

Latro

The Urth list — 17 messages, 7 voices, 24 Apr 2015

<https://urth.darkrealm.vip/thread/urth/6734>

Exported from an unofficial mirror of a public mailing list. Copyright in each message remains with the person who wrote it. Email addresses are obscured as `user at host`, the form the original archive published. This file was rebuilt from parsed fields rather than retained headers, so it is faithful in content but not byte-exact.

Lee — 24 Apr 2015, 15:15

Marc Aramini: ... a trial run full of human suffering which will lead to the shifting from pagan gods to Christian monotheism as the pagan gods are reconciled to a new divine order)

Sounds also like a summary of the entire Sun series to me.

Mo Holkar: Of course Wolfe was thinking of the play on latro in Latin meaning thief, while latreia in Greek means worship: but it seems a bit of a stretch of inference to see hidden meaning in the "mono-" prefixed version specifically?

I think David was just providing an example to direct our attention to the Greek root word with the prefix tagging along for the ride. [Edit- ah yes, David confirms this]

Since, as Dan'l mentions, "latria" is an important word in Catholicism, I find it completely plausible that Wolfe had both the thief and worship meanings in mind.

Dan'l Danehy-Oakes: Latria is the worship to which only God is entitled; what we offer to the saints in general

is "dulia," respect or reverence, and to Mary, "hyperdulia," extreme reverence.

David Stockhoff: Yes: thief/mercenary + worship(er) seems an interesting combination. Especially given how Latro

seems to have received his head wound: despoiling a shrine after a battle, IIRC.

Was Jesus, who had his own head wound, not crucified, flanked by two "thieves"? Jesus' ministry was an attack on

the prevailing Judaic religion of his time. And Jesus had his own fit of anger in the Temple. Wolfe has cited this

episode, where Jesus whips the moneychangers, as evidence The Saviour had spent some time as a torturer.

David Stockhoff: I didn't know that meaning of "-dule," which I have always seen rendered as "slave."

Hierodules need not be slaves at all. In fact, if they are analogous to saints, it might be debatable whether they are meant to give reverence or receive it. Or both

"Both" is the perfect description of the relationship between Barbatus & Famulimus and Severian. Not to mention

that Tzadkiel him/herself owns to having been Severian's acolyte in a previous iteration.

Dan'l Danehy-Oakes — 24 Apr 2015, 15:57 · in reply to Lee

Ummmm.

Not to be argumentative, but, no, Jesus' ministry was *not* an attack on Judaism; to the extent that it was an attack at all, it was an attack on the hypocrisy of the priestly class. But Jesus did not see himself as destroying Judaism ("...not one jot or tittle of the Law shall be taken away...") but fulfilling it.

On Fri, Apr 24, 2015 at 8:15 AM, Lee <severiansola at hotmail.com> wrote:
Marc Aramini: ... a trial run full of human suffering which will lead to
the shifting from pagan gods

to Christian monotheism as the pagan gods are reconciled to a new divine
order)

Sounds also like a summary of the entire Sun series to me.

Mo Holkar: Of course Wolfe was thinking of the play on latro in Latin
meaning thief, while
latreia in Greek means worship: but it seems a bit of a stretch of
inference to see hidden
meaning in the "mono-" prefixed version specifically?

I think David was just providing an example to direct our attention to the
Greek root word with the

prefix tagging along for the ride. [Edit- ah yes, David confirms this]

Since, as Dan'l mentions, "latrìa" is an important word in Catholicism, I
find it completely plausible that Wolfe

had both the thief and worship meanings in mind.

Dan'l Danehy-Oakes: Latrìa is the worship to which only God is
entitled; what we offer to the saints in general

is "dulìa," respect or reverence, and to Mary, "hyperdulìa," extreme
reverence.

David Stockhoff: Yes: thief/mercenary + worship(er) seems an interesting
combination. Especially given how Latro

seems to have received his head wound: despoiling a shrine after a
battle, IIRC.

Was Jesus, who had his own head wound, not crucified, flanked by two
"thieves"? Jesus' ministry was an attack on

the prevailing Judaic religion of his time. And Jesus had his own fit of
anger in the Temple. Wolfe has cited this

episode, where Jesus whips the moneychangers, as evidence The Saviour had
spent some time as a torturer.

