CONCLUSION
CONCLUSION

There is one vital point that needs to be emphasised at the very onset of this conclusion in order to ensure an effective grasp of the topic discussed in this work. It needs to be underlined in the strongest possible terms, that both post-modern epistemology as well as the epistemology of C. S. Lewis equally base their respective positions upon a presupposed foundation. Post-modern epistemology grounds its contentions within a paradigm of linguistic, sociological and psychological assumption. C. S. Lewis grounds his epistemology upon the assumption that human consciousness is innately aware of the supernatural realm. The present work can not be truly appreciated in an academic sense, unless this point is recognised as being basic to the entire argument of the dissertation.

The epistemologies of both C. S. Lewis and post-modern thinkers start from particular presupposed philosophical assumptions. Neither of these epistemological assumptions can be philosophically vindicated in a categorical, concrete, or absolute manner, and both epistemologies depend upon, for their philosophical validation, evidence that is selective and contextual in nature. Post-modern epistemology relies upon the related findings of academic disciplines such as psychology, sociology, linguistics, and anthropology. C. S. Lewis, on the other hand, points to suggested evidence of human experience of the supernatural (i.e. rationality, the categorical imperative, sehnsucht, and religious awe) in order to establish his claims.
What must be admitted by all serious students of epistemology, is the absolute dependence of all world-views without exception, upon foundational epistemological presupposition, and as such, can only be philosophically validated by means of selective and contextual configuration. Unless this is realised prior to any academic critical examination, a particular world-view may appear to be irrefutably valid whilst in reality it will be entirely due to the examiner's own rational perspective. As one stands rationally inside a particular philosophical paradigm, all of its premises will naturally be found to be systematised and inter-related. This phenomenon however, does in no way vindicate a world-view's validity outside of its own paradigm. It is therefore essential that no epistemology be granted any privilege of credence without first recognising this fact.

Once the above contention has been conceded to, it follows that both post-modern epistemology as well as the world-view of C. S. Lewis stand on equal ground before objective and critical scrutiny. Outside of their own particular paradigms, both require the same objective examination - both are obliged to rationally bear the same burden of proof. Unless a philosophy can objectively justify its claims in a way that is answerable to intelligent criticism, then it has no right to impose its position on the minds of thinking people outside of arbitrary domination and control. To demand an exemption from such a critical examination, would be to reduce all philosophy other than one's own, to irrelevance and absurdity, and to claim the sole exception to this rule to be one's
own philosophy of the moment. Although this is indeed the implication of post-modern epistemology (or at very least, its unavoidable consequence), it remains as a philosophical system, somewhat inconsistently, in dialogue with philosophy in general.

The question may be raised then, which of the two epistemologies presented in this dissertation appears the more in line with actuality, philosophically credible, and contextually consistent? The answer to that question will obviously depend upon the epistemological bias of the reader. The present writer is in no way deluded into an ignorance of the subjectivity bound nature of human interpretation. This being stated, however, I believe that the present dissertation has at very least, exposed one significant philosophical inconsistency that post-modern epistemology seems incapable of accounting for - and that is - the very ground of its fundamental contention. If, as post-modern epistemology teaches, no over-arching standard of truth really exists, and that all human experience of such, is in reality, merely social/linguistic construction of contextual signification - a reality exclusive to one particular paradigm - then how does one account for the very claim argued for? If all metanarrative thinking is denounced in post-modernism, what justifies the very rejection of metanarrative?

On closer inspection of post-modern epistemology, it is discovered that an ideological motivation lies at its core. Such ideology (the call for inter-cultural tolerance and equal rights) is simply assumed without explanation in much of
post-modern writing. It needs to be asked therefore, how such moral and ethical convictions may be demanded universally, as well as imposed upon those whom the mind-set is now educating, while such a demand and imposition absolutely contradicts the epistemological foundation that support its very claim? Such an obvious philosophical inconsistency begs the question, and yet seems to be considered to be irrelevant in post-modern circles. The claim by post-modernists to stand outside of *Western logocentric critical objectivism*, seems to me, to be a mere *evasion* of the question - especially due to the fact that post-modernism offers no alternative to objective and critical scrutiny, and depends upon this very structure for other purposes.

