3

4

5 6

7

8

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

36 37

38

39 40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50 51

52

53

They hear many sounds that are unintelligible to them. And they voice many sounds that are just as unintelligible——to them——and even to us. They know the sounds that become intelligible to them only insomuch as they are able to associate the sounds with the sources of those sounds. The certain sounds a baby makes which become intelligible to us become so only because we are able to associate the sounds with their sources. Sounds that can't be associated with their sources can't be understood. Meaning emerges in the midst of the associations of sounds and sources——we must be able to put two and two together to understand relationship——we must have an ear that hears; and there must be a sound and a source.

A sound that can't be associated with a source is like a sound that can't be heard. And a source that makes no sound is like a sound that can't be understood. A sound that can't be heard is like a story that can't be told. And an ear that can't hear is like a story-teller that has no story to tell. But the human ear is more than an inner mystery just as spoken and written words are more than just so much sense data. A deaf infant must learn to know a word in a more profoundly inner way.

If your ear hears something but you don't notice the sound, what do you hear? If you notice the sound but you don't listen to it, what do you hear? We don't notice our ears when they hear a sound. But if we notice a sound that our ears hear; and we notice the sound source; and we associate ourselves (as the source of hearing) with the source that makes the sound——then meaning can emerge between the two sources that can transcend the very medium (sound through air) of their association. A meaning that comes about through the physical faculty of hearing can become a meaning of such significance that it doesn't need that medium anymore in order to continue to exist. This is a mystery of languages.

Languages are more than mediums of communication. Communication is more so like the medium of language. Communication is How language is whatever language is --- not What language is --- whatever language may be. A language need not be communicated to be a language. The origins and the sources of language are separate things. The origin of a language may be in communication; a language may originate in its most germinal form in the midst of two sources; and it may grow and develop and live and die there in the midst of that communication between those sources. But the essence of that language is more than its temporal and spatial manifestation in that locus of physical communication. That essential something that makes language language is not found in its origin, but in the sources of its origin. All of Creation originated in the midst of nothingness that became a somethingness called, "communication": by its Creator: in the language that is utterly and exclusively unique to Communication is the germ of an idea that becomes what Himself Alone. is commonly known as a continuum. A continuum is a thing---a onething--wherein somethings become more like samethings, the closer they are to eachother. In a linear continuum, for instance, numbers that are near to each other are more alike than numbers that are far from each other. The number 4 and the number 4.2 are more similar than the number 4 and the number 24. Numbers can be big or they can be small. And they can be near or they can be distant. Numbers can be proximal. Or they can be dimensional. They can be both, spatial and temporal. And they can have dimensionality (size and shape) and proximity (position and place). Numbers originated in zero; but their source was infinity and eternity

2/7/13

2/7/13

There's an old saying, "Children should be seen and not heard." It is much misunderstood---in each and every word of it---by many who say it and by many who hear it said. One might rephrase it by saying this: Children should be heard and not seen. It does not mean that children should be silent, any more than it means that they should be invisible. What it does mean is that there are places and times for a child to be a child, and places and times for a grown-up to be a grown-up. And we should learn to understand the differences. An understanding of these things makes it possible for an adult to appreciate a child as the one uniquely sovereign individual that that person actually is, apart from his or her station in life. Justice listens; and then love looks upon the source. Love-in-action is the doing of justice. To do justice is love-in-action. To do justice for the sake of mercy is hope-in-action. Hope-in-action is the doing of justice for the sake of mercy. To have faith-in-action is to walk humbly, hand-in-hand, with someone you love.

An ear hears sound-in-action. An eye sees light-in-action. But we don't always notice what our ears hear and our eyes see. If you don't have an eye for something you might very well not recognize it when it enters your field of vision---even if it's lit up with light-in-action. If you don't have an ear for something you very well might not discern the sound that it makes in the cloud of sounds around you---even if it resonates with sound-in-action. Your heart just might be in your head if your head is in the clouds. And you just might be trying to reason in your heart if your head is in the sand. You cannot abuse the world around you with impunity. You will reap the consequences of what your hands have done. If you nurture those deeds, and don't repudiate your behavior, then your day of thick darkness will appear---when your eyes see a strangely amorphous world. And your night of sleeplessness will moan and mutter in a low-grade cacophony of feverish background sounds.

We must cling desperately to the truth, no matter whenever it finds us and no matter wherever it finds us. No matter our condition or our station in our lives. Neither health nor power nor wealth nor poverty nor weakness nor infirmity---no good or no ill thing that we may enjoy or suffer in our lives (nothing) makes it any easier (only harder) for us to gain a knowledge of truth. It's not in us to know truth when we hear it or see it. The voice of truth must create an ear within us if we are to hear it. The light of truth must create an eye within us if we are to see truth (as He is and as He was and as He will be) in this world of ours in which we live and breathe and move and die. We can't understand our Creator. Only He can make Himself understandable to us.

Not all languages consist of words, but every language of our world exists in a written form of somekind---even if the communicators don't have a clue about it: not even how to read in it or how to write in it. Children learn to recognize a letter by copying it (by hand and by eye). They must learn how to write letters before they learn how to use them. But words are not the same as letters. Children must know how to read words before they can learn how to write them. They must learn how to read in a language before they can write in that language. An ability to write words issues from the authority to read them. Authority goes before ability; ability follows after authority. We all must learn to converse (speak) in a language before we can interact (behave) in that language. Different languages foster different behaviors, yes? Or no?

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27 28

29

30 31

32

33

34 35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49 50

51

52

53

of language. What we say, and how we say it, are two discrete aspects of language---just as what we do, and how we do it, are "intrinsically separate" (discrete), one-from-one. These things are similar, but not the same. When they belong to the same language they are very similar, one-to-one-to-one-to-one (to eachother); but it's in their distinction, one-from-one-from-one-from-one, that they become most meaningful to us. We rely on contrast and contradistinction to discern meaning around us.

