



Love, Being and Time: An Essay on Julian of Norwich

メタデータ	<p>言語: English</p> <p>出版者: 福島県立医科大学総合科学教育研究センター</p> <p>公開日: 2018-10-24</p> <p>キーワード (Ja):</p> <p>キーワード (En):</p> <p>作成者: Kameda, Masanori</p> <p>メールアドレス:</p> <p>所属:</p>
URL	<p>https://fmu.repo.nii.ac.jp/records/2000705</p>

原著論文

Love, Being and Time: An Essay on Julian of Norwich

Masanori Kameda

Section of Linguistics, Centre for Integrated Humanities and Sciences

Received 12 September 2018, Accepted 4 October 2018

1.0 The aim of this essay

This essay aims at exploring the semantic interrelationship among *love*, *being* and *time* in *A Book of Showings to the anchoress Julian of Norwich*¹ (1342—c.1430²). Through this exploration, we may see in what semantic universe Julian was standing and how she found her own existential possibility in a spiritual dimension.

2.0 In the end is the beginning³

All of Julian's theological statements concerning the divine love are logically deducible from the 16th revelation: *Love was our Lord's meaning*, which is also the very summary of all revelations given to her in 1373 and the *terminus ad quem* (the destination point) of her life-long spiritual journey, which is characterized as *anagogical contemplation*, a theological exploration finally attained in 1388 A.D. At the very end of *Showings*, she says:

And frothe tyme pat it was shewde, I desyerde oftyn tymes to wytt [know, cf. wyste] in what was oure lords menyng. And xv yere after and mor, I was answeyrd in gostly/ vnderstondyng, seyng thus: What, woldest thou wytt they lords menyng in this thing? Wytt it wele, loue was his menyng. Who shewyth it the? Loue. [What shewid he the? Love.] Wherefore shewyth he it the? For loue. Hold the therin, thou shalt wytt more in the same. But thou schlt nevyr witt therin other withoutyn ende (And from the time that it was revealed, I desired many times to know in what was our Lord's meaning. And fifteen years after and more, I was answered in spiritual understanding, and it was said: What, do you wish to know your Lord's meaning in this thing? Know it well [be well

¹ *A Book of Showings to the anchoress Julian of Norwich*. ed. by Edmund Colledge O.S.A. and James Walsh S.J., Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1978, part I and II. *Showings* have *Short Text* and *Long Text* based on 16 revelations given to Julian. The former is considered to be written after having received the revelations on 13 May, 1373, and the latter the spiritual reflections about them twenty years after (later than 1393). In this essay, the Short Text is abbreviated as *BSA* (1978), *ST* and *Long Text* as *BSA* (1978), *LT*.

² On Julian's historicity and her personal background, see *BSA* (1978), I, pp. 41-42. Pope Benedict XVI, in his *General Audience* at Paul VI Hall (Wednesday, 1st December 2010), refers to Julian and says: 'It is known that she lived from 1342 until about 1430, turbulent years both for the Church, torn by the schism that followed the Pope's return to Rome from Avignon, and for the life of the people who were suffering the consequences of a long drawn-out war between the Kingdoms of England and of France. God, however, even in periods of tribulation, does not cease to inspire figures such as Julian of Norwich, to recall people to peace, love and joy'. On medieval England 1215-1435, see Saul N. (1997). *The Oxford Illustrated History of Medieval England*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, pp. 102-136.

³ Cf. Eliot T. S. *East Coker*, part II, line 1, *Four Quartets, The Complete Poems and Plays of T. S. Eliot*, London: Faber & Faber, 1982, p. 177.

aware⁴], love was his meaning. Who reveals it to you? [Who showed you this?] Love. What did he reveal to you? [What did he show you?] Love. Why does he reveal it to you? [Why did he show it?] For love. Remain in this, and you will know more of the same. But you will never know different, without end [Hold fast to this, and you will know and understand more of the same; but you will never understand nor know anything else from this for all eternity].⁵

In stating *Loue was his menyng* (Love was Lord God's meaning), what Julian actually refers to is that the *distinctive attribute* of God is *love*. Stating *Love is God* therefore does not make sense. *Loue was his menyng*, though it is stated in the past time because what she here refers to is her past spiritual experience, can be paraphrased as *God is love* ($\exists x (x \text{ is god} \wedge x \text{ is love})$), which should be more precisely read as *There is one and only one God and he is love* ($\exists x ((Gx \wedge Lx) \wedge \neg \exists y (Gy \wedge x \neq y))$).

God is love, for Julian, is not the conclusion of philosophical argumentation she finally attained but the revealed truth to be stated *a priori*, which is ⁶accepted in faith (a Deo revelata, suscipienda per fidem⁷), and which connotes the very essence of all of what she *saw* in spiritual sight and *understood*⁸ throughout her contemplative life, namely that which essentially consists in her anagogical contemplation⁹ of *mysterium fidei*.

2.1 Julian's spiritual journey via *anagogical contemplation*

Julian's life-long spiritual journey is characterized as *anagogical contemplation*;¹⁰ so here we, beginning with its lexical meaning, need to reconfirm what anagogical contemplation is and why it plays a key role in exploring the semantic interrelationship among *love*, *being* and *time* in *Showings*.

Lexical meaning of anagogy: The English word *anagogy* is etymologically derived from the Greek word ἀναγωγή (v-inf. ἀνα-ἄγειν: *to lead up* and *elevate*), which generally means: (1) *elevation*, religious or *ecstatic elevation* in a mystical sense, (2) *spiritual elevation* or *enlightenment*, esp. to understand mysteries and (3) *mystical interpretation*,

⁴ Windeatt (2015): *Julian of Norwich, Revelations of Divine Love*, tr. by B. Windeatt, Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2015, p. 164, pp. 732:13-733:19; CWS, (1978): *The Classics of Western Spirituality. Julian of Norwich, Showings*, London: SPCK, 1978, p. 342.

⁵ BSA (1978), *LT*, lxxxvi: 13-19; CWS (1978), pp. 342-3.

⁶ Kameda M. (2016). 'Remarks on the Language of Love: A Semantic Exploration', *The Bulletin of Centre for Integrated Humanities and Sciences*, Fukushima Medical School, vol., 5, n. 2.131, 2.223-2.226. The article related to this essay, see Kameda M. (2000). 'Semantics of Love: A Study in Julian of Norwich'. *Journal of the Japan Society of Catholic Theology*, Tokyo: The Japan Society of Catholic Theology, vol. 11, p. 65-97.

⁷ Aquinas S. T. (1980), *Summa Theologiae, S.Thomae Aquinatis Opera Omnia* 2, Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Friedrich Formmann Verlag, I, q. 1, a. 1, ad 1m.

⁸ In Julian's *Showings*, *I sawe (this corporeal sight)* is a typical formula of her anagogical contemplation as well as *oure lorde schewyd me (a gastelye sight...)* and *I was answered in myne vnderstandynge (reason)*.

⁹ OED's definition of *contemplation* as 'a form of Christian prayer or meditation in which [a person] seeks to pass beyond mental images and concepts to a direct experience of the divine' is quite agreeable (*Oxford Dictionary of English*, Oxford University Press, 2005^{2nd}).

