

Religion of the Future: Reclaiming the Subjective Pole by Art and Metaphor

Overview

The claim of this paper is that because organized religion is declining in the western world not only because of the failure of past theological and philosophical systems, but largely due to the successes of science in competing with religious traditions in describing the world, a religion of the future will have to come to terms not only with the place of science in describing the universe, including philosophic assumptions about reality, but how we understand humanity in the universe defined by its creation of values, including religious and spiritual beliefs, which if lacking, would make life hardly worth living. Living in the world is more important than knowledge. Religion as an art form contributes to the expression of such values. Characterizing such values as artistic or metaphoric expressions, avoids conflict with scientific theories and discoveries. Science progresses by building on past discoveries, and is judged by that progress. The greatest artistic expressions, including religious, may have been composed in the distant past. The difference lies in specific understandings of human life and the wider universe. There is a different *modus operandi*. Humans live richly by metaphors, not heartless and value neutral scientific theories.

Both science and religion are responsible for creating conflict between them, religion by denying the legitimacy of a naturalistic non-contradictory scientific approach to the world which tolerates no contradictions or false facts; and science by separating the material world from mind, or subjectivity, which results in depreciating what gives the emotional richness to human life, including spirituality.

Interpretations of quantum physics changed the deterministic nature of the micro world and allowed for freedom and creativity, humanly expressed as the operation of free-will. Restoring mind to the material universe by mutual measuring among subatomic particles changes the traditional idea of material. In addition, the cognitive sciences have argued for the metaphoric nature of all language including scientific language. Thus, a window has been opened to view how metaphors in both the arts and science operate in the real world. Science tended to view the universe metaphorically as a machine, and following, humanity as a part of the universe also as mechanical. Religion retained a belief in an "other" or transcendent aspect of the world, commonly expressed in the Judeo-Christian faith with regard to human kind, as being "in the image of God," or the universalizing metaphor of "Incarnation." Metaphors, in themselves, are neither true nor false; rather their strength is in what they evoke. Although the approach to scientifically associated metaphors differs from that of religion which is artistic, the ingredients were in place to allow for a new understanding of religion, one which is artistic and metaphoric in nature. Humans were co-creators in a creative universe, which increasingly becomes more "wonder-filled" and mysterious with scientific discovery. With the critical demonstration that mind is never eradicated by objectivity, scientific objectivity was nudged, largely through quantum physics, to readmit mind to the universe it investigated.

In science, the universe as machine metaphor is hard to shake off. If we promote this metaphor, the work of science relative to humanity will be algorithms and robotics. The future is up for grabs. Religious or spiritual metaphors play into artistic expressions of what it means to be human, to love, and be creative in art and morality, and to create religions. But science viewing the brain, as it does the universe, from the outside, depreciates mind, consciousness, and a sense of the spiritual, as an attribute of an imperfect machine, the brain. As a machine, human beings are believed capable of improvement by computerization and robotics. Thus the future of human beings does not lie in flesh and blood bodies that relate to each other as artistic bodies, but in algorithms of extreme machines that can reproduce themselves. This view is basically genocidal. It is sometimes called the Technological Singularity, reflecting on the Big Bang as the place where everything begins. Computers and robotics replace humans as the creators of art and values.

The metaphor of man being created in the image of God gifts man as a “co-creator,” thus man co-creates the image of God inclusively; patriarchy is overcome not only by including women, but the whole of what human beings may create and understand themselves to be in a universal environment, including the values of justice, mercy, and grace, not only to each other, but the entire living world.

A religion of the future must concentrate on what matters most to human beings; anything constituting a claim on reality beyond the emotional power that defines these human values must be put aside as of lesser importance. Doctrines that nit-pick particular interpretations of scripture, or that coerce individuals to believe a fixed way, external to the things that matter most to human beings, must be allowed to fade away. Likewise, glorifying science and technology, while valuable, does not qualify for the things that matter most to human beings. Rocket technology is not what human beings value most.

No religion can be considered superior to any other as a starting point; creativity demands a universal matrix in which to grow. Every religion will have to examine its metaphors in a context of diversity of cultures and societies to understand how they differ, and how they may coexist creatively and inclusively. But objectivity is not the primary means of this evaluation; this is an artistic and collaborative effort grounded in the mystery of what it means to be human, and what matters most for human life. In a sense we may refer to Kauffman’s understanding of Kantian Wholes: “the parts exist by and for the good of the whole, and the whole exists by and for the good of the parts.”

Because co-creativity engages a world that is always beyond our intellectual grasp, “crisis” is the catalyst for change; thus metaphors undergo change by “living,” in ever novel environments. This metaphoric modification is universal involving even science. But our interest is religious and spiritual, and specifically involves an “Adventism” of the future. This project will not depend on a more rational and biblical defense of doctrines, but a more artistic and creative approach to metaphors that have shaped the “church” mission and life. Thus, rather than scrapping all religious expressions and beginning with the assumption that a religion of the future may be created rationally with the goal that “one brand fits all,” a religion of the future involves reworking religious traditions and metaphors as they presently exist. Such a project will necessitate a new and hitherto untapped artistic resource in every religion. The question is, can we all improvise, play harmoniously, and jam, with others whose emotional expressions may not be identified with our own? The question of what a society permits morally and ethically

receives answers by the power and resilience of metaphors, not by accessibility to existing disembodied laws external to our human living.

Quotations From Artists About Perceptions of Art

“A work of art should be a revelation. Art that is a revelation explores the territory between the explicable and the inexplicable. The inexplicable is more interesting to me. As with any adventure, the process of painting is full of the potential unknown. Something new is revealed even though it may be linked to what we already know or suspect. The beauty of it is its mystery; the mystery of it is its beauty.” -- Dale Threlkelad

“Art is the lie that enables us to realize the truth.” --Picasso

Loosely quoted from “The Big Interview with Dan Rather,” AXS TV: “Imagination is necessary to make the intangible tangible. There is a sacred music, everything becomes the now, frozen in time. There is a supreme emotion to be experienced; it gives you the chills before you reach for the guitar. You ‘will’ the guitar to do what it wants. Ultimately, the sacred is expressed in relationships. There is a spiritual romance; if it weren’t for that I wouldn’t want to be on the planet. Love is the voice of power and empowerment; by it you express gratitude and commit yourself to integrity.” --Carlos Santana

“Art changes our outlook on life. It may not be experienced overtly in a religious or political belief, but it changes our outlook. If all you are doing is following the rules, you don’t get to the bottom of things.”-- Translation of a marginalized, unorthodox, Turkish Imam, known as The Rock Imam (Link TV).

Question: “Where do your songs come from?” Answer: “I don’t know; I just try to hold on to the pen.” -- Hank Williams

“The experiences of friendship and love,--[unfortunately] comity and hate—cannot in the fullest sense be communicated through art. They can only be lived. Such moments--in life are never forced or premeditated—they spring up within us, sometimes without preparation. . . . In any event the particular form they take is unpredictable. It derives its overwhelming strength partly from this mysterious element of surprise. This comes from the recognition of a truth that always existed, but had never before been so clearly grasped, and whose relevance to one’s personal experience is recognized for the first time. In these respects the deepest experiences of life partly differ from and partly resemble works of art. . . . They resemble art because the artist, in the process of creation, is carried forward in his greatest flights of genius by intuitive and inner experiences—which are as little premeditated as are the greatest moments between two lovers.”—John Nef, “Art, Science, and Life,” *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, Volume 15, 1959, Issue 2, [Science and Art](#).

“As an artist and mathematician, I have spent a lot of time trying to reconcile how I approach each of these two seemingly different things. When approaching a mathematical problem, it is necessary to abide by the process of deductive reasoning and physical laws. On the other hand, when I do painting, these laws do not apply. In that case, it is necessary to allow the creative process to unfold in an

unhindered manner as much as possible. However, these can synergize with one another in unexpected ways.” – Ed Belbruno (www.Agora-Gallery.com/Ed_Belbruno.aspx)

“I am certainly no scientist. My thinking departs from art. Science plays a part in my work since it complements artistic creation. Together art and science can reveal the vicissitude of nature, as David Rothenberg states in his book, *Survival of the Beautiful*. They both engender knowledge. Science can deliver facts and technology with which I can work, but it will never steer or limit me. Art means total freedom, no algorithms but my own.”—Koen Vanmechelen, *Artdependence*, July, 2017).

The Role of Metaphor Engaging Religious or Spiritual Understanding

I have taken the position elsewhere on this website that to ameliorate the alienation of science from religion, science, unless it’s general mind-set changes, must be kept separate from religion by understanding religion as an art form, thus not to be judged as scientific theories are judged among themselves. How does a non-scientist distinguish among undisclosed scientific perspectives that both deny and affirm the role of religion or spiritual expression? In an earlier essay, I first acknowledged the difference between art and science by coming upon the opinion of the subject by Karl Mannheim on the differentiation of science from art; then discovered Noson S. Yanofsky’s discussion of the non-contradictory nature of the universe, but human nature allowing contradiction because of “mind.” With these ideas feeling right and accommodating what I have learned of science and reason, I found additional encouragement for engaging the significance of metaphor for an understanding of life from Stuart Kauffman. I quote from his book, *Humanity in a Creative Universe*, p.27: “Art, unlike science, is not about true and false propositions; it is metaphoric. . . . Metaphor evokes. We live richly by metaphor in all our art.”

