The hiërophany - if made visible and tangible by means of a cosmic axis - generates the world of the people involved in that hiërophany: the axis is ‘in the center’ (meaning both of the material universe and of the world of the people involved), ‘in the navel of the world’ (id.), - yes, the axis is the world centre itself.

-- **2.e.** The hiërophany - if expressed in the axis - is always connected with a wisdom act (H.-A. 10), performed by those involved, -- and performed as a repetition (i.e., by imitation, mimicry, appropriation, yes, identification (identitative structure)) of what either great magicians or deities have performed.

Thus, in the points 2.c., 2.d., 2.e., what Eliade calls ‘the place as a repetition of the cosmogony (origin of the universe).

***Applique models of the cosmos structure...***

1. -- L. Chochod, *Huê la mystérieuse*, (Mysterious Hue), Paris, 1943, 295ss., mentions a rather regulatory model, but peculiar to a piece of our planet.

**Notes** -- (1) Hué or Huê is the capital of central Vietnam (and the old center of Annam).

(2) Chochod refers, in context, to the An-Hoi pagoda. The term 'pagoda' is a hiëro-analytical term: 'pagoda', after all, comes from the Sanskrit (i.e. the sacred language of Brahmanist India) 'bhagavat' (sacred); 'pagoda' is, therefore, a sacred, power-laden building', temple, especially of the Brahmanist or Buddhist religion); yet 'pagoda' also means 'sacred image' ('sacred' in the sense, always, of 'sacred').

***Let us now listen to Chochod.***

"When an Annamite has a dream, which he, for some reason, considers unnatural, or when some extraordinary event happens to him/her, he builds a scattering house and a small temple exactly there, where - according to his feeling (H.-A.4: mantic 'seeing') - the occult power has shown itself (H.-A.19: hiërophany). Then also he celebrates a sacrifice".

This is what the Annamite ancestors repeated countless times and what the Annamite, now, repeats (H.-A. 19: cosmic foundation repeated).

Immediately the event becomes public, acquires volume and creates tradition. In other words, as Eliade, o.c., 16f., says, the little sanctuary becomes the centre of the community.

***The hiërophany as 'cratophany***

In addition to the term 'hiërophany', Eliade also introduced the word 'kratophany' ('kratos' (Greek) is something like strength and, immediately, power over something else). This means "the showing (phenomenon) of power" (Cfr. C.J. Bleeker, *De structuur van de godsdienst* (The Structure of Religion), 46v.).

Chochod also sees this aspect: "No more is needed - he continues - to bring about a new deity. Or, more precisely, a new symbol of the supernatural power.

Hence the names 'Ngoc Phu Nhan: 'Chua Ngoc', 'Thiên Phi Ngoc Nu' (the latter also being the name of a goddess (o.c., 293)), 'Duc Thanh Me: etc.'.

These names do not define anything precise, they are applicable to a crowd of ‘genii’ (spirits), demons or demigods”. (ibid.).

### **Conclusion.**

(1) Chochod, like all objective-minded religious researchers, clearly sees that, time and again, the power, as a global, encompassing reality (H.-A.12), which is the sacred (in the neuter), always, ‘works’ in the Annamite hiërophanies, i.e. generates dreams, induces extraordinary events. It is this engendering reality that he, embodied in countless beings, writes off as “nothing precise”, - he, Chochod, the Western Enlightened Sceptic (H.-A.17).

(2) But - in opposition to this inexpert statement it can be rightly said (and the sequel will verify this) that, instead of imprecision, there is multiformity and, even more, many carriers (‘beings’) of the power (‘generating power’).

So much for what O. Willmann, at the time, called ‘archaic’ religion. Now, an applicative model of the same nature of beings, from the Bible.

### **2 - The Bible, Gen 28: 10/22.**

This text gives an analogous (partly identical partly non-identical) model

(a) Alfred Bertholet, *Die Religion des Alten Testaments*, (The religion of the Old Testament.), Tübingen, 1932, 24/34 (Vormosaische Kulte und ihre Nachwirkungen), (Pre-Mosaic cults and their aftermath.), gives, o.c., 33, a tip on the subject. He mentions, briefly, models of ‘god of the fathers’ (Der Vätergott), (The father god), --i.e. Gen 28:13.

**Note:**-- Two traditions are here connected with the word.

(i) The Yahwistic one recounts a true theophany (the manifestation of Yahweh, the supreme being (H.-A.10 (at the very bottom: essential holiness)) in which, on the one hand, Yahweh renews the promises made to Abraham and Isaac and, on the other, Jacob acknowledges Yahweh as his God.

(ii) The Elohist tradition describes, in terms of Mesopotamian ‘ziggurat’ (the tower with stepped floors), the ‘ladder’ (better: staircase), which Jacob, in his dream, -- better: ‘dream-vision’ (H.-A.4 (wisdom as charismatic ‘seeing’)), ‘sees’, his vow and the foundation of the sanctuary at Bethel.

The text: “Jacob travelled from Bersabees to Haran. By chance he came to a certain place, where he decided to spend the night, because the sun had already set. He took one of the local stones, placed it under his head and fell asleep on it.

There he lived through a dream (H.-A.21). He “saw” a ladder (H.-A.19: cosmic axis), straight up the earth and whose top touched heaven. The angels of God ascended on it and descended from it (cf. John 1:51 (the angels of God ascend, there, and descend above the Son of Man;--which is a typical New Testament cosmic axis). Immediately Yahweh stood before him and said: “I am Yahweh, the God of your ancestor Abraham and the God of Isaac.

The ground on which you lie asleep I give to you and your offspring. (...). I am with you: I will protect you wherever you go. Moreover, I will lead thee back to this ground. Nay, I will not leave thee! For I will perform what I promise thee”.

Jacob awoke and said: “Truly, Yahweh is here, without my realizing it”. He shuddered and said -- “This place is terrifying! It is, after all, nothing less than a ‘bêt El’ (house of God) and the gate of heaven.

Early in the morning he got up, took the stone on which his head had rested that night, and erected it as a memorial stone (stele). Then he poured oil on the top of it.

To this place, which before was called Luz, he gave the name Betel.

*Note.*-- The pouring of oil is an act of worship.

### **3. The Bible, Exod 3:1f,**

This text gives, now, what O. Willmann calls a mosaic (Old Testament) model.

*Note.*-- The first calling story of Moses (Ex. 3-4) is, again, a connection of the two traditions.

(1) The Yahwistic model contains, again, the theophany (H.-A.21) and the mission of Moses (3:1/5; 3:16/20). The Elohist model contains the revelation of God’s ‘name’ (i.e., of course, mysterious reality, expressed in the ‘name’ (but, here, to be understood as a function name)).

The parts of the text which interest us here.

(1) -- “Moses pastured the flock of his father-in-law Jethro (Jitro), priest of Madian (Midian), taking it deep into the desert until it reached the mountain of God, Horeb”.

*Note* -- ‘Horeb’ is the same mountain as Sinai, but in the language of Deuteronomy (and of the Deuteronomistic tradition).

According to some exegetes, this phrase is a reader’s gloss (i.e. an explanation added by a reader to the text for the sake of clarification),-- similar to Ex 17:6.

*Note*-- The remainder of the text portions mention the phrase “angel of Yahweh” (Gen 16:7; 22:11; Jud 2:1; etc.) or, also, “angel of God” (Gen 21:17;31:11; Ex 14:19; etc.).

(1) Relying on the language of Gen 16:7 (Angel of Yahweh) and, a little further, of Gen 16:13 (‘Yahweh’ without more), many exegetes claim that, in such texts, it is not about an angel, understood as a separate (‘created by God’) being, but about Yahweh, resp. God himself, insofar as he appears (shows himself; phenomenon; theophany) in some angelic form.

(2) To be honest, this interpretation does not seem to correspond well with the constant practice of the Supreme Being, whereby he lets his creatures act as mediators (intercessors), as independently as possible.

In this second interpretation, they would then act as intermediaries between, on the one hand, a very transcendent (exalted) God and, on the other hand, beings (here e.g. Moses) who are not simply suited to communicate with the exalted deity.

“The angel of Yahweh appeared to Moses in a flame of fire from the middle of a bush. Moses looked on: the bush was ablaze, but it did not burn up. Whereupon he said to himself:

“I will go and walk around it. I want to take a closer look at such a spectacle. Above all, I want to check (H.-A. 6/8 (progressive reduction)), why precisely the bush does not now (*note* -- Against all ‘natural’ expectation) burn up”.

Yahweh noted that he walked around the bush to look at it. God called out to Moses, from the middle of the bush:

“Moses! Moses!”

To which Moses replied, “Here I am!”

(God) resumed

“Do not come any closer! Rather take off your sandals, for the place whereon you stand is holy ground (H.-A. 22)”. (God) continued:

“I am the God of your fathers,-- the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, the God of Jacob (Israel) (H.-A.21).

Then Moses hid his face, fearing to look upon God.

*Note* -- *La Bible de Jérusalem* notes (p.87, n.h) that God is so exalted that no creature can ‘see’ Him and survive this ‘seeing’.

**Ex 3:13f:** “Moses said, thereupon, to God: -- “Look: I am going, truly, to the Israelites to say to them, ‘The God of your fathers (H.-A.21) is sending me to you!’ But if they say, ‘What is his name?’ what shall I say to them?”

God then said:

“I am the one who is (*note* - One also translates: ‘I am’)”.

God continued:

“Behold what you shall say to the Israelites: ‘I am’ has sent me to you!”

Still God said to Moses: “You shall speak to the Israelites as follows: ‘Yahweh, the God of your fathers’ (H.-A. 21),-- the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, the God of Jacob, sends me to you! -- Thus will I be called, yea, forever. Thus shall I be called from generation to generation”.

This is the second part of the text that interests us here. The reason follows.

**Note: (a)** The first - in my opinion the true reason - is that, in archaic-magical language, the name of a being is more than what we, enlightened-rational Westerners, see in it, namely a sound, which indicates something. Nothing more.

No: in the archaic-magical sense, the name is the expression of:

(i) the power to generate; H.-A.21; cf. Gen 17:15f; 35: 9/14),

(ii) in its special ‘function’ (role, specialization) (ibid.). In other words, the name, in that language game, is a magic-functional name. For magic is nothing else than

(i) power (generating power),

(ii) used functionally.



**(b)** The second reason lies in the fact that, on this occasion, we point out, very briefly, that:

**(i)** the Yahwistic tradition claims that the Yahweh religion dates back to archaic times; read Gen 4:26, where it is mentioned that Enosh (Enos), son of Seth (who was born of Eve, replacing Abel who was killed by his brother Cain), “was the first, who began to call upon the name of Yahweh”,

**(ii)** This, whereas according to Elohist tradition (as it is here spoken) the name Yahweh was only revealed to Moses as the name of the God of the fathers.

**(iii)** The ‘Priestly’ tradition, in turn, insists on claiming that the name of the God of the fathers sounded ‘el shaddai’ (el shaddai), as Gen 17:1 mentions (// Gen 28:3; 35:11; 43:14; 48:3; 49:25; this was the name of God in the patriarchal or patriarchal age).

This may, to us enlightened Westerners, seem ridiculous -- those names! But the fact that the three named ‘traditions’ (thought models) attach such importance to it, proves that the name is more than a means of indication, i.e. (magical-functional) being. This, namely ‘being’, now again not in the antique philosophical sense, of course, of either singular or universal ‘nature’ (actual being, in the midst of all that is). No: magical and functional, i.e., specialized magical.

#### **4.-- *The Bible, John 1:51***

Here (H.-A. 22), what O. Willmann calls the Christian religion, in its cosmic axis, the cross, announces: “Verily, verily, I say unto you, ye shall ‘see’ heaven opened (H.-A.22: the gate of heaven) (H.-A.4: wisdom as God-given charism) and the angels (H.-A.23) of God ascending and descending over the son of man”.

In other words, the dream of Jacob (Gen 28:10/17) will, on New Testament level (H.A.18 In other words, Jacob’s dream (Gen 28:10/17) will, on the New Testament level (H.A.18: “as her own”), come true in Jesus as the son of man (Dan 7:13; Matt 8:20; 24:30; Jn 3:14), i.e. as the one who, in a mysterious way, surpassing the average person, and setting an example for all possible co-workers and friends of God, is nevertheless a single human being, but a human being who has overcome all mere human weaknesses.

This opening of heaven will become a reality when this son of man is “exalted” (John 3:14), i.e:

- (i)** nailed to the cross, literally, lifted up, and
- (ii)** ‘glorified’, namely with that glory which he possessed, as the second person of the Holy Trinity, but which - after his death on the cross - pervades his humanity.

The Bible, Joh 3:13/14, announces, a second time, the cross as “axis mundi” (H.-A. 19), but on a Christian level: “No one except the one who came down from heaven, the son of man, has ascended into heaven” (Jn 3:13).

Note: Saint John is writing for believers who have already experienced the ascension of Jesus: here, therefore, he is putting words in the mouth of Jesus - an ancient custom, which virtually all chroniclers and historians, even a man as critical as Thucydides (Thucydides) of Athens (-465/-395), honored in antiquity: the Ascension, known to Saint John’s readers, is, here, interpreted as theophany (H.-A. 21), in the sense that it is a reference to the ascension of the human body. A. 21), in that it (i) testifies to Jesus’ heavenly origin and (ii) provides him, actually, with the glory of the - predicted in Dan 7:13 (“on the clouds of heaven”) - son of man.

The text, John 3:14, which now follows, specifies the access condition (‘antecedent’) to that Ascension.

**(1) *The Mosaic model.***

(a) *La Bible de Jérusalem*, 184, n.h., mentions an observation, which, perhaps, contains an archaic (pre-Mosaic) model.

As early as -1300+, copper was taken from the copper mines of Araba. At Meneiyeh (now Timna) several small copper snakes have been found, which, perhaps, cover a hiëro-analytical purpose.

(b) The text now quoted assumes that the Israelites are on their way to what is now called the Gulf of Aqaba -- “Through that journey the people became impatient. They spoke both to God and to Moses:

“Why have you led us out of Egypt so that here, in this wilderness, we perish? Look: we have neither bread nor water! And we are disgusted by such a miserable meal, a meal of hunger.

Then God sent ‘burning serpents’ upon his people. (*note* -- ‘Saraph’ (Hebr.) is translated among other things by ‘burning’, -- also by ‘winged’ or even by ‘poisonous’). Its bites brought death to the people. Then they came to Moses with the words:

“We have sinned. By speaking against Yahweh and against you. Intervene on our behalf with Yahweh, so that He may remove the snakes”. Moses intervened and Yahweh answered his plea:

“Make a (burning) snake and fix it on a pole (*note* -- One also translates: ‘standard’). Whoever will be bitten and look at it will survive”.

Moses therefore made a brazen serpent, placed it on a pole: when someone was bitten by a serpent, he looked up to the brazen serpent and survived”.

*Note*.-- Whoever is familiar with the laws of magic (generative power employed; H.-A. 24 (at the bottom)), knows that - as far as the restoration of the life force is concerned (for that is what we, with so many cultures, call the power (i.e. the generative power), insofar as it constitutes the life principle of e.g. man) - the law of equality through equality (as the archaic and antique-medieval cultures expressed themselves) applies. -

Application: if snakes bite you to death, turn to a **(i)** like shape, **(ii)** with opposite direction, **(iii)** yet more powerful generative power charged, life force restoring image (here: the copper snake), and you will recover from the loss of life force caused by the snakebite.

### **(2) *The Christian model.***

Joh 3:14.-- “As Moses exalted the serpent in the wilderness, so must the Son of Man be exalted,-- this, that all who believe, through him, may obtain eternal life.”

*Note*: -- **1.** *La Bible de Jérusalem*, 1533, n.f. specifies:

- (i)** God, absolute possessor of all (possible) life,
- (ii)** transfers this to the son (both ‘son of God’ and ‘son of man’)

**2.** But, here, it is, very particularly, about what John calls ‘eternal’ life, so that this type of life, in a stricter sense, is called ‘godlike life’, in the sense that this type of life surpasses the bodily-earthly life (elevated life).

**3.** This type - the divine life - is, when Jesus speaks of it in Israel,

- (i)** already given (to him who believes),
- (ii)** but will be given in a higher degree (second level increase, apparently), at the moment Jesus rises from the dead. Cfr. John 6:39f; 6:54; 11:25f; cf. Matt 7:14; 18:8; 19:16.

The Bible, Jn 19:16/18; 19:33/37, mentions the realization of the cross as ‘axis mundi’.

**(1) John 19:16/18:**

Then Pilate gave Jesus up to their power, -- this to be crucified. So they seized Him, immediately. Carrying His cross, He came out. He went in the direction of the ‘place of the skull’ (in Hebrew ‘Golgotha’). There they crucified him with two others, one on each side, Jesus in the middle”.

M. Eliade, *De mythe van de eeuwige terugkeer (Archetypen en hun herhaling)*, (The myth of the eternal return (Archetypes and their repetition), Hilversum, 1964,20, provides the following explanation, which is typical of Eliade’s thinking.

“For the Christians, Golgotha lay in the middle of the world (H.-A.19), for it was the summit of the ‘cosmic’ (in Eliade’s language, ‘cosmic’ is something like both ‘sacred’ (loaded with generative power) and ‘material-cosmic’) mountain (H.-A.19: mountain).

Also, Golgotha was the place (H.-A.19: local character), where Adam (i.e., in a magical sense, (i) the progenitor and (ii) the bearer in view of all the offspring (‘Adam’s children’), of the overall life force (H.-A.27) of mankind) had been created and buried”.

**Note** -- It was noted that John, 19:17, calls the place, where Jesus’ cross is erected (and where he is, precisely, ‘exalted’), ‘skull place’.

Enlightened rationalism: pure coincidence, -- or, rather, one called it Golgotha, skull place. Executions’ that testify that Adam’s life force, precisely there, at that ‘sacred’ (H.-A.: not in the human scientific, ‘projective’ sense of 9; but in the hiëroanalytical sense of 14) place, turned into its opposite, namely death, and even death by the neck.

Eliade’s text ‘continues: “Thus the blood of Jesus falls on the skull of Adam, who, at the foot of the cross, is himself buried (understand: in the sense, just outlined), - immediately, it is ransomed (note -- This ‘ransoming’ stands for the ‘turning’ into the opposite of ‘death’, ‘burial’)”.

Eliade, himself an Orthodox by education, adds: “The conviction that Golgotha lies at the center of the world has been preserved in the folklore of Eastern Christians (e.g. among the Klein-Russians; cf. Holmberg, U., *Der Baum des Lebens*, (The tree of life), Helsinki, 1923, 72)”.

**(2) John 19: 34/37,**

indicates the scope of Jesus' life sacrifice as crucified.

***The Mosaic model.***

To Noah (= Noë) and his children, after the rescue from the Flood, God says the following: "(...) All that moves, -- all that 'lives', shall be for you to eat. All this I give you, just as I gave you the green of the plants. This, except for one point: you shall not eat the flesh with its 'soul', the blood".

In other words, as in the archaic cultures, so here too, in pre-mosaic thinking: the blood is the seat (infrastructure) of the principle of life (H.-A. 27), i.e. the generative force inherent in the living being.

**Consequence:** whoever loses blood, -- whoever causes blood to flow, he/she is affected, i.e. affects the infrastructure of the principle of life (Gen 9:3/4).

The text which we are now quoting is an artificial application of this. The framework in which the sacrificial application takes place is the covenant, with Moses as mediator, between God (Yahweh) and Israel.

**Ex 24:6/8:** "Moses took half the blood (of the young bulls, which served as peace offerings) and poured the blood into bowls.

**a.** The other half he sprinkled on the altar (note -- The altar visibly represents Yahweh). Then he took the book of the covenant and read it to the people. The people declared: "All that Yahweh has said we will do. We will obey it".

**b.** Moses took (the first half of) the blood to sprinkle on the people. He said, while doing so: "This is the blood of the covenant which Yahweh has made with you, on the condition of all these commandments (from the Book of the Covenant)".

**Note** -- Moses, as mediator, unites by means of sacrificial blood (understand: as infrastructure ('seat') of generative power,-- here: specific to young bulls) Yahweh (via the altar) with (henceforth) 'his' people.

***The Christian model.***

The text, John 19: 34/37, reads as follows: "One of the soldiers, with a lance, pierced the side (of Jesus): immediately blood and water flowed out. (The one who saw it testifies to this ... so that you also may believe. For this happened for the purpose of bringing about (what) the Scripture (had foreseen): "Not one piece of bones shall be crushed from him".

**Note**-- This citation is, apparently, a concatenation of a phrase from Ps 34 (33):21: “Yahweh preserves his bones, so that not even a part of them is crushed” and, on the other hand, from Ex 12:46: “You shall not crush any piece of bone (of the paschal lamb)”. -- This conflation is all the more understandable since Jesus, apparently, is referred to as the Paschal Lamb.

Then the Johannine text ends as follows: “Another Scripture says: ‘They will look up to the one whom they have pierced’”.

**Note** -- This quotation is from Zech. 12:10.

The context deals with the deliverance and renewal of Jerusalem:

(i) Then comes the day when I (Yahweh) am set to destroy all the nations that come against Jerusalem.

(ii) But over the house of David and over the inhabitants of Jerusalem I will pour out a spirit of grace and supplication, and they will look up to me, whom they have pierced”.

We give the reading as it is mentioned by Saint John among others. In any case, the context seems to be the following:

(a) the ‘siege’ of Jerusalem is lifted;

(b) there is national mourning;

(c) a source of salvation is opened. It is in that end-time situation (also called ‘eschatological’) that ‘the death of the pierced one . and this as part of the foundation of salvation for the city of Jerusalem (which - figuratively - stands for the community of the saved).

Thus it becomes understandable that St. John, who witnessed the death of Jesus, almost ‘naturally’ thinks of Zech 12:10, to refer to the death on the cross with - silk piercing.

This all the more since Zech 12:10 immediately continues with the following words: “They shall mourn over Him as over an only son. They will weep over Him as over a first-born. One thinks of John 1:14 (‘as the firstborn’; cf. Matt 3:17).

The salvific moment is expressed, here, in John 19:34, by the typically Johannine term ‘water’ (as a symbol of the Holy Spirit, insofar as it springs from the resurrection of Jesus). But that is a separate theme.

***Explanation.***

The 'water' (with John).-- Except Num 19: 1vv. (esp. 19:8 ("shall wash the body with water"); 19:9 ("the cleansing or lustrous water") and Ps. 18:5 ("The waves of death choked me. The torrents of Belial (underworld) terrified me"), John 4:1/42 (Jesus with the Samaritans) and John 7:37/39 (The promise of the "living" water) are talking about water,--in the latter two cases, in a Johannine sense.

**1. Joh 4:13/14** reads as follows: "Whoever drinks of this water (i.e. the ordinary water of the well) will thirst again. But whoever drinks of the 'water' that I will give him will never 'thirst' again. On the contrary, the 'water' that I shall give him will become in him the source of 'water' that bubbles up to eternal life".

**Note** -- Already in the Mosaic period (O.T.), springs of water are meaning-laden themes (e.g. Gen 24:10; 29:1; Ex 2:15) and 'water' is a symbol, indeed a present-day thesis of divine life (H.-A. 27), -- especially of divine life in the 'messianic' (Christian) age (e.g. Isa 12:3; Jer 2:13; Ezek 47:1; etc.).

It is, at the same time, a symbol of the wisdom (H.A. 4) (the law) that practically merges with the divine life (Proverbs 13: 14; Sir (= Ekklesiastikus) 15: 3; 24: 23/29).

**2. John 7:37/39** reads: "On the last day of the feast, the great day, Jesus stood there and cried, "If anyone is thirsty, let him come to me", that whoever believes in me may drink! This, according to the Scripture: "Out of his bowels shall flow rivers of living water".

Jesus spoke of the spirit (pneuma) that all those who had believed in Him would receive: "For there was no spirit yet, because Jesus was not yet glorified".

**Note** -- "Spirit" (Pneuma) is, here, the principle of divine life, insofar as it breaks through after the resurrection (H.-A. 27), into the inner self,--an inner source alike. The natural principle of life (H.-A. 27) or life-force is, by this, elevated on a level (ibid.).

Scholastically expressed: grace (resurrection spirit):

- (i) presupposes, yes,
- (ii) Elevates (raises the level) nature (the principle of life).
- (iii) Through which salvation is possible (H.-A. 14: Salvation), to a higher degree than before Jesus' glorification (H.-A. 25).

## **II.c. *The analysis: three main types of the sacred.***

### ***Introduction.***

#### **1. - *Nathan Söderblom***

“Söderblom (1866/1931) can still be considered the grand master of the history of religion”. According to C.J. Bleeker, *De structuur van de godsdienst (Hoofddlijnen ener fenomenologie van de godsdienst)*, (The structure of religion (Main features and phenomenology of religion), The Hague, s.d-, 27).

We are therefore in agreement, to a great extent at least, with his *Das Werden des Gottesglaubens (Untersuchungen über die Anfänge der Religion)*, (The Becoming of Belief in God (Studies on the Beginnings of Religion), Leipzig, 1915-1,1926-2, which Bleeker referred to as ‘pioneering’ and ‘still retaining its significance’. With him we summarize once more:

(a) Religion, for the true believer, is not an occasional day of celebration; it is a/ beyond the visible and tangible (secular) life, b/ the actual content, i.e. its founding and sustaining power (o.c.,175);

(b) the ‘pagan’ or folk religion is the permanent substratum (infrastructure, substructure) of every ‘culturally higher’ as well as of the biblical religions;-- says Söderblom, o.c., 177: “the little people have never felt at home, with heart and soul, in the higher spheres of the sacred.

(i) It is, with its worship, with its needs and expectations, at home in the swirl of earthly and subterranean (underworld) powers; no ‘higher’ culture can stifle or banish them entirely.

(ii) Also, in later times, - when e.g. the high Zoroastrian religion (in Iran; o.c., 255) or the Biblical religion (in Israel and, from there, elsewhere) becomes the dominant religion -, the people remain ‘contaminated’ by the unbroken paganism, as the lower layer of culture.

More than that: their attention, which goes out to such subordinate powers, is, if, at least, one only starts from their (by a higher developed religion instilled) assumptions (lemmata, points of belief), to be labelled as superstition”.

This antithesis, within a culture and within the religious man himself, is particularly strongly expressed in the pair of antitheses “the people/the people of God” in the Biblical context (see H.-A., 18: religionism/ biblicism).