¹⁰ CWS (1978), p. 117, pp. 74-75: Julian is very much at home with the fourth, *anagogical sense of Scripture*.

hidden ‘spiritual’ sense of words’.¹¹ The Latin word *anagogia* is, according to De Lubac, equivalent to *sursumductio*; it comes from the prefix ἀνα, which is *sursum* (upward), and the word root γωγή, which is *ductio* (leading).¹²

Anagogy in Church Fathers: De Lubac’s scholarly work *Exégèse Médiévale (Medieval Exegesis)* ascertains that Origen (c. 185 - c. 254), Gregory of Nyssa (c.330 - c.395) and Jerome ‘had already made anagogy one of the names of the spiritual sense in general. Anagogy, *a sense of the things above* (sensus de superioribus)¹³ or *caelestia mysteria ventura* (the heavenly mystery to come)’¹⁴ leads ‘the mind’s consideration *from things visible to those invisible, or from things below to things above, i.e., to the divine things*’.¹⁵ Later, Robert of Melun (c. 1100-1167), an English scholastic philosopher and theologian, following the same idea, wrote that it is anagogy ‘which lifts the understanding of the mind through the visible things to the invisible (quae per visibilia ad invisibilia animi levat intelligentiam)’.¹⁶ Jerome (c. 342 - 420) as a biblical scholar harmonizes opinions about *sensus anagogicus* in his time and says: ‘We ought to climb from the letter to the spirit, from earthly to heavenly things (De littera debemus ascendere ad spiritum, de terrenis ad caelestia)’.¹⁷

Sensus anagogicus, an exegesis in faith,¹⁸ thus guides us to a *spiritually elevated way* of understanding things or events in Scripture. We therefore ‘can view realities and events in terms of their eternal significance, leading us toward our true homeland: thus the Church on earth is a sign of the heavenly Jerusalem’.¹⁹ Semantically, *sensus anagogicus* (anagogical sense) – one of three *spiritual senses* of Scripture together with *sensus allegoricus* (allegorical sense) and *sensus tropologicus* (tropological sense) – is based on the *sensus litteralis vel historicus* (literal sense or historical sense). This means that ‘the meaning conveyed by the words of Scripture and discovered by exegesis [follows] the rules of sound interpretation’.²⁰

Sensus allegoricus (allegorical sense): A figurative understanding of a thing/ person in the story of the Old Testament which has its/ his or her own counterpart in the New Testament,²¹ such as ‘*the crossing of the Red Sea* is a sign or

¹¹ OED (2009, 2nd edition on CD-ROM, v. 4.0): Oxford English Dictionary (2009^{2nd} edition on CD-ROM), v. 4.0, Oxford University Press.

¹² De Lubac H. (2000), *Medieval Exegesis*. tr. by E. M. Macierowski, Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans/ Edinburgh: T & T Clark, vol. II., p. 180, modified.

¹³ De Lubac H. (2000), vol. II, p. 180, p. 401, Note 13.

¹⁴ De Lubac H. (2000), vol. II, p. 185.

¹⁵ De Lubac H. (2000), vol. II, p. 180, p. 401, Note 14.

¹⁶ De Lubac H. (2000), vol. II, p. 180, p. 402, Note 17, cf. vol. I, p. 236, p. 432, Note 49.

¹⁷ De Lubac H. (2000), vol. II, p. 185.

¹⁸ De Lubac H. (2000), vol. I, p. 260.

¹⁹ CCC (1994): *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1994, p. 31, n. 117-3: 1-3. Cf. Aquinas S. T. (1952), I, q, 1, a. 10,

²⁰ CCC (1994), p. 31, n. 116. Cf. Aquinas S. T. (1980), I, q, 1, a. 10, ad 1, sol: omnes sensus fundentur super unum, scilicet litteralem (all the senses are built upon one sense, viz., the literal sense). The English translation of *Summa Theologiae* I have quoted in this essay owes much to Fathers of the English Dominican Province (Westminster, Maryland, 1948).

²¹ Hunter A.M. (1984^{9th}) *Interpreting the Parables*. London: SCM Press, p. 10f; Swinburn R. (1992) *Revelation: From Metaphor to*

type of *Christ's victory* and also of *Christian Baptism*,²² The same goes for *The First Letter to the Corinthians* 10:3-4, where *the rock* Moses hit in *Exodus* (17: 6) corresponds to *Christ*, who is *the spiritual rock* from which all of the Israelites drank the spiritual drink.

Sensus tropologicus (tropological sense): Scriptural exegesis relating to morals. That is, the events reported in Scripture show us how to *act justly* or *how we should live and act under the grace of God*.²³ Aquinas refers to *sensus tropologicus* in *Summa Theologiae* and says: 'so far as the things done in Christ, or so far as the things which signify Christ, are types of what we ought to do, there is *the moral sense* (secundum vero quod ea quae in Christo sunt facta, vel in his quae Christum significant, sunt signa eorum quae nos agere debemus, est sensus moralis)'.²⁴

2.2 Anagogical contemplation: Its eschatological characteristics²⁵

Anagogical contemplation is essentially eschatological. De Lubac clearly explains the reason why:

It is in traditional eschatology that the doctrine of the four senses is achieved and finds its unity. For Christianity is a fulfillment, but in this very fulfillment it is a promised hope. Mystical or doctrinal, taught or lived, true anagogy is therefore always eschatological. It stirs up the desire for eternity in us. This is also why the fourth sense [anagogical sense] is forced to be the last'.²⁶ Therefore, we can see in anagogical contemplation that 'the resurrection of Jesus Christ was the pledge and example of our own future resurrection: then, only death being at last vanquished, shall we enjoy the whole *truth* whose *figure* the Son of God had brought upon the earth'.²⁷

Viewed in this light, the following passages in the Scriptures, in which Jesus Christ is described as the fulfillment of all promised hope, are also considered to be the fruits of anagogical contemplation:

Matthew 1:22 Now all this happened in order to make come true what the Lord had said through the prophets.²⁸ (Hoc autem totum factum est, ut adimpleretur quod dictum est a Domino per prophetam dicentem.²⁹

Analogy. Oxford: Clarendon Press, pp. 58-9 Both Hunter and Swinburn refer to John Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*, in which *Christian*, a pilgrim makes a journey to the Heavenly City and 'this journey clearly corresponds to the gradual formation of a *Christian's* character by doing actions so as to make him fitted for Heaven' (Swinburn R. (1992), p. 58).

²² CCC (1994), p. 31, n. 117-1.

²³ CCC (1994), p. 31, n. 117-2. Aquinas S. T. (1963), *Summa Theologiae*. London: Eyre & Spottiswoods/ New York: McGraw-Hill, I, q. 1, art. 10, resp. And on the senses of Scripture, see Appendix 12.

²⁴ Aquinas S. T. (1980), I, q. 1, a. 10, resp. Blackfriars' edition of *Summa Theologiae* (1963) reads: 'the moral sense when the things done in Christ and in those who prefigured him are signs of what we should carry out' (p. 39).