Cognitive science adds additional insight on how we come to communicate and act on the presence of metaphors. Metaphors become imbedded in our unconsciousness through actively experiencing the world, and when we act consciously we are initially unaware of the underlying activating influence of the unconscious. Our language develops along with the process of living by our metaphors. We cannot escape them, though we may change or modify them by our will accompanied by the plasticity of our brains. The language of science has traditionally been restricted by empiricism, experiencing and describing only material things. This has important consequences for science and the logic that drives it. As we have noted in the Review of Kauffman’s book, *Humanity in a Creative Universe*, Kauffman rightly claims science progressively “lost its mind,” and with it, interest in the value of subjectivity and emotion in human nature. The universe and the human being essential became machines.

While reason within a scientific context, by its empirical disposition, will attempt entering the darkest parts of our cognitive forest to shine its light on the material base of it, its sight is limited by restrictions of its own view of the nature of “material.” Science and logic cannot tell us anything about the nature of our human emotional life: why we have emotions and have created values, and arts, which have come to so define human life at its core. Being awed by the knowledge that we humans are composed of star dust is only the beginning of our understanding of being human; it is our creation of values that define us, and our understanding of humanity is only complete when the “other,” the “it” becomes a “thou” as

Martin Buber informed us long ago. Without these created values human life is hardly worth living. Having and acting on those values and artistic expressions constitutes a sphere of living in which the empirically imposed limitations of science and logic no longer become problematic for the existence and good of the emotional life. There are artistic creations of the irrational which enhance our social and emotional life fructifying what we continually identify with our humanity and our living in the world. Because I have added religion among the art forms, religious language and other artistic expressions become central to expressions of meaningful content. Even an idea considered fantastic and unreal may contribute religious ideas such as a caring God, or a purposeful universe; even life or experience and renewed relationships after death, despite their apparent fantastic nature to the scientific mind, may contribute metaphorically to our value system in human ways scoffed at by the empirically and rationalistic conditioned-mind. Our actions, rightly, should be concerned with values addressing the present world and time, but “I-thou” relationships point beyond the present.

Religious faith is grounded in the emotive, artistic content mediated by sensual data and forms, including empirical events; scientific faith is not. Despite scientific faith being overly optimistic of its own grounding and predictive abilities, science, as a method, should withhold judgment on these artistic and value laden features by consigning them to insufficiently evolved brains or imperfect machines. We are speaking of living, not an analysis of lifeless and mindless material. Also, this observation would be an incentive for science to examine its belief in disembodied laws outside of the universe. The metaphors of religious language are not true, false, or meaningless. If I understand what is being said by transparent scientists, in the realm of human thought and language, they, we, may have to allow contradictions to exit. There are more subtle points of existence to consider. With our improved state of thinking about the nature of reality, we are not so sure of ourselves anymore.

I would not like to give the impression that when I reference Stuart Kauffman that he is writing in defense of religion as such. He is writing in defense of regaining the sacred, the re-enchantment of the universe, of spirituality; but his major thrust is a co-created civilization beyond our own, where we come to be in the world in a different way (p. xiii). This world is in the here and now and does not achieve its value from the idea of a here-after. However, we may add, the continuity of religion is grounded in faith and hope, and this expressed artistically. Due to the metaphoric nature of language the idea of a here-after has to be revisited. It resonates with our humanity, especially in the context of relationships.

Hope

.....
 It sticks to the wings of green angels
 that sail from the tops of maples.

.....
 It sprouts in each occluded eye
 of the many-eyed potato,

.....
 It is the mouth that inflates the lungs
 of the child that has just been born.

.....
 It is the singular gift
 we cannot destroy in ourselves,
 the argument that refutes death,
 the genius that invents the future,
 all we know of God.

.....
Alive Together: New and Selected Poems,
 By Lisel Mueller (extracted from the longer poem).

One might think that viewing religion as an art form is merely a return to a supposedly failed Romanticism which arose to counter to the effects of science and the impact of reason on religious and emotional expression. To some extent this “return” is true because Romanticism countered the Copernican principle of removing humans from the center of understanding reality to substitute an objective approach. Romanticism sought to retain or recover the human subjective core, which, like the universe, was being subordinated to the materialistic, mechanical world of classical physics. Consciousness, free-will, the creative propensity, including the creation of value, were subordinated to material things, the entailments of laws independent of human thought and emotional desire, indeed independent of the material universe, in other words, disembodied. Admitting the failures of idealistic and humanistic schemes, such as Hegel’s, to overcome the damage done by scientific understanding of the world and human nature by developing metaphysical patterns, Romanticism did strive to retain the unique value of humanity with its non-rational, emotional attributes in the world, which impacted its view of reality. This interest of Romanticism, not apart from reason and science, must be retained. It is not reason, science, and technology that matter most to us as human beings. The recent success of advanced rocket technology by SpaceX, while amazing is not what matters most for human life. While made possible by dedication and hard work, marvelous as it is, we never hear a human being say, “I wish I had more time so I could work longer hours.” As Yanofsky argues, unless there is “love, desire, music, and arts our world has no meaning.” The life of human beings gains importance only when it includes “ethics, values, and beauty.” Reason is a tool for “will” and “desire” but it has its limits.ⁱ

The Decline and Recovery of Religion

It is a well-known fact established by social research that interest in organized religion as an important source of value has been declining among Europeans for a number of years. This phenomenon is also true in the United States, excluding Fundamentalist religions which have not taken historical criticism and science seriously. As heirs of the Reformation and the Enlightenment there seems little chance outside of a change of religious paradigm that this will be reversed. While we cannot predict whether religion of the future will transform into forms which are both able to critique and accommodate science without losing spiritual content, or decline into an uninformed spiritualism of Fundamentalism, we can offer a solution which recognizes the metaphorical nature of language and symbols, specifically that offered by religion, to ameliorate the environment of decline. Religion informed by science and reason tends to decline into social models from which the sense of the sacred has been eviscerated,

while Fundamentalism thrives by enforcing spirituality, which, like the soul, is unattached to the material world except as understood from the Bible.

Art has a number of features that recommend it as accommodating the quest for the religion of the future. The first is that it is a creative feature of humanity in a creative universe. Art is the medium in which we encounter the unentailed. Art is freedom. There are no laws of art from which we can pre-state the outcome. Whether an artist is a novelist, poet, painter, sculptor, or a comedian, no one can predict where the story will go, what the poem will evoke, or what component will find itself in a creative environment which has been acausally prepared by what has come before and attracted by the initial intentions of the artist. In other words, the progression and end is unknowable.

Science and technology progresses by building on earlier successes, and we tend to judge a society or culture by its scientific achievements and the prediction of future invention. In art, and by extension religion, the highest expressions of language can be understood to have happened in the distant past, such as the writings of Shakespeare, the Bhagavad-Gita, Isaiah, or other art forms. But art as metaphor continues to evoke, to change, and create, so the creative mind continues to act. The past is always present, and one must consider what happens when she is reading; what may be said once a work of art once it is heard, viewed interpreted, and integrated into life. Art, by reading, seeing, and hearing, creates further art, and gives new insights to human life in different times. We can speculate what human life might have meant in the past and will mean in the future, but what meets its deepest needs will be attuned to those characteristics. Art is rich with life; scientific description and prediction is "heartless," devoid of the values that constitute the subjective and emotional content of life which make it worth living. While it is a confessional agreement in science that the universe accepts no contradictions, that is, a statement cannot be both true and false at the same time, and a prediction of two incompatible events is impossible, the *human mind* allows for contradictions; one can both love a person and hate them, have contradictory opinions and interpretations. By Yanofsky's assessment, that is the undeniable nature of being human. The human does not operate on the model of a perfect machine, humans experience conflict, and human language must also express conflict. Our language can tie itself into contradictory knots. We do not need to apologize to science for the state of our minds or brains or for the inadequacy of language. Besides that point, there are other areas associated with the vagaries of human thought and language that demand attention, as the cognitive sciences have pointed out, especially regarding the metaphoric nature of scientific language. The understanding of laws and mathematical reality to be outside and above the universe and to be discovered, rather than created, has been pondered by many with no resolution.ⁱⁱ

An artistic expression resonates in the mind of the perceiver; beyond the artist's creativity there is the reception of the reader, hearer, or onlooker. Artistic reception will evoke the next possibility beyond the original expression; and this understanding is also un-entailed by any rule of doing and interpreting art. Like Kauffman's view of the biosphere and the economy, art is un-entailed. Art is the very antithesis of law which presumably would state what is and what can become. Art is most expressive of enablement. What poet, me included, will not admit that often the Muse presents herself while one is reading another poet, and what musician will not admit (at the risk of being sued) that his music was enabled by

something like non-locality and simultaneity--the sympathetic vibrations from the music of another composer? Art is basically quantum (to use a metaphor), indeterminate, and with many possibilities of expression. The artist may be ignorant of the history of art and art criticism. To such an artist the world is still enchanted, the sense of the sacred has never have been lost. He or she may know nothing of elite opinions, yet their art demonstrates that they understand the world in creative and profound ways. They may worship the Christian God, or be fascinated by demons, yet they move in an unknown, unguided by law or restricted by popular phase space.

Because I have addressed humanity, not just Western humanity with its history of science and reason, like an ever changing phase space, we will have to enlarge our religious tent to include all humanity and all religions and expressions. Being religious is not a free pass to universal approval; indeed the contradictory nature of human beings would prevent a coercive opinion-driven perspective. Nevertheless, as chaos of humans being alive in the world moves intersectional in the whole of the world, there will be occasions where sharing and alignment take place, where the mutual observations and measurements of the parts contributes to the creative role of the whole, and for the moment the chaos becomes order. This is the moment of creativity that unifies the life of human beings to each other and to the world and universe of which we are an inseparable part. It follows that if there is creativity there is also destruction, but the destruction providing the building materials of novelty. One may argue that there has been no improvement in human morality over time because of the horrors of war and such things as the Holocaust, but living by metaphors is about creativity and improvisation, not determinism grounded in a view of human nature, such as crediting a selfish gene.

