VALUE   FRAMEWORKS

REALITY SEARCH

VERSION TWO

MICHELLE NAILON CSB

FORWARD

Value Frameworks

Value Frameworks - Version Two should stand independently from *A Line of Logic--Version One*, as also independently from *Reality Search, Versions Three, Four* and *Five*.

A Line of Logic- Version One presents "the underlying argument" a collection of five ancient texts. In *Version One*, in order to focus on the argument, without getting bogged down in other discussions, there is deliberate omission of the traditional names of the texts. They are given descriptive names instead. Also because some people are unfamiliar with the texts considered, the use of traditional names in *Version One* could give the impression that 'in-house' language is going to be used. It was therefore considered an anonymous approach fort *Version One* in *Reality Search* would help to create a more level 'playing field'. It would also help to focus attention on the line of logic or argument or structure at the base of the texts rather than what people already know about the texts from other quarters.

Value Frameworks-Version Two, as following here, does provide traditional names and some discussion of the background in which these texts were written. But, the descriptive headings and analysis, as introduced in

Version One , remains the same. Again, stress is placed on the intrinsic logic and credibility of the underlying argument of the texts. *Value Frameworks - Version Two* shows how the 'underpinning' of this argument has been constructed.

Version Three - Two World Views, provides the same framework of the texts again. First it provides a summary of the value lists presented by the texts (c/f *A Line of Logic- Version One).* Then it provides a summary outline of their frameworks in the texts (c/f *Value Frameworks- Version Two).*

Five Pivotal Texts- Version Four, sets out the framework of previous *Versions*. It then presents a fluent paraphrase of the literal translation that is used. This book also refers to the original Greek text and a range of other translations. It also gives comments to explain how this or that expression, construction, point or story etc fits into the line of logic that underlies all five ancient texts.

Translation Analysed- Version Five presents a literal translation of the five texts considered. The reason for providing this, is to demonstrate that the analysed framework presented in *Reality Search* is based upon the original wording of the texts and the original design of the text writers.

Contributing Studies

As noted, *Value Frameworks - Version Two,* provides

some explanation as to how the underlying argument of the texts was uncovered. Because the 'discovery' of this argument is original to *Reality Search* there are no references and no Bibliography   No references were consulted! Something clicked and the writer ran with it. On the other hand the whole 'enterprise' of *Reality Search* has been influenced by a wide range of background studies and environments on the part of the writer.

These include - a Bachelor .Arts at Melbourne University with studies in::
Biblical History and Archaeology (Dr Thompson)
Luke/Acts,
Gospel of John (Professor Bowman),
History & Philosophy of Science - Cosmology,
and later on, Reading Ancient Greek

There was also the study of a Bachelor Theology Degree in the ecumenical environment of the United Faculty of Theology Melbourne. Here, ideas put forward for example in Systematic and Moral Theology had to undergo the hard scrutiny of logic for their credibility. Other subjects undertaken here included:
Religious Education (Dr Denham Grierson)
and Corinthians I

Later on there was a study of Religious Sociology I and II undertaken at the Jesuit Theological College Melbourne with Dr Noel Ryan SJ. This Religious Sociology study was seminal to the *Reality Search.*

endeavour. It included an overview of social philosophies which was later developed into an informal thesis. This informal thesis traced the influence of Greek philosophy into the philosophy and development of Western Civilisation.

As well as the above there was also a study of world religions, ethics and C20th theology undertaken with the Melbourne College of Divinity.

Besides academic study there was the environment of industrial research at the Inter-church Trade and Industry Mission with Rev Alan Scott for 9 years. There was also the environment of the Social Questions Committee of the Catholic Women's League with its on-going scrutiny of social issues and social legislation over a 25 year period. Paramount as a background and before and during the above, was a three- year Novitiate training and decades of life in a Religious Order after the upheavals of the Catholic Church's Vatican II of the 1960's. .

In more recent years a Masters Degree in Theology at Australian Catholic University provided helpful studies for *Reality Search.* Subjects in particular here included:
Gospel of John (Mary Coloe PBVM),
Interpretation of Scripture (Rev Terry Curtin),
Letter to Romans (Prof. Frank Moloney SDB),

In terms of experience, doing temp-typing in over 100 industrial backgrounds around Melbourne, provided

an introduction to the language, pressures and thought patterns of industry as a whole. Whatever the Government Department of Company in Melbourne the *Reality Search* writer has possibly worked there.

On the other hand, in contrast to all the above, the development of *Reality Search* as a whole, has continued on a solitary basis from the end of 2001 to mid 2006. In some senses this development of *Reality Search* has been like a prolonged meditation, particularly in relation to *Value Frameworks- Version Two.* However some significant supports for the enterprise has been provided members of Project Employment Inc and the Brigidine Congregation.

Package Presentation

Value Frameworks- Version Two is part of a package of material in a kit rather than an individual book. Besides the five books which make up this package there is also a CD. The CD provides *Reality Search Versions Three Four* and *Five* in coloured pages. There are also some Powerpoint presentations. Thus the CD can be used in group work-shops with a projector or at a personal level. In this sort of usage, it would be possible to flick from a one *Version* to another.

The Big Bang

The *Reality Search* books may appear repetitious to some extent. But this is because of the difficulty

people have had in comprehending the basic framework on which the argument is developed. Why so? The analysis is actually based upon the cosmology of the "Big Bang". It claims the five ancient texts that it deals with are based on the Big Bang cosmology as well. (even if it was not called by that name at the time). A reliance on this background cosmology is demonstrated in the "Cartoon" appendix of *A Line of Logic -Version One.*

Reality Search proposes that Western civilisation has tended to rely on a 'static' cosmology of Greek civilisation as expressed by the astronomer Ptolemy with his "dome" concept of the world and stars. More recently of course Copernicus and Galileo showed the earth is only one of a number of planets revolving round one star amongst millions. But there was still a 'static' type of cosmology here. The world appeared to be floating aimlessly and anonymously in an infinite space which had no obvious beginning or end. Because of this the priority of time and place and the interconnection between the two has not been apparent.

In the past few years more cosmologists have supported the "The Big Bang" origin of the universe. They have even put a date which at present is about 13.8 billion years ago. Suddenly origins of the universe and galaxies can be traced back to an explosion of light photons at a specific time and at a specific place. All matter originally came from light photons and all matter is interconnected. This

cosmology compares with what was believed by the writers of the ancient texts considered in *Reality Search.* The "Big Bang" provides a 'creation date' and beginning picture as does the first book of the Bible with its opening statements "In the beginning" and "Let there be light."

