kruiskerk.co.za
info@kruiskerk.co.za
wynandnel@iafrica.com

Toetrede

Liturgie van die Lig

Aansteek van die kerse

Woorddiens

Tema: Stroomop of alternatief?

Skriflesing: Markus 11:1-11 (1953)

1 EN toe hulle naby Jerusalem kom, by Bétfagé en
Betánië, aan die Olyfberg, stuur Hy twee van sy dissipels
uit
2 en sê vir hulle: Gaan na daardie dorp reg voor julle; en
dadelik as julle daar inkom, sal julle 'n eselsvul vind wat
vasgemaak is, waar geen mens op gesit het nie. Maak
hom los en bring hom.
3 En as iemand vir julle sê: Waarom doen julle dit? moet
julle antwoord: Die Here het hom nodig; en dadelik sal
hy hom hierheen stuur.
4 En hulle het gegaan en die vul by die deur, buite op die
straat, vasgemaak gevind en hom losgemaak.
5 Daarop sê sommige van die wat daar staan, vir hulle:
Wat maak julle dat julle die vul losmaak?
6 En hulle antwoord hul soos Jesus beveel het. Toe laat
hulle hul begaan.
7 En hulle het die vul na Jesus gebring en hulle klere
daarop gelê, en Hy het op hom gaan sit.
8 Toe gooi baie mense hulle klere op die pad oop, en
ander kap takke van die bome af en strooi dit op die pad.
9 En die wat voor geloop en die wat gevolg het, het
uitgeroep en gesê: Hosanna! Geseënd is Hy wat kom in
die Naam van die Here!
10 Geseënd is die koninkryk wat kom in die Naam van die
Here, die koninkryk van ons vader Dawid! Hosanna in
die hoogste hemele!
11 En Jesus het in Jerusalem gekom en in die tempel. En
nadat Hy alles rondom bekyk het, en omdat dit al aand
was, het Hy met die twaalf uitgegaan na Betánië.

Broodjies vir die pad

> Hope rides on the decision either to believe that God stands on this dark road waiting to walk with us toward new light again or to despair of the fact that God who is faithful is eternally faithful and will sustain us in our darkness one more time.
>
> *Joan Chittister*

◆◆◆

Volg Jesus se denke na met 'nuwe brein'

Andre van Niekerk

Christen-gemeentes herdenk tans die lyding van Jesus Christus. Deur stiltetye, eredienste en geloofsgewoontes, soos die weerhouding van musiek of wyn, help ons ons bewussyn om nie net Jesus se swaarkry te onthou nie, maar om ook self in begrip vir ander en in medelye te kan groei.

Bybel-dele soos Jakobus 2 en 1 Johannes 3 toets die opregtheid van ons liefde: Indien dit nie by woorde bly nie, maar uitmond in dade van opoffering, is dit geloofwaardig.

Jesus se lewe toon wat daadwerklike medelye is. Hy identifiseer so sterk met siekes, armes en verworpenes dat hy 'n vriend van straatvroue en sondaars genoem word. Sy liefde is opreg: Dit maak nie somme oor wins en verlies aan gewildheid nie. As gevolg van sy meelewing oortree Hy sabbatswette en gaan by 'n gehate belastinggaarder tuis.

Friedrich Nietzsche (1844-1900) het Jesus se medelye verag. Hy wou mense van die tirannie van ordentlikheid en valsheid bevry deur Joods-Christelike waardes te vernietig. Christus se beeld van God wat omgee en saam met mense ly, bestempel hy as 'n misdaad teen die lewe. Om ander jammer te kry is slawemoraal. Slawe en onderdaniges sou patetiese slagoffers wees wat met denkbeeldige waardes en 'n godsbeeld vir hul eie swakheid kompenseer terwyl hulle die sterkeres skuldig wil laat voel.

Mense wat soos Nietzsche 'n afkeer van medelye het, verwys na die wetenskap se bevindings. Byvoorbeeld dié van Charles Darwin (1809-1882) en afleidings van Herbert Spencer en Thomas Huxley dat medelye 'n onbereikbare ideaal is. Die lewe is 'n oorlogsveld waarop slegs die sterkste oorleef. Waar altruïsme wel voorkom, is dit net 'n skyn-omgee. Dit is slegs samewerking ter wille van eie oorlewing. Diere se gedrag word deur die hipotalamus bepaal. In dié oerbrein gaan dit om vier drange: veg, vlug, vreet en voortplant. Diere en mense is neurologies bedraad om selfsugtig te wees.

Hierdie verklaring vir selfsug is egter 'n ernstige verskraling. In talle wesens het ook 'n nuwer brein, die neokorteks, ontwikkel. Daarom vind ons by soogdiere in teenstelling met ander dat kleintjies nie meer opgevreet word nie, maar gespeen, beskerm en spelend grootgemaak word.

Menswees word juis deur die ongemaklike saamleef van dié twee breindele gekenmerk (Karen Armstrong, Twelve Steps to a Compassionate Life). Die oerbrein wat op selfsug en oorlewing ingestel is teenoor die reflektiewe brein se meelewing met ander, die aanvoeling vir die estetiese en die belewing van die mistieke.