The position I defend here is that religion and/or spirituality must be among what is fundamental to the living of human beings. It is among the art forms. If religious components lose their contribution to what is meaningful in human life they would have to be abandoned as irrelevant. But most likely, spiritual content has escaped its prison of irrelevance and legality and is hiding in the irrational, veiled images, and sounds of art. Religion as an art form is not dependent on any static doctrinal content or teleological scheme from whatever environment it is adopted, such as the theological employment of Hegel's dialectic. Some kind of growth may be understood in an art form, but that growth takes place between the art form and the beholder; it is not an objective claim applying to history whether Hegelian or evolutionary. We are not looking for a law-like process leading to a specific goal or end. We are implying that the contemplation of an art form, in this sense religious, is an instantaneous or contemplative event, and that any teleological sense gained from the art form touches a teleological sensitivity in the observer. This may be analogical to what Christians refer to as "conversion." It may be instantaneous or gradual. Some may prefer to integrate this point of view with Jung's archetypes, but teleological sensitivity may be due to the way the brain works. In any case, the specific consciousness of the observer implies that the brain is likewise capable by its evolutionary attributes to receive and process the sense of an end or goal, as surely as it is capable of creating a sense of the beautiful.

The Well-Spring of Beauty and Wonder

Specifically referencing Western thought, we could go to great lengths to comment on the course of intellectual history from the Enlightenment with its rationalistic core to the Romantic Movement with its humanistic focus, and on to Existentialism, Nihilism, and the egalitarian emphasis of the Postmodern era, but because this history is governed by rationalistic ideas of law which not only critiqued other ideological positions, but then turned on itself to weaken its own will to power by offering unsustainable certainty by its methodologies, it seems more important to follow the course of “uncertainty” to better understand the basic nature of reality, but also of human beings. It may be that a crisis of uncertainty is the driver not only of faith, but of novel discovery.

With the birth of quantum physics, the deterministic role of disembodied natural law and laws of the mind, or reason, offered by Newton and the Enlightenment, the objective certainty of scientific results began to destabilize. Science had to confront a world of uncertainty and the role of the conscious observer. The pesky issue of consciousness became a critical problem for science and philosophy along with the matters of free-will and personhood. With the birth of the cognitive sciences and new theories of linguistics emerging from it, the metaphoric nature of language was revealed as never before; the world became unstable.

This discovery raised questions about the language of science; *it also appeared to be metaphoric*. With the birth of quantum physics and the dearth of language derived from sense experience to encapsulate the unobservable content of the subatomic world metaphoric language in scientific description became obvious. Thus, the language of Heisenberg, Schrodinger, and Einstein took on an artistic way of expression, in places described as poetic, certainly metaphoric; in fact, it is claimed, this language became dominant, thus art played a crucial role in expressing new knowledge of the quantum world. In a sense, scientific knowledge appeared not to be found in science alone, and artistic imagination was not to be found only in art; science and art had to unite in the collective imagination resulting in the necessity of including art in a unified view of human knowledgeⁱⁱⁱ This conclusion forced reconsideration of the negative assessment of the collective imagination and the collective unconscious with regard to the Romantic movement, Jungian archetypes in particular. At the present time, there is frequent mention of the “wonder” experienced in scientific discovery, especially in astrophysics, which takes on a quasi-religious reference, hinted at by popularizers like Neil de Grasse Tyson. This assessment of the artistic features of the scientific imagination are not to be negatively assessed, but they are not exhibited prominently in scientific literature, most likely because it raises the issue of the place of human consciousness in observation and description, and with it the fear of Cartesian dualism. The novel way physicist and mathematician Max Tegmark speaks of consciousness as a new state of matter, or particles arranged to process information, thus avoiding dualism, is one of the most interesting starting points for and understanding of subjectivity and consciousness. But in the end it seems computational and mechanical (See endnote viii). The solution to the issue of how wonder and beauty are recognized would seem to lie in the fact that “scientists are human,” and that an integrated subjectivity is active in their objectively oriented scientific life.

Scientifically it is unclear just how a sense of wonder gives rise to aesthetics and ethics. Are scientists, as followers of the scientific method, to be gifted with the hitherto philosophical and religious task of

formulating ethics and a theoretical sense of the “beautiful.” Why does the universe appear wonderful and beautiful to a scientist; is scientific language or mathematics up the job of informing us? Putting the issue of scientific language aside, in expressing religious experience there is also a lack of language sufficiency resulting in metaphoric and poetic language; and in extreme cases, those who have experiences of great intensity are able only to express themselves by babbling or speak in tongues. One cannot simply ignore this phenomenon as if it is due to hysteria. Not only does metaphor avoid the caustic claims of reductive materialism or scientism, metaphor is the substance of religious experience expressed in music, language, the tactile arts, and text; and if text, then the Bible is a metaphor for faith.

At the present time there is considerable interest in the way the brain works in creating and processing knowledge, including that of morality and religious experience. Obviously this engages physics; but in engaging physics it seems it would have to contribute to explaining physics itself, and this would be “mind” dependent and metaphoric. Pondering the scientific question of wonder, beauty, and morality, if the metaphoric nature of scientific language conveying information about the material world also includes a sense of wonder or the numinous, an occasion is offered for explanation of this phenomenon by cognitive neuroscience. Neuro-scientific research on religious experience sees its task as examining the material substrata of the mind for clues of the relation of art and religious experience to various brain states. Thus, it is thought, it may be possible to create a kind of scientific neuro-theology which tends to go beyond science but remains grounded in it.^{iv} One may reference work by neuroscientists on brain injuries and pathologies for theories of the origins and developments of religious experience, study the brain for evidence that it is compatible with or designed for religious experience; or examine the theories that hallucinogenic mushroom are responsible not only for the origin of spirituality and religion, but of language, and the invention of the gods. These claims would have to be worked out within evolutionary history to appear credible. I doubt that despite interpretations of ancient pictographs containing images of mushrooms supposedly connected to religious rites or the historical evidence that hallucinogenic mushrooms were, and are still used, in religious ceremonies, that these theories can be strengthened to the point of critical consensus. Certainly, hallucinogens, which provide the means of releasing a number of chemicals in the brain that are linked to feelings of well-being and ecstasy, also terror and damnation, thus positive and negative spiritual experiences, cannot be ruled out as possible factors in artistic, thus religious imagination. Neuroscience generally does not look favorably on hallucinogenic or dream reality as having any contribution to an understanding of reality, which is sometimes expressed as “baseline reality.” Nevertheless, neuroscientists have come across the same problem of understanding the marvelous brain as quantum physics has, confessing that a kind of “uncertainty principle” limits knowledge of the way the brain works; and there too we are presented with the language of wonder to describe the relationship between matter and mind, including ideas of God and unity with the divine.^v

The results of neuroscience investigating areas of the brain activated in correspondence with emotional and/or spiritual experience shows that no one area of the brain is responsible for the phenomenon of spiritual experience; rather many, if not all, areas of the brain contribute in ways, which are not well understood, to the creation of religious or spiritual experience. The complexity of the brain and the incompleteness of understanding how it works, results in no scientific dogma of religious or spiritual

experience being purely the result of the way the brain is understood to work. If this were the case, one could argue that the brain itself is innately capable of producing spiritual experience freely, and no environmental influences or hallucinogenic mushrooms were needed in the distant past. On the other hand, one could argue that emotion understood to be spiritual, is the result of how the brain works when hallucinogens are introduced modifying brain chemistry. While I personally think manipulated brain chemistry is overplayed to minimize the importance of consciousness and free-will, it is also important to recognize that spiritual experiences can be induced by meditation and the power of metaphors as well. This is of special interest to the understanding of religion as an art form. When all is said and done, it is difficult to deny that scientists are forced to admit their humanity, and the irreducible mental component in all scientific assessments.

The Metaphoric Nature Of Scientific Language

Few question the role of metaphor in artistic expression, including its role in religious expressions. The discussion of the role of metaphor in science is another matter. Cognitive science has already called attention to the role of metaphor in scientific language, but while analogy and metaphor are central to scientific thought, they are tightly controlled. While science generally seems somewhat conflicted over use of metaphor and analogy, it is acknowledged that metaphors and analogies are important tools in teaching, including teaching in science. The definitional difference between metaphor and analogy, "is" and "like," appears to me hardly significant scientifically. In hard sciences analogical similarities are tested by measurement, and success in prediction is the result of a law-determined causation.^{vi} Loose associations of analogical similarities among metaphors, such that one is the physical cause of the other, meet universal skepticism from scientists. These metaphors are not apt for science. We should not doubt that the aptness of scientific metaphors is gained by their success in making non-metaphorical predictions. This does not mean that the metaphor is equitable with reality, even though it enabled prediction. If a metaphor is taken to be literal all kinds of contradictory conclusions can arise.

