

God Gives Us the Fruit of Praise Offered Up to Him Alone, An Epidictic Comment

Dr. Mike McDuffee,
Professor of History & Historical Theology,
Moody Bible Institute, Chicago, Illinois, USA

In the living stream of the Incarnation of the Word there is from thought to word to deed to objections to new words, be it of remorse, of thanks or of protest. We are never however left to our own devices to fend for ourselves. Because your words and mine, your deeds and mine, but most of all your thoughts and my thoughts are all stations of a single process of the speech of events. The devil promises us that thoughts, deeds and words have led up to separate accounts. The promises of the devil always appear so. Because he is in fact the devil; because he renounces the holy Trinity. Believe me dear reader: the devil lies.[1]

Reading is an act of life by which a person exercises his or her identity, which in turn is the living expression of a person's community. As a Christian without further qualities, I read Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy believing we live together in the world that Jesus created. That is the parable of life I live. I have read too much of Rosenstock-Huessy's writings to not think this way without him, however, I admit I have not read enough of his writings to understand his thinking. *Hoc quo que doloribus* – this too is agony, nevertheless...

Opportunities to listen to others offer us clues to our calling unto unity through a dialectic of wonder and doubt. This exchange produces the parable of life we call faith, which marks the dynamic and dangerous moment in which we live. Rosenstock-Huessy confessed Jesus as the maker of the possibility that gives us this moment: "Because he was the first to turn mankind's direction toward unity, Jesus is the center of history." [2] Rosenstock-Huessy goes on to say:

Today people take the unity of human history so much for granted – as if it were simply there, like space – that they are apt to dismiss as baseless exaggeration the notion that any event could be its center. In Christian eyes, however, that Jesus is the center of history is the one statement on which no man after him can go back without plunging his world into utter darkness.[3]

Through the eyes Jesus gives us anything that becomes visible is light. The timing of the present permits us to realize that this unity into which Jesus draws us is one which remains rich with the religious sense of communal identity, orientation, and imagination. To our global ear the belief rings hollow that humankind on its own is building a secular modern house of history, one that adheres rigidly to the secular framework made of scientific findings, market management and political ideologies designed by western architects obsessed by an axiomatic "radical historicist" [4] compulsion for fixing the boundaries of reality and laying down the rules for what is and is not allowed entry into its content. Increasingly, as the twentieth century was drawing to a close, as one scholar put it, "a claustrophobic sense of life in a world without transcendence arguably grew." This tendency to break free from a secular modern choke hold on reality has continued into the twenty-first century. "Today the turn to transcendence and to the transcendentals of truth, goodness, and beauty continues to take many forms." [5] We have not witnessed in world affairs [6] the diminishing of the sacred as an impetus for stirring people's passions or generating political action. Wherever the upholders of secular public order and scientific materialism insist they hold sway alternatives of

transcendence abound. We are finding ourselves entering a postsecular condition, which, according to theologian Graham Ward, is characterized by “the new visibility of religion.”[7] Every day Ward explains, we learn through “massive mediafication” that we are “dealing with a religious situation as well as a political situation.”[8] The postsecular modern condition, religion’s new visibility so-called, both confronts us and summons us in the form of challenge and blessing as part of what Vaclav Havel called our “single planetary civilization to which we all belong.”[9] The post-World War II, at the height of the west’s exporting of secular modernization goods, services and procedures served at the same time as an incubation period for religious affections and affinities to find modern expression. According to Timothy Samuel Shah and Monica Duffy Toft “the period in which economic and political modernization has been most intense – the last 30 to 40 years – has witnessed a jump in religious vitality around the world”[10] Democratization has permitted people worldwide to “challenge the secular constraints imposed by the first generation of modernizing, postindependence leaders”[11] during the period of decolonization after World War II. There is no sign of this religious resurgence diminishing. Based on their observations these scholars conclude: “As a framework for explaining and predicting the course of global politics, secularism is increasingly unsound. God is winning in global politics. And modernization, democratization, and globalization have only made him stronger.”[12] Elsewhere these scholars have stressed that

the representatives of God are in the ascendancy and are playing a central role in defining the dominant problems and patterns of world politics in the unfolding twenty-first century. God’s partisans are back, they are setting the political agenda, and they are not going away. This is what makes the present century “God’s Century.”[13]

