

Scripture's Meaning Makers And Slavery And Any Topic Whatsoever

This PDF is linked within content that in part overlaps with it in the following two locations:

www.Slavery.Bible which is:

Slavery In The Christian Metanarrative Is Defined As A Swath Of Privations Many Pains Therefore The Christian Metanarrative Cannot Have A Pro Slavery "Verse" Much Less A Pro Slavery "ANY-Thing"
<https://metachristianity.com/slavery-in-the-christian-metanarrative-is-defined-as-a-swath-of-privations-many-pains/>

www.BibleViolence.com which is:

Deficiency Of Being, Old Testament Violence, The Metaphysic Of Privation, And Christ Crucified
<https://metachristianity.com/old-testament-violence-the-metaphysic-of-privation-and-christ-crucified>

Scripture's Meaning Makers and Slavery

Part 1 of 3:

A primary difficulty is that Meaning Makers in any metaphysic entail accounting for whole metanarratives. Any conclusion on definitions within, say, "Non-Theism-Yes" or "Metaphysic XYZ" that fails to include "whole books" which is to say the Whole of "the" "metaphysic" (whatever it may be) is simply an uninformed conclusion.

It should be obvious but probably still worth mentioning:

Adding more and more paragraphs and hours to the aforementioned failure to include [wholes] doesn't transform the aforementioned uninformed conclusion derived from [parts] into an informed conclusion.

Version 1 For those who want to define [Any-X] in the [Any-X-Metanarrative], your work will by necessity need to include express and obvious vectors into and out of the Metaphysical Wellspring of all Ontological Possibility vis-à-vis the [Any-X] Metaphysic.

Version 2 For those who want to define [Slavery] in the [Christian Metanarrative], your work will by necessity need to include express and obvious vectors into and out of the Metaphysical Wellspring of all Ontological Possibility vis-à-vis the [Christian] Metaphysic.

Adulting:

Grownups Are Capable Of Processing Whole Metanarratives

No one reads 20% of History or Philosophy or Physics and just stops. Why? Because "Reality" doesn't work that way. In part it entails reading whole books. Metanarrative. If one doesn't interact with the Whole, one is simply avoiding the Christian Metaphysic. Which means IF the thesis fails to deploy the actual explanatory termini in the actual metaphysic under review (Christianity) THEN the claims and

conclusions are NOT addressing Christianity AND SO the content is simply uninteresting because it is simply not applicable.

A historian or an Assyriologist and so on CAN define [Reality] by treating it “as-if” the “metaphysics-of” reality stop once you get to said history, to Assyrian History perhaps, but that would be terribly myopic. And sloppy. Eventually we get there – to that Myopia – to that Sloppiness – and so we may well gently introduce a few suggestions for our Historian friends who wish to “critique” the following question:

“Does Being//Existence vis-à-vis Irreducible Self-Giving vis-à-vis Timeless Reciprocity vis-à-vis the Trinitarian Life Define Slavery As The-Good/Beautiful/Whole/Healthy/Ideal/Lovely?”

Regarding the aforementioned Myopia and Sloppiness as we approach that question we can add the following suggestion::

Stop. Think. Being||Existence condemns Slavery.

“Yet” various folks argue (claim) the following:

“Based on —
[1] a swath of contingent and mutable vectors within Assyriology
—and on —
[2] a swath of Scripture
— we *rationaly conclude* that it is the case that *in fact* Being||Existence vis-à-vis Irreducible-Self-Giving vis-à-vis Timeless-Reciprocity do NOT condemn Slavery.”

The methodological shortfall in that syllogistic myopia is obvious, and painfully so and, so, again:

If one does not interact with the Whole, one is simply avoiding the actual Christian Metaphysic which (again) means IF your thesis claims to address Christianity THEN it is simply uninteresting because it is simply not applicable.