#### **2. *William Ernest Hocking***

Hocking (1873/1966), a student of W. James and Josiah Royce, as well as of Husserl, apparently sees a third term: the rational Enlightenment (after folk religion and higher religion).



a. “If we summarize the assessments (interpretations) of our time with regard to religion, we find a contradiction: on the one hand, our time cannot do without religion (what Hocking calls ‘reflexive dialectics’); on the other hand, this same time does not know how to keep religion alive (what he calls ‘interpretation’) “. (W.E. Hocking, *Les principes de la méthode en philosophie religieuse*, (The principles of method in religious philosophy), in: *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale* (Paris), 29 (1922): 4 (oct.-déc.), 431).

b. “Primitive religion, viewed from the outside (note - The ‘externalist’ method), appears as a wilderness of rites, avoidances (taboos), feelings of all kinds (fear, dismay, horror,-- inexplicable courage in the face of feared powers). Yet it should be deciphered by means of a key, namely the certainty that, where there is a feeling, there is also an idea.

In primitive religion, too, vision (intuition, direct knowing) is at work: it encounters realities, powers, which are both universal (as present in nature) and historical (as situated in a social context). These religious intuitions carry within them a core of dialectical certainty (i.e. logical justification), which takes the mystical form of a negation.

Primitive religion can be seen as a resolute refusal (a “no”) to the threats, which physical nature directs at man, if not devouring him already. Are not illness, mutilation, shed blood, death, the biological crises of love and childbirth just as many “threats” of this nature?

Is not the primal religion a challenging attitude here? It is a resolute and massive refusal, which manifests itself in a ferocious apparatus of rites and shunning (taboos). What it does not accept is the fact that the cycle of physical (note - ‘secular’) powers makes up all that man has at his disposal, or determines his fate completely.

Not religion, but the absence of religion, is credulous towards natural (note - ‘secular’) phenomena. Religion is, on the contrary, the invincible refusal of the human spirit to be credulous in the face of the apparent realities around us”. (Ibidem, 452/453).

### **Conclusion.**

Religion has evolved from the archaic (primitive) to the cultivated and evolved, the so-called 'higher'. In the course of this cultural process, a crisis occurs, as Hocking typifies it, above under a, and which springs from some form of rationalistic enlightenment.

There is no better book on this than J. Sperna Weiland, *Het einde van de religie (Verder op het spoor van Bonhöffer)*, (The end of religion (On Bonhöffer's trail), Baarn, 1970, especially o.c., 115/124, where 'religion' is defined as 'two-world thinking' (which is then branded as 'metaphysics', as if all metaphysics, by definition, were the flight from the world).

Furthermore, 'religion' is characterized as an escape from this secular world, an escape that, above all, results in an "introverted interiority" (o.c., 119).

It is obvious that, with this, only one type of religion (already eaten away by secularism and Enlightenment) is described. The one-sidedness of this view springs, clearly, from a lack of real religious experience.

The explicit reference to Nietzsche (1844/1900) and his criticism of religion ('Hinterwelter', 'metaphysician', 'religious man') speaks clearly in this regard. So much for the introduction.

### **II.c.I.-- Animism, a first main feature of religion,**

Introduction. E.B. Tylor (1832/1917), *Primitive Culture*, London, 1872, introduces the term 'animism'. Wilhelm Wundt (1832/1920), the founder of experimental psychology, was one of the further elaborators of animistic hierarchical analysis (*Völkerversychologie*, (Folk Psychology), Leipzig, 1909, IV (Mythus und Religion), (Myth and religio).

Generally speaking, 'animism' lies in the fact that one experiences and interprets the sacred as a collection of living (vivisection belief, sacred vitalism, hiëro-philosophy) and/or life-giving (spirit belief, soul belief, pneumatology) beings.

In other words, not only the three levels (underworld, earth, firmament) characterize the sacred, but real beings populate the cosmos. And they are always related to life, in the sacred sense.

**Bibliogr. sample.** -- N. Söderblom, *Das Werden*, 10/25 (*Der Animismus: Belebung und Beseelung*), (Animism: animation and ensoulmen); W. Schmidt (1868/1954), *Origine et évolution de la religion (Les théories et les faits)*, (Origin and evolution of religion (Theories and facts)), Paris, 1931, 104/124 (L'animisme).

### ***Applique models.***

We outline, briefly, three examples.

#### **(i) *The goddess Aphrodite.***

**a.** According to F.R. Walton, *Aphrodite*, in: *The Uxford Cassical Dict.*, Oxf., 1950-2,67, Aphrodite is the Greek goddess of love, beauty and fertility.

Already Hesiod of Asskra (-800/-700), *Theogonia*, 188f, mentions her. Already before Homer (before Hesiod) she is the 'Kupris' (the Cypriot goddess,--perhaps because on Cyprus she met her match (Astarte, Ishtar). She was worshipped all over the Greek world.

**b.** Well, Aris Fakinos is a contemporary Greek novelist (in French translations: *Derniers barbares*, *L'homme qui donnait aux pigeons*, *Récit des temps perdus*), (Last barbarians, The man who gave to pigeons, Tale of lost time).. His *Récit des temps perdus*, published in 1982, recounts, more or less epically, the life of his grandparents, who were poor Greek peasants. 27, rue Jacob (Bulletin d'inform. des Edit. du Seuil), 241 (1982:oct.) writes, in this respect, the following:

“Do you really think that Vangelis, your grandfather, was able to meet the goddess Aphrodite ('rencontrer' )?”

“My grandfather could neither read nor write. He knew nothing of mythology or history. He was, after all, just a simple Attic farmer. Well, how could he, with such telling details, have described a woman (Aphrodite), if he had never seen her (cf. H.-A. 4: Seeing mantis)? -- Maybe he was a poet.

Let us not forget that Homer was not an 'intellectual' (in the later sense), but a 'rhapsodos' (a singer, who, reciting poems, went from town to town), i.e. a folk singer, who goes from village to village. Just like, by the way, Yorghis, the announcer in *Récit des temps perdus*. Says Fakinos.

“Your grandfather asked you, however, not to tell everything. Have you, with this book, not offended his will?”.

“My grandfather was afraid that I would be branded a madman. You must decide for yourself what you will tell them and what you will conceal. But I had the right not to conceal,-- to keep an insight for myself alone, which, if not passed on, would be of no use”.

**Conclusion.**-- So the contemporary poor Greek peasant still 'sees', like (at least part of) his distant ancestors from early antiquity (IXth, VIIIth centuries before Kr.), the goddess Aphrodite. The little people, for whom our enlightened rationalists (including the proletarian Marxists) show such contempt ('infantile stage of thinking'), preserve, as Söderblom notes, archaic religion. And as lived reality, as Hocking says.

**(ii) A god ('elohim'), rising from the earth.**

**a.** This brings us to the Old Testament (1 Sam 28:3/25). *La Bible de Jérusalem* (1978), 342s., refers to Saul and the witch of En-Dor ('sorcière', magician). Besides 'witch', they are also called 'nekromantis' (Greek term for seer who conjures up the dead ('nécromancienne') and 'fortune-teller' (devin, devineresse).

The necromancy ('spiritism')

**(i)** was, in Israel, practiced (2 Kings 21:6; Is 8:19),

**(ii)** but was, by the Law, forbidden (Levit 19:31; 20:6,27). Especially Deut 18:11 points out the prohibition. Something the Catholic Church still holds to today.

**b.** La Bib. D.J. notes two aspects - which Söderblom confirms -

**(i)** the narrator of 1 Sam 28: 3f appears to share the popular belief.

**(ii)** The Church Fathers, the hermeneuts (interpreters) are divided: some see demonic religion in it; others, divine intervention; still others, (self)deceit of the visionary. La Bible proposes to see in it a literary artifice: the narrator, who does not believe in it, applies a literary genre (death call story) to illustrate an idea (Saul's rejection and replacement by David).

Four interpretations! Typical for non-people! For the 'higher' religion!

"I see an Elohim rising from the earth"(1 Sam 28:13) exclaims the seer, when she sees the deceased prophet Samuel ':

**(i)** The word 'el' expresses, in most Semitic languages, 'deity', i.e. an exalted being, who is 'causer' (originator) - and thus 'father', 'sage' etc. (See H.-A. 3 (wise); 21 (begetting power)).

**(ii)** Elohim is the plural (used about 2,570 times) meaning the same: 'deity', 'higher, superhuman being'.

***Bibl. sample.***

J. Hemleben, *Over de grens van het leven (Voorstellingen over een bestaan na de dood)*, (Over the border of life (Representations on an existence after death)), Rotterdam, 1977, 37/41 (The necromancer of Endor);

P. Brunel, *l'évocation des morts et la descente aux enfers* (Homère, Virgile, Dante, Claudel), (the evocation of the dead and the descent into hell (Homer, Virgil, Dante, Claudel), Paris, 1974 (note the double title, which does link 'summoning of the dead' with 'descent into hell (underworld); but does not identify them);

C.J. Bleeker, *De moedergodin in de oudheid* (The Mother Goddess in Antiquity), The Hague, 1960, 44:48 (De tocht naar de onderwereld van de Babylonische Vrouwe Inanna), (The journey to the underworld of the Babylonian Lady Inanna).

Noteworthy is H. Möller: *Erwachen im Jenseits*, (Awakening in the beyond), Pratteln-Basel, 1955 (a two-fold series of 'hell-journeys' (understand: contacts with souls of the dead, but in a very Biblical spirit).

**Note.**-- The Greek 'nekuia' (also: 'nekonía'), which is the title of Homer's Odyssey, 11, means either 'summoning of the dead' (nekromancy) or (which, in the case of a summoning of the dead, acted as a source of energy) 'sacrifice for the purpose of summoning the dead'.

Descent into hell emphasizes the fact that the visionary, with his 'spirit' (i.e. both thought and imagination and the soul's body (the fine material part of the soul), descends literally, by means of a minimal out-of-body experience, below the ground, into the sphere of the 'spirits' to be summoned or contacted.

***Sjeol (sheol).***

In Hebrew, 'sheol' means the depths of the earth (Num 16:33; Deut 32:22; Is 14:9); there the dead (their souls) descend (Gen 37:35; 1 Sam 2:6). Both good and evil 'live' there a shadowy existence (1 Sam 28:19: Saül shall be there, as Samuel is there); Ps 89:49; Ezek 32:17/32), which is colorless (Ekklesiastes (Qohelet) 9:10). God is not believed (praised) there (Ps 6:6; 88:6,12; 115:19; Is 38:18).

Which does not prevent God, as omnipresent Supreme Being, from being active in the underworld as well (Deut 5:26;-- 1 Sam 2:6; Wis 16:13; Amos 9:2).

The clear articulation of retribution after death (eternal life; eternal death) and of the resurrection comes only later, at the end of the Old Testament.

***The text.***

First of all: the reign of king Saul is usually situated in 1032/102 (thus centuries before Homer).-- Like the wife of Jeroboam (1 Kings 14:1,5/6), Saul too dresses up to go to the seer.-- Note the ambivalence, the fact that the king's wife is in the same position as his wife. Notice the ambivalence in Saul, who, on the one hand, when things are going

well, honors the 'higher' (Biblical) religion, up to the legal prohibition of the 'lower' (the little people and the psychics fitting), and on the other hand, in times of need, secretly, in disguise, takes refuge in the same religion outside the 'Law'.

This system of two measures and two weights still flourishes today. It was seen as excellent by people like Söderblom.

***Last point:*** Saul is attacked by the Philistines.

“Samuel had died (note -- Hemleben classifies Samuel - not so much with the 'prophets' (predictors) as with the 'seers' (a broader term)) (...). Saul had expelled the necromancers and soothsayers from the land (...).

When Saul saw the army camp of the Philistines, he was afraid ( ... ). He consulted Yahweh. But Yahweh gave him no answer: neither by dreams (note -- Oniromancy, dream foretelling) nor by 'primeval' (urim) (note -- Usually the expression is 'primeval' and 'toemim' (to make it appear with the result of truth); one does not know anymore where this mantra existed) nor by the prophets.

Then Saul said to those around him: “Find me a summoner so that I may go to her and consult her. To which his courtiers said: “There is one at Endor”.

Saül dressed himself (...), left with two men and arrived at night at the woman in question.

He said to her: “Let the future be foretold for me by a phantom (*note* -- Hemleben: 'the spirit of prophecy') through your mediation, and call upon him whom I shall call thee.

But the woman replied: “Oh, come! Surely thou knowest what Saul did, how he purged the land of summoners of the dead and soothsayers. For what reason dost thou lure my life into an ambush so that I may be killed?”

Whereupon Saul swore to her under oath, “As it is true that Yahweh lives, so shall ye suffer no punishment for this!”

The woman asked, “Whom should I call for thee?” -- To which Saul said, “Call me Samuel.” Then the woman 'saw' Samuel, screamed loudly and said to Saul, ‘For what reason have you deceived me? But thou art Saul himself!’

The prince said to her, “Fear nothing! Rather say what thou seest.”-- To which she replied, “I 'see' an elohim rising out of the earth.”

Saül asked, “What image impression (*note* -- Appearance, form, shadow-form) does he have?”

She replied: “The one who rises is an old man. He is wrapped in a cloak (note -- prophet’s cloak, carrier of ‘powers’).”

By this Saul knew that it was Samuel: he threw himself down to the ground.

Samuel said to Saul: “For what reason have you, in calling me, disturbed my rest?”

“The reason is, I am in great fear! The Philistines are waging war against me. God has turned away from me: He answers no more, neither by the prophets nor by dreams. For this reason I have called upon you: show me what I ought to do.

Samuel said: “For what reason consult me, if Yahweh has turned away from you and has become your enemy?”

**a.** Yahweh has, in fact, carried out what He, by my intercession, caused you to foretell: the kingship He has snatched out of your hand and given to your neighbor, David. The reason is: you have not obeyed Yahweh. That is the reason why He is dealing with you in this way today.

**b.** There is, however, more: Yahweh will, with you, also deliver your people Israel to the Philistines. Consequence: tomorrow you and your sons will be, here, with me. Yahweh will also deliver the army camp of Israel to the Philistines”.

**(iii) *The descent into the underworld and the resurrection of Jesus.***

1 Petr 3:18/22 is, according to *La Bi.d.Jér.* (1978), 1758, the first part of an ancient confession of faith, the components of which are

**1.--** The death of Jesus (3:18);

**2.--** The ascension of Jesus to hell (3:19/21a); cf. 2 Petr 2:4/6.

**3.--** The resurrection of Jesus (3:21b);

**4.--** The seated at God’s right hand (3:22);

**5.--** the “parousia” (second coming) with the judgment of the living and the dead (4:5).-- with the transformation (cf. 2 Petr 1:3/4), this ancient confession of faith already transcends the phases of Christ’s glorification (cf. Rev 31).

Bearing in mind the utmost care (‘critical sifting’) with which such ‘confessions of faith’ were drawn up, we conclude that - in line with Deut 5:26;-- 1 Sam 2:6; Wis 16:13; Amos 9:2 (God’s active intervention also in the underworld) - Jesus’ descent into ‘hell’ is something essential.

That this creed, still dating from the Apostle Age, was not a straw man is shown by two facts.

**(1) *The Byzantine liturgy (Easter Sunday)***

It still has a text in which the dogmatic richness of the Greek-Eastern Church Fathers is reflected: “He who gives the resurrection to the human race was condemned to death like a lamb.

But the rulers of the underworld trembled, and the gates of sorrow sprang open: Christ, after all, the ruler of glory, made his regal entrance (note -- Literally, ‘appeared’). He called out to those who were imprisoned in the underworld: “Come out”. He called out to the inhabitants of the darkness: “Leave the darkness”. (K. Kirchhoff, *Osterjubiläum der Ostkirche (Hymns from the fünfzigtagigen Osterfeier der Byzantinischen Kirche)*, (Easter Hymns of the Eastern Church (Hymns from the fifty-day Easter Celebration of the Byzantine Church)), Münster (Westf.), 1940, I (Pentekostarion), 22).

Or still: “Praise be to Christ, who rose from the dead. For he who received both soul and body separated them in his suffering.

(i) The pure soul descended into the underworld, to steal away the spoil of it.

(ii) In the grave the holy body of our Saviour of souls knows no dissolution”. (Id., II (Pentekostarion), 236 (All Saints’ Sunday).

**(2) *The Roman Liturgy***

It has retained - from this Greco-Eastern richness - the essential: do we not say every Sunday, under the creed, “who came down to hell”?

***The texts.***

(Christ himself died for the expiation of sins,--he did this as a righteous man for the sake of the unrighteous, to bring us to God.

(i) Dead according to the flesh (emphasis added),

(ii) was raised to life according to the ‘spirit’ (H.-A. 31)”.

With this last sentence St. Peter summarizes the totality of opposites (also: harmony of opposites, i.e. death/flesh/spirit), as it has been introduced - since Christ (about which more later, when there is talk of ‘demonism’).

Explanatory notes on the text.

*La Bi.d.J.* (1978), 1758, explains.

(a) The ‘flesh’ of Jesus died on the cross (Rom 8:3/4). --

(b).1. Following the primacy of Peter (Mat 16:18), Jesus speaks of Hades (Greek for sheol), using the terms “the gates of the underworld, with which he designates powers of evil (H-A. 22 (heaven’s gate), which (i) tempt men to sin i.e. the ethical form



of death) and (ii) prepare them, immediately, for 'eternal' (form of) death, chained as they are in the underworld.

(b).2. - 1 Pe 3:19f. is, probably (according to La Bi.d.J.), -- tradition however has had no doubt about it (after all, one does not see, in the Scripture narrated life of Jesus, any other act of Christ, which can be a descent into hell!) -- an allusion to Jesus' ascension through hell, between his death and resurrection (Mat 12:40; Acts 2:24,31; Rom 10:7; Eph 4:9; Heb 13:20).

***Jesus descended:***

(i) either (according to *La Bi.d.J.*) 'in spirit' ( cf. Luk 23: 46 ( Ps 31: 6): 'into your hands I commend my "spirit"')

(ii) or - what *La Bi.d.J.* prefers - 'in spirit' (cf. Rom 1:4).

(In that spirit He went and proclaimed the message to the spirits in the dungeon (cf. Hades), to those who, when Noah (=Noe) built the ark (cf. Gen 7:7), had refused to believe...").

***Explanation (cf. La Bi.d.J.).***

**(i) A first interpretation of "spirits in the dungeon":**

Jesus proclaims the Good News to the 'imprisoned spirits' mentioned in the Book of Enoch.

It should be noted that Enoch (Henok) means a corpus of apocalyptic (H.-A. 4/5) writings, with a Jewish background, centered around the patriarch and culture bearer Henah ('causer'; see further) (see e.g. Gen 5:22/23).

In that case, conscious 'spirits' (animism) were subjected to the glorified Christ (denoted by the standard Greek term 'kurios', 'Lord').

Indeed, 1 Pe 3:22 says:"(...) Jesus, having passed into 'heaven', is at God's right hand, having submitted to Himself (i) the angels, (ii) the powers ('exousiai', 'potestates') and (iii) the powers ('dunāmeis', 'virtutes')".

*La Bi.d.J.* refers, at once, to Ephesians 1:21/22; Philip 2:8/10.-- By such names (to which Eph. 1:21 adds still 'kuriotètes', 'dominationes' deities) are designated -- what *La Bi.d.J.*, 1688 calls -- cosmic powers (now in the broad sense of 'powers', of course).

They are, by St.-Paul (Col: 16;2:10; Gal 3:19;4:3; Col 2:15; Ephesians 2:2; 6:12; 1 Cor 15:24), well, on the one hand, in the salvific work of God (resp. of Christ, who, like the omnipresent deity, is active in the three cosmic dimensions ('levels', to speak with R. Bultmann: H.- A. 19); cf. Philippians 2:10 "in the highest heavens, on earth, in the nether regions"), 1 Col 1:16; 2:10; Gal 3:19 (angels as helpers).

Yet St. Paul underlines, gradually more, the demonic character of it (Gal 4:3, Col 2:15;-- Ephesians 2:2; 6:12; 1 Cor 15:24).

It should be noted that, instead of speaking of ‘cosmic powers’, one would do much better, with N. Söderblom (more on this later), to speak of ‘causers’.

**(ii) A second interpretation of ‘spirits in the dungeon’:**

The ‘spirits’ (phantoms, ‘souls’ (animism) of the dead, who were punished as a result of the Flood, but who, by virtue of God’s great mercy (‘to mega eleos’) - so it is called in the Byzantine liturgy - or by virtue of God’s patience, are nevertheless called to Trinitarian (from the Holy Trinity) life.

Indeed, 1 Pe 4:6 speaks explicitly of the fact that “God sent the good tidings also to those who had died, so that, condemned as earthly men, they might nevertheless live, seen from God, thanks to the Spirit (H.-A. 31)”.

*Note* -- 1 Cor 15:29 gives us a Pauline text, which, when read in this context, is telling: “If it were not so, what do those who are baptized for the benefit of the dead do? If, after all, the dead do not rise at all, for what reason are they baptized for the benefit of the dead?”.

By identifying oneself, for example, with one particular dead person (identitive method,--a basic fact of all archaic religion) and by being baptized for his benefit, because in his place, the one who does so transfers the “power” (generative power) of this to the one he replaces and imitates.

The necessary reason for this is, among other things, that the first Christians who did so assumed that the dead (not all the dead) could acquire Trinitarian life.

*Note* -- 2 Pe 2:4 gives us an additional view of the underworld, in one of its parts: “(For) even angels who committed sin, God did not spare them, but, on the contrary, sent them to the tartaros (the deepest part of the underworld), where they are shut up for judgment.”

### **Regulative model.**

After the three applicative models (Aphrodite (H.-A.35/36; Elohim (id., 36/39); Hellenism (id., 39/42), we pause, very briefly, for a summary overview.

#### **1.-- The overview of N. Söderblom.**

The author, o.c.,10/25, can, roughly speaking, be summarized as follows:

##### **a.-- Animatism.**

(O.c.,11;15). One may also say: ‘sacred vitalism’ or ‘hiëro-zoism’: Reason: animatism is (i) living-heart belief (ii) such that the principle of life (‘soul’, ‘spirit’, -- ‘soul-matter’) remains unspoken.- Thus, a stone, a heavenly body or so may be religiously interpreted as ‘living’ (in the sacred sense, that is,-- not in the ordinary biological sense). This, without ascribing a soul or an (astro-theological) deity to it, for example.

##### **b.1.-- Embodiment or incarnation belief.**

(i) The belief in a spirit or, rather, a soul, i.e. a spirit as an immanent life-force (animating condition) in a body (stone,-- plant, animal, human) would, strictly speaking, render the term ‘anima’ (‘animus’) of the word ‘animism’.

(ii) Occasionally religious people (especially psychics) distinguish, under the point of view of what is called ‘soul substance’ (‘matière d’ame’), more than one soul and, also, more than one type of soul substance. This amounts to a plurality of life forces (immanent, life-giving conditions).

Thus, at least in occultist circles, the distinction between ‘low-subtle’ and ‘high-subtle’ either souls or soul substances is well known.

Since one occultist school calls the other ‘ethereal’, we avoid both terms ‘ethereal’ (usually: low-subtle, closer to coarse matter, more materialized) and ‘astral’ (usually: high-subtle, more rarefied or fine matter, less materialized).

For a very detailed study of this aspect of animism, see J.J. Poortman, *Ochêma* ((*Geschiedenis en zin van het hylisch pluralisme*), (History and Meaning of Hylic Pluralism), Assen, 1954; id., *Vehicles of Consciousness (The Concept of Hylic Pluralism: Ochêma)*, 4 vols., Adyar-Madras / London / Wheaton, 1978 (a fascinating, thorough study).

We quote one passus from *Ochêma*, o.c., 107v.: Alb.C. Kruyt (1869/1949), well-known Dutch missionary and researcher, in his *Het animisme in de Indische archipel* (Animism in the Indian Archipelago), (1906) (...) contrasts “two main names, which the Indonesians have for concepts, which we can render with ‘soul’. (...)”.

**(i) 'Soul' is the life force that animates all of nature.**

'Soul' is, for the Indonesians, first of all, the life force that animates the whole of nature. This concept of soul means a fine (fine, rarefied, subtle, fluidic) substance that animates the whole of nature.

With P.D. Chantepie de la Saussaye (1848/1920), the first, who, consciously, approached sacred phenomena phenomenologically (H.-A. 1) (*Lehrbuch*), (Textbook), (1887), at Leiden, Kruyt called this 'soul substance' (also called: 'life fluid').

It should be noted that two ideas, already clearly prevalent among the Greek philosophers of nature, are in keeping with this hiëro-zoïsm(animatism):

**1. Hylozoism,**

This is the doctrine that all matter is "alive" somewhere,--a term introduced by the English Platonist Ralph Cudworth (1617/1688; *Systema intellectuale* (1678)) to oppose atomism (mechanicism).

The term 'world soul' can, in part, be interpreted as belief in 'world soul substance' and then runs parallel with hylozoism (e.g. with Anaximenes of Miletos (-588/524), with Paleo-Pythagoreans (-500/-300; cf. J. Zafiropulo, *Empédocle d'Agrigente*, Paris, 1953, 35/63), etc.), so that world soul belief and animatism are very similar;

**2. 'Life spirits'**

This concept, already present with the Paleo-Pythagorean Alkmaion of Kroton (-520/ -450); instead of this still with R. Descartes (1596/1650), one can also speak of "sensory soul" (*anima sensibilis*; cf. Francis Bacon of Verulam (1561/1626)): in physiology and e.g. in perception an airlike substance (cf. with "fine" or "thin" substance) plays a role.

Herakleitos of Ephesus (535/-465) also shows a similar idea.-- With this last concept we have already gone beyond very strict animatism (hiëro-philosophy), for life spirits and sense souls are limited, within the cosmos, to the actual soul and/or its activities.

**(II) 'Soul' as nadir of life force.**

For the Indonesians (according to Kruyt) the 'soul' is the post-mortem life force, for which he prefers the term 'soul'; Kruyt, curiously, calls the belief in it 'spiritualism' (this, because he seems to regard the post-mortem soul as very immaterial).

**Note.**-- With W. Wundt one distinguishes between body soul and free soul.

The “body-soul” is the soul, the life-principle of the body in question, insofar as it remains within the body; the “free soul” is the same soul insofar as it dwells outside the body in what is called an “out-of-body experience”. There is also talk of a ‘soul journey’.

Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, already refers to such experiences, whether in the waking or dream state.

**One bibliographic sample:** S.J. Muldoon/ H. Carrington, *The Projection of the Astral Body*, London, 1929-1, 1972-7 (note: ‘astral projection is, precisely, out-of-body experience-with-the-soul’) -- In active magic (H.-A. 24) the free soul plays a leading role. More about this later.

**Note -- Soul-transfer or reincarnation belief (re-embodiment belief).**

N. Söderblom, o.c., 14f., mentions, very briefly, a worldwide idea: the fact that plant, animal, human souls - at least according to the reincarnation belief - can reincarnate after leaving a body definitively in death.

A very controversial idea, especially when one assumes, like the Paleo-Pythagoreans mentioned above, that a human soul can, for various reasons, reduce itself to an animal soul or even a plant soul or an object soul.

### **b.2.-- Fetishism.**

After the belief in embodiment or incarnation above (b.1.), let us now look at fetishism (b.2.).