Better to understand what and who we are (not) than what and who we are like. If we only identify with those who are similar to us we can lose our unique identity to the similarity between us. We can deceive ourselves. Where we once may have rightly identified with someone, we eventually may falsely identify as them. It is good for us to embrace such contradistinctions. The French language says it perfectly, "Veev la dee fay rahns!" which means, Longlive the difference (between a man and a woman, in particular)! But if we identify as (rather than "with") an identity other than our own we grievously deceive ourselves; and we abominate the uniqueness of that identity other than our own. We must carefully consider the source of identity. If something quacks like a dog and barks like a duck, it may simply be even more confused than us.

Humans (people) and animals (beasts) are similar creatures compared to other forms of life, such as plants and insects. But similarity is not sameness. Not in general. Or in particular. A wild animal---and a domesticated animal---and a savage human---and a civilized human are similar. Especially when reason compares them to a plant or an insect.

Similar "ness" (which is similar to sameness --- but not the same) has more to do with a comparison of different things than with the essence of the things that are compared. Essentially similar? How similar is the word, "similar" to the word, "dissimilar", for instance? Compared to what? How similar is a person to a beast? Compared to a vegetable? Quite similar. Or how similar is a vegetable to a fruit? Compared to an egg? Or how similar is an egg to a seed? Compared to an insect or an animal or a plant? Or a male and a female? Or humans and humanity? We are able to think in ways that unreasoning animals cannot. cannot reason; but we can even reason about reasoning. You may choose to think of yourself as an animal, and you may define the word "reason" to mean whatever you may want it to mean, but even if your definitions and your thoughts are unreasonable they are not unreasoning: you still The God of the Bible says that we reason in our heart when we try to rationalize the irrational and make reasonable the unreasonable. He said to a particular humanity in a particular time and place, : Come now, let us reason together:. Even a particular six-word sentence can have great meaning, beyond all of its particulars, because we are able to reason. We can go from here to there, through reason, in ways that no animal can ever go. We can make connections from one thing to many things, and from many things to one thing --- from one thing, in general, to many things, in particular, and from many things, in particular, to one thing, in general --- from the literal to the abstract --- to the real from the imaginary --- to the concrete --- to the intangible --- to the past --to today---to tomorrow---through reason. Humans travel back and forth in ways that are impossible for animals. We reconsider time and space. We reflect upon the world around us, as it once was, and as it is, and

as it might be. Reason in us discerns reason in our world---by design.

1/14/13

1/10/13

1/11/13

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26 27

28

29 30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48 49

50

51

52

Reason is how we refine meaning, it's how we interpret or translate the world around us into something that we can understand. Knowing is different than understanding. We can know the world around us without understanding it. We can even get to know it very, very well---and we can completely misunderstand it --- even with all our knowledge. Beasts know the world around them to one extent or the other, but they cannot understand what they know, because they cannot reason. They can think; but they cannot reason. Domestic animals know humans to one extent or the other, but they can't understand us, because they can't understand. We will misunderstand them if we can't contrast ourselves with them in Animals are not people. People and beasts share similarity, this way. not same "ity". For example, a dog can hear a human verbal sound until he knows that sound and whatever else is associated with that specific sound. But he can have no understanding of that sound as a word or as a thought, nor can he misunderstand a word or a command. Your beloved pet can "mis"know (or mistake) your speech; but he can't misunderstand You can mistake him for what he is not; but you can't know him as a person. Knowledge is similar to (but not the same as) understanding---

there is a difference between them---wisdom is the contrast of the two. Wisdom is also the relationship between knowledge and understanding. Wisdom is the how and the when and where between the what of knowledge and the why of understanding. It's the difference between what and why.

A child thinks he knows what the sky is, and what the color blue is, and he looks up at the sky above and says to himself, "The sky is blue." So he asks his father, "Why is the sky blue?" And his father responds, saying, "Why is a simple question to ask but it's a difficult question to answer. I can give a simple answer to you but not to your question. The simple answer is another question. You ask me? Let's ask the sky. You ask me why the sky is blue because you don't understand what a sky is, or what a color is. What's a sky? What's a color? How is a blue sky blue? When is the sky blue? Where is the sky blue? If you could answer these questions then you would know better than to ask why this sky is blue." And the child thinks to himself, "I'll ask the sky next time---it'll be easier for all of us." And the father thinks, "I need to ask more questions of the world so I can find the right ones for my son."

There's a difference between a question and an answer; and yet it's not as stark a contrast as we tend to think it is --- an answer can be a response so puzzling to the questioner that it is more like a question than an answer---and a question can be a query so compelling that it's more like an answer than a question. Like time-and-space (in its four generates) query-and-response is one marriage, of two. Or four things--not one (a query---the source of the question---an answer---the source of the response). Or three things --- not four (the source of the query; the query-response continuum; the source of the response). is to History-Geography as Query-Response is to Answer-Question. Each is a continuum: an inseparably continuous whole wherein, and where "out", things that are close together are more indistinguishably similar than things that are distant from one another. Most questions have answers. Most answers are questionable. Most people ask questions from answers--from answers that they handle like money. They trade for more of what they possess: knowledge in hand, to buy wisdom. Such misunderstanding.