This is really not complicated: No one reads 20% of History or Philosophy or Physics and just stops. WHY? Two reasons:

First: Because “Reality” doesn’t work that way. Second: Because of something called Adulthood. Think about the following:

In the argument which concludes that Being/Existence does NOT condemn slavery we find:

[1] a swath of a few centuries within contingent variables of Something-Something BCE
[2] a swath of a few chapters out of the whole book
[3] a swath of few vectors from a metaphysic floating in midair, informing nothing and providing no explanatory termini

Full Stop.

Meanwhile:

On the *other* side of the proverbial table, we find:

[1] 25 Centuries of voluminous and tedious linguistics feeding into Christendom

[2] a century of linguistics in and of Messianic Judaism

[3] 1500 years of tedious mapping of metaphysics beginning with mere perception of non-self and progressing step by step through to Being Itself as Existence Itself (and etc.).

[4] www.slavery.bible Atheist/Non-Theist Tim O'Neill comments: "Like most things in history, the abolition of slavery was a gradual process and involved many factors. But if I were to single out one religious tradition that was most influential, it would be Christianity." <https://historyforatheists.com>

...and the list of vectors keeps going (not for long, just a few more to make the list a little tedious to have to read, for the benefit of our Historian friends) with a few more items....

[5] The first order trajectory regarding the Final Insufficiency of Sinai — what scripture itself defines as the Lesser, as Insufficient, as the "Ministry of Death" because it can only *restrain *death and never can *give *life.

[6] Scripture's Definition of all which is beneath the proverbial Ceiling we call Temporal Becoming located far, far outside of The Edenic and far, far outside of Eschatology's terminus in the what the Christian Metaphysic describes as Participatory vis-à-vis the Perfection of Being — for example as we map "*Deficiency Of Being, Old Testament Violence, The Metaphysic Of Privation, And Christ Crucified*" in the following www.BibleViolence.com

[7] The fact of Evil as Privation and what Scripture's Means are for ending (Cosmic) Privation, and why they are not another 499,842 laws, and why history proves that we are always on that trajectory and why instead of returning again and again to Sinai, the Metaphysic invariably Maps to... well what? Do our Historian friends know?

[8] The fact of what logical necessity forces us to define as the ONLY logically possible resolution of ANY Privation of Good/Being/Existence ((the logic is not complicated as we find when we start unpacking, say, eliminative materialism)) – namely the categorical Wellspring of all said categories aka Goodness Itself/Being Itself/Existence Itself – and what is "that"? Well sound ontology is needed but the short version is probably familiar to most, namely we find the logical necessity that we have nothing less than All-Sufficiency's Own Self-Outpouring vis-à-vis Good/Being/Existence ((and so on but eschatology is not the actual topic)).

In the next section (**Part 2**) we will look at the following:

“...But I am not looking for what the lens of CHRISTIANITY says I am only looking for what THE BIBLE says....”

That is at times a part of a reply or else the only reply and it is helpful to explore that too. But before that there is one more brief item to add here in this first section because it helps focus the lens on the fact that we are all – every one of us – always busy in attempting – in our own way – the work of *bringing into harmony the greatest number ascertained facts while disposing of the greatest number of difficulties with the least amount of strain*. That is a paraphrase of Snowden (coming up). So, that said, here is that “one more brief item” before moving into **Part 2** and the posture of “But it’s THE BIBLE and not CHRISTIANITY that I’m looking into” which we find at times.

Why Was The Slave-Bible Safe For Slaves?

F. Sanders comments:

“I’ve spent some time with this terrible 1807 American “Slave Bible” in the last year or so. It’s a perverse document that sets itself a hard editorial task: If you hand the Bible to slaves, which parts do you need to omit in order to keep it “safe?””

Let’s add two more questions:

- Was Pastor Marting Luther King Jr. exegetically off the rails when he describes Scripture’s condemnation of slavery and of racism?
- Why did Pro-Slavery Christians rip out **Leviticus** and other books from “the bible” in their “slave bibles” to make them “safe” to allow slaves to read?