If Nietzsche was correct to say all our philosophy is the correction of linguistic usage, then in this moment of heightened religious awareness, engagement and visibility we might consider the public singing of God’s praise as a way of tapping back into the stream of vitality that feeds all speech. In singing God’s praise in public we encounter, confront, expose, rebuke and remind the prevailing secular prejudice that it is in fact powerless, and that the secular state does not oversee the public sphere as adjudicated to no one. Singing God’s praise in public attunes our hearts to the timing of this moment, it will fill us with the joy for doing good. We commend the secular managers of speech for their shrewdness in how they use it. The sons of the secular age are shrewder in dealing with their own generation than many of us who now see the increasing visibility of religion in its global light. The secular use of the languages God has given us confirms that the one true God, who is Holy Trinity in Perfect Divine Unity,[14] is a God of His word, that He gives His word and that as a God of generosity and justice He alone is worthy of receiving from us all praise for His glory.

It is wrong to steal from the dead what they once gave to the God of the living. Therefore, absent any academic compunction and without godly remorse, here and now I steal back what Peter Sloterdijk said Friedrich Nietzsche first stole from God. I commend Peter Sloterdijk for having reported the theft and for identifying the thief. In his speech delivered on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of Friedrich Nietzsche’s death, given in Weimar, Germany, 25 August 2000, Sloterdijk lays out the scene of this crime before exonerating its perpetrator.[15] He teaches us that languages “serve to form communicating group-bodies.” Next he observes, “People possess language so that they can speak of their own merits – and not least of the unsurpassable merit of being able to talk up these merits in their own language.” Sloterdijk is correct, language is more than an effect of the human instinct for sociability or a mere system of correlation between human passions and cultural patterns. Languages make us vessels of music for singing praises. And we have taken it upon

ourselves to use this gift of praise for praising ourselves. We compose melodies by use of meme, metaphor and mimes is to create an aphonic world of meaning dedicated to our own founding and self-celebration. As Sloterdijk puts it, “Languages are instruments of group narcissism, played so as to tune and retune the player; they make their speakers ring in singular tonalities of self-excitation. They are systems of melodies for recognition, which nearly always delineate the whole program as well.” We seek to amplify and expand this world of meaning of our own making for ourselves with all manner of various devices, all to one purpose. “When used in accordance with its constitutive function of primary narcissism, language says one and the same thing over and again: that nothing better could have happened to the speaker than, precisely, to have been who he is, to have been who he is at this place and in this this language, and to bear witness to the merit of his being in his own skin.”[16]

And if we have not been faithful in that which is another’s, who will give us that which is our own? Sloterdijk speaking in the name of Nietzsche is correct; the essence of language is that language per se is an instrument of eulogy. The fire we have stolen is God’s revelation of Himself, His burning love for us, the streams of praise that God alone deserves because He pours them out through us as a libation to His glory. The righteousness of God is God’s love within the Godhead as Lover, Beloved and Love enjoined, enjoyed and inherited as Father, Son and Holy Spirit. To the resentment of the rulers, authorities, cosmic powers over this present darkness and the spiritual forces of evil in the heavenly places, especially the great dragon, that ancient serpent, who is called the devil and Satan, God puts on display the beauty of His love for all to behold by giving His image to another. He loves Adam and Eve, humankind of this world, each of us male and female, whom He created in His own image. He has given us the fullness of faculties and the maximized range of temperament necessary for singing His praises in His sight today; and in His presence for all the ages come. This is the true purpose of song, approximation illuminated by anticipation, with this expectation consummated as ineffable unity. Jesus prayed, “O righteous Father, even though the world does not know you, I know you, and these, whom you have given me know that you have sent me. I made known to them your name, and I will continue to make it known, that the love with which you have loved me may be in them, and I in them (John 17:25-26).” Of this Jesus it is written He has said to God:

“I will declare the wonder of your name to my brothers and sisters. I will sing your praise among all your people.” Psalm 22:22/Hebrews 2:12

Sloterdijk like Nietzsche before him rejects any of this happening in history. Who can blame him? Who can believe any of these things without God’s help? Still, not believing these things gives no one the right to pick God’s pocket to take from it what praise a child of His put in it. So Sloterdijk has no excuse when he insists that speakers introduced prayers and offered praise to God as a practical strategy cloaked in humility in service to the human ego, claiming this became necessary at the time when “cultures reached the level of monarchy”[17]:

Their discretion required them to be humble, to do what was required for the mood of their own royal space. Precisely to the extent that high cultures in times gone by outlawed an orator’s direct expression of egotism, they showed, with the linguistic brio of primary narcissism, ways whereby dutifully manifesting an enthusiasm for the big other, one could place oneself close to the recipient of praise.[18]

To prove his point Sloterdijk digs up the bones of a dead monk named Ohtfrid von Weißenburg, who wrote a synopsis and commentary of the four Gospels as the first rhymed poem in the German language, sometime in the second half of the ninth century. Sloterdijk presents this lowly priest as an author who writes as if he is the aggressive alter-ego to Cervantes' Don Quixote. According to Sloterdijk, Ohtfrid took up writing in the same way a Frankish knight wields broadsword for his liege lord:

Gospel verse in the German language is presented as an offensive, the aim of which is to establish a politico-religious system of boasting that, by virtue of a catch-up lesson in rhyme and rhythm, plugs into the art of the politically possible. The point thus being that, in future, in the image of the Gloria Francorum, the effective link would no longer be missing between the veneration of God and the poetics of Empire.[19]

If I treated Sloterdijk in the same manner he reads Ohtfrid then I would take his words to mean he has persuaded himself to be a Christian. Ohtfrid said to his bishop that he wrote part of the Gospels in German for fellow Germans, “so that a small amount of the reading of this song might cancel out the play of worldly voices and, occupied with the sweetness of the Gospels in their own language, they would be able to forego the sound of useless things.”[20] Ohtfrid explained that he presents the Gospels in five books instead of four, “because their fourfold evenness glorifies the oddness of our five senses and turn the superfluous things in us, not only of actions but also of thoughts, toward the exaltation of heavenly things.” His is a beautiful vision of seeing everything with eyes that behold the transparent nature of all things, transforming the perception of creation unto disclosure of the fuller beauty of the Creator and Author of the Gospels. Ohtfrid believes this transformation comes to body, mind and heart by remembering Christ, His virgin birth, His life, miracles and ministry, His death on the cross for our sins, His burial, and His resurrection from the dead according to the Scriptures, His ascension into heaven, seating at the right hand of God and the Day of Judgment. Reading the Gospel in the language spoken in the place of one's birth in this fallen world illumines the eyes of the heart of those born again of the Spirit to see all things in the light of the glory of Christ. The old has passed away; behold, the new has come:

Whatever sins we commit by sight, by smell, by touch, by taste or by hearing, we purge that depravity in the memory of that reading: let useless sight be obscured, illuminated by the Gospel words; let evil hearing not be harmful to our hearts; let smell and taste restrict themselves from depravity and join in the sweetness of Christ, and let the innermost parts of the heart ever be touched by the memory of these readings written in German.[21]

Ohtfrid went on to say,

It is a fitting however, that in whatever way, be it in corrupt or in language of perfect grammar, that mankind praise the Author of all things, Who gave them the instrument of the tongue to sound the word of His praise among themselves, Who seeks in us not the worship of polished words but the pious mood of thought, the piling up of works in pious labor, not useless lip-service.[22]

God gave Ohtfrid a lovely vision of sanctification for purging his fellow German readers from the power of sin and the repression of guilt so they may worship their Lord and Savior with wonder and reverence. It is theft to exploit this vision by reducing its scope. Peter Sloterdijk bears false witness against Ohtfrid, making him a servant of two masters when really he only served One. Ohtfrid

serves his Lord through obedient action in the evangelical freedom His Lord has given him. The music of Christendom through the centuries sings His praises as a story with a future without end: exposition, development and recapitulation, again and again, *inclusio, inclusio*, in one language after another, never the same, constantly breaking the language barriers of blood and birth, and looping back to exchange and encounter and cross pollinate afresh, never the same blessing, through Jesus the center of history continually offering up a sacrifice of praise to God, that is, the fruit of lips that acknowledge his name. (Hebrews 13:15)