1/16/13

1/17/13

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27 28

29

30 31

32

33

34 35

36

37

38 39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49 50

51

52

53

other people in this specific regard---that is to say, those who don't ask questions from answers---can often be identified by their tendency to answer a question with another question. Is an answer a non-answer if it's a question? If it's a very good response to a query then it's a good answer; it's not just a question, it's a "non"question. the alienating effect of a non-answer, the affect of nonquestions upon askers (the one who asks the initial question and the one who responds with an additional question) is engagingly constructive---it takes two to communicate, yes. Or am I just talking to myself here. Say something? So. What's next. How would you respond to this. me a question? Query these thoughts and answer them with nonquestions? What is like a question? What can be compared to it? A query is like a question. A question is similar to a query. But it is not the same. Put simply: A question is something one asks---one cannot ask a query. We can question something without asking questions. We can also query something without questioning it. The mass of my body queries a chair when I sit in it; and the mass of the chair responds to the query, for better or worse from where I sit---that is to say, from my perspective.

The entire space-time continuum of the material universe is a query and response phenomenon of phenomenally complex phenomena. The closer things get to one another the more indistinguishable one thing becomes from another -- even something like time from space. Quantum mechanics grapples with the similarities of time and space at the closest places of matter (how can something be in two places at once?). No one needs to ask a question in order to keep it all going; questions and answers are not necessary; queries and responses are sufficient. But it isn't enough for us. We must ask questions in order to live as human beings It's an essential aspect of who we are. We are unlike in this world. our animals, which query the world around themselves in order to exist.

We are creatures of reason. We were created to ask questions --- and to receive answers. And we must give answers to questions --- we cannot simply respond to stimuli like unreasoning animals (however thoughtful our response---not unlike thinking animals---may be). It is appointed everyone to give a final answer to the One Who created them, according to the scriptures of the God of the Bible. Many who refuse His answer in this life, think that they will nonetheless accept Him in the world o come. Because they think that they are essentially acceptable just the way they are---that is to say, they believe they are good at heart--even if they may not be entirely good in every other way. If they are good at heart then they believe the truth about themselves (concerning their heart). But if they are not essentially good at heart (in their heart of hearts of hearts), then they are deceived in their hearts and They are double hearted and double minded. They believe a lie that someone has told them about themselves; and they have repeated it to themselves. Those who think this way about their hearts (and about good and good-enough and bad-enough and evil) believe that they should be given a chance to say, "Yes" to their Creator in the way of a final question at the end of a final inquiry---before a final judgment. But what they fail to understand is that the answer of their heart will be, "No". because the good-enoughness in their heart of hearts has little desire for their Creator's goodness. And His absolute truth will compel them

to express the utter aversion of their bad-enoughness to His rightness.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26 27

28

29 30

31

32

33 34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48 49

50

51

52

1/20/13

Most people ask questions which are informed by their private store of information. they formulate their inquiry: from the solutions that they already possess: because it's the only way of knowledge that they know---knowledge from knowledge. working for a knowledge of knowledge their wages are never enough to afford them the knowledge of wisdom or understanding. they can't afford to ask a question of wisdom, because it would cost them everything that they think they possess---to answer just one of her questions first. but they refuse to work as slaves in the fields of knowledge; so they labor to glean answers for themselves. and they will not serve as eunuchs in the courts of understanding. think better of ourselves than this. yes. we have our honor. have our dignity. in that order. and just as pride which goes before dignity seeks ever to preserve itself at dignity's expense, so answers that go before questions must always be right, no matter what the cost to wisdom. folly prostitutes her dignity in order to assert her pride. there is a bit of the courtesan in the fool's golden heart of adamkind; and a flaccid honor about our beating heart of flesh that hardens into stone: these are deeply troubling realities that we're loathe to admit.

wisdom does not esteem herself wise---wisdom is not wise in her own estimation. does she lack self-esteem? authentic wisdom is wise only insomuch as she acts and speaks in deference to the understanding that she is not the source of wisdom---that she does not, in and of herself, determine what wisdom is. she understands that she is not wise at all, apart from the only true source of wisdom, who is personified as a "he" to her "she", namely, the one and only GOD-WHO-IS her creator. she is folly apart from him. wisdom is a prostitute apart from understanding.

it takes time to ask a question and it takes time to give an answer. the give and take of time and space is how G-d, in his wisdom, chooses to explain himself in his creation. and it is how our mystery is laid bare to itself, apart from him. what we now understand as a continuum of space-time is also a continuum of geography-history and a continuum of where-when. the universe and all that it contains, seen and unseen, declares the glory of the creator. but he is holy and no one has ever seen him. yet he explains himself, as light, to the energy and matter the light of creation knows him as light. he is known of space-time. as light in the light of time-space. but he is not the creation light. he explains himself to the ?how? and ?what? of ?where-when? as a final question: ?why?. the wisdom of our age comprehends him in the initial query, or the "first cause". he's known as ?who? in the wisdom of our age. but he cannot be known as WHO-HE-IS by the created wisdom of our he can only be understood by the world in the last question: ?why?: he explains himself to wisdom in the final response, or the last he is and was and will be, the first and the last explanation to the ?wisdom? of his creation. the new heaven and the new earth and those who dwell in it will know him as the one and only true first and final answer: to everything: and they will finally know and understand him as WHO-HE-IS. in that day his name, as Creator-and-Redeemer, will be one and the same. in that day his IDENTITY---as the first and last reason of creation --- as the WORD and VOICE of GOD, in heaven and earth--as the aleph and tav of the torah of earth, and as the first sound and the last sound of the torah of heaven---in the Father---and in the Son--and in the Ruach of truth: in that day he will be one and his name one.