Our Non-Theist friends may not see the relevance of that (sinful) move by Christians expunging Scripture’s actual Metanarrative. Leviticus is removed entirely, which reveals a sort of almost comical sloppiness inside of an epistemic unawareness when folks insist Any-Old-Set-Of-Margins will suffice, or, when folks come to the table with an “exeges” that is unable to retain more than a few chapters at a time.

It’s not complicated: Sub-Narratives never can “become” Meta-Narrative. “But Leviticus! But Sinai!” is fine to work off of as one’s initial few steps, but to get lost inside of that slice of reality is a common manifestation of a failure in basic reading comprehension. To slightly paraphrase/borrow from Snowden, we can say the following:

The Metaphysical/Exegetical landscape which brings into harmony the greatest number of verses and ascertained facts while disposing of the greatest number of difficulties with the least amount of strain is the Metaphysical / Exegetical landscape with the highest plausibility. That’s one of the ways Trinitarianism eventually rises above all other maps — it’s uncanny because that is not only the *exegetical and *metaphysical result but it is also the result as we move outward into the topography of Person and Self and Mind and Reciprocity as well as Sin/Privation and Grace/Closure and more.

Part 2 of 3:

The following is a fallacious evasion of the terms Subtext, Context, Narrative, Metanarrative, and Meaning Makers:

“...But I am not looking for what the lens of CHRISTIANITY says I am only looking for what THE BIBLE says...”

Here is the reply that will expose the Where and the How it is by which that is fallacious:

“Okay. What are the Bible’s Meaning Makers?”

That of course ends up getting some sort of the following as a reply:

“...Well THIS is where looking for definitional meaning starts and THIS is where looking for definitional meaning ends...”

1/3 The moment one begins to draw lines within any text one is going to have to justify why *such-and-such* and *so-and-so* actually define *the nature of reality inside of that setting* – but then – the moment one makes the attempt, one is found introducing not only ontology regarding Mankind but also regarding, for just three basic yet pesky examples, Perception, Intuition, and Philosophy of Mind – but then – the moment one makes the attempt, one is found introducing not only....but also... repeat... repeat.

2/3 In short any “margin” of ***“...Well THIS is where looking for meaning starts and THIS is where looking for meaning ends...”*** is going to be a [bracketed] epistemic in which the very brackets themselves are going to be exposed as being stuck inside of the Munchhausen’s Trilemma ((epistemic Circularity and/or Blind Axiom and/or Infinite Regress)) UNLESS one ***follows through*** and demonstrates BOTH full-on metaphysical escape from said Trilemma AND ALSO one’s own metaphysical explanatory termini which are themselves free of Circularity, Blind Axiom, and Infinite Regress.

Perception Itself ?

Being Itself ?

Existence Itself ?

The-Good Itself ?

Absolute Consciousness ?

Illusion ?

3/3 The problem in all of that thus far is that the average Historian or Assyriologist and so on is not prepared to, say, unpack what it actually means to any epistemic should one claim, say, that the Hard Problem of Consciousness CAN “in principle” be solved outside of Theism or if one claims that, say, the Hard Problem of Consciousness CAN’T be solved reality’s Rock Bottom is NOT Absolute Consciousness, or, say, well, you get the idea. Munchhausen’s Trilemma is a kind of universal acid – unless one demonstrates the aforementioned escape/closure, and so on.

All of that is WHY it is the case that WHEN the Christian states “The conclusion doesn’t address the claims of Scripture” what that means in basic terms is the following:

Every “conclusion” from our proverbial Historian friend or Assyriologist friend that BEGINS with:

“...Scripture condones [Reality-X] because....”

—and then proceeds to develop semantic architecture that lands in or concludes in any slice of or swath of what Scripture’s Meaning Makers specifically define as:

...Privation...