This story of deliverance invites everyone to experience what it means to free our emotions, our imagination, our speech, to race ahead in life with an enlivened effervescent sense of exploration and discovery that never leaves us, revealing to us that the good news is something the like of which has never existed before, it is lively and merry, *Allegro*, it is deliberate and reflective, *Andante*, and it is giddy, final and fugal, *Gigue*, guaranteeing we forget nothing without repeating ourselves, always creatively given to continue singing His praises still fresh and yet unused. Lifting our spirit into this swirl of music gives us ears to hear Ohtfrid's prayer recorded centuries ago, made available to us through the hard work preserving such praise through translation. What a gift! What a sacrifice! What love! The work done by generations of scholars allows us to be blessed by this medieval monk's gratitude for the multilingual celebration of divine worship:

You alone are the Master of all the languages that exist. Your power has conferred language to all and they have come – O salvation! – to form words in their languages to recall Your memory for always, to praise You for eternity, recognize You and serve You.[23]

Rosenstock-Huessy realized that reading, pondering, translating and seeking to actualize the Biblical order of life fueled western Christendom's cultural work that resulted in the building of modern societies. About translating the Bible as an engine of cultural change he wrote that "this restoration by common terms of thought was the pride and rallying cry of every total revolution in Europe and America. So definitely is the revolutionary process of the last thousand years bound up with the unification of thought by the common possession of the Bible that every revolution [beginning with the Gregorian one of the eleventh century] passionately claimed a special section of Biblical history as the classical text for its own drama." [24]

Rather than acknowledge this vision, a grand vision that continues to expand, [25] and one that freely offers every redeemable soul a precious role in its multilingual epic of glory, Sloterdijk prefers to see it through Nietzsche's myopic eyes, as no more than a way station onto a point of arrival of *his* preference. At *his* end station for speech each of us devotes the language given us to decorate the interior of our own soul according to our own taste for the purpose of becoming our own "self-designed" individual. Smitten with his own destructive style of practicing self-devotion, Nietzsche calls us to consume the gift of life as we make it a product of our own making by contriving our desired self. Sloterdijk praises Nietzsche for pronouncing himself the prophet, the apostle and bearer of this different and last gospel (not that there is another one). He commemorates Nietzsche for celebrating himself for being the first to turn language into a tool of self-design, for celebrating the individual's own glory. He lauds Nietzsche for pioneering the era of human speech which now engulfs us in the secular soaked west. Unless otherwise distracted by the irrelevant, all talk should be autobiographical for promoting one's own glory. God help us! and He does. Sloterdijk's Nietzsche has us all chattering away from one another, marketing ourselves through one social medium after another, eternal recurrence endured as the drudgery of networking a never-ending series of

selfies. Each redeemable soul so disposed is indentured to a Mercurial Me – the mini-me – without cure or end; absent conviction, without even the dignity of rebuke or condemnation. Eulogizing Nietzsche as its “designer and prophet,” Sloterdijk acknowledges that this autoplastic individual stands for anything, “it constantly forges changing alliances with all that has made up the modern world.”[26] Such a person voices the secular postmodern person who replaces praise for God with the perpetual drivel of praising oneself.

As if the times were not perilous enough, Sloterdijk’s Nietzsche inducts us all into his model of hell, grooming us to be more eager in becoming lovers of self, lovers of money, proud, arrogant, abusive, disobedient to our parents, ungrateful, unholy, heartless, unappeasable, slanderous, without self-control, brutal, not loving good, treacherous, reckless, swollen with conceit, lovers of pleasure rather than lovers of God, pretending to have the appearance of godliness but denying its power. (2 Timothy 3:1-5) Doing so however exposes the irony of using language at second hand. Why have anything translated at all? Why not blurt and blow as the indigenous urge arouses? Germans[27] more than any other people on the planet want works written in other languages to be translated into their own and have the resources to get this done. Do the many faces of Christ receive any honor or praise for this? Does Weißenburg receive honor for this? Or Martin Luther? The Magus in the North? Or that holy fool, Lenz, or the youthful literary genius and revolutionist Büchner? No. Why should I read Sloterdijk’s speech originally delivered in German about turning God’s praise into grist for Nietzsche’s mill originally written in German? Why should I listen to him tell me in translated English that “all languages formed by metaphysics gravitate around a misological core,” that “morality is the universalism of vengeance,” that in “metaphysical-religious discourse, contemptuousness [for reality] becomes an insidiously twisted self-praising force”[28]? I take all these things from the stream of speech, the very consciousness of life by which I live and move and have my being in God. I listen to them back to the gospel, the great gate behind which Jesus closed the ancient world, permitting only His future to pass through into our lives, which alone gives living meaning to anything we understand. I read Sloterdijk, and Nietzsche, as I hear them within the world of meaning which Jesus has provided through the generations of praise that assembled men and women, families and communities have offered up to God for centuries.