The epistemology of C. S. Lewis, on the other hand, tends to be philosophically consistent, as well as systematically synchronic in all of its basic premises. Lewis is, in his epistemology, able to account for his cosmology, his ethical imperatives, as well as his ideological assumptions. Although it is generally held that a supernatural epistemology bears the burden of proof in its court, and that post-modern thinking is more realistic and consistent with human experience of actuality, the opposite is actually found to be the case. Post-modern epistemology claims to convey no knowledge at all save the knowledge that true and real knowledge is an epistemological impossibility. From such a foundational launching pad however, post-modern innovators construct and seek to impose elaborate value systems and methodologies for the transformation of economics,
health, education, and religion, in fact for the transformation of the entire multi-cultural world into a New World order.

The following table representing the two epistemological presuppositions will illustrate the above paragraph.

**The post-modern epistemological position on truth:** ‘The idea that truth is a correspondent between statements and objective reality has been subject to a great deal of criticism. Much of this criticism is based upon confusion, inasmuch as the critics often while verbally rejecting positivism, still presuppose the positivistic equation of the meaning of a statement with the means of its verification.’ David Ray Griffin (1988:29).

**The Lewisian epistemological position on truth:** ‘I aim tonight only at reversing the popular belief that reality is totally alien to our minds. My answer to that view consists simply in restating it in the form: ‘Our minds are totally alien to reality’. Put that way, it reveals itself as a self-contradiction. For if our minds are totally alien to reality then all our thoughts, including this thought, are worthless.’ *De Futilitate* (Christian Reflections 1991:96).

**The post-modern epistemological position on thought as human construct:** ‘Rorty and Foucault, respectively, have argued that the ‘mind’ and ‘sexuality’ are
historical ‘inventions’. And Patrick Heelan has shown that our most basic perceptions of space have a cultural history.’ Susan Bordo (1987:117).

The Lewisian epistemological position on thought as human construct: ‘My point is that those who stand outside all judgements of value cannot have any ground for preferring one of their impulses to another except the emotional strength of that impulse.’ (The Abolition of Man 1978:40).

The post-modern epistemological position on language: ‘The forms of a person’s thought are controlled by inexorable laws of pattern of which he is unconscious. These patterns are the unperceived intricate systematisations of his own language… Every language is a vast pattern-system, different from others, in which are culturally ordained forms and categories by which the personality not only communicates, but also analyses nature, notices or neglects types of relationships and phenomena, channels his reasoning, and builds the house of his consciousness.’ Benjamin Whorf (Wiley 1956:43).

The Lewisian epistemological position on language: ‘Whatever is positive in the conception of the spiritual has always been contained in them (i.e. words); it is only its negative aspect (immateriality) which had to wait for recognition until abstract thought was fully developed. The material imagery has never been taken literally by anyone who has reached the stage when he could understand what ‘taking it literally’ meant.’ (Miracles 1990:82).
The post-modern epistemological position on propositional dogmatism:

‘The pluralism of doctrines and theories within a single culture such as ours, as well as the pluralism of cultures, makes any claim to the truth of things an implicitly political act. Dogmatism, totalitarianism, and narrow intolerance are all directly connected with unjustified claims to final truth.’ David Hall (1991:58).

The Lewisian epistemological position on propositional dogmatism: ‘What I am trying to say might be interpreted to mean that doctrines ‘don’t matter’, and that the essence of the spiritual life lay either in the affections or in some ‘mystical’ experience to which the intelligence is simply irrelevant. That the spiritual life transcends both intelligence and morality, we are probably all agreed. But I suppose it transcends them as poetry transcends grammar, and does not merely exclude them as algebra excludes grammar.’ (Christian Reunion and other Essays 1990:21).

The post-modern epistemological position on religion’s validity: ‘In order to avoid unnecessary confusion, it is important to realise, that in radical Christology the divine is forever embodied. The word is always already inscribed. Incarnation therefore, is not a once-and-for-all event, restricted to a specific time and place and limited to a particular individual.’ Mark C. Taylor (1984:115).