Because the significance of the "Big Bang" cosmology is still filtering through in general thinking the connection made by *Reality Search* between the "Big Bang" and the ancient texts is not readily accepted. So, in the reading of *Reality Search,* familiarity with the ancient texts does not appear to be an obvious advantage. As someone said when the initial analysis of the texts was being sorted out . "I know nothing at all about this. So you can try it out on me."

The *Reality Search* material is intended for use in industry workshops.   Whether or not people wish to adopt the texts as a 'belief system' is up to themselves. But the findings of the writers, and the survival strategy that they put forward should be of interest to all.

CONTENTS

VALUE   FRAMEWORKS

VERSION   TWO

Chapter One
Uncovering the Texts

Chapter Two
How Were the Gospels Written?

Chapter Three
Reality Search and Its Analysis

Chapter Four

The Loss of a Structure

Chapter Five

Recognise Law & Order
(Text 1) and   The Gospel of Mark

Chapter Six

Internalise the Law
(Text 2) and   The Gospel of Matthew   71

Chapter Seven
Find Direction for Order

Chapter Eight
Launch the Society

Chapter Nine

Sources

Chapter Ten

Pass on the Power of One

(Text 5) and   The Gospel of John

Value Frameworks - Reality Search - Version Two

Chapter One

UNCOVERING THE TEXTS

Background to the Study - Plato / Aristotle

Before looking more closely at the texts it may be helpful to outline further some of the background to the analysis being presented in *Reality Search.*

This evolved from an interest in Greek and other Western philosophies over a number of years. In fact having obtained a Distinction in a subject on these lines the *Reality Search* writer did the subject twice more for the sake of interest. This led to an examination of the influences in philosophy of two major Greeks, Plato and Aristotle. It appeared that there were two major patterns. that came out in the ideas of Western philosophies to follow. One stream of views appeared to be based on Plato and the other stream was based on Aristotle. It was seen that both these philosophers analyse gradations of matter and spirit. This has influenced them to think in terms of a duality of matter and spirit in any material environment. It also led them to take particular interest in "order" and the imposition of order whether through a totalitarian state or through a democracy. Mostly, the two wrote in terms of the city state. Thus both these philosophers and those who had

positions similar to them could be considered to be setting out their philosophies on the basis of place.

Plato and Aristotle were at the same school in Athens for 20 years (about C5th BC). Plato was the teacher of Aristotle who adopted a similar spirit/matter position. But Aristotle modified this. Aristotle in turn was the teacher of Alexander the Great who, when the pupil of Aristotle helped him to compile the first museum.

What were the similarities and differences between Plato and Aristotle? As already stated, both were concerned with place and the matter that constitutes place. Both had the idea of duality between spirit and matter. But Aristotle saw that Plato had deficiencies in his position and he tried to overcome these.

Plato considered that the more spiritual something was, the closer it was to its First Cause in the perfect, spiritual form on which a thing was based. Plato thought of spirit in terms of pure truth and goodness. He tended to reject matter as being evil. Plato looked back towards the original form of something, for example a right-angled triangle. He considered a tree for instance to be closer to the Ultimate Truth than a painting of it. Thus he saw art as a step away from the truth. This opinion extended to all art works such as the stories written by the Greek writer Homer. On the other hand in contrast to Plato, Aristotle looked forward to what something could become. An egg for instance had the potential to become a chicken or a snake. This egg therefore could be viewed as a step towards greater reality

rather than away from it.

The basic differences between the two philosophers of looking back and of looking forward may not be considered very great, especially as both considered things in terms of spirit and matter. But when applied to social structures their positions could have radically different effects. The favourite discipline of Plato was geometry because a pure form could be applied in differing ways, e.g. the rectangle. On the other hand Aristotle's favourite discipline was biology because a whole range of life forms and cities could be classified n terms of the order in which they were found. Aristotle was prepared to accept the range of forms and classify them . Plato was more inclined to try to impose a blue print. Aristotle was also inclined to accept the views of a city state in terms of self-government through a city constitutions. In fact Aristotle collected bout 100 such constitutions. Plato on the other hand had the view that a state should be governed by a philosopher-ruler who could see truth clearly, like a man who can see the sun from a cave. He can only describe the sunlight he sees to other people in the cave. Plato considered the elite followers of the philosopher ruler have the right to impose order on a society because it is only they who understand the truth.

Plato had the idea that members of a society (especially the elite) would share equal citizenship. The society would encircle itself in a definite place. The philosopher ruler and elite would have control. Sub-groups within this society would be discouraged. Thus

there was even discouragement of family groupings. Rather, the individual would relate directly to the state. Indeed, the state would be the individual writ large. Plato wrote up these ideas in his *Republic* . The problem was that such a place did not exist - nor could it ever exist!

Aristotle's approach by contrast consisted of describing constitutions that were actually working. He had a more moderate position as already pointed out. He encouraged self-government and social groups like the family Indeed he defines the person as a social being. With his concept of the city state, it was not surprising that Alexander the Great could move out around the known world and set up an empire based on such a philosophy. It was said after Alexander had conquered everywhere; he sat down and cried as there was nowhere else to go. Perhaps Aristotle had pointed out the need for direction in such an order-based society. Finally Alexander was not sure where to aim for.

One can go through a list of Western philosophies with similarities to Plato. Even a spiritual writer like St Augustine had parallels to him as did later writers like Marx. However while Plato and Augustine saw Ultimate Truth as the final reality, philosophers like Nietzsche inverted this so that material reality was considered ultimate and the sense of the eternal truth was denied.

Philosophers with parallels to Plato seemed to be in historical situations parallel to his as well. Plato wrote

at a time of impending chaos in the city of Athens. He wanted to impose order there. Augustine wrote at the time of the collapse of the Roman Empire. Luther wrote when the Holy Roman Empire was breaking up into national states. Machiavelli wanted to impose a unified Italy onto city states. Marx wrote as the Industrial Revolution was breaking apart the feudal system. Hitler emerged when Germany still reeled under penalties imposed on it after the Fist World War. Mao Tse Tung emerged after China had been ravaged by invading forces, especially the Japanese. One country that did not succumb to rule by idealism was Britain, largely because reforms had already been underway there and the need for the masses to rise up was not so evident.