If language really did serve Nietzsche’s revenge, if his reversal of God’s great reversal could turn back to poison what God made for us and for our salvation to be taken as medicine for our cure, then our faith is futile and we are still in our sins. This could only result in our consuming – devouring – one another. Nietzsche’s way of speaking teaches me to throw away as trash everything anyone else might say to me, or it advises I steal it to be quickly recycled as fodder for my next eulogy I am putting together to deliver in honor of myself. I would imitate Nietzsche’s disciple Sloterdijk, agreeing with him that the adoration of divine beauty as the incentive for truly seeing all things in this world as a way of creating beauty for others to enjoy where it could not be seen before is in fact a crass transaction, so that poetry, prayer and song make “the languages of humanity as a whole” as nothing more than a “media of God’s narcissism.” Sloterdijk as Nietzsche’s disciple, is convinced the God of the Bible, the Lord of the gospels, can no longer change water into wine. Jesus Christ in whom the fullness of deity dwells in bodily form is a dead matter to culture and art. He is spent, worthless, like salt without taste, of no use for the soil of life or for its manure pile. The center cannot hold, and the visibility of religion in the world today is not light. The secular self and its secular modern culture condemns Jesus again, as if he could be cut off from us and cast away. But if this is the case how will anyone be salted with fire?

Sloterdijk tells us, “Nietzsche’s evangelism thus means: know oneself; take a stand against the millenarian-old forces of reversal, against everything that has been called Gospel to date.[29]” I can no more know myself on my own than I can forgive myself. To be who I need to be I need another to speak to me. I need someone to speak *for* me. How beautiful are the feet of those who preach the good news, especially in my troubled mother’s tongue! As much as I need Sloterdijk to understand his Nietzsche, even more I need Christ to understand His God, because no one has ever seen God; the only begotten One who is God, who became flesh and dwelt among us, who is at the Father’s side in the bosom of the Father, He has told us about Him, He has declared and explained Him, He has made Him known. He has received honor and glory from God the Father, whose glorious, majestic voice called down from heaven, “This is My beloved Son, with whom I am well pleased, listen to Him — give Him constant heed.” (John 1:14, 18; Luke 9:35)

The nations need Jesus Christ in heaven and His life in His church in the history He makes until He returns to rebuild the ruins and restores what remains. Nietzsche, Sloterdijk, you and me dear reader, we are all part of this one project, which historically pushes us together to look beyond ourselves. Christ’s is the only cultural project that at the same time makes us investment partners through our speech in the unity He assures us is ours already. The project of Christ demands that we tap into our creative reservoirs of linguistic exchange while protecting our assets accrued through generations of cultivating groves of spoken treasure in fields of linguistic diversity. The love of Christ compels us to translate the Bible, to search as much for endangered languages as lost souls to save. This project, not incidentally, steadfastly advances the rightful primary use of language. If he had not read the Bible in his troubled mother’s tongue, Nietzsche as an individual could never have had a high enough view of himself as to pronounce himself the last prophet, who proclaims what no one can hear, the dawn of a new humanity happy and powerful, free of resentment and full of self-praise. Indeed, if the Bible were not translated into German he would have been the first to have done so.

In typical boorish and bombastic fashion, well suited for adorning a spoiled child of the west, one nurtured among those who have benefitted the longest from the generations of translating God’s word into the languages of the nations,[30] Sloterdijk hawks a text that sells the pearl of great value to buy whatever he can get. In the eyes of the so conditioned the “stock-standard” gospel is unacceptable. Even as a side effect in the affairs of this world it has lost all power to incite any cultural achievement. It cannot award a person credibility or serve as the warrant for earning a reputation in good standing. It is an embarrassment. But please, take heed Peter Sloterdijk, peek tippy-toe over the west’s window sill. The church stretches far beyond the boundaries of the European Union and lives outside the metropolitan zip codes of America. She grows, she suffers, and she sings in Asia and Africa and throughout all of Latin America.