The Lewisian epistemological position on religion’s validity: ‘If Christianity should happen to be true, then it is quite impossible that those who know this
truth and those who don’t should be equally well equipped for leading a good life. Knowledge of the facts must make a difference to one’s actions.’ (God in the Dock 1990:68).

A further impression that may be gleaned from this study is that the Church need not be intimidated by the prevailing post-modern zeitgeist. It would seem, judging by the volume of academic Christian writing on the subject of post-modernism and the Church, that it is widely believed to be the call of the hour for the Church to conform to, and adapt itself to, post-modern needs, language and culture. Church growth leaders seem to be increasingly imploring ministers to abandon ‘outworn’ and ‘obsolete’ methodologies of evangelism, and adopt new ones that are more ‘contextual’ and ‘relevant’ to the needs of the moment. It cannot be too strongly stated that such a compromise with this mind-set will result in the ultimate self-contradiction of our faith.

What is often not considered in such a call for the Church to adapt to post-modern thinking, is that the very foundational assumption in which the entire post-modern mind-set is epistemologically rooted, is based upon the philosophically unverifiable presupposition that truth is something that is relative, and that reality is, in the final analysis, a mere interpretation of experience. Such an epistemological position not only contradicts the idea of objective truth, but also openly opposes it. Orthodox Christianity, on the other hand, is based upon the assumption that human consciousness is inseparably interwoven with
supernatural reality - the very kerugmatik declaration of the Gospel is something to Christians, that is always expressed imperatively. It needs to be, in the light of this, more universally realised in academic Christian circles, that any epistemological compromise with post-modern thinking, is in the final analysis, a rational inconsistency. Such a compromise will never advance the Church’s interests in the society at large, but will ultimately only serve to dilute and disengage effective Christian witness altogether. Orthodox Christianity always presupposes, and is always founded upon super-naturalism. If this ground is denied it, then Christianity ceases to be ontologically what it has been for the past two thousand years. It may indeed retain the orthodox terminologies, but it will no longer be the same faith that has been believed upon and confessed by all previous generations. Post-modern epistemology, to the present writer’s understanding, seems to be one of the major challenges facing historical orthodoxy in our time, and it is upon this conviction, that the present dissertation was prepared. Lewis shows us in his Christian writings, that such a world-view as post-modernism, with its reductionist epistemology will inevitably result in a particular attitude to life, humanity, and the future, that will be conditioned to match the mind-set. For a Christian to claim therefore, to be a post-modernist in the epistemological sense of the word, would have to imply a serious contradiction in terms.

We learn from this study that the writings of C. S. Lewis are still just as much applicable and relevant to our post-modern age at the turn of the twenty-first
century, as they were when they were originally written and addressed to modernist antagonists in the nineteen-forties and fifties. Lewis can in no way be simply dismissed as being literary obsolete and irrelevant. He seemed in many of his Christian works, to anticipate the eventual demise of modernism with its unshakable confidence in science and technology, and expected the rise of a mind-set that would deny truth and objectivity altogether. It may be interesting to consider whether, in some fifty years or so, post-modernism as an epistemology will still be speaking to the thinking people of that time in a way that will still be relevant and valuable. I somehow think that Lewis is going to long survive post-modern epistemology.

In his posthumous book, Prayer: Letters to Malcolm (1977:70), Lewis expresses the very essence of his epistemological confidence in this poem,

‘They tell me Lord, that when I seem
To be in speech with you,
Since but one voice is heard, it’s all a dream,
One talker aping two.

Sometimes it is, yet not as they
Conceive it. Rather I
Seek in myself the things I hoped to say,
But lo! my wells are dry.
Then, seeing me empty, you forsake

The listener's role and through

My dumb lips breathe and into utterance wake

The thoughts I never knew.