Metaphor in art also is capable of bringing "human" change about, thus a "kind" of causation, in different ways unrelated to a constricted understanding of natural law. Art has the capacity to change minds, individuals, communities, thus the world, primarily by emotional response to an image, music, drama, poetry, and other art forms. Science, traditionally understood, cannot fathom emotional content causally or physically. Metaphorical causation of the artistic kind consists of emotional conviction and knowledge. It may result in unintended consequences, but it addresses existential conditions identifiable with human values which are the grounds of meaning for human life. If scientific discoveries produce wonder or an idea of the ineffable, that is an added gift for the spiritual sense, but wonder is not the end of the spiritual journey.

To comment further on science and metaphor, there should be no difficulty in accepting how metaphors and analogies are at the heart of scientific language and description. It is hard to deny that when Rutherford imagined and described the structure of the atom on the analogy of the solar system the association produced a metaphorical description. We may also draw on the opinion that art anticipates science to suggest that earlier, when Kepler contemplating the solar system, pictured the Sun as the "center" and all the planets circling it, it was his "adoration" of the Sun because of his trip to sunny Italy,

as much as his scientific imagination, that he pictured the planets circling the Sun as if in “adoration.” Leonard Shalain claims that art “precognitively, anticipates science” by creating complex images before they are expressed in physics. Shaun McNiff, comments that both artists and scientists draw on a collective imagination which “links all ideas,” and in the depths of the creative process becomes more similar to myth and poetry which may be closer to the methods of the advanced science than we may recognize.^{vii}

Such claims abound, and are obviously disputed; I restrain from commenting. But when Einstein spoke of the “fabric” of space-time, he was employing metaphor as a tool for explanation; thus metaphor became a means of grasping and expressing an idea. But if the metaphoric nature of Einstein’s language about the fabric of space-time went unrecognized, the poetic feature of it forced itself into our consciousness when he spoke of gravity being a “warp in the fabric of space-time.” One wonders if Einstein may have been reading Job 38: 12f. where morning and dawn are depicted as taking hold of the fringes of the earth, shaking out the few remaining stars, before the light turned on in his mind. The metaphoric and poetic concept was a work of scientific imagination. When metaphors for time are imagined, they range from time is a river, to a line made up of an infinite number of points, to the “reduction of time to space” as in the time-space continuum. Time is space, thus measurable. And what are the “Big Bang” and “black holes” but metaphors? We are looking at metaphors, means of understanding, not reality itself. Scientists realize that no analogical association is legitimate until a measurement is made, especially if the content of the analogy is itself metaphorical; and no metaphor is true because it is used in scientific language. The “result” of employing scientific metaphors is subject to falsification. Science has been understood, and still is, by the masses, as being objective and the results equitable with the truth of reality. But physics does not know what reality is; even the basics are in question. Think about a definition of gravity. Everything associated with it becomes problematical. And the problems increase when physics reduces physical things to mathematical equations which no longer need empirical correspondence. But this scientific methodology and mathematical language puts them beyond any grasp of most people, artistic or spiritual; and mathematical Platonism is suspiciously questionable, although moving with conviction beyond the need of empirical verification.^{viii}

The claim of the cognitive sciences that the language of science is metaphoric deserves serious attention when applied to the existence of reality. If language is metaphoric, it follows that scientific interpretations and scientific attitudes do not depend on the presupposition that there are disembodied laws, laws not part of the physical universe, responsible for all entailments of the universe and valid throughout the universe, or that scientific reason, or logic, is capable of understanding causation simply deterministically from these laws. If we are scientists, let us do science without apology for not knowing the answer, perhaps never knowing the answer. Humans must get on with the art of living without the permission of science.^{ix}

Art and World-Views

World views change; so we can expect new world views to generate new metaphors to move understanding. Perhaps there can be no world-view. Because all knowledge involves the brain, neuroscience, by phenomenological analysis, has given multiple views of what is generally expressed as

“baseline reality,” that are imperfect expression of “ultimate reality.” But does the submission that there are many baseline realities prevent us, as concerned with religion and spirituality, from affirming the value of metaphor across baselines considered scientifically appropriate. I think not, but would like to be informed further on this matter because it involves many “minds” in the composition of baseline realities. Metaphorical language in science gives expression to insight and evaluation, in other words, to “mind,” subjective expression to research and discovery which humanizes its objectivity. While we can expect that the question of what it means to be human will be ongoing in science, particularly from evolutionary biology and neuroscience; how we live in the world as beings possessing freedom, more specifically, free will, often responding to the attribute of subjectivity or emotion, will be more important. In art, we cannot negate the value of an artistic creation on grounds that we disagree with its world view. It may sound trite to affirm un-negotiables, but the subjective content of art is untouchable by analytical science, as a purely physical discipline; living in the world is more important than model based scientific descriptions of reality. Living involves such emotional knowledge as love, free-will, consciousness, the ability to create novelty, and a spiritual sensitivity which we call religion—with all its imperfections. Living is art, and art changes the world, or at least tends to change it.^x “Confessedly,” due to present limitations of method and knowledge, metaphors employed as art defining human life and values differ from those of science. This confessional condition may possibly be modified upon further recognition of the indispensable use of metaphors for all thought. As mentioned, some thinkers entertain the idea that science and art can be conjoined; others deny it. Metaphors of art are vessels of the subjective condition of the human being “believing the world” which brought them into being, and which through evaluation with that world, is responsible for expressions of religious faith.

But there are other adaptations of metaphor that challenge religious and moral interests indeed they challenge the definition of humanity. Beyond some scientists challenging the value of artistic metaphor, other scientists, by the model of the machine, are engaged in artificial intelligence and dream of recreating the whole idea of what it means to be human. This has been named a “technological singularity” by Steven Hawking and Neil de Grasse Tyson.^{xi} These positions cannot be critiqued except from within our present human value system; imagining another creation of technological human devising is not possible even with the promise of immortality, because an aspect of this imagining is actually mass murder or genocide. At the end of the Anthropocene it may be that robotics will be responsible for the last great extinction, carbon based, human extinction.

It is a different, though morally related, matter when it comes to using technology to heal diseases, including genetic engineering, editing of embryos, and artificial gestation. If one is religious, and the religion confessed teaches that God is the only creator, and that humanity is in no sense a co-creator when it comes to the human body, then genetic engineering is immoral on religious grounds similar to the issue of abortion. But if the metaphor of human beings being co-creators extends to the human body, the issue becomes maximally a moral one only when a scientist or technologist chooses create humanity according to the ideological image, which is “in their own image” those not conforming being considered inferior, thus expendable. The issue of genetic engineering is a weighty issue, but seems acceptable guided by the metaphor of human beings are healers.^{xii}

Contemporary Use of Metaphors on Living: A Lesson for Religion

The generation of analogies, or association of metaphors, form conceptual scenarios and shape mental pictures that could be shaped in other ways with different metaphors and associations. Take for example, the metaphor of the universe as “machine,” which steers problem solving into areas which may not be mechanical at all, such as emotionally driven actions of human beings; this creates problems for neuroscientists who model the brain after a machine or computer. Now, fuse the machine metaphor with the war metaphor as the efficient way to get things done, and one may witness the mechanization and militarization of significant aspects of life including basic argumentation, business, sports, politics, medicine, etc. One has to fight for everything. Everything is a battle; the strategy is to win the battle; one has to outmaneuver his or her opponent, gain the higher ground to defeat the opponent. The fusion of metaphors creates value systems which in turn create other metaphors which produce positive or negative value systems. If winning is everything, and we are concerned with machinery, this diminishes human values like being truthful and trustworthy.^{xiii} George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, have developed the war metaphor as it concerns argumentation. This is of current interest because of Trump’s Art of the Deal, which as metaphor gives structure and content to his self-agrandizing “winner” and “losers” metaphor. Also, Lakoff has authored many articles on how the war metaphor is employed to justify political actions against perceived enemies.

War means winning with the best technology. The Pentagon and the NFL have been accused of colluding to militarize American football to recruit young men to the armed forces. This involves a decision that possibly can lead to great harm or loss of life in war; and to mention endless war increases negative weight of the value. In time, football becomes war between opposing teams rather than a game. It is promoted by war video games featuring warring human sporting teams as robots. With fighter plane flyovers at football games, the symbolic militarization of the flag and national anthem, heroes, and nationalism, war is glorified. We can keep our minds open to recognize the way metaphors function to create realities that were never present before metaphors joined and morphed analogically into other possible ways of looking at the world and life. Certainly, from the advertising of war games we can understand that the “cash value” of the manipulation of metaphors is an equally important constituent in the formation of important values driving a society. These metaphorical scenarios are not “truthful” rational creations, they grow, they evolve, possibly in the unconscious, thus they are not transparent to our consciousness. They take on a life of their own similar to the way, I argue, art changes those who behold it, seeing meaning that even the artist realized only seminally if at all. Reason is not absent from this process of value formation, but it discriminates among formative contexts of metaphors and fusion of metaphors. No greater failure to metaphoric creativity may be found than in the militarizing of Christianity with the result that we are responsible for the Crusades and teaching children to sing, “Onward Christian Soldiers, marching as to war.” The Salvation Army seems to have escaped actual militaristic behavior from the war metaphor, unless one considers its actions a kind of “war on poverty,” which has a reflection on government programs. However effective, other metaphors may achieve the desired ends with greater permanence, if not greater humanity.