—is a “conclusion” that is from the get-go NOT being informed by Scripture’s Meaning Makers – and of course that entails the Christian Metaphysic and as such we come to the following:

A Bit Of An Object Lesson Or Example:

The “conclusion” doesn’t address the claims of Scripture. Let’s call the following paragraph “**Exhibit-ABC**”. It would be an example of a “proper” or “more robust” reply by the Christian to those who have come to the table with a set of meaning makers, definitions, conclusions, and so on which are wholly expunged of the Christian Metaphysic. Here it is:

Exhibit ABC: Hey guys thank you but your conclusion doesn’t address the claims of Scripture. As such we rightly conclude that you are not refuting [Slavery] vis-à-vis [God] vis-à-vis [Christianity] because you haven’t described [Slavery] in its Essence as per the ontic of Being vis-à-vis Existence based on the Blueprint of the Trinitarian Life, which is to say based on Being/Existence as nothing less than Timeless Reciprocity and Ceaseless Self-Giving as we map the Great Chain of Being vis-à-vis Logic vis-à-vis Reason's demands for Closure that is free of / void of Circularity, Equivocation, and Blind Axiom (see Munchhausen Trilemma) and therefore your conclusion is simply, well, uninteresting. —> keep reading —> and notice —> as our Historian/Assyriologist friends ask: “**WHAT? HUH? WHAT does Exhibit-ABC even MEAN?**”

The reply of “WHAT? HUH? WHAT does Exhibit-ABC even MEAN?” from the folks who claim to be addressing the “The Bible” and/or the CHRISTIAN Metaphysic is a reply that gives the Christian an actual “QED” which he (the Christian) can then kindly take hold of and give to those very same folks who said, “Huh?” Why can the Christian count that as a QED?

Because of the following:

The Blueprint of the Trinitarian Life and the “What” of the Crucified Christ and the Why/How it is that the whole of everything “Adamic” is defined by Scripture as Lack/Privation and that *includes* Sinai as Not-Up-To-The-Job
—are all—

not only unfamiliar to said folks

—**but also**—

said folks have in fact undergone their entire project only AFTER having (in praxis) expunged nearly the WHOLE of THAT Metaphysic — the *Christian Metaphysic — which they claim to be exploring for Definitions and Meaning Maker

—**and/or**—

they have presented their entire project only AFTER *ipso facto* expunging nearly the WHOLE of their OWN Meaning Makers as we do not find, anywhere while reading their conclusions, ANY such arguments.

Slavery is actually a simple example but there are obviously several topics this basic “**review of methodology**” or “**review of critical thinking**” readily applies to.

The sort of Blind, Blasé “...*well we'll just close our eyes and drop our pen onto the page and any “meaning” will be, well, whatever dear and wherever dear and however dear...*” sums to, again, an approach that is fine if that is what one is attempting to produce and argue. However, if not, and if one is intending to address “The Bible” on topic-x and/or “The Christian Metaphysic” on topic-x then one’s content is, again, simply inapplicable and, therefore, uninteresting.

Part 3 of 3:

The URL www.Slavery.Bible goes to a page or post titled:

Slavery In The Christian Metanarrative Is Defined As A Swath Of Privations Many Pains
Therefore The Christian Metanarrative Cannot Have A Pro Slavery “Verse” Much Less A Pro
Slavery “ANY-Thing”

It’s tedious work because most are *not willing* (or unable) to do the work but, logical necessity by logical necessity by... logical... necessity each and every explanatory terminus ultimately pushes through and conclusions of “*Scripture Condone Slavery*” are exposed as wholly uninformed by Scripture’s Meaning Makers.

Recall from earlier the “**Exhibit-ABC**” and let’s add this brief epistemological follow-up:

The response of “Huh?” to that “exhibit-abc” earlier is helpful because it shows that the person who replies with that “Huh?” actually believes one of two things:

either

(1) exhibit-abc *has nothing to do with Christianity*

or else

(2) epistemology has nothing to do with the content of their own semantic architecture

Those are okay for the underexposed and underread (uninformed) — for a little while. However, at some point one accumulates, not months, and not a year, but years of Christians asking:

"What on earth are you talking about? Your syllogism has nothing to do with Christianity."