And thus you neither need reply

Nor can; thus while we seem

Two talkers, thou art one forever, and I

No dreamer, but thy dream.'
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APPENDIX NO 1

Lewis supplies the following list as an appendix to his work, The Abolition of Man (1978:49). The list may be just as helpful to my own reader as well, in establishing Lewis’ primary evidence for supernatural reality, the Categorical Imperative. He writes, ‘The following illustrations from the Natural Law are collected from such sources as come readily to the hand of one who is not a professional historian. The list makes no pretense at completeness...It is at least arguable that every civilisation we find has been derived from another civilisation and, in the last resort, from a single centre - ‘carried’ like an infectious disease or like the Apostolical succession.’

1.) The Law of General Beneficence.


‘Do not murder.’ (Ancient Jewish Ex. 20:13).


‘In Nastrond (i.e. Hell), I saw ...murderers.’ Old Norse. Volospa 38, 39).

‘I have not brought misery upon my fellows. I have not made the beginning of every day laborious in the sight of him who worked for me.’ (Ancient Egyptian. Confession of a Righteous Soul. ERE v.478).

‘I have not been grasping.’ (Ancient Egyptian Ibid.).

‘Who meditates oppression, his dwelling is overturned. (Babylonian. Hymn to Samas. ERE v.445).

‘He who is cruel and calumnious has the character of a cat.’ (Hindu. Laws of Manu. Janet, Histoire de la Science Politique, vol 1, p. 6).

‘Slander not.’ (Babylonian Hymn to Samas. ERE v. 445).

‘Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour.’ (Ancient Jewish. Ex. 20:16).

‘Utter not a word by which anyone could be wounded.’ (Hindu. Janet p.7).
‘Has he...driven an honest man from his family? Broken up a well cemented clan? (Babylonian. List of Sins from incantation tablets. ERE v.446).

‘I have not caused hunger. I have not caused weeping.’ (Ancient Egyptian ERE 446).

‘Never do to others what you would not like them to do to you.’ (Ancient Chinese. Analects of Confucius, trans. A. Waley, xv. 23; cf. xii. 2).

‘Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thy heart.’ (Ancient Jewish. Leviticus 19:17).

‘He whose heart is in the smallest degree set upon goodness will dislike no-one.’ (Ancient Chinese Analects iv. 4).

b.) Positive: ‘Nature urges that a man should wish human society to exist and should wish to enter it.’ (Roman Cicerio, De Officiis, i. 1v.).

‘By the fundamental Law of Nature, Man (is) to be preserved as much as possible.’ (Locke Treatise of civil Govt. ii. 3).

‘When the people have multiplied what next should be done for them? The Master said, Enrich them. Jan Chi’iu said, When one has enriched them, what next should be done for them? The Master said, Instruct them. (Ancient Chinese, Analects viii. 9).

‘Speak kindness...Show good will.’ (Babylonian. Hymn to Samas. ERE v 445).

‘Men were brought into existence for the sake of men that they might do one another good.’ (Roman. Cicero, De off. 1. vii).

‘Man is man’s delight.’ (Old Norse. Havamal 47).

‘He who is asked for alms should always give.’ (Hindu. Janet 1. 7).

‘What good man regards any misfortune as no concern of his?’ (Roman. Juvenal xv. 140).

‘I am a man: nothing human is alien to me.’ (Roman. Terence, Heaut. Tim.).


‘Love the stranger as thyself.’ (Ancient Jewish. ibid 33, 34).

‘Do to men what you wish men to do to you.’ (Christian. Matt. 7:12).
2.) The Law of Special Beneficence.

'It is upon the trunk that a gentleman works. When that is firmly set up, the Way grows. And surely proper behaviour to parents and elder brothers is the trunk of goodness.' (Ancient Chinese. Analects i. 2).

'Brothers shall fight and be each other's bane.' (Old Norse. Account of the evil age before the World's end. Volospa 45).

'Has he insulted his elder sister?' (Babylonian. List of sins. ERE v. 446).

'You will see them take care of their kindred and the children of their friends...never reproaching them in the least.' (Redskin. Le Jeune, quoted ERE v. 437).

'Love thy wife studiously. Gladden her heart all thy life long.' (Ancient Egyptian. ERE v. 481).

'Nothing can ever change the claims of kinship for a right thinking man.' (Anglo Saxon. Beowulf, 2600).