As Christians whom God has set to sojourn home from the west, there is no better way to remonstrate Sloterdijk’s encomium in Nietzsche’s behalf than to sing God’s praises in public in the languages He has given us. Sloterdijk is wrong. He knows neither the Scriptures nor the power of God. But how can he join us if we do not do the impossible and assemble “outside of church” to sing about these things in public? Where is the public? Whatever place threatens Christians with public ridicule for believing the gospel and thus gives us a fair chance at examining the things concerning Jesus found in the Scriptures is a suitable place to sing God’s praises. In doing so we prepare one another for when fiery trials come upon us to test us, when we are insulted for the name of Christ, when we suffer as Christians, so we might not be ashamed, but glorify God in that

name. We want to sing His praises, so that when He appears we may also rejoice and be glad, so when His glory is revealed we may have confidence and not shrink from Him in shame at His coming. Wherever we assemble, with mind and spirit we come together to pray and sing God's praise so that others like Peter Sloterdijk may be convicted by all and be called to account by all because the secrets of their hearts are disclosed, so they come to realize that God created them too for prayer and to sing praise to their Creator. Might they too worship God and declare with us God is really among us.

Notes:

[1] Eugen Rosenstock-Huussy, *Die Sprache der Ereignisse, 4. Die menschliche Trinität, Nachwort von 1963* (1924, afterword, 1963), pp. 134-135. trans. by mcduffee

[2] Eugen Rosenstock-Huussy, *The Christian Future or the Modern Mind Outrun* (Harper Torchbooks, 1966), p. 67.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Mark Bevir, author of *The Logic of the History of ideas* (Cambridge University Press, 2001), defines radical historicism to include meaning, "Religious perspectives lose all believability, unless religious language is a purely metaphorical way of referring to natural processes without theological meaning." Mark Bevir, "Post-Analytic Historicism," *Journal of the History of Ideas*, vol. 73, n. 4 (October 2012): P. 665. The moment in which we now encounter one another summons religious voices who challenge sanctioning the claim to legitimacy and its warrant for imposing this metaphoric restriction upon language that allegedly, with authority, keeps reality clear of theological meaning.

[5] Glen W. Olson, *The Turn to Transcendence: the Role of Religion in the Twenty-first Century* (The Catholic University of America, 2012), p. 264.

[6] A disproportionately small yet dangerous element within today's revitalized religious environment is of course the Islamist terrorist, who acts as a member of an "extremist wing of a *political religion*." See Niall Ferguson, "Clashing Civilizations or Mad Mullahs: The United States between Informal and Formal Empire," in *The Age of Terror*, ed. by Strobe Talbott and Nayan Chanda (New York, N.Y.: Basic Books, 2001), pp. 113-141. Also, Daniel Benjamin and Steven Simon, *The Age of Sacred Terror* (New York: Random House, 2002).

[7] Ian Warlick, "Post-secularity, Hegel and Friendship: An Interview with Graham Ward," *Radical Orthodoxy: Theology, Philosophy, Politics* vol. 1, numbers 1 & 2 (August 2012), p. 335.

[8] Ibid.

[9] Vaclav Havel, "The Need for Transcendence in the Postmodern World," Speech given at Independence Hall in Philadelphia upon receiving the Philadelphia Liberty Medal on the 4th of July, 1994, read at http://constitutioncenter.org/libertymedal/recipient_1994_speech.html.

[10] Timothy Samuel Shah and Monica Duffy Toft, "Why God is Winning," *Foreign Policy* (August 3, 2010), http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2006/06/09/why_god_is_winning#sthash.U0VK3iKu.dpuf.

[11] Ibid.

[12] Ibid.

[13] Monica Duffy Toft, Daniel Philpott and Timothy Samuel Shah, *God's Century, Resurgent Religion and Global Politics* (New York/London: W.W. Norton & Company, 2011), p. 207. See appendix for their "Ten Rules for Surviving God's Century." See too *Rethinking Religion and World Affairs*, ed. by Timothy Samuel Shah, Alfred Stephan and Monica Duffy Toft (Oxford University Press, 2012), billed as the first comprehensive and authoritative guide to the interconnections of religion and global politics.