1/21/13

1, of D

2

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27 28

29

30 31

32

33 34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

also labors to understand its world without (hardly any) understanding. A baby queries its world, but its mother gives it more than a response--she gives her baby an answer. She gives her baby a name, and it's not an "it" anymore. Her baby is a she or a he---and he or she has a name. And she continues to give him or her answers along with responses; and through reason the baby sees relationships, and makes connections, and asks his or her first question. And the baby begins to eat solid food; and other people in addition to the baby's mother can begin to feed it. And those who feed it won't refer to it as an "it" (if they still call it an "it") for very long---because they cannot help themselves but to talk to the baby. And a baby who can eat solid food is a baby who can understand (however softly) the person who nourishes him or her---with words and with food. We eat in order to live; but we also live to eat--one is good, and one is very good; and there's nothing wrong with such goodness so long as we are not consumed by it. We query our existence in order to live; but we also live to ask questions. We are nourished by answers---to grow in knowledge and (if we eat wisely) understanding. Humans and animals have many things in common, but the similarities

don't make us the same; our similarities are not "samelarities", so to speak. We humans are like animals and animals are like us; so animals and human beings are alike. But likeness doesn't supersede difference. Two persons might be alike physically, even to the degree of identical genetic sameness -- but they aren't the same person. Knowledge defines them as identical; but wisdom identifies them as different: they exist as two separate beings, not as one thing. Identical twins occupy time as one subordinate identity as long as they both live; but they occupy space as two separate and unique individuals from the earliest reaches This a wondrous mystery of G-d's wisdom toward us. of their existence. The mystery of identical human twins allows us to tease apart, ever so subtly, the relationship of time and space, a relationship which is so intertwined that we describe it as inseparably continuous (time cannot be separated from space and remain time, nor can space be divided from time and remain space, at least as we know these things in a continuum).

Identical twins are a sign, an indication of something greater than what meets one's eye. A sign of this particular kind also provides us with a sign"ature", if you will, a signature of sorts, that identifies the source of that "something greater". If we are unable to recognize a sign or a signature as a sign or a signature when we see it, then we certainly won't be able to read it (even if we know how to read a sign). But if we are unwilling to recognize a sign as a sign (even if we know what a sign looks like), then we won't be able to understand that sign (even if a translator interprets it into a written language). There is great meaning to be found in the likeness of one thing to another; but a definitive meaning of a thing (a meaning that defines it——a meaning that lends definition to it and brings clarity to it, in such a manner that our eyes can perceive it for what it is) exists outside of itself——in the difference between "it" and everything else around it. Meaning is the reality that exists in the pristine contrast of unique likeness.

There is difference and there is similarity between you and animals. Your uniqueness exists because of the difference between you and every thing else around you (no matter how similar that "everything else" is to you). It is a mystery of Identity, this significance of uniqueness.

1/5/13

1/8/13

1/14/13

1/15/13

1/22/13

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26 27

28

29 30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48 49

50

51

52

It's easy for most babies to learn to hear and speak and understand the language of the world around them, because they can, "See Dick run!" so to speak. A baby sees everything at first, and understands nothing of what it sees ---it sees everything and nothing, all at the same time. Because it sees the universality of the world around it. But it can't distinguish one thing from another within that whole wide world around it---not one single thing from another. It might as well be blind for all the good its vision is at first. But a new born baby starts using its eyes to read almost as quickly as a new born foal starts using its legs to stand. A baby doesn't read written words, in the narrow sense of "read written words", but as soon as its eyes perceive movement and begin to track that movement---then he or she begins to observe motion and analyze motion; and from those observed motions of the nonsensical whole of his or her world, that baby begins to derive the most primary, elementary meanings from its postpartum existence in that universality. Motion activates the baby's tracking systems (in this particular sense, its visual tracking system). From its observations of motion the baby discerns movement; from its grasp of movement the baby discerns change; and from its experiences with change the baby distinguishes difference.

For those who observe the wonder of this process, and ascribe words to it, it becomes progressively more awkward and difficult to describe that baby as an "it". That baby has begun to distinguish itself, even in its own inarticulate eyes, as an individual. It's easy to describe an unborn baby as a "process"---as a "pregnancy"---as a "fetus"---when we can't track it with our eyes as it separates itself from its mother---as it makes its placenta within the it of a womb, that "it" its mother. A baby can be excused for being unable to grasp its mother as anything other than a thing---even postpartum---because all of its senses other than its eyes---for all of its prior existence---have tracked movement and change, and found that nothing exists apart from itself other than the material world of the womb around it---which it "perceives through a placenta darkly," so to speak. Twins are two "its" that individuate themselves ante partum, and share a mysterious postnatal impartibility.

There is more to this material universe than meets the eye. Riddle and puzzle and game and life and love and the one and the many. and deeds and behaviors and languages. When is a mother not expectant? When she is with fetal tissue. And when is an individual not a person? When that someone needs to be put out of my misery? Or when a peoples becomes selfish? when the pleasures and the desires of the many become the insatiable and the unquenchable hunger and thirst of the one? And the one will do and say anything to self-justify and self-preserve its false identity? When we choose to make a person into an it, we become An infant can be excused for its infantile speech and behavior as it begins to become an articulate and gesticulate individual, learning to read interpersonal behavior, and learning to speak a human language --by sight and by touch and by sound and by voice. Eye and ear are only instruments. Even a blind and deaf infant can learn to envision music--to sight-hear sound or to read songs by ear---because of words. Words and deeds. These are the difference between humans and beasts. and words---written or unwritten. An animal cannot do a deed, just as it cannot speak a word. A person who cannot, or will not, distinguish this difference between man and beast cannot enjoy a love of the truth.

12/28/12

12/30/12

1/1/13

1, of E

are opened---not too long after it catches its first breath in the air and the time and the space that it shares with the lives and lifetimes of those who are around it. It began to learn how to read even before it was born. It began to learn how to communicate even before it took its first breath. Actions frequently do speak louder than words. But a woman who is with child---and that unborn person who quickens within her---converse in a quieter language than their physical ears can ever hear---actions that whisper wordless poems too wonderful for the naked eye to ever behold. It's an inherent mystery of communication. It is an autonomic kind of learning. Human life is a unique mystery. It is unlike every kind of sentient, animal life. Mankind seeks-out meaning.