There are further parallels. Between Plato and more recent philosophies. Plato, as with Russia later, had his "saved" leader. In communist Russia great stress was put on mathematical disciplines like music and ballet. The Russian State had total control of production. As with Plato, private ownership was virtually abolished. Of particular interest in parallels was the way Plato had a plan for work camps consisting of individuals ultimately owned by the State. Marx followed suit with such an idea in his *Communist Manifesto* . In the 1970's the *Gulag Archipelago* written by Solzhenitsyn was published. This showed to what extent such labour camps had actually existed throughout Russia from 1918 to the 1950's and beyond. The publication of Solzhenitsyn's book was one of the final proofs given that communism was unsustainable, inhumane and

quite irrational. It was a few years later that the efforts of the communist government to control the future through its five year plans etc had finally taken the USSR to the point of bankruptcy. The Soviet Union broke up soon after. Yet even to this day the dream of the ideal state can still exist. A country like North Korea continues to date to hold on to an idealism so similar to Plato's. On the other hand China has quietly re-introduced private enterprise etc.

In contrast to the totalitarian regime imposed by the followers of Plato, Aristotle has been used as a basis for democratic system of government.   Before the Renaissance of the early CI5th the Church writings of Aristotle were recovered from the Crusaders who brought back copies of the lost manuscripts from the Arabs. . St Thomas Aquinas then based his *Summa* on Aristotle's approach to creation. The Catholic Church still uses the creation framework of Aquinas as its basic philosophical position.   Other philosophers such as Locke have also based their philosophies on Aristotle. The constitutions of countries such as the U.S. and Australia have in turn, been based on the philosophy of Locke. In fact democratic systems around the world have directly or indirectly been based on Aristotle and therefore in contrast to the totalitarian system of Plato.

As noted before, both these systems rest finally on the sense of place. Both therefore have a weakness about the sense of time and the need for a sense of direction into the future.

The five ancient texts considered in *Reality Search* were in fact written after some centuries after the time of Plato and Aristotle. It is therefore likely the writers of these five texts had read Plato's *Republic* and works by Aristotle. Or they were familiar with the contents of these writings. Certainly the key figure presented in Text 4 - *Launch the Society* must have known of these philosophers At one point in Text 4 it was mentioned by a monarch, that the "great learning (of this man) had sent him mad!" If even the monarch knew of his scholarship, then this scholar must surely have been acquainted with the ideas of Plato. Text 4 also show this same figure to be interacting with the people who have been considered to write Text 1, 3 and 4 They had been his travelling companions. So what they did not know for themselves about Plato's philosophy, this individual would have been prepared to pass on to them.

What makes this historical background interesting is that one could almost expect a critique of Greek philosophy to be somewhere (albeit buried) within Texts 1-5 that were written some centuries later especially as Greek culture had spread throughout the known world . A literary technique of burying a critique within these five texts was possible.

When the writer of *Reality Search* started doing the analysis of the five texts as presented here, there was an awareness of parallels that exist between Western philosophies. Considerable work had already been done in this area, especially relating to social structures. But parallels between the Greek philosophy and the five

texts to be considered were not yet evident. No author known to the *Reality Search* writer had delved into this type of analysis. It therefore appeared necessary to go through the texts for oneself to see if a critique of Greek philosophy was in fact there. It could only be assumed that this was likely but how such an assessment could be uncovered was not known at the time.

After actually completing an analysis a few months later a range of other types of analyses could then be made. Parallels between the value lists found in Texts 1-5 and current situations were apparent. For example, consider Text 3. In the list of criticisms of a society which overstresses idealism (c/f *Give Direction to Order*) one can see parallels with Plato's *Republic*. One can also consider the list of suggestions for improving a more moderate type of society based upon place. Indeed one can get the sense of someone going through Aristotle's collection of constitutions from 100 city states or at least combing through the ideas from these. One can picture them saying "That's a good idea, but this would make it a better one etc." One could even imagine Aristotle with his inclination to see and nurture potential, agreeing and welcoming these sorts of suggestions. Aristotle of course was gone some centuries before the Texts 1-5 were written. But his ideas were still alive then and they still are. As stated above they are enshrined in the constitutions of democracies at the present time.

When Texts 1-5 were first approached consideration was given as well to a second, other major social

system at the time. This was Judaism. In contrast to the Greeks and their sense of Order this was (and is) a system based upon time and law.

Before attempting an analysis of the five texts there was a realisation that whoever crafted the teaching there and whoever wrote the texts about this teaching was aware of both social systems. This reflection led to a leading question.   Do the five texts take each of these two systems (of law and order) and then present the two separately as system A and system B . Or, do they take both systems and try to mould them into something entirely new, that is, a System C. At the time the *Reality Search* writer did not give much thought to this type of leading question. Also connections between time and law and then place and order had not yet been clarified. If these had been clarified, there would have been a realisation that every day language does not tolerate a fusion between these two pairs of words. People speak of time and place. They speak of law and order. But they do not come up with a common place word to combine both . Yet even though the words stand independently apart they are still used together as a common, unified phrase. In a similar way the two ways of thinking based upon these factors do go together yet they remain in some sort of dialectical tension. The two social systems remain as A and B, with each of them criticising the weakness of the other. Perhaps the C system does exist as an underlying pattern but only if the A and B sub-systems continue to operate in some sort of tension with each other. In any case if either A or B systems try to destroy the other

they will thereby destroy themselves.

What are the texts?

If a reader has not yet worked out that Texts 1-5 are the gospels and the *Acts of the Apostles* they are being told now. Text 1 - *Recognise Law and Order* is the gospel of Mark, Text 2 called *Internalise the Law* is the gospel of Matthew, Text 3 - *Give Direction to Order* is the gospel of Luke who also wrote Text 4, the *Acts of the Apostles.* In this discussion this book has been called *Launch the Society*. Finally Text 5 - *Pass on the Power of One* is the gospel of John.

People may say. "The gospels don't interest me. I'm not a Christian." They may not be a Christian. But they cannot escape the factors of time and place which the gospels explore As material beings time and place is all anyone has whether they believe in God or not! Christianity is not something to be forced upon people. But it does look at questions that are crucially relevant to all. Those who avoid the search that it undertakes miss out on something that is ultimately very much their business.

