

Toetrede

Liturgie van die Lig

Woorddiens

Lesing 1: Handeling 1:15-26 (1953)

¹⁵ EN in dié dae het Petrus in die midde van die dissipels opgestaan — die skare van persone daar bymekaar was omtrent honderd-en-twintig — en gesê:

¹⁶ Broeders, hierdie Skrif moes vervul word wat die Heilige Gees voorspel het deur die mond van Dawid aangaande Judas wat die leier was van die wat Jesus gevange geneem het;

¹⁷ want hy is saam met ons getal gereken en het die lot van hierdie bediening verkry.

¹⁸ Hy het dan 'n stuk grond gekoop met die loon van ongeregtheid en het vooroor geval en oopgebars, en al sy ingewande het uitgestort;

¹⁹ en dit het bekend geword aan al die inwoners van Jerusalem, sodat daardie stuk grond in hulle eie taal Akeldáma genoem is, dit is Bloedgrond.

²⁰ Want daar staan geskrywe in die boek van die Psalms: Laat sy woonplek woens word, en laat daar geen inwoner in wees nie! En: Laat 'n ander een sy opsiensamp neem.

²¹ Van die manne dan wat saam met ons rondgegaan het al die tyd waarin die Here Jesus by ons in- en uitgegaan het,

²² van die doop van Johannes af tot op die dag dat Hy van ons opgeneem is — van hulle moet daar een saam met ons getuie word van sy opstanding.

²³ En hulle het twee voorgestel: Josef wat genoem is Bársabas, met die bynaam van Justus, en Matthías.

²⁴ En hulle het gebid en gesê: U, Here, wat die harte van almal ken, wys uit hierdie twee die een aan wat U uitverkies het

²⁵ om die lot van hierdie bediening en apostelskap te verkry, waarvan Judas afgewyk het om heen te gaan na sy eie plek.

²⁶ Toe werp hulle die lot, en die lot het op Matthías geval; en hy is gekies om saam met die elf apostels te wees.

Broodjies vir die Pad

We live on this side of the resurrection/ascension. In the absence of first hand experience of Jesus, we rely on the testimony of others. We test that testimony and decide if it is true for us.



Uittreksels uit 'n essay van De Certeau uit *The Postmodern God*, (pp 135-158).

"However it is taken, Christianity implies a relationship to the event which inaugurated it: Jesus Christ." Which has "...two contradictory characteristics: the will to be faithful to the inaugural event: the necessity of being different from these

beginnings."(p.142) "Whatever types of transmission or of reading of the 'original' exist, they never repeat the Gospel." "(This fidelity is not a repetition or an objective survival of a past.) Each explication postulates the reference to a past event that makes other expressions possible."(p.143) "But this fidelity itself is not of an objective kind. It is linked with the absence of the object or of the particular past which inaugurated it. The past is not our security. Beside the first statement of this fidelity (possible only after the disappearance of Jesus) is the Scripture, supposing its own conditions, the death of the 'Son of Man.' The Christian language begins with the disappearance of its 'author.' That is to say Jesus effaces himself to give faithful witness to the father who authorizes him, and to 'give rise' to different but faithful communities, which he makes possible." "The process of the death (the absence) and the survival (the presence) of Jesus continues in each Christian experience."(p.145) "Christianity is still capable of opening a new space... discovering a living necessity (linked to the disappearance of an objective security because this truth has the form of a creative, risked freedom...)"(p.147) "For Jesus to die, [and be removed from human time and place] is to 'make room' for the Father and at the same time 'make room' for the polyglot and creative community of Pentecost, for the plurality of Scriptures, for the multiplicity of the future Christian generations."(p.150)

<http://www.sacraconversazione.org/?p=189>

Coming Out As a Heretic

by Kate Blanchard

I could very much relate to the recent NPR story about a Christian minister losing her faith. Like her, I once counted myself among the über-faithful but then "fell away" in my twenties. Despite marrying a clergyman and spending lots of time in theological school, I never made it back to the one true way.

But there is a major difference in my story and this minister's story, which is that she has embraced the name "atheist," while I cannot bring myself to do so.

This reluctance is not because I have anything obvious to lose. Being an atheist would not cause any new familial strife; and unlike the pastorate, my career does not demand any particular religious orthodoxy. The major issue for me is an aversion to militant secularism, akin to some people's aversion to "organized religion." The new atheism, of the sort that has celebrities, conventions, media outlets, or protest marches, is not simply about doubting the existence of traditional deities. It is more often about intellectual elitism, and sometimes even outright racism toward people whom Christopher Hitchens referred to as "semi-stupefied peasants in desert regions." Orthodox secularism, it seems, is about feeling superior to those poor, deluded souls who still cling to religion—that weird little psycho-social appendix left over from some earlier stage in human evolution.

Other common categories don't seem to fit well either. The ever-popular "spiritual but not religious" implies a particular type of interior life—one grounded in emotion and experience more than cognition. A Jewish friend of mine calls herself "religious but not spiritual," but this doesn't seem to work as well in a Protestant framework, where individual faith is emphasized over ethnicity or outward traditions. The "Emerging Church" is a possible refuge, but it still strikes me as vaguely imperialistic; and try as I might, I simply don't see myself among the so-called "rise of the nones."