²⁵ CWC (1978), p. 81. Cf. De Lubac H. (1998), II, p.188, 197. Cf. I *Thesssa* 5:2 (The day of the Lord will come like a thief in the night) and *Lk* 17:20f. The coming of Christ will be sudden and discernible for all (NRSV (2010⁴): *The New Oxford Annotated Bible* (New Revised Standard Version), New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 2010).

²⁶ De Lubac H. (2000), vol. II, p. 197.

²⁷ De Lubac H. (2000), vol. II, pp. 182-3.

²⁸ All of the English quotations here are from GNT (1992): *Good News Bible: Good News Translation*, New York: American Bible Society, 1992.

2:17 In this way what the prophet Jeremiah had said came true. (Tunc adimpletum est quod dictum est per Jeremiam prophetam dicentem.)

4:14 This was done to make come true what the prophet Isiah had said (ut adimpleretur quod dictum est per Isaïam prophetam)

5:17 Do not think that I have come to do away with the Law [of Moses] and the teachings of the prophets. I have not come to do away with them, but to make their teachings come true (Nolite putare quoniam veni solvere legem aut prophetas: non veni solvere, sed adimplere.)

26:56 But all this happened in order to make come true what the prophets wrote in the Scriptures (Hoc autem totum factum est, ut adimplerentur Scripturæ prophetarum.)

Mark 14:49 ...But the Scriptures must come true. (...Sed ut impleantur Scripturæ.)

Luke 4:21 This passage of scripture has come true today, as you heard it being read. (Quia hodie impleta est hæc scriptura in auribus vestris.)

22:37 For I tell you that the scripture which says, 'He shared the fate of criminals', must come true about me, because what was written about me is coming true. (Dico enim vobis, quoniam adhuc hoc quod scriptum est, oportet impleri in me: Et cum iniquis deputatus est. Etenim ea quæ sunt de me finem habent.)

24: 44 These are the very things I told you about while I was still with you: everything written about me in the Law of Moses, the writings of the prophets, and the Psalms had to come true. (Hæc sunt verba quæ locutus sum ad vos cum adhuc essem vobiscum, quoniam necesse est impleri omnia quæ scripta sunt in lege Moysi, et prophetis, et Psalmis de me.)

John 13:18 But the scripture must come true that... (...sed ut adimpleatur Scriptura)

15:25 This, however, was bound to happen so that what is written in their Law may come true: 'They hated me for no reason at all' (Sed ut adimpleatur sermo, qui in lege eorum scriptus est: Quia odio habuerunt me gratis.)

17:12 ...so that the scripture might come true (...ut Scriptura impleatur.)

Acts 1:16 ...the scripture had to come true in which the Holy Spirit, speaking through David, made a prediction about Judas, who was the guide for those who arrested Jesus. (oportet impleri Scripturam quam prædixit Spiritus Sanctus per os David de Juda, qui fuit dux eorum qui comprehenderunt Jesum.)

3: 18 God announced long ago through all the prophets that his Messiah had to suffer, and he [Jesus] made it come true in this way. (Deus autem, quæ prænuntiavit per os omnium prophetarum, pati Christum suum, sic implevit.)

²⁹ *Vulgata* (1975^{2nd}): *Biblia Sacra Vulgata*. Editio quinta, German Bible Society, Stuttgart, 1975

3.0 Analogy: What anagogical contemplation makes possible and meaningful

What anagogical contemplation, a kind of mystical exploration,³⁰ makes possible and meaningful totally depends on the *substantial relationship* between human and God, who is *the substance* (cf. *god is þe substance*³¹). Julian herself also substantiates this, referring to what she saw in her anagogical contemplation:

I sawe no difference between god and oure substance, but as it were all god; ... oure substance is in god, that is to sey that god is god and oure substance is a creature in god (I saw no difference between God and our substance, but as it were, all God: ...our substance is in God, that is to say that God is God, and our substance is a creature in God³²). ... Our substance is in oure fader god almighty, and oure substance is in oure moder god all wisdom, and oure substance is in oure lorde god the holy gost all goodness, for oure substannce is hole in each person of the trynyte, which is one god (Our substance is in our Father, God almighty, and our substance is in our Mother, God all wisdom, and our substance is our Lord God, the Holy Spirit, all goodness, for our substance is whole in each of the [Person of the³³] Trinity, who is one God.³⁴)

This passage of *Showings* further provides us with the ground for talking about God not metaphorically but ‘literally though only analogically’³⁵. In the case of Julian, *God is all that is good* (cf. *he es to vs alle thynges þat is good*³⁶), *God is the maker of all things* (cf. *he has made alle thynges*³⁷) and *God sustains everything* (cf. *god keps it*³⁸/ *it is kepydde*³⁹) are all stated analogically.

It is therefore *analogy* that gives a factual and logico-linguistic basis – as *sensus literalis* gives the very basis for *sensus spiritualis* in biblical exegesis – for Julian’s anagogical contemplation of *mysterium fidei*. If not, her use of language will become totally groundless and eventually degenerate into the arbitrary and subjective issue⁴⁰ or simply the matter of *trope*, a figure of speech. It is therefore only through analogy that we can access the invisible or the insensible (the transcendental being) via the visible and the sensible (beings-in-time).

³⁰ ‘[A] mystical exploration is’, as McCabe pointed out, ‘not at all the same thing as a mystical experience’ (McCabe H, *The Logic of Mysticism in Religion and Philosophy* ed. by Martin Warner, Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1992, pp. 45), De Lubac H. (1998), vol. I – III.

³¹ *BSA* (1978), *LT*, lxii: 14.

³² *BSA* (1978), *LT*, liv: 17-20, *CWS* (1978), p. 285.

³³ The words inside brackets are all mine.

³⁴ *BSA* (1978), *LT*, lviii: 59-62, *CWS* (1978), p. 295.

³⁵ McCabe H, ‘The Logic of Mysticism’, *Religion and Philosophy* ed. by Martin Warner, Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1992, pp. 58. McCabe, referring to St Thomas, says: metaphor is the heart of religious language but it cannot be sufficient of itself. It needs to be underpinned by such non metaphorical but analogical assertions as that God exists, that God is good, that God is the creative cause and sustainer of our world, that he is loving (ibid., p. 58).

³⁶ *BSA* (1978), *ST*, iv: 2-3, *LT*, vi: 2, 29, ix: 12 etc. On Christ’s goodness, *LT*, lxxix: 17, lxxxii: 14. etc.

³⁷ *BSA* (1978), *ST*, v: 14.

³⁸ *BSA* (1978), *ST*, iv: 17.

³⁹ *BSA* (1978), *ST*, v: 15.

⁴⁰ Lewis C. S. (1992^{Rep}) *The Allegory of Love: A Study in Medieval Tradition*. Oxford and New York: Oxford Univ. Press, p.113. Though what Lewis mentions is ‘how allegory supplied the subjective element in literature’, this is also the matter in common to scriptural exegesis that is the very basis for understanding mystical experience.