An assumption is made in the *Reality Search* discussions that many people know very little about the gospels, that is, Texts 1-5. Fewer still have had the opportunity to consider the texts as a whole such as in a single or two or three sittings Allowance is made for their position.

Chapter Two

How Were the Gospels Written?

The Gospel of Mark

The chapter and verse divisions now found in the bible were added after the texts were written and first used. At the same time, the way the original Sections were divided up may have presented a problem for the early Christians. The community of Mark's gospel for instance, was under heavy persecution. The Emperor Nero wanted to re-build parts of Rome. So he set fire to Rome and blamed the Christians. As this tiny group was not popular anyway, he then proceeded to burn these people at the stake. There were many defections taking place and the community was on the defensive. Mark was not in a position to advertise that the Section divisions of his text provided a critique of the society in which his community was trying to live.

Amongst scholars it is generally agreed that the first gospel written was that of Mark. It was later that Matthew and Luke based much of their material on his text. They also developed these gospels according to their own theological/philosophical interests. They also share material not to be found in Mark . This has been called the Q source which mainly consists of sayings). Mark's gospel is written in a Greek style which is rather rough and simple. As such it is a beginner's' text for an

attempt at translation. It was probably not the first language of the writer and was itself a translation. The text has a style that is both short and graphic, for example if people sit on the grass Mark notes that the grass is green.

It is demonstrated in *Reality Search* that three of the four paragraph Sections in the first gospel are written in a concentric circle pattern. That is, the paragraphs are written in terms of a 'pair' and these form a pattern of A B C D C B A. etc.

Mark's Section C on "the child" has a different format.

Section A here appears to be about a society that is based upon law. Section B is about a society based upon place. Section C is about the "child" that passes between the two types of societies. Section D is also in a concentric circle. It is about the struggle of the individual to cope in their social environment. There is an additional, short passage at the end of this gospel. However as older manuscripts leave this out it is not included in *Reality Search*.

Technically how may a gospel writer have put his text together? It is possible the writer was working on tables a couple of metres long. The writer and possibly helpers could have put the text together like a mosaic, matching this or that piece of papyrus together to make a point and gathering similar points together into the one Section. The one Section of the gospel could form the one writing scroll.

At the present time, if one of the five texts is typed on to A4 sheets, a Section according to the analysis of *Reality Search* extends about the length of an 8 person table. The reading of a Section can be comfortably stretched over a one or two hours. In the C1st, people did manual work in groups - like for example St Paul who made tents with his friends. In such a situation, one person could read out a scroll of Scripture to his or her co-workers. A Section of the text consists of about 16 paragraphs. In a situation of people quietly working at a task this would form a comfortable amount of background reading.

As stated the writer of Mark's gospel was likely to be at personal risk. It is not surprising therefore that his paragraph headings are embedded into the text. Another reason for using this literary technique would be to prevent omission and corruption of the underlying structure of the material by a copyist. If the gospel material was divided up under headings which were separate from the stories themselves it would be quite easy for copyists to leave out a heading here and there, especially given the conditions they were working under. An extra reason for Mark and others to "bury" headings into the text is that as well as being in conflict with people outside the Christian community, leaders were faced with heresies amongst people in their own ranks. An example here that of Gnosticism Gnostics made claims about having esoteric knowledge and they tended to despise material things.   Some of the apocrypha (or extra) gospels, which have been omitted from the church canon, also reflect twists on the

Christian message.

In terms of the construction of a gospel, if a paragraph "hook" is embedded into the beginning or middle of a sentence it is necessary that it stay there for the sentence and its paragraph to make sense Given that is a key word in its paragraph this makes it more difficult to omit it for any reason. Also if the underlying line of logic or critique of a text is beneath its surface it would be less likely to be tampered with, namely by those that it is criticising. Given all the problems in and around the early Church it is extraordinary that the texts managed to survive as they did.

There is another question that people may wonder about as they read the stories here. Jesus is going from place to place. It may appear that the sequence of places Jesus visited or things that he did and said have been changed by the gospel writers. Would historical accuracy be sacrificed here? Gospel readers have long since been aware that there are a lot of differences in detail between the gospel stories. It is obvious that writers have exercised a degree of literary licence. Jesus himself used this technique given that much of his teaching is in parables - "There was once a steward" etc. This does not mean that historically speaking he actually knew of such a steward or king or woman etc. The writers of the gospels made adjustments so the stories could be presented to provide a theological point true to the teaching of Jesus. The stories are presented in a framework that shows the basis from which he

spoke.

On the other hand even though the writers adjusted details, they could have recorded historical facts in their texts that they intended to pass on. But readers and tradition over the centuries thought these were contradictory and so glossed them over. An example here is that of the "beloved disciple" of Jesus. John, the gospel writer says this disciple is Lazarus, the man who was raised from the dead. He tells how people at the tomb of Lazarus saw Jesus weeping about the death of Lazarus. They acknowledge the bond that has existed between the two and they say "See how he loved him." But tradition presents the 'beloved disciple' of Jesus as the Apostle John. In making such a switch, tradition may have overlooked some of the historical dimensions of Jesus and some of the theology that the gospel writers wanted to hand on.

Matthew and Luke

As stated, Matthew and Luke copied and adjusted much of Mark's gospel. Matthew for instance adds in phrases to Mark's text to show a developing family type of relationship both between Jesus and his disciples and amongst the disciples themselves. Luke has his own emphases e.g. on the underlying direction in which people were travelling. He also has themes of meals and other exercises that help to develop a sense of urban community.

John and multiple levels of meaning.

John's gospel is quite different from the first three which are called the "synoptics" because of their similarities. It is believed that the gospel of John was written considerably later than the first three gospels, around or after the turn of the C1st. It appears John is writing on a number of levels in a more complex way. He selects out particular people, especially women, and develops a story of considerable length and significance about them. He would have been aware that he did not need to include many of other details of Jesus' life because the other gospels had already done this. Rather he appears to focus on what is especially significant. He explores at depth the question about who Jesus actually is. At the same time, as with the other gospels, the design of John's gospel has similarities to a mosaic. A scholar can for example work out a generally acceptable structure for this gospel. But another and different kind of framework can also be found there. In an attempt to work out levels of meaning one is reminded of the eye teasers above a dentist's chair etc. In the case of the gospels each such pattern can serve a particular purpose.