The reason we refer to a baby as an "it" instead of a "him" or "her"

1/3/13

1/24/13

The reason we refer to a baby as an "it" instead of a "him" or "her" has something to do with our frames of reference as impersonal objects of an internal mystery. When we reference a baby as an "it" we simply attest to a lack of an awareness of the child's personal identity as a boy or girl. When the baby was hidden (inside a woman) we didn't know whether it was male or female; but if we see the child within the womb as a person, then the next thing that we want to see about the baby is whether it's a boy or a girl. When at last it is revealed as a boy or a girl, then we immediately begin to become more aware of its personal identity. Once we visually apprehend a baby as a male or female, then we will cease to reference that baby as an "it" from that time forward.

But this isn't true of all of us humans as people-to-people persons. Individuals who don't care much one way or the other about what a baby is or isn't, reluctantly begin to reference it as something other than an "it"---because they reference themselves as something more personal. And it would be incongruous to their own sense of identity to continue to refer to something as an "it" that is progressively and practically indiscernible from themselves---as it is rationally apprehended within their frame of reference. As they persist in continually articulating the child as an "it" it becomes more and more difficult to continue to articulate themselves as anything more than "it". The longer the baby lives, the more it becomes like them. The harder they try to deny "it", the more irrational their own frame of reference becomes: They must do what they must do---one way or the other. Do they see their blindness?

We now have enough learning that we can learn the gender of a child before the baby is born. Some parents choose not to search out a baby in this way. Some parents don't want to find out because they want to love that child-person as the unfolding mystery that she or he is. It truly doesn't matter what unfolds (before or after birth) but only who unfolds. And they are willing to wait. Even for a lifetime; even for forever. But some people don't want to find out because they can't be bothered with a baby's existential demand for their attention and love. What sustains them in the living of their life? Not the useless eater. Not the enablers of the useless eater. No, but their sustenance is to do whatever they desire to do; and to live however they desire to live.

We learn to love what we choose to know, as a way to know it better—and we learn to hate what we have diminished, as a way to hide our sin—we might hurt those who we despise, but we will hate those who we hurt. Even a wise man's eyes are useless in the dark. Yet even a child born blind can see in the light of Torah. But who told us that we're naked? What do we know about ourselves that no one has ever had to tell us?

1/25/13 1/24/13

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29 30

31

32

33 34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48 49

50

51

52

Saliva is the lubricant of our speech. Air is the lubricant of our voice. Blood is the lubricant of our codes. But there was a time, in the beginning, when lubricants were not lubricants. Because there was no friction in Creation as we know friction. Friction wasn't friction, just as lubricants weren't lubricants. Saliva was and still is saliva. Air was and still is air. Blood was and still is blood. But they all were different in the continuum of the garden of G-d, the designer and creator of everything that was. Speech was the perpetuation of saliva. G-d's voice was the perpetuation of the life that was in the air. His code was the perpetuation of the life that was in the blood. Water is the lubricant of earth today. But earth was the perpetuation of water in that day: of the garden: of the palace: of the King of the universe. What happened that caused Creation to begin ever so slowly to grind

What happened that caused Creation to begin ever so slowly to grind to a halt? What happened to time that turned it into an arrow, tipped with entropy? What happened to space that turned it into life's grave? Tell me if you think you know the answer. We call it, "sin". But who can understand it? Who thinks that they know the heart of the mystery of a lawless good and its evil? Who dares to call good evil, and evil good? Evil understands nothing of good and good knows nothing of evil.

The world is not in perpetual motion; but the history-and-geography of the G-d of Jacob is true and certain; and it will never end, and it will never cease, and it will never expire. Because the author of all Creation is HimSelf the perpetuation of Israel. Israel was blind from birth, but G-d HimSelf kneeled down and spat on the ground, and made a mud from the soil of the earth and anointed his eyes. And He sent him way, to wash in a particular pool of water --- which was designated for the use of the one-who-is-sent. And Jacob's eyes were opened after he heard, and believed and followed, and obeyed G-d's instruction for him. And G-d became his G-d; and He called him by a new name; and He shared HimSelf with him by taking upon HimSelf a new name. He became the G-d of Israel. Jacob's eyes were opened by the light of Torah; and Israel learned how to read by the light of Torah. G-d made Torah into a code to the nations. He inscribed His people on the land of His promise to Abraham. Can you read the writings? Which direction will you turn or which instruction will you follow, in order to behold a light that can open the eyes of the blind? Or where will you go, to hope for a voice that can open the ears of the deaf? Or will you stay wherever you are?

The Jewish sages say over and over, that life is for learning. they say that learning, over and over, is for life. One might further paraphrase them by saying that the human heart beats for meaning. meaning is for the air we breathe. Jews learn early how to talk---two Jews; three conversations --- and a joke; or too many --- for good measure. Where did they learn this? How did they learn it? Did it just happen? It should be said without question that the Jews are a literate people. And they have been such---for however long they have been whatever and whoever they are. They are a people of letters. Jacob begins to read life writ large a mere eight days after he is born; Israel suckles her her children with the history and grammar of a language called, "Torah." A Hebrew tongue learns to converse, in sanctified whispers of devotion, with the King of the universe. It's a great mystery of redemption and re-creation. It's the mystery of Jacob as Yeshurun-and-Zion as Israel--born out of the mystery of Jacob as Israel. In the land of G-d's Word.