[14] “Supreme Trinity and Perfect Unity,” Otfred von Weißenburg, *Letter to Lindbert*, written between 863 and 871, trans. by James Marchland, accessed at <http://wiretap.area.com/Gopher/Library/Classic/Latin/Malin/ohthrid.txt>.

[15] Peter Sloterdijk, *Nietzsche Apostle*, trans. by Steven Corcoran (Cambridge, Mass. and London, England: The MIT Press, 2013). He bleached us from the sea. He found us in the earth. We changed ourselves. Sun burnt and leached out, we make ourselves up to be our own cult. Without taste or worth and near to being cursed. See Peter Sloterdijk, *you must change your life* (Polity, 2013). The trope and template for the speech we speak begins with us getting caught disobeying the one who loves us. We become afraid. We hide, then we blame someone else. Next we become jealous, angry and arrogant. We boast about ourselves calling others to our cause, killing them if they refuse to join — over and over again.

[16] Peter Sloterdijk, *Nietzsche Apostle*, pp. 8-9.

[17] Peter Sloterdijk, *Nietzsche Apostle*, p. 13. Sloterdijk adds that he says this, “having no particular belief in the dogmatic presuppositions of sociological evolution theory.” p. 13. Neither do I. But for interesting reading on the matter see *Religion and Power, Divine Kingship in the Ancient World and Beyond*, ed. by Nicole Brisch (Chicago: The Oriental Institute, 2008, 2012) accessed at <http://oi.uchicago.edu/pdf/ois4.pdf>.

[18] Peter Sloterdijk, *Nietzsche Apostle*, p. 14.

[19] Peter Sloterdijk, *Nietzsche Apostle*, p. 15.

[20] Othfrid’s *Letter to Lindbert*, trans. by James Marchand, accessed at <http://wiretap.area.com/Gopher/Library/Classic/Latin/Malin/ohthrid.txt>. Donald MacKenzie supposed that Othfrid’s reader “was not a layman but a fellow cleric possessed of some Latin, but meager learning, for whom the whole meaning (ad literam, ad allegoriam, ad tropologiam) of the Bible story was to be made clearer,” or as Hermann Fränkel put it in the forward to MacKenzie’s work, “to drive home the import and deeper significance of one Bible verse after another.” Othfrid von Weissenbrug: Narrator or Commentator?: A Comparative Study (Stanford University Press, 1946), pp. 132, 117.

[21] *Othfrid’s Letter to Lindbert*.

[22] *Othfrid’s Letter to Lindbert*

[23] *Othfrid’s Letter to Lindbert*.

[24] *Out of Revolution, Autobiography of Western Man* (Norwich, VT: Argo Books), p. 738.

[25] The United Bible Societies, the world’s largest Christian mission organization reported in its 2012 Scripture Language Report that of the 7,105 languages in the world today the complete Bible has been translated into 484 languages, the New Testament into 1,257 languages, with portions of the Scriptures having been translated into 817 other languages. This means even today in the twenty-first century only thirty-six percent of God’s children can sing Him praises in the language of their home and heart. This too is agony. Nevertheless, the firm foundation of God stands, bearing this seal: “The Lord knows those who are His,” and, “Let everyone who names the name of the Lord depart from iniquity.” Results contained in the UBS 2012 Scripture Language Report accessed at <http://www.unitedbiblesocieties.org/sample-page/bible-translation/>. The Catholic Biblical Federation and the United Bible Societies cooperate in the translation and publication of the Bible. Archbishop Vincenzo Paglia, president of the Catholic Biblical Federation stressed that the Bible remains the most effective “place” where Christians can meet. Catholic Online (10/15/2008), accessed at http://www.catholic.org/international/international_story.php?id=30064.

[26] Peter Sloterdijk, *Nietzsche Apostle*, pp. 66-76.

[27] “‘Top Fifty’ Target Language,” Index Translationum, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Culture Organization, accessed at <http://www.unesco.org/xtrans/bsstatexp.aspx?crit1L=4&nTyp=min&topN=50>.

[28] Peter Sloterdijk, *Nietzsche Apostle*, pp. 34-35.

[29] Peter Sloterdijk, *Nietzsche Apostle*, p. 37.

[30] *Out of Revolution, Autobiography of Western Man* (Norwich, VT: Argo Books), p. 738.