N. Söderblom, o.c., 11, mentions, briefly, the fact that e.g. the soul of a powerful dead person or an unknown spirit of the dead lives in e.g. a tree (vegetable fetish) or in a crocodile (animal fetish).

Such indwelling belief is, very realistically, reproduced by F. Nicolay, *Histoire des croyances, superstitions, mœurs, usages et coutumes (selon le plan du décalogue)*, (History of beliefs, superstitions, morals, habits and customs (according to the plan of the Decalogue)), Paris, s.d., 1, 3/22 (Dieu et les dieux : culte des esprits chez les sauvages et les non-civilisés), (God and the gods: spirit worship among savages and uncivilised people). The author quotes Father Baudin, Catholic missionary in W.-Africa:

“The fetish believer (‘fétichiste’) distinguishes sharply between the spirit and its enclosure (that which serves him to stay). During my stay (the first years) on the Slave Coast (Bay of Benin, Gulf of Guinea), our neighbor, the great lightning fetishist, died. From his hut they removed all his fetishes (‘sacred-objects’) as well as many henceforth useless objects. (...).

The Negro-Africans told me that:

(i) since the deities were no longer in them, because they had left with their/their servant,

(ii) the former fetishes no longer meant anything. (...). According to them, the fetish men / fetish women possess the ability and art (causal belief: H.-A 21) to banish deities and spirits ('génies') in an object (causal belief). Such objects (inorganic and organic), once isolated from the profane sphere by means of rites (acts of power), become as many 'animated bodies' moved by the deities and spirits".

**Linguistic note:** the West Negro-Africans also call the deity or spirit that dwells in them 'fetish' (metonymy by attributive analogy).

**Note.** - M. Verneuil, *Dict. prat. des sciences occultes*, Monaco, 1950, 199, identifies 'fetish' with 'pentacle' (// amulet, talisman). All the objects mentioned she attributes, one-sidedly, to 'vertu magique' (magical power), without serious reference to the animistic side.

However, 'loaded' (i.e. power-laden) objects, as soon as they are 'inhabited' by spirits or deities respectively, radiate magical (= producing) power.

Hence, among the 'specialists' without sacred experience worthy of the name, the disagreements concerning the purely animistic or the purely magical character of the fetish.

**Bibl. sample.**

(i) Charles de Brosses (Dijon 1709/Paris 1777), *Du culte des dieux fétiches*, (The cult of fetish gods), Paris, 1760, is the first interpreter of fetishism.

(ii) Auguste Comte (1798/1857), the founder of positivism,-- Jonh Lubbock (1834/1913), as an ethnologist, commemorates Brossian fetishism. Cfr W. Schmidt, *Or. et évol. d.l. relig.*, 80/88(Le fétichisme).

**Conclusion.**-- One does not, therefore, confuse strict inspiration (immanent principle of life) and fetishism (indwelling).

**b.3. -- Inspiration - and possession belief.**

After the belief in embodiment (b.1.) and fetishism (b.2.), we will now (b.3.) look at the belief in inspiration and possession. One or more foreign spirits and/or free souls may be present in something (e.g. a human, an animal) such that it:

(i) is no longer itself (alienation, 'aliénation'),

(ii) but a willing tool of those strange 'power-bearers' who either simply inspire it (pass on inspirations) or make it possessed (i.e. inspire it so that it no longer realizes this).

One could, in pure Dutch, speak of suggestive faith (by analogy with ‘suggestive fear’ e.g.; cf. (by analogy with ‘inspire fear’ e.g.; cf. suggest).

***Applicative model: the possessed of the races (Mk 5:1/20).***

Let us simply read the text.

**a.** They came to the other side of the lake, to the land of the Gerasenes. No sooner had Jesus stepped out of the boat, than a man in the power of an unclean spirit (*note* -- alienated from God) walked out of the fissures and into the tombs.

He lived in the sepulchers. No one could keep him bound, even with a chain: often, after all, they had already bound him with foot and handcuffs, but he pulled the handcuffs apart and shattered the footcuffs. (*Note*-- This physical ‘power’ is, merely, the secular expression of a sacred, other-worldly ‘generative power’ (H.-A. 21; Law 13/16 (esp. 14:6,19; etc.; one attributes this physical power to one type of ‘spirit (= power)’ of Yahweh).

No one could tame him. - More than that: uninterruptedly, day and night, he dwelt in the tombs and in the mountains, screaming, working himself up with stones.

**b.** When, from afar, he saw Jesus, he rushed towards him, threw himself down before him and cried out loudly: “What is going on between me and you, Jesus, son of the most high God? I beseech you, by God, do me no harm!”

After all, Jesus was telling him, “Unclean spirit, leave that man!”-- Jesus, going on, asked him questions (*note* -- A regular incantation custom), “What is your name?” To which the possessed man replied: “Legion is my name. We are, after all, with many”.

**c.** Then the possessed man repeatedly begged Jesus not to banish him from the region (Greek: ‘chora’) - well, a large herd of boars happened to be herded against the mountainside. Whereupon the legion begged: “Send us in the direction of the swine so that we may dwell in them”. -- Jesus let them go: the unclean spirits moved out of the possessed one into the pigs.

***As a result***, the herd of swine plunged from the steep bank into the lake, -- numbering about two thousand, -- so that they drowned in the lake.

**d.** The herdsmen ran off and told the fact both in the town and in the country.

Then the people came to see what had happened. When they came to Jesus, they saw the former man possessed, clothed and in his right mind -- the one who had been in the Legion: they were frightened. The eyewitnesses went on to tell how things had gone with the man possessed and what had happened to the pigs. Whereupon they urged Jesus to remove himself from their region.

**Notes.**

(i) To those who think that a sudden change of behavior like that of the pigs, who run and throw themselves into the lake, is nonsense, it is pointed out that e.g. the lemmings, a species of rodent in Northern Europe and Siberia, suddenly start a kind of 'migration' by the thousands and, as the case may be, drown themselves collectively in the water.

Externally, without thinking of possession, the boar's behavior had a similar structure. A priori, an animistic explanation cannot be excluded. This is all the more so since biologists are not brimming over with insight into such a trait either.

**(ii) Bibliogr. sample.**

One work: J. Zutt, Hrsg., *Ergriffenheit und Besessenheit (Ein interdisziplinäres Gespräch über transkulturell-anthropologische und -psychiatrische Fragen)*, (Seizure and Obsession (An Interdisciplinary Conversation on Transcultural Anthropological and Psychiatric Issues)), Bern/ Munich, 1972, - from which one quotation: J. Zutt, o.c., 11, takes as its basic concept 'seizedness' (ergriffenheit) - someone is 'seized' by an idea, a person, a thing -; 'filled-heartedness' is an amplified seizure: one is 'filled' by what is lovely, beautiful, good, true, divine; 'possessedness' is an amplified seizure: one is seized by what is ugly, evil, hostile, false, demonic.

In each case the emphasis is on the passive: one is seized, filled, possessed.

(iii) *Curious*: Jesus assigns, to Legion, a place in the cosmos. the unclean spirits may resettlement,-- in animals. Which, for demonic beings, is normal (see below).

*Curiously*, they do not ask to be banished from the land, according to the text. Fr. Heiler, *Das Gebet*, (The prayer), Munich, 1921-3, 113, speaks of local spirits ('enchorioi'). Thus the ancient Romans assumed that every city, district, street, piece of land had a local 'lar' (nature spirit) as its guardian spirit.--This, perhaps, explains Legion's question.

So much for the chapter on inspiration.



#### ***B.4. Faith in thigh-beings.***

The ‘thigh’, in Dutch, ‘de dij’. But the Dutch language also has the verb ‘gedijen’, and it means thicken (to grow), to increase, to swell.-- A. Lefèvre, *La religion*, Paris, 1921,161, points out that animism knows ‘beings’, which are connected with the root ‘djan’, ‘gen’ (in Sanskrit, Greek and Latin): ‘djanitar’, ‘genetèr’, ‘genitor’ (vr.: genitrix), procreator (who makes things and processes prosper);-- ‘genos’, ‘genus’ and ‘gens’ (genus), etc.

**Note:** One may be surprised at the connection between the thigh and the wellbeing. The thighs of women contain a lot of life force. It is also there, between the thighs, that the new life emerges.

**a.** -- “In addition to and for the same reason as the ‘manes’ (the kindly souls of the dead), the ‘lares’ (H.-A. 48: the protective nature spirits of places), the ‘penates’ (the spirits protecting the household goods), the ancient Romans revered the ‘genii’ (mv.; enk.: ‘genius’).

Apuleius (Madaura +125/Carthage +180; Neoplatonic thinker and writer) says: “Our ancestors were convinced that the manes, if they were evil, should be called ‘larvae’ and, if they were benevolent, they called them ‘lares’. Genius’ and ‘lar’ are the same being”!

One might as well say the same of the Greek ‘daimones’, in whom Hesiod of Askra (H.-A. 35) sees souls of ancient, vanished generations.

But both the name (‘genius’, ‘genii’) and the various roles of the ‘genii’ (thieving spirits) do not allow them to be identified, without question, with the souls of the dead.

**a.** The root ‘gen’ (...) means, par excellence, ‘to conceive’, only then ‘to be’ and ‘to become’.

**b.** The choice of words by the Latins to designate a whole class of deities that are difficult to define by ‘genius’ includes:

(i) the genesic (associated with thigh) concerns. which are so intimately associated with all religious ideas’,

(ii) a separate belief in a generative power (‘force génératrice’), situated either in or above every being (...) and which is at the heart of it. (...).

Just as all men have their own driving spirit, called ‘genius’, so all women have their own driving spirit, called ‘iuno’. This double (companion) is, however, also ascribed to the deities, as well as to the forests, the fields, the meadows, the springs, the mountains.” (A. Lefèvre, o.c., 248 / 249).

***To sum up:***

The male and female thigh spirit represent one type of life force (H.-A. 43 (embodiment belief), which strengthens one's own soul (life-force) -- and does so through indwelling (H.-A. 45) and inspiration (inspiration: H.-A. 46).

Hence, the thigh spirit is present both in and above (outside) the soul or spirit involved. Like a thigh being, which "everywhere accompanies" (A. Lefèvre, o.c., 249). -- One would rightly speak of extra spirit (extra soul) or added spirit or soul..

***Explanation.***

H. Steuding, *Griechische und Romische Mythologie*, (Greek and Roman mythology), Leipzig, 1905-3, 118, describes the Roman model: "Closely related to their own souls are the male thigh-beings ('genii'), the preservers of the male's life and generative force, and the female thigh-beings ('iunones') - completely equal in essence - of women.

At birth (*note* -- In fact already at conception in the mother's womb) they take up their post in man; at his death they leave him (*note* -- Though not in all cases), in order to move into the sphere of the manes (benevolent souls of the dead). Like the souls of the dead themselves, they are portrayed in serpentine form (image impression)". - So much for the immanent form.

At the same time, however, the thigh spirit is a deity in man, who is worshipped as a guardian spirit, by whom one swears, to whom one offers a sacrifice on the day of one's birth. -- So much for the transcendent form. In this transcendental form he is compared to the guardian angel.

H. Jennings Rose, *Genius*, in: *The Classical Oxford Dictionary*, Oxford, 1950-2, 383, says that "in classical times, the thigh-spirit was conceived as the complete analogue of what the Greeks called 'idios daimon', i.e. the thigh-spirit added to one person (god, region, object).

For H. Jennings Rose, *Iuno*, *ibid.*, 471 f.: the iuno is the 'numen' (divine guiding being, who gives 'hints' to his protégé(s)), who 'watches over' women and her roles.

Both the genius and the iuno are described as power-carrying, power-charged ('mana: about which later).

***Conclusion:*** throughout its biological life (and beyond), the thigh spirit acts as a source of power (incidental) and a programmer (to a great extent).

***Two main types of thigh-beings.***

The people involved speak of the thigh-beings in terms of kinship (natural, sacred (not merely biological)). this language game leads us to two main features of the thigh-beings phenomenon.

***Type 1.-***

Jer 3:26, the prophet says: “If the thief is caught, he is ashamed.-- The house of Israel says to the tree, “My father art thou! The house of Israel saith unto the stone, Thou hast given us birth! If the house of Israel speaks thus, it shall be ashamed, together with its kings and its leaders, its priests and its prophets”.

In other words he who speaks this way, knows, feels himself descendant (and, so, related) to the tree or the stone. he may carry the name of it (‘eponym’).

***Explanation.***

A. Lefèvre, O.c.,162, says: “What happened in Rome is found everywhere: the ancestors - feroeër(s) (Iran), pitri’s, genii, penates (Rome) - were, as generators, objects of veneration.

**(i)** The ancestors, who had distinguished themselves by a brilliant achievement or who had founded a tribal or family tradition (note -- heroes, cultural founders, salvagers), were the most highly regarded.

**(ii).1.** The first parent (...) was the eponymous or naming hero or, also, the founding hero of house or city (and, by title, true house-god).

**(ii).2.** Still higher, ascending in the genealogy, one designed a first couple (note -- primal couple,-- sometimes first or primal-androgien (male-female being)), as ‘father’ and ‘mother’ of a whole people or, even, of the whole human race. ( ... ).

**(ii).3.** In parallel with the ancestors (progenitors, causers) mentioned above, the worship of earthly, atmospheric, heavenly spirits led to the acceptance of cosmic primordial couples, such as, e.g., the heaven and the earth (...) (*note* -- as causers of the universe).( ... ).

**(ii).4.** Human and cosmic causalities ran together”. -- in other words, they were all called “father” (al-father, al-mother), parent. This is how one understands the text of Jeremiah, above.

### ***Application.***

The Roman main deities were Jup(p)iter, who gave the genius to the men, and Iuno, who gave the iuno to the women.

J. Schmidt, *Greek and Roman Mythology*, Helmond, 1968, 151, writes: “As the protector of women, the Great Goddess Iuno accompanies them throughout their lives, from birth to death: she fulfils the role of a kind of double agent, since every woman possesses her, just as every man possesses his genius. For each decisive stage of a woman’s life, Iuno has a nickname: at marriage, she is called Iuno iugalis (marriage-involved Iuno); the women giving birth call on her assistance as Iuno lucena (life-giving Iuno),-- at the same time, the children that are born are placed under her ‘protection’.

(...). She is the supreme mistress of house mothers, Iuno matrimonialis”. -- Immediately we get an insight into the role of a “mother” (originator of destiny): the Roman woman never felt lonely: in her (immanent iuno) and, at the same time, above her (transcendental iuno;) was, after all, that life-giving goddess figure, who, by means of the indwelling spirit of the thigh, directs, strengthens, -- as if she were a supersoul, a spirit in - and - above her.

The indwelling serpent (female animal) is both similarity and coherence (‘similitudo participata’, say medieval thinkers) with Iuno, the Supreme Goddess, who fathered the serpent.

### ***Type 2.***

The second type of kinship is the brother-sister relationship.-- Let us take a concrete example. Basile Tanghe, o.c., *De slang bij de Ngbandi*, (The snake at the Ngbandi), Brussel, 1919, 11/14, tells, as a lived experience, such an affinity (the Ngbandi are a Central African people, in Zaïre and Congo). Since 09.05.1912 Tanghe stays in Lembo (in Ubangi).

On 15.05.12 he discovered under his bed an oversized snake for the first time. Since then, it disappears each time in a mysterious way. On Sunday 19.05.1912, shortly after noon, the hunt for the very large snake can finally begin.

“At last Ginga, the cook (from Monge), hits the beast with a mercy shot. Whereupon it starts to howl and cry like a madman”. A workmate of the cook, Zanga, then says: “Shut up, because Ginga is a snake!

(i) Suddenly Ginga stops screaming and speaks normally. When Father Tanghe asks what all this means, he answers: “I am a twin child. Therefore, I am a snake. I have just shot my brother. If I had not screamed, I would have become ill. Now that I have fulfilled my duty of mourning, I am at peace”.

In the ideas and lore of the Ngbandi, twins ‘are’ (i.e. by conception) ‘serpents’ (they share the thigh spirit with the serpents of the region).

(ii) Monday 20.05.1912: Kumba, the twin sister of Ginga, comes, from an hour away, with her husband. She too says that she is ‘a snake’.

a. Consequently, she brings some scrapings of red mbio wood, in a bag of leaves.

a. She takes some of that mbio and draws a red line with it on both Ginga’s arms, along the inside, from the wrist to the shoulders.

b. In turn, Ginga does the same on the arms of his twin sister.

b. Then they both take the remainder of the Mbio to sprinkle it on the snakeskin, which lies drying in the sun.

### ***Explanation.***

From the rest of the book it appears that the Ngbandi worship the serpent in connection with their most special life activities (e.g. the lullaby which the mothers like to sing is the song of the serpent; -- in celebrating (dancing and getting drunk), catching ants and hunting, fishing (by inland people and inhabitants of the shore), the journey of the rowers, carrying freight, especially the making of we.as.(the ritual of the sacred ashes) the we.serpent is central).

The Ngbändi venerate, in particular, the serpent in the twin children (in mockery (sacred mockery), at the mother’s walk with the twin, at the naming, the village sacrifice on behalf of the twin, entering the house,--at the death of a twin child) and this as a demonic being (“Speak to any Ngbandi: every tribesman will say that the serpent is bad” (o.c., 41)).

### ***The reason:***

The sacred kinship between the twin and the snake, between the snake and the mother and father of the twin, between the snake and its other (blood) relatives. Thus, its father is called ‘father of the snake’, its mother ‘mother of the snake’.

The mother is, indeed, very close: in her songs she sings the names of all the twins she has known or heard of, and she calls them all ‘serpents’ and ‘my children’.

If she sees a serpent (a real one), she calls her own twins and says to the serpent passing by: “My child, continue on your way, so that they will not harm you”.

If people come to kill the serpent, she simply runs away. If they kill them, she comes screaming: “ah! snake, my child!” (o.c.,47).

Sometimes - and the missionary does not hide the fact that, from time to time, unexplainable but real things happen - an incident gives food for thought. “I had asked Yabwa, mother of twins, (...) about twin worship. (In her willingness to answer) she had even covered her forehead with a white cloth -- to show how twins are worshipped.

The next day, she came down, leaning on a stick, foot for foot, “She was so sick. At night the snake had tried to strangle her, because she had worshipped the twins without (sufficient) reason”. (O.c.,48). Is this imagination or real hallucination?

When the brother of the twins goes hunting, he acts like their father: even if both twins have died, he says: “my brothers (he names them), make me see game”. -- This shows that the twins are believed to have power, causal power.

### ***The snake***

At least three types of snakes are discussed:

- (i) the biological animal, which we all know;
- (ii) the twin and its relatives;
- (iii) but then there is ‘the snake’. Who or what is this apparent abstract?

“I once asked Yabwa, a twin mother, for what reason the Ngbandi venerate the snake: ‘Don’t you know that the snake is the ‘toro’ of the Ngbandi?’

The Mbanza and the Ngbugbu each have their Ngakola; the Banziri have the hippopotamus as their ‘toro’. Among the Ngbandi, you will not find any other ‘toro’ but the snake”.

Well, ‘toro’ in the regional language, means ‘supreme spirit’ (supreme being supreme) (o.c., 52).

Further testimonies confirm Yabwa's statement.

(a) Gaso, "a man like a tree, one of the principal residents" says "Your god is in the church (he pointed to our chapel). With us the snake is what 'god' is with you". (o.c.,54).

(b) The students of the faith tell that among the Ngbandi, only 'the serpent' can boast of a worship which can be compared to that of the god of the Christians (ibid.).

In other words, now we begin to understand what the prophet Jeremias (H.-A. 51) quotes about the tree, the stone. The supreme spirit, somewhat comparable to Yahweh, to the supreme being (in the strictly monotheistic sense), comes through here.

For more on this aspect of animism: W. Schmidt, *Or. et év.*, 219 / 234 (Le 'grand dieu' des primitifs), where the writer mentions A.W. Howitt and Miss Langloh-Parker (Australian natives) and E.H. Man (Andaman Islanders), as well as the Scottish thinker Andrew Lang (1844/1912), *The Making of Religion* (1898), all of which point to a supreme spirit belief.

#### **B.5. -- *Belief in a supreme spirit.***

The supreme spirit, like all spirits, in its contact with mankind assumes various manifestations, which are likewise imagery: 'the stone', 'the tree', 'the serpent' is, indeed, the supreme spirit, but in a special function (cf. H. Usener (1834/1905; 'Funktionsgötter'), i.e. when he recognizes the life or power of creation of e.g. the stone, the tree, the serpent, which he identifies (H.-A. 42: identitive method), in the form of a spirit, has its effect, especially on those to whom he has passed on the same spirit (at the time of biological conception or through a later rite).

The "fatherhood" of the Supreme Spirit is based, first of all, on this passing on of his own spirit (which, for example, "works" in the hunting happiness of the "brothers" of the twins). Thus one calls him 'our father' or 'he, who bore (begot) us!

The Ngbandi, although convinced of the 'evil' in the snake, on hearing the Bible story, about the devil in the image - appearance of the snake, asked "as many as ten times" to "P. Tanghe:

- (i) whether the serpent was so 'evil' after all and
- (ii) whether the God of the Christians was really and truly stronger than 'the serpent' (o. c.,54).

That, with this, the radical distinction between, on the one hand, the supreme spirit (in the animistic sense) and, on the other hand, the supreme being (in the (primeval) monotheistic sense) becomes clearer, is also shown by what W. Schmidt, o.c., 103 (*Le manisme*, (manism) the ancestor worship), writes: “What is true (...), is the fact that (...) the first parent - more precisely: the first man (H.-A. 51), of a tribe or of the whole of mankind, pushed the supreme being (strictly monotheistic)

(i) pushed into the background and

(ii) prepared its practical elimination”.

More so: the explanation (abduction) is provided, at least in part, by R. Ambelain, *Le vampirisme (De la légende au réel)*, (Vampirism (From legend to reality)), Paris, 1977 , 233s., where he describes the sacred structure of the soul (substance) exchange (passation d’âme).

**1.** The soul (matter) exchange (H.-A. 43 (animatism), as e.g. in the rites of the vodou (= vaudou), especially its African form, shows that one double (H.-A. 49vv. 52: extra soul, a spirit) can be replaced by another (note - Here, of course, partial replacement, i.e. ‘fusion’, merging, is meant).

Ambelain sees in it, the explanation of possession, which - he says - the Church understands as real phenomena (H.-A.50: indwelling (H.-A.45); inspiration, inspiration (H.-A.46).

**2.** Ambelain further defines: in the voodoo - rites (the West-African as well as the Haitian ones) one may no longer victimize people; consequently: one takes an animal as ‘sacrifice’. However, before this ritual is carried out, the double of the animal present in both parties is loosened. Result: creepy behavior.

**A.** -- The child or girl who has been ‘victimized’ (at least in the minds of the people, for the animal replaces it) - by being deprived of its own thigh-spirit and, instead, having an animal thigh-spirit instigated or, better, imbibed - becomes and remains mute; it cannot be taught to speak (as a full human being) or to walk upright.

Also, in many Central African villages there are idiots, whose idiocy is due to this or to such practices.

**B.** -- The animal, however, because it has had a human spirit implanted in it (i.e. from the child or girl it ‘replaces’ as a sacrifice), always exhibits (according to Ambelain) both a behavior and a look, which, remarkably, are ‘human’ (better would be: human-animal,-- which is what Ambelain means). At least in the period between the exchange ritual and the sacrificial death.



This explains why Dan 7:9/14 (text about the world judgment), receives as a comment, from Alfred Bertholet, in his *Die Religion des Alten Testaments*, (The Religion of the Old Testament), Tubingen, 1932, 131: “the kingdom of God resembles (understand: and participates in) ‘the son of man’ (*note* - text, on which Jesus invoked to characterize himself), just as the worldly kingdoms resemble (understand: and participate in) animals. (H.-A.52: similitudo participata or in - upper structure). In passing one would better say ‘unanimal’ (for the animal, as a creature, is good).

***Double epilogue.***

Under the titles ‘thigh belief’ (H.-A. 49/55) and ‘supreme spirit(s) belief’ (ibid., 55/57), we have touched upon two schools of religion:

**(i) *Manism***

(Herbert Spencer (1820/1903), the sociologist; ‘manism’ or ‘ancestor theory’); see W. Schmidt, *Or. et ét évol.*, 89/104;

**(ii) *Totemism*,**

which, as a term, dates from 1778 and, as a theory, from J. F. MacLennan’s (1827/1881) *Primitive Marriage* (1866) and its elaborators (Robertson Smith, ll. of the preceding, with his *Kinship and Marriage in Arabia*, Cambridge, 1885 (sacrificial theory among the Semites); J. G. Frazer (1854/1941), *Totemism*, Edinburgh, 1887 (highly documented); Emile Durkheim (1858/1917) founder of the French School of Sociology, a.o. in his *Les formes élémentaires de la vie religieuse*, (Elementary forms of religious life), Paris, 1912 (pan-totemism)). - Cfr . W. Schmidt, o.c., 139/156 (Le totemisme).

For further information on totemism: M. Besson, *Le totémisme*, Paris, 1929 (o.c., 69s.): Frazer’s conceptionalist interpretation, e.g. in those Australian women who know themselves to be ‘pregnant’, outside the natural mating process, by means of “a special (Note -- Interpret: subtle (H.-A. 43); P. B. Tanghe, o.c., 45, speaks of ‘spirit children’) intervention of the totem”);

M. Augé, prés., J. Middleton, *Anthropologie religieuse (Les dieux et les rites)*, (Anthropology of Religion (Gods and Rites)), Paris, 1974, 20/22 (Elkin); 97/112 (A.P. Elkin, *La nature du totémisme Australien*), (The nature of Australian totemis). -- Cl. Lévi-Strauss, *Le totémisme aujourd’hui*, (Totemism today), Paris, 1969 (esp. pp. 23).

### ***The phenomenon of 'medium(n)sme'.***

**Bibl. Sample:** Joh. Verweyen, *Die Probleme des Mediumismus*, (The problems of mediumism), Stuttgart, 1928. Occultist' (H.-A. 9) is the one who, in addition to this coarse material world, also accepts a second world (H.-A. 33/34), which appears to us as subtle (rarefied or fine material (H.-A. 43) and immaterial. Even more so, is "occultist" the one, who, like the apocalypse-maker (H.-A. 4; 41 (Henok)) practices 'wisdom', (i.e. lawfulness, natural process, as well as its control), while he "dwells in that second 'rarefied' and 'immaterial' world".

Mediumistic' (also: 'mediamic' or, even mediumistic') is that occultist who acts as a 'meson' (Gr.), 'medium' (Lat.), intermediary (mediator), between this (earthly, physical, coarse, secular) world, on the one hand, and, on the other, the 'other' world. "Medien vermitteln zwischen diesen beiden Welten" (according to Verweyen, o.c., 10).