'Did not Socrates love his own children, though he did so as a free man and as one not forgetting that the gods have the first claim on our friendship?' (Greek. Epictetus, iii. 24).

'Natural affection is a right thing and according to Nature.' (Greek ibid. 1. xi).

'I ought not to be unfeeling like a statue but should fulfill both my natural and artificial relations, as a worshipper, a son, a brother, and a citizen.' (Greek. ibid, 111. ii).

'This first I rede thee: be blameless to thy kindred. Take no vengeance even though they do thee wrong. (Old Norse. Sigdrifumal, 22).

'Is it only the sons of Atreus who love their wives? For every good man who is right minded, loves and cherishes his own.' (Greek. Homer, Iliad ix. 340).

'The union and fellowship of men will be best preserved if each receives from us the more kindness in proportion as he is more closely connected with us.' (Roman. Cicero, De Off. 1. xvi).

'Part of us is claimed by our country, part by our parents, part by our friends.' (Roman. Ibid 1. vii).

'If a ruler...compassed the salvation of the whole state, surely you would call him good? The Master said, it would no longer be a matter of 'good'. He would without doubt be a divine sage.' (Ancient Chinese. Analects, vii. 28).
'Has it escaped you that in the eyes of gods and good men, your native land deserves from you more honour, worship and reverence than your mother and father and all your ancestors? That you should give a softer answer to its anger than to a father’s anger? That if you cannot persuade it to alter its mind you must obey it in all quietness, whether it binds you or beats you or sends you to a war where you might get the wounds of death?’ (Greek. Plato, Crito, 51. A, B).

‘If any provide not for his own, and especially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith.’ (Christian. 1 Tim. 5:8).

‘Put them in mind to obey magistrates.’... ‘I exhort that prayers be made for kings and all that are in authority.’ (Christian. Titus 3:1, and 1 Tim. 2:1,2).

3.) Duties to Parents, Elders, Ancestors: ‘Your father is an image of the Lord of Creation, your mother is an image of the earth. For him who fails to honour them, every work of piety is in vain. This is the first duty.’ (Hindu. Janet i. 9).

‘Has he despised father and mother?’ (Babylonian. List of sins ERE v.446).

‘I was a staff at my father’s side... I went in and out at his command.’ (Ancient Egyptian. Confession of the Righteous Soul. ERE v. 481).


‘To care for parents.’ (Greek. List of duties in Epictetus 111. vii).

‘Children, old men, the poor, and the sick, should be considered as the lords of the atmosphere.’ (Hindu. Janet, i. 8).

‘Rise up before the hoary head and honour the old man.’ (Ancient Jewish. Leviticus 19:32).

‘I tended the old man. I gave him my staff.’ (Ancient Egyptian. ERE v. 481).

‘You will see them take care...of old men.’ (Redskin. Le Jeune, quoted ERE v. 437).

‘I have not taken away oblations of the blessed dead.’ (Ancient Egyptian, Confessions of a Righteous Soul. ERE v. 478).

‘When proper respect towards the dead is shown at the end and continued after they are far away, the moral force (te) of a people has reached its highest point.’ (Ancient Chinese. Analects, i. 9).
4.) Duties to children and posterity: ‘Children, the old, the poor etc. should be considered as lords of the atmosphere.’ (Hindu. Janet, i. 8).

‘To marry and beget children.’ (Greek. List of duties, Epictetus, 111. vii).

‘Can you conceive of an Epicurian commonwealth?...What will happen? Whence is the population to be kept up? Who will educate them? Who will be director of adolescents? Who will be director of physical training? What will be taught? (Greek. Ibid.).

‘Nature produces a special love of offspring’ and, ‘to live according to Nature is the supreme good.’ (Roman. Cicero, De off. 1. iv, and De Legibus, 1. xxi).

‘The second of these achievements is no less glorious than the first; for while the first did good on one occasion, the second will continue to benefit the state forever.’ (Roman. Cicero, De Off. 1. xxii).

‘Great reverence is owed to a child.’ (Roman. Juvenal. xiv. 47).


‘The killing of the women, and more especially of the young boys and girls who are to make up the future strength of the people is the saddest part...and we feel it very sorely.’ (Redskin. Account of the battle of Wounded Knee. ERE v. 432).