Time/Place Structures

Was an interest in multiple frameworks common at the time the gospels were written? Computer and other imaging can now show how ancient monuments like the pyramids etc were designed with highly sophisticated mathematics. Levels of meaning were 'layered' into a

building to bring out its spiritual significance, especially in relation to the union between time and place. In South America for instance features formerly thought to be natural have been demonstrated by computer imaging to be the remains of a temple designed to catch the first light of Spring etc. Thus for this ancient people and for a few moments each year, time and place would be united. Obviously the connection was important to these people since they went to so much trouble to plan and construct these structures.

Gospel writers were aware of design layouts. In urban environments these even extended to street patterns. Such patterns can still be found in the uncovered ruins of Pompeii. It should not be surprising that the writers and their communities would have an interest in setting up of an "inner structure" to the gospels to produce a similar type of effect.

An Overall Structure for the Texts?

The three writers after Mark all appear to know of his text especially Matthew and Luke who wrote soon after him. This means the underlying structure of his work could have constituted an introductory, definitive text for the four texts to follow. Was the general outline of all five texts conceived by a central authority. Then the writers in their own situation had the task of filling out their part of the outline. Was the emerging church, as a central authority organised enough to do this?

The story in *Acts* suggests something on these lines may have happened. James and the elders decide to 'telescope' the practice of law for the sake of Gentile converts. On one hand they thought this would save the situation. But shortly afterwards it seems that Jewish Christians are not happy and arguably it is they who start a riot over Paul in the Temple. *Acts* then gives a lengthy account of a storm while Paul is making his way to Rome. One wonders if the storm account is a literary reflection of a period in the history of the emerging church. It is during this phase that church leadership decides the best way to solve a possible split is to go right back to the basics of what Jesus taught. They would set out what Christianity means in a 'kit' of five major texts?

A tradition that the Apostles were poor, ignorant fishermen may have been true in one sense. But it was not necessarily the whole truth. The later Apostle Paul for instance was a tent maker and continued to make tents while he preached the gospel. But he was far from ignorant. Indeed a monarch of the time recognised him as a renown scholar. He told Paul that he thought that this scholarship had driven him mad.

The analysis of gospels presented in *Reality Search* show that a key theological point and methods of construction within one text are picked up and developed further in the texts to follow. To demonstrate. With Mark as an introduction, Matthew uses Mark's idea about law being based upon authority. He develops the idea further in order to set out a way to

construct a society based upon internalised law. Luke also uses Mark. He takes Mark's idea about the need for a society based upon order to have a sense of direction. Luke then develops the idea to set out a way to construct this sort of society. Both Matthew and Luke also pick up on Mark's stress on the role of the child. They both have an introductor Section on the child. Matthew shows Jesus as growing up in a tribal, a law-based society. Luke shows him emerging from a world society that is largely based upon order.

It appears that when John's gospel was compiled, an effort was made to bring all the theological threads of the three earlier gospels and the *Acts* together. John also continues on with Mark's idea about the individual who tries to operate in terms of their own "power of one". By the time of John's gospel, the emerging church would have had experience of how tensions between two quite different ways of thinking and operating could conflict with each other. John the writer would have had special interest in pointing out that heavy criticism between people with one world view and another, could have negative implications for the whole.

Chapter Three

Reality Search **and its Analysis**

Dividing the text into Sections and Paragraphs

A further word needs to be said about the paragraph construction shown by the analysis of *Reality Search.* In particular there is need for some explanation about the three gospels that apparently use paragraph pairing in their construction. In relation to the latter. When an earlier draft outline of the gospel analysis in *Reality Search* was shown to someone it was thought by the writer of *Reality Search* that the analysis clearly showed that the traditional sequence of chapters and verses had been retained. However when this person saw the analysis she commented on the amount of work that must have been involved going through the gospels to find and match up paragraphs that had so much in common.

Indeed if anyone did any re-arranging of paragraphs it was the original writers!   The analysis of *Reality Search* simply follows the traditional text sequence.

The whole argument of *Reality Search* about an inner structure for the gospels and *Acts* rests on the discipline of sticking to the original sequence of the texts and their original wording. As already pointed out it was in order to demonstrate that this discipline was followed that

the literal translation of the texts has been provided in *Version Five* of *Reality Search.*

When Mark (Text 1) was first analysed it was not known by the writer of *Reality Search* whether an inner structure for this gospel existed there or not. In the initial exploration, locations of Jesus were sketched out as these appeared to be obvious paragraph headings. It was only later that it was realised these locations formed a pattern. When the pattern was being 'fine tuned' it appeared a number of times that there was no pair for this or that paragraph. But invariably, it was not in fact the gospel that had omitted the key, linking word or hook for a paragraph. Rather the over sight was on the part of the analyser. For example at one point it was thought "If there is no mention of the word "sea" within these three lines there is no match to fit the word "sea" in another part of the Section. So there is no circular pattern here. But the word "sea" was in fact there in the text all along. In the initial stages there was not a serious belief that matches or an overall structure for all the paragraphs would be found. An obvious reason for the scepticism was - "Why hadn't somebody else found these - even centuries ago. With all the saints, scholars and geniuses that have studied these texts in depth! They couldn't have all overlooked a basic structure for them." Perhaps one reason for any such oversight could be because they did not have the luxury of being able to juggle texts, paragraphs, frameworks etc around on a computer.

In any case each time a match turned up in the initial

'discovery' of patterns it was a surprise. For example at one time there was no match for the children saying "Hosanna in the highest." So, it was thought, that's that. But then it was found that when the whole text had been copied onto A4 sheets a few of the text's lines had been omitted. These lines had the soldiers saying "Hail, King of the Jews."

As the analysis progressed into the gospels to follow Mark, it was not known if or what key words or "paragraph hooks" might be there so a major Section of paragraphs could be formed. Also, at the time, Section headings were not known. The paragraphs and an obvious point that was being made within them had to be isolated first. Then when the obvious points were collected into a list it would be a matter of figuring out what was common to all. At this stage the significance of the types of key words being used e.g. places, types of verbs or the names of addressees etc. was not realised. Nor was it realised that there was a match between repeated sentences or antiphon/choruses between the different Sections and the general theme of the text at hand. Indeed virtually the whole analysis for all the texts had been sketched out, before it was realised that the whole structure was underpinned by extrapolations on "time" and "place". Thus when an outline of how the analysis was uncovered was written up in a paper called "Links" (late 2002) , it is only in the last part of this paper that there is a discussion of the relevance here of "time" and "place."