3.1 Analogical contemplation based on analogy: Its logico-linguistic structure

The following passage of *The Letter of Paul to the Romans* 5: 17-19 will give us a good example that firstly needs to be interpreted analogically and then anagogically:

If, because of one man's trespass, death reigned through that one man, how much more will those who receive the abundance of grace and the free gift of righteousness reign in life through the one man Jesus Christ. Then as *one man's trespass led to condemnation for all men*, so *one man's act of righteousness leads to acquittal and life for all men*. For as *by one man's disobedience many were made sinners*, so *by one man's obedience many will be made righteous*.⁴¹ (Si enim unius delicto mors regnavit per unum: multo magis abundantiam gratiae, et donationis, et justitiae accipientes, in vita regnabunt per unum Jesum Christum. Igitur sicut per unius delictum in omnes homines in condemnationem: sic et per unius justitiam in omnes homines in justificationem vitae. Sicut enim per inobedientiam unius hominis, peccatores constituti sunt multi: ita et per unius obeditionem, justi constituentur multi.⁴²)

According to Aquinas, analogy is *when the truth of one Scriptural passage is shown not to conflict with the truth of another passage* (analogia vero est, cum veritas unius Scripturae ostenditur veritati alterius non repugnare).⁴³ The passage quoted from Paul's letter here is precisely considered to be one example:

Suppose (A) stands for *One man's trespass led to condemnation for all men*; (A') for *One man's act of righteousness leads to acquittal and life for all men*. And (B) for *By one man's disobedience many were made sinners*, and (B') for *By one man's obedience many will be made righteous*. Then, we can see that there are analogical relationships between (A) and (A') and between (B) and (B'). In the relationship between (A) and (A') *Adam* is analogous to *Jesus Christ* on one side and *Adam's trespass to the righteous act of Jesus Christ* on the other side; and in the relationship between (B) and (B') *Adam* to *Jesus Christ* on one side and *Adam's disobedience to Christ Jesus' obedience* on the other side.⁴⁴

And if there are analogical relationships between (A) and (A') and between (B) and (B'), on that basis we can have the following anagogical vision that is not a hypothesis but the factual truth in faith: (A') is a *spiritually elevated way* of understanding what (A) describes, and (B') of (B). That is, both (A') and (B') show how humans will be justified in faith or by the life to come. What De Lubac says in *Exégèse Médiévale* is therefore very much to the point: 'in

⁴¹ RSV (1997): *The New Oxford Annotated Bible* (Revised Standard Version), New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1977

⁴² *Vulgata* (1975^{2nd}).

⁴³ Aquinas S. T. (1980), I, q. 1, a. 10, Ad 2, Sol.

⁴⁴ Analogy is, for Augustine, 'when harmonious agreement between the Old and New Testaments is shown (Analogia, cum veteris et novi Testamentum congruentia demonstratur)[*De Genesi ad Litteram Imperfectus*, Liber, C.2, n.5 (PL 34:222. See De Lubac (1998), vol. 1., p. 126, 358, Note 20).

Christian exegesis there is no longer myth on the one hand; there is no longer naturalistic thought or philosophical abstraction, on the other'.⁴⁵ [When Paul refers to one man's trespass and one man's disobedience, he means Adam's trespass and disobedience. Julian refers to *Adam* in *Revelation XIV*⁴⁶ and says: *Adam, that is to sey oone man was shewed that tyme and his fallyng to make there by to be vnderstonde how god befhodyth alle mann and his fallyng. For in the syghte of god alle man is oone man, and oone man is alle man* (Adam, that is to say, one man was shown at that time and his fall, so as to make it understood how God regards all men and their falling. For in the sight of God all men are one man, and one man is all men). It is quite obvious that Julian sees Adam as the universal set of human beings: $U(\text{Adam}) = \{\text{human}^1, \text{human}^2, \text{human}^3 \dots \text{human}^n\}$ or $\{\text{man}^1, \text{man}^2, \text{man}^3, \dots \text{man}^n\} \in \text{Adam}$.]

This is also the case in *Paul's First Letter to the Corinthians* 15: 42-53:

It is sown a physical body, it is raised a spiritual body. If there is a physical body, there is also a spiritual body. ... Just as we have borne the image of the man of dust, we shall also bear the image of the man of heaven. ...the dead will be raised imperishable, and we shall be changed. For this perishable nature must put on the imperishable, and this mortal nature must put on immortality⁴⁷ (Seminatur corpus animale, surget corpus spiritale. Si est corpus animale, est et spiritale, sicut scriptum est: ...Igitur, sicut portavimus imaginem terreni, portemus et imaginem cælestis. ...canet enim tuba, et mortui resurgent incorrupti: et nos immutabimur. Oportet enim corruptibile hoc induere incorruptionem: et mortale hoc induere immortalitatem).

Suppose *the perishable* (Gr. φθορά, L. corruptio: mortality/ death) stands for (A) in fraction, *the physical body*⁴⁸ (Gr. σῶμα ψυχικός, L. corpus animale) for (B), *the imperishable* (Gr. ἀφθαρσία, L. incorruptio) for (C) and *the spiritual body* (Gr. σῶμα πνευματικός, L. corpus spirituale) for (D) respectively. Then we can see that the very core of Paul's message quoted here is formed by the following proportional analogy: (A) : (B) = (C) : (D). That is, in her anagogical vision, (C) : (D) is a spiritually elevated way of understanding (A) : (B), the world to come seen *sub specie aeternitatis*.

3.2 How *analogy* makes Julian's *anagogical contemplation* possible and meaningful

We have examined how *analogy* gives a factual and logico-linguistic basis for Julian's anagogical contemplation and then reconfirmed this through biblical exegesis taking Paul's letters as examples (cf. 3.0-3.1). Following this, let us analyze the structure of what she saw in her anagogical contemplation described in

⁴⁵ De Lubac H. (2000), vol., II, p. 101.

⁴⁶ *BSA, LT*, li: 101-4.

⁴⁷ *RSV* (1997)

⁴⁸ *RSV* (1997) reads σῶμα ψυχικός in the Greek text as *a physical body* and ἀφθαρσία as *the imperishable* literally (Aland B. et al. (2008^{4th}). *The Greek New Testament*. Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 2008).

the Fourteenth Revelation, which concerns the loving-care provided by *earthly mother* and *the second person of the Trinity, the true mother*⁴⁹ *for all of humans*:

The moder may geue he child sucke hyr mylke, but oure precyous moder Jhesu, he may fede vs wyth hym selfe,...*with the blessyd sacrament, this is precious fode of very lyfe...* ([Earthly] mother ‘can give her child to suck of her milk, but our precious Mother Jesus can feed us with himself..., with the blessed sacrament, which is the precious food of true life)⁵⁰ ...*though oure erthly moder may suffer hyr chylde to perussch, oure hevynly moder Jhesu may nevyr suffer vs pat be his children to peryssch, for he is almighty, all wisdom and all loue...* (...*though our earthly mother may suffer her child to perish, our heavenly Mother Jesus may never suffer us who are his children to perish, for he is almighty, all wisdom and all love*).⁵¹

It is evident that a human [earthly] mother and her loving activities, such as feeding her baby with milk from her breast, are analogous to the Second Person of the Holy Trinity⁵² (*The seconde person, which is oure moder*⁵³/*oure moder Cryst*.⁵⁴), who is the true mother for all humans and his [Christ’s] activities in love, such as giving his life – in the word of Julian, *precious fode of very lyfe* (the precious food of true life) – to humans to be saved. Or it is possible to say that the relationship between a human [earthly] mother and her loving activities is proportionate to the Second Person of the Holy Trinity (Jesus Christ) who is the true mother for all humans and his [Christ’s] activities in love. Either way, in Julian’s anagogical contemplation, what humans’ true Mother, the Second Person of the Holy Trinity does in love is seen as a spiritually elevated way of understanding the human [earthly] mother’s activities in love. This is the same in understanding the analogous relationship between *oure erthly moder may suffer hyr chylde to peryssch* and *oure hevynly moder Jhesu may nevyr suffer vs pat be his children to peryssch*. Thus we can conclude that analogy makes Julian’s anagogical contemplation possible and meaningful. That is to say, Julian’s anagogical contemplation can make sense on the basis of analogy.