A related outcome of living by metaphors is reflected in the recent school-shooting in southern Florida. I don’t know the proper name to assign; is it “A Gun is Power; a Gun is Freedom” metaphor? Whatever it is, it has the NRA and politicians who take campaign contributions from the NRA as part of its image,

thus politicians who are reluctant to sponsor or support stricter gun laws and background checks. It will be bad for business, both the arms business, and politics. Living by this metaphor has resulted in many deaths, much heartbreak and social disruption; while politicians wishing to be reelected and needing financial backing, would rather tolerate the mayhem than promote a different metaphor, which would evoke greater decency in political and social action. The response has always been the same, logical arguments: guns don't kill, people do; background checks won't keep gun out of the hands of criminals or the mentally ill. We are certainly not living by reason or the rules of logic. The metaphor must be changed and with that change will be a change in human behavior. Guns, the freedom to bear arms, and restricting the government from interfering with a contested constitutional right applying to the individual, are not among the things that give value to human life; in fact it operates in the opposite direction. It devalues human life. It raises the value of the freedom to allow other people to die for "A Gun is Power; A Gun is Freedom" metaphor."

Another metaphorical function which has present day cultural and individual consequences is how the concept of "Woman" is formed. Women may be understood, as they have been in the past: Women are cattle, or understood as chattel. The metaphor of "servant" can create the feminine image, or "incubator," or "bunny." Fundamental Darwinism understands women as basically defined by reproduction and nurture of offspring. These metaphors, it has been argued, are the result of historical and evolutionary experiences. Thus, our conscious minds are unaware of anything else. But these metaphors are at best only valid within a fixed deterministic understanding of biology and brains, in particular.

One of the more contemporary influences of metaphor on human life lies in the religio-political arena. The Trump administration is closely affiliated with the Christian Evangelical movement, which has been supportive of the Trump agenda, and generously financed by the Koch brothers. It has been argued by African-American commentators, and African-American pastors who are dissociating themselves with the Evangelical movement which is predominantly white, that these agendas are aimed at enhancing the position of white dominance, if not white supremacy. In addition, this movement to the political right, advocates for small government, which makes legislation in favor of the financially elite, and against the poor and minorities, who benefit from a larger, left leaning government, an important social and political issue. If we look at the metaphorical content of these claims we find three major metaphors at work: the metaphor of America is white and Christian; the ideal American is free as an individual, thus the government should be small so that the collective citizenry does not interfere with this freedom. These metaphors are contradicted by equally potent metaphors from the left. But in each case the metaphors evoke moral and ethical questions which must be answered within a larger religious, philosophical, and religious, or theological perspective.

The creation of new metaphors along with new values gives different understandings. Reason is present in the discrimination among metaphors, but, again, it does not operate by discovering disembodied moral laws which validate morality existing outside of our human living. The outcome cannot be pre-stated. Neuroscience is hard at work attempting to understand how metaphors arise as the result of brain activity, but at present research ends up in admitting that there are limitations to scientific analysis that seem insurmountable.^{xiv}

If we submit that religion is an art form, thus metaphoric in nature, we will have to admit that all religions are metaphoric, neither true nor false, but rather evocative. Furthermore, the validity of metaphors and religions depends on how their metaphors meet the criterion of speaking to what matters most for human life. We cannot judge the value of the metaphor on whether it is objectively true or false, but whether it has changed, or is allowed to change to meet the conditions of what humans actually wish to live for, to accommodate new moral and spiritual content, new knowledge and convictions. Thus, religion as an art form is not about the business of invalidating images of the Virgin Mary, the Hindu Gods or the Buddha. It will tend to be eclectic in nature. To appreciate the content of religions in general we look at the data of specific religions and religious texts, including the Bible, interpreting them with an eye to their metaphoric content. Thus, when the Bible speaks of God as Father, we will assume the metaphoric nature of God and fathers. The metaphor will reflect all of the images for father experienced that create the metaphoric association. God is a warrior, jealous, stern, vindictive, requiring punishment or the death of those who violate his commands. On the other hand, surviving Patriarchic editing, God is given almost feminine characteristics, such as a mother hen; he is said to love his children and protect them from harm. Thus, God is not the "Stern" father, but the nurturing father. In the mind of Jesus, the metaphor of the Father has a meaning of being just, but caring and redemptive, in his relationship to humans; but there is also judgment on transgressors. Obviously, there are different conceptions of fathers behind the metaphor of God the Father. Which one we, with discrimination, chose to build on and integrate within our religion is a matter for theological and moral reflection; but the driving force behind it is artistic in nature, not rationalistic.

Perhaps the most problematic, but also fruitful, metaphoric understanding of God is that God became flesh in the Incarnation, and beyond this, the Trinitarian confession. Theologically, this confession cannot be the result of logical determination without insurmountable objections. But artistically, planned or unplanned, it meets a receptive sense in our subjectivity. The ground-of-being, is not to be understood as outside of us, but within us. The metaphor of all-encompassing reality, a panpsychism, has joined with our own metaphors for being: we are all his children, all sons and daughters of God, of universal creation, and united in universal spirit. In a sense, if we cannot get outside of our brains to know the world objectively, we have always been gifted with incarnation, and we must assume that our brains are indispensable in processing the meaning of metaphors under the mission of expression of what it is to be human.

There will never be agreement on the nature of God, not only because we cannot agree on the meaning of the metaphor, but on our ideas of equality, justice and forgiveness relative to that metaphor. Much of this is through subjugation of the female to the male, if not absolute elimination by Patriarchy. The history of the Judeo-Christian religion can be considered within the context of marginalizing and excluding the role of the female. What happens when a metaphor undergoes transformation conforms to the idea that while the father metaphor transforms the image of God the Father, the image of God the Father, transforms the image of human fathers. But this is not sufficient. The conception of the god-head must change to accommodate the feminine, and all natures of God's children. However, changes will be made by the principle that art has the ability to change the world. Feminists, and the LGBT+ communities will have different takes on the metaphor of God the father, but resolution of differences

will not be resolved by organizational or political power. Reason is involved, not as a judge of truth, but as a helper, in choosing the most appropriate, inclusive, art form for individual and communal religious commitment. As humans who are basically contradictory by nature, we will have to live by improvisation. "Hail, Mother of God." But nature has proven to be indispensable element in our religious perspectives. No view of God can overlook it, and metaphors of God antagonistic to nature are not in the interest of the values that make human life worth living, and by extension, all life.

In assessing the place of metaphor, acknowledging that metaphors are neither true nor false but continuously creating new insights, we will have to admit that those who confess to slogans like "The Bible and the Bible Alone," using biblical metaphors to create the exclusive life of the church, are not in violation of an all-inclusive rational principle. If living by the interpreted metaphors of the Bible supplies the values that make human life the best it can be, we should applaud this ideology. But, in fact it is impossible to sustain this judgment of what is best without negative subjective moral judgments about a wider humanity. It is not necessarily in opposition to science. It is when adherents to this creed violate the values of truthfulness and trustworthiness, which are supposedly grounded in the metaphors of the creed that the church departs from truthfulness, and loses its integrity in the wider world, including that of science. Of course, one may say similar things about scientific ideology that attempts to devalue religion on the grounds of its own dogmas and the superiority of its own metaphors.

It is probably impossible to convince everyone that our sense of morality is the outgrowth of metaphoric contemplations of life experiences imbedded in our unconscious, most, if not all, of which are unknown to us. The metaphors of morality are the continuous creations of our artistic spirit, not of scientific analysis or abstract reason. What should be clear is that while science may be viewed as a tool in informing ethics, science and reason cannot be the moral starting place. Thus arguing that ethics develops within evolutionary theory, namely "survival and flourishing of sentient beings," and that the "arc of the moral universe really is bending toward progress," driven by individuals, the fundamental unit of nature, rather than groups, and that the drive to survive is the essence of the human organism, which bequeaths the idea of natural rights to individuals, cannot be compatible with the artistic assessment of metaphors by which we live.^{xv}

On the other hand, at present, there is welcomed interest in the relationship between morality and art. The argument derived from metaphors like "fathers" and "women" illustrate that Art and Morals are "two aspect of the same struggle." Feminist theologian, Janel Soskice describes the experience of keen attention to the details of paintings by Lucas Cranach, 15th century painter, and friend of Martin Luther. Contemplating the details of the characters in the paintings, gender, focus, places in the painting, facial expressions, and activity, in the presence of Jesus, evoke a plethora of emotions and moral impressions. Soskice is "compelled" to respond affirmatively to her womanhood in the eyes of God. This function of art complements the idea I have promoted here, that by beholding we become changed. Beauty, morality, and spirituality, harmonize to create the formation of values and the motivation to act on them. This gives human life its meaning. Soskice obviously brings a distinct kind of Christian-theological mind to what she beholds, but no one, theologian or scientist, can escape this "mental" feature of living in the world. The issue of the meaning of God will be raised by some people, perhaps preferring the "living universe," as God, rather than the personhood of God, the Father, which affirming our humanity

or in the case of a feminist, womanhood, but in each case we are working with metaphors, and the universe presents problems for science and rationality as great as the personality of God. Our understanding of the universe is also metaphoric despite its scientific guise.^{xvi}

The Problem presented by History

Christian theology has labored with the fact that Christianity is anchored in real historical events. The over-used affirmation, that God reveals himself in history, or revelation takes place in history, have resulted in numerous books written on this theme, which actually is not a biblical theme at all. History as revelation, was a salvage operation, and an opportunity offered by Enlightenment philosophers such as Hegel and Kant. Certainly, the Bible contains a type of history-like writing that moves through time by themes containing beginnings and endings often expressed by themes such as promise and fulfillment or prophecy and fulfillment, or apocalyptic, but none of this historiography is identifiable with critical historiography. Even the stories of Jesus, with historical references, are not to be compared to critical historiography. The story of Jesus as Son of God is a historical metaphor, and as such cannot be considered true or false as history. In the Gospel we face the power of metaphor to create possible courses of action and belief in history which is open to critical examination. The Gospel is art. Belaboring the fact that there is no historical or archaeological proof that Jesus existed, and therefore the same as a fairy tale, are ideologically misguided. Outside of the writings of Plato, there is not proof of Socrates existence either. It seems intellectually shallow to discount the existence of Jesus on the sparse evidence accepted as historical. The metaphors arising from and associated with Jesus give rise to Christian theologies, and that is what theology must concentrate on. The letters of the Apostle Paul are another form of art; here are carefully crafted arguments designed to convince readers, who are familiar with the manner of reasoning, often Hellenistic, to give consent. But this implies that Paul's metaphors are not eternal or final. He is enlarging the tent of belief in Christ to include gentiles, and a religion of the future must recognize this universalizing of religious belief. We refer to Kantian wholes: the parts exist by and for the good of the whole, and the whole exists by and for the good of the parts.