Regarding the isolation of paragraphs. While analysing

the paragraphs it was reasoned that if a particular word was indeed a "paragraph hook" and it occurred twice within a set of lines then that would mean two paragraphs were there. But if the lines of text around such a "hook word" could not stand on their own as a distinct paragraph, then the word being suggested as a 'hook' was not a key or paragraph 'hook' at all. Another word would need to be tried.

Also at this time of analysing it was not realised there was a coherance between the Sections of one text and an inter-connection between all the Sections of the text and indeed the all of the other Sections of the other four texts being considered as well.

How then did the analysis proceed? Actually finding the key words of paragraphs and grouping these into Sections did not take long at all. The full, translated text would be typed out within a few of days. Thus finding the Section breaks proceeded fairly quickly. Some Section breaks looked quite transparent, for example the breaks between the 'infancy narratives' and the rest of the text, or the break between the body of the gospel and the last stage towards the crucifixion of Jesus. On the other hand others Sections were more elusive to analyse for example the fourth section of John (*Pass on the Power of One*).

On the other hand what has taken a great deal of time, years in fact, has been the formatting of the analysis. Originally this was done in htm documents for web pages. Each page had to be individually coded for this.

Then there was an adjustment period in changing over to the XP Professional package and the formatting of pdf documents. Then, virtually every time explanatory text (as in this *Version Two* of *Reality Search*) was checked for typing errors, it was re-worked instead.

A reason why the *Reality Search* analysis itself sped along was that this was done 'back to front' from the way the present analysis reads. At the time of doing the analysis there was no awareness that the major lines of argument being presented in the one work would be picked up and logically followed into the next one. Thus trying to comprehend the whole theological and philosophical framework at once, was not a problem. At that stage the whole analysis did not exist. On the other hand for people looking at the completed analysis as a whole there can be difficulty. There has been a sense of dismay on the part of the writer of *Reality Search* that people who have seen its whole outline at once should be so confused.

Possible Workshop Presentation

Arguably it would be possible and might be easier for readers to understand the *Reality Search* framework if there were a text or CD or DVD presentation which followed through the original, step-by-step compilation of the analysis. This could start with the texts written in their traditional format of Chapters and Verses- even in a 'scroll like' layout. Then a process could be followed of breaking up the traditional format into major Sections, then finding the key paragraph words etc.

The paragraphs, whether on their own or in pairs could be given headings, then grouped up under a Section heading and linked in with other Sections. Then some of the implications of the material could be considered. This sort of process would enable workshop participants to "discover" the underlying structure for themselves - with for example one group uncovering one Section and another uncovering another Section etc. If people have trouble understanding the whole framework at once they may prefer to consider just one part of it.

References

In terms of the original process of devising the *Reality Search* analysis, having a background in Biblical Studies, with three degrees specialising in this from three tertiary institutions, would have assisted the process. There was also an awareness of the dearth of academic references available for this kind of analysis. For example in the process of doing an M Theology degree by course work, an attempt was made to find references relating to a "Water Circle." The *Reality Search* writer had uncovered in the gospel of John (now shown at the end of this gospel.) One of the few comments to be found on the significance of the central verses of this "circle" made the following point. 'The "I Am" statement in these verses is so unimportant that it should be separated out from the other "I Am" statements of Jesus and ignored.' This sort of comment was less than helpful! In any case the analysis of John's Gospel made by Prof Frank Moloney SDB has been

generally accepted   to cover the structure of John's gospel. Around 2001 there was minimal discussion of alternatives.

On the other hand when the overall structure of the gospels as presented in *Reality Search*   was being explored, there was an awareness of new interest amongst scholars in the final compilation of the gospels as we now have them. There has been new focus on the theology that the various biblical writers are presenting. A subject on "Interpretations of Scripture" (Dr Terry Curtin A.C.U.) showed how the official Catholic Church is now using a range of subject disciplines in the interpretation of Scripture . A basic document on this subject was written by Cardinal Ratzinger, the present Pope. His document promotes approaches that extend beyond the historical-critical method of Scripture research which dominated biblical interpretation in the late C20th.

When the writer of *Reality Search* was doing three degrees there did not appear to be much study of the philosophical environment from which the gospel emerged. There was one article however, written by a Jew, that claimed the historical Jesus had in fact remained a Jew. It was Paul who was the first Christian because it was he who introduced the views of Greek philosophy into what Jesus had taught. The view of this article was not accepted by the writer of *Reality Search.* However a question was raised. To what extent was Christianity tuned into the philosophy of the Greeks?

Chapter Four

The Loss of a Structure

Reality Search makes the claim that five ancient texts, the Gospels and *Acts of the Apostles,* have an overall construction. It would therefore be logical for *Version Two - Value Frameworks* to immediately demonstrate how such a structure is set into the frameworks of these books. However as *Reality Search* presents something new, readers are likely to approach such a demonstration with scepticism.

A pause is therefore needed to consider how such a "structure" could be lost in the first place.

Leadership Influence

These texts were written gradually over a number of decades. So how could a coherence in logic, already demonstrated in *Version One*, be designed and executed? In the *Acts of the Apostles* (Text 4 or *Launch the Society*) the leaders of the emerging church gathered at critical junctures to make decisions about policies and courses of action. In such a setting one could assume they also met and made decisions about how some "official" accounts of the life of Jesus should be designed and written up. As the leadership was geared to replace anyone who dropped out e.g.

James was killed by Herod killed fairly early, the group could continue on with its intention. At the same time this leadership could also make shifts. Later leaders, over decades and centuries, could opt to drop off an emphasis on structure that their predecessors had designed. This "dropping of emphasis" would be intertwined with historical factors as well. It would be impossible to draw up a full list of reasons as to why an overall structure for the gospels could be lost but general knowledge allows a number of factors to suggest themselves.