1/25/13

, 20, 20

1/26/13

1/25/13

1/3/13

1/4/13

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27 28

29

30 31

32

33

34 35

36

37

38 39

40

41

42

43

44

45 46

47

48

49 50

51

52

53

that it cannot do a deed? Indeed, who are we that we can wonder about such things? A deed is similar to a word; words and deeds are similar. A word is also similar to a deed. But not in the same way that a deed is similar to a word. If a word and a deed are similar---not the same--then they are also dissimilar. It only stands to reason. But if they are more similar than dissimilar, then we must explain ourselves if we declare that they're dissimilar. How're they dissimilar? How're they not the same, for that matter? The way things go together and the way they stay apart is called, "grammar", in language. Awkward grammar is still grammar; bad grammar is still grammar. Loosely speaking, we can say that there's a grammar to everything around us in our world. people write tightly about this grammar of life: we call them, writers. They can say whatever they wantto, they can speak however they need to. They can not say emphatically enough that the code of grammar has need to be broken -- by truth. Good writers love the rules of grammar -- and they loose them only with great care---and for good reason. But a bad writer produces bad writing---no matter how masterful his use of words or how beautiful her grasp of grammar. How is truth-and-understanding different from knowledge-and-wisdom? Truth keeps everything apart and wisdom brings everything together: by knowledge and with understanding. Wisdom is about relationship. Sound wisdom listens for absolute truth; but unsound wisdom is blind to the light of truth. And she goes about declaring, "Everything is relative! There are no absolutes that can't be undone! Eat and drink with me, my love, and you'll see what I mean!" But she walks about by the candlelight of her own eyes. And she won't see destruction when it comes upon her. Nor will she hear anything in the deafening silence that it makes of all her musings. Who have ears to hear the :still small voice: of truth? If they listen for it, they will hear it. If they listen to it, then they will follow it. And it will draw nearer to them, even as they move closer to it. And they'll hear it more clearly and sense it more certainly---until they know "it" as a "He" in contradistinction to their "she"--- and they walk together with Him, in the absolute wisdom of the age to come---in a wisdom that is not of the corruptible wisdom of this age, with its self-corrupting beauty, but in the absolute and incorruptible beauty of the new heaven and the new earth of the re-creation. We who have been re-born in G-d, through the person of Jesus of Nazareth (a unique, one-of-a-kind Human--the Son of adamkind --- the new male of Man) have heard His voice and we have followed Him---and we see in His light, and walk according to His word. And we are His betrothed --- and He is our beloved. But even our eyes have not yet seen the life that awaits us. Nor have our ears yet heard the effable truth that our Creator and Redeemer has yet to speak. These are things of the grammar of Torah, and the Besorah of the story of Creation---and Redemption---and Re-Creation. These are the mystery of mysteries. Even so, a child can apprehend them. Yes, only a child can know them. But the wise and the intelligent, who think themselves all knowing in their imaginings, and who imagine themselves truly wise in their thoughts, will never understand --- even for all their learning. They painstakingly encode the corrupted data of their hearts and think to call it, "Fiction and Non-Fiction." And their truth is stranger to them than their fiction. There are differences between a word and its And there is a world of difference between a code and its deed.

1/30/13

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26 27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48 49

50

51

52

A word and a code are similar, but not the same. They both consist of four letters (as words in the English language) for one thing. they both consist of infinite uniqueness (as names for the enumeration of a numerical infinity of things) for two things. But the two things differ in this: words must be spoken first, before they can be written down; but codes must first be written, before they can be actuated and implemented. "Nonsense," says the gate-keeper of his code, "I can see something that has never before been seen, and write out a word for it before anyone says a thing." So he can create a word before he speaks If his new word is derived from pre-existing words then he speaks rightly---except that (strictly speaking) he doesn't "create" the word, he procreates it, so to speak. If he creates the word from absolutely nothing other than his own whimsy---then his word is nonsense. must be willing to accept his nonsense if we choose to accept his word. What code grants him the imprimatur to pronounce his word a legitimate word? Where is it written that he is authorized to speak meaning into existence? He speaks gibberish into nothingness; and many believe him.

The authority to write codes is derived from the authority to write words. Those who author a code do not gain the right to author a word.

A code is similar to a word; but not in the same way that a word is similar to a code. There is a directionality (a one-wayness) to their similarity---the delegational similarity that allows for authoritative meaning. Meaning is the reality that emerges in the contradistinction of similarities: meaning becomes meaning (it gains its definition --- it comes into its focus, so to speak) in the contrast that exists between like or similar things. A hypothetical "onething" that hypothetically exists in utter and complete dissimilarity to absolutely everything in everything (a onething that is so uniquely unique that nothing is like it in any way whatsoever: a onething that is so absolutely isolated in its hypostasis-ness that, for all hypothetical purposes, it is utterly alone in its "is"-ness: nothing "is" except it) is all but meaningless. If that onething can't be compared to anything, then for all practical purposes that "anything" doesn't exist at all to that onething: it has no meaning to that onething: it has no real meaning: it has no meaning. Furthermore, if that onething is so hypostatically unique in its utter uniqueness that its "it"-ness cannot even be compared to its "is"-ness, then that onething is also devoid of meaning: it would be an absurdity--if (hypothetically) there were such a thing as absurdity, that is. the other hand, if that hypothetical onething, delegates its authority in its unique "it"-ness, to its unique "is"-ness, such that uniqueness can be compared to uniqueness, then the beginning of meaningfulness is expressed (in the concepts and realities of "sameness" and "comparison") in such a way that "meaning" apart from that onething becomes possible for a "thing" other than that onething (in the comparison and contrast between that "thing" and that onething). That "meaning" is meaningful only by the authority of its source: the onething. The source of that meaning that exists in the relationship between that onething and that thing is in the authority of that onething --- which preceded everything. If that onething explains to that thing that their relationship is one of similarity and not one of sameness, then that thing must understand difference and deference if their relationship is to remain meaningful. But if that thing rejects that explanation then falseness becomes real.