4.0 The interrelationship among *love, being* and *time*: A logical analysis of in Julian’s spiritual sight

Julian’s detailed descriptions of what she saw in gastelye sight (spiritually elevated vision) and understood through

⁴⁹ BSA (1978), *LT*, liv: 17-20, 20-27, lvii: 47-91, lviii: 12-63, lix: 9-48, lxiii: 28-34. On the motherhood of Jesus, the Second Person of the Holy Trinity, see Kameda M. (1997). ‘God-talk Language in Mother Julian of Norwich’s *Showings*: An Exploration of God’s Motherhood’. *Journal of the Japan Society of Catholic Theology*, Tokyo: The Japan Society of Catholic Theology, vol. 8, pp. 57ff. On metaphorical understanding of the motherhood of God among Church Fathers, such as Clement of Alexandria (c. 150-c.215), Ambrose (c.339-97) and Augustine (354-430), see Beer F. (1992) *Women and Mystical Experience in the Middle Ages*. Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press, p. 152f.

⁵⁰ BSA (1978), *LT*, lx: 29-32, *CWS* (1978), pp. 298-299.

⁵¹ BSA (1978), *LT*, lxi: 37-40, *CWS* (1978), pp. 300-301.

⁵² BSA (1978), *LT*, lviii: 19-68.

⁵³ BSA (1978), *LT*, lviii: 37-38.

⁵⁴ BSA (1978), *LT*, lviii: 46.

Revelation I show how love, being and time are interrelated to each other and why love is the very foundation of every being/ life:

① *And this same tyme that I sawe this bodily sight, oure lorde schewyd me a gastelye sight of his hamly lovyng. I saw that he es to vs alle clethyng, for love wappes vs and wyndes vs, halses vs and alle be teches vs, hynges a boutte vs for tendyr love, that he maye nevere leve vs. And so in this sight ye saw sothelye that he ys alle thynge that ys goode, as to myne vndyrstandyng* (At the same time as I saw this corporeal sight [bodily vision⁵⁵], our Lord showed me a spiritual sight of his familiar love. I saw...He is to us everything which is good. ...He is our clothing, for he is that love which wraps and enfolds us, embraces us and guides us, surrounding us for his love, which is so tender that he never deserts us. And so in this sight [vision⁵⁶] I saw truly that he is everything which is good).⁵⁷

② *And in this he schewyd me a lytille thyng, the qwantyte of a haselle nutte, lyggande in the palme of my hande, and to my vndyrstandyng that, it was as rownde as any balle* (And in this he showed me something small, no bigger than a hazelnut [a little thing, the size of a hazelnut⁵⁸], lying in the palm of my hand, and I perceived that it was as round as any ball). *And I was answerde generally thus: It is all that ys made. I merveylede howe pat it might laste, for me thought it might falle sodaynlte to nought for litille [nawght for littleness]. And I was answerde in myne vndyrstandyng: It lasts an euer schalle, for god loves it; and so hath alle thyng the beyng throwe the love of god [hath all thing being by the loue og god⁵⁹]* (And I was given this general answer: It is everything which is made. I was amazed that it could last, for I thought that it was so little that it could suddenly fall into nothing. And I was answered in my understanding: It lasts and always will, because God loves it; and thus everything has being through the love of God).

③ *In this lytille thyng I sawe thre partyes. The fyrste is that god made it, the seconnde ys that he loves it, the thyrde ys that god kepes it. Botte whate is that to me? Sothelye, the makere, the lovere, the kepere. For to I am substancyallye and aned to him, I may nevere have love, reste ne varray blysse; that is to saye that / I be so frestenede to hym that thare be right nought that is made betwyx my god and me* (In this little thing I saw three properties. The first is that God made it, the second is that he loves it, the third is that God preserves it. But what is that to me? It is that God is the Creator and the lover and the protector. For until I am

⁵⁵ Windeatt (2015), p. 6.

⁵⁶ Windeatt (2015), p. 7.

⁵⁷ BSA (1978), ST, iv: 1-2, CWS (1978), p. 130.

⁵⁸ Windeatt (2015), p. 7. Windeatt reads this passage more literally and precisely than Walsh and Colledge.

⁵⁹ BSA (1978), ST, iv: 8-12, This passage, as Colledge and Walsh point out (BSA (1978), ST, Footnote, 11), strongly echoes *The Wisdom of Solomon* 11: 25-26: For thou lovest all things that are, and hatest none of the things which thou hast made: for thou didst not appoint, or make any thing hating it. And how could any thing endure, if thou wouldst not or be preserved, if not called by thee?) (Diligis enim omnia quæ sunt, et nihil odisti eorum quæ fecisti; nec enim odiens aliquid constituisti aut ecisti. Quomodo autem posset aliquid permanere, nisi tu voluisses? aut quod a te vocatum non esset conservaretur?). Cf. *The Revelation to John*, 4:11: Thou didst create all things, and by thy will they existed and were created (σὺ ἐκτίσας τὰ πάντα, καὶ διὰ τὸ θέλημά σου ἦσαν καὶ ἐκτίσθησαν).

substantially united to him, I can never have love or rest or true happiness; until, that is, I am so attached to him that there can be no created thing between my God and me).⁶⁰

