

1. To what extent is archeology a science, and to what extent is it an art? Investigative research may be said to be science to the extent that it deals with the testimony and measurement of data. It may be said to be an art to the extent that it deals with the intuitive inferences needed to explain the meaning behind fragmentary data.

A striving after scientific comparison is well illustrated in the contrasting of the two alleged sights of Debir. Both were (1.) ancient Canaanite walled cities, (2.) poorer cities of especially early monarchical times, and (3.) Destroyed by the Babylonians. Thus they conformed impressively to Biblical history. However the more recently discovered sight conforms more in its geographical characteristics with the Biblical account: its water supply is lean, Josh. 15:19k Jg. 1:15, whereas the sight discovered in the 1920's by Albright had a more sufficient than lean water resource. Also, the recently discovered sight is in the hill country, conforming to the Biblical description, whereas the sight acclaimed by Albright was in lowlands. Are the two lone wells 2.5 KM north of the more recently acclaimed sight the upper and lower springs given to Othni-el? A careful attempt to organize the sources which are behind any conclusions involved may be regarded as science, but to what extent are intuitive parallels made in the investigations really science?

Sensation and art. Another side to archeology is best illustrated in statements like these from the articles dealing with the ~~xx~~ stables or storehouses: "the physical remains, when properly interpreted, were more romantic and breathtaking than the Biblical references would have led anyone to imagine." "Ahab stables simply doesn't have the same ring as Solomon stables." Instead of dealing with black-and-white certainty, we are dealing with darker grays as opposed to lighter grays, with debates over which is the lighter gray. Yadin wrote, "It seems to me that the association with Ahab is quite consistent with the testimony of Shalmeneser III, according to which Ahab is accredited with commanding a great number of chariots . . ." The direct topic being immediately discussed is an association not stables or storehouses. By association, people begin to come to conclusions.

Under these circumstances, when conclusions must often be repented of, a form of investigation which is partly an art must be regarded as art, even though it has scientific aspects involved. Thus Yadin diplomatically wrote, "We should be grateful to Professor Prichard for raising the issue because it is wise from time to time to give new consideration to points here-to-for universally agreed upon." Why? The field is too much an art to allow for too extensive a habit of dogmatism.

2. Are the Hebrew Scriptures strictly a reflection of first-millennium B.C. projections of what they believed happened beforehand? Did the religion evolve from a primitive ~~monolatry~~ monolatry?

Perhaps certain Hebrews projected certain then present ideas back to an earlier time. One need only to examine the extent to which David is credited with writing so many more Psalms in the 3rd-century B.C. LXX over that of the Masoretic Text. David was a hero who was given glory. The patriarchs were such heroes, that it was God's love for them, not the descendent nation, that brought about the establishment of God's covenant nation. Would first-millennium B.C. storytellers have invented the idea that such heroes did such offensive things as (1.) Marry a half-sister, Gen. 20:12, Lev. 18:9,11, 20:17, Dt. 27:22), (2.) Marry rival sisters, (Gen. 30:1, Lev. 18:18), (3.) descending from a relationship between a man and his prostitute daughter-in-law, (Gen. 38, Ruth 4:18-33), and (4.) Abraham planting a "sacred" tree, (Gen. 21:33 Dt. 16:21). Twenty-seven of the thirty-eight names connected with the patriarchs never reoccur passed early Exodus in the Bible. A unique custom of oath-taking, (Gen. 24:2, ~~xxx~~ 47:29), absence of the horse among Abraham's livestock (Gen. 11:32-35) and references to

very good!

$$\frac{70}{70} + \frac{10}{15} =$$

$$\frac{80}{80}$$

94% A

5

lead us to ask, is anyone who defends a first-millennium origin of the Torah willing to postulate an imaginative attempt by the storytellers to make their stories sound plausible?

very good

Did the Patriarchs actually represent a primitive monolatry which evolved into sophisticated monotheism? Perhaps the religion did become increasingly complex, but that was because God was first dealing with a family, whereas later he was dealing with a nation. A nation's demands are of course more complex, therefore, religious matters were more complex. Was the patriarchs' religion a monolatry? A plausible alternative may not be proven at this point, but its very sensibility is enough to neutralize the impact of the monolatry theory. Abraham's household had to conform to the religion of the head of the house, (Gen. 17:11-13). If anyone was to take up the patriarch's religion, it would be the blessed son, but not necessarily any other son or servant who leaves the house somehow. Jacob, for example thought of Yahweh as merely Isaac's God at the time he was being blessed, (Gen. 26:20). It was God's promise to bless him (Jacob) that finally won his attitude over to the conclusion that his father's God would also be his God, (Gen. 28:20-22). This relationship with a single supreme being was only a simple but dramatic departure from the worship of those around them. To the Canaanites, El was the father of Baal, a father distant from the people, whereas Baal was increasingly close to the people, transplanting the authority of El. Abraham, however, claimed a covenant relationship with El. "There is no fear of El in this place," ~~ax~~ (Gen. 20:22), Abraham had occasion to tell Abimelech. Abraham's "covenant relationship" with El was substantiated in the eyes of people as a result of events such as the freeing of Lot after which Abraham tithed to the priest of El Most High, (Gen. 14:15-23), Heth's recognition of him as a mighty prince ~~ax~~ (Gen. 23:6), etc. Are these merely dependent upon assuming the accuracy of the account? Could not the view that these are separate accounts be also accurate? Perhaps the real issues of credibility versus discredibility are more at stake in issues presented in the first question asked, concerning the projecting back of customs from the first century. Why? Because the two assumptions, the projecting back by storytellers from around 900 B.C. to 1900 B.C. and the monolatry theory come from similar sources. Are not these two assumptions themselves a result of 2nd millennium A.D. ideas being projected back on 2nd millennium B.C. events?

3D

4 ~~3~~ *-1*

3. The essential historicity of the patriarchal narratives means that the background has identifiable parallels with 2nd millennium B.C. evidence to indicate that these events could have happened. We cannot expect *more than* substantial historicity (other witnesses of specific events in Genesis) to occur with such ancient data.