1/28/13

1/31/13

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27 28

29

30 31

32

33

34 35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

a real possibility as long as the source of the potential falseness is real. Falseness can not find its source in truth. And truth does not share the same source with falseness. There is an absolute difference between falseness and truth. And they coexist only by the forbearance of authority. Authority becomes no less authoritative in its exercise of forbearance. On the contrary, authority demonstrates its authority no less through its forbearance than through its might. Authority can express itself through the power of its might, or through the power of its forbearance. It is the glory of authority to build up and to pull apart --- to promote and to remove--- to judge and to determine--- to save and to define: authority can exercise its might, or delegate its power --at will. Authority becomes no less authoritative in its authoritative delegation of power. It is the honor of authority to confer authority at will. Authority can and will delegate its power of destruction and creation to the many and the small and the great and the few---however and whenever and wherever it chooses to do so. For its good and right reasons and purposes. It is the glory of the delegate to keep in good faith that which is delegated --- and it is the honor of the delegate to exercise in true proxy that which is delegated. True and faithful are those who recognize, and observe, and practice, and keep the authority of their master and superior -- in the same spirit it was given to them. But the abuse of their authority severs authoritarians from the source of their power and might -- and authority will judge them in their sins.

Why does evil exist? Why should judgment be necessary? Why should the potential for falseness be allowed in the first place? Who Is G-d? Who is God, that He allows what He allows? ?Who? is a simple question to ask, but who can be quite hard in its reply. If we ask someone who he is, he might give us a direct answer if we ask him directly. If we ask him indirectly he might answer us indirectly, yes? But if we look for answers that are as easy as our questions then we look for foolish things which we will never find in wisdom. And we will not understand. But the simple answer is another question. Who are you to do what you should not do? What is wisdom or beauty, to become corrupt? We can't know beauty as who we are, except beauty be as what it is. How can we know wisdom if it be immutably wise and we be immutably whoever we are?

Our Creator would reason with us---if we would but listen to reason. Who is like Him? Who can be compared to Him? There is no one. There can be no Him but Him; He alone Is-Who-He-Is. There is no other. Who is anyone to question the design of the Beginner and Ender of Creation?

Supposition: In some beginning, the universe was created, by design, to model God's glory in a work that would so singularly and so utterly exemplify God that one might mistake it for a portrayal of God Himself--signed, even, by His own hand: except for the fact that He Himself was nowhere to be found, and no one had ever actually seen Him---so no one could tell by the design and pattern and imagery of the work itself if it was a portrait of the creator, or a portrayal of something entirely different. Suppose a sentient being imagines he sees the image of God in his imagined portrait of Creation; then suppose he imagines he sees his reflection in that image; and suppose he will not listen to reason.

In truth, G-d dwells in inapproachable light. But He speaks wisdom to the wise and the foolish alike; and warns them in no uncertain ways that Creation is encoded with great potential for onething called evil.

2/1/13 1/11/13

2/1/13

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26 27

28

29 30

31

32 33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48 49

50

51

52

Authority has the power of its might at its right hand. And at its other hand is the power of its will. It has the power to command; and the power to motivate. It has the power to instruct; and the power to teach. Authority has the ultimate power to do; and the ultimate power to undo. Sovereign authority has the ability to do whatever it deigns to do. And sovereign authority has the right to do whatever it deigns to do. Why?

2/3/13

2/1/13

Who asks why? An unlearned child, perhaps? Or perhaps an insolent youth? Or just a curious mind? A truly curious mind soon learns that the question why is always the last question answered; and the curious child soon learns that the best question should first be a question of who. Who can recognize authority? One who witnesses it. And who can witness authority? One who in some way encounters the evidences of it. Sometimes we bump into authority through ignorance, and we then become aware of authority through the way it responds to our bump. Sometimes authority will give us a bump; and we then bear a witness (we evidence the existence) of authority. And the next time we recognize it better.

2/4/13

Who can accept authority? The one who has recognized it in another. Only a who can confer authority. The physical world around us bears a witness (evidences the existence) of great authority---it is possessed of authority. An ocean wave moves through deep waters and responds to the query of the earth with some authority. The sun generates a light and a heat of intense authority. The cloud and the wind of the domain above us behave in ways just beyond our authority to grasp. Should we call it something else? The ancients spoke from wisdom when they said that authority (wherever it is evidenced) is evidence of a who of some kind. They just didn't know who. They perceived the ways of authority as it was made manifest within the who of human identity---the man and his woman---and the mother and her people---and the many and their few--and the son and his father and his subjects and a ruler with a scepter, and their lord with his queen, and the daughter of her people with her But they were content to imagine gods who were only magnified versions of themselves: they were content to induce their imagined one from the collective authority of their many --- and they were content to deduce their imagined many from the sovereign authority of their human And their contentment was made so much easier by the adversarial spirit of demonic angelic identities who were willing to imagine right along with them (albeit on a loftier plane than the earthly pedestrian imaginations of mere mortals). The demons demonstrate their authority among the affairs of mortals as a way to justify their rogue existence. And the great and the few among the many of mankind conspire with them to solidify their own authority: and their technocrats and bureaucrats and dignitaries and functionaries do their bidding without questioning Because authority is at work in the affairs of heaven and themselves. And only fools deny it. But even the wisest among the angelic and the human alike observe that even sovereign authority is destroyed by authority whenever and wherever it abuses authority. Authoritarian authority is false authority --- and its falseness has never once become anything other than its undoing. But delusion springs eternal --- or so it would seem for the authoritarian. This is the trite tautology that torments the adversarial angels of heaven's sovereign throne: absolute power corrupts absolutely. Is it true in heaven? Consider the source.

as to the just finality of its sovereign might and its sovereign right. Because even the forbearance of heaven's authority has a beginning and an end in this Creation; and the justice and righteousness of G-d will be fulfilled in the completion of Creation-history——even as they were fulfilled in the establishment of Creation-history. G-d redeemed what He created even before it needed redemption——from its very foundation. He wrote down His Word and He bound it with the law of His Torah. And He laid it upon the altar of His Creation. And He called it very good. All the angels of heaven sang His praises. And He sat down and rested.