Is die bestaan van die verskillende breindele – uiteraard hier vereenvoudig – nie deel van wat Paulus die stryd tussen

"vlees" en "gees" noem en wat Johannes verwoord as die skeiding tussen "duisternis" en "lig" nie?

Wanneer die reflektiewe brein se krag die instinktiewe in toom hou, vind jy nuwe lewensmoontlikhede. By die San was dit noodsaaklik om te jag met die oerbrein se vermoë. Maar die "nuwe brein" se reflektiewe krag sorg dat die skoonheid van die prooi in rotstekeninge verbeeld is en waarskynlik in rituele as blyke van simpatie verwonder is.

Wanneer die instinktiewe egter die refleksiewe oorheers, raak dit uiters gevaarlik. Die oerbrein met sy selfsugtige drange neem die "nuwe" brein se vermoë om wapentegnologie te skep in diens. Dit kan die aarde vernietig.

Daarom is denkers se verheerliking van die ou brein en die verkleinering van Christus se medelye so gevaarlik. Ons geloof dat God na mense met medelye uitreik en dit ook van ons vra, is juis nie minderwaardige denke nie, maar in pas met ons brein se hoogs ontwikkelde funksies.

Laat ons in Lydenstyd ons aan Jesus die lydende Christus oriënteer. Dan word die "nuwe" brein ten koste van die oerbrein gevoed. Dan kom daar iets van God se gees, iets van sy opstandingskrag in ons in beweging.

http://www.netwerk24.com/stemme/2015-03-25-andre-van-niekerk-volg-jesus-se-denke-na-met-nuwe-brein

Brood vir die pad

Goeie Vrydag gebruik meeste Christene dwarsoor die wêreld nagmaal. Wat beteken dit vir jou?

Drinking Blood with the Pope

Andy Johnston

In 1527 Martin Luther wrote of Ulrich Zwingli that he would "Rather drink pure blood with the Pope than mere wine with the fanatics" (*The Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ – Against the Fanatics*). How had two reformers united on so much ended up so fundamentally divided and in such hostility?

Luther and Zwingli met for the first and only time at the Colloquy of Marburg in 1529. The Colloquy was essentially a theological debate with a decidedly political goal. There was a real danger of Charles V raising an army against the evangelicals at this point in time (the threat did not actually become a reality until the Schmalkaldic War in 1546-47). Philip of Hesse, one of the leading Lutheran princes was anxious to achieve theological unity which would then pave the way to a military alliance. Neither was actually achieved.

Luther and Zwingli had little or no expectation of success at Marburg. There was agreement on 14 out of 15 articles but there was never a hope of consensus on the Lord's Supper. According to eye witness reports Luther simply wrote on the table either in beer froth or chalk dust (I like to think it was the former) "Hoc est corpus meum" ("This is My Body") and that was that – deadlock!

In the earliest phase of his writing, most notably in *The Babylonian Captivity of the Church* (September 1520), Luther condemned the view that the Mass was a "good work" or a sacrifice in no uncertain terms. Interestingly, he also spoke of "signs" of covenant at this stage of his career such as the rainbow, God's covenantal sign to Noah, circumcision, God's covenantal sign to Abraham and bread and wine and the signs of the new covenant (*A Treatise on the New Testament, that is, the Mass*, August 1520). In other words, Luther came very close to the "Zwinglian" view that the bread and wine are not literally the body and blood of Christ but should be viewed merely as signs of the covenant, but he stopped just short. However, we must remember that the so-called "Sacramentarian controversy" – the rejection of the real presence, the bread and wine literally becoming the body and blood of Christ – had not yet occurred at this point. The main focus of Luther's attack here was against the Catholic doctrine of the Mass as a sacrifice.

Equally ironically, in his earliest writing on the subject, Zwingli showed no interest in the nature of Christ's presence in the bread and wine. In the disputation held by the magistrates in January 1523, which established Zwingli's Protestantism as the position held by Zurich as a whole, Zwingli showed no interest whatsoever in the nature of Christ's presence in the bread and wine. He simply denied, like Luther, that it was a sacrifice.

Within a year, however, Zwingli had shifted to the more radical sacramentarian or symbolic position. As I have written elsewhere Zwingli derived his mature theology of the Eucharist from Cornelius Hoen, whose views Luther had specifically repudiated just a few months earlier. For Luther, any symbolic interpretation of the Lord's Supper had become tainted and guilty by association with his former colleague Andreas Carlstadt. For Luther, Carlstadt was an enemy of the Gospel and his views were an attack of the Devil.

It is never good to form theology out of polemic. Zwingli was more correct that Luther on the Lord's Supper, but that is not saying much. Both were, of course, correct in rejecting the Mass as a good work or a sacrifice. Luther's assertion that we should simply believe and accept Christ's words as recorded in Scripture, "This is My Body", at face value is, quite simply, ridiculous. Jesus also said "I am the door" (John 10:9), but this does not mean He swings on hinges! Had Luther never heard of metaphor? But Zwingli's insistence that the bread and wine are merely a "memorial of Christ's saving passion" reduces breaking bread to intellectual assent to a long-ago event and robs us of faith in Christ's presence through the Holy Spirit. Zwingli's view has long held too much sway in evangelical circles. It is time it came to an end.

http://thinktheology.co.uk/blog/article/drinking_blood_with_the_pope

wynandnel@iafrica.com 082 901 5877