the kind of entities that one can find defended by folks as diverse, atheistic, but rather more palatable entities, such as the gospel, or the Pauline tradition; and savor of Ted Jennings comes across not so much as Christianity, proper, Jennings to be his most blatant apologetic for what Nietzsche calls "that stroke to Diognetes (that is even speculated to be a pseudonym of the Roman emperor) that Jennings writes of a kind of savoring. The intent of the letter to Diognetes letter finds a kind of Christianity to be the salt of the empire, is the very salt and savor of that empire." Jennings' reading is that the writer of the Diognetes letter finds a kind of Christianity to be the salt and savor of Rome. Jennings then emphasizes certain sections of the letter to Diognetes that tarries upon the concept of, "the corruption of youths" or "paidophthoria," in Greek. Jennings goes to great pains to show the perhaps flippant translation of paidophthoria as "pederasty" and how such a tactical mistranslation plays no small role in the instauration of a kind of double-edged ageism, the demonization of consensual post-pubescent same-sex relations, and even its conflation into a rejection of same-sex relations, on the whole. One of the many tasty morsels in Jennings' text is his disclosing of the culprits who try to sneak or smuggle paidophthoria, corrupting the youth (the very allegation leveled against Socrates), or perhaps what would best be translated as pedophilia (a breed of non-consensual pre-pubescent child abuse) into the Ten Commandments. The smugglers are Clement of Alexandria, Barnabas, and the Didache (the teaching of the twelve disciples). "Of course in no known version of the Bible does such a commandment anywhere appear." Leave that to Leviticus. The crux of Jennings' argument is his reading of Plato's Laws, showing how the tolerance of same-sex relations in the earlier Platonic dialogues is more enjoyable; an almond, which already has an ambiguous taste (both bitter and sweet; both male and female; the very fruit of Cixousian bisexuality: a hard and bitter seminal seed with an inner milky maternal sweetness). This has something to do with the taste of a lover; specifically a French kind of lover; amant. And let's not lose track of this taste of letters and lovers shared between mother and daughter as we encounter Jennings' reading of a certain Roman love letter about the relation between man and boy, which is to say between father and son; god and Jesus. (We would do well to add a few more women, mothers, and daughters to Jennings' treatise, when we can.)

As Jennings investigates the genealogy of homophobia, he displays certain sapience for the taste of love and letters. It is on an anonymous letter addressed to Diognetes (that is even speculated to be a pseudonym of the Roman emperor, Hadrian) that Jennings writes of a kind of savoring. The intent of the letter in question, written sometime in the second century of the common era, is "to persuade the reader that Christianity, far from being a threat to the public weal of the empire, is the very salt and savor of that empire." Jennings' reading is that the writer of the Diognetes letter finds a kind of Christianity to be the salt and savor of the Empire. Jennings then emphasizes certain sections of the letter to illuminate this thing called "Christianity" at its most salty and savory. (While I'm on the subject, I must say that I find this particular text of Jennings to be his most blatant apologetic for what Nietzsche calls "that stroke of genius called Christianity." In other texts and on other occasions, the salt and savor of Ted Jennings comes across not so much as Christianity, proper, but rather more palatable entities, such as the gospel, or the Pauline tradition; the kind of entities that one can find defended by folks as diverse, atheistic, and irreligious as Heidegger, Badiou, Lacan, Freud, Kristeva, Derrida, or Engels. The overarching thesis of Jennings text is that homophobia is not so much Christian as Greek. It is the result of the bastardization of Paul or the gospel through the legacy of Hellenization that is apostate from their true textual tradition. Does this thing called Christianity deserve to be so defended? The very structure, title, and architectonic of the Jennings' argument is not so much that homophobia isn't Christian but that it isn't Pauline; isn't true to more than a very few scant references throughout the whole of the Hebrew Bible, nor the gospel of Matthew. But that's what "Christianity" is, isn't it?: nothing but the mutation of the gospel and Pauline theory by Greco-Latin thinkers and (dias.)

But back to the letter to Diognetes. The letter reads, "What the soul is to the body, Christians are to the world." The god of such a world-soul acts "as one who saves by persuasion, not compulsion, for compulsion is no attribute of God." What comes about is a relation between saving and savoring; between the soteriology of Diognetes and the tongue of Jennings. The salt of Ted Jennings is the savor of a kind of Christianity; one which seems to taste more savory than sweet; more seminal than milky. It would be the taste of a love tradition that savors beloveds; one which does so by way of persuasion rather than compulsion. One of the key issues in Jennings' text is to show the crucial difference between pederasty and pedophilia; the former as a practice of persuasion, seduction, or consent, the latter as one of nonconsensual predation upon pre-pubescent children. This all tarries upon the concept of, "the corruption of youths" or "paidophthoria," in Greek. Jennings goes to great pains to show the perhaps flippant translation of paidophthoria as "pederasty" and how such a tactical mistranslation plays no small role in the instauration of a kind of double-edged ageism, the demonization of consensual post-pubescent same-sex relations, and even its conflation into a rejection of same-sex relations, on the whole. One of the many tasty morsels in Jennings' text is his disclosing of the culprits who try to sneak or smugle paidophthoria, corrupting the youth (the very allegation leveled against Socrates), or perhaps what would best be translated as pedophilia (a breed of non-consensual pre-pubescent child abuse) into the Ten Commandments. The smugglers are Clement of Alexandria, Barnabas, and the Didache (the teaching of the twelve disciples). "Of course in no known version of the Bible does such a commandment anywhere appear." Leave that to Leviticus.
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