Loss of Jewish and Gentile Divisions

- In John's gospel at the turn of the C1st he tries to bring Jewish and Gentile factions together. Church leadership could later assume that this effort had succeeded. The two factions no longer appeared so obvious.
- With the destruction of the Temple and Jerusalem, Judaism dispersed. It continued around the synagogue and study of the Torah (the first five books of the bible). But interaction between emerging Christian communities and Jewish communities was reduced. Certainly Christians were not publicly converting Jews in the synagogues in the way that Paul was doing in the first part of *Acts.* Christianity was no longer seen as a 'sect' of Judaism.
- By the C4th with the Emperor Constantine (d. 337) Christianity became the established

religion of the Roman Empire. So the distinction between Christians and "Gentiles" was diminished. Everyone was supposed to be Christian.

- Also, according to tradition, as early as the apostle Thomas, Christianity was taken beyond the Empire to India. By the C5th it was spreading to places like Ireland where people had an established, wholistic cosmology. The Irish knew nothing of societies of Jews or for that matter Greeks. Nor did the missioners they produced. These Christianity further afield again.

Against this kind of setting it is likely that the Church leaders considered the church to be more like a "melting pot" than a "mosaic" of two societies (one based upon time/law and the other upon place/order). Nor would they be thinking in terms of a dialectical tension between the two. Indeed it is likely they would want to "play down" separations rather than draw attention to them.

Loss of an Emphasis on Structure

One could run through a list of more factors at play.

1.   In the first centuries of persecutions, Christians would be unwilling to highlight the gospels as a critique of their Gentile persecutors.

2.   The use of books rather than manuscripts

meant Gospel sections were merged together rather than being separated out into possible section-scrolls.

3.   The placement of Matthew (c/f Text 2) in the New Testament book as being the first gospel, would highlight the "authority" factor of a society (and Church) based upon law. But introduction to the overall structure of the gospels is to be found in the first Gospel of Mark (Text 1)! It was to be many centuries before scholars considered Mark was the first gospel and some may still question this.

4.   There was an early introduction of Chapters and verses as being the basic gospel structure. This system of 'labelling' fragmented the texts into single sentences or less.

5.   The Greek-written gospels were translated into Latin by St Jerome. The Latin Vulgate was adopted as the official text of the Catholic Church. The use of Latin was a way of controlling gospel interpretations and the ever-present introduction of heresies. Catholic Church reliance on the Vulgate continued until the Vatican II Council in the 1960's. Insofar as Jerome had omitted or changed paragraph "hooks" in the original text a paragraphing structure would have then been overlooked in the centuries to follow.   In Matthew for instance some of the 'hooks' are particular types of verbs. It would be easy for a translation to change these. One positive aspect of Jerome's Vulgate has been that the largely unused Greek texts were less likely to be miscopied for example by scribes over the

Middle Ages.

6.   The liturgical year of the church allows a regular church goer to move through the gospel texts in stages. However Church services do not provide for listening to the gospels as a whole. In three minute stop/start readings of the Scripture, it is unlikely questions about gospel structures are likely to be raised.

7.   Over the centuries there has been a popular dislike of Jews and an abhorrence of 'paganism' (insofar as there has been contact with either group). It has therefore been unlikely that the official church would highlight the fact that the gospels portray the formation of a 'hybrid' of these two mind sets. In any case, in later centuries, beyond the Roman Empire, the word 'pagan' did not necessarily mean a reliance on Greek philosophy as it did at the time of Jesus and amongst the early Christians.

8.   *Reality Search* shows how an underlying framework could provide some guidance as to how the details of a text could be interpreted. However over the centuries the Church has monitored interpretation of Scripture through its supervision of clergy and written material distributed. Thus, only extensively trained Ministers of the Word have been allowed to preach within church services. Even today 'deviant' interpretations of the Scriptural texts are soon reported to the local Bishop etc. Also, written material to be used for teaching doctrine (c/f catechetics) is supposed

to be submitted to Church authorities for an Imprimator. With a 'magisterium of the church' system of monitoring, an internalised framework of theology in the gospel structures themselves (c/f *Reality Search,*) would tend to be side-lined.

9. As the Church became part of the establishment of the Roman Empire, pre-Christian "pagan" texts were abolished. Hence in subsequent centuries throughout the Empire, the texts of Greek philosophers were destroyed. A result of this was that over the Middle Ages scholars were unable to compare the gospels with Greek philosophy anyway. They were therefore unable to consider any critique at all of philosophers such as Plato and Aristotle.

The virtual end of the Middle Ages was heralded when the crusaders returned home to Europe with copies of the teachings of the ancient Greeks. For the first time people were introduced to identified Greek mathematics, geometry, cosmology, philosophy etc. It could be argued however that they may have been more accustomed to Greek ideas than they realised. In the C13th the scholar and Dominican Aquinas based his *Summa* on the philosophy of Aristotle. Church leaders objected to such a link with 'paganism'. However Aquinas demonstrated to them that the great St Augustine - a pillar of the medieval church, had in fact obtained his key ideas from Plato. The Church leadership had not realised this! As it turned out in the centuries to follow, the Augustinian monk Martin Luther set in train the Protestant Reformation. The

Church then came to rely on the teachings of Aquinas for its basic philosophical position. Ironically enough it would seem that a philosophical crisis similar to that which faced Plato and Aristotle in C5th BC, was to be played out again amongst Protestants and Catholics in the centuries to follow the Reformation. The champion Martin Luther (c/f Plato) was challenged by the champion Aquinas (c/f Aristotle)

Loss of a Cosmology

Possibly the biggest loss to Christianity in the loss of its original gospel structure was the loss of the gospel's cosmology. With the gradual establishment of the Holy Roman Empire it was assumed that Christianity had put paganism behind it. But arguably, the Church's cosmology had became largely absorbed into that of the Roman Empire, that is, the Greek or Gentile philosophy. A totalitarian tendency could ensure this.

It has been pointed out in *Version One* of *Reality Search* that Greek philosophy attempted to establish a society based upon place (c/f the city state). On considering the cosmology of the Church over the centuries it would appear that the Church's cosmology has also had a focus upon place. The Greek cosmologist Ptolemy had a 'dome' paradigm for his cosmology. In a similar way, in traditional church imagery there has been the imagery of heaven above, hell beneath and people between them. With such a 'dome' cosmology one could say that if the Church were only a product of Greek philosophy this is "Fair

enough!" But the Church is supposed to be based upon the gospels. These continue a Jewish as well as a Greek view of the world. So what about the gospel's sense of time?