4.1 Love: The very foundation of every being/ life

- (1) In the context of ② and ③, it is obvious that *a little thing, the size of a hazelnut (lytille thyng, the qwantyte of a haselle nutte)* Julian – as stated in ① – she saw in her spiritual sight symbolically depicts that every created thing exists by the love of God, the Uncreated (the love of *god that es vn made*⁶¹).
- (2) The expanse of the semantic universe ② creates will be clarified after analyzing what is described in ③.
- (3) The crux of ③ will be logically summed up as $\exists x((x \text{ is god} \wedge \forall y(y \text{ is a thing}) \rightarrow ((x \text{ creates } y) \wedge (x \text{ loves } y)) \wedge (x \text{ keeps } y))$, which is premised on *There is one and only one God and he is love* ($\exists x((Gx \wedge Lx) \wedge \neg \exists y(Gy \wedge x \neq y))$).
- (4) Then we can proceed to ② whose crux can be logically summed up as *Every created thing has being if and only if God loves it* which can be rendered by the following *biconditional statement*: $\phi \leftrightarrow \psi$ (In this case, ϕ stands for *x has being*, and ψ for *God loves x*. Here, ' \leftrightarrow ' reads as *if and only if*.) This implies: every human, for example, has his/ her own being if and only if God loves him/ her, or no human will exist if God does not love him/her. [Suppose p stands for: *God loves human* and q for: *A human has being/ existence*. Then the logical formula of *Human has his/ her being/ exists if and only if Gold loves him/ her* (*Human will not have his/ her being if and only if God does not love him/ her*) will be: $(p \rightarrow q) \wedge (\neg p \rightarrow \neg q)$ that is semantically equivalent to $(p \leftrightarrow q)$. That is, $(p \rightarrow q) \wedge (\neg p \rightarrow \neg q) \equiv (p \leftrightarrow q)$.] This is also Julian's response to the question, *Why is there something rather than nothing?*
- (5) Therefore, for Julian, the following was a logically necessary consequence: *oure lyfe is alle grounded and rotyd in loue, and without loue we may nott lyve* (our life is all founded [grounded⁶²] and rooted in love, and without love we cannot live).⁶³ [Here, *oure lyfe is alle grounded and rotyd in loue and without loue we may nott lyve* can be semantically translatable to: *If our life is all founded and rooted in love, it is not the case that we can live without love (of God).*]

In ② and ③, *love* is, as clearly stated in *Revelation 14* et al., identified as the specific property of Jesus Christ, the Second Person of the blessed Trinity, who is our true Mother (cf. *the depe wisdom of the trynnyte is oure moder*⁶⁴).

⁶⁰ BSA (1978), ST, iv: 8-23, CWS (1978), pp. 130-1 and LT, 5: 9-22, CWS (1978), p. 183.

⁶¹ BSA (1978), ST, iv: 43-44. Corresponding Passage in LT is 5: 1-9, CWS (1978), p. 183.

⁶² Windeatt (2015), p. 103, 195.

⁶³ BSA (1978), LT, xix: 5-6, CWS (1978), p. 263, cf. LT, lxxxvi: 24-26, p. 342 and BSA (1978), LT, 86: 25: the loue wher in he made vs (the love in which he created us). The human soul is also the creation by God and naturally rooted in His endless love (oure soule is kyndely rotyd in god in endlesse loue (BSA (1978), LT, lvi: 15-6; CWS (1978), p. 289). God is the very fround/ foundation all of humans are beseeching and from which humans' prayers spring (BSA (1978), LT, lxi: 9-11, 26-27, xlii: 5, 18-21, 65-66).

⁶⁴ BSA (1978), LT, liv: 20-27 and CWS (1978), p. 285, BSA (1978), LT, lviii: 19-27, 34f and CWS (1978), pp. 293-5.

4.2 Sin as nothing

Julian sees that *God created everything in love* ($\exists x (x \text{ is god} \wedge \forall y (y \text{ is a thing} \rightarrow x \text{ creates } y \text{ in love}))$), and the love of God is the very foundation of every being/ life. This means: through the His love, God is present in all things (*I sawe that he es in all tinge*⁶⁵) and sustains them. Thus everything which is made for love and exists through the love of God is *good* in nature:

I may make alle thyng wele, and I can make alle thing welle, and I shalle⁶⁶ make alle thing wele, and I wylle make alle thyng welle; and thou shalt se thy selfe pat alle maner of thing shall be welle (I may make all things well, and I can make all things well, and I shall make all things well, and I will make all things well; and you will see yourself that every kind of thing will be well⁶⁷).

What is stated here is, in the words of Aquinas, *omne ens, inquantum est ens, est bonum* (Every being, as being, is good).⁶⁸ God, who does *good* in opposition to *evil*,⁶⁹ is therefore analogically considered to be *everything which is good* (cf. 4.0 - ①).

Julian sees that (a) sin ‘has no kind of *substance*, no share of *being*, nor can it be recognized except by the *pain* caused by it’ (*it had no manner of substance, ne no part of beyng but the by the payne that is caused therof*⁷⁰). (b) Sin, that is not *good* (nought goode⁷¹), is *nothing* (synne is nougt.⁷²). (3) Sin is, however, *necessary*⁷³ (Synne is behouely/e.⁷⁴) because ‘we cannot in this life keep ourselves completely from sin, in the perfect purity that we shall have in heaven (we may nott in this lyfe kepe vs fro synne alle holy, in full clenesse as we shall be in gevyn⁷⁵). Following (a), (b) and (c), which reflect how heavily the theological language Julian uses is owed to St Augustine,⁷⁶ let us examine what will happen to us when we commit a sin, an evil act in the eyes of God, such as murder.

⁶⁵ BSA (1978), ST, viii: 2.

⁶⁶ Shall in both OE and ME is ‘used to express *necessity*, indicate ‘what is appointed or settled to take place’ and ‘a *determination insisted on in spite of opposition*’ (OED (2009, 2nd edition on CD-ROM, v. 4.0).

⁶⁷ BSA (1978), LT, xxxi: 1-6, CWS (1978), p. 229.

⁶⁸ Aquinas S. T. (1980), I, q. 5, a. 3, resp. Cf. I, q. 5, a. 1, sed contra, where Augustine’s *De Doctrina Christiana*. i, 42 is referred to: *inquantum sumus, boni sumus* (inasmuch as we exist we are good).

⁶⁹ BSA (1978), LT, lix: 9: Jhesu Crist, that doth good against evyll, is oure moder;... (CWS (1978), p. 295).

⁷⁰ CWS (1978), p. 225, BSA (1978), LT, 27:26-28.

⁷¹ BSA (1978), ST, xiv: 54.

⁷² BSA (1978), ST, viii: 9, cf. xxiii: 26, etc.

⁷³ In the context of Julian’s theological argument, what the *necessary* (adj) means is: *inevitable, inevitably resulting from the nature of things* (OED (2009 2nd edition on CD-ROM, v. 4.0)).

⁷⁴ BSA (1978), ST, xiii: 52.

⁷⁵ BSA (1978), LT, lii: 57-58, CWS, p. 281.

⁷⁶ Cf. Saint Augustine (1998). *Confessions*, tr. by Chadwick H., Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, III, vii (12): *malum non esse nisi privationem boni usuque ad quod omnino non est* (evil has no existence except as a privation of good [evil was nothing else but a privation of good], down to that level which is altogether without being). The quoted passage in brackets is the translation by Watts. W (Saint Augustine. (1999). *Confessions*, Massachusetts: Harvard University, vol. 1, p. 121).

Suppose *x* (a human person) had killed *y* (an another human person) deliberately. In this case, what would happen to both *x* and *y*? In killing *y* deliberately, because *being* is convertible with *good/ goodness* (*ens et bonum convertuntur*⁷⁷) and killing *y* deliberately is an evil that is the absence of *being* and *good*, it is clear that *x* starts losing his/ her share of *being*, his/ her *goodness* and the *genuineness* as the quality of being human. Or, it may be possible to state that in killing *y*, *x* *steps over the barrier of being human*.⁷⁸ This means: in killing *y*, *x* not simply kills *y* but kills *x*'s humanity.