David Stockhoff: I didn't know that meaning of "-dulìa," which I have
always seen rendered as "slave."

Hierodules need not be slaves at all. In fact, if they are analogous to
saints, it might be debatable

whether they are meant to give reverence or receive it. Or both

"Both" is the perfect description of the relationship between Barbatus &
Famulimus and Severian. Not to mention

that Tzadkiel him/herself owns to having been Severian's acolyte in a previous iteration.

Lee — 24 Apr 2015, 18:20 · follows Dan'I Danehy-Oakes

Dan'I Danehy-Oakes: Not to be argumentative, but, no, Jesus' ministry was *not* an attack on Judaism; to the extent that it was an attack at all, it was an attack on the hypocrisy of the priestly class. But Jesus did not see himself as destroying Judaism ("...not one jot or tittle of the Law shall be taken away...") but fulfilling it.

I won't take it as argument but as a point of discussion. It wasn't the main point of my post, so

I didn't elaborate. But in fairness I didn't just say "Judaism", I said:

Jesus' ministry was an attack on the prevailing Judaic religion of his time.

By which I meant the practice of Judaism as administered by the priestly class of Judea. The Sanhedrin made it clear they weren't happy with Jesus' ministry and considered it a threat. Even today, there are certain Christians AND Jews who deny Jesus was Jewish.

I think there were times when the words of Jesus imply he considered his goal to be bringing back a lost purity to Judaism. Though the Old Testament consistently implies that the Hebrews were a constant disappointment to God. (small wonder that guilt is an important part of being Jewish ;-))

But other times Jesus seemed to acknowledge that he was bringing something new to the table (even if fulfilling ancient prophecy). For some reason Luke 12:51 and Matthew 10:34 come to mind, where Jesus notes that he has not come to bring peace but rather division and a sword- setting family members against each other, etc.

I take this as a, if not transparent, then translucent way of Jesus saying that he expected his ministry to create divisions between the Jews who were doing things the current way vs. those planning to follow Jesus and how he expected things to be done differently in the future.

What changes were expected? No more "eye for an eye, tooth for a tooth" but rather "turn the other cheek" to use the oft-cited example. There are quite a few homophobic statements, acceptance of polygamy, glorification of war, use of maiming and dismemberment as legal punishments, etc. in the Old Testament, but not in the New Testament.

So I have to wonder how many wives those Judean priests had.....

Dan'I Danehy-Oakes — 24 Apr 2015, 18:37 · in reply to Lee

Actually, there is one notable anti-gay statement in the NT, but it's Paul, not Jesus.

And you're right to wonder how many wives the Sanhedrin might have had; Paul says that an elder (presbyter, priest) should have only one.

On Fri, Apr 24, 2015 at 11:20 AM, Lee <severiansola at hotmail.com> wrote:
Dan'l Danehy-Oakes: Not to be argumentative, but, no, Jesus' ministry was
not an attack on
Judaism; to the extent that it was an attack at all, it was an attack on
the hypocrisy of the priestly class. But Jesus did not see himself as
destroying Judaism ("...not one jot or tittle of the Law shall be taken
away...") but fulfilling it.

I won't take it as argument but as a point of discussion. It wasn't the
main point of my post, so

I didn't elaborate. But in fairness I didn't just say "Judaism", I said:

Jesus' ministry was an attack on the prevailing Judaic religion of his
time.

By which I meant the practice of Judaism as administered by the priestly
class of Judea. The

Sanhedrin made it clear they weren't happy with Jesus' ministry and
considered it a threat. Even

today, there are certain Christians AND Jews who deny Jesus was Jewish.

I think there were times when the words of Jesus imply he considered his
goal to be bringing

back a lost purity to Judaism. Though the Old Testament consistently
implies that the Hebrews were

a constant disappointment to God. (small wonder that guilt is an important
part of being Jewish ;-))

But other times Jesus seemed to acknowledge that he was bringing something
new to the table

(even if fulfilling ancient prophecy). For some reason Luke 12:51 and
Matthew 10:34 come to mind,

where Jesus notes that he has not come to bring peace but rather division
and a sword- setting family

members against each other, etc.

I take this as a, if not transparent, then translucent way of Jesus saying
that he expected his ministry

to create divisions between the Jews who were doing things the current way
vs. those planning to follow

Jesus and how he expected things to be done differently in the future.