Thus, for folks who are unorthodox but aren't atheists, who care about metaphysics but who aren't mystics, perhaps the good old-fashioned term "heretic" will satisfy. The kind of heresy I'm talking about here is what Thomas Aquinas defined as "restricting belief to certain points of Christ's doctrine [as determined by the Roman Catholic hierarchy] selected and fashioned at pleasure." (I would question only the implication that heretics are unique in "selecting and fashioning" their beliefs "at pleasure.")

I find this name appealing for multiple reasons, not least of which is that it allows me to claim some connection to Christianity. The more I've learned about the history of Christianity, the more I've come to accept its ongoing diversity. The earliest Christians, as evidenced by both the New Testament and ancient theological writings, did not agree on the nature of Jesus or his work. In the fourth and later centuries, Christians made valiant (if misguided) attempts to unify their beliefs and practices by stamping out what they saw as errors; but Jesus people haven't agreed since then either, despite centuries of the religious elite claiming otherwise.

Embracing heresy is a way of asserting my place—however tenuous—in this ancient tradition, while acknowledging that most of what I think and do will not pass creedal litmus tests. In a religion of more than two billion adherents, this is hardly a surprise.

I also like "heretic" because it is different, at least in my mind, than secularism, atheism, or "none." Heresy implies not rejection of or indifference toward religion and its objects, but rather curiosity and engagement. Just because I can't see or make sense of God doesn't mean I don't want to, or that I hate believers; on the contrary, I respect—with fear and trembling—the powerful role that religious experience plays in the lives of most humans. Heresy demands a particular religious vocabulary, though it also allows for unabashed syncretism (call it a salad bar if you must). I can be what one of my students called a "Chreaster" who looks to the Daodejing for wisdom, who reads my child Bible stories but also Zen parables, a biography of Muhammad, and Greek myths.

Yes, acknowledging our heresy might be just the thing for non-religious non-atheists. It's certainly better than opting out altogether, ceding the sacred turf to those lucky enough to have found answers to all their questions. Indeed, we may even be doing them a favor. After all, where would orthodoxy be without heresy to remind it of what it's not?

Kate Blanchard is Assistant Professor of Religious Studies and Director of Women's and Gender Studies at Alma College in central Michigan. She is the author of *The Protestant Ethic or The Spirit of Capitalism: Christians, Freedom, and Free Markets* (Cascade 2010).

http://www.religiondispatches.org/archive/atheologies/5941/coming_out_as_a_heretic/

Brood vir die Pad

Maak verlede 'n informant en nie 'n aanklaer

deur Wilhelm Jordaan

Verbelentheid – om jou iets wys te maak wat nie so is nie – is 'n gevaarlike menslike nuk.

In Geoffrey Chaucer (1340-1400) se *The Miller's Tale* word verbelentheid se gevare vermaaklik uitgebeeld; so tussendeur Nicholas en Alison se nagtelike gerinkink en ongepoetste poetse. So ook in Molière (1622-1673) se drama oor verbeelsiekte (*Le Malade Imaginaire*).

Ons grinnik graag oor mense se opvallende verbelenthede, maar vergeet soms die subtieler gedaantes, dié wat van jou gees besit neem en algaande jou lewensgehalte en -genieting verskraal.

Een daarvan is om te dink die verlede is 'n tiran waaraan jy nie kan ontsnap nie en wat jou tot in die uithoeke van die aarde sal agtervolg, soos die meedoënlose polisiehoof Javert op die spoor van Jean Valjean in Victor Hugo se *Les Misérables*.

Dat mense so dink, is nie vreemd nie. Daar is mos diegene wie se geheues oor 'n ander mens volgeprop is met fyn besonderhede wat nooit vergeet word nie en as't ware in gereedheid gehou word om 'n ander mens se "rekord" vars te hou.

Dit versterk die indruk dat jou verlede agter jou aandraf, met die geesdriftige hulp van al te gewillige medemense.

'n Mens kan egter ook, sonder ander se bydrae, selfkoesterend in die verlede rondwaal.

Dit kom in baie vorme:

Die slegte kinderjare met ouers wat sus en so was; talente wat net aan ander uitgedeel is; die swakkerige genepoel waaruit jy kom; slegte lewenskaarte; die net mooi alles wat van die begin af teen jou was ...

Dikwels word sulke treurmaries aangehef om simpatie te wek – om jouself só te onthef van eise en verwagtings; of om verantwoordelikhede te ontduik.

Of om met sittende ywer niks te doen nie en die verbygaande lewe te betrag. Soos die karakter "Ou Vorster" in 'n verhaal deur Jan van Melle.

Op die vraag hoe dit met hom gaan, antwoord hy: "Ja, dit leef, maar dit is ook omtrent al wat ek kan sê."

Natuurlik is dit belangrik dat jy toegang het tot jou verlede vol mislukkings, skandes, teleurstellings en verflenterde drome.

Maar net in die mate dat die kennis van gister jou met groter insig en sterker daadkrag betrokke maak by 'n winkende toekoms; 'n geskiedenis wat nog deur jou geskryf moet word.

So 'n verlede word dan 'n betroubare informant.

Dit is nie 'n venynige aanklaer wat 'n lys van veroordelings in die openbaar voorlees terwyl jy jou kop in skaamte laat sak nie.

Dit lê jou nie lam van selfbejammering of skuldbesef nie, maak jou nie wanhopig nie en sluit jou nie af en uit van ander nie.

Inteendeel, dit besorg jou 'n vrymakende energie wat jou ongehinderd die toekoms in neem.

<http://www.beeld.com/Rubrieke/WilhelmJordaan/Maak-verlede-n-informant-en-nie-n-aanklaer-20120515>