4.21 Evil or sin experienced as *pain*

Next, we need to examine why Julian says that sin can be recognized through *pain*.⁷⁹ It seems to be very clear that what she refers to here is *a spiritual pain/ grief* that is the opposite of *spiritual happiness/ joy*. In the above-mentioned case (4.20), it is necessary that *x*, in *x*'s killing *y* deliberately, experiences his/ her evil act as pain, which steadily and certainly damages his/ her goodness and genuineness as the qualities of being human. This is because *x*'s evil act is not under the love of God, that is, God is not present in *x*'s evil act. This illumines evil, which constantly annihilates the quality of being human; that is nothingness or meaninglessness in which the love uncreated (God) is not present.⁸⁰

4.22 Sin and the loving activity of God

Then, if sin, which gradually ruins our humanity is necessary in this life (cf. 4.2), how can we come to an agreement with Julian's grand thesis, *Hath alle thyng the beyng throwe the love of god* (everything has being through the love of God (cf. 4.0f))? It is because, as Aquinas appropriately states: 'God loves sinners insofar as they are existing natures.' (*Deus peccatores, in quantum sunt naturae quaedam, amat*). There is no absurdity between the reality of humans who sin one after another and the loving activity of God.⁸¹

5.0 Being-in-time: The very nature of human being

The ontological condition of every created thing as symbolized by '*a lytille thyng* (a little thing), that was so little that it could suddenly fall into nothing'⁸² in her spiritually elevated vision, reveals the very nature of human beings

⁷⁷ Cf. Aquinas S. T. (1980), I, q. 5, a.1, resp: bonum et ens sunt idem secundum rem, sed bonum dicit rationem appetibilis, quam non dicit ens. Cf. I, q. 16, art., 3, resp: Sicut bonum habet rationem appetibilis, ita verum habet ordinem ad cognitionem, autem in quantum habet de esse, intantum est cognoscibile. ...sicut bonum convertitur cum ente, ita et verum. ...sicut bonum addit rationem appetibilis supra ens, ita et verum comparationem ad intellectum.

⁷⁸ Dostoevsky F. (2008^{Revised}). *Crime and Punishment*. tr. by Peace p. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, p. 248-9, 255, 264, 316, 402,

⁷⁹ Cf. *Oure synne is cause of Christes paynes* (BSA (1978), LT, lii: 51-52). Cf. lii: 57-58, CWS (1978), p. 281, p. 304, p. 328, 338.

⁸⁰ Cf. BSA (1978), ST, viii: 1-2.

⁸¹ Aquinas S. T. (1980), q. 20, art 2, ad 4 sol, Kameda M. (2016), 2.3214.

⁸² BSA (1978), ST, iv: 13-14; BSA (1978), LT, v: 1-19, CWS, p. 183.

created by God, the uncreated (cf. 4.0 –②, footnote 56). Julian’s later contemplative reflection will help understand that. She says:

in oure making’, we had begynnyng, but the loue wher in he made vs was in hym fro with out begynnyng (In our creation we had beginning but the love in which he created us was in him from without beginning. In this love we have our beginning,...)⁸³

As mentioned in 4.1 (4), *Every created thing has being if and only if God loves it* ($\varphi \leftrightarrow \psi / (p \rightarrow q) \wedge (\neg p \rightarrow \neg q) \equiv (p \leftrightarrow q)$). This means that if every created thing has being if and only if God loves it, it is necessary that it has its beginning and end. That is, every created thing – not excepting every human being – is *perishable*⁸⁴ and could suddenly fall into nothing, being essentially a *being – in – time*. In the words of Kierkegaard (1813-55), ‘as soon as a human [person] is born, he [she] begins to die’.⁸⁵ The following biblical passages give very good pictures of the temporal characteristics of a human being:

Psalms, 30: 16 *My times are in your [God’s] hand* (in manu tua tempora mea/ ἐν ταῖς χερσίν σου οἱ καιροί μου).

78: 33 He (God) ended their [the people who kept sinning] days like a breath and their lives with sudden disaster.⁸⁶

144: 4 We are like a puff of wind; our days are like a passing shadow.⁸⁷

Isaiah, 40: 6-7 All people [*Vulgata*: omnis caro; *LXX*: πᾶσα σὰρξ; *KJV*: all flesh⁸⁸] are grass, their constancy is like the flower of the field. The grass withers, the flower fades, when the breath of the Lord blows upon it; surely the people are grass.⁸⁹

The Letter of James, 4: 14-15 You don’t even know what your life tomorrow will be. [What is your life?⁹⁰] You are like a puff of smoke [a mist], which appears for a moment [for a little while] and then disappears. What you should say is this: ‘If the Lord is willing [wills] we will [shall] live and do this and that (ἐὰν ὁ κύριος θελήσῃ, καὶ ζήσομεν καὶ ποιήσομεν τοῦτο ἢ ἐκεῖνο).’⁹¹

Each human individual therefore has his/ her own ‘allotted span of time’.⁹² That is, *every hour* given to each human individual so that he or she lives is a *donation*, a donation of *being* in the form of *time* that comes from *the life itself*⁹³ – in Julian’s theological context, God, *who is our life* (god that is oure lyfe⁹⁴).

⁸³ *BSA* (1978), *LT*, lxxxvi: 24-26, *CWS* (1978), p. 342.

⁸⁴ Cf. *BSA* (1978), *LT*, lxi: 37-40, *CWS* (1978), pp. 300-301. Cf. *BSA* (1978), *LT*, liii: 42-45, *CWS* (1978), p. 284.

⁸⁵ Kierkegaard S. (1992) *Eighteen Upbuilding Discourses*. tr. by E.V. Hong and E.H. Hong, Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton Univ. Press, p. 280. Cf. *BSA* (1978), *LT*, xxxvi: 68-69, *CWS* (1978), p. 241: *in thys passing lyfe* (in this passing life).

⁸⁶ *GNT* (1992)

⁸⁷ *GNT* (1992)

⁸⁸ *Vulgata* (1975^{2nd}), *Septuagint* (2007), edited by Alfred Rahlfs, Second Revised Edition, edited by Robert Hanhart, Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, Stuttgart. *KJV* (2007): *The Holy Bible* (Authorized King James Version), London: Oxford Univ. Press, 2007.

⁸⁹ *NRSV* (2010^{4th}): *The New Oxford Annotated Bible*, New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 2010. Cf. Psalm, 39:5, 89: 47,

⁹⁰ *NRSV* (2010^{4th}): ἡ ζωὴ ὑμῶν.