Artistic religious expressions of our subjectivity will be universal and non-exclusive, embracing the whole world of spiritual conception and expression. Only when there is an inclusive sense of spiritual capacity can we discriminate among values and cultures. This would mean that Christianity with its belief that there is no other name but Jesus by which we must be saved will have to suspend that "dogma" to appreciate the content and expression of other religions or forms of spirituality. This does not mean that spiritual expressions are all equal in the sense of post-modernism, but that when the metaphors that are the seed of religious expression in different cultures do not contribute creatively to the good of the whole, the whole will not offer possible niches for those parts to thrive. Thus, a religion of the future will be based on the conviction that the parts exist by and for the good of the whole and the whole exists by and for the good of the parts. We cannot understand the whole statically as conforming to the superiority of one of the parts, as if it conforms to some timeless template. The exclusion of some metaphoric expressions is to be expected if the whole does not offer spiritual niches for survival. The traditional understanding of "the true religion or church" immediately becomes suspect and dated. The only way of conceiving of a true religion is by its conformity to the way, as a part, it exists by and for the good of the whole, as the whole exists by and for the good of the parts. Rather than think of this process

as one operating by timeless laws, it would be better to think that the parts enable the whole and the whole enables the parts. Thus, there is freedom in the formation of a resulting spirituality or religion at any given time. Also, we must admit that human nature is basically contradictory, and that universal agreement in a creedal sense is impossible, even undesirable, accepting the occasional rendezvous of the “realities,” which are unstable, existing for only the shortest time to permit measurement.

I don't think that this determines that the meaning of any particular metaphor cannot be considered superior to another metaphor. But let us not allow logic to sweep us away; but some metaphors may meet spiritual needs better than others. But once again we encounter the difficulty of time and the inexhaustible capacity of metaphor to create novelty. But, admitting to new possibilities does not mean that we can consider that because we give one metaphoric interpretation greater value than another that one metaphoric expression cannot possess greater value than other metaphors. Of course, this idea is philosophical and is “time sensitive.” What this means first for Christianity is that we would have to be content with the metaphoric value of Jesus and the Incarnation within the theme of things that matter most to human beings, not as the “revealed” absolute ground for the meaning of life and human values by the historical Jesus. Christian communities created the metaphorical Jesus. This means that artistically speaking, while the Jesus metaphor, for all human life and for all time, may be the most important ingredient human life encounters, it also may not be. Time, loosely speaking, only would tell. Anyway, this is not the point of this presentation; it is religion as an art form and the beauty of holiness being its feature of attraction in developing the religion of the future. In this sense it differs from a sociological approach. ^{xvii}

Repeating the contemporary situation between science and religion, it is generally recognized that science as reductive materialism has not been favorable to religion and in the process changed the understanding of religion. The change largely involved metaphors from science: the nature of matter, universal deterministic laws, and implications drawn from evolution for the nature of human life. The change it is argued, “took place by a kind of stealth,” and worked to negate the sense of the divine in religion. Except for the resistance of Fundamentalism, the power of scientific explanation changed religion into forms of social activism. The question is: Can the religious imagination devastated by science revive? Are there any signs that this is happening among people who have learned to live with a view of barren “naturalism,” that is devoid of religious imagination, and without a sense of the sacred? There is evidence that among scientists barren naturalism is not necessary or desirable. Is the window of wonder that is opening in science sufficient for such a restoration; and what does it imply for the scientific mind when it confesses to wonder in the universe accessible to human intelligence? Science, largely by way of quantum physics, is once again looking through a window of wonder which contrasts to the deterministic world that shaped its view of the world; but it has no language to translate its meaning to humanity, nor does it have the power to restore the religious imagination. In such a case religion will remain horizontal and incapable of attracting devotees, or it will tend to Fundamentalism. What we need to dwell on is “a religion of the future,” and a “science of the future” which mature sufficiently to grant validity to the other, or synthesize. Both the religious and scientific imaginations possess energy and craziness or weirdness. Each of these generates experiences of wonder which stimulate the subjective human capacity and activate the imagination; each demonstrates the lack of

language to communicate information substantially, to claim the truth as its sole domain. Within this area where formation is flexible, there is hopefully room for synthesis.

Because I am operating mainly within the Judeo-Christian religion, perhaps, we can gain insight by recognizing the vitality of religious metaphors, specifically, biblical traditions. These traditions are metaphoric and the directions they take are not consistent rationally. Yet we can attempt to trace the process by which they shape religious ideas and institutions. This shaping is artistic and we may take the creation of narratives as an art form like poetry, painting, sculpting, or music. If we are looking at the Bible, any theme will do: God, Covenant, Messiah, Day of the Lord; all undergo creative change of direction.

The Vitality of Biblical Traditions

Because the Hebrew Bible and its theologies, along with the philosophies that provided structure to the argumentation have been my academic concentration, I will draw on a work by Walter Brueggemann and Hans Walter Wolf, to illustrate how tradition (you may read metaphors) are reworked in history as new situations arise in times of crisis that require their voice in new contexts.^{xviii} While I will not center my attention on the New Testament, the change in the meaning of traditional metaphors found in the Old Testament and some aspect of Judaism is evident. The Messiah metaphor evolves from a militaristic image to one more favorable to the ideas of the Suffering Servant and a Prince of Peace, attributes of Jesus; and the concept of Torah also is modified, especially in the writings of the Apostle Paul, to meet new conditions necessitated by the mission to the Gentiles. These changes demonstrate how old traditions and metaphors achieve a reworking due to historical circumstances. Concentrating on the literal truth or falsity of the metaphors overlooks the artistic content which rings true to human subjective experience which paves the way to engaging the future.

Returning to attention on the vitality of Old Testament traditions, a distinction must be made between the traditions or the historical metaphors and the history that may or may not be discovered by critical investigation. Because the metaphorical history is not centered in its own historical referents, that is, its applications are to events in history that are not specifically mentioned, but alluded to existentially--times of "crisis" for faith, for example; insisting that historical metaphors, persons, times, and places, have to correspond to events open to historical-critical investigation misses the point that the "real" interest is addressing Israel's faith, either as judgment or salvation. The crisis is addressed by the reworking of old traditions and metaphors which forms a kind of preaching or proclamation to the community of faith. The metaphorical history takes a spiritual or poetic form created from past traditions. This history in the German language is called *Heilgeschichte* or the Salvation History. Critically understood this would mean the history of the "experience of salvation," but attempting to validate the poetic metaphors by the historical critical method is pointless. *Heilgeschichte* is an invented poetic word necessitated by the failure of historical methodology to address the subjective pole of Israel's existence and faith.

We need not get hung up by the fact that Wolf adopted the method of dividing the Pentateuch into multiple documents indicted by the writings of the Jahwist, Elohist, Deuteronomist, and Priestly

Writings. Methodologies are conditioned by historical influences and new discoveries. This is true in science as well as in theology as is demonstrated in science by the discovery of the quantum world which demanded new approaches and new vocabulary and metaphors to explain it. In the interest of keeping this manuscript brief, I will not touch on every point of the history of transmission of traditions which critically accompany Wolf's and Brueggemann's theology. What the history of the transmission of traditions demonstrates is that the elements of the traditions change to meet new situations in the faith of the community. Theologically, then, one cannot ground faith in the historical accuracy of the traditions, but only in the proclamation which meets a specific "crisis" of faith.

Beginning with the writer called the Yahwist, it is generally agreed by literary critics that he composes his proclamation in the historical context of the monarchies of David and Solomon. It is both a critique of and an apology for the monarchy. Its major concern is confronting hubris and the temptation of kings to assume authority over all affairs of state and religious faith. The tradition which is the central theme of his message is the promise made to Abraham, a promise of blessing, land and descendants. Wolf's theological purpose is to show that the Yahwist in reformulating this address from God to Abraham affirms a normative statement of faith by the community of faith contained in the text. The Yahwist, in interpreting the tradition of God's promise to Abraham offers both protest and affirmation of the conditions of faith at the time. This is not a recounting of what the faith presently is, but what the faith should be. Thus, there is a difference between original intent and new proclamation. For example, the promise of land would obviously dominate the thinking of the David-Solomon monarchy. In the context of the tradition, the Yahwist stresses that the monarchy is not there to advance its own purposes, but to bear the blessing of the promise, "By you shall all the families of the earth be blessed."

The texts assigned to the Elohist present many problems which raise the question if it is an independent tradition. It is certainly overshadowed by the Yahwist tradition. But those texts assumed to bear the message of the Elohist bear the theme of "fear of God." This message, in a setting of crisis, bring some interpreters to place it in the time of Elijah where worship of other gods is forbidden as a central affirmation of faith, and where syncretism had created a crisis for Yahwistic faith.