5.) The Law of Justice: ‘Has he approached his neighbour’s wife?’ (Babylonian. List of Sins, ERE v. 446).


‘I saw in Nastrond (i.e. Hell)...beguilers of other’s wives. (Old Norse, Volospa 38, 39).

‘Has he drawn false boundaries?’ (Babylonian. List of Sins, ERE v. 446).

‘To wrong, to rob, to cause to be robbed.’ (Babylonian, Ibid).

‘I have not stolen.’ (Ancient Egyptian. Confession of the Righteous Soul, ERE v. 478).


‘Choose loss rather than shameful gains.’ (Greek. Chilon FR. 10 Diels).

‘Justice is the settled and permanent intention of rendering to each man his rights.’ (Roman. Justinian, Institutions, 1. i.).
‘If the native make a ‘find’ of any kind (e.g. a honey tree) and marked it, it was thereafter safe for him, as far as his own tribesmen were concerned, no matter how long he left it.’ (Australian Aborigines ERE v. 441).

‘The first point of justice is that none should do any mischief to another unless he has first been attacked by the other’s wrongdoing. The second is that a man should treat common property as common property, and private property as his own. There is no such thing as private property by nature, but things have become private either through prior occupation (as when men of old came into empty territory) or by conquest, or law, or agreement, or stipulation, or casting lots.’ (Roman. Cicero, De Off. 1.vii).

‘Whoso takes no bribe...well pleasing is this to Samas.’ (Babylonian. ERE v. 445).

‘I have not traduced the slave to him who is set over him.’ (Ancient Egyptian. Confession of the Righteous Soul ERE v. 478).


‘Regard him whom thou knowest like him whom thou knowest not.’ (Ancient Egyptian. ERE v. 482).

‘Do no unrighteousness in judgement. You must not consider the fact that one party is poor nor the fact that the other is a great man.’ (Ancient Jewish. Leviticus. 19:15).


‘Whose mouth, full of lying, avails not before thee: thou burneth their utterance.’ (Babylonian. Hymn to Samas. ERE v. 445).

‘With his mouth, he is full of yea, in his heart full of nay? (Babylonian ERE v. 446).

‘I have not spoken falsehood.’ (Ancient Egyptian. Confessions of the Righteous Soul. ERE v. 478).


‘In Nastrond (i.e. Hell), I saw perjurers.’ (Old Norse. Volospa 39).
‘Hateful to me as the gates of Hades is that man who says one thing and hides another in his heart.’ (Greek. Homer iliad, ix 312).

‘The foundation of justice is good faith.’ (Roman. Cicerio, De Off. 1. vii).

‘(The gentleman) must learn to be faithful to his superiors and to keep promises.’ (Ancient Chinese. Analects., 1. 8).

‘Anything is better than treachery.’ (Old Norse. Havamal 124).

7.) The Law of Mercy: ‘The poor and the sick should be regarded as the lords of the atmosphere.’ (Hindu. Janet, i. 8).

‘Whoso maketh intercession for the weak, well pleasing is this to Samas.’ (Babylonian ERE v. 445).

‘Has he failed to set a prisoner free? (Babylonian. List of Sins. ERE v. 446).

‘I have given bread to the hungry, water to the thirsty, clothes to the naked, a ferry boat to the boatless.’ (Ancient Egyptian. ERE v. 478).

‘One should never strike a woman, not even with a flower.’ (Hindu. Janet 1. 8).

‘There, Thor, You got disgrace when you beat women.’ (Old Norse. Harbarthsljoth 38).

‘In the Dalebura tribe, a woman, a cripple from birth, was carried about by the tribes-people in turn until her death at the age of sixty-six...They never desert the sick.’ (Australian Aborigines. ERE v. 443).

‘You will see them take care of...widows, orphans and old men, never reproaching them.’ (Redskin. ERE v. 439).

‘Nature confesses that she has given to the human race the tenderest hearts, by giving us the power to weep. This is the best part of us.’ (Roman. Juvenal, xv. 131).