⁹¹ *GNT* (1992)

6.0 Love one another or you perish: Towards a tropological understanding of *Showings*

The very heart of Julian's message in *Showings* is excellently condensed into the following, Pope Benedict XVI's address to his audience at Paul VI Hall, Rome in 2010:

Julian of Norwich understood the central message of spiritual life: God is love and it is only if one opens oneself to this love, totally and with total trust, and lets it become one's sole guide in life, that all things are transfigured, true peace and true joy found, and one is able to radiate it.⁹⁵

Those who see through to the importance of her message and accept this address in a genuine way will also find the truthfulness of what St. Paul stated in his *First Letter to the Corinthians* 13:2: *If I have no love, I am nothing/none/nobody*, i.e. *I don't exist* (ἐὰν ἀγάπην μὴ ἔχω, οὐθέν εἰμι/ si caritatem autem non habuero, nihil sum).⁹⁶ This is because 'only by loving does the Christian exist authentically'.⁹⁷

Though Julian knew nothing about Greek, the syntactic structure of ἐὰν ἀγάπην μὴ ἔχω, οὐθέν εἰμι, in which εἰ (the Ionic dialect later turned into ἐὰν) with the indicative of reality (*If...really*) verifies that there is a causal relationship between the precondition, ἐὰν ἀγάπην μὴ ἔχω and its conclusion, οὐθέν εἰμι such as *If p, then q in actuality* [or] *If not p, then not q in actuality*.⁹⁸ Loving, that transfigures the meaning of life dramatically, is therefore itself 'a new mode of existence,⁹⁹ [and] a new way of looking at reality'.¹⁰⁰

St. Paul's self-awareness of how to be an authentic Christian seems to be deeply echoed in Julian's description in the *Revelation I* of *Showings*:

⁹² Ende M. (1985) *Momo*. tr. by J. Maxwell Brownjohn, New York: Doubleday & Company, p. 134, cf. p.132. Cf. 'The days allotted [apportioned] to me had all been recorded in your book (Psalm 139: 16, *GNT* (1992)); Ecclesiastes, 8:11.

⁹³ Ende M. (1985) *Momo*, p. 47. Cf. *Matthew* 10: 29: Are not two sparrows sold for a penny? Yet not one of them will fall to the ground apart from your Father (*NRSV*) without your Father's consent (*GNT*, p. 1079) the will of your Father.

⁹⁴ *BSA* (1978), *LT*, 48: 22, *CWS* (1978), p. 262. Cf. Psalm, 36: 9; Acts, 17: 25. *The life itself* can be, using the language of the New Testament, replaced with *He who is and who was and who is to come* (ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος) or *I am the Alpha and the Omega*, ..., *who is and who was and who is to come* (ἐγὼ εἰμι τὸ Ἄλφα καὶ τὸ Ὠ, ..., ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος) *The Revelation to John*, 1:4 and 8 (*The Greek New Testament*, Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2007, 4th edition). Cf. Exodus 3: 14: ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ὢν.

⁹⁵ Benedict XVI, *General Audience* at Paul VI Hall, Wednesday, 1st December 2010. (Liberia Editrice Vaticana, 2010)

⁹⁶ *Vulgata* (1975^{2nd})

⁹⁷ Murphy-O'Connor J. (1990). *The First Letter to the Corinthians* commented by Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, O.P. in *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary* ed. by Brown RE, S.S., Fitzmyer JA, S.J. and Murphy RE, O.Carm., New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1990, p. 811f. Cf. Murphy-O'Connor J. (2009) *Becoming Human Together: The Pastoral Anthropology of St. Paul*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, pp. 48: 'The distinctive characteristic of authentic humanity is a creativity which effectively opens new horizons of being to others'.

⁹⁸ Moulton J. H. (1998) *A Greek of New Testament*, vol III, *Syntax* by Nigel Turner, T & T Clark: Edinburgh, n. 372.

⁹⁹ Murphy-O'Connor J. (2009), p. 149, 177.

¹⁰⁰ Murphy-O'Connor J. (1990), p. 801.

*For ȝyf I loke syngulerlye to my selfe I am right nought; botte in generalle I am in anehede of charyte with alle myne evynn cristene.*¹⁰¹ *For in this anehede of chryte standes the lyfe of alle mankynde that schalle be save* (If I pay special attention to myself, I am nothing at all; but in general I am in the unity of love with all my fellow Christians. For it is in this unity of love that the life consists of all men who will be saved¹⁰²/ For if I look at myself in particular, I am nothing at all; but in general I am in oneness of love with my fellow Christians. For in this oneness of love depends the life of all humanity who will be saved¹⁰³).

(Φ) In saying *alle myne evynn cristene* (all my fellow Christians), Julian sees who Christians are: every Christian, living together in *the community-in-sinfulness*¹⁰⁴ or *the community of forgiveness and reconciliation*,¹⁰⁵ namely those who are deeply aware of his/ her sins and his/ her existential condition to be saved.

(X) In saying *ȝyf I loke syngulerlye to my selfe I am right nought; botte in generalle I am in anehede of charyte with alle myne evynn cristene* (If I pay special attention to myself, I am nothing at all; but in general I am in the unity [in oneness] of love with all my fellow Christians). Julian obviously based the major premise in her whole theological argument on the statement: *Every created thing has being if and only if God loves it* (cf. **4.0ff**). This manifests how she can hold her authenticity as being a Christian. That is, what she manifests is: if every created thing has being if and only if God loves it, and if she is not in the unity [in oneness] of love with all her fellow Christians, then she is nothing in actuality.

Through (Φ) and (X), it becomes clear what *tropological understanding* the whole message *Showings* calls on every Christian for is: loving one another. Loving one another is – not like ‘Aristotle [who] in considering the nature of friendship had concluded that a good man could not be the friend of a bad man; and since the bond of authentic friendship is a shared allegiance to the good’—¹⁰⁶an eschatological way of life or a way of anticipating the life to come,¹⁰⁷ that is, *God, who is Life Itself* (cf. (cf. **2.1ff**, **4.3**).

The very core of Loving one another is therefore thought possible to be filled with the eschatological tension expressed in the following exclusive disjunction: *Love one another, or you perish*.¹⁰⁸ Suppose *r* stands for *Love one another*, and *s* for *You perish*, then the logical formula *Love one another or you perish* will be: $r \nabla s \equiv (r \vee s) \wedge \neg(r$

¹⁰¹ Cf. I John, 4:16.

¹⁰² *BSA* (1978), *ST*, vi: 22-33, cf. *LT*, ix, 5-11, *CWS* (1978), p. 134.

¹⁰³ Windeatt (2015), p. 9. Cf. *Matthew* 5: 43-48, *Luke* 6: 27-28; 32-36.

¹⁰⁴ Arendt H. (1996) *Love and Saint Augustine*. Chicago and London: The Univ. of Chicago Press, p. 102.

¹⁰⁵ MacIntyre A. (1985) *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory*. London: Duckworth, p. 174.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, MacIntyre A. (1985), p. 174.

¹⁰⁷ Cf. *CWS* (1978), p. 81), De Lubac H. (2000), vol. II, p. 181, p. 4012, Note 22.

¹⁰⁸ Teilhard de Chardin P. (1967) *Sur L'Amour*, Editions du Seuil, Paris (ET: *On Love & Happiness*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1984, p. 36. Cf. *BSA* (1978), *LT*, xlix: 23-24, *CWS* (1978), p. 264

\wedge s), which further elucidates that it is a Christian who, acknowledging that there is no case that both love (r) and perish (s) are true, stakes his/ her total existential possibility on love (loue/ charyte), *the revealed truth*.