

Chapter Notes shared by Mike Grammer of Toronto - Ch 2

74-75, so he's started us off. Let's not be craven about this. Let's move right along. Why did not God "sing" and there be light? Why did not God "think" it and there be light? Why did God *have* to use words? Why? Because for God to have any meaning, one must foster a relationship-based interaction with him/her. And one can only do that within some kind of frame of reference that incorporates similarities. And so this is, in a way, the most essential form of anthropomorphism---bringing God into the human realm by having him/her use a human trait for the most powerful of God's works---words and "voice".

Logos may also be an access point for another "subconscious prerequisite" of something being divine. It has to inculcate or enhance belief. In an age of skepticism, divinity is likely all the harder to come by. Maybe I didn't include "belief" in my recipe because belief is the pan, not one of the ingredients.

76, there's also no question that at least some of the legitimacy for a papacy had to come from the historical position of the High Priest and his "conduit-iveness" to the holy one.

76, bottom, dare we see some repetition to the Abraham—Isaac-Jacob story?

76-77, OK, certainly fair. But that does not mean God at any point decreed that any special powers or any of his/her Godhood would descend to Solomon. Not at all.

77—yes, and so? So are we all begotten of God, no? At least I think in the ancient times the argument could have been made. Let us please not discount the political need of a small people to make themselves greater.

78, and back to Gilgamesh, no? Something *this* ingrained in the psyche of the fertile crescent human may have a lot more to do with humanity than it does with the divine---putting a single person on this kind of pedestal appears to be a repeated and repeatable need of a population.

78 bottom, that is certainly interesting! I will need to scope out the Hebrew for that psalm on my next visit to synagogue.

79-80 so the thing I might ask is this---are these verses meant to signify the king's Godhood *throughout the course of his life and reign* or only at certain recognition or signpost moments---such as when he ascends to the throne or does something particularly and noteworthy holy? (including being born). The idea of ordinary people having transient divine moments is probably something worth exploring

80 top. Really? It's not obvious to *me*. It could very easily be that the last 2 lines could be a postscript and have no material connection to the wonderful counselor, but are instead a result of his/her/its existence. Because there is a God on high, the throne of David shall have an endless peace. Also...why just David's kingdom? Unless "his" kingdom means the Lord's, and not David's.

81, so yes, absolutely. This has been a passage of endless speculation and interpretation, if I remember correctly. But I like this new slant on it---that if we intertwine the idea of holy Logos and Moses as the “mouth of God”, we might have something here. It is an avenue of thought I have never explored.

81, bottom, say rather that Moses was becoming more familiar and more comfortable with God and you’d be more convincing for me. To my knowledge, there is no dry or didactic second-hand account of Moses himself from any member of any tribe. It is at least as fair a point that, at this critical time in the “story” of our religion, the leadership of that religion could not be fractured into a group or a number of successors---it all had to be one guy.

82, indeed. And then...whee! BUT---if I follow my own observations and say that Moses did indeed inculcate, cultivate and enhance belief...and arguably even does so today, then can we not say that he was, in fact, potentially divine? Perhaps we must.

83, I think that would have been very natural and very necessary to any attempt to understand their world and God’s place and part in it vis-à-vis their own. Isn’t sainthood exactly the same thing?