‘They said that he had been the mildest and gentlest of the kings of the world.’ (Anglo Saxon. Praise of the hero Beowulf, 3180).

‘When thou cuttest down thine harvest...and hast forgotten a sheaf...thou shalt not go again to fetch it; it shall be for a stranger, for the fatherless and for the widow.’ (Ancient Jewish. Deut. 24:19).
The Law of Magnanimity: ‘There are two kinds of injustice: the first is found in those who do an injury, the second in those who fail to protect another from injury when they can.’ (Roman. Cicero, De Off. 1. vii).

‘Men always knew that when force and injury was offered they might be defenders of themselves; they knew that howsoever men may seek their own commodity, yet if this were done with injury unto others it was not to be suffered, but by all men and by all good means, withstood.’ English. Hooker, Laws of Eccl. Polity, 1. ix. 4).

‘To take no notice of a violent attack is to strengthen the heart of the enemy. Vigour is valiant, but cowardice is vile.’ (Ancient Egyptian. The Pharaoh Senusert 111. cit. H. R. Hall, Ancient history of the Near East, 161).

‘They came to the fields of joy, the fresh turf of the Fortunate Woods and the dwellings of the Blessed...here was the company of those who had suffered wounds fighting for the fatherland.’ (Roman. Virgil, Aeneid. vi. 638-9, 660).

‘Courage has got to be harder, heart the stouter, spirit the sterner, as our strength weakens. Here lies our lord, cut to pieces, our best man in the dust. If anyone thinks of leaving this battle, he can howl forever.’ ( Anglo Saxon. Maldon 312).

‘Praise and imitate the man to whom, while life is pleasing, death is not grievous.’ (Stoic. Seneca, Ep. Liv).

‘The Master said, Love learning and if attacked be ready to die the good way.’ (Ancient Chinese, Analects viii. 13).

‘Death is to be chosen before slavery and base deeds.’ (Roman. Cicero, De Off, 1. xxiii).

‘Death is better for every man than life with shame.’ (Anglo Saxon, Beowulf, 2890).

‘Nature and reason demand that nothing uncomely, nothing effeminate, nothing lascivious be done or thought.’ (Roman. Cicero, De Off. 1. iv).

‘We must not listen to those who advise us ‘being men to think human thoughts, and being mortal to think mortal thoughts,’ but must put on immortality as much as it is possible and strain every nerve to live according to the best part of us, which, being small in bulk, yet much more in its power and honour surpasses all else.’ (Ancient Greek. Aristotle, Eth, Nic. 1177 b).
‘The soul then ought to conduct the body and the spirit of our minds the soul. This is therefore the first law, whereby the highest power of the mind requireth obedience at the hands of all the rest.’ (Hooker op. cit. 1. viii).

‘Let him not desire to die, let him not desire to live, let him wait for his time...Let him patiently bear hard words, entirely abstaining from bodily pleasures.’ (Ancient Indian. Laws of Manu. ERE ii. 98).

‘He who is unmoved, who has restrained his senses...is said to be devoted. As a flame in a windless place that flickers not, so is the devoted.’ (Ancient Indian. Bhagvadgita ERE ii. 90).


‘I know that I hung on the gallows for nine nights, wounded with the spear as the sacrifice to Odin, myself offered to myself.’ (Old Norse. Havamal, 1. 10 in Corpus Poeticum Boreale; stanza 139 in Hildebrand's Lieder der Alteren Edda. 1922).

‘Verily, verily I say unto you, unless a grain of wheat falls into the earth and dies, it remains alone, but if it dies it bears much fruit. He who loves his life loses it.’ (Christian. John 12:24, 25).
APPENDIX NO 2

The example that I have selected at random for this appendix in order to illustrate the impact that post-modern epistemology is having upon evangelical thinking, is, I believe, clearly seen in the following article. Stephen Pierce a Baptist minister wrote the following article for the Baptist denominational magazine, *Baptists Today*, September 2002, p.6. The article is entitled, *Baptist Leadership in a New Millennium*.

