

Chapter Notes shared by Mike Grammer of Toronto - Ch 3

91, what interests me is that the Romans, who had a fondness for recording, don't seem to have anything as source material. Too insignificant?

92, too, and despite what he says on 93, it isn't *completely* fair to dismiss the gospels, since oral tradition and passing on already had a strong tradition of relative accuracy. The other attributable question is this---how critical *were* facts as opposed to message and meaning in these documents. How critical are they today? Deb has talked about this, very persuasively to my thinking.

93, so if I have maintained all these years that the Torah is, at its core, a written way of thinking, then Jesus is perhaps, at his core, a living way of thinking--or an avatar for a way of thinking

94--indeed!

94, you should all be made aware that Josephus himself was a literary and creative genius, rewriting the Old Testament almost entirely as the first form of combat against anti-semitism and geared with his Roman audience in mind

95, this is a very intriguing exposition to me

96, it is interesting to consider John the Baptist--and some of the other disciples too. No leader of a religion ever worked in a vacuum. For Abraham, Lot and Abimelech (I think I'm remembering---I'll have to look it up and make sure) played important roles of their own. Moses had Aaron and Joshua to buttress his story---from Aaron flowing the line of the priesthood and Joshua the first great Jewish general.

97 I hope the holy land group got to Nazareth, but it's true---it ain't very big

97 middle, well, I think you could take issue with these statements any number of different ways. Jesus was sharing his divinity by putting himself 'under' John. Jesus was bridging the gap between humans and son of God by growing up in humble surroundings.

97 bottom, I have an easier time with the counterexample

98 middle, that is a very fair point

99, apocalypics, let's reference back to Spong and say that, with part of their scattering and diaspora experience behind them and rich in prophetic history, the soil was very fertile for this point of view to be espoused

99-100, historically I'm sure accurate. It did not become the mainstream of our religion.

100, pessimism, this actually runs counter to my own Jewish worldview which says you concentrate on bettering yourself and others in this life

101 middle, note there is still the note of violence, even in this prep-for-utopia vision. I always say, though, "the meek shall inherit the earth...after the strong are done looting and pillaging it" (laugh/joking of course)

102, this does highlight a tremendous fulcrum-change for my religion. Previously largely looking at the past and remembrances of covenants and historical trials, triumphs and tribulations, you DO see here a change in outlook where looking forward became *fashionable* as opposed to just the province of the prophets. Is this a part of the 'equation' that allowed Christianity to be born? For my limited knowledge, there's not much in your religion that 'looks back'

104, an examination of the proverbs would probably show some of this at the root-- psalms too.

106-107, really fascinating line of thought. A counter-thought. Did Jesus live two identities? His relatively humble teaching life and then a transformation to the Son of Man where the resurrection was the catalyst?

108, from the Unetaneh Tokef (the Book of Life), (more or less) 'as the shepherd counts his flock, so God will cause each of us to pass under his rod' in judgment. Sheep are specifically referenced.

The goats---let's remember what you learned from Spong and our tradition about the sin-offering and the goat that is sent into the wilderness, Azazel.

109, here's another author making an indirect reference to each disciple being from one of each of the tribes.

111, he makes a strong point

112, an interesting theoretical question. Did Jesus *know or think* he might be transformed *to* the Son of Man? I'm starting to tune in to the flavour of the book. I like! (and I see he addresses this at 118)

113 as he begins to tie back to his discussion about the anointed King of Israel

113, pronounced 'moe-shee-ach' with the German 'ach' at the end.

114, just a reminder that for quite a time before that, church and state had been at least titularly separated. David descended from the tribe of Judah (if I remember correctly) (and thus so does Jesus in at least one Gospel interpretation), where the

High Priesthood descends from the family of Moses---specifically his brother Aaron. I don't think we're told of which tribe Moses claimed kinship to

115 but even this synopsis alludes to a dichotomy--between the 'active' of the anointed king/son of God and the 'interpretative' of the priesthood. One wonders if someone took this as a germinating precedent when the crusades came to pass---one pays due note that, to my knowledge, no pope led any crusade.

118 top, fair enough, we shall see where he goes

119, or he could have been God preparing his earthly advisers. Just sayin'

119, I may have referenced this before, but isn't there *always* a 'bad guy'? Cain + Abel. Abraham and (indirectly) Lot. Isaac and Ishamael--and Laban the Syrian. Moses and Pharaoh. David and Goliath. Even, later, Esther, Mordecai and Haman. There's always a bad guy. In the 'storytelling flavour' that Bishop Spong referenced, how could the Christian story be written without at least one (insider) bad guy.

120, a rather unique analogizing to the Easter Rising and the Orange Parade of Irish history, at least in the way he writes it.

122, top---well, now! I'm prepared to listen....

122 bottom, contrast that with the very rigid legal trial and evidence requirements that were inherent in Jewish law already at the time.

123, and if it was a religion seeking to separate itself, at least somewhat, from Judaism, why. *would* they name him so?

124, so here's something interesting akin to my 'Product Life Cycle' argument I've put forward in the past. Christianity began, as a significant departure from Judaism, 1800 years after our religion began. Christianity itself underwent the schism and reformation 1600 years after its birth. Islam started up around 600-700 right? So, if a declining curve is being measured (perhaps based on the advancement of civilization), is Islam poised for its major upheaval or turning point?

126, no, it didn't happen. The closeness to idolatry would not have allowed it