The Deuteronomic histories, running from Joshua through 2Kings, and assessing the religious conditions in Israel up to the Exile, judge the behavior of Israel from the perspective of the Book of Deuteronomy. These theological formulations ask what has happened in the history of Israel with Yahweh now that the nation is in exile and that history seems to have been brought to an end. Was the promise of God to David sufficient to hold onto the idea of continuity? The theological discussion is complex, but Wolf finds the core of the Deuteronomic proclamation in the idea of "repentance and return" as the condition of continuity.

The Priestly Writings are also intent on giving a perspective on faith during the Exile. The central affirmation of P is reentry into the Land; and irrespective of the many laws and rituals developed by the priests, the narratives in the Priestly work are the key to the "proclamation." The creation story of P is the beginning of the Pentateuch. The Creation Story of Genesis 1 revives a war-like tradition of creation overcoming hostile conditions to demonstrate God's power over the forces of chaos. By God's word the earth, without form and void, becomes a habitable place. God commands the earth to put forth

vegetation and bring forth living creatures; but to mankind, created in God's image, the command is to exercise dominion, and to be fruitful and multiply, filling the earth, and to subdue it. If we are to look for a historical referent it would be the period of Exile for the people of God in a foreign land. It will take the power of the God of creation to actualize the reentry into the land from which Israel was exiled, thus restoration. The language is reminiscent of the "conquest," so the suggestion that the land is yet to be entered and repossessed. The movement of the entire narrative is toward the Sabbath. Sabbath is not only concerned with rest and recuperation of mankind, but recuperation of the land. The text offers the possibility that the Sabbath for the land, in which the land is restored and becomes productive, serves for the motif that the inhabitants also become recipients of the Sabbath offering.

There are other possible interpretations and applications of the Sabbath texts stemming from the obvious fact that the Sabbath for the land is not mentioned in the text of Genesis 2: 1-3; rather it is the day when God finished the creation and rested from work. From this condition, God blessed and made the Sabbath day holy. How we prioritize rest for land or for the completion of creation is a matter of what we read into the texts. It may be that God's rest from work, obviously a positive condition after ordering the forces of chaos, is necessary before any commands are issued regarding the "rest" of the land. Also, Israel would have to experience rest before any creative disposition for the rest of the land could be considered. Thus, it may be that what we have here is a cultic Sabbath liturgy associated with the restored temple. But, in any case, all may fit into the restorative proclamation of the Priestly writer.

While, other than pure Dogmatics, there were other methods of doing theology, such as taking a cross cut through the history at various points to see "how things were progressing," a task that ultimately took the New Testament proclamation as its end point, those that developed the "story of redemption" perspective had the greatest impact. This type of theology, like other critically based theology, represented above as *Heilsgeschichte*, is the results of the demise of traditional views of revelation become weakened by the advent of science and of the Enlightenment. Philosophical concerns with the Philosophy became a pattern to be imitated by theology. The dialectical method of Hegel and the concerns of Kant who claimed that the laws of the mind, or reason, were identical to the established laws of nature, became motivational in the becoming of both history and nature. Essentially physics took on the character of metaphysics, and was easily transformed into a theology of history, or *Heilsgeschichte*. "God reveals himself in history," from within, not from above, as in traditional revelation. But, critics responded that history seemed to be a record of mass murder; where is the self-revelation of God. Obviously, such a historical presentation of the content of the biblical text must conclude with the message of the New Testament canon, not with Rabbinic Judaism. In this case, the old traditions or metaphors are refashioned to meet the conditions of the early Christian church. One may adopt this method of theology, but it becomes exclusive and raises the question of whose history the historical material really is? Does that history lead to Judaism or to the Christian church? This methodology seems to lack a universal focus. What we may say positively about this theological moment in the history of theology is that may be considered an art form. It employs a system of argumentation current at a particular time and builds a case for the legitimacy of its message. But the history of salvation it develops remains metaphorical as due its components. We cannot escape the role of metaphor in life, and this involves not only theology but a theory of ethics, morality. On what grounds

do we include and exclude members of the human race who like us live their lives by means of processing their metaphors and collective myths?

Since the loss of favor for Heilsgeschichte theology, largely due to its early argumentation being supplied by Enlightenment philosophy, Hegel with its dialectical and purposive teleological schemata, in particular, and later, its lack of grounding in critical historiography, other emphases have taken its place under a less visible title of theology. These range from “Narrative Theology” where the moral and spiritual content of specific stories are extracted, almost “archaeologically,” to the adaptation of views from Alfred North Whitehead, Charles Hartshorne, and John Cobb, termed, “Process Theology.” Process Theology is evolutionary; there is the lure of God to the future. If God is always in the future, a view of God from a past historical experience cannot be dogmatized and static. Within the process framework major themes of the Old Testament are developed to make theological statements. Finally, there is a discussion of God and the world process in which Heilsgeschichte is restored within the process.^{xix} All of these developments in biblical interpretation are due to a state of “crisis” in biblical theology brought by critical thought, mainly scientific, but also to the critique of post-modernism which relativized all progressive philosophical developments of history and nature, and biblical theology became just one more religious expression among many with no superior coercive properties.^{xx}

It is in the context of this continuing crisis that we offer the view that religion is an art form, not alien to science, but unabashedly favoring the subjective pole of reality, including the subjective character of religious experience. All arts: poetry, mythology, music, narrative, painting and sculpture, to mention the most familiar, by beholding and hearing, have the power to change the viewer or hearer, thus to change the world. And this process is not particularly rational, or rebounding off the reality of scientific uncertainty or the relativizing power of postmodernism. The conviction of being right with the nature of things, call it reality if you will, comes from the passion of our humanity, not from theory driven science that is habitually antagonistic to the value of the subjective pole in a materialistic universe. We cannot justify our human-place in the universe by reason. If we understand our relationship with the universe being both material and moral, we will have to call on both reason and metaphor to express it in the sense of belonging. The subjective pole cannot be excluded, thus the human relation to the universe will involve an emotional response. My position is that at the deepest level this is to be understood as religious in nature.

In a Pauline, biblical sense, which I deem artistic, the universe itself has “justified” our humanity, thus our commitment to both the objective and the subjective pole of living reality. But it is the subjective pole that points beyond itself to new realities and becomes the ultimate generator of hope and religious faith. The language of objectivity fails us at this point and the only way those who have religious experiences can communicate the subjectivity of those experiences is to engage its expressions with a subjective language suitable for it, thus the language of the arts. While I am not suggesting that measurement and prediction can be made from artistic metaphors unattached from scientific intentions, in a utilitarian sense, this is similar to the language adopted to describe the quantum world for which the language of the classical world was unsuited. This is not something that arises from a substance dualism, but from the changed understanding of the “material” universe which incorporates the subjective pole of reality. Here subjectivity and objectivity become blurred but seem to tend toward

unity. Recognition that the subjective pole cannot be separated from so called objectivity should prevent any exclusive understanding of mindless materialism from depreciating what it means to be a human being living in a creative universe.

My specific interest in developing the theme of religion as an art form is not merely to give it an academic guise, but to express my concern and commitment, for, and to, a religion of the future in which the living Seventh-day Adventist confessing community of faith participates. Adventism is in a crisis of faith, conjoined to an intellectual state of "crisis." This crisis is not unlike that experienced as the result of the Enlightenment, or the earlier crisis of faith resulting from Israel's exile and captivity, or the angst brought by the failure of the Parousia. In general, Adventists have been so overly attentive to Fundamental Beliefs as verifiable beliefs from the Bible alone that we have minimized the value of scientific research except in cases of discernable human value. Among a majority of constituents, excluding a sizeable number of academics, dogma has been disguised as science to become pseudoscience. With the efforts of a few committed apologists, large numbers of Adventists are convinced of the superiority of biblical and denominational insights into material reality, and it is science that is wrong. This situation will change in time as the dogmatic position weakens from the fatigue of defending the indefensible, but in the process there is the danger that the confessing community will weaken and evaporate into the wider, spiritually faceless, world where the sense of the sacred has succumbed to the numbing effects of secularism. Of course, science has to tend its own house for dogmatic conditions, as postmodernism has made clear. I would hazard to say that the crisis of faith in science, because of its empirical nature, is even more serious than it is in religion. Multiverses and string theory seem to be ways of avoiding having to confront the problems of empirical reality, and escape into the ontology of Pythagoras in which numbers and mathematics do not have to have a basis in the empirical for legitimacy.

In a postmodern world where all world views are supposedly equally judged, one might think a religious perspective might gain credibility, but this cannot be so unless a new vision of religious and spiritual life are forthcoming from the wreckage brought on by "crisis," whether or not one is aware of postmodernism. In religion a new crisis of certainty appears due to dependence on the Bible alone for relevant information, and confrontation with science and philosophical analysis. This crisis is interior, thus for religion this is not a crisis of lost land, as with Israel, but a crisis in present understandings of faith. For Adventists the crisis is largely due to the constant need to explain the delay of the Second Coming. Because Adventists have a keen sense of the history in which they live, and on which the religion is founded; and, in addition a traditional abhorrence of myths, and emotive generated expressions, as guides for the way we live, we cannot go forward through the crisis to claim new ways of understanding what living by faith is.