I read with much interest the article by Clive Jacobs about overcoming difficult church matters through the power of the risen Christ, and I was amazed at the insight Clive has into a fundamental issue in Baptist life. Clive calls it ‘a spirit of control’ that comes from a compelling need for power and people’s need to assert their rights.

A team without a captain, a highway without a traffic cop, a school without a principal - the result would be chaos! The same is true for the Church, although leadership is much more complicated for us as Baptists. We have strongly asserted our principle of ‘congregational government’ and in the past we have sought to govern everything in Church life.

The joke on the Internet has a ring of truth...‘How many Baptists does it take to change a light bulb?’ ‘Answer - 10!’ One to change the bulb, 5 to form a committee, and four to make potato salad.

But times are changing, and so is ‘Baptist life’.
For the past ten years or so, the key phrase we heard was ‘generational change’. We became familiar with catchwords - ‘baby boomers’, ‘baby busters’ and ‘generation x’.

Alarm bells rang, and the gloves came off when the music of the new generation began to replace the hymns. Hymn books were replaced with song books, which were replaced with video projectors. With all the changes that have taken place, there has, I think, been a fundamental change that has been overlooked - that the president addressed briefly in the December 2001 issue of Baptists Today. There has been a fundamental change in Baptist leadership.

Baptist leaders, especially those in pastoral positions are the key. They are the ones fighting what Clive called ‘The Spirit of Control’. The statistics are despairing, of men and women who ‘throw in the towel’ and give up the fight. Not only in South Africa, but all over the world. The average tenure of a Baptist pastor in a church in South Africa is approximately three years. In the USA it is 9 months! The principle issue causing pastors to terminate is the issue of leadership and control.

So what’s up?

It’s my understanding (and the subject of my doctoral work) that Baptist leadership is subtly reacting to a phenomenon known as ‘post-modernism’ - a shifting attitudinal change that is basic to everything we believe. The reaction to the escalating change is, I believe, a desperate attempt to keep things ‘the way they always have been’ - but its a losing battle. Churches bemoan the fact that they are shutting down, they have no youth, no young marrieds’, no evening service, and they are in ‘survival mode’.

Lets have a brief and somewhat simplistic look at an approaching phenomenon that in fact defies description. And it’s here that you must start. Post-modernism is emerging and incomplete. There are some things happening that we can hold on to, but mostly we are like the pinball in the old pinball machines (this will date me!). We just bounce off what is happening around us!
As I have tried to grasp the mind-set of the post-modern person, the first thing I have discovered is that they come to the Church for the EXPERIENCE. There is little or no interest in denominational loyalties. Post-modern people want an ‘inner truth’. They are not asking ‘What is the meaning of my life?’ but rather, ‘Does my life have meaning?’ They don’t care if the church is Baptist, Pentecostal or Mormon for that matter. They are not interested in whether the pastor is reformed or charismatic, or any other distinction we consider to be important. What DOES matter is that this is the church in my neighbourhood, and the person in the pulpit teaching the Word of God is a person with whom I have a relationship.

Listen pastors! See some red lights flashing here! Post-modern people are not interested who is in control, they are not loyal to denominations, they are loyal to ‘friendships’. They are seeking experience and if we want to reach them, we have to be smart. Not ‘godless smart’ just smart enough to understand their thinking (Discerning!).

Have you noticed the increasing tendency to remove the denominational name from church bulletin boards in favour of ‘The Community Church’, or a Biblical metaphor - The Family Church. It’s a post-modern pointer!

Clive is right, its not about who is in control, any longer, its about PEOPLE being released into ministry. So what is it that we should be doing as leaders to deal with the exponential rate of change that is hitting our churches?

Here’s what you can do...

Make sure you are a relational pastor who gives time for people. Visit, visit, visit, visit, visit. We have a planned visitation programme. Become involved in the community, be interested in what the community does. Make sure that your home is open for people to call in. Encourage people that their life does have meaning. Make sure that you as a preacher do your part in making every
service a ‘worshipful experience’ by not compromising the truth, but by helping your hearers apply the truth in their lives. Develop a sense of ‘subjective well-being’ by people about their lives and the life of the Church. ‘It is well with my soul, and the ‘soul’ of my Church!’