Good

I do not object to your

4. Was Laban more than just an uncle or was he taking Jacob on as an adopted son as well? (1.) Gen. 29:19: Laban's pleasure at allowing Jacob to marry a daughter of him is paralleled by the fact that the first mention of any sons of Laban weren't until Gen. 31:1. Could Laban have been without heirs when Jacob first arrived? Even if that question is hard to answer, the taking on of Jacob as an adopted son is particularly illuminated in Rachel's theft of the teraphim. Rachel and her sister were concerned that Laban regarded them as foreigners and was using up the money given for them, (Gen. 31:15). Rachel stole the property gods, claims of inheritance which could only be made by a son or adopted son. (2.) In the Nusi law of the adopted son, the adopted son had to marry within the patriarch's family. Gen. 29:24, 29 shows that ~~his~~ the handmaidens given to his wives were owned by Laban. Laban desired that Jacob marry no one outside of his family even after he had fled, (Gen. 31:50). According to the custom, this would have been necessary for Laban to regard Jacob as an heir. (3.) The patriarch, according to the law, owned everything in the house, including what the adopted son used for his personal functions, (Gen. 31:43). I do not like to say that I agree or

... have approach.

disagree with evidence like this. Workable solutions are possible to explain peculiarities to this account. If Laban as a brother according to the custom arranged the marriage for his sister Rebecca, then his arranging of the marriages of his daughters can sensibly be accounted for if he had no sons. Does the out of place setting of the Nusi tablets present a problem? A chain of customs traced through Mauri, Lipit-Eastar, and into Hitite laws may strengthen ties between Nusi and the patriarchs, but there's always the common cop-out: let's see what the Eblah tablets unveil.

6. Was Abraham merely a shepherd? Abraham has been portrayed as a shepherd because of the key references to the ownership of livestock. However, like in Abraham's case, Job's wealth was also heavily measured in livestock. (Job 1:3, 42:5) yet he hasn't been commonly alledged as being a shepherd. Perh, it is because Abraham was migrant. However, Abraham was migrant, (Gen. 23:4) because according to law, he couldn't own land in the place where God had required him to go. That Abraham was not a mere shepherd is best illustrated in comparing Gen. 12:14-15 with Gen. 46:34. While every shepherd is an abomination to the Egyptians, Abraham's wife was praised by the princes to Pharaoh, and she was taken into Pharaoh's house. If he was more than just a shepherd, what was he? Heth, who was involved with a Hitite trading outpose, regarded Abraham as a mighty prince. He often stopped near major cities or trading outposts. He and Lot departed between Bethel and Ai, (Gen. 13:3). The oaks of Mamre (Gen. 18:1) is near where Abraham negotiated a burial place for Sarah, Gen. 23:2-4, 49:29-30). Abraham was in the area of a traderoute between Cadesh and Shur (Gen. 20:1). Other secondary things can be mentioned to indicate Abraham's status. (1.) His sending of 318 men to free Lot, (2.) The respect with which Abimelech treated Abraham, (Gen. 20:7-16, not merely because God intervened but also because he regarded Sarah as worth taking in in the first place. and (3.) The respect with which Heth paid Abraham, calling this sojourner a mighty prince. His status as something other than a shepherd, his dealing with traders, and his stature as a successful man would point to Abraham's status as a respected trader, head of a large household.

Good
insight!

15

1. Where was the Exodus? Where was Mount Sinai? Discuss two possibilities for each.

(A) The expression in Hebrew (which LXX called the "Red Sea") is "sea of reeds" literally. This could refer to bodies of water other than the Red Sea. In his book The People of Ancient Israel, Kuntz suggests one of a number of lakes near the Suez on Egypt's northeastern frontier, (P99-100). The assumption here is that this "sensational" account is an exaggerated description of the events which had evolved over the centuries. On the other hand, further south along the west coast of the northern Red Sea is a place where the Israelites could have been boxed in with Pharaoh's army to the north, and mountains to the west and south and water to their east. (Ex. 14:3). The ability or willingness of God to intervene is the real issue. Critics observe common conditions and figure, God doesn't intervene in such fashion, therefore, he didn't then.

(b) The possibility that Mount Sinai is in the midst of the Sinai peninsula near Suez appeals, assuming that daily encampments were made for a six-week period in order to get there after the Red-Sea crossing. Elijah's forty-day journey to there from Beer-Sheba (1 Kings 19:3,7-8), favors a location more distant from Israel. Admirably ancient tradition proposes a location considerably far to the south. It could have been reached from the point of the Red-Sea crossing if and only if encampments were weekly, so more time was spent traveling for their six-week journey.

2. Was the Exodus during the 15th or the 13th century? The 18th dynasty ruled Egypt in the 15th century and the 19th ruled in the 13th. According to the view supporting the 13th-century Exodus: (1) the Israelites lived in Goshen where Ramses II's government located there could most conveniently rule them. The 18th dynasty was too far north. (b) Israelite slaves were building a city called Ramses, the name of two 19th-dynasty Pharaohs. (Josh. 1:12) xxxxxx (Ex. 1:11). (c) Ramses claimed to have conquered Debon, a city conquered by Moses earlier according to Num. 21:1. (d) 1 Kings 6:1 is an obviously rounded figure. Interestingly, this 480-year figure has 40 and twelve as factors. If the writer was actually saying that there were twelve forty-year generations from the Exodus to Solomon, and he was over-estimating the length of a generation, which should have been 23 years, a sensible three hundred years could be accounted for. Likewise, Jg. 11:26: its three hundred years, (an emphatic seven generations of forty years each) could be explained as being 170 or so years after the Exodus. (e) The invasions of Israelites into Palestine had been going on for some time as evidenced by pre-Exodus Israelite architecture. This is because many came from beyond the river before the Moses's people came from Egypt and invaded under Joshua's leadership, (Josh. 24:14). Supporting the earlier view: (a) In spite of the 18th-dynasty capitol being "too far north", other factors created an atmosphere which called for the oppression of the Israelites. The Israelites' growth was feared, (ex. 1:9-10). Why? Because the 18th dynasty had risen to power by driving out the Hyksos (Asian rulers) and their memory was regarded as a lesson as to how to deal with the Israelites. If that was the case, then why was Moses spared by the princess? Hapshetsut adopted Moses because her father Thutmos I had no heirs. Partly from Thutmos comes the name "Moses." Moses fled Thutmos III with whom Hapshetsut had been in conflict. (b) While Raamses (spoken of in Ex. 1:11) was a city of storage, a 13th-century Exodus would require it to be a capitol. (c) Archeology neither supports the testimony of Ramses II nor that of Num. 21:1. This sort of evidence is lacking, because of the low percentage of evidence which has been excavated. Who is right, the Bible or Ramses II? (d) The editor of the Kings was well aware of the length of a generation. No genealogies are more detailed than those of the kings of Judah. If and only if ancient witnesses testify of a common asso-

56/60

2

3

10

my
of
God

ciation between a generation and forty years would there be evidence that this explanation is no more than a patch-work theory to support the view of a 13th-century Exodus. (5) Pre-13th century Israelitish dwellings in this case fit very well with a 15th century ~~ex~~ Exodus. ~~Exodus~~ 24:14 can be explained very well as meaning that earlier ancestors of the Israelites lived beyond the Euphrates and later ancestors lived in Egypt. Just because their patriarchs worshiped El-Shaddai after leaving Haran, this worship would not have been maintained in any sort of purity in Egyptian slavery. When strong leadership from God wained, their worship wained likewise, a trait which is abstracted in the last verse of the book of Judges. ~~The~~ The issue is one of sources. Do we believe Ramses II concerning Debon or do we believe Num. 21:1? Are assumptions used to interpolate fragmented archeological data to conform to the Bible, or do we interpret what we conclude to be a distorted Bible according to the picture formed in many people's minds who study archeology? God is in a better position to defend the Bible than archeological evidence. Man is ~~ex~~ in a better position to defend archeological evidence than the Bible is. My defense of either would be second rate.

5
3. Was it necessary for the Israelites to travel around Edom and Moab in their late 15th-century sojourning? Num. 21:4 says yes. (Confrontation with Moab begins in Num. 22.) Critics say this is fiction. No inhabitation would have given Israel such problems in the 1400's. These places were inhabited in the 13th century however. The two problems with this critical view are (a) the deduction was made by Nelson Gluck whose track record has occasionally been off the track to say the least--his conclusions concerning Solomon's copper mines are an example. (b) Settlements from around 1400 have been found in Moab.

4
4. Concerning the views of Albright, Alt-and-Noth, and Patten-and-Hoeh relating the Bible with various archeological periods:

(a) Albright found mass destruction in Canaan in F and G. Josh. 12 appeared to describe a sudden anitial success by Joshua, while ~~Josh~~ 1 showed a protracted struggle lasting into G, where iron chariots intimidated Judah. Hatsor was taken by Joshua, and Deborah would be dated around 1125.

Concluded
(4) No
4
(b) Alt and Noth found "pre-Exodus" Israelite dwellings which required the conclusion that Jushua did not lead the first Israelites into the land in his 1200's invasion. Josh. 24:14 demonstrated the possibility of Egyptian and Mesopotamian Israelites dwelling in the land. Arad of Num. 21 (they figured) was destroyed in A. ~~and resettled in C, so Num. 21 must have taken place in the iron age.~~ Jerecho fell in B, to early for the time of Joshua. The Exodus was in C. Lachish and Hatsor fell in C. dated later than B. and the fall of Jericho. Joshua invaded in E. He could account for the second destruction of Hatsor.

10
(c) Hoeh and Patten, like Aharoni, figure that Num. 21 is sufficient to challenge the common view that the nonexistence of Arad proves this chapter to be fiction. Pharaoh Shoshenq (Shishak) wrote of the conquest of "greater Arad (commonly known to archeologists) and lesser Arad (Num. 21). Dhibon was destroyed with its mud-brick dwellings leaving no known trace. Unfortunately, a double standard is used among ~~xxxx~~ critics, for they do not doubt Ramses II's boast of the conquest of Dhibon, but where is the evidence? Furthermore, archeological assumptions include that pottery changes happened pretty-much simultameously. The transition from B. to C. marks the arrival of the sea peoples (according to Patten and hoeh) in the west, influencing Lachish and the trading center Hatsor before Jercho much further east. Thus ~~xxxx~~ Jerecho fell at B. at the time Lachish and related cities were C. Not only does this assume the accuracy of the Bible, but the question is raised, to what extent does geography and migration, as well as chronology have to be taken into account in identifying the relationship between pottery styles and "dated" events. Thus Israelitish dwellings are easily explained in D. as post-Exodus. Deborah took Hatsor in F. Jephthah lived in G. 300 years after the battles under Joshua on the east bank of the Jordan.

Rather than figure that the book of Joshua was contradicting Jg. 1, the conclusion is that Josh. 12 was a summary complemented by a discription in Jg. 1 as to the broad nature of the warfare. Joshua swept but did not occupy the land. Judges contains flashbacks, and sometimes mentions events already at least partly included in Joshua, ((Josh. 14:13, 15:13, Jg. 1:10) concerning lands given to Caleb and his daughters is an example.

5. (a) Was the relationship between the twelve tribes merely an Amphictyony? That is, ~~were~~ were they primarily united by a religious shrine, having to manufacture an ancestry to unite them? (1.) Mizpah, ~~S~~Shiloh, and Gilgal were places for sacrifices. Thus a single shrine wasn't what necessarily united them. (2.) Major decisions were made at diverse locations. (3.) Judges were not chosen by the tribes, as might be expected if they were to be the consensus leaders of united tribes. (4.) Conflicts among Jacob's wives and their diverse status did not fall into patterns that would be expected if the stories were manufactured. The largest and smallest tribes came from the favored wife. Geographical characteristics were further independent from the identities of the tribal mothers. ~~Sx~~ East-bank land was shared by Reuben of Leah, Manasseh of Rachel, and Gad of a handmaiden. While Simeon lost its tribal identity, Gilead, (an important region) could never obtain tribal status. Thus one major geographical location was not considered a tribe, and Simeon, considered a tribe, lost its geographical land. Gilead was shared by Gad and Manasseh of different mothers. While ~~Rx~~ Reuben (the unstable, wicked first-born was ~~were~~ of a primary wife, Joseph had to transplant him to become the first-born. (5.) The memory of the twelve tribes was so rooted that long after the ten tribes went into captivity in 720, in Ezra 6:16 begins a memorial offering for the 12 tribes in 515 B.C. If the story were manufactured, it is as though lots were cast to put the story together to avoid the suspicion that a pattern would otherwise result. Is that an intelligible possibility?

(b) So rooted was the tribal system that Levirate marriage was practiced to make sure that a prematurely dead husband could pass on his name if he left no heirs. (that his name may not be blotted out of Israel Lev. 25:7 if there are no heirs). If and only if there are no sons the daughter may be an heir. Sons were heirs because the daughter who married left the family entirely. But if a daughter was to be an heir, she had to marry within her clan. If she married outside of her tribe, the tribal land inheritance would be in chaos. I don't understand why she had to stay within her land unless that further aided in an orderly distribution of the land. When a criminal was fleeing an avenger of blood, his adversary was a close kinsman of the victim. This ~~was~~ was because these affairs were a family matter whereas in our society they are an affair of the state. This further illustrates the tribal mentality of the Israelite people.

1. A. What was involved in the Religious Laxity at the time of Malachi? Cyrus's order gave political sanction to the building of the second temple in 538 (Ezra 1). Samaritans lead the opposition which frustrated their progress until Darius was reigning in 520 B.C. Darius's accession to the throne amid much political chaos may have thrown weight behind Haggai's message which the Eternal gave him to address to Zerubbabel, that God would shake kingdoms and favor Zerubbabel in terms which pictured him as a Messiah. (Hag. 2:20-23). This spurred on the ~~king~~ finishing of the temple. The world's kingdoms were not over-thrown, however, and disallusionment which followed set the stage for Malachi. In Malachi's day, the priests generally dishonored God's name, and God was displeased in spite of the presence of a standing temple, (Mal. 1:6, 10). They regarded the temple service as a wearisome necessity, (Mal. 1:13). They sacrificed blemished, and therefore unacceptable, animals to the Eternal, (Mal. 1:13-14). ~~Their instruction~~ Priestly instruction caused the people to stumble (Mal. 2:8). Wives were taken from families who worshiped foreign gods, (Mal. 2:11) a practice which Ezra and Nehemiah abolished, indicating that Malachi did not ~~follow~~ follow them. The people were not tithing, (Mal. 3:8-10). Thus, an apparent disallusionment from the failure of "end-time" expectations had taken its toll.

B. What was involved with Ezra's commission? Artaxerxes referred to Ezra as "the priest, the scribe of the law of the God of heaven." Like his predecessor Cyrus—(exemplified in Ezra 1 and in the "Cyrus cylinder", Artaxerxes sought a man from a local province of the kingdom (or of that ethnic stock) who was qualified to administer the oracles of that local god. Whatever that god commanded, it was to be done in that god's local area lest his wrath be against the realm of the imperial king and his sons, (Ezra 7:23). Ezra had set his heart to study the law of the Eternal, to do it, and to teach it. (Ezra 7:10). God's love before the Persian kings was known by Ezra to ~~include~~ include the building of a wall around Jerusalem, (Ezra 9:9). Whatever God required, including animals and cereal for the offerings at the Eternal's altar, the setting up of the vessels of the temple before God, and any other restorations specified in the law in Ezra's hand was financed within specified limits out of the Persian king's treasury.

Finally, temple service was to be tax-exempt and a sufficient number of magistrates were to be taught God's law which was to be physically enforced with royal sanction including appropriate death penalties.

C. Why did Artaxerxes grant Ezra's commission? As already mentioned, and as further illustrated in Darius's order that the Egyptian priests should write down and strictly administer the laws of Egyptian diety, Ezra was to administer the law from Jerusalem, because of his ~~competence~~ competence. It would on one hand insure domestic peace among the Jews loyal to Yahweh, and it would insure that the wrath of the God of heaven would not bring chaos in the kingdom by keeping the Jews loyal to the king.

4

2. Why after Artaxerxes had withheld permission to build the wall around Jerusalem, did he later give permission to Nehemiah? From 463 to 455 B.C., Egypt was in revolt (stirred up by the Greeks) against the Persian king. Adversaries of the Jews wrote a letter to Artaxerxes complaining about the building of a wall in Jerusalem on the basis that fortified Jews at Jerusalem would then withdraw their tribute and have the potential will to push for the independence of the Trans-Euphrates province. If this were ~~xxx~~ contemporaneous with the Egyptian revolt, even the favor extended to Ezra may not be enough to insure the king's support for the building of the wall. Artaxerxes ordered that the building be desistently suspended, but he left the possibility open for the continuation of the building later. Not only was the Egyptian revolt crushed, lessening any potential threat from a fortified Jerusalem, but a peace-treaty with Greece in 448 B.C. ended this potential source of trouble for the time being. In 445 B.C., ~~Nehemiah~~ Nehemiah received word of the wall in Jerusalem which was apparently broken down with impunity when the anti-Jewish inhabitants received permission from the king to put an end to the building of the wall, (Ezra 4:23, Neh. 1:3). Nehemiah was the king's cupbearer, a task reserved only for an honored and trusted servant of the king. He had sought help from the Eternal after drawing near in fasting and prayer, and the Eternal influenced the king to question Nehemiah about grievances of which ~~Neh~~ Nehemiah had kept to himself until questioned. Because the Egyptian rebellion was a thing of the past, and Nehemiah was a trusted servant of the king, and because God had answered Nehemiah's prayer, the king gave Nehemiah permission to administer Jerusalem's restoration, and Nehemiah ~~wx~~ became the governor and lead in the rebuilding of the wall.

3. Ezra lead in re-establishing for generations to come, the law of God in Jerusalem, but a number of reforms were necessary.

2

A. Mixed marriages. What Malachi had found to be a problem, (Mal. ~~2:11~~ 2:11), Ezra prayed about in shame before the Eternal, (Ezra 9:1-6). Nehemiah later wrote how when Jews had married Gentile women, half the children spoke the language of Ashdod, and they tended to speak the language of the ~~wx~~ respective mothers (Neh. 13:23-24). This shows how important the mothers' influence was, and therefore how dangerous it was for Jews to marry daughters of families who worshiped other gods. If the mothers influenced the religion of the children as much as they did their language, the maintenance of God's worship for very many generations depended upon the end of these marriages.

B. Reading of the law.

2

B. The Reading of the Law. ~~ix~~ Since the language of Judah (Hebrew) (Neh. 13:24) was spoken to a very limited extent, and the law was written in Hebrew, it had to be interpreted to the people, (Neh. 8:8). A comparison of Neh. 13:1 and verse 4 indicates that the expulsion of Tobiah and (as told in verse 7, Nehemiah's return to Jerusalem after 433 B.C. was all before the great day of the reading of the law; this assumes that the reading of the law mentioned in Neh. 13:1 is the same event as that of Neh. 8-9. As a result of this great assembling, a covenant was made by the people to keep the law, and they vowed not to intermarry with the foreigners who worshiped other gods, (Neh. 10:30). The introduction of the seventh month in Ezra 7:73 with no more than a subtle break in the story in ~~xxxxx~~ ~~Exx~~ Neh. 7:4 to indicate a time gap in the book of Nehemiah, it's commonly concluded that the great assembling occurred at the feast of tabernacles after the wall's completion some fifteen or so years earlier in about the fall of 744 B.C. As ~~wx~~ only a ready scribe could do, Ezra read the law, able according to tradition to understand a Hebrew text with no vowels, no punctuation, and no word separation. He knew the oral traditions which further detailed beyond the written details the theory and practical applications of the law.

3. C. The Institution of the Regular Reading of the Law in Synagogues. Somehow, the people in succeeding generations had to learn and remember what the covenant renewal in Ezra's day entailed. A new institution for the preservation of the reading of the law to the people was necessary during the Babylonian captivity. In this new setting with the temple destroyed, the law was read at assemblies on the marketing days (the second and fifth days of ~~the~~ each week), on sabbaths and holy days. Under these circumstances, the synagogue assembly originated. This institution was well-established, then, for the preservation of the covenant-renewal of Ezra's time.

2

D. The continuing activity of the scribes. Scribes were to be trained from among the priestly families to become scribes; they copied the law and learned the traditions to interpret it. Many didn't desire the difficult work of training; being a temple servant provided status with far less ~~difficult~~ difficult training. As time passed, there were too few knowledgeable people among the temple authorities, and the Jews broke up into sects with the temple authorities primarily making up the Sadducees, and many knowledgeable and less educated layman becoming Pharisees. Thus the unity of what Ezra had once established had become a thing of the past.

2

4. Written law does not address all the theoretical and practical problems which new situations in life demand of it. Established practices as to how to address issues of the law not a part of the written law make up oral law.

2

5. Existence of oral law can be illustrated in these examples:

A. Dt. 17:3-9 refers to civil matters not defined in the written law which other understood or orally defined customs had to establish: decisions had to be made concerning one kind of homicide ~~xx~~ and another, and cases too difficult for the local authorities were taken to a higher court, but an appeal process did not exist.

2

B. A bill of divorce was called for in Dt. 24:1, but the details of its format, content, or more details of its customary practice were not given in the written law.

2

C. According to Neh. 10:32, the people layed upon themselves the obligation to charge 1/3 shekel for the temple service yearly. Is this the ancestor of the half-shekel tax mentioned in Ma. 17:24-27?

2

6. Oral law was applied in light of (1.) The parental incompleteness of written law, (Dt. 24:1), (2.) The need to distinguish between different kinds of cases, judgments, the letter of the law verses its spirit, etc., (Dt. 17:3-9), and (3.) The preservation of humanly-established regulations in order to carry out reoccurring functions, (Neh. 10:32).

2

7. How is it that Nehemiah was an ~~effective~~ effective leader?

A. He was a good organizer. People were motivated to repair parts of the wall strategic to their own interests, (Neh. 3:23,28-30). Workers were armed or guarded by defenders because of the opposition to the building, (Neh. 4:16-18). Nahemiah appointed a God-fearing man to have charge over Jerusalem (Neh. 7:2).

2

B. He threw himself into the task: he and his close workers stayed at the work-site, not even changing their close while the building of the wall was in its intense stages, (Neh. 4:23).

2

C. He was prudent: when he first arrived, he investigated the place secretly and by night before making his business public, (Neh. 2:12-16). He turned down an offer to meet with Sanballat and Geshem who ~~xx~~ had harmful intensions--it reminds me of how Mr. Armstrong dealt with the press--

2

8 (Neh. 6:2-3). These adversaries failed to use the intimidation of Shemaiah against Nehemiah; they got Shemaiah to suggest ~~xxxx~~ to Nehemiah that he barricade himself in the temple for his own safety, lest his enemies kill him, but his very enemies had put Shemaiah up to it, a thing which Nehemiah realized. (Neh. 6:10-13).

2 D. He was a profitable servant. With integrity as governor of Judea, he abstained from the food allowance given to him by the king, and unlike his predecessors, he did not lay heavy burdens upon the people, (Neh. 5:14-18). By abstaining from the king's allowance, he saved the people from bearing an extra tax burden, asking that God be the one who would remember him.

3. Chronological charts often list the reign of Artaxerxes I as lasting about 41 years beginning in 465 or 464 B.C. Nehemiah chapters 1 and 2 refer to Chisleu and the following Nisan as being in the 20th year of Artaxerxes, indicating a fall-to-fall year. Thus it is possible for his seventh year (Ezra 7:7) to have included at least the early part of 457 B.C., especially if he began to reign in 464 B.C. This is important because of the prophecy in Dan. 9:24-27, calling for 483 years from the going forth of an order to restore and build Jerusalem till the ~~xxxx~~ coming of a Messiah. Many scholars including J. D. Douglas say this couldn't have taken place until a wall was being built, and that this was accomplished not by Ezra but by Nehemiah in 444 B.C. Ezra 7:2 referring to Ezra's understanding that a building of a wall was an option opened to him indicates that Dan. 9:24-27 refers to his coming in 457 B.C. Christ's baptism 483 years later in 27 A.D. then becomes an important part of the puzzle. Ezra's failure to get things started has already been referred to earlier, in light of the Egyptian rebellion, coupled with the adverse letter to the king spoken of in Ezra 4:2-16. Even scholars who say that Artaxerxes II is referred to in Ezra 7:7 dating Ezra's coming to Jerusalem as 397 B.C., say that Nehemiah's governorship was during the time of Artaxerxes I, 444-432 B.C. They then claim that the reference to Nehemiah in Neh. 8:2 was inserted, since Ezra was a generation after Nehemiah. This is not plausible, because it was Ezra, not Nehemiah, who was held in such high esteem by later Jews; perhaps Ezra could get occasional spurious mention but not Nehemiah. For the same reason, an accidental omission of "thirty" in Ezra 7:7 would not have been tolerated. If Ezra had come initially to Jerusalem in 427 B.C., in Artaxerxes's 37th year, it would naturally be concluded that the great reading of the law was then occurring, made possible by the unprecedented appearance of Ezra. How intolerable would it have been to have omitted the "thirty" and now be presented with the suggestion that Ezra's initial attempts lacked physical backing and had failed until a team-effort with Nehemiah made success possible. Therefore, Ezra did not come in 397 B.C. and necessitate the insertion of Nehemiah into Neh. 8:2, and Ezra did not ~~xxxx~~ make his appearance in Artaxerxes's 37th year, even if this was the occasion of Nehemiah's return. Just because Ezra spent the night in the chamber of Johanan in Ezra 10:6 doesn't mean that ~~he~~ Johanan was high priest. An interesting question remains unanswered in class discussion: Kuntz defended the 397 B.C. date for Ezra because he said that according to the Elephantine Papyri, Johanan was high priest in around 400 B.C. leading to Ezra's purges. What do these papyri indicate happened to the temple authority after the time of Nehemiah?

Very
very
good!

9

35
2

1. A. Why were there both pro-Seleucid and pro-Ptolemy groups in Judea after the Jews had betrayed the Ptolemies and assisted in the Seleucid take-over of the region 201-198 B.C.? The ancient Jewish priesthood was internally established as being in the lineage of Zadook. As a temple state under the Ptolemies, they enjoyed ~~ix~~ religious ~~at~~ autonomy. Internal control over who would continue as priest as well as local autonomy depended upon ~~remaining~~ becoming a Polis under the Seleucids or reuniting with the Ptolemies as a temple state. The family of Tobiah favored becoming a Polis; to them, the Hellenization of Jerusalem was a sufficiently small price to pay. Onias III knew that Hellenization would destroy their traditions, and that by not becoming a Polis under Seleucid rule, Jewish autonomy, which was only political, would not last. Therefore, he favored reuniting with the Ptolemies.

2
4
3

B. The Jews were divided along social and economic lines. The Tobiahs wanted to Hellenize and to ~~en~~ enjoy the status and glamor of being a Hellenistic city. Onias III in total opposition wanted to preserve the pureness of the traditions. His brother, Joshua, wanted to put on a facade of Hellenism to appease the Seleucids and to become a Polis leader without destroying the traditions of the fathers; he knew that union again with the Ptolemies was impossible. The common people were with Onias III; they were distrustful of Hellenization. Hellenization would benefit the educated, and the powerful landowners.

4
3

2. After Joshua had accused Onias III of treason against Antioch in 175 B.C., he was made the high priest. He took for himself the Greek synonymous name Jason. Antioch at Jerusalem was incorporated as a Polis. A gymnasium was built for athletic competition. No local social problems existed, because all were circumcised anyway. God was the patron diety. They gained the sought-after charter, economic privileges at home and abroad, and tax exemption. However, the high priest was no longer the people's representative or God's representative, but the king's representative. Joshua wanted to preserve the ancient traditions, but his Hellenistic facade convinced the king that he (Joshua) was pro-Hellenistic and that only a rebellious minority of the Jews opposed Hellenization. In 171 B.C., Onias III was murdered and Menelaus became the high priest. The Zadook lineage had all but ended. Menelaus with the ~~ix~~ family of Tobiah really wanted to Hellenize, so the Hellenization process was accelerated. In 168 B.C., Antiochus ~~ix~~ Epiphanes attacked Egypt; the Romans forced him to withdraw. *He* invaded Jerusalem, and furthered its Hellenization by insisting upon the worship of Zeus. Even though the bull was customarily sacrificed to Zeus, he insulted Jewish tradition by ordering swines to be sacrificed.

2

3. Before Epiphanes invaded Jerusalem, the worship of Yahweh continued and all the benefits of a Polis were granted to the elite at Jerusalem.

1

4. The priesthood was debased not only by being appointed by the king but by the destruction of the power of the Zadookites.

2

5. Joshua wanted to preserve the traditions of the fathers, while Menelaus simply wanted Hellenization with all of its glitter.

2

6. The ~~ix~~ priesthood ceased to be a lifetime office; the will of the foreign king ~~ix~~ caused it to change hands often; this was the priestly institution which governed the religious affairs of Judea at the time of Christ resulting from the days of Antiochus Epiphanes.

7. A. Traditional and modern-critical scholars differ as to the scheme of the four beast-kingdoms of Dan. 2 and 7 because the conservatives say they point to the Messiah's coming in this present age while the modern-critics say it pointed to a Messianic intervention in the time of the Maccabees.

Biblical Symbols		Conservatives	Modern Critics
Daniel 2	Daniel 7		
The head of gold	The lion	Babylon	Babylon
The silver arms and breast	The bear with 3 ribs	Medo-Persia	The Medes Or Medo-Persia
Bronze belly and thighs	Leopard with 4 heads and 4 wings	Alexander and four empires formed after his death	Persia Or Alexander's original empire
Iron legs	Terrible beast	Ancient Rome	Alexander and successors
Iron and clay feet: 10 toes	10 horns	Catholic Rome Successive kingdoms or end-time kingdoms	or only Hellenistic successors Five Seleucid kings plus Five simultaneous Ptolemies Until Maccabees' revolt

In case the chart is unclear, (1.) the gold head and lion are Babylon; (2.) the arms and breast of silver and the bear according to conservatives are Persia; Critics are divided, some say the Medes and some say Persia or Medo-Persia which are in this context synonymous; (3.) The bronze belly and thighs and the leopard with the 3 ribs between its teeth are according to conservatives the Greco-Macedonian empire and its Hellenistic successors. According to critics who re-cloned the second beast as the Medes only, this third beast is Persia, while critics who regarded the second beast as Persia regard the third as Alexander exclusively. (4.) The terrible beast along with the iron legs and clay and iron feet with the ten toes according to conservatives identifies ancient, middle-ages and modern Rome--Catholics don't hold that view. Critical scholars and many Catholics who don't associate the Leopard with Alexander identify him here; all Critics virtually identify the Seleucids and Ptolemies (five Seleucids and five Ptolemies before the Maccabean revolt) with the legs and ten toes. Daniel 2 with the statue and Daniel 7 with the beasts are very close except the ten toes of the statue are likely the end-time ten contemporary kings while the ten horns of the beast are not mutual contemporaries and are spread over some fifteen and a half centuries. This according to the conservative view. Modern critics would see them perhaps as synonymous with the Seleucids and five Ptolemaic kings which happened to have reigned before the Maccabean revolt.

If Daniel was a 6th century B.C. book as conservatives would conclude, and if the fourth beast fights Christ who has yet to come, naturally the fourth beast points to Rome and Roman heirs. If Daniel was a 2nd century B.C. book as critics believe it to be, and if detailed passages like Daniel 11 betray apocalyptic retrospect as far as 165 B.C. and speculation as to the end-time, then it stands to reason that the fourth beast would point to then contemporary events to honor those involved in the Maccabean revolt.

B. The Conservative-Critical controversy involves points such as the following throughout the book of Daniel:

(1.) Historical obscurities such as Jeremiah 25:1 compared with Dan. 1:1 are viewed by critics as demonstrating an ignorance of history in the book of Daniel. Jeremiah places Nebuchadnezzar's first year as king in Jehoiakim's fourth year while Daniel says it was in Jehoiakim's third year. A hand-out on the background of Jeremiah given to us in (I think) Old-Testament prophecy class suggested that Dan. 1:1 occurred a year prior to that of Jeremiah 25:1 assuming that Nebuchadnezzar was the crowned-prince working as a field marshal for his father. A year later on Ab 8, 605 B.C., his father died, and the rest of the

4
lonian chronicles shows that Jehoiachin was imprisoned in Nebuchadnezzar's year 3 according to Hebrew reckoning and year 7 according to Babylonian reckoning. By this reasoning, Nebuchadnezzar should have been king of Babylon ~~amxix~~ during Jehoiakim's year 4 according to Hebrew reckoning (Jer. 25:1) but in this Jewish king's year 3 according to Babylonian reckoning; Daniel wrote in Babylon and would likely have used Babylonian reckoning. Since Nebuchadnezzar is referred to as king in Daniel 1:1, it's possible that the hand-out earlier referred to, (while it is a possible explanation) may place the captivity of Daniel a year to early. At any rate, either of these explanations would not only reflect a conservative approach, but they demonstrate ample evidence that the critical view overlooks evidence that can explain Dan. 1:1.

4
(2.) Literary obscurities include the use of Greek terms (especially among the musical instruments of Daniel 3:5). According to the critics, this thoroughly points to a Hellenistic dating of this book. Actually it doesn't prove anything. Greek mercenaries fought on both sides of the battle of ~~xxxxxxxixixixix~~ Carcamish in 605 B.C. within a year of Daniel's being taken captive. This potential for cultural conflict allows for the occasional infusion of Greek terms in an Aramaic world, especially among the educated of the world's most powerful nation wherein Daniel wrote. Thus, the conservatives contend that the book could have been written in the 6th century B.C.

4
(3.) An apocalyptic obscurity involves the portrayal of angels in the book of Daniel. Critics point out that references to angels in Hellenistic Jewish literature was extensive. Traditions about the death of Moses, the book of Jubilees, and Enoch much of which is reflected in the book of Jude did not exist in the Babylonian and Persian period enough to warrant a 6th century dating of Daniel. If Daniel was written in the 2nd century, its references to angels would be very much the contemporary style. Surely conservatives are assuming that Daniel's prophecies were progressive in imagery as well as miraculous foretelling of history. Conservatives point out that a 6th century Daniel was less ~~xxxxxxxixixixix~~ out of step than critics alledge. It was the visions given to Ezekiel which pioneered these angelic scenes in ~~xxxxxxx~~ apocalyptic literature. ~~xxxx~~ Ezekiel is widely if not universally acknowledged by critics as being of 6th century origin. Even widespread critics' dates for Ezekiel precede conservative dates for Daniel. Conservatives may over-estimate the pioneering character of Ezekiel's visions and under-estimate those of Daniel; Daniel's account was more extensive in naming various angels (as far as I know), but the tendency to pioneer began in the 6th century based upon reasonable evidence independent of Daniel.

Also Zechariah has "apocalyptic"
sections. Yet no scholar doubts
either their authenticity or its
- 6th century BC date.

1. How could it be said that Simon ruled a Constitutional monarchy which had no king? Simon's power included executive powers like that of the Jewish kings of old in that he was both chief administrator and head of the military. Unlike the ancient kings, he was also the high priest, the powers of which included administrative powers as chief of the Sanhedron. He was not the king, but he was provisionally ~~xxxxxx~~ elected until a descendent of David could assume the throne. As chief of his people he was called an ethnarch. Because he had to be loyal to oral and written law, the torah, he was adhering to a Constitution, so he ruled a constitutional monarchy, but not as king.

4.9
1
Incomplete
-3
2. A. What accounts for the rise to power of the Sanhedron? In 142 B.C., Simeon or Simon had secured independence for Judea with respect to the government at Antioch. His government needed structure. A Both the conservative common people and the more Hellenized aristocracy had to be represented. A monarchy was impossible since David had no heir. The aristocrats were discredited, because of their earlier Hellenizing role. A people's democracy was too Greek in character to be acceptable. As a result, a chief of the people, not called a king, was placed as head of a judicial-Legislative council, the Sanhedron. It was dominated numerically by people who ideologically were similar to the Zadokites of old, but a minority of the Sanhedron were more influential group which made up the administrative aristocracy.

B. The Aristocrats of the Sanhedron alone had the management experience necessary for a competent executive branch of government. The chief priest could best work with them on a day-to-day basis in managing the affairs of state. They were more educated as to world conditions, and they could better set foreign policy and communicate with the Hellenistic governments round about. Foreign governments would identify them alone as those Jews who were competent in doing diplomatic and international business.

10
3. Simeon 142-134 B.C. ruled an independent Judea which came to be at peace with the Ptolemies and Seleucids, aided by a Jewish-Roman friendship. However, peace with tiny neighbors such as Samaria and Edomea was a threat to Judiism, because they might intermingle peacefully and dilute the ancient religion. Defeat in war against them meant that neighboring cultures could be imposed upon them. The solution was for the Jews to rule them. In Johnathan Hircanus's reign, 134-104 B.C., Judea conquered Samaria and Idomea and the Edomeans were forced to convert to Judiism; the Samaritans were regarded as a hopeless case. In the reign of Judah Aristobulus 104-103 B.C. Galilee was conquered and they were compelled to convert to Judiism. In the reign of Jonathan Alexander 103-76 B.C. the Jews conquered Jordan to the border of Moab. This put them in control of the ~~xx~~ ancient overland trade through Palestine; control over such trade depended upon control of most of these conquered lands, especially Samaria and Galilee, and the Jews therefore prospered greatly.

~~ADJ~~

The Jewish conquests prior to 76 B.C. had a surprising benefit: it set a precedent, so that when the Jews favored later conquerors such as Julius and especially Octavian Caesar, these conquerors gave to the rulers over the Jews lands from these conquests which were lost ~~between~~ between 76 and 47 B.C. due to civil strife and poorly-chosen alliances.

6
4. In the reign of Simeon, and especially that of John Hircanus, tensions arose between the people's more conservative spokesmen and the administrators in the Sanhedron for these reasons: (1.) The functions of the administrators required powers which naturally conflicted with the generally more judicially-oriented powers of the less Hellenistic majority. They had power struggles wherever their goals clashed. (2.) The less powerful majority was antagonized by the administrators' advising the chief priest to use mercenary soldiers, and forceable conversion of conquered peoples. This defamed the priesthood. As the only defenders of unhellenized religion, they had to contend with a high priest who was both religious and "civil", and his civil powers were very Hellenistic in the way they were being executed. Hircanus finally expelled them from the Sanhedron, for which reason may have been partly responsible for their being known as Pharisees.

3
3
5. What led to civil war? The administrators who were coming to be known as Sadducees alone had the power with the Pharisees expelled. But they were ignorant of the law. The Pharisees demanded (1.) the right to administer the oral law binding upon the priests, and (2.) the separation of the ethnarchy and the high priesthood. Hircanus agreed that his elder son would become priest and his younger son would be made ethnarch. After his death, however, his older son seized the ethnarchy as well. He, Judah Aristobulus, wanted the ethnarchy because of its status with surrounding governments. He died after only a year, but his brother Jonathan Alexander wanted both offices as well, and this failure to make the compromise work triggered civil war. When the mercenaries were becoming victorious over the Pharisees, the Pharisees appealed to Antioch, which led to the vicious execution of many Pharisees. A reconciling compromise was reached: (1.) Jonathan Alexander remained high priest and ethnarch; (2.) the Pharisees were brought back into the Sanhedron, and (3.) Jonathan's elder son Hircanus II was to become high priest and Jonathan's younger son Aristobulus II was to become the ethnarch.

2
6. A. Antepater backed Pompey who lost in his war against Caesar in 47 B.C. Julius Caesar chased Pompey who fled to Egypt where he was killed. Caesar was trapped at Gaza, and Herod gave him necessary military assistance, more than making up for his former support for Caesar's enemy Pompey. Caesar restored to Herod's puppet Hircanus II the ethnarchy as well as lands lost after the Galilean rebellion eleven years earlier. He returned to Rome and led the Senate to pass many pro-Jewish measures which aided in the preaching of the gospel later.

Confused

(-1)

1

6. B. After the assassination by Casius and Brutus of Julius Caesar in March of 44 B.C., Mark Antony and Octavian Caesar sought out Brutus and Casius. Casius reeked havoc in Palestine and the Jews put up resistance. Antepater saw the need to concede to the Roman invasion, but after his murder in 43 B.C., his sons Pasael and Herod the Great sought vengeance. But Casius met his demise in around ~~ax~~ 42 B.C., and Herod was made governor of Judea that year. He remained loyal to Mark Antony who was ruling the eastern part of the Roman empire.

7. After the rebellion in 6 A.D., the Herods were replaced in Judea itself by a nonsemitic Roman procurator. If the Herods weren't Hellenistic enough, the Procurators in order to enjoy the Hellenistic pleasures of life without offending the Jews stayed at Caesarea. They came to Jerusalem only for the Passover to ward off potential rebellion, brought on by an expected Messiah who was to dramatically appear at Passover time according to the then ~~ax~~ conventional Jewish wisdom. The procurator, Pilate, was there as a result to pass judgment in the execution of Jesus. He tried to put the matter ~~in~~ in the lap of Herod the Tetrarch of Galilee, which would have met that Jesus would have been executed by beheading or some method other than crucifixion which would have ~~spoiled~~ spoiled Jesus's role as a Passover-lamb sacrifice. It was as though God had orchestrated the demise of the Herods' rule over Judea to set up the execution of Jesus in a Roman province.

1

35
5
2

1. Mark 12:13-17. Pharisees included zealots in this case who were opposed to paying taxes to Caesar. Their question was designed to force Jesus either to offend His zealot following by affirming the legality of paying taxes to Caesar, or to proclaim rebellion against Caesar by opposing taxes being payed to Rome. Rather than answer the question, Jesus gave a proverbial principle while He evaded the issue of what belongs to Caesar and what belongs to God.

god
2

2. Mark 12:18-27. The aristocratic sadducees anticipated a deliverance of the national organism not a resurrection of the individual. Their loaded question was designed to demonstrate that the very idea of the resurrection was made ridiculous in the levirite law. Rather than prove the resurrection from the conclusion of Daniel, Jesus cited Exodus 3:13 in the Torah, because the Sadducees regarded the Torah as the single authority before anything else. Jesus thus in-~~ex~~ cited approval from many Pharisees who loved to use passages such as Genesis 3:19 to prove the resurrection in debates with the sadducees.

2

3. Mark 12:28-30. The scribe was a knowledgeable pharisee who may have been humbled by Jesus's response to his question, for Jesus quoted to him the pivotal Torah passage which he (the scribe) privately recited before going to sleep each night. + 3 times a day in synagogue + immediately upon getting up

2

4. Luke 13:10-17. The ruler of the synagogue objected to the healing, because there were work days when this could be done. Jesus retorted with their customary reasoning. If a certain less important privilege was allowed, then a privilege of greater important was allowed according to customary thinking. Jesus argued that that a daughter of Abraham was of more value than an animal. Therefore, if a Jew was willing to rescue an ox on the sabbath, surely He had the right to heal a daughter of Abraham on the rest day.

2

5. Luke 22:52-53. The chief priests and officers of the temple began the proceedings to have Jesus arrested, so they are in a sense being implicated here. "Have you come out as against an active revolutionary?" Jesus complained. They wouldn't arrest Jesus in the open, but they waited until late at night.

2

6. John 18:12. The band of soldiers and their captain was apparently a Roman cohort for which reason the movie version of The Day Christ Died adopted a scenario of colaberation beforehand between Jews and Romans for the arrest of Jesus. Officers of the Jews--Sadducees--are mentioned as being with the Roman troops which was larger than a mere "band."

2

7. John 18:12. The Sadducees, as administrators directing the Roman troops, led Jesus to the doyen, an honored former high priest, Anas, for what would be in our system a grand jury investigation.

2

8. John 18:14. Caiaphus reasoned perhaps that it was better to put one man to death than to allow unnecessary division to remain among the people by not putting him to death even though the indicted man is not directly responsible for the division.

2

9. Mark 14:55-56. The chief priests--mainly Sadducees--needed the consistent testimony of two or three witnesses to put Jesus to death, (Dt. 17:6 19:15).

The story of Susanna is a good illustration of the identifying of false witnesses by their inability to agree.

2 10. Mark 14:61-62. "The son of the Blessed" was an expression which (1.) could have been phrased "the son of God", but the name of God was avoided just as it is in the expression "kingdom of the heavens." (2.) It was a term referring to the anticipated physical Messiah different ~~ex~~ from the supernatural "son of man." Jesus answered that not only was He the physical Messiah but that He (the Messiah) was linked in identity to the mighty "son of man," which surprised the inquirers.

2 11. Mark 14:64. "You have heard his blasphemy," that is his repulsive saying. Jesus was not guilty of what Lev. 24:16 defines as blasphemy, for He had even avoided using God's name. They proclaimed him to be deserving of death, because his reference to the son of man was if anything treason not blasphemy, but the Romans had to decide that.

2 12. Mark 15:1. The midnight indictment had been handed down by the upper sanhedron, as it wasn't until morning that the whole sanhedron met to hear the recommendation of the night hearing.

2 13. John 18:28. 2 Chron. 30:22 has been a catalyst in the argument that the eating of the passover mentioned by John here referred to the feast of unleavened bread, thus allowing for the 15th of Nisan as the date of these events. However, such a specialized Jewish expression would have been elaborated by John who was writing to a heavily Gentile audience. Therefore, this expression is best literal-ity taken which shows that the Jews had not yet eaten the passover dinner and that this was therefore the morning of the 14th of Nisan.

2 14. Luke 23:2. That Jesus preached against the paying of tribute to Caesar was a false charge designed to add spice to the real charge that Jesus proclaimed himself to be the Christ, the king, which amounted, the act of Jesus that is, to treason.

2 15. Luke 23:5. Activities of Jesus in Galilee would be both a concern to the Romans and a convenience to Pilate: a concern because Galilee was a zealot stronghold not militarily but philosophically, and if Jesus were doing anything to stir them up it would be dangerous; it was a convenience, because now Pilate ~~cmx~~ could hope that Herod the tetrarch of ~~Marx~~ Galilee would judge Jesus, so Pilate could escape any possible trap the Jews were laying for himself by making him (Pilate) judge the case.

2 16. Luke 23:14-15. Pilate found Jesus innocent especially of insurrection or of treason, and when he sent Jesus to his adversary Herod, he also found Pilate's judgment sound; Pilate appreciated Herod's confirmation so much that the two became friends. Pilate intended to chastise Jesus as a reminder to the indicted man to avoid the kind of activities which could cause a stir in the future, but this was far less severe than the nasty scourging He got when He was condemned.

2 17. John 19:12. Now that Pilate had judged Him to be innocent, the mob leveled its strongest pressure against Pilate. The procurator had offended the Jews first by exposing the Roman standards (which the Jews looked upon as idolatrous statues) when his ~~xxx~~ soldiers first carried them into Jerusalem, and later when he paid for the building of aqueducts into Jerusalem out of temple money. The Jews were allowed to send reports on the procurator back to Caesar, and Pilate had to yield to them in the trial of Jesus or bear further hostility. You are not a friend of Caesar, that is, you are disloyal to Caesar, they charged, if you don't execute a man who calls himself a Christ and ~~kim~~ king. Pilate gave in.