What changes were expected? No more "eye for an eye, tooth for a tooth" but rather "turn the other cheek"

to use the oft-cited example. There are quite a few homophobic statements, acceptance of polygamy,

glorification of war, use of maiming and dismemberment as legal punishments, etc. in the Old Testament,

but not in the New Testament.

So I have to wonder how many wives those Judean priests had.....

Norwood, Frederick Hudson — 24 Apr 2015, 20:08 · in reply to Dan'l Danehy-Oakes

Yes, Paul has an anti-gay statement. He says that gays are as bad as gossips!

Rick

From: Urth [mailto:urth-bounces at lists.urth.net] On Behalf Of Dan'l Danehy-Oakes Sent: Friday, April 24, 2015 2:38 PM To: The Urth Mailing List Subject: Re: (urth) Latro

Actually, there is one notable anti-gay statement in the NT, but it's Paul, not Jesus.

And you're right to wonder how many wives the Sanhedrin might have had; Paul says that an elder (presbyter, priest) should have only one.

On Fri, Apr 24, 2015 at 11:20 AM, Lee <severiansola at hotmail.com<mailto:severiansola at hotmail.com>> wrote:

Dan'l Danehy-Oakes: Not to be argumentative, but, no, Jesus' ministry was **not** an attack on Judaism; to the extent that it was an attack at all, it was an attack on the hypocrisy of the priestly class. But Jesus did not see himself as destroying Judaism ("...not one jot or tittle of the Law shall be taken away...") but fulfilling it.

I won't take it as argument but as a point of discussion. It wasn't the main point of my post, so

I didn't elaborate. But in fairness I didn't just say "Judaism", I said:

Jesus' ministry was an attack on the prevailing Judaic religion of his time.

By which I meant the practice of Judaism as administered by the priestly class of Judea. The Sanhedrin made it clear they weren't happy with Jesus' ministry and considered it a threat. Even today, there are certain Christians AND Jews who deny Jesus was Jewish.

I think there were times when the words of Jesus imply he considered his goal to be bringing back a lost purity to Judaism. Though the Old Testament consistently implies that the Hebrews were a constant disappointment to God. (small wonder that guilt is an important part of being Jewish ;-))

But other times Jesus seemed to acknowledge that he was bringing something new to the table (even if fulfilling ancient prophecy). For some reason Luke 12:51 and Matthew 10-34 come to mind, where Jesus notes that he has not come to bring peace but rather division and a sword- setting family members against each other, etc.

I take this as a, if not transparent, then translucent way of Jesus saying that he expected his ministry to create divisions between the jews who were doing things the current way vs. those planning to follow Jesus and how he expected things to be done differently in the future.

What changes were expected? No more "eye for an eye, tooth for a tooth" but rather "turn the other cheek" to use the oft-cited example. There are quite a few homophobic statements, acceptance of polygamy, glorification of war, use of maiming and dismemberment as legal punishments, etc. in the Old Testament, but not in the New Testament.

So I have to wonder how many wives those Judean priests had.....

António Pedro Marques — 24 Apr 2015, 22:02 · in reply to Lee

No dia 24/04/2015, às 19:20, Lee <severiansola at hotmail.com> escreveu:

I didn't elaborate. But in fairness I didn't just say "Judaism", I said:

Jesus' ministry was an attack on the prevailing Judaic religion of his time.

By which I meant the practice of Judaism as administered by the priestly class of Judea.

Jesus was certainly opposed to the Saducees. There is no dearth of verses chiding them as enemies of God.

But not every priest was a Saducee, not even the whole Sanhedrin, and the evidence is that the common Jew didn't do anything regarding religion that Jesus especially condemned.

Even

today, there are certain Christians AND Jews who deny Jesus was jewish.

And Nietzsche questioned if Socrates was Greek!

No more "eye for an eye, tooth for a tooth" but rather "turn the other cheek"

Doubtless a major change, but let's not make the former worse than it was: it is an injunction by God to not be disproportionate in replying to aggression. Something to heed even today!

David Stockhoff — 26 Apr 2015, 14:32 · in reply to Norwood, Frederick Hudson

And no one is more gossipy than "the gays." Worse than a houseful of wives!

On 4/24/2015 4:08 PM, Norwood, Frederick Hudson wrote:

Yes, Paul has an anti-gay statement. He says that gays are as bad as gossips!