Like the participants of other crises we stand before a universe which regardless of biblical testimony, appears much of the time to be unconcerned with, and even hostile to us as human beings and believers. One could offer a Jungian solution on the grounds of archetypes, or appeal to a scientific conclusion that all life is inseparable from the universe, but these offerings are sustained by critical investigations which, although helpful are subject to scientific scrutiny which may try to undermine any claims they may provide for faith. It seems that much art produced after the Enlightenment became

faithless and hollow spiritually. But this is to say that the crises created spiritually, seeded resolutions and new artistic faith expressions. Human beings as artists will continue to be creative, and that operates as a kind of warranty for the novelty in faith, although one cannot predict what the novelty will be. Crises in science or religion are crises of mind-sets which work toward resolution, thus are not final stops. The scientific method is not set in concrete, and religion is not confined to an infallible text. Crises bring resolutions. While appeals may be made to Jungian archetypes, or scientific opinions of “wonder” that humanity is inseparable from the universe as steps to a resolution of the crises, the conviction that human life being included in a greater whole, is not gained exclusively from science or a text-bound religions of “the literal, but from the subjective pole, artistically expressed as conviction. This may appear in a society unaware of the history of the western mind. While from a scientific and rationalistic perspective the universe seems hostile and purposeless, at times it appears nurturing and moving progressively into the future without any goals visible except to the eye of faith. Thus, the goals perceived by Enlightenment philosophy and the passions of Romanticism may come to life again in a context in which humanity and universe share a future as they have shared a past, and now share a present. This is an artistic achievement of conviction even while the universe appears to be purposeless to an objective eye.

I am suggesting the crisis of faith is an artistic one, to be resolved by approaches to faith which are artistically understood. If we wish to critique religion, it must be done artistically; if we wish to create a vibrant spirituality it must be a work of art. At this point it will be necessary to call on a new kind of talent within the church; not ignoring the whole, because everyone is creative, but a pool of artistically gifted people who think beyond the world while being in it, people who view the world as the medium with which their own minds work. This will require rethinking the spiritual content of our educational commitments, religion under the heading of things that matter most, the values without which religion becomes an empty shell of pretense and dogma. These values are evoked by metaphors, rituals, stories, poems, music, etc. This does not mean there will be nothing left that we can believe, but this credo will be “sung not signed.” We will have to pull up from our subjective religious experience different reasons for why we believe it in a world in which such belief is usually under attack by scientific and rationalistic ideology. Such an Adventism will have to study its past religious metaphors to discover why they have or have not changed to meet new conditions that define faith. It will demand we begin thinking of an Adventism of the Future, one that cannot be accurately predicted except by faith that humans will continue to create new attractive metaphors for the things that matter most. But beyond concern with the part there is the affirmation that the part contributes to a greater whole. “The parts exist by and for the good of the whole, and the whole exists by and for the good of the parts.”

The path of beholding, listening, contemplating an art form may be thought of as similar to Buddhist meditation. At this point we may consider the empirical data of neuroscience on serious meditators that demonstrates the power of meditation to change or shape behavior and thought.^{xxi}

In Buddhism, meditation seeks to dissolve the material world, but in art-meditating on religious forms and traditions, one maintains contact with the material world and its artifacts while extracting or sensing the additional subjective information intended or unintended by the artist. There should not be a restriction on what the artist meant and what the contemplator discerned. What the contemplator

saw or heard and the artist intended are equally valid. This would be especially true of music where no informing words or visual mediums are needed. The point of contemplating an art form or a work of art is awareness that the subjective content of the art makes changes in the material brain, thus the world, just as surely as Buddhist meditation does to the brain of the meditator. At this point it seems that such a program depends upon the verification of scientific observation. Acceptance depends on whether the empirical evidence of the subjectively changed brain states is taken as scientifically valid. This is data for the neuroscientists and cognitive scientists to argue about. The point made here is that art changes the world by beholding, listening, reading, meditating. The natural/supernatural dichotomy vanishes, time and space evaporate. The value of objectivity held by traditional materialistic science must vanish in the ineffable being of the universe; likewise the fundamentalist tenets of religions. Science and religious Fundamentalism must both recognize the point of postmodernism, that no approach to the big questions is mind free. The only solution to the ever unfolding question of living creatively in the creative universe is to recognize that when uncertainty arises or when crisis of belief raises its head, this is the catalyst for moving to a more profound sense of ourselves and our wondrous world.

ⁱ *The Outer Limits of Reason: What Science, Mathematics, and Reason Cannot Tell Us*, p. 352.

ⁱⁱ Yanofsky's discussion of the non-contradictory nature of the universe and the contradictory nature of the human mind, carefully considered in the "Introduction" of his book, has many points to ponder. See also, Mario Livio, *Is God a Mathematician?* Livio straddles the rail on whether mathematics is created or discovered. Others cited do not.

ⁱⁱⁱ *Imaginative Science Education: The Central Role of Science in Education*, Yannis Hadzigeorgiou, pp.190 ff. Google Books. Cf., *The Passion of the Western Mind: Understanding the Ideas That Have Shaped Our World View*, Richard Tarnas, pp. 366ff.

^{iv} Andrew B. Newberg, *Principles of Neurotheology*. See chapter 10, "Epistemological Issues in Neurotheology." Cf. Newberg, *How God Changes Your Brain*; which is a practical preface to the later theoretical work.

^v Newberg, *Principles*, pp. 216ff.

^{vi} Describing scientific concepts as metaphors does not mean they are false. They are "apt." "That is they can entail non-metaphorical predictions that can be verified or falsified." Lakoff and Johnson, *Philosophy in the Flesh*, p. 160. I will not comment on scientific use of analogies in scientific theory beyond referring the reader to John Clement: "Observing Methods for Generating Analogies in Scientific Problem solving," *Cognitive Science* 12, Issue 4, 1988, pp.563-586 (published on line, Feb. 11, 2010. Cf. Zainab Goonay, "Metaphors in Science," *The Fountain Magazine.com.*, also Dedre Gentner and Michael Jeziorski (A. Ortony, Ed), *Metaphor and Thought*, 2nd edition, pp. 447-480.

^{vii} Cited from Art-based Research, p.80.

^{viii} I reference the works of Max Tegmark, physicist and mathematician, who thinks mathematical patterns are not only more appealing for knowledge than empirical verification, but that conscious is the way particles are arranged, in other words, a mathematical pattern. By this means, he argues that mathematical patterns are sufficient to accept the idea of a multiverse, but also that conscious is a state of matter in which particles arrange themselves as information and give rise to subjectivity and consciousness (see his TedXCambridge, YouTube video and other papers available by Google search.

^{ix} Both Stuart Kauffman, *Humanity in a Creative Universe*, and Lee Smolin, *The Singular Universe and the Ultimate Reality of Time* comment on the presuppositions associated with the laws of the universe. I have noted Kauffman in various places, as I have Smolin, but to refresh our understanding of Smolin's views, especially on p. 521, where he argues that that laws emerge from earlier causal factors and are part of the physicality of the universe-- this corresponds with Kauffman's idea of acausality. These laws are not eternal and immutable, given the ultimate nature of time as dynamic, which is contrary to time as static and reduced to space. Time changes all things,

including change itself. The absence of eternal immutable laws allows genuine novelty to appear in the universe. Furthermore, the denial of the reality of time, “widens the gulf between science and consciousness to such an extent that it renders all of our experience questionable, including the perceptual experience into which we must translate, and on the basis of which we must make our scientific discoveries.”

^x If it is conceded that religion is an art form, metaphoric in nature, this eliminates rationally generated arguments for or against atheism. We are either compatible with or prisoners in our environments. Atheism is a way out of prison after we have been captured, brainwashed, and incarcerated by a captor upon whom we have become dependent, and whom we even come to love. Pure reason is not responsible for enlightenment and escape, change comes from weighing and modifying our metaphors, an artistic and largely emotional process. We can never get away from the attraction we have for the “source of life,” our life in particular. Nor can I understand how we could merely disappear into the environment after having survived this “crisis.” Nevertheless, the Freedom From Religion Foundation continues to employ rationalistic atheists to promote their position of mind-schism. Thanks to poet, Lisel Mueller, *Alive Together*, writing about the captivity and release of Patty Hurst, for these insights.

^{xi} TV discussion by de Grasse Tyson’s called “Star-Talk. See, “Being is Not an Algorithm,” on this website; also on this site, Orlindo Olivera, *Aeon*, “The Digital Mind: How Science is Redefining Humanity.”

^{xii} Correcting a defective gene by the CRISPER, gene editing technique, is discussed in *Nature*, Aug. 2017, and reviewed with other discussions of gene editing in *Popular Science (Special Edition)*, 2018.

^{xiii} George Lakoff and Mark Johnsen, *Metaphors We Live By*, PDF file, especially the discussion on the War metaphor.

^{xiv} “The Neural Basis of Figurative Language Production.” Search for article on this website.

^{xv} Michael Shermer, “A Moral Starting Point,” *Scientific American*, Feb. 2015, p.84. Abstracted from Shermer’s book, *The Moral Arc*.

^{xvi} Janelle Soskice, *The Kindness of God: Gender and Religious Language*. See also, Art and Morals, Two Aspects of the Same Struggle, *Spectrum Magazine* blog, Feb. 5, 2018.

^{xvii} Roberto Mangabeira Unger, *The Religion of the Future*.

^{xviii} *The Vitality of the Old Testament Traditions*.

^{xix} Robert Karl Gnuse, *The Old Testament and Process Theology*.

^{xx} Brevard Childs, *Biblical Theology in Crisis*.

^{xxi} “How Meditation Changes Your Brain:” *The Lion’s Roar*, pp. 53ff. Cf. Newberg, *Op. cit.*