In other words, the term 'occultist' is broader than the term 'medium'. For example, a magician (in) (H.-A. 24; 45; 46 (magistic), i.e., one who handles power (mana,--about which further) in a functional way, is necessarily an occultist but not necessarily a mediumistic one. Thus, for example, a spiritist (spirit summoner) is both occultist and mediumistic.

### ***Control spirit'.***

Take, for example, the medium Mrs. Piper (= Leonora E. Piper (1857/1950), of Boston, Mass. (USA)), who has been investigated by numerous researchers and has never been caught in a fraud (Verweyen, o.c., 148ff.).

Her 'entity' (= another name for controlling spirit) was called Phinuit, who passed herself off as 'the spirit'(!) - animistic phenomenon - of a French doctor. Usually Mrs. Piper fell into a deep trance, in which her female voice suddenly changed into the 'rough, male' voice of Phinuit.

This one - apparently a demonic being - spoke, through her, with an eerie mixture of (i) gallicisms, (ii) Negro dialect, (iii) American flat language, (iv) sometimes interspersed with vicious curse words. This Phinuit was succeeded by one George Pelham and one Imperator. Whether Mrs. Piper was, now, purely mediumistic or, besides mediumistic, also e.g. a seer, we (with many) leave undecided.

The question arises: what is the relationship between 'the controlling or supervising, on the one hand, and the medium of control, on the other? Both have a driving spirit, which has the same characteristics. In this way the controlling spirit is both above (H.-A. 52;50) and in the medium. In other words, the controlling spirit is the very procreator of the medium.

### ***The entity***

In early 1983, after immense success in the USA, the film *The Entity* was released in French cinemas, somewhat reminiscent of *The Exorcist*.

The main event of the film: a girl, played by Barbara Hershey (awarded), is tormented ('bullied') and raped ... by an invisible being ('the entity').

The film is the work of Franck de Felitta. De Felitta met, after all, in 1977, in California, Carla Moran, a girl who, for years, has in reality been visited by an 'entity', mediumistically, in that aggressive-erotic way.

De Felitta, as a rationally enlightened man, was convinced that 'such nonsense' did not exist. Religious: even more so, 'paranormological' explanations were 'illusions'. At most, sacred fantasy could be distilled from them.

Over time, however, the Felitta changed its mind. For example, he got to know Howard Long, the famous American specialist (he treats Carla). With other researchers from the Univ. of Cal. (Ucla), he attends, in person, the manifestations of the entity.

These 'manifestations' reaching into the secular sphere include:

- (i) multicolored light forms the aura (sphere of radiation around the person);
- (ii) In the lab itself, one sees an eerie apparition, which "forms" (causes, "begets") there; it throws itself upon the young woman.

Those present film the event: the entity, on the film itself, leaves behind both the multicolored light phenomena and her apparition.

The medical report is formal, this time: Carla, who says nothing, has been both physically (grossly) tormented (nail scratches on chest; shoulder completely torn; injuries between the thighs) and physically raped.

***In passing:*** in other circumstances, but after identical scenes, Carla is three times pregnant.

In other words, both the 1977 film footage and the medical reports show more than just 'sexual neurosis' (as psychiatry and neurology - in the rational, enlightened sense - maintain) what the medieval theologians called 'incubus' (literally: an upper body, as distinct from 'succuba' (lower body)), is the sacred - occult aspect.

According to the medieval demonologists, an incubus is a demon (i.e. a sacred being, sometimes good, sometimes bad), of the male sex (which the biblics would not call a 'god'), who, with women, 'has sex', to put it bluntly.

A succuba is, then, a demon ('goddess'), who does the same but with men.-- Sinistrari d'Ameno, The 'demoniality' (work of an Italian theologian of the XVIIth e.) writes: "Such demonic beings perform sex with women and men, twofold:

(i). The first way applies to (black) magicians and sorceresses (the so-called "witches"), whom they, at first, themselves, solemnly summon, so that, afterwards, by virtue of this union, on the one hand, such beings behave sexually towards their "subjects", while, on the other hand, the latter, voluntarily, surrender to them;

(ii). The second way applies to people, who, completely and utterly, move outside the (black) magic. F. Boutet, dir., *Dict. des sciences occultes*, Paris, 1937-1; 1976-2, 1835).-- According to one tradition Lilit(h), the 'goddess', mentioned for a moment in Isaias 34:14, would be such a sex goddess.

In any case, according to J. Degas, *L'Emprise* (the French title for *The Entity*), in: *Nostra* 563 (27.03.1983, 12s., the mystery, in Carla's case, is total:

(i). the so-called "scientific" (?) treatments, to which they were 'expertly' subjected, increased the expressions even more and

(ii) the so-called 'exorcisms' (devil's incantations) remained without result.-- This twofold negative effect occurs, in passing, far more than physicians and exorcists would like to admit. Certainly, if there is even a single erotic or 'sexy' aspect to the so-called neurosis or possession (mediumism). The question arises as to what lies behind this double failure? Perhaps one Gina Covina, *The Ouija Book*, London, 1981, 18/31 (*Beginnings*), touches the sore point. On the one hand, she says, there are the explicit intentions of people who practice Spiritism, for example (which the book deals with in the first place).

But, on the other hand, there is no doubt that both sacred and certainly occult realities, through those conscious intentions, first of all deal with and respond to (i.e. answer to) both conscious and unconscious motives (a-priori's, lemmata, presuppositions).

“All your presuppositions and convictions will come more clearly to your mind (process of becoming conscious) if you experiment with the yes-no sign (of the spiritists). Checking them from the beginning will speed up the process. (o.c., 21).

Applied: both doctors and exorcists, precisely by failing (or, like the doctors, making things worse), are thrown back on themselves: it is not the pure phenomenon (E. Husserl) -- here: the Carla phenomenon -- that is ‘wrong’, but the investigators, the experimenters (who are both doctors and exorcists, in fact), whose (un)conscious principles for approaching it, fail.

Which, in good epistemology, is called falsification (i.e. of the hypotheses, lemmata, abductions). With K. Popper (1902/1994) we can, however; say that, like any falsification (i.e. proving that a premise was wrong), this too is progress, in terms of knowledge, one knows, at least, how not to approach it from now on.

In our view the problem is, surely, in the spirit of the thighs, -- that of the incubus and that of Carla --, which both have in common. In my opinion - the chapter on causation will try to make this clearer - it is so: whoever does not know the sacred-occult method (magic) to create a spirit and has mastered it, cannot - always in my opinion - really help Carla (not in the symptoms, but in the cause).

**Reason:** only a driving spirit, which is both of the same nature (similia similibus; H.-A. 27) and more powerful (H.-A. 21;--36; 46; 47) can, through identification (H.-A. 42) with Carla, the victim, eliminate evil in her. But this is beyond the scope of this chapter (reason: it is magic).

### ***Erwachen im Jenseits:***

Under this title, a ‘spiritualist’ book was published in 1955, written by a Helene Möller. Her ‘entity’ - so the (medially written) texts claim - is the archangel Raphael.

**Bibl. sample:** H. Möller, *Einsamer Weg zu Gott* (Lonely path to God), (Autobiographie), Liestal (Schweizerl.), 1960, 559 S. -- Frau Möller is medium, yet both her life and her abundance of writings show that both her spirit and her 'entity' are of a radically different nature to that of Leonora E. Piper (H.-A. 58) or - certainly - that of Carla Moran (H.-A. 59), who are, both clearly demonic (i.e. reflecting good and evil). A. 58) or - most certainly - that of Carla Moran (H.-A.59), both of whom are clearly demonic (i.e. reflecting the interpenetration of good and evil).

**a. - A sample.**

O.c.,172f., gives us an insight into the method. Frau Möller is, as it were, a second medium: on the one hand, she hears the voice (a purely inner voice; no typical "hallucinatory" sounds) of the archangel; on the other hand, through the mediation (particularly the impressive power (glory; H.-A. 31;39)) of that archangel, she contacts souls from the typical underworld sphere (H.-A. 36 (Elohim, who ascend from the earth); 40 (inhabitants of darkness); 42 (phantoms), to whom she tries to communicate a 'high' (i.e. coming from the sphere of the glorified Christ, seated at the right hand of his Father) message.

This twofoldness reaffirms the cosmic system clarified by M. Eliade (H.-A. 19).

First the voice of a spirit out of darkness: "In my present situation it remains a mystery to me why I should have to listen, over and over again, to the mad, exciting, narcissistic ('aufgeblasene') talk of other spirits (*note* -- who does not think of J.P. Sartre's '*L'enfer, c'est les autres*'?), (Hell is other people).

All these spirits seem to me to be unbelievably poor and their talk completely useless.-- Advise me of the reason why I am here and cannot leave (H.-A. 40: 'trapped').

Then the message: "To your question the spirit that brought you to me (= Raphael) wants to answer itself. Here is what he says: Without any strength (H.-A. 21 (power)) alive, you feel yourself at the mercy of the talk of pitiful spirits, for you cannot escape their company. (...). Reflect on the manner in which ye have lived on earth.

You have wasted your precious earthly life with useless and senseless talk, just to pass the time. (...). For you found no time to think about and discuss really important questions ('issues').

Completely absorbed in the banal thoughts of the poor, thoughtless human being, you have spent your life.

It is true that you have not neglected your earthly duties: you have, after all, taken care of the people who were entrusted to you. But the orderly, empowering (H.-A. 62: Power), God-elevating prayer life was lacking.

**Consequence:** in your present situation you are missing the world of ‘high’ (note – Understand: non-demonic, divine) ideas. For instance, ideas such as ‘God’ or ‘the kingdom of heavenly spirits’ did not ‘exist’ for you. God, in fact, as an effective method of forming your mind and your imagination in the right way (cf. ‘education’ is the ‘high’ sense of earthly life), has recommended that you really take these high ideas seriously. On the contrary, you have rejected this method of forming the soul.

**Consequence:** It is precisely for this reason that you are now subjected to the mind-numbing, vacuous, confused talk (*note* -- Who is not thinking here of M. Heidegger’s ‘reasoned’, i.e. the superficial verbalization of the serious realities of life?), peculiar to that type of spirits which, like you, did not take care to form their souls with a view to making contact with ‘heavenly’ (meaning God-fearing) spirits, whose task it is to point out the way to God. In other words, the present state of affairs you are now experiencing is but one application of the law by which like attracts like (H.-A. 27; 61).

So much for this logically constructed, reasoning speech to what might be called ‘a purgatory soul’.

***Explanation.***

The regulative model (rule of conduct), which the archangel Raphael (we presume it is he) applies here, dates from the days of one Ben Sira(ch), Ekklesiastikus 15; 11/20. “(...) God, in the beginning, made man and left him to his free judgment, you decide whether you will keep the commandments.(...). People can choose between life (H.-A. 31 (the whole page) or death (H.-A. 41): what they decide is given to them”.

Galatians 6: 7/8 clarifies this: “Do not mock: God does not allow Himself to be mocked. For whatever you sow, that will you also reap:

- (i) he who sows in poor humanity (‘flesh’), will, from it, reap destruction;
- (ii) he who, however, sows in the spirit (H.-A.31), will, out of that spirit, reap eternal life”.

The sowing-harvesting law, expressed here, points to apokalypticism (H.-A. 4; 41; esp.58), revelation of the laws in the sacred.

**b. - *The angel of light.***

We translate, now, the closing words of *Erwachen im Jenseits* (Awakening in the Hereafter). Reason: it typifies the high type of ‘angel’.

(A). “In the dialogues, as they are to be read in the book, namely with souls of the dead, a teaching has been made available by God concerning the way in which man (living on earth) can establish contact with spirits from the earthly sphere of the other world.

Many types of souls who lacked the strength (H.A. 62: Power) needed to rise above the earthly sphere could ( ...) be made to see, precisely because they were still full of earthly ideas and impulses.

In other words, precisely because the souls contacted are still “earthbound” (i.e. bound to their previous lives on earth) and “demonic” (exhibiting both good and evil), the angel Raphael could easily allow Frau Möller to act as a medium.

In other words, Frau Möller, as a medium, is in touch and in touch with earthly souls who reside in the underworld. She thus places herself in the great tradition of the descent into hell (H.-A. 37: Descent into heaven).

(B). “However, the souls that have ascended to the ‘high’ sphere of God’s world of light are only very rarely able to make themselves known to a human being living on earth. The reason: the earthly ideas and impulses are extinguished in her. For, in God’s world of light (Hebrew 19: Upper World, Heaven), the redeemed spirit changes the earthly being in him to such an extent that he comes out of it as reborn,--as an “angel of God.



a. A possible return to the earthly world he rejects, therefore, as unworthy, for it subtracts from God.

b. A spirit of this (high) type returns to the earthly sphere, temporarily, only on God's command. Yet he does not lose God's world of light within him, since he is at work under the influence of God's power (H.A. 62: Power). Moreover, his activity within the earthly sphere always betrays, somewhere, that he belongs, by right, to the light world of God.

This is what I (= Raphael) wanted to say as an explanation of my activity through the working power of a person connected to me (= Frau M.).

By the way: this person will fade away from the earthly world in a short time (note -- through death), whereby my activity on earth will come to an end(...). I myself, after the death of this person serving me, will return to the light world of God, where I belong. (...)"

In other words, without a medium who is both underworld-oriented and light-world-oriented, an angel of God cannot (unless by other means of force) intervene on earth in a human life, let alone 'descend' into the actual underworld to proclaim a message (H.A. 41;42), as Jesus did for us.

### ***Explanation.***

The word 'angel' (in the God-fearing sense) means, in scripture,

(i) apart from God's visible manifestation (image impression; H.-A. 23),

(ii) spirits created by God, immediately subservient to Him, and constituting His 'court-holding' (staff group), -- at least a part of it.

Job 1:6 ('calling on Yahweh'); 2:1, mentions the fact: now, from then on, 'angels' (messengers, commissioners) are sent out with a task of destruction (Ex 12: 23; 2 Kings 19:35; Ezek 9:1; Ps 78:49); then again, they are the guardian angels of nations or of individuals (Ex 23:20; Dan 10:13); also mediators of messages (Ezek 40:3; Dan 8:16; 9/21v. Zak 1:8f; 2:2; Acts 1:1;10:1/11).

The names vary: sometimes they are called "sons of God" (Job 1:6; Ps. 29:1) or "saints" (Job 5:1) or "army of heaven" (heavenly heir: 1 Kings 22:19; Ps. 103:21; 148:2). Or still 'servants of God' (Job 4:18, where their weakness is emphasized).

One should also not forget what H.-A. 41 (cosmic powers) says on the subject.

### ***The angel Raphael***

He is mentioned in Tob 5:4 (as a companion on a journey (Tob 3:17; //Gen 24:7)); Tob 3:17 (as a healer); Tob 12:12 (as a mediator of prayer). Tob 12:15 he says: “I am Raphael, one of the seven angels, who are always ready to penetrate into the presence of the glory of the Lord (H.-A. 26;39)”. Scripture gives three of the seven names: Michael (Dan 10:3; 10:21; 12:1); Gabriel (Dan 8:16;9:21;-- Lu 1:19) and Raphael. -- Check Apok 8:2.

**Conclusion:** Although H. Möller’s claim that the angel Raphael accompanied her is nowhere to be verified with absolute certainty, the possibility of a new appearance of this angel can be concluded from the biblical book Tobit (mere lemma).

**Note.**-Cfr. H.-A. 28 (Adam). -- The figure of Adam (not without Eve and the serpent (cf. H.-A. 54v.)) is central in Biblical and, in particular, in Christian thought. The following liturgical texts, reflecting the Greek Fathers of the Church, bear witness to this:

(i) “My Savior (Jesus), as the living, un-slaughtered sacrifice, you, as God, have voluntarily offered yourself to the Father. By this you resurrected Adam and his entire family with you at your resurrection from the grave”. (K. Kirchhoff, *Osterjubiläum der Ostkirche*, (Easter Jubilee of the Eastern Church), Munster (Wf.), 1940, II. 61 (see also o.c. 63; 77).

(ii) “Adam’s nature, which descended to the lowest parts of the earth (under-world), Thou hast recreated, God, and, this day (Ascension), Thou hast carried it, upward, above every dominion and power (H.-A. 41v.: cosmic powers)” (ibid.,77)

(iii) “Thou, Christ, didst seek out Adam, who, through the deceit of the serpent, had been led astray. Clothed with his nature, Thou didst ascend into heaven. Immediately Thou hast set Thyself, as throned with him, at Thy Father’s right hand”. (o.c.,83).

(iv) “Adam, bewitched by the deceit (of the serpent), was thrust into the abyss of the underworld. But Thou, God, who art compassionate by nature, came down to seek him: on Thy shoulders Thou didst lift him up and raise him up with Thee”. (o.c.,128).-- In other words, the whole work of redemption involves Adam and his whole family (his ‘nature’).

In order to better understand this connection and parable (H.-A. 52), we quote a text from Easter Sunday (Byz. lit.): “Yesterday (Silent Saturday), I was buried with you, Christ; today (Easter Sunday), I am risen with you.

Yesterday I was crucified with thee: Thou, O thyself, let me share in thy glory, in thy kingdom”. (K.Kirchh., O.c.,I,3).

I, thou, we all, are one member of the set of descendants of Adam and Eve, the first human couple.- See H.-A. 51.- Since Christ, by his solidarity and likeness to all men (H.-A.18: Catholic), contacts and imitates each one of us, what happens to Christ happens to us (Adam and descendants), through the reversal (H.-A. 28: Cover), which he works.

Our own Roman Paschal Liturgy says it brilliantly: “(Christ), who destroyed our death by dying and renewed our life by rising”.

In other words, there is communion of destiny and equality of fate. Or, as one still says, life-likeness (A. Friedrich, *Die Forschungen über das frühzeitliche Jägertum*, (The research on early hunter-gatherers), in: *Paideuma* II (1941/1943), 20/43, or in: A. Schmitz, *Religionsethnologie*, (Ethnology of religion), Fr.a.M., 1964, 213 ff. (‘Lebensgleichlauf’), (‘Life synchronisation’).

**(i) *The similarity of fate and coherence: the first parents***

This (life-likeness) applied, first of all, to the first parents (Adam):

**a.** From the first human couple (monogenism), all human beings came into being through descent (progeny: ‘generatione’) (i.e. there are neither pre- nor post-adamites);

**b.** Through the first sin (‘primordial sin’) - the fall - Adam (and Eve) lost the God-given life (‘sanctifying grace’), with all its consequences (weakened insight, ‘demonic’ (inclined to good and evil) will, suffering, death (in the physical sense));

Immediately, due to life’s similarity, we all lose divine life (= original sin) -- with all its consequences (intellectual, will, health).

This transfer does not take place ‘imitatione’ (because we live like Adam and Eve), but ‘generatione’ (with our reception in the mother’s womb). Thus the Council of Trent. However, it should be noted that the transmission is not a biological phenomenon, but a sacred one: our genius, *iuno* (spirit of the thigh), which we receive from our first parents, is the actual carrier of this life-giving process.

Thus we can rightly say: “I have sinned, in or with Adam (and Eve) (in our genius, in our thigh spirit, which we receive by being received, original sin and original sin run together)”.

**(ii) *This similarity and coherence with Christ .***

This similarity and coherence also applies, as described above, to Christ, the new “head” of humanity -- it is twofold:

**(a)** He shares our original sinful condition (in its consequences): having entered the mother’s womb, He too is doomed to suffer and die (life-long parity with Adam);

**(b)** We share in His glorification (H.-A. 39), which contains the change of destiny: He was, after all, received immaculate in the womb of Mary (who, by grace, is also the immaculate recipient), -- which is to say that Jesus did not carry within Him the demonic genius (thigh spirit) that sprang from Adam and Eve. On the contrary, He possessed the spirit of glorification (H.-A. 31), which, after His resurrection, He communicated to those who “believe”.

In this way, in the spirit of the thigh, he exterminated the demon we had inherited from our first parents. This ‘spirit’ (new life principle or ‘thigh-spirit’) was first clearly shown by Him in His transformation, at least insofar as He carried it latently within Him (note: receiving undefiled does not mean “not by going to bed with someone” (by not being ‘intimate’, as it is called today), but receiving ‘without original sin’ (and therefore without a demon on the part of the parents)).

Needless to say that the change, which Jesus works in our destiny, by transforming us in our spirit, is also cosmically wide: “everything is, now (Resurrection Passes), full of light: the heaven, the earth and the underworld (H-A. 42). The whole of creation, therefore, has reason to celebrate Christ’s resurrection in which it has found its truce”. (K. Kirchhoff, O.c.,I,3).

***Note. -- The Ascension of Jesus.***

(1) The Ascension of Jesus is one moment (part) of his ‘taking away’ (2 Kings 2: 9/11 (the prophet Elijah(s) is taken away); Mark 16:19; Acts 1:2; 1:10 / 11; 1 Tim 3:16), which includes the Passion Week and the Glorification (resurrection, ascension.) (H.-A.39). St. John’s is called ‘glorification’.

(2) Acts 1:6/11 gives us, in the version of S. Luke, the account: “After these words, Jesus was, under their eyes, exalted (lifted up), and a cloud took Him from their sight.

As they gazed upon Him as He ascended, suddenly two men in white robes stood beside them, saying: ‘Men of Galilee, why do you continue to gaze at the firmament? The Jesus, who was just taken from you, will return in the same way as you saw him go away into heaven’.

*Note*.-- (1) The cloud is a fixed fact - already in the Old Testament theophany’s (H.-A. 21) - and it characterizes the parousia (return) of Jesus (Dan 7:13; Matt 24:30).

(2) The return, better: “the second royal entry”, in glory (cf. transfiguration), is the termination of the removal, which, then, literally, ends: after the latency (removal) the patency, in power.

*Note* .- The Eastern liturgies always specify the biblical data “You, who are light of light (H.-A. 64: Angel of light), carried a cloud of light up on the Mount of Olives (where Jesus was taken away) (...)”. (K. Kirchhoff, o.c., II, 66).

“As the assemblies of angels (note -- angels of light or, as H. Möller says: ‘high’ angels) beheld Christ, the mediator between God and men, as earthly man, in the heavenly heights, they shuddered (H.-A. 22: shudder-waking) and sang, in unison, a sealing song”. (ibid., 81).

“Open the gates of heaven (H.A. 22; 41)! Behold Christ, as King and Lord, ‘appeared’ (= made His regal entry), in the earthly body!” Thus the lower powers (H.-A.41v.) spoke to the higher ones (H.-A. 64v.)” (ibid., 82).

### *The cosmic scope*

This (H.-A.42, 68) is expressed in: “When Thou, Christ, hast gone up the Mount of Olives, to perform the will of the Father, then:

- (i) they that dwell in the underworld shuddered (H.-A. 22) and
- (ii) the angels in heaven were appalled (H.A. 22).
- (iii) With both of them the apostles (on earth) heard, trembling with joy (H.-A. 22: tremendum et fascinans), when Thou didst speak with them (...).” (ibid., 144).

“After Thou, good Lord, hast done the will of the Father, and, immediately, made the heights one with the depths, Thou didst rise in glory”. (ibid.,145).

**Conclusion:** -- H.-A. 65 we saw that only a medium who is both underworld-centered and light-world-centered can serve a high angel as a mediator with a view to working within our earthly sphere: did we not just read that, thanks to Christ's descent and ascension (both acts of salvation together), the heights and the depths are made one? - Christ, then, is the world axis (axis mundi) par excellence (H.-A. 19) - where the ordinary, human medium, at least if it is suitable for that, is only a participation ('methexis' (Platon), 'participatio').

It is immediately clear that the two acts of salvation - that of hell and that of ascension - which are completely neglected in our present catechesis, or are merely 'symbolical' (Symbolist), are integral parts of a profound situation.

### **II.c.II.-- Manatism, a second main feature of religion.**

**Introduction.**-- N. Söderblom, *Das Werden d. G.*, 26/92 (Die Macht); W. Schmidt, *Or. et év.d.l.rel.*, 157/195 (Le magisme); 197/212 (Critique générale du magisme); Fr. Heiler, *Die Religionen der Menschheit*, (The religions of mankind), Stuttgart, 1959, 77/79 (Dynamismus: Tabu und Mana); Th. van Baaren, *Doolhof der goden*, (Maze of the gods), Amsterdam, 1960, 84/87 (Mana); -- especially G.v.d. Leeuw, *Phänomenologie d. Religion*, Tübingen, 1956-2, esp. 3/207 (Das Objekt der Religion);

In other words, there is not a single serious book of hiëro-analysis (religious science) that does not thematize 'power' (mana, force),--and that as the main fact. Even van Baaren, who does not have manatism (dynamism, -- also called pre-animism) at heart (partly with good reason), gives it a place.

#### ***The connection with animism.***

a. 'Or animism' now:

1. Animatism,
2. Embodiment belief,
3. Fetishism,
4. Inspiration belief, or, not least
5. Thigh belief and
6. Supremacy Faith means,

it is not conceivable without manatism. How often have we not already referred to 'force' ('macht')? Cfr. H.-A .21; 24;--36; 46v., etc.!

b. G. Welter, *Les croyances primitives et leurs survivances (Précis de paléopsychologie)*, (Primitive beliefs and their survivals (Précis de paléopsychologie), Paris, 1960, 52, brilliantly characterizes the link between animism and manatism: "The most striking feature of (...) the 'soul' or the 'spirit' is power ('puissance')."

Also: these terms (soul, spirit) could, perhaps, simply be replaced by ‘dunamis’ (the Greek for strength), -- a term expressing ‘la puissance magique des êtres ou des choses’ (the magical (hence the term ‘magisme’ or magie belief) power of beings or of things).

E.g. the ‘power’ (‘vertu’) of a medicinal plant or the (magical) power of a witch (‘sorcerer’). Cfr. H.-A. 24.

(...) This ‘dunamis’ (Greek) corresponds to the Polynesian ‘mana’: i.e. the force, the ‘fluidum’ (‘le fluide’) (H.-A. 44), that emanates from a body, whether inorganic or organic. Better expressed: it is the exuding body itself that ‘décorpore’ (literally ‘disembodies’, volatilizes), -- this very body, either to remain purely volatilized or ‘fluide’ (fluidic), or to re-attract (‘s’incorporant’) into a nearby or distant (‘au loin’) body - object, animal, plant, human being”. So much for this brilliant text, which is confirmed by all sensitives and/or mediums.

That this exuded ‘mana’ is the basis of magic is shown by Welter, o.c., 53: “The witch (‘sorcerer’):

(i) can consciously exhale (‘détacher’) a part of his soul (understand ‘soul substance’ (H.-A. 44)),

(ii) to draw this (part) e.g. into the body of a crocodile (‘introduire’), which (*note* -- understand: under the influence of the information (= idea, command), contained in that soul substance; H.-A. 46: inspiration belief) is going to attack a woman, who is just busy rinsing her linen in the river”.