Consider. The opening words of the Bible are "In the beginning." and then the creation story unfolds. In terms of the "Big Bang" cosmology, the original writer or poet in the bible got the creation story extraordinarily right. Creation began with "Let there be light," like the burst of light photons in the Big Bang. With his opening the Genesis poet sets out the major framework for Judaism cosmology. He bases this firmly upon the sense of time. Individual rabbis may have thought and taught otherwise. But the Torah presents the official position.

In contrast to Genesis, Christian tradition has tended to telescope the story of creation into seven working days, and, it seems each of these days consisted of twenty-four hours! So naively has such an interpretation of "day" been accepted, that the claim has been made that this "working week" was about 4,000 BC. How so? This date was obtained by adding up the various mentions of time in the Old Testament of the Bible. How widely was the date accepted? An illustration comes to mind here. In the 1960's there was a Catholic Monsignor who used to teach the Diocesan catechism to a Grade Four class on Wednesday morning The lesson would start with the question. "When was the world created?" With one voice the answer was. "4,000 BC". This question and

answer did not fit well with biblical studies already available at the time (let alone science). But decades later, a popular 'static' cosmology is still around.

In a popular mind-set, at the other end of earth's 'time span', there is the Day of Judgement. At the level of the individual, the Day of Judgement is at the time of death. This consists of a reckoning of the person's good and bad deeds during their lifetime. In its most 'mathematical' form this debit and credit system is expressed in the system of indulgences.

Logically, it has to be conceded that the good and bad point system does make a lot of sense. It provides a forum of accountability. However where is the sense of a connection with time and personal growth here (as for example to be found in some extent in the Hindu understanding of dharma)? Did Protestants have a solution here? Their predestination approach meant a person was already saved or lost no matter what they did. There are corporate ramifications to this approach. A whole country can consider itself 'saved' and therefore justified when it permanently poisons an environment to suit its cause.

There needs to be some sort of adjustment, an adjustment to embrace all of creation.

Merging of time and place societies

To re-focus on the subject at hand about a lost cosmology. When Jesus and the gospel writers were

describing both the possibilities and limitations of societies based upon time and place, they had specific, historical communities of people to deal with. But even then, there was some overlap between these two groups. King Herod for example was supposed to be a king of the Jews but he set up a court and lifestyle that was based upon that of the Romans. On the other hand some Gentiles apparently prayed in conjunction with the local synagogues of the Jews.

Even so, there were also clear distinctions between the two groups. These were so clear that the Romans apparently attempted to wipe out Judaism with its siege of Jerusalem around 70 AD. They certainly finished off its elaborate system of Temple worship.

As noted, the Jew/Gentile distinctions tended to fade in centuries to follow the writing of the gospels. Jews remained cut off to a large extent in their ghettoes. Even today they try to live within walking distance of their synagogue. Pagans on the other hand, were absorbed into Christianity and to some extent, vice versa. To illustrate the vice versa. The vast majority of Irish people claim to be Catholic But an Australian who combed their pubs still claims he could not find a single Irish drinker who would deny the existence of Ireland's "little people."

Rediscovery of Time and Place Societies

Now, in the C21st, the question needs to be raised. Did the "types" of law and order societies described in

the gospels actually continue? Consider three general type of 'clash' which to some extent answer this.

(i)   Catholics V Protestants

A few points are noted. Within Catholic circles there is general emphasis on the law and authority of both church and family. Catholic 'life' is centered around the observance of time within the liturgical calendar. At the same time, Protestantism started soon after the re-discovery of the philosophy of the Greeks. The ecclesiology or church structure of Protestantism is based upon democratic structures and it has helped the development of modern democracy (c/f the Greek city state with its constitutions etc). Protestantism supported the growth of capitalism in the West. The first universally recognised sociologist Weber, shows the connection between capitalism and Protestantism. How so? Classic Protestantism claims that the individual is either 'saved' or not 'saved'. So people worked hard to show that "they were indeed saved."

(ii)   Democracy V Communism

The C20th was dominated by the tyrannies of communism and Nazism. In such cases idealism was taken to excess. Yet a detailed study of, for example the *Communist Manifesto* shows a striking parallel between communism and the basic position of the Plato as set out in his *Republic*   At the same time constitutions of democracies have parallels in principle with those collected by Aristotle. Both Plato

and Aristotle show the two sides of the Greek philosophy "coin". They both appear to be at either end of the same spectrum.

(iii)   Islam and the West

While Judaic society is largely hidden from the general public (in Australia at any rate), Islam is showing itself to the West more and more. Islam was originally based upon Judaism. It is a society based upon religious law. Like Judaism it has a focus on time - for example there are five prayer times during the day. There is an obvious dilemma within Islam today. It cannot escape from the technology of the West. But how can it live with the West and the ideas that it is based upon?

Christianity by contrast is not only based upon the sense of time and law. It also incorporates the sense of 'order'. Christianity (especially its Protestant arm) supports the democratic structures on which Western governments are based. At the same time however Christianity has a critique within it to help it restrain a tendency towards excess.

An Effect of Mass Media

Every day, most people are invited to consider some sort of society in their TV viewing. Because of the range of this viewing they are given wide scope to compare one society with another and analyse strengths and weaknesses here . One can daily witness

"types" of the two societies (law-based) or (order-based) that are to be found in the gospel. The interactions between the two as reflected in the media also parallel the social interactions to be found in the gospels and *Acts.* In today's environment of instant news. it is easier to realise that "the Jews" and the "Gentiles" of the gospels were not 'absorbed' into each other within the Christian church at all. Rather they continue on. And so do the issues within themselves and between each other.

They exist within the right and left factions in politics. They live on in the long-term ties of family as against temporary ties that are based on neighbourhood and work place. They live on in the rights of ownership within private enterprise and the differing levels of bureaucracy. These two social types "live on" within the individual themselves as they juggle the needs of family and the demands of the paid workforce. Emphases shift over a lifetime. There is the idealism of youth and the wisdom of old age. Yet even within the individual the two viewpoints form a 'mosaic' rather than a 'melting pot'.

To illustrate some of the conflict. Individuals have three major natural law needs, that is, a healthy life, a personal support structure and security into the future (c/f commandments 5,6 and 7). Yet present things like obesity, divorce rates, debt levels etc. all show that meeting the basic needs of a person is not easy.