These things of the Torah of heaven and earth are not mere academic curiosities. Nor are they exercises in theoretical abstractions. they are as real as they come. As real as life. And as real as death. And they will be permanent, in the finalization of their beginning and There's more to our world and its life than the status quo. their end. This isn't "all there is". We've got it wrong. There is more; but we don't understand. This is --- all of it --- infinitely and eternally more significant in its uniqueness than we can ever understand: all of this is more (so much abundantly more) than it seems to the darkened hearts of humanity. G-d will rewrite His Creation on the eighth day, just as He has rewritten His Torah on the hearts of those who have believed in These are mysteries into which angels long to look: but they cannot know, even in all their brilliance, what we can experience even in our lowly estate---how the G-d of all Creation could humble Himself before it all --- so as to exchange His infinite might for such absolute forbearance---even so much as to die to Himself---for the sake of love.

To do justice is to understand love. To do justice for the sake of mercy is to understand hope. Hope is an action, just as love is. And the action is to love mercy. Who can do such things? They are things of authority——things of the forbearance of authority——and only those who do them in humility can truly do them at all. Such humility finds its source in the strength of authority. To walk humbly, hand—in—hand, with authority is to understand faith; faith is an action of authority.

These are the greatest of all of the actions of the Creator and the Redeemer of Creation: as spoken and written and performed and finished by Him in His Torah. Walking humbly with the W-rd of Torah is the way that G-d becomes our G-d. But how did G-d become our G-d? How did He do what He did? This is the greatest mystery of them all: how did G-d become our G-d? The answer is sealed in that scroll of the foundation of Creation. G-d laid it down. And He took it back up. And He holds it in His right hand. Heaven longs to look into it. But there is :no one in heaven, or on the earth, or under the earth: who is able to see what's written inside it. Except for one individual---one man---Jesus, the King of Israel: the Lion that is from the tribe of Judah, the Root of David: A single man---out of all Creation: the self-sacrifice of G-d for the redemption of His Creation. He is able to take the scroll: and to open it: and to see what's written inside and on the back of it.

G-d's name is always sanctified in Torah, and by Torah, and through Torah. Don't be deceived. Anyone who in any way impugns the holiness of the G-d of Israel does so only to his own delusion. :Let the reader understand:. G-d will soon say, :Enough:. He will make an end to all unrighteousness. He will judge evil and forever consign it to its own falseness. And the wicked will not escape their just and final domain.

2/5/13

1/23/13

2/4/13

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26 27

28

29 30

31

32 33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44 45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

2/1/13

G-d, in the very beginning of the beginning of the beginning, spoke. This is enough information. If we care to accept it. He tells us (in the beginning of the Torah of Moses) that He created. He tells us how He created what He created: where Moses writes about light: G-d speaks and it comes to pass. He declares the end from the beginning, and all history and geography is written into existence. He spoke, and heaven and earth came into existence; He spoke, and a continuum of continuums formed---in between the virtual reality of the heaven and the material reality of the earth. Just what exactly is it about us, that we don't understand? What came first, do you suppose, when it comes to us? idea of us? Or us? Or did an idea and an us begin at the same moment? Is it unfair of me to play so colloquially with American English words and figures of speech? After all, I'm just one American among a world of almost countless peoples of so many nationalities and languages and styles of living, and thinking, and speaking, and writing, and reading. Did not G-d create all of us equal? Or was it, "each of us equivalent"? Or whatever. Now I've gone and forgotten what it was that I was about to say. Hmm, let's see. Oh yes, now I remember: I'm just a jester: a teller of jokes --- a cause for good laughter. It's not about me at all. And it's not about you either. And it's not about Abraham or Isaac or Jacob, for that matter: it's about who G-d is, and what He's done, and what He has yet to do. That's it. If you care to accept it. You got a problem with Zionism? No. You've got a problem with G-d. You need to get over it---you desperately need to get over your problem---or it will be your destruction. There. I said it. So now what will you do? If you're not reading this then I'm not speaking to you, am I? But if you're reading this then I'm speaking to you alone, am I not? I'm not speaking to billions of faceless, nameless, masses of a singular human ity. Only to you.

G-d is one and His Name is one. And G-d, being G-d, is able to see you all by yourself---among all of us---all at once---and all together. You can know His love---so impossibly exclusive to you---and you alone. But you can only know it on His terms. And His terms are exclusive as well. As well they must be. If you would love G-d you must love your neighbor; and if you would love your associate you must love the Torah. And if you would love the Torah you must love the nations of the Torah; and if you would love the Torah's commonwealth you must love Messiah's people, the Jews. And if you would love the Jews you must love Yeshua, the King of the Jews. And if you would love Jesus you must follow Him. And if you would follow Him you must turn away from your way of living your life, and take up the sins of your former way of living your life--and die. Not in secret. But at the place of the death of the Lord of Adam. In full view of all adamity. You must die, one way and another. Either in your sins. Or for your sins. Or to your sins. Only Yeshua has died for your sins, with you (if you were with Him), in such a way that you can return to this life, born anew, in the life that He lives. But only you can die to your sins, with Yeshua, in such a way that you no longer are who you were when you were alone, but a new original you, the one who G-d originally made you to be, before you were lost to who you became in your sins. We all come into this world with a choice to make one day. We must choose how we will die, whether before the fact or during the fact or after the fact. Better to decide the matter now.

plowman