So then — there is a point there at which one crosses over into willing culpability for splashing about in pools of the nonsensical and calling it "God" as one rejects "it".

The Christian reply is that one is welcome to reject "it" but the entire syllogism is comprised of content in which we have yet to see anyone capturing any syllogism of Christianity in their path to conclusions.

Why say that? Because:

Notice the “why” behind why such approaches not only fail to map the Christian Metaphysic but also fail to retain sound metaphysics ‘period’ as they map reality. That “why” is straightforward because their syllogistic structures land in untenable syllogisms that collapse **UNLESS** the following are TRUE:

1. Physics precedes Metaphysics
2. Contingent precedes Necessary
3. Non-Mind precedes Absolute Mind
4. Privation outreaches Whole||deal
5. Sinai outreaches Life||The-Good
6. Insufficiency's Hollow outreaches All-Sufficiency's Outpouring
7. Mutable outreaches Immutable

And so on and yet it is the case that **IF AND ONLY IF** those seven *reductio*'s are TRUE can the claim of “Condone” receive some faint hope of surviving – but of course “*Reductio*'s” are not only *not true*, they also *cannot be true* — *not even in principle*.

The fact that such elementary logic seems to go wholly missing from the entire edifice of our Historian friends and Non-Theist friends and Assyriologist friends as they describe their “conclusion” that “Scripture Condone Slavery” is evidence that their methodology is entirely in the dark in even rudimentary ontology regarding anything anywhere near the zip code of something like:

Ultimately our Meaning and Life and Wholeness are all found in Self-Giving, in Reciprocity, in the Total Rationalism of Absolute Consciousness.

Instead it seems to be almost a physicalist's latticework of anemic semantic content unable to make even elementary distinctions amid being and non-being, necessary and brute, and so on. As we move into the conclusion here it is perhaps quite obvious but still worth pointing out the following observation:

The url titles of <http://Slavery.Bible> and of <http://BibleViolence.com> are perhaps a play on words but the point should be obvious – namely – that it is in fact somewhat elementary maps of a *metaphysic* under review and as such we find all semantic architecture within basic frameworks of *logic* and *identity* because “that” is “what” we navigate vis-à-vis “metaphysic”. As we come to our conclusion in the next

secgtion, therefore, read the following two “titles” with the concept of “logic” and the concept of “identity” as in *logical identity* in mind:

Title 1 of 2:

*Slavery In The Christian Metanarrative Is Defined As A Swath Of Privations Many Pains **Therefore** The Christian Metanarrative Cannot Have A Pro-Slavery Verse Much Less A Pro-Slavery **Any-Thing***

Title 2 of 2:

Deficiency Of Being, Old Testament Violence, The Metaphysic Of Privation, And Christ Crucified

What is necessarily entailed in *deficiency of being*?

What is necessarily entailed in the *metaphysic of privation*?

What is necessarily entailed in *Christ Crucified*?

Conclusion:

Given all of these observations, we can only re-introduce our somewhat myopic friends to the Whole of Scripture vis-à-vis the Christian Metaphysic all over again:

Scripture's© Singular® Metanarrative© & Thematic® Lines© find no Malleability in the Epicenter as all definitions and meaning-makers must survive the traversal and demands of Being-Itself as Timeless Reciprocity & Ceaseless Self-Giving vis-a-vis the Trinitarian Life. Ultimately our Meaning and Life and Wholeness in Existence converge in the Singular Terminus of Self-Giving ||| Reciprocity. Non-Theism's terminus in Being as Irreducible Indifference and Terminal Non-Distinction contradicts all that we call *sight* even as our terminus in Trinitarian Being as Timeless Reciprocity & Ceaseless Self-Giving affirms all that we call *sight*.

END.