### ***Manaism.***

In 1878, the English missionary R.H. Codrington (1830/1922) introduced the term ‘mana’ as a scientific term, into hieratic analysis. Cfr. his *The Melanesians*, Oxford, 1891.

W. Schmidt, o. c., 210, summarizes: ‘H. Codrington (... ) sets out how:

(i) the ‘mana’ is exclusively the property of:

a. the nature spirits and

b. a small number of ancestors (deceased) and

(ii) the living (on earth) share in it only through spirits’.

Apparently, as Schmidt points out, Codrington is referring to one particular type of mana that struck him. We saw, after all, that, hiëro-analytically, all that exists is, in one way or another, ‘mana’ (H.A. 43 (animatism); 44 (hylozoism)).

But let us, in part, let Codrington himself speak: “The religion of the Melanesians consists:

(1) from the conviction that an outside or supernatural power exists, which they situate in the invisible”.

(2) ( ...) from the use of means so that this power may be to their advantage. The prayers, the sacrifices of their religion revolve around this type of 'force':

1/ It is different from the physical (understand: coarse material) 'force';

2/ it is a condition for both good and evil (note - it is 'demonic');

3/ Of course, it can be found in almost anything;

Nevertheless, one kind of beings possesses special characteristics:

(i) spirits;-- here P. W. Schmidt had it right.

(ii) a. either souls of deceased persons

(ii) b. either outside - and supernatural beings - this power, so much so that they can communicate it, notwithstanding the fact that, in making this communication, they make use of, e.g., a stone, some water, etc., as 'mediums'.

(Thus Max Müller (1823/1900), the founder of the history of religions, in 1878, when he published quotations from a letter by Codrington).

**Note.** - Now, don't think that we remain bound to a Melanesian term: when the Iroquois (= North-American Confederation of Indians) speak of 'orenda' and the Dakota (incorrectly called 'Sioux') of 'wakanda' or the inhabitants of Malagasy (formerly: Madagascar) of 'hasina', they mean, mutatis mutandis, the same phenomenon.

### **Magism.**

In addition to the Schmidt mentioned above, we refer to J.H. King, *The Supernatural (Its Origin, Nature and Evolution)*, London/ Edinburgh/ New York, 1892 (which speaks of pre-animistic magism (it was sometimes thought that animism was a late arrival and that magi belief lay before that); RR. Marett, *Pre-animistic Religion* (1899), in which magism, analogous to King, is defended.

By the way: magistic approaches can already be found in J.G. Frazer, *The Golden Bough*, London, 1890-1; 1900-2 -- W. Schmidt, o.c., 162/170 (intellectualistic explanations), 170/176 (voluntaristic explanations), 177/195 (emotionalistic explanations), clarifies the - hopeless - search of enlightened Rationalism for an 'explanation' (within the Enlightenment ideologies) of magic; -- not that both intellect (the more primary the stronger) and will (the more demonic the more effective) and mind (the more intense the better) do not play an essential role in magic; far from it!



But, as Welter (H.-A.71), by means of an applicative model (= example) clarifies, magic is, above all, a matter of:

- (i) mana (power, strength, as e.g. Codrington describes it),
- (ii) 'functional' (effective, controlled) application.

Example: the 'making' of a pentacle (H.-A. 46). Other example: the 'seeing' (H.-A.4), yes, 'manipulating' (i.e. process control) the sowing-harvesting law (H.-A. 64: law/apocalyptic).

### ***The hylian pluralism.***

***Bibl. sample.:*** J.J. Poortman, *Ochêma*, Assen, 1954, 89/126 (The hylic pluralism among the 'nature peoples').

N. Söderblom, o.c., refers to J.N.B. Hewitt, *Orenda and a Definition of Religion*, in: *American Anthropologist* (New Series) 4 (1902), 33/46.

Hewitt speaks, in particular, of the 'orenda' among the Huron Indians. "That 'life' is a characteristic of every thing, -- including the stones, the waters of the tides (ebb and flow) -- is, according to Hewitt, a premise fundamental to the cosmic philosophy of primitive man.

This belief has, in the primitive, a sequel: the idea that, in every body, the same hidden ('mystical') power, which manifests itself in a variety of causalities and modes, peculiar to that world whose center it is, can be found.

This supposed magic is, according to Hewitt, ascribed (by the primitive) to all things, to all bodies!

Van der Leeuw, the man par excellence of dynamism (= belief in power), puts it as follows: power and matter are, in the mind of the primitive, closely connected. One may, according to Van der Leeuw, speak as well of 'seelenmacht' ('soul-power') as of 'seelenstoff' ('soul-fabric'; H.-A. 43v.)! (Poortman, o.c., 112).

Van der Leeuw generalizes, in a hylic-pluralistic sense, an observation like that of Hewitt. Apart from the 'gross' substance, there is the 'subtle' substance.

It is precisely the mana, now, that is understood as effective (= purposeful, functional) "Something is 'mana', if it 'works' (causes, begets). It is not 'mana' if it does not 'work'.

These are the words of a native of the island of Hocart". (V.d.L. *Phän.d. Religion*, Tüb., 1956 - 2.5).-- Here the link is made with the third great aspect of religion, causation.

### ***Von Reichenbach's theory of od.***

Carl von Reichenbach (1788/1869), author of *Odisch-magnetische Briefe* and *Der sensitive Mensch*, (Odic-Magnetic Letters and The Sensitive Man), drew attention at the time to one type of radiation emitted by:

- a. metals, crystals, -- magnets,
- b. plants, animals, people.

The discoverer of paraffin and kreosote began, around 1840, to take an interest in electro-magnetic phenomena, as well as in the teachings of Franz Anton Mesmer (1734/1815), the man of 'magnetization'.

#### **a. -- Sensitivity.**

1. If clairvoyant, 'sensitive' people remain in a dark room for hours, they 'see' (H.-A. 4; 35: 73), mantically, all objects, in that complete darkness, lights. In that connection, the sensitives said that e.g. the right hand of man emits a blue, the left a yellow-red 'light' (its 'aura') (cognitive asp.).

2. Some sensitives feel strongly oppressed if they are in a crowded room: in church, for example, they will try to get a corner seat at all costs. Others cannot bear to have someone standing behind them. If they do not 'see', they 'feel' an 'effect' ('aura'), especially from people, emanating from them and causing discomfort (eudemonic or well-being aspect).

#### **b. -- Od.**

Reichenbach called this emanation 'od' -- 'Od' comes from the Old Germanic 'wodan' (also: 'wuodin:'odan', 'odin'), denoting the "all-pervading force".

Mesmer's 'magnetism' he described as one type of 'od', namely, that applied functionally (to cure).-- This odic force or 'odyle' shows, according to Reichenbach, an analogy with the electro-magnetic phenomena. -

In addition to Mesmerian 'magnetization', he considered the telepathic phenomenon ('I have, in me, the inner experiences of a fellowman') and many spiritualistic phenomena, applications of odic force, to be the same as the phenomena of the 'magnetizer'.

#### **c. -- Reichenbach's mana.**

It is clear that Reichenbach, in his own way, discovered and interpreted the mana.

**Bibl. sample.:** W.H.C. Tenhaeff, *Auszergewöhnliche Heilkräfte (Magnetiseure, Sensitive, Gesundheitsbeter)*, (Exceptional Healing Powers (Magnetizers, Sensitives, Healers), Olten, Freib. I.Br., 1957, 26 28. 31 ev.

#### **Fertility religion.**

**Bibl. sample.:** N. Söderblom, *Das Werden..*, 26.-- 'Fertility' means, hiëro-analytically, 'effectiveness'.

One speaks of “a ‘fruitless’ effort”. The specific ‘fruitfulness’ of plants, animals, people, is only one type of it.

H.-A. 73, we saw that the Hocart native spoke of “something that works” (mana) or “something that does not work” (non-mana). What ‘works’ achieves the stated goal, is ‘goal’-meaningful, bears ‘fruit’.

1. The horse sweats conspicuously; hardly is it able to pull the load.-- The Swedish farmer, insofar as archaic and, immediately, manaistic, then says: “The horse is ‘maktstulen’ (‘power robbed’, has lost its ‘power’)”. Reason: e.g. an evil man has, by means of ‘black’ art (i.e. unscrupulous magic), robbed the horse of its strength (power).” Consequence: it pulls, but without reaching its goal.

2. Also a human being can become ‘maktstulen’: this is how the old Nordics, confronted with a human being, who, seriously, miscalculates and fails, thought that he/she was ‘ham.stolinn’, i.e. deprived of his/her ‘ham’ -- Söderblom says that, in ‘hamingja’, the root ‘ham’ is present. Well, ‘hamingja’ means:

(1) strength, power;

(2) fate, i. e. occurrence as a result of possessing or not possessing power, which determines fate;

(3) thigh spirit (guardian spirit) (H.-A.50 ; 67: community of destiny and likeness), which, after all, makes up the soul substance of a person for the purpose of prosperity (‘happiness’) (Fr. Heiler, *Das Gebet*, Munich,1921-3, 111: “The life-force, life-matter is a kind of man in man”. “The soul substance (H.-A. 44) gives the human body life, strength, health”).

In other words, the power works out results through the spirit of the thigh and determines destiny. Whoever has mana can, in principle, reach the goal and succeed. That is the pragmatic aspect of mana.

In other words: whoever has the power of the subtle, will, in the gross order, succeed. Cfr. hylic pluralism. - The sacred power is the trans-empirical (H.-A. 7v.) principle (= condition of possibility) of physical succeeding.

**Note.**-- One curious type of mana is the Old Iranian ‘hvarenah’ (glory; H.-A. 39; 62; 67), meaning ‘life’ in its fortunate form (household goods, property, mental disposition, vigor,-- well-being and prosperity, yes, holiness). Cfr Söderblom, o.c., 246/259 (Die iranische Herrlichkeit: die Macht in der Avesta).

### ***Tabooism.***

We are all familiar with the word ‘taboo’, if only because the rational Enlightenment has, above all, eagerly defused a whole series of ‘taboos’ through ‘criticism’.--But, on its own, one does not yet know what precisely, hiëro-analytically, ‘taboo’ is.

***Bibl. sample.:*** G. Welter, *Les croyances prim.*, 93/116 (Le tabouisme), 117/157 (La loi du sang);

H. Webster, *Le tabou* (Etude sociologique), Paris, 1952;

M. Douglas, *Reinheid en gevaar*, (Purity and danger), Utr./ Antw.,1976.

**1.** James Cook (1728 / 1779) introduced the word ‘ta.pu’ (‘ta.poe’), from the South Pacific, into Western Europe under the rewriting ‘taboo’. In 1777 he landed on the Tonga Islands.

When the meal was being served, no one wanted to sit down and no one wanted to eat any of the food that was put before them. When he expressed his surprise, they said that all were ‘taboo’ (‘to be avoided’).

According to James King, who succeeded Cook in 1779, ‘taboo’ (in the Sandwich Islands (= Hawaii)), said of persons and/or things, meant something like ‘inviolable’ (sacred), ‘excellent’, ‘devoted to something (sacred): so that avoidance (abstaining from something with deep reverence) was necessary (H. Webster, o.c., 14s.).

**2.--** Which Welter, o.c.,94, describes as follows: “Something extraordinary must be mana to a degree that far exceeds the ordinary. Consequently: it is ‘separated’ from the ordinary, ‘inviolable’.

Immediately its mana must, on account of its rarity, be particularly operative and, perhaps, harmful. Such a thing is, therefore, ‘dangerous’ and, immediately, it should be prohibited”. -- You see: tabooism is avoidance religion.

**3.** The Bible gives us a wonderful example: “When the priests go out into the outer court, to the people, they should take off their service clothes and put them in the rooms of the holy one (the sanctuary). Otherwise they will ‘sanctify’ the people with their robes.

(...). They should teach my people the difference between ‘holy’ and ‘profane’ and the difference between ‘pure’ and ‘impure’“.

As A. Bertholet, *Die Rel. d. Alt. Test.*, 7, says, commenting on ‘sanctification’ of the people, “sanctity means ‘increased strength.

One pays attention to 'increased': namely with regard to the" profane, ordinary things and persons. By contact (touch) something flows over (outflow), - 'contagious' (Ezek 44:19; 44:23). See e.g. Levit 6:20 (27), which deals with the sin offering. "Whatever touches the flesh of it shall by the very fact be 'holy,' and if blood splashes on the garment, the stain should be cleansed in a holy place (H.-A. 24)".

**4.-- *The ethical (moral, binding) scope of what is 'to be avoided'.***

This is, often, not grasped from an enlightened-rational point of view.

W. Schilling, *Religion und Recht*, (Kohlhammer), 1957, esp. 72f., points out this mistake, relying on R. Otto, *Das Heilige*, Breslau, 1917.

Our ethics, which is not that of the popular religion (H.A. 32), but that of the higher culture stratum ('enlightened', 'higher religious'), does not understand the own value, binding in conscience, which characterizes 'taboo' and 'sacred'. Schilling quotes Otto himself: "That which is praised as 'only sacred' is not pure power without more, in the sense that that power merely makes claims to power and, thus, compels.

The sacred has, at the same time, in its own being (*note* -- this is: as mana, 'sacred', power-charged), the highest right to it, the highest claim to service: in other words, the sacred has the right to be praised (as sacred), because it is, without more, in itself, praiseworthy". - It is about the lived experience of the value to be honored in itself, -- what Otto, usually, calls 'augustum' (highly sacred).

In other words, it is not about one or another individual rule of conscience (e.g. "Do not kill without necessary and sufficient reason" etc.). It is about all the rules of conscience together (their system), insofar as they, all of them, in their system, are inviolable (taboo, 'sacred', to be respected).

Negatively expressed: what is some rule (e.g. 'Respect your fellow man') worth, in the eyes of a nihilist, for whom all inviolability is non-existent ('suspect', 'abolished')?

Dostojewski, Sartre, in their critique of nihilism, which no longer knows anything sacred, have made this very clear to us.

(1) We know that the Enlightenment, through the diversions of the human sciences, points out the projection holiness (H.-A. 9v.) - the taboos are in that view:

- a. purely subjective,
- b. at best, cultural-historically grown “socialisations” of something which, in itself, is not sacred (taboo).

(2) But that is only one side of the question: “There was in a city, a judge, who:

- a. did not ‘fear’ God (= respected) and
- b. did not trouble himself with men.

Thus Jesus, Luk 18: 2,4.

Nihilism consists, human science or not, in identifying, i.e. disproving, all seriousness, every inviolability, in itself, as a mere subjective creation or a mere product of human culture. Desacralization, also and especially of the objectively inviolable. Then there is nothing (‘nihil’) sacred, inviolable, any more,--all taboos are abolished.

It may be noted that this nihilization of all sanctity, itself, is a purely subjective act or purely cultural-historical cause. Thus it cannot be taken absolutely seriously. If nothing is absolutely serious, why take the nihilist seriously?

**Bibl. sample:** Söderblom, o.c., 179/181 (where he outlines the cultural-historical development of the term ‘holy’).

### ***Male and female mana.***

The force (subtlety) is plural: it is, among other things, feminine and masculine. But first applied models of something that our Enlightenment-rational culture seems to have forgotten completely.

### ***A.-- Male mana.***

A. di Nola, *La prière (Anthologie des prières de tous les temps et de tous les peuples)*, (Prayer (Anthology of prayers from all times and all peoples), Paris, 1958, 29, gives us a wonderful example.

### ***Invocation prayer magician (witch).***

“Oh, thou who commands power thou, spirit of the male energy (mana), -- thou canst do all things. Without thee I can do nothing, can do nothing. I, who am devoted to thee,-- I, who am devoted to thee, spirit, -- from thee I derive my strength, my power.

You have given me the gift, spirit of power: you I call upon. Accept willingly my magic song, which thou must obey. I, for my part, have delivered to thee what thou didst ask me, spirit. The sacrifice was made. Sacrifice offered to thee in the jungle, spirit, since then I am at thy disposal and thou art at my disposal. Come!” (Magic song of the Fang, a people in Gabon).

*Note* -- R.P. Trilles, *Chez les Fang*, (Among the Fang), Lille, 1912, 192/196, describes how the witch (unscrupulous magician), in person, chooses a human victim, from his own family: first his own mother, then a young girl (sister or daughter), finally, sometimes, a younger brother (this last very rarely; because the male blood (H.- A. 29; Levit 17:11, 14) has a completely different 'value' (= mana type); by the way, the male blood (note – understand : blood soul(substance)) is not the property of the family, but of the whole community.

In other words, “Sacrifice, offered to you in the forest” is, almost always, female mana! Without which the spirit of male energy cannot even sustain itself (as we shall see later).

***Biblical model.***

A. Bertholet, *Die Rel.d.A.T.*, 2, refers to 2 Kings 4:32/35 (4: 8/37).

The prophet Elisha (Eliseüs) knew the Sunamite, a wealthy woman, where he could go to eat whenever he passed by. She had a little son.

“The child grew up. One day it went to its father, who was with the mowers. Suddenly it cried, “My head! My head! The father ordered a helper to take the child to his mother (...). The mother sat with the boy on her lap until noon. Until he died. (4: 32 / 35): “Elisha entered. There lay the child, dead, laid on his bed.-- Elisha entered the room, closed the door.

(1) He prayed to God (Yahweh).

(2)a. Then he crawled onto the bed, laid himself on the child, with his mouth on his mouth, his eyes on his eyes, his hands on his hands. he pressed himself against the child. The body of the boy got warm.

(2)b. Elisha got off the bed, then walked, (...) up and down. Then, again, he got on the bed and pressed himself against the boy.-- He did this seven times. Then he sneezed and opened his eyes.

*Note*.-- One sees here the law of transcendence of the mana (H.-A. 77: contact) and the work.

***New Testament model.***

That holiness (life-force) is transitive is evident, beautifully, from Mk 5: 25/34 (Mk 6:56; 7:33; 8:23; 10:16 (embracing touch, narrated by Mark).

“There was a woman there, who had been suffering from hemorrhage for twelve years... She went to the back of the crowd. She touched his cloak. For she said to herself, ‘If I, at least, can touch his clothes (H.-A. 76v.), then I am saved’.

Immediately, the source of her hemorrhage dried up and she became aware in her body, “egno”, knew that she was cured of her ailment.

At the same moment, Jesus was aware in his inner being (‘epignous’) that a ‘dunamis’ (H.-A.71), power, was emanating from him. In the midst of the crowd he turned and said: “Who has touched my clothes? His disciples said, “With Thine own eyes Thou seest the crowd pressing in from all sides. And yet Thou sayest, “Who has touched me?”

He looked round to see the woman who had done it. Then, fearing and trembling, knowing what had happened to her, she came and threw herself at Jesus’ feet to tell him the whole truth, whereupon Jesus said, “Daughter, your faith has saved you. Go in peace and be healed of your affliction”.

1. *La Bi.d..Jér.*, Paris, 1978, 1464, comments: “This ‘dunamis’ (power) is understood as an ‘effluve physique’ (a physical efflux), which works the healing (H.-A. 73;75), as Luk 6:19 says (“The whole crowd sought to touch Jesus, because a ‘dunamis’ (power) went out from Him (H.-A. 71: efflux), which healed all”). See also Luk 5:17 (“The ‘dunamis’ (power) of the Lord (= God) caused the fact that Jesus healed”),-- this -- so La Bi, d.J. continues -- by means of touch (cf. Luk 6:19).

2. Jesus, seemingly contradicting Manatism, says: “your faith has saved you”. -- But beware: Gina Covina (H.-A. 60v.) taught us that the pure phenomenon (Husserl), here: the causal ‘dunamis’ (power), Jesus’ own, only comes through - certainly as regards sacred things - on condition that “all your presuppositions and convictions” (H.-A. 61; Gina Covina (H.-A. 60v.)) are fulfilled. A.61; Gina Corina’s own words) are in agreement (likeness) and in contact (coherence) (H.-A.27; 61: similia similibus) with that pure phenomenon.

Well, on close inspection, Luke’s text says that:

(i) and Jesus’ dunamis

(ii) and the woman’s faith, at the same time, attuned to each other, ‘caused’ (‘produced’: H.-A.75: the pragmatic aspect) the result (H.-A. 21; 24).

In other words: all grasping of the pure sacred phenomenon is auto-implicative (involves the I, subject).

**Consequence:** neither mechanical ‘magic’ (mechanistic magism) nor merely subjective ‘belief’ (fideism).



### ***Aretalogy.***

Let us begin with one text: “God worked (‘epoiei’; H.A. 73; 75), through the hands of Paul, non - everyday (H.-A. 76: something extraordinary) deeds (‘dunameis’, with special mana charged and, thus, miraculous, miraculous facts).

So much so, that it sufficed to lay on the sick the kerchiefs or linen that had touched Paul’s body. Immediately:

- (i) the sicknesses were taken away from them and
- (ii) the unclean spirits were drawn out of them”. (Acts 19: 11).

### **1. *Aretalogia***

This Greek word meant the pronunciation (telling, describing) of ‘aretai’ (manly deeds, sign of someone’s ‘virtue’). St. Luke, in a quasi-popular way, practices, here, this literary genre. But not purely ‘literary’!

### **2.--*Meslin: introduction to the miraculous.***

M. Meslin, *Le merveilleux. (L ‘imaginaire et les croyances en Occident)*, (The marvellous. The imaginary and beliefs in the West), Paris, 1984, - in fact the work of a series of specialists (history of mentality, history of art, psychology, folklore, history of religion, etc.) - provides an introduction to the miraculous. - gives an introduction to the miraculous (from Graeco-Latin Antiquity to the present).

Meslin, professor of comparative history of religions at Paris-Sorbonne, author of *Pour une science des religions*, (For a science of religions), Paris, 1973, confuses false (not based on mana experience but fantasized) imaginations with real sacred phenomena. *Le surnaturel d’autrefois est devenu le paranormal*” (The ‘supernatural’ (note -- understand: the ‘miraculous’) of the past has become ‘the paranormal’) is one sentence that proves the enormous confusion.

The Church, for example, has always rigorously distinguished between “extra-natural” (paranormal) and “supernatural” (strictly divine, which escapes the pure supreme being.

H.-A. 54/57: the supreme spirit is profoundly different from the Supreme Being, as, already, the apocalypticist Daniel strictly distinguished between the realm of God (man-son), supernatural in nature (H.-A. 31: Grace), and the worldly realms (animals), supernatural in nature (H.-A. 31: Nature).

A book like that led by Meslin can be very fascinating, but it confuses (systematically or not) two thoroughly different types of ‘merveilleux’ (miracle).

***The genitals are, par excellence, mana.***

After all, the driving force of earthly life has its center of gravity not in the head or elsewhere, but in the genitals.

Incidentally, the proxy, in archaic Dutch, means either sex part or parts or male genitalia. Apparently the root ‘power’ is still in it.

***The Bible gives us an example.***

**Gen 24:2, 9:** “Abraham was a very old man (...). He said to the oldest of his helpers, who oversaw all his goods: ‘Lay your hand on my power. (Note -- The Puritan translation is “under my hip”). I make thee swear by Yahweh, the God of heaven and the God of earth, (H.-A. 65; 70: medium) that thou shalt not seek for my son a wife from among the Canaanite girls in whose midst I dwell (... )

**Gen 24:9.** -- “Then the helper laid his hand on the power of his master Abraham and thus took the oath concerning the matter”.

**Gen 47:29** -- “Israel (the patriarch Jacob) settled in Egypt. (...). As the time of his death approached, he called his son Joseph, saying: “If you love me, lay your hand on my power, so show me your willingness not to bury me in Egypt”.

G. Welter, *Les croyances prim.*, 85, says: “By virtue of one type of touch magic (‘magie de contagion’), one can magically substantiate (‘confirm’) an oath

(i) One can, swearing, touch the proxy. In Latin ‘testiculi’ (testicles) is the diminutive of ‘testes’: witnesses (of an oath). (Welter refers to Gen 24).

(ii) One can, swearing, take a stone or a heap of boulders, allusions to firmness, as ‘witnesses’.

The two types of oath-ritus are expressed together in the German saying “Stein (ii) und Bein (i) schwören” (...), -- literally: “Swearing by the stone and the agent (‘la cuisse’)”.

The ancient Romans said: “Jovem lapidem iurare” (To swear by Jupiter (H.-A. 52: Jupiter as giver of the thigh spirit) and by the stone”).

**Conclusion** -- The archaic religions certainly deeply convinced of the taboos not in the least the taboos around the sex (proxy), did therefore not yet fall into the puritanism of the higher religions or of some liberals, today, -- both so proud of ‘detached thinking’.

## **B. Female Mana.**

Besides the male Mana (H.-A.- 78), there is also the female Mana. This is what we are talking about now. “The woman is the given from the beginning, the man the become, -- she the cause, he the effect”.

This axiom (= basic starting point) could be taken as the basic scheme of all early creation stories. They differ, after all, only in details and in the embellishment of the always the same theme”.

Thus Richard Fester, palaeolinguist, What creation stories betray, in: R. Fester et al, *Vrouw en macht* (Five million years of women’s history), Helmond/ Antwerp, 1980, 36.

With this hiëro-analytical insight in mind, we now go over the following manaistic data.

### **1. -- The mana of women among shamans.**

J.-L. Degaudenzi, *La femme et la magie*, (Women and magic), in: *Nostra* (Paris) 14.08.1980, 25, relates the following telling fact.

“In (...) shamanism, it is not the man who, originally, is able to:

- (i) to step out (‘voyager dans d’ autres dimensions’),
- (ii) heal illnesses,
- (iii) to speak with deities and the dead.

No: it is the woman. In Siberia, there are still small tribes that have preserved this ancient certainty. In others, where the shaman is of the male gender (better: ‘of the male proxy’), he still imitates the woman, in the summoning and in the course of his activities.

For example, he grooms himself with a feminine garb, uses her imitation jewelry, dons a girl’s dress; yes, he even proceeds to wear imitation breasts (cfr *Nostra*, 432)”.

Reread, now, H.-A.76 (service clothes); 80 (clothes); 81 (headscarves, linen). It is clear, at least to a ‘consciousness’ not prejudiced by enlightened rationalism, that it is not sex or deviance, but manaistic awareness that is at work here.

### **2. -- Biblical model.**

R. Ambelain, *Le vampirisme (De la légende au réel)*, (Vampirism (From legend to reality)), Paris, 1977, 201, cites 1 Kon 1:1/4 as a model of contact magic (H.A. 77: transcendence = contact magic).

(1). “King David (-1010 / -970) had, in the meantime, become an old man of advanced age: although he was well covered, he still could not get warm. Therefore his courtiers said to him: “One should seek for our lord, the king, a young girl who is still a virgin”.

“She should serve him and nurse him. More than that, she shall sleep in your womb. then this will give ‘warmth’ to our lord, the king.”-- There was a search, all over Israel, for a beautiful girl. one found Abisag of Shunem (shunem,-- the sunamite). They brought her to the king.

