

Today (24Jan85), in connection with sketching a course in thought-reeducation (ie, combing out the kinks in reasoning, identifying and eliminating the logical fallacies patterned into one's familiar cognitive patterns), I read the hundreds of "LOGIC" and "FALLACIES" in SUBJECT GUIDE TO BOOKS IN PRINT (R.R. Bowker)—where I ran across "Kant's logic" and "Marx's logic" and and and; and, at that point, Mark's logic popped into mind. I'd been meditating, earlier in the day, on the particular connection-making, thought-patterning, inferential trails in the shortest Gospel, whose theology has a pervasive liturgical purpose: "Mark" is both an instance of and a call to worshiping the Biblical God in, through, and (shocking!) even as Jesus. The Gospel's dynamic motif is *Deus absconditus/revelatus*, God's self-concealing and self-revealing ("re-velation" being literally, in Latin, un-veiling)...This thinksheet exhibits this inferential-connectional flow: my meditation is in the mode of and faithful to Mark, though I extend somewhat beyond his tight limits (he having, I'm convinced, determined his Gospel's length by the standard-length papyrus scroll, "codex," purchasable at the stationers).NB: (1) As CHRISTIAN, I flow with Mark, which was central to my conversion 9Mar34; (2) As THINKER, I step outside this charmed circle and observe that the validity of this connection-making is internal to Christianity, is not logic in the public domain (to whatever extent you, dear reader, may believe an "objective" logic possible); (3) As IRENICIST, I just observe that M., necessarily, has one eye on Christian promo and the other on Christian apologetic-polemic vis-a-vis Jewish reality (ie, Judaism and Jewish promo contra-Christianity): that was an Oedipal birth-need, as it were Jesus "slaying" (Freudian sense) Moses, to get Christian existence clean-and-clear on its own. To continue this Markan tension today is either ignorant or antisemitic: the Gospel itself, read with latter-day eyes, directs us to apply the corrective of convergence: without denying that we are two religions, how also are we one religion? This implies evolving, out of Jewish/Christian dialog, a Jewish/Christian existence (something different from "Jewish-Christian" or "Hebrew-Christian" existence). Accordingly, in the rest of this thinksheet expect nothing of (2) or (3): here, I'm inside Mark, inside Christian worship with its distinctive and community- and soul-nourishing logic. No offence to outsiders--esp. none to Jews, of whose liturgical thinking Christian liturgical thinking is an extension to Gentiles (Romans 9-11 being a meditation on the mysterious paradoxicality of our twoness and oneness)...An article is, while not the source of my meditation, its occasion: I was triggered to this thinksheet after reading Harry L. Chronis, "The Torn Veil: Cultus and Christology in Mark 15:37-39," JBL Mar/82.

1. Some lessons can be learned from asceticism (=deliberately, voluntarily, doing without), others from deprivation (=having something taken from you against your will). Biblical religion made creative responses to repeated deprivations, and creative use of asceticism.

(1) DEPRIVATION--Adam and Eve deprived of Eden; Noah deprived of all but what he could get on the ark; the Patriarchs here and there deprived of this and that; the Israelities deprived of their land by famine, and then of their freedom by "a Pharaoh who knew not Joseph"; Israel and Judah deprived of their lands by, respectively, Assyria and Babylon; the Jews, on their land, deprived of their freedom by Greeks and then Romans; Jesus deprived of his life; a million Jews deprived of their lives when they were (AD/CE 70) deprived of their temple (and holy city). (I'm limiting the list to the Biblical period.)

(2) ASCETICISM--The prophets' self-deprivations under the necessities of their ministries, including Jesus' sacrificial suf-

OVER

fering and death. (Asceticism in the interest of self-development, the major motive in much of the Eastern religions, is almost unknown in Scripture, where the major motive is the glory of God, whose service entails mission-related cutbacks on personal wantings.)

2. While tabernacle-temple were focus for the Holy, neither ever was unambiguously locus of the Holy--so either the loss of the first temple (CE 587-6 BC) nor the loss of the second*(AD/CE 70) meant the loss of the religion of YHWH. Holy land and holy place may be of the "bene esse" (prosperous existence) of the Faith, but are not of its "esse" (essential being). Though land-involved, Torah was never temple-captive, despite politico-consolidative efforts to make it so.

3. While the temple with its cultus "stood for," was an analogy-homology of, the people in worship and shalom, the people distributively and individually were, by metaphor, the temple. Liturgical-devotional-poetic language tolerates, even promotes, such an easy flow of idea and trope. Here the Christian mentality is a linear descendant and parallel of the Hebrew-Israelite-Jewish.

4. Every pious Jew and Christian is Torah enfleshed and the essential cultus on legs. This is the steady thinking of templeless prophets, sages, rabbis, preachers and teachers (eg, Jer.31.33: God internalizes Torah in his people in "a new covenant," incorporating the restoration of "the sacred hill of Jerusalem, the holy place where he lives" (vs.23: inwardness is primary but not subjectivistic)). In a brief hiatus, the postExilic prophets rejoice in the outward temple (in the total restoration of Jerusalem); but that second temple was only briefly (under the Maccabees) free of foreign domination (by Persians, Seleucid Greeks, Romans), and templeless thinking (from the Exilic period) developed throughout this period--laying the groundword for "late-Jewish" and Christian thinking.

5. The Gospels show Jesus/temple in ambiguous/ambivalent relationship. Jesus as Pharisee had his primary base in synagogue, temple being secondary (festivals only). Jesus' thinking here, and Christian thinking about Jesus here, is a special case of the cognitive-devotional-liturgical category I'm calling "templeless thinking," or, better, "temple-transcending thinking." No argument possible: The earliest Christians were both synagogue- and temple-observant Jews, and their being Jesus-Jews (to avoid "Jews for Jesus"!) constituted them at most "a party," certainly not--yet--a new religion.

6. Moses & Jesus have, in the religions stemming directly from them, opposite positions: MOSES serves (God in and through) the people, who are ("spiritually") the temple, the people serve (God in and through) JESUS, who is (1) "greater than the temple" (Mt.12.6), (2) which is to be destroyed (Jn.2.19), but which ("spiritually") is his own body (Jn.2.21)---indeed, (3) he's accused of being about to destroy the temple (M.14.58; cf.15.29); yet (4) the community gathered around Jesus are "God's temple" (1Cor.3.16; cf. 2Cor.6.16), and (5) their bodies are "the temple of the Holy Spirit" (1Cor.6.19).

7. Mark's synchronous tearing of the temple veil (15.38) and of Jesus' body is the ultimate outliving and outshowing of Jer.'s truth: Jesus-in-the-heart is the true temple (112JBL/Mar/82). And Jesus' resurrection is the true-eschatological "rebuilding" of the temple. (In Mark's "theologia crucis," cross-theology, Jesus' sacrificial suffering and death both reveal his divinity and achieve salvation.) Christian halacha (ethics, living), parallelly, reveals the King enthroned on-and-beyond the Cross. So (Rev.21.22) no temple is needed.