

TA51, Response 8 (to Archambeault, C5)

Postscript to R7

THE ROOT OF APEIRON AND UNEXPERIENCE by Glenn C. Wood 21 August 2002, posted 3 September 2002

A review of C5 reveals little clarity in referring Mr. Archambeault to comments about the significance of aletheia and the connection to the question of the relativity of apeiron to the incarnation. The subjective-objective mode of interpreting aletheia can be used with apeiron as seen below.

To begin clarification, please note Mr. Muller's TA51C1 {15} where he says that "... Apeiron and incarnation -- as it has historically been understood with respect to Jesus Christ <28> -- are mutually exclusive." I guess that explains why Mr. Archambeault doesn't get the connection; there is none -- it seems.

Here Mr. Muller appears to be saying apeiron and the incarnation have no relation. But the importance of " -- as it has historically been understood with respect to Jesus Christ --" should not be overlooked.

Even more historically, for instance, if you, Mr. Archambeault, remember your Bible teaching days and the historical story of Ruth from the Bible's Old Testament, how Naomi's Ruth, from whom Jesus was partly derived (differently from zero derivation and apeiron as currently used), was of a people of another lineage so much so Naomi had to have approval or consensus of a segment of the community to refer to Ruth's son as Naomi's son. Jesus, having a heavenly father as historically believed, and the lineage being more open than in a traditional sense, is consistent with the globalizing ministry of the Biblical Paul.

Mr. Muller's major premise {14} upon close review is not a minor complaint when he says "...[T]he apeiron should in principle be available 'democratically' to all who want to avail themselves of it, and also without deification. And further, there is no question of who comes to whom<24>." Mr. Muller seems to be saying that under existing traditional incarnation concepts, one does not get to the "apeiron" through Jesus Christ (using his combination). That seems to me to be taking a holy bite out of Jesus after he was put down, and a bite out of the holy side of history too. Note: I don't recall anyone saying yet who must come to whom, but it seems it's Mr. Muller who says who whom isn't come to. That now in evidence, it can be said we are asked to come to "it-whatever" -- the apeiron - - and the whom is the personal stuff and self images we take with us in the coming.

(Without appearing to convert Mr. Muller to a traditional -- God forbid -- "Creed" or exclusive concept less than the whole book -- well maybe to invite him to a

nondenominational gathering if one can be found -- it's being suggested here that more serious respect be given to the sacrifice Jesus made and the impact upon those seeing him after the resurrection, and the book revealing it. If Mr. Muller has an eye for deification, what size a peripheral glimpse would be given to the crucified one, the son of man and the son of God, would be beyond the range of my inner eye, except; it seems questionable when he says it makes no difference who comes to whom (as long as it's an interpretation like an atheistic-iconic Buddha?). I wonder though; who were those wise men from the east whom came to who?)

As for apeiron, without giving a more deified or T-Transcendental meaning to it, I think the word comes from a root meaning experience. Adding Alpha to it is like simply saying there's something negatively beyond what's normally thought of as experience, like adding "in" or "un." The only place I know of where it is used in the Bible is in Hebrews, fifth chapter, verse 13, where Paul uses it or a form of it to show that the experienced are compared to the inexperienced with regard to behavior and understanding the gospel message. The inexperienced can get bogged down in what cannot be experienced -- the apeiron -- in a personal way. Here, It seems, we are being admonished to keep distance from the apeiron or what cannot be experienced with the intensity of life like the life Jesus was and we are immersed in. We, it appears, can lose contact with reality, become disorientated, if withdrawn that far from experience.

The word can serve transcendently and mean more -- or even less for that matter and still be transcendently functional -- than the traditional use of it, and that can accommodate a much more open minded interpretation which questions Mr. Muller's comment which suggests the apeiron and the incarnation are mutually exclusive. He seems willing to accept the historical meaning or rather the popularity of apeiron and traditional views of the incarnation. Our different milieus probably shed light on why he does, and I don't ... chose to.