Rick

*From:*Urth [mailto:urth-bounces at lists.urth.net] *On Behalf Of *Dan'l Danehy-Oakes
Sent: Friday, April 24, 2015 2:38 PM
To: The Urth Mailing List
Subject: Re: (urth) Latro

Actually, there is one notable anti-gay statement in the NT, but it's Paul, not Jesus.

And you're right to wonder how many wives the Sanhedrin might have had; Paul says that an elder (presbyter, priest) should have only one.

On Fri, Apr 24, 2015 at 11:20 AM, Lee <severiansola at hotmail.com <mailto:severiansola at hotmail.com>> wrote:

Dan'l Danehy-Oakes: Not to be argumentative, but, no, Jesus' ministry was **not** an attack on Judaism; to the extent that it was an attack at all, it was an attack on the hypocrisy of the priestly class. But Jesus did not see himself as destroying Judaism ("...not one jot or tittle of the Law shall be taken away...") but fulfilling it.

I won't take it as argument but as a point of discussion. It wasn't the main point of my post, so

I didn't elaborate. But in fairness I didn't just say "Judaism", I said:

Jesus' ministry was an attack on the prevailing Judaic religion of his time.

By which I meant the practice of Judaism as administered by the priestly class of Judea. The

Sanhedrin made it clear they weren't happy with Jesus' ministry and considered it a threat. Even

today, there are certain Christians AND Jews who deny Jesus was Jewish.

I think there were times when the words of Jesus imply he considered his goal to be bringing

back a lost purity to Judaism. Though the Old Testament consistently implies that the Hebrews were

a constant disappointment to God. (small wonder that guilt is an important part of being Jewish ;-))

But other times Jesus seemed to acknowledge that he was bringing something new to the table

(even if fulfilling ancient prophecy). For some reason Luke 12:51 and Matthew 10:34 come to mind,

where Jesus notes that he has not come to bring peace but rather

division and a sword- setting family

members against each other, etc.

I take this as a, if not transparent, then translucent way of Jesus saying that he expected his ministry

to create divisions between the jews who were doing things the current way vs. those planning to follow

Jesus and how he expected things to be done differently in the future.

What changes were expected? No more "eye for an eye, tooth for a tooth" but rather "turn the other cheek"

to use the oft-cited example. There are quite a few homophobic statements, acceptance of polygamy,

glorification of war, use of maiming and dismemberment as legal punishments, etc. in the Old Testament,

but not in the New Testament.

So I have to wonder how many wives those Judean priests had.....

David Stockhoff — 26 Apr 2015, 14:36 · in reply to Lee

There is that. But what head wound do you mean---from the crown of thorns?

On 4/24/2015 11:15 AM, Lee wrote:

Was Jesus, who had his own head wound, not crucified, flanked by two "thieves"?

Lee — 27 Apr 2015, 16:18 · follows David Stockhoff

Dan'l Danehy-Oakes: And you're right to wonder how many wives the Sanhedrin might have had; Paul says that an elder (presbyter, priest) should have only one.

Thanks for that confirming info. I find the proscription against polygamy to be the most

anthropological/sociologically profound difference between Christianity and its predecessors and

competitors, yet it is so rarely discussed.

Antonio Pedro Marques: Jesus was certainly opposed to the Saducees. There is no dearth of verses chiding them as enemies of God. But not every priest was a Saducee, not even the whole Sanhedrin, and the evidence is that the common Jew didn't do anything regarding religion that Jesus especially condemned.

I think you are right that there was a special place in Jesus' heart for the common man. But there was
(and perhaps still is) a belief among jews of the time that those with wealth, status and power had
been specially blessed by God.

But over and over, the message of Jesus is that the lofty trappings of wealth and high social status in this world are not only irrelevant to the Kingdom of Heaven but can be seen as signs of disfavor with God. The Eye of the Needle and Good Samaritan parables come to mind as generally critical of the wealthy and the superior, priestly castes of Cohains and Levites.

This is what I meant by saying Jesus' ministry was an attack on the prevailing practice of Judaism at the time. It was rather centered around reverence for wealth, power and inherited social status.

(There are some arguments that much of Jesus' ministry was a veiled criticism of jewish toleration and veneration of Roman rule but that's controversial and a whole other can of worms to open.)