This girl was exceptionally beautiful (H.-A. 76: something extraordinary). She nursed the king and served him, but he did not ‘know’ her (opm.-- he had no intercourse with her).

**Note** -- The ‘warmth’ is only understood, if one, now, reads H.-A.79, that the prophet Elisha “pressed himself against the child” so that “the body of the boy got ‘warm’“. This typical ‘warmth’ occurs very regularly when healers - (e.g. by the laying on of hands (another form of ‘pressing’) or simply, by the gaze (which is identitive (H.-A. 42;61), i.e., which causes similarity and coherence (H.-A. 27;61; 63; 80; esp. 52) (H.-A. 80 (aligned)), are at work.-- It is, therefore, anything but, vulgar sexual ‘heat’!

### **3. Sexual Power.**

Numbers 5:11/31.-- The title reads ‘Jealousy’ (better; ‘man’s envy’). When a husband suspects his wife, rightly or wrongly, he may, at least for his wife’s sake (why is it that he too goes through a divine judgment?), have a divine judgment performed, of which we will spare the reader the intricacies.

The apex of the text, from our point of view, is expressed by the priest as follows: “(...) If, however, it appear that you (the accused woman) have committed adultery (...), let Yahweh make you serve, among your people, a curse and a blasphemy, by invading your sex (proxy; *la bi.d.jér.*: ‘sexe’) (...). Let these waters of curse penetrate your bowels so that (...) your sex (proxy) may fall! (Thus says the priest). Whereupon the accused woman: “Amen! Amen!”

In other words, the context shows that her fertility spirit (H.-A. 75) is meant to make her childless,--a primal shame, in that cultural context.

**Note** -- W. Lederer, *La peur des femmes* (Fear of women), (*gynophobia*), Paris, 1980, 43, brilliantly confirms our interpretation: “We have mentioned the very apt remarks of S. Freud (1856/1939), the theoretician of psychology, concerning the head of medousa (‘Medusa’s head’), who, since Homer and Hesiod (VIIIth century B.C.), has been regarded as one of the Gorgones, i. e. horror goddesses, of the world. i. creepy goddesses, whose head-hairs consisted of intertwined strokes, is mentioned, and the impression of horror, which emanates from the vulva of the woman.

### **1. *The female genitalia***

In the same essay, *Das Medusenhaupt*, (The head of Medusa,), Freud discusses the effect of seeing the female genitals. As an applicative model he quotes the shield of the goddess Athena, on which the head of Medousa has been placed.

He also quotes a pass from the writings of François Rabelais (1494/1553), the French humanist: when the devil himself (Satan) is confronted with a woman who shows her genitals in his direction, he flees as quickly as possible.

The women of ancient Egypt knew no better method of exorcising evil spirits that lurked in the harvests.

The hero Bellerofontès (also Bellerofon), in Greek mythology, when he tried to conquer the land of the Lucians, was horrified and fled when the Lucians women came up to him and pulled up their skirts towards him.

Pliny the Elder (+23/+7S), in his *Historia naturalis* (a kind of encyclopaedia), mentions the fact that a woman, faced with a phantom, will drive it away if she exposes her intimate parts”.

### **2. *Gynophobia (fear of women)***

A similar gynophobia (fear of women) is sung by the pop singer J. Lahaye, in a video clip with two dancers, who seduce him, dressed in sex lingerie and performing half deflowered: “j’ avais peur, peur, peur” he sings. And refers to hell.

**Conclusion.**-- The proxy, i.e. the genitals, as far as mana, is a well-known fact. Especially the exorcists (and some doctors) know that truth is involved in the exorcism or tranquility power, situated in the sex.

If prudish influences, working in our enlightened society, do not prevent it, they will also come forward. Even the phrase from the Bellerofontes myth betrays exorcist experience, incorporated into myth.

***Note: Manaist nudity.***

G. V.d.Leeuw, *Phän.d.Rel.*, 384, speaks, briefly, of what he calls ‘ritual nudity’ (in prudish language: ‘ritus paganus’). Especially the woman, in the religions, tends to defoliate herself so that she radiates mana, in an increased degree (H.-A.76: holiness).

The functional side (H.-A. 24) is diverse: weed control, -plants, animals, increase of human fertility, -repulsion of evil powers (e.g. in Brandenburg: when a cow, during milking, hits it with its hind legs, a girl sits on the milking chair, without her panties, to calm down the hunted animal), -enforcement of an oath, -prophetic performance (Saul, Cassandra).

The form of defoliation may vary: even in prayer corridors, defoliation, for manaistic reasons, is committed (rain girls, Lady Godiva, in Coventry), as well as in sacred dances etc.

***More general conclusion.***

J.-L. Degaudenzi, a.c., 24, writes: “The biological phenomenon, which causes the self-consciousness of PSI-powers (= paranormal abilities): is it specifically female? The scientific bioplasmatists (i.e. who study the aura, by means of Kirlian effect; H.-A.74) are gradually more convinced.

Especially Thelma Moss (Univ.Calif., Los Angeles) believes that the feminine element, present in every living being (H.A. 43 (animatism); 44 (hylozoism); 73 (orenda) whether this being is, now, male or female, causes PSI abilities.

Indeed, the female aura differs from the male. Even in mediums (H.-A. 58) of the strong sex, one finds in the auric emanations - around the index and middle finger, in particular - bioplasmic rims, which cannot be found in non-PSI gifted men.

--Dr. Inyouchine (Inyuchin), from the Soviet Union, undoubtedly the greatest specialist in the field of bioplasmatists (aura studies), claims that it is not so simple: “The PSI capacity (note -- mantic) is, undoubtedly, of cell origin (note -- perhaps it would be wiser to say: located somewhere in the cells).

However, is it only physiological or does the mental aspect intervene in causing PSI giftedness? The fact that the aura varies according to the degrees of concentration and depends on the individual psyché should be considered”.

**Note.** - Before we finish the theme of the sexual life force (mana), just one reference: W.B; Kristensen, *Verzamelde bijdrage tot kennis d. antieke godsdiensten*, (Collected contribution to the knowledge of ancient religions), A'm, 1947, 222, mentions a statement by Pliny the Elder (H.-A. 85): "Fascinum, qui, deus, inter sacra Romana, a Vestalibus colitur".

This means:

(i) 'fascinum' = 'fallos' or sacred penis (the conception sense (H.-A. 52: and likeness and coherence)), i.e. a priapic-sexual object, of mana nature (and therefore sacred object), which, solemnly, was carried in the procession of the Dionusos celebrants);-

(ii) "qui, deus, inter sacra Romana, a Vestalibus colitur".

(ii) "qui, deus: '= ' who, as deity

(iii) "inter sacra Romana" = "in Roman worship".

(iv) "a vestalibus colitur" = "worshipped by the Vestal Virgins". In other words:

(1) The Vestalesses were the "priestesses" (better: "we. servants") of the hearth and earth goddess Vesta, in Rome; her first function was to keep the hearth and earth fire, which burned day and night, on Vesta's altar (= Vesta's "fetish"; H.-A. 45), burning; -- as wise slaves (W.B. Kristensen, o.c., 217 vv.), i.e. as young women subject to the underworld deities (H.-A. 39), they were chosen, for the duration of thirty years, by none other than the Pontifex Maximus (still one of the 'pagan' honorary titles of the pope; means: 'highest bridge builder' (chief priest)).

If they let the fire of the Roman state die out, they were flogged; if they broke their vow of virginity, they were buried alive (i.e. they were returned, because of sacred adultery against the male fascinum, who visibly represented the prince of the underworld, to that same prince of the underworld, rotting in the earth).

(2) The Vestaless was considered to be the loving bride of the underworld god; at the same time she was, precisely because of that, the visible representation of the underworld goddess Vesta, who is the female energy - according to Kristensen (o.c., 217; 220) vis-à-vis the underworld god who is visibly present in the wiping out.

Does not C.J. Bleeker, *De Moedergodin in de Oudheid* (The Mother Goddess in Antiquity), 130, say that the Old Indian goddess Lakshmi (=Kali), as consort of the god Vishnu (Vishnu), is also his 'shakti', i.e. the female energy (source) of the male god?

### **Summary of Manaism.**

**a.** The plurality of holiness, understood as power, is richer than the sexed one: “All that comes out of the human body or originates from it,

(i) contains the soul (*note* - Versta, immediately; soul substance and power (H.-A. 73)) of the individual and,

(ii) consequently, the soul (*idem*) of the sibbe (H.-A. 51). The actual secretions (blood (H.- A 29; 79), semen, sweat, saliva (Jn 9: 6: at the healing of the blind-born, “Jesus spits on the ground, makes mire of the saliva, strokes the mire on the eyes”; cf. Mk 8: 22: The blind man of Bethsaida “put Jesus’ spittle on his eyes”); urine, excrementa), the waste (nail clippings, hair (Judg 16: 17, 19: Someone shaves off the seven braids of Samson’s head hair; “thus Dalilah made him small and he lost his ‘strength’”), also the shadow, which the body sheds on the ground or so. All this is mana”. (G. Welter, *Les croyances prim.*,119).

Bertholet, *Die Rel.d.A.T.*,1. also confirms this: “Certain objects count as particularly powerful:

(i) constituents of the body (hair, eye, hand, saliva, blood, breath (Jn 21: 22 : “Jesus breathed on the Apostles and said: ‘Receive the Holy Spirit’”);

(ii) the spoken word, especially the word of blessing and cursing, the name;

(iii) instruments, clothes, jewels, staffs, weapons;

(iv) the written word”.

**b.** Bertholet adds:

(i) water, fire;

(ii) vegetable things.

But his list is very incomplete.

A. Lefèvre, *La religion*, Paris, 1921, discusses the religions and the magics:

(i) earth religion; litho-, hydro-, pyrolatry (rock, water, fire);

(ii) atmosphere (rain, wind, thunder, lightning - religions and - magics);

(iii) sky-religion (astrolatry: sun, moon, planets, stars and constellations)

(iv) phytolatry (plant religion and magic (also called ‘green magic’). - Zoolatry (animal religion and magic).

All this shares in the universal-cosmic mana, but with its own ‘powers’.

### **II.c.III -- The causal belief, third religion-principal trait.**

**Introduction** -- The rational-enlightened misunderstanding.

(i) The magic rite is ‘operational’ (‘opérateur’, bringing about); it consists of a material (coarse) process, to obtain a material result,--and this, directly, without the intervention of an intermediary.



(ii) The religious rite (...) is always the rite of reconciliation: it seeks only to please the deity in the face of man's desires; moreover, it is imaginary, has no mana in it". -- Thus G. Welter, *Les croyances pr.*, 74. This is, of course, extremely simplistic and, moreover, incorrect. But rationally enlightened people write such things.

J. Maxwell, "*La magie*", Paris, 1922, 8, says: "The religious act can only be a prayer or an invocation; the magical act is always an 'operation', consisting of a series of well-defined actions".

Again: simplistic and just wrong. Proof? "The religious act is a prayer; the magic act is the expression of a will; the former is humble, the latter is non-humorous."(ibid.). Pure nonsense. Prayer too is will and magic can be humble. The prayer of the Pharisee, Jesus said, was a humble prayer. The prayer of the magician, H.-A .78, is humble, genuine supplication. Thus the literature on magic (and religion) teems with one-sidedness and exaggerations.

Pliny the Elder, *Hist. Nat.*,30: 1, says: "No one doubts that magic arose from medicine." This opinion is, even today, acceptable: in primitive communities the magician, above all, is a healer, and his main role is to cure diseases, the cause of which, usually, appears unnatural." (J. Maxwell, o.c.,11).

A little further Maxwell says: "The practice of magic presupposes non-natural beings (H.-A.3) or invisible spirits: angels, demons, thieving spirits ('génies') or souls of the dead. This belief appears to be widespread". (o.c.,11).

You see, Maxwell also contradicts himself. Is not spirituality a religion? Was not the healer a central sacred figure? 79/81: Jesus healed: he was religious (for he appealed to his heavenly Father): he was magician, for his dunamis healed. So did Elisha!

**Conclusion:** Only well-defined prejudices (ideologies) split religion and magic; consequence: the religious and the magical facts do not correspond to the presuppositions of such proposers.

We refer to Gina Covina's epistemology (theory of knowledge), H.-A. 80v.: the pure phenomenon only comes through, if one 'looks' without a-priori (the pure beholding, of Husserl).

## ***Introduction -- More precise characterization and location of magic.***

J.-A. Rony, *La magie*, Paris, 1950, 9 / 24, describes to us the magic ceremony.

### **1. Situation**

(esp. the most complete model, Mesopotamism and Egyptian):

**1.a. Occurrence:** midnight, dawn, dawn (astrologically: lunarstan-den, solstice, etc.); place: temple, cemetery, swamp, dump, magic circle;

### **1.b. Infrastructure :**

Materials (herbs, magic potion, amulet, nail remains, foetus, excrement, sper-ma; -honey, wax, plaster, etc.); implements (divining rod, pendulum; doll, mask, knife, key, mirror, ladder, disc, etc.).

### **2. The essence**

**2.a.** Form of the operation (according to Rony, this would be very stereotypical (i.e. regulated down to the details and unchangeable;--which is certainly not true of all magics) and imperative (i.e. infallible;--which is certainly not true of all magics).

**2.b.** Content (= operation itself):

(i) The goal is to make fruitful effort (succeed) truly fruitful;

(ii) the means: in natural magic, impersonal forces and, in ceremonial (evocative) magic, spirits (again: both run into each other; it is only a matter of accents).

### **3. Types:**

**3.a.** Generative magic works with already present energies (mana), according to contact (coherence) and imitation (resemblance);-- cfr Frazer's contagious and imitative magic. Cfr H.-A. 27.

**3.b.** Generative magic first establishes the necessary and sufficient energy (mana) rather often in a celebration. Only after that it performs the transmissive or applying acts. It is here, in the magical process, that the causation (generation) is situated.

For instance with the Aruntas (= Aranda's, in Australia):

(i) first, one establishes an evil power, called Arunkulta (= Arungquila), destined e.g. to harm or even kill enemies (e.g. an adulteress);

(ii) thereafter one acts, applying this power. Cfr N. Söderblom, *Das Werden*, 33.

Now one understands why we talk about magic first, before we tackle causation. The structure just sketched returns, after all, in the causation.

**Bibl. sample** -- N. Söderblom, *Das Werden d.G.*, 94/156 (*der Urheber*). (the originator). -- W. Schmidt, *Heilbringer bei den Naturvölkern*, (Healing bringers among primitive peoples), in: *Settimana Internazionale di Etnologia Religiosa*, IV (Milana 17.09.1925), Paris, 1926, 247/ 261).

### **A.-- The naturism.**

**Bibl. stampl.:** W. Schmidt, *Or. et év.*, 51/64 (*L'école d.l. mythologie de la nature*); (The school of nature mythology), 65/80 (*Les religions des peuples indo-européens*; (The religions of the Indo-European peoples), first field, where the naturist school tested its applicability); 125/137 (*La mythologie astrale et le panbabylonisme*; (Astral mythology and pan-Babylonis), second field of verification).

W. Schmidt typifies as follows: relying on the Tubinger symbolists (Fr. Creuzer (1771/1858), *Symbolik und Mythologie der alten Völker*, (Symbolism and mythology of the ancient people), Leipzig, 1810/ 1812), the hiëro-naturalists ('nature mythologists') claimed that, originally, religions were a 'psychic paganism' (note: understand: animistic paganism) such that they conceive the natural forces (H.A. 88) as living (H.-A. 34 ff.) and as personified. If you will: animism, as far as in nature, outside man and his culture, at home.

#### **1. The power in/behind the natural phenomenon**

G.V.d.Leeuw, *Phän.d.R.*, 37/54 (Heilige Umwelt), (Sacred environment), ; 54/66 (Heilige Oberwelt), (Sacred Upper Worl); 66/76 (Heilige Mitwelt: die Tiere), (Sacred co-world: the animal), specifies: "What we call 'nature' plays, indeed, in all religions an overwhelming role. It is, however, never nature or natural phenomena as such (= in themselves, secular), which are worshipped, but always 'the power' (H.-A. 70) in it or behind it". (o.c., 39).

#### **2.-- A mantic view of nature.**

G. Hodson, *Les fées*, (The fairies), Paris, 1966, gives us a sensitive (= mantic (H.A. 4; 35; 73v.)) view of naturism.

**A sample.** - "The ondine (= water nymph) belongs to (H.-A .45 (indwelling belief); 50; 87) the element (*note* -- Here in the sense of "part of nature") 'water': she (...) is never to be 'seen' (mantically or sensitively) far from rivers, mountain streams and waterfalls.

She has a well-defined female form. She is always completely naked (H.A. 86); usually she is wingless, rarely wears an ornament.

Sometimes she is smaller in stature than a human being, sometimes as large. But she is always of a ravishing beauty (H.-A. 84) and her movements are harmonious.

Her 'favorite abode' (note -- 'fetish') is a waterfall: there she is seen playing, usually with other nymphs, enjoying to the maximum 'the magnetic force' (H.-A. 74) inherent in the fall of the water". (o.c.,79).

Hodson, an excellent sensitizer, says, further, that at rest, the ondine dwells under water (note -- 'fetish'): **1.** in the fresh quiet depths of ponds, **2.** below waterfalls, **3.** in the quieter tributaries of rivers, **4.** in ponds, **5.** in pools.

**Hodson**, O.c.,80, dwells on the natural process ('system') - absorption (input)/ processing (transformation)/ release (output) - of which the water fairy (note -- the word 'fairy' comes from the Lat. 'fatum' (fate; H.-A. 75)) is the bearer, when she exercises her generative magic in and around the waterfall, (H.-A. 90).

"Suspended evenly, amidst the dust rains or at the midpoint of the bubbling waterfall, (recording) the nymph, slowly, takes in the magnetism of:

- (1) the sunlight (H.-A. 88: astrolatry) and
- (2) also of the water (H.-A. 83: hydrolatry).

Once the absorption limits have been reached, it releases the energy with which it was overloaded in a blinding flash of light and color.

(I) During this magical moment of energy release, she experiences an ecstasy (...): her facial expression - especially the eyes - is (...) glorious (H.-A. 26; 39; 62; 66v.; 75), indescribable; her eyes emit dazzling rays, while they sparkle (...)

(II) Immediately afterwards, she experiences a dreamy happiness (...). Her form becomes, temporarily, vague and indistinct. -- Then, after processing the whole experience, she appears again: the process begins again!

Who does not think, here, of the idea of 'peak experience' (central to humanistic psychology (1962: o.1.v. Abraham Maslow (+1970)))?

*Note*, in Hodson's description, the two layers:

- (a) the manaistic 'nature process' (absorption/processing/release) and
- (b) the living through ('hermeneutic' aspect; cf. W. Dilthey (1833/1911): 'verstehende' method).

### **B.-- The being that causes**

Dion Fortune (= Violet Firth (1891/1946)), *Psychische zelfverdediging (Een studie in occulte pathologie en criminaliteit)*, (Psychic Self-Defence (A Study in Occult Pathology and Crime)), A'm, 1937, 72/76, describes, in hermeneutic terms, i.e. in the form of a description of one's own experience, the causation (conception) and destruction (exorcism) of a vengeance demon,

#### **1-- Manaism, among Finns and Lapps**

N. Söderblom, o.c.,54, quotes E. Reuterskiöld and U. Holmberg, who tell of manaism among the Finns and the Lapps.

1-- Vaki' means, on the one hand, 'people' (i.e. the people of the small, 'mythical' nature-spirits, at home (H.-A. 45) in: (i) the fire, (ii) the water, the earth (H.-A. 88: pyrolatry.; hydrolatry; earth.), etc., on the other hand (according to Holmberg), 'power'-as a variant one knows the word 'voima' that both the people at home in (i) thunder (H.-A. 88 atmosphere, thunderstorms.), and (ii)a earth, water, (ii) b. forest (ib.: phytol.) as well as their 'power' (voima means, first of all, 'strength').

**2- ‘Die Zauberer verstehen vahi oder voima für ihre Zwecke zu benutzen’** (The magicians understand the art of using vahi (vaki) or voima for their purposes (H.-A. 24; 71 (dunamis)). This is exactly what we are going to see at work now. At the same time, we shall make the acquaintance of (poly)-demonism.

**Note 1--** The term “demonism” (H.-A. 40: totality (= harmony or union) of opposites); 48 (possession); 54 (‘the serpent’); 56 (soul (substance) exchange animal/human (possession); 56v. (animal/spirit; the worldly realms); 60 (incubus/succuba; ‘black’ (= demonic) magic); 62 (underworld soul; the darkness);-- 28 (Adam); 66/68 (adam, with his whole family) 78 (witch); 85 (Satan; evil spirits); 87 (underworld deities); 90 (evil power)) is a religious-historical idea,-- not an appreciation term (or, at least, not initially).

**Note 2.** The term ‘polydemonism’ is related to polytheism (polygoddess). According to D.J. Wölfel this has two origins:

- (i) hero worship (heroism; H.-A. 51) and
- (ii) polydemonism, which means nature spirit worship (H.-A. 91: naturism); from this second aspect Wölfel ‘explains’ how “numerous gods, in polytheism, make a wild, barbaric impression and how they, with animals, are associated and, often, in barbaric cult forms, are worshipped”.

So that polytheism is a fusion of:

- (i) the heroic figures
- (ii) with these - older - nature demons.

Cfr P. Schebesta, ed., *Oorsprong van de godsdienst (Resultaten v.h. prehistorisch en volkenkundig onderzoek)*, (Origin of Religion (Results of Prehistoric and Ethnographic Research)), Tielt/Den Haag, 1962, 57 (see also: J.W. Hauer (1923), R. Thurnwald (1951); o.c., 17; 23).

**Note 3** Sometimes the term ‘pan.theism’ is used in the sense of universe-animism and, if it concerns the Chinese form of it, one speaks of ‘pandemonism’.

As is widely known, the first Hellenic thinker, Thales of Miletos (-624/-545), was one, who

- (i) understood water as primordial substance (mana) and
- (ii) asserted that “everything was full of deities” (G. Welter, *Les cr. prim.*, 54).-

So much for the lemma (H.-A. 1).

## **2.-- The law of mana.**

Mana' is energy. Well, so far, it has been found, purely physically, that the law of entropy governs all energy.

### **A. Energy and organism**

(i) Rudolf Clausius (Köslin (Pomerania) 1822/ (Bonn) 1888), German physicist, specialized in thermodynamics, introduced the term 'entropy' in 1868, with the meaning of "energy quantum, which, no longer, is convertible into labor". In other words, 'unusable energy'.

(ii) Sadi Carnot (1796/1832) recognized the principle of entropy (in steam engines) as early as 1827. Hence, the Carnot-Clausius law: "the general energy, present in the universe, is invariable, but the general entropy in it is steadily increasing".

### **B. Biological evolution and energy flow**

The biologist Alfred Lotka, *Contribution to the energetics of evolution*, in: Proceedings of the National Academy of Science (1922), 8:149, was one of the first to link biological evolution, on the one hand, and the flow of energy, on the other. "Energy flows, uninterrupted, through every living organism so that:

(i) it enters (= absorption) the system (H.-A. 92), which every living being is, at a high level (= 'negative entropy') and

(ii) it leaves the same system (= release), at a lower level. Consequence: living beings only survive because they are able to absorb negative entropy (= usable energy, at a high level) from their environment and accumulate it.

What is called the 'struggle for life' depends on the extent to which each organism is equipped to absorb usable (= labor producing) energy. (Jeremy Rifkin/ Ted Howard, *Entropy (A New World View)*, New York, 1980 - 2, 53)

The book in question cites, as worldviews and philosophies of life that take account of this entropy law, both the ancient Greek (with its idea of rise and fall; H.-A. 40: 'life/death') and the Biblical (with its idea of 'spirit/flesh' (ibid.)). Modern mechanicism (Francis Bacon (1561/1626), René Descartes (1596/1650), Isaac Newton (1542/1727), - three typical enlighteners) rejects Rifkin/Howard because it does not take into account increasing entropy.

**Note:** H.-A. 34vv. (animism), especially 43vv. (regulative model) leave no doubt: the sacred is, entirely, a matter of life,

***To create life, to survive.***

It is, therefore, not surprising that the conclusion regarding causation (i.e., working with mana) is exhaustion if one does not rebirth oneself. Not least in spiritist circles, but all occultists have to deal with entropy (in the form of exhausted formulas etc.).

**B.1 -- *The creation (foundation, begetting) of a vengeance demon,***

**1.** The context, in Fortune's book, deals with the 'projection of the etheric body' (o.c., 67/77).

Projection' means 'externalization'. Ethereal' means that type of fine matter which is closest to coarse matter (H.-A. 43). It is, therefore, about the free soul (H.-A. 45), especially the personal thigh spirit (H.-A. 49).

**2.** The context is, further, about artificial 'elementals' i.e. spirits associated with one of the four 'elements' (fire,-- air, water, earth) (fetishistic: H.-A. 45; manaistic: H.-A. 88), such as the water fairy, H.-A. 91.

There is a shade of color in the word: it is usually used to refer to 'lower' spirits (i.e. infrahuman beings). Indeed, such beings, as nature spirits (naturism; H.-A. 91), are demonic (H.-A. 93), i.e. ethically dualistic.- 'Artificial' means that also the human being is demonic (H.-A. 93).

Artificial' means that man too, but then as magician(s) - as originator - can create such beings. Either the naturally gifted or the exceptionally well-practiced can do this. We will see this at work later on.

**3.1.a.** The 'thought-form'. -- Man's inner life consists of ideas, wills, qualities of mind. Now, in view of the double stratification (endure: hermeneutic, and mana: process of nature; H.-A. 92), each part of the inner life is accompanied by a fluidic (finest, mana) form: - e.g. a cloud, colored pink, arises in an erotic fantasy. In view of animatism (H.A. 43) and hylozoism (H.-A. 44), life is already contained in such a cloud.

**3.1.b.** 'Thought' is, here, to be understood in the Cartesian sense: consciousness content (i.e. more than merely intellectual).

The structure of the artificial elemental is:

**(i)** an idea (consciousness-content: anger e.g. as clear as possible, brought before the mind (consciousness) (informative);

**(ii)** charging this consciousness-content (idea) with mana (from one's own thigh-mind, but supplemented with a similar force (mana) from the environment (H.-A. 94) (manaistic: auto-implicative and naturistic).

This charging occurs unconsciously in the naturally gifted, and also in the well-practiced; in others it is extremely difficult.

**3.2.** The (specific) difference between a mere thought-form and an artificial elemental is that the latter, (i) as an independent living being (natural-spirit), (ii) leads an independent existence from its enabler, notwithstanding the fact that it remains connected to its enabler by means of a silver cord (i.e. a mana-necklace (Ecclesiastes 12:6)).

**(I) a.I. *The foundation of a vengeance demon.***

Follows, now, a praxeological description (H.-A. 90) of the foundation of a vengeance demon (Praxeology is description of an act).

***Initial situation.***

**(i) *Incentive.***-- Someone, whom she had helped, at the cost of considerable financial sacrifice, does D. Fortune a great injustice.

**(ii) *Response.***-- She was stirred up by an urge to attack (cf. Freud's 'es' (the arch-primitive in man,-- sacred: his demon (thigh spirit, in its unrefined state), which, on disappointment, becomes aggressive ('thanatos')). A strong temptation to pay! "I sunder revenge" writes D. Fortune. Thus it activates the spiral of violence (responding to injustice with an urge to attack).

**(I) a.II. *Hallucinatory type of *fantasma* (= revenge demon).***

**1.** One afternoon, as I was not far from dozing off, the thought came into my mind (meaning consciousness) of abandoning all self-control (which, in ancient Greek, is called 'hubris') and striking.

**2.** 'In my imagination the ancient Norse myths rose up: I thought of Fenris, the horrible wolf'.

**Note** - Hrodvitnir (Fenris wolf) is, in Norse mythology, a creation of the god Loki (his causer). This wolf child was raised by Tyr, the god of war, and became so strong that the deities feared him. He was, thanks to the dwarves (nature spirits; H.-A. 92 by means of gleipner (a magical rope).

**3.** Immediately afterwards, I had the peculiar feeling (mantic) that, at the level of the plexus solaris (solar plexus; stomach region), something was coming out of my body. Yes, next to me, on the siesta bed, a large wolf materialized. It was:

**(i)** a well-formed, ectoplasmic (outside the 'plasma' of D. Fortune (H.-A. 86), i.e. situated outside her body-mana) form (*note* -- this form is the thought-form (H.-A.95), also 'image-impression' (imago), i.e. a shadow to make an impression).



- (ii) Its color was grey (rather colorless).
- (iii) I sensed, through the sense of touch, its weight.

**Note:** Materialization occurs when the mana, understood as subtle substance (H.-A. 73: hyllic pl.), becomes grossly materialized (H.-A. 43) through the low-subtle state (etheric). This can happen either from the thigh-spirit (double) or from a spirit without. The ectoplasm is the materialized form, where materialization is the process of ectoplasmic formation.

### ***Regulative model***

“I was, at the time, totally ignorant of the art of generating elementals. yet, now, by a coincidence (note -- D. Fortune was, apparently, naturally gifted), I had discovered the correct method”.

She summarizes:

1. the state between waking and sleeping;
- 2.1. ‘Thoughts’ (contents of consciousness) - ‘phantasms’ as the psychologists say;
- 2.2. highly charged with “emotion” (feeling, drive);
- 2.3. incubated (“I am constantly seeking revenge” (o.c.,73));-- this creates the auto-implicative (coming from the subject itself) mana;
- 3.1. ‘invocation’ (evocation, possibly conscious ‘evocation’ (H.-A. 90: evocative magic));
- 3.2. of a natural force (ambient mana (H.-A. 94’; 3.3. which qualifies (simili-similibus: which has both contact and resemblance with the auto-implicative mana (H.-A. 27; 90).

### **(1)b. *The ethical (= moral) reaction.***

D. Fortune was filled with horror about what she had done (consciousness-raising process).

**Note:** Freudians would speak here of the censor, the higher personality (the Ich with its Ueber-Ich), watching over (i) reality and (ii) the moral norm, limiting the principle of lust (hubris, transgression).

Noalogically, i.e. starting from a theory of man which, like the Platonic and the Biblical, presupposes a higher (Platon: ‘noble’) soul, one says: the conscience speaks. Indeed, man is more and different than his thigh spirit (in its unformed state).

### ***The ethical fork in the road.***

(a) If she (= D. Fortune) does not again destroy (‘kill’) the being she has conceived, it will:

- (i) become independent and
- (ii) grow into a Frankenstein monster (o.c., .75;74).

*Note* -- D. Fortune points, here, to Mary Wollstonecraft Shelley (1797/1851), the second wife of the poet Percy Bysshe Shelley (1792/1822), - an English writer. She became known as the creator of 'Frankenstein' (in: *Frankenstein, or the Modern Prometheus* (1818)). In it, she describes a affordance process: in her mock-scientific novella, a professional scientist possesses:

(i) the ability to create and bring to life a human being,  
(ii) with the horrible consequences of that type of causation. It is, after all, a demonic creature, indeed, a balladic or creepy creature.

(b) If D. Fortune, however, wishes to 'kill' the mythical creepy creature, she must fulfil the following conditions:

**1. *The most necessary:***

Not, through panic, to be confused.

**2. *The killing (exorcism)***

This assumes sufficient occultist praxis so that it - and not the Wolf of Vengeance - prevails; for, in the nature-spirit world, the lord-servant dialectic (Hegel, Marx) prevails, to which already, Herakleitos of Ephesus (-535/-465) pointed out, where he writes that the struggle (polemos), which controls all being, creates deities and men, freemen and slaves (deities being lords and men being slaves).

In other words: with this world of nature spirits, we enter directly into the world of Marx (class struggle), Nietzsche (will to power) and Freud (aggression). Expressed differently, sacredly: if man does not evolve beyond his natural thigh-spirit (H.-A. 68: Adam's nature; demonic thigh-spirit), then neither sound reason nor the Holy Spirit of God (H.-A.27;31) come into their own (= demonism; H.-A.93).

**3. *The debunking***

This should be done as quickly as possible, for 'mythical' beings become more powerful (mana increase) the longer they can 'live' (demonic life increase).

*Note* -- The fork in the road, indicated by D.F., is one application of H.-A. 63v. (freedom and sowing - harvesting law; -- H-A. 92: two layers ).

**B.2.-- *Exorcism (= conjuration) of the revenge demon.***

D.F. chooses ethically.

**(II) A.-- *First phase.***

1. She moves, very carefully, towards the mythical creature. It apparently objects to being disturbed (note -- its lustprinzip!): it turns its long snout towards her, growls, shows its teeth.

She gives the creepy creature a stomp in the side (*note* -- similia similibus: he who deals with demonic creatures, enters into a quarrel, must, definitely, adopt their (and not their own higher (H.-A. 64v.)) form of behavior, otherwise they don't understand you). she says, imperatively: "if you don't behave properly (*note* -- "morally well"), you will have to lie on the floor".

**2.** – *Note* - Now notice the deceitful docility (H.-A. 98: lord/ servant), of this demonic being.-- tame as a sheep, Fenris gets off the bed. As he does so, he changes his impression (*note* -- All experienced exorcists know that demonic creatures do this easily): to her great relief, he becomes a dog (*note* -- Here that relief is naive: D.F. does not, as yet, understand that he is playing comedy).

Even more: the creature, through the northern part of the siesta room, leaves. (*Note* -- Again, a frequent phenomenon: it is as if an opening, in e.g. a wall, occurs, in which the creature sinks in -- It should be noted, at the same time, that in one ancient interpretation the north continues as an "evil wind" (o.c.,76).

**3.** On the one hand, new feeling of relief (because of the weakening), on the other hand, feeling of tension (premonition): "It is as if, with this, it is not over yet". (*Note* -- in occult (i.e. sacred, not perceptible to everyone) things, feeling, foreboding, aftertaste, etc., are sometimes very decisive; they have lemmatical (H.-A. 1) value). This is, indeed, verified. A housemate:

**a.** has had a restless sleep (*note* -- resonance phenomenon: both similarity and coherence),

**b.** has dreamt about 'wolves' (*note* the plural instead of the singular: each member of the nature spirit world is both similar and (especially) related to the others;-- onirological (dreamlike) aspect);

**c.** awoke in the night and saw, in the corner of her bedroom, the fiery gene of a wild (H.-A. 93: wild polydemonium) animal' (mantic).

### **(II)B.-- *Second phase.***

Digression.-- V.M. Firth, thoroughly troubled, seeks advice from her teacher in occultism. From which the regulatory model becomes clearer.--

**1.1.** The artificial demon is a form of thought, from its own 'substance' (mana), brought to hallucinatory life by resentment.

**1.2.** The elemental language is a real, through the subtle umbilical cord, drawn out “part” (thigh-spirit) of D.F. himself;

**1.3.** The longer it ‘lives’, the more difficult it is to ‘kill’ (exorcise);

**1.4.** he creates the impression (H.-A. 99: feeling etc.) that, if the impulse (H.-A. 96: Freud’s Es), inherent to the mythical-demonic wolf(dog), is once transformed into action, then he would tear himself away (H.-A. 96) from the ‘psychic’. A. 96) from the ‘psychic’ (note -- understand: subtle) umbilical cord, which, so far, keeps him bound to her plexus solaris (solar plexus) and, immediately, would no longer be absorbable in herself.

**2.1.** The mythical beast can, as the case may be, be killed by ‘metanoia’ i.e. regret, even more: remorse and even real repentance concerning the grudge and the urge to settle accounts;

**2.2.** It must, in that forgiving hypothesis, at all costs (if need be, with atonement), (i) be recalled and, above all, (ii) in D.fortune ‘s own life force (note -- now understood as higher soul (H.-A. (1) 44 (immat. soul); (2) 64vv. (light angel); (3) 97 (noölogie)) to be absorbed (and not, somewhere, in nature, outside the human being, going astray, expelled).

**3.** In the other hypothesis (persistence of drift (H.-A 96 (Es); 93 (demonism)) she enters the left path (i.e. the black or unscrupulous magic).

**1.** “Fortunately for all concerned, I still had enough common sense ---. to see that I was at a crossroads”.

*Note* -- One should not confuse ‘common sense’ (ethical common sense, here) with ‘common sense’ (sens commun, sensus communis, common sense), which expresses the average, established views of the group. Here, above all, common sense is the desire to put Freud’s realitatsprinzip into action (H.-A. 97: censor; much more accurately: conscience (noölogical)).

**2.** D. Fortune’s prospect was not exactly pleasant (note -- Lustprincipal point of view).

**2.1.** She was supposed to translate into praxis an ethical principle already known to the ancient Greeks: “suffer injustice rather than commit injustice”.

**2.2.** Magically speaking, she had to absorb a wolf-dog demon, via the umbilical cord, -- to perform the most efficient form of exorcism.

**2.3.** Coincidentally, in such a risky operation, she could count on neither much sympathy nor, above all, on any help from fellow men.

**Conclusion:** “It had, however, to be faced” (o.c.,75).

D. Fortune concludes:

- (i) to drop this opportunity for revenge;
- (ii) at the earliest opportunity, to recall and absorb the mythical beast.

**(II). C. Third stage.**

**The swallowings exorcism.** -- Cf. H.- A. 90 ( magical solemnity).

**(A). She calls back the Fenris,**

when dusk falls (H.-A. 62: ‘out of the darkness’) D.F. calls back Fenris. Through the northern side of the room he returns. he goes,

- (i) in a friendly and
- (ii) even, in a tame (H.-A. 99: deceitful meek.) posture, stands on the hearth-cloth (H.-A. 91: ‘element’).

**(B). Fenris materializes.**

She obtains, by means of further effort (= causing), an excellent materialization: “One could have sworn that an alder dog (H.-A. 99) was watching me. It was, in fact, such a tangible apparition that even the scent of the Alsatian dog was not lacking”. “From me to the shape, ran a shadowy ectoplasmic line”.

- (i) One end of the ‘silver cord’ emptied into her solar plexus.
- (ii) The other end disappeared, at belly height, in the shaggy coat of the alder dog, but in such a way that she could not see the exact point of exit.

**(C).1. The subtle mana process.**

The actual engulfment (killing) begins as follows:-- As one, by means of a straw, swallows a glass of lemonade, so D.F., by means of the silver cord, but not without an effort of both imagination and will, draws the life (sic, o.c.,76) out of the self-made demon.

It begins to fade (note -- The rarefied substance, though materialized, turns from low-subtle to high-subtle (astralization)). But, at the same time, the silver cord inflates and becomes more massive (condensation).

**(C). 2. The hermeneutic aspect.**

The ethical-psychic experience (center of the ‘understanding’ (= verstehende) method of W. Dilthey (1883/1911) proceeds as follows.

“In my interiority, an emotional storm, fierce, began to rise: I felt the fiercest impulses (H.-A. 96; 100: Freud’s ‘es’),-- to go out and tear apart everything and everyone that came in my way,-- exactly like an amok-making Male.” (H. A. 59: healing report).

“With a tremendous effort (counter-conditioning) I overcame those impulses. After which the storm calmed down”.

**(D).1.-- *The further subtle process.***

The demonic form, meanwhile, gradually ebbs away, so that, on regaining inner peace, a formless, grey haze remains -- “I swallowed it up, too, along the silver thread, in me.

**(D).2.-- *The further experience (herm.).***

“The tension lessened. Finally, I was, once again, myself,-- only bathed in sweat”. - As far as I know, this was the end of the story”.

***Two remarks.***

(1) C. G. Jung’s synchrony. -- “Particularly curious was the fact that, precisely during the brief ‘life’ of that ‘thing’ -- twenty-four hours -- an opportunity for a formidable revenge presented itself.” -- Thus D. Fortune himself. (H.-A. 75: power = destiny).

(2) H.-A. 84/86 (genital power; ritus paganus) taught us, a.o. with Freud, who, although aggressively atheist and materialist, had a sharp eye for such things, that, if a woman timidly (although not religiously) shows her genitalia, specters, evil spirits and, even, Satan either fade away or give way.

Well, also in our little country, women can be found, who, mostly out of family tradition (witch genealogy), apply this method - I say method -. The result is that a self-made demon, like the one above, weakens in a flash in the sex of the woman in question. Without effort, without sweat etc.!

Of course, the first moments or, even, hours or days, yes, months or years, thereafter, an imperceptible change of behavior takes place: both her fate (crashing, quarrelling, running amok, etc.) and her psyché become demonic.

The Church has, therefore, with great reason, resisted this efficient but demonizing ‘method’. Freud does not seem to have taken this into account when, instead of repressing (or suppressing) the ‘es’ (with the fate that goes with it), he recommended methods of extrication. Hence the more than natural demonization, which then occurs. Psychoanalysts, if honest, will readily admit this.

Even if involved (e.g. transference) so-called saving ‘therapists’, some of them are in danger of perishing from it.

**C.-- 'Die Urheber' by Nathan Söderblom.**

(1) H.-A. 103, we saw that, according to Pliny the Elder as well as to someone like Maxwell, who is called a 'specialist in the matter' by Serge Hutin, magic arose from medicine.

(2) "Who, exactly, is capable of creating something remarkable (H.-A. 76)? Already at the beginning we could surmise, what the information on the matter fully verifies: the answer is: 'the healer', 'priest-tribe leader' (N.Söderblom, o.c, 153).

1. As the best-known of the 'Urheber' (causers), Söderblom, o.c., 94, cites Bajami, whom he characterizes as follows: "He is portrayed as a mighty healer, who, once, from the West, came,-- people, animals, trees, watercourses, mountains 'made', -- who instituted sacred ceremonies and recorded from which sibbe a member of a certain other sibbe (H.-A. 51 (kinship)) should take his wife (i.e. introduce fixed rules for marriage). When he had accomplished all this, he went away".

2. "(The information) verifies, in abundance, that a bajami or other 'causer' (Urheber) is presented as an ancient, magician, wise healer, or 'quack' or 'shaman' (H.-A. 83), who, in 'ancient' times, created and arranged everything.

His actual activity has, today, ended. He lives, therefore, in another country, perhaps 'above', -- without caring much about the people". (o.c. 153).

*Note.*-- With this last trait one typifies the Urheber of Söderblom as 'dei otiosi' (singular.: deus otiosus;-- literally: 'pious god').

**Conclusion.**

(1) One sees that, with what we called a terminus technicus, 'supreme spirit' (as distinguished from the (actual) supreme being), (H.-A. 55) - actually, we have already described a real Urheber. *The serpent of the Ngbändi*, in its malevolence, should not be taken as an ideal image of the Urheber.

(2) That W. Schmidt, however an excellent ethnologist and religious scientist, tried to identify this Urheber with the supreme being is, somewhat, understandable: did not the Ngbändi themselves compare their 'serpent' with the 'god of the Christians'? Yet the difference is considerably greater than the resemblance. To which Söderblom, o.c., 123/134: *Der Urmonotheismus* (cf. H.-A. 55: bibl.) explicitly refers.

(3) The ‘primeval father(s)’, (‘primeval mother(s)’), also called ‘primeval father(s)’ (‘primeval mother(s)’), as Söderblom calls his Urheber, too (cf. H.A. 55 (‘our father’)), are described as ‘origin being(s)’ of either natural or cultural data.

On close reading, this seems to be Söderblom’s core idea. For, according to e.g. the Unmatjera (an Australian aboriginal tribe), the people themselves created the totem animals in primeval times (H.-A. 57),--and this precisely by the performance of magical ceremonies themselves (H.-A. 90): “The sacred rites thus, in themselves, brought into being the object at which they were directed, namely the totem genus.”(o.c.,96).

N. Söderblom immediately adds: “The parallel is telling: not ‘Urheber’ in the strict sense, occur; the archaic people themselves were, without distinction, ‘Urheber’“. (Ibid.).

So that a differential emerges:

(i) on the one hand, the myths, which say that the prehistoric people were, without distinction, thus all, causers;

(ii) on the other hand, those which postulate a single ‘urheber’.

As the author concludes: “The common trait” which remains fundamental throughout all the legends belonging to the circle of myths is the purpose of those myths: to explain the origin of things.

But this touches the very essence of myth-analysis:

“Pour la pensée mythique, toute généalogie est, en même temps et aussi bien, explicitation d’ une structure: il n’y a pas d’autre façon de rendre raison d’ une structure que de la présenter sous la forme d’un récit généalogique” (J.P. Vernant, *Mythe et pensée chez les Grecs (Etudes de psychologie historique)*, (Myth and thought among the Greeks (Studies in historical psychology), Paris, 1971, 2 v., 1,16).

In other words, according to Vernant, mythic thinking is, essentially, ‘lineage thinking’, but lineage thinking, obviously aimed at uncovering a fundamental structure of natural and cultural reality.

It is clear that this basic structure, in many variants, is what we, in the creation phase (H.-A. 95/98), have seen done by someone like Dion Fortune, a purebred occultist.

Söderblom, o.c.,149f., writes: “Either the first human beings and animals or their souls and germs are thought to be outflows (‘aussonderungen’) from the ‘body’ of the primal being (= Urheber),--or (they) are made out of formless lumps (...). ( ... ).



Separation ('Ausscheidung'), i.e. 'emanation', and manufacture can also be combined in the legends of origins (note -- understand: myths).

First, the shapeless lumps or human germs rise from the 'body' of the Urheber. Then he forms them, according to necessity. Even something like circumcision or the like, which is performed, at initiation, are a continuation of the human formation. In particular, it is only through the Mysteries that they are "completely finished". This is expressed as follows: "making boys into men". The fact that the primordial beings introduced e.g. a rite of circumcision (...), is, at the same time, the completion of their activity as causers and creators".

In other words, either emanatism (outflow myths) or artificialism (production myths) or the two in one.

**(4) To sum up.**

**a.** One of the most significant causal ideas is the Indian 'Manitou':

**a/** now it is a personally conceived spirit. (H.A. 34vv: pneumatology), in an animistic sense;

**b/** then again 'Manitou' means 'power' (H.-A. 70v.: mana,-- pneumatology);

**c/** finally, 'Manitou' means 'causer' (H.-A. 104vv.).-- In other words, the Indians use one and the same word for the three main features of the sacred.

**b.** Söderblom himself summarizes differently. Urheber' are:

**a/** Not ordinary nature spirits (o.c., 134 / 145: Die Naturhypothese; see H.-A. 91v.: naturism).

**b/** Also no ordinary ancestors (o.c., 146 / 149; H.-A. 51/54: ancestors; 57: manism).

**c/** Also no pure supreme being (high god, Hochgott, - a Yahweh, a Trinity), as H.-A. 103 already made clearer.

So it remains: 'ein Genus für sich' (a separate category), which Söderblom calls 'Urheber',--which we translate by 'causers' (the correct German meaning, by the way).

**(5) One further remark.**

There is not enough space to treat the Urheber in more detail. However, the primeval hero, who "caused" inorganic nature (rivers, mountains), organic nature (plants, animals, people), "brought about", -- e.g., Kuloskap (Algonkin), Bajami (Aborigines, Austr.) -- is, not infrequently, also "culture-heros" ("salvation-maker"; H.-A. 51): he saved the people from distress, e.g., by:

**a/** teaching them to hunt, to fish,-- to make fire, to manufacture implements,-- to build huts, to manufacture canoes or

**b/** instituting sacred acts (rites), e.g. marriage rules, totemism, etc.

### ***One comparison.***

One may be familiar with Th.S. Kuhn, *De structuur van wetenschappelijke revoluties*, (The Structure of Scientific Revolutions), Meppel, 1976-2. The core revolves around 'paradigm', i.e. a fundamental example. One is familiar with the foundation ('causing') of e.g. modern- contemporary natural science, especially by G. Galilei (1564/1642), who founded - what is called - the exact science (on the one hand, experimental, on the other hand, mathematical).

Well, as Kuhn, o.c.,36, says: Galilei c.s. 'produced' (sic!) a paradigm that proved to be capable of guiding the scientific research of 'the whole group' (*note* -- Please understand a basically endless series of researchers).

Exactly this is the definition of the Urheber as culture founder, but ...(usually) in a premodern culture context! Is it not said, in modern-day language, that people like Galileo are 'the fathers' of modern-day science?

*Note* -- The incredibly harsh prejudices (yes, ideologies) of the higher religions as well as of the liberals, especially in the West, have prevented even open minds like a Söderblom from speaking of the god religions with a single word.

### ***Therefore this bibliogr. stitchpr...:***

-- Merlin Stone, *Eens was God als vrouw belichaamd*, (Once God was embodied as a woman), Katwijk, 1979;

-- C.J. Bleeker, *De moedergodin in de Oudheid* (The mother goddess in antiquity), The Hague, 1960,

-- *Enc. of World Religions* (Judaism, Christianity, Islam, Buddhism, Zen, Hinduism, Prehistoric and Primitive Religions), London, 1975, 19/23 (The Mother Goddess).

This theme is too rich to say anything more about it here and now (H.-A. 83/ 87 gives, however, the basic insight).

### ***II. D. The analysis: the main problem of every religion. .***

The problem-without-a-more of every religion was touched upon - very briefly - H.A. 93 ((poly)demonism). There it was briefly said that naturist religion is, always, a mixture of good and evil, of life and death (H.-A. 95/98 (life); 98/102 (death)).

What is called 'the devil's circle' ('Teufelskreis') is, perhaps, the most pregnant expression of this. The religions have the impression that the following traits keep recurring.

### ***Bibl. Sample.***

-- W.B. Kristensen, *Verzamelde bijdragen tot kennis der antieke godsdiensten* (Collected contributions to the knowledge of ancient religions), A'm, 1947 (vrl. 231/290: Circle and totality);

-- R. Girard, *La violence et le sacré*, (Violence and the sacred), Paris, 1972;

-- C.J. Bleeker, *De moedergodin in de Oudheid*, Den Haag, 1960 (a.o. 27 (The hermaphroditic character of the Earth Goddess); 57/59 (Isis, the wise one); 133v. (Kali);

-- C.A. Meier, *Antike Inkubation und moderne Psychotherapie*, (Ancient incubation and modern psychotherapy), Zürich, 1949 (vrl. 13/22: Die göttliche Krankheit).

### **A.-- *The twofold impotence.***

Man's powerlessness in the face of (i) demonia and (ii) satania is twofold -- that of the spirit (nocturnal) and that of failing contact with the Supreme Being (anagogic).

#### **1. - *The urge to live is blind to the higher***

M. Scheler (1874/1928), who, together with E. Husserl, was one of the founders of the phenomenological school, but who was sufficiently imbued with Romantic Vitalism to see the problem, writes in his *Die Stellung des Menschen im Kosmos* (The Position of the Human Being in the Cosmos), Darmstadt, 1930, 83, that amidst the urge for life which is coursing through reality, man, as a spirit, i.e. as a rational ability to 'sublimate' this urge for life (o.c., 79), i.e., to integrate it to a higher level, has to deal with the impotence of that spirit.

For the Scheler of that period, the lower (matter, plants, animals, animality in man) is the stronger, while the higher (spirit) is the weaker. For, originally, the urge to live that comes from below is "dämonisch" (demonisch), i.e. blind to all spiritual (note -- understand: higher) ideas and values.

#### **1.a. - *The sphere of demonism***

S. Freud (1856/1939), the founder of psychotherapy, in: *L'avenir d'une illusion*, (The future of an illusion), Paris, 1976-4 (*Die Zukunft einer Illusion*, London, 1948) sees, in his own way, the problem: "We were just talking about the hostility to civilization, in that the latter exerts pressure on the instincts, which it forces to mortification.

Suppose all avoidances (taboos) have been lifted! In that case, one could seize any woman in one's taste, - one could kill one's rival without restraint, or any one who stands in one's way, - one could, without the latter's consent, seize any property of one's fellow man. How beautiful this would be, and what a series of satisfactions would 'life' offer us in this hypothesis! 77 (nihilism) cf. 84v; 96 (Es)): lyrical, hedonistic (lustprinciple!).

The way out, for Freud, is: “But the basic difficulty (note -- For the ideal of survival; H.-A. 102) is, indeed, quickly realized: my fellow man has precisely the same desires as I do. He too will treat me with no more diffidence than I treat him”.

In other words: the social motivation breaks through to accept civilization (oppression). “*Das Unbehagen in der Kultur*”, (The unease in culture), however, remains underground.

### **1.b.-- Vladimir Soloviev**

(= Soloviev; 1853/1900), *La justification du bien (Essai de philosophie morale)*, (The justification of the good (Essay in moral philosophy)), Paris, 1939, 38, sees what Scheler calls ‘spirit’ differently: thanks to the capacity for shame, a sense of belonging and reverence, man, as spirit, grows beyond the urge to live.

O.c., 187, he writes: “The stone exists; the plant exists and lives; the animal lives and is aware of its life in its various states; man, on the basis of ideas, understands the meaning of life; -- but only the children of God actually realize that meaning of life which consists in the conscientious order of all things to the end.

In other words: Solovjef sees that man no longer reaches beyond (infrahuman) life, but, in powerlessness (which Scheler underlined), for only man, equipped as a ‘son/daughter of God’, realizes the ideas - anagogically (thanks to direct contact with God).

Cfr H.-A 31 (increase of level); 64v. (light angel). And: both go together! Only in this way the impotence of the ‘spirit’ is overcome.

### **2.1. The powerlessness of the ‘kingdom of God’.**

When we now examine how the Bible and, in particular, Christianity, have tackled and ... (not) solved the problem of demons and Satan, we find the following.

G. Szczesny, *De toekomst van het ongeloof (Actuele beschouwingen van een niet-christen)*, (The Future of Unbelief (Current reflections of a non-Christian)), A’ m, 1960, believes that faithlessness is the fate of a certain type of ‘present Western’ man, probably extremely numerous:

- (i) Christianity “no longer provides any answers”
- (ii) while official philosophy and current pseudo-religions do so only to a very limited extent.

**Consequence:** world-views crisis, the ‘big void

## **2.2. *The impotence of the Kingdom of God***

This is twofold: both synchronic and diachronic.

### **2.2.A.-- *Synkronic.***

(i) H.-A. 4, teaches us that manticism consists in “seeing” that, apart from this, secular world, there is a sacred world (H.-A. 32v.: two-world thinking).

(ii) 1. H.-A. 101v. (likewise: 63v. ) taught us that telestics (initiation; entering into the sacred) shows us a twofold stratification, in man-in-this-world: every consciousness is, manaistically, accompanied by a fluid structure (thought-form); every free act, precisely because of this, ‘causes’ consequences (sowing-harvesting-law-ness, not only in the conscious domain (hermeneutic, human-scientific), but, first of all, subtle (hylic pluralism (H.-A. 73), -- rationality (H.-A. 73). A. 73), -- rationally-expressed: in the unconscious domain.

(ii) 2. H.-A. 91v. (water nymph) taught us that, also within the sacred world, an analogous twofold stratification is present: the hermeneutic (‘conscious’; hermeneutic/human-scientific) living through is accompanied by the manaistic (unconscious; process), energetic domain, also in e.g. a water nymph.

*Note* -- Biblically, are :

(i) the priestly-prophetic type, which adheres rather to the hermeneutic-consciousness, and

(ii) the wisdom (= sapiential) and especially the apocalyptic (revealing, i.e. the manaic processes) type, which are situated, rather, in the unconscious, parallel to the layers mentioned under (ii)1. and (ii)2. (H.-A. 4v. apocalyptic; cf. H.-A. 58).

### **2.2.B.-- *Diachronic.***

The idea of ‘consecrated history’ is, merely, the evolutionary, historical side of the mantis: history is ‘consecrated’ (sacred), i.e. two - secular (ad(i)) and double - layered (**ad(ii)1** and **ad(ii)2**).

Biblically, this means that:

(i) the priestly and the prophetic texts, well, provide the surface (hermeneutic; human-science), but

(ii) that the wisdom texts and, especially, the apocalyptic texts offer the corresponding depth processes (manaistic layer, destiny determining; unconscious processes).

Both scriptural aspects belong together. If not, there is a gap.

### **3.1.-- *The Brazilian Candomblé***

H.-G. Clouzot, *Le cheval des dieux*, (The horse of the gods), Paris, 1951, is, in the form of a travelogue, the description of the mysteries (sacred initiation rites) of the Brazilian Candomblé (one of several neo-sacred religions, sometimes disparagingly called 'sects').

The climax of the story (for our subject) is o.c., 221: Clouzot describes how, in the course of the weeks, the three 'iao's' (initiates) lost all respect for themselves and discarded all semblance of human behavior. (...).

(i) The three girls expressed themselves in a more difficult way as they went along.  
(ii) They put themselves, like four-footed animals (H.A. 57; 93), on all fours to lick the dishes served to them (...).

This, while Vera (Clouzot's Brazilian wife), who showered those three Negro girls with courtesies and gifts (note -- As a paying body, at initiation), felt them moving further and further away from her. "I have the impression" she said, "that, between us (the Clouzot's) and the girls, there will forever be a gulf." (...).

Instead of bringing her fruit jellies from the goojave, I should - like the initiating negro does all the time - insult them, call them "dirty" negroes and say that they "stink". But I will never be able to do such a thing".

In other words, due to the Candomblé's demonistic method (in Bahia), deification (better: demonization) arises; -- at once, expulsion from the Western (Enlightenment-rational) Clouzot's.

### **3.2.-- *The Fang in the Congo***

P. Trilles, *Chez les Fang (Quinze années de séjour au Congo Français)*, (Among the Fang (Fifteen years in the French Congo)), Lille, 1912 (H.A. 79), 190s., as a Catholic missionary, describes the same gap.

"Every ngil (note -- Black or half - black magician) (... ) picks out a child, about ten years old, and adopts it as a 'son' (H.-A.51vv.: 'sacred: telestial kinship, with life-likeness as a consequence (H.-A. 67)). From then on, he forms it according to his ideas (H.-A. 63 (high id.,-- here, low); 95). (...).

Such children, daily, see evil examples before them and live amid the most hideous destruction. (...). They are ready for any crime. (...)

Often they have come to the (Catholic) mission, pulled along by a comrade,--at once attracted also by the unknown. They deceive the catechists, with a profound treachery: sometimes they stay, at the mission, until baptism.

“They always left the mission worse than they came in. Christian formation had no hold on them”.

**Conclusion.**-- The Clouzot's felt the cultural and interpersonal gap and Father Trilles notes that the (black)-magical formation is such that the “mighty” Catholic Church, with its formation, runs to letter! Magical-demonistic initiates (= telestics) are programmed, not only on the conscious (hermeneutic) plane, but on the unconscious -- and indeed manaistic -- plane. Even the priestly-prophetic level, on which the mission usually moves, without a wisdom-apocalyptic basis, is crushed.

### **3.3. - A primitive form of occult soul life.**

J. Pearce-Higgins, *Poltergeists, Hauntings and Possession*, in: J.D. Pearce-Higgins/ G.St. Whitby, ed., *Life, Death and Psychical Research*, London, 1973, 188ff., mentions, from exorcist experience (not (merely) from speculation), that the unconscious (note -- understand: the mana) of many people, who, for exorcism, are eligible, show “a far more primitive form of psychism” than what he, usually, finds, in his praxis (in which he believes that only “earth-bound human souls in the afterlife” are at work (H.-A. 62v.)).

Sooner or later - he says - the (Anglican) Church will have to engage with this. “I find the study of the type of occult practices which occur in the Caribbean, the Philippines and the Far East, repugnant” (ibid.). He refers to the growing occultism in Great Britain and the USA, which moves in an analogous vein to the abovementioned repugnant ones.

He notes that ‘considerably more powerful prayers’ are needed than his regular texts!

**The reason:** “The entities (H.-A. 58) involved appear to be of extremely low intelligence” (H.-A. 56; 99; 110). “One hardly knows indeed whether they are not ‘elemental’ (H.-A. 91:naturism; 95) subhuman creatures”.

He has, he says, had to use more traditional exorcisms. He even refers to the fallen angels.

**Conclusion.**-- Jesus, Mk 8: 35/37, says: “To what profit is it to the whole world, if one damages his own ‘soul’ (‘psuchê,’) ? What will man give in exchange for his soul?

In the Greek text there is ‘soul’ (‘psuchê’) twice. One translates, well, by ‘life’. Fine, but on the condition that one means sacred life.

Jesus defines his task, Mk 6:35, as saving the soul. Well, soul moves:

- (i) in the other world and
- (ii) on two levels: hermeneutically (conscious and free) but also manaistically (unconscious and processual).

Also, H.-A. 79/81, when he heals, for example, he demands faith and mana change he accomplishes through his “dunamis”. Not only faith (fideist).

Not only the change, manaist (mechanical magic). But the two together.

What he says, Mk 3:4, in healing the withered hand on the Sabbath: “Is it lawful, on the Sabbath, to do good rather than harm? To save the soul rather than to kill it (‘apokteinaï’)?”.

In other words: the healing of the hand is:

- (i) a visible, secularly ascertainable phenomenon (‘sign’),
- (ii) a whose true depth is in the other world and
- (ii) b in the soul, through which man bathes in the mana proper to that other world.

Well, Clouzot, Trilles, Pearce-Higgins touch upon this fundamental sacred structure: if Western man (Clouzot) or the churches (higher religion; H.-A. 32 / 34) are crushing on initiates, then this is, among other things and above all, because they, through enlightened rationalism, to a lesser or greater degree, no longer see the other-worldly with the manaist processes.

In that case one has “religion” as Sperna Weiland caricatures it (H.A. 34: inner cult with worldliness).

**Secularization** - in the form of adapting to this world, with ‘Christianization’ of e.g. abortion, homosexuality, partisan Christianity etc. - is, well, adapting to the secular situation.

But what exactly do these secularizations mean

- (i) in the other world and
- (ii) in the mana processes caused by abortion, homosexuality, left-wing methods etc. (H.-A. 92v.)? The enlightened leave this sacred question unexamined. Because they have repressed, yes, suppressed, the soul salvation, as Jesus understood it .



***The Enlightenment: reason without faith.***

Even more: the whole Enlightenment itself is, hiëroanalytically speaking, in need of the same criticism: in its XVIII-th century version (J.Locke (1632/1704); D.Hume (1711/1776): Enlightenment; F.M. Voltaire (1694/1778); J.J. Rousseau (1712/1778): Lumières; Chr. Wolff (1679/ 1754); I. Kant (1724/1804): Aufklärung) she is, secularly speaking, cultural revolution (H.- A. 106: paradigm; 51; 105: culture hero): it designs a culture, thoroughly ‘rational’ (understand: the religion- and faithless reason, which underpins ‘philosophy’ (intellectualist (R. Descartes (1596/1650))); empiricist (J. Locke, D. Hume)) and professional science (primarily, mathematical physics (Galilei; H.- A.106))

***The enlightenment: sacredly,***

As far as the sacred is concerned, the Enlightenment is well-nigh uncharted territory. On the contrary, this view has been repressed, if not suppressed, both by the churches and by the Enlightenment itself (H.-A 112). For all possible issues, even in Church circles, are systematically excluded from hiëro-analysis.

Unless one takes the few, ecclesiastical and enlightened, who practice “occultism” and, in the enlightened midst, the secret societies (“lodges”) as timid attempts to shed light on the purely religious root (animistic, manaistic; -- under the purpose of causation) also, yes, especially of enlightenment.

Is it sheer coincidence that eminent figures of the enlightenment were freemasons of all people, who belonged (as they call themselves), not to the strivers, but to the ‘initiating core’? By the way: why is it that, precisely on this point, especially in the handbooks and articles on Enlightenment, one is so scarcely telling? To hide something? Perhaps.

There is not enough space here to expose this tender spot of the religionless Enlightenment. But it is still doable.

***B.-- Deuteronomy 18: 9/12***

The condemnation of idolatrous religions.

***Bibl. sample:*** D.J. Bretherton, *Psychical Research and the Biblical Prohibitions*, in: *Life, Death and Ps. Res.*, 101/124.

This rock-solid article decays into two parts:

(i) J.D.P-H, *The Background of Deuteronomy* (a.c., 101/110);

(ii) *The Deuteronomic Prohibition* (a.c.,110/124). The latter begins as follows: “Deut. 18: 9/12 (The Deuteronomic Prohibition) has been ‘used’ for a long time by (i) prejudiced, (ii) ignorant and (iii) fearful people as an argument against real occult (‘psychical’) research by Christians”.

Deuteronomy (cf. E.P, Blair) consists of three accounts attributed to Moses:

(i) what God did (Deut 1/4: 43); what He requires (Deut 4:44/28: 68); what He proposes (Deut 29/30: 20); final narrative (Deut 31/34: 12). The infamous prohibition is in part (ii).

In translation this reads as follows. “When you have entered the land which Yahweh your God has given you, you shall not learn to commit the same abominations as those peoples. No one shall be found among you who sends his son or daughter through the fire, or who practices divination, or who divines times, or who is a sorcerer, or a sorceress. Nor the sorcerer, nor whosoever consults an ob, nor whosoever consults a yiddeoni, nor whosoever conjures up the dead. For all those who practice these things are abominations in the sight of God. Also, because of such abominations, Yahweh your God drives those peoples away from you”.

Which is further (18:14): “For those nations, whose possessions you are now taking away, obeyed tyrants and soothsayers”.

1. The underlined words form the point of our reading: “the abominations of the nations”. It is therefore logical that one understands the applicative models of the sacred writer as abominations peculiar to peoples, -- and not as models of paranormological or even occult research. Reason: he was absolutely not talking about that.

*Note*-- What ‘ob’ and ‘yiddeoni’ mean exactly is disputed: they seem to have been sacred objects, useful in oracular praxis.

2. That our interpretation, indeed, is the correct one, appears, further, from Deut 18:15 “Yahweh your God will ... make a prophet like me (Moses): rather listen to him”. (Understood instead of to those idolaters).

*The autor’s conclusion*-- “All the banned practices (...) are inadmissible, because they are idolatrous”. (a.c., 124). If we interpret correctly, we mean “and especially insofar as they are idolatrous, -- not in themselves, however, as paranormal or occult praxis”. In any case: that, precisely that, is the tendency of the article.

*Note* -- By the way, we have, from Jesus himself, something like this: “John said to Jesus, ‘Master, we have seen someone, who does not follow us, casting out devils in your name. We wanted to forbid him, because he did not follow us.

But Jesus said, “Do not prevent him! For he who performs a miracle (‘dunam.’; H.-A. 71; 80), in my name, cannot immediately thereafter speak evil of me. He who is not against us is for us”. (Mk 5:38 40).

Note the use of the word: precisely the same word “dunamis” (1. power, mana; 2. miracle (by virtue of dunamis)) as in Mk 5:29 (the story of the hemorroïssa).

**Note** -- This word of Jesus gets its full meaning if one compares it with Acts 19:13/19 (The Jewish exorcists). “Some wandering Jewish exorcists tried to pronounce the name of the Lord Jesus when treating those who had unclean spirits in them.

They said: “I adjure you (*note* -- ‘humas’ (= plural)) by Jesus, whom Paul preaches! It was the seven sons of Skeuas, a Jewish chief priest, who did this. But the evil spirit answered them: “Jesus I know (‘ginosko’) and Paul I know (‘epistamai’). But who exactly are you?

The man who had the evil spirit within him threw himself upon them, overpowered them all and mistreated them (H.-A. 59/61; cf. 101 (mischief)) so that they fled from the house without their clothes and injured.

**Note.-- In passing:** from this (and from The entity) it is clear, that praying alone is insufficient, but that - apart from prayer-formulas - power (might) is necessary (H.-A. 111: powerful prayers).

**Conclusion** - The one, who did not follow the apostles and yet, in Jesus’ name, exorcised them (being assisted by Jesus), must have had prayer but much more “power” (mana).

Indeed, manaism is no catheter theorem! But sometimes bloody reality. (H.-A. 98 prevailing; lord-servant dialectic, characteristic of demonism).

Which again shows that, apart from the hermeneutical (possibly: human-science) plane, the typically ‘occult’ (understand: manaistic) plane is very decisive. Cfr. H.-A.109vv, where the impotence of mere hermeneutics is overwhelming.

**Conclusion:** This - and not secularizing ‘adaptation’ - seems to be the way out of what Szseny says is “that Christianity no longer offers answers” (H.-A. 108)

Is then, the present emerging occultism the way out? -- Certainly not. The reason is clearly given in Deut 18: 9/12: If, practising occultism in such a way that one does not get beyond the peoples (H.-A.18; 32; 114), as far as they are clearly stuck in paganism (and, immediately, in demonism), then this same occultism has not even seen the basic problem, namely, that both satanism and demonism corrupt both the animistic and the dynamistic and the causative side.

**1.-- *The satanists are clear.***

They proclaim, also in our regions, “that, between heaven and earth, there is no power that can measure up (H.-A. 98: Lord-servant dialect) to Satan”, whom they defiantly call ‘our god’ and whom they serve (sic!).

**2.-- *Unclear are our occultists.***

Much more unclear - first of all for those involved - are our paranormologists and, in particular, our ‘occultists’ of all kinds. One reads e.g. Serge Hutin, *Aleister Crowley (le plus grand des mages modernes)*, Marabout, 1973, in which this black magician (H.-A. 60), who, by the way, came from a family of Plymouth Brothers and who identified himself with ‘566’ (Apoc (= Rev.) 13:18), the beast of the end times, is ‘justified’ as much as possible (A. Crowley: 1875/1947).

Or still: J.-P. Bourre, prés., *Magie et sorcellerie* (Magic and witchcraft), (l’autre monde, hors série No. 3 (Paris)), a.o. 43/57 (les apotres de lucifer, -who are presented as “Faustian initiates”, who, through, especially, blood- or “red” magic, grow into “éveillés” (“awakened ones”)).

One wonders how, after almost twenty centuries of the Church and about twenty-six centuries of Hellenic culture, in the full twentieth century, which boasts of its “enlightenment”, the writers and/or publishers still do not “see” the basic problem, Satan and Demons (H.-A. 4 ).

**3.-- *A great remainder remains unclear.***

Then, follow the ‘masses’ who, in and/or outside all kinds of associations and circles and ‘sects’ (here one finds them indeed), practice ‘parapsychology’ or ‘occultism’. Except for a very few, all these people do not ‘see’ after many years the satanic and demonic influence they are being subjected to, mostly completely unconsciously.

Nevertheless, the signs are there, time and again.

(1) The whole thing clearly bears the traits of absurdity, so typical, especially of Satan. The more one immerses oneself in it, the more “it is to become ‘silly’ (insane) about it”, (according to one of the readers).

In other words: one can as well, in a dark room, dressed in black, as our London and Belgian Satanists like to do, when they come to impress, in the meetings, look for a black hat, which is not there!

More down-to-earth: one never arrives at a logically coherent characterization and positioning of any ‘phenomenon’, no matter how sensational (informational absurdity).

Never is the goal to be reached, according to methods (?) and effort (!), with certainty, as a result, attainable (pragmatic absurdity). Apparently, in every experiment, both the manaist laws and the loyalty of the involved ‘spirits’ (both terrestrial people and extraterrestrial ‘entities’) are cracked, checkmate.

Apart from this capriciousness, which particularly enrages professional scientists, there is the crushing phenomenon of increasing entropy (H.A. 94v.), which manifests itself in the exhaustion even of the most charged mediums: apart from what is already called in the Old Testament the ‘aluka’ (leech, vampire) (Proverb. 30:15), everyone, sooner or later, reaches the end of their God-given power.

***In passing:*** on efficiency (H.-A. 73: “It is not mana, if it does not work”. Proverb. 17:8 says: “A gift is a magic stone (‘talisman’) (H.-A. 46), for whoever has it: in whichever direction it is turned, it succeeds (H.-A. 74v.). But check this out (H.-A. 6/8: verification): almost all lucky stones, in market squares and in ‘shops’ (especially the ‘alternative’ ones, abundantly available (sometimes at unbelievable prices), do not ‘work’ or, “even, ‘work’ in the opposite direction (e.g., the bearers become unwell somewhere, etc.);--what, of course, always ‘works’ is that those who sell them, make money with them.

One never knows, further, what moral value, both the practices and the people and ‘entities’ involved in them, embody (ethical absurdity).

On the contrary, the more unscrupulous it is, the more ‘efficient’ it seems (at least, when seen from a short distance). Typically demonic is the fact that, in all of this, the moral (conscientious), the immoral (unscrupulous) and, above all, the amoral-stupid blend together nicely (ethical mishmash).

As W.B. Kristensen puts it, splendidly and in his antique Greek: ‘harmony’ (integration) of opposites. Cfr H.-A. 40 (where the turning point, realized in it by Christianity, is touched upon very briefly); 66/68 (Adam’s nature).

These are three partial impressions, always present in the total impression of ‘absurdism’.

**Note Bibl. Sample:** it is not to be supposed, now, that we have no regard for paranormology.

-- Reference should be made to R. Heynes, *The Hidden Springs (An Inquiry into Extra-Sensory Perception)*, London, 1961 (vrl. o.c.,198/208, where it is discussed how in the full XVIIIth century, a Catholic researcher, Prosper Lambertini (1675/1758), who became pope in 1740 (Benedict XIV) used a truly modern hiëro-analysis).

-- J. Beloff, *Parapsychologie vandaag (Nieuwe vormen van onderzoek)*, (Parapsychology today (New forms of research)), Rotterdam, 1975 (vrl. A. Koestler, *Postscript*, o.c.,204/208, where the hidden mutables are finally (!) discussed).

-- Sh. Ostrander/ L. Schroeder, *Parapsychologische ontdekkingen achter het IJzeren Gordijn*, (Parapsychomological discoveries behind the Iron Curtain), Haarlem, 1972;

-- H. Gris/W. Gick, *Nieuwe parapsychologische ontdekkingen echter het IJzeren gordijn* (New parapsychological discoveries behind the Iron Curtain), Haarlem, 1979 (in both works, it turns out how the Soviets sometimes show more scientific objectivity than our Western enlighteners).

But beware - also in these four works, for a trained eye, demonism comes through more than clearly.

(2) For the sake of fairness, a short text by W.B. Kristensen, *Verzamelde bijdragen tot kennis van de antieke godsdiensten* (Collected contributions to the knowledge of ancient religion).

“This demonic type of conception of God was known to most ancient peoples (H.-A. 114). It asserted itself, moreover, in the relationship to the highest gods. The Israelitish ‘god’ of Job,-- the Greek supreme god Zeus, the double Fortuna (goddess of fate) in Rome, the Indian Varuna, once even the Persian (= Zoroastrian) Ahura-Mazda (insofar as it comprises both good and evil heavenly spirits),-- all exhibit, as sovereign determiner of fate (H.-A. 75; 102), the demonic nature of the Babylonian Anu. Both salvation and calamity (contradictory components of the ‘whole’ also called ‘cycle’), both downfall and upfall (the contradictions, which constitute the permanent (eternal, absolute) life of the universe (‘world’)) in which the Babylonians saw the ‘divine’ totality, came from the above-mentioned ‘gods’.”

“‘Righteous’, in the ordinary(our own) sense of the word, they were not. By their conduct they denied the laws which they (...) had laid down for mankind.

“The ancients were fully aware of this contradiction (H.-A. 116v.: absurdism) in the ‘divine’ being”.

**Conclusion:** compared to the ancient ‘theologians’ we, the enlightened, are not better off.

### **C - the opposition 'Satan (demonism) / 'Trinity.**

Here there is no strict 'dualism' (so that there would be two equal camps, of course; H.-A. 55).

#### **(1) Two epithets.**

1/ 2 Cor 4: 4 calls Satan 'the god of this world' ('ho theos tou ainos toutou'), who 'blinds' the thinking (H.-A. 63; 117: inform. nonsense.) of a part of men

2/ John 12: 31 Satan is called 'the ruler of this world'. ('ho archon').

We can, very realistically, interpret: Satan is 'God', rep. 'Ruler' of this world, to the extent that he:

(i) the secular reality ('this world'),

(ii)a . from the other world and

(ii)b . controls it as a complex of animistic (souls, spirits), manaistic (forces, miracles) and causal realities (H.-A. 109).

In other words, to the extent that he controls the basic sacred structure.

Thus, according to Acts 13:10, he is the one who "stands behind paganism, with its idolatry and sorcery. (W.G., Devil, in: B. Alfrink et a., *Bijbelsch Woordenboek*, Roermond, 1941, 330).

#### **(2). The Trinitarian Empire.**

##### ***Bibl. sample.:***

-- J. Lebreton, *Les origines du dogme dd la Trinité*, (The origins of the dogma of the Trinity.), Paris, 1919-4;

-- M. Brauns, *Het geheim der goddelijke persoonlijkheden (Een Drie-eenheidsgematiek)*, (The Secret of the Divine Personalities (A Trinity Dogmatic)), Bruges, 1958.

-- J. Tyciak, *Die Liturgie als Quelle östlicher Frömmigkeit*, (The liturgy as a source of Eastern piety), Fr.i.Br., 1937, 112f., says that a Russian theologian, Florensky, proposes a swap solution: "Either insight thanks to God or madness (H.-A. 116v.: absurdism). (...). Between eternal life 'in the womb' (H.-A. 27: similia similibus). (Note -- In friendship and cooperation with) of the Holy Trinity, on the one hand, and, on the other, the (...) eternal death is (...) not a hair's breadth between. What is called a strict dilemma!

##### ***One final remark.***

P. Schebesta, ed., *Oorsprong van de godsdienst*, (Origin of religion), Tiel/The Hague, 1962, 59, where he speaks about the hiëro-analytic essence of magic (understood as control, functional, of mana (H.-A. 24; 72v.), writes:

"The life-force (H.-A. 73) comes from the highest being (H.A. 55: Supreme Being), who, himself, possesses the most 'power', -- thus, also, is the greatest magician and 'all' (H.-A. 63; 92 (the two layers); 109) can.

She goes (i) from the progenitor (H.-A. 51 (primordial couple); 66/68), (ii) to the descendants and continually reproduces itself'. Perhaps we should learn to see God, besides hermeneutically, also sacredly (H.-A. 109).

All that has been said before throws a special light on 1 Jn 5: 1/2:

“Whoever believes that Jesus is the Christ is (immediately) begotten of God (‘geggenètai’). He who loves the begotten one (‘gennèsanta’) also loves the one begotten of him (‘gegennèmenon’). From this we know that we love “the children of God”.

***Final remark.***

There is no better ‘theory’ than the (liturgical) prayer of the Church (“Your prayers are like thousand year old oaks”). Such a ‘thousand year old oak’ reads, among other things, as follows:

“The apostle Paul (...) taught you, God, to worship as one consisting of three persons, from whom (= Father), through whom (= Son) and in whom (= Holy Spirit) the universe came into being. (K. Kirchoff, *Osterjubil d. Ostk.*, II, 112)

“Origin of all spirits (H.-A. 55), thou, beginningless Father, God’s equal Word (= Son) and thou, divine Spirit (= H. Spirit), thou who art good and righteous, protect us, who, in faith, exalt thy power (H.-A. 79/81: the two layers, 109), in song, thanks to thy mercy”. (ibid. ).

(i) Fallen was, once, our nature (H.-A. 66vv.), when she fell into delusion, immediately, slipping into destruction, immaculate (Virgin Mary).

(ii) Now, however, He who, from you, became an earthly man, God the Word (= Son), in a manly manner, has restored our nature and initiated us into the mystery of the threefold light of the primordial divinity”. (id., I, 93).

**Note.**-- Since Freud, especially, but much earlier, the first person, the procreator (‘Father’), has been demonized (H.-A. 55) as ‘the father-(figure)’. Such ‘abstractum’ betrays the true essence of the person, who the Father, in the Trinity, really is (here a thorough objection arises against orientalizers, who confuse the Indian ‘father figure’ (Brahma) with the first person).

Both demonization and hypostasis (i.e., turning it into an abstract hypostasis) misconstrue the first person in a vindictive way.

Even W.B. Kristensen (H.-A. 118) too often confuses Israel’s Yahweh, God, with the other ‘highest spirits’ (better, because clearer, than ‘highest gods’ (H.A. 55: supreme spirit/supreme being).

Admittedly, the entire Old Testament still remained firmly entrenched in a hazy, but true demonism. Yet Yahweh, God, is by no means a truly demonic person, even in the Old Testament.

*Deo uno et trino Mariaeque gratis maximas  
(9730 Nazareth, 19.05.1985).*