Dan'l Danehy-Oakes — 27 Apr 2015, 16:35 · in reply to Lee

Lee,

Jesus' concern/love for the poor/common man was actually a continuation/ confirmation of what several of the Prophets in the Old Testament had said on the subject.

It would not be at all accurate to say that Second Temple Judaism was centered on "reverence for wealth, power, and inherited social status." Indeed, the Law made a number of exceptions, especially in the matter of required sacrifices, for the poor. (The Presentation of Jesus in the Gospel according to Luke illustrates this: when Joseph and Mary take Jesus to be "redeemed" at the Temple, they buy and offer two doves, which is the sacrifice of "those who cannot afford a lamb.")

Second Temple Judaism was very much centered on the Law of Cleanliness, or ritual purity. Even a poor man's house would have a mikvah, a basin where you would wash your hands before entering or eating. (It was the water for the mikvah that Jesus turned to wine in the wedding at Cana.)

And, yes, Jesus is quite critical of the wealthy who do not care for the poor. In general, His deepest scorn is reserved for hypocrites; consider, for example, the parable of the Goats and Sheep, in which many who claim Him as Lord but did not care for the unfortunate* are told "I never knew you," while those who did care for the unfortunate but didn't know Him are told, "It was Me you served all along."

* not only the poor, but the sick, crippled, weak, and imprisoned.

The point of the parable of the Good Samaritan is similar: the hypocrisy and selfishness of the Kohain and the Levite are contrasted with the earnest caring of the Samaritan: and it must be remembered that to a Jew of the Second Temple, "Samaritan" was something like "Palestinian" must be to an Israeli today, or like "Black" was to a white South African during the Apartheid days. Someone lesser, unclean, a bit disgusting, and definitely an enemy.

On Mon, Apr 27, 2015 at 9:18 AM, Lee <severiansola at hotmail.com> wrote:
Dan'l Danehy-Oakes: And you're right to wonder how many wives the Sanhedrin might have had;
Paul says that an elder (presbyter, priest) should have only one.

Thanks for that confirming info. I find the proscription against polygamy to be the most

anthropological/sociologically profound difference between Christianity and its predecessors and

competitors, yet it is so rarely discussed.

Antonio Pedro Marques: Jesus was certainly opposed to the Saducees. There is no dearth of verses

chiding them as enemies of God. But not every priest was a Saducee, not even the whole Sanhedrin,

and the evidence is that the common Jew didn't do anything regarding religion that Jesus especially

condemned.

I think you are right that there was a special place in Jesus' heart for the common man. But there was

(and perhaps still is) a belief among jews of the time that those with wealth, status and power had

been specially blessed by God.

But over and over, the message of Jesus is that the lofty trappings of wealth and high social status

in this world are not only irrelevant to the Kingdom of Heaven but can be seen as signs of disfavor

with God. The Eye of the Needle and Good Samaritan parables come to mind as generally critical of

the wealthy and the superior, priestly castes of Cohains and Levites.

This is what I meant by saying Jesus' ministry was an attack on the prevailing practice of Judaism at

the time. It was rather centered around reverence for wealth, power and inherited social status.

(There are some arguments that much of Jesus' ministry was a veiled criticism of jewish toleration and

veneration of Roman rule but that's controversial and a whole other can of worms to open.)

Dan'l Danehy-Oakes: Lee, Jesus' concern/love for the poor/common man was actually a continuation/ confirmation of what several of the Prophets in the Old Testament had said on the subject.

Sure, of course. Makes sense.

It would not be at all accurate to say that Second Temple Judaism was centered on "reverence for wealth, power, and inherited social status." Indeed, the Law made a number of exceptions, especially in the matter of required sacrifices, for the poor.

Not to be argumentative, but as you note, these were "exceptions" for the poor. Meaning the general rule was that sacrificing a portion of your wealth WAS an essential part of being a good Jew, at the time.

And who got that portion of your wealth? The ruling class of the priesthood.

Concomitantly, if the admiration of personal wealth and power and status wasn't an important part of Judaic religion at the time, why would Jesus spend so much time preaching against it, especially the role of the priestly castes?

Aren't such things a part of human nature? Don't we still hear sermons against worshipping money and power? I can't imagine that Judean Hebrews were so different about that than everyone else, including we of modern society.

I suspect we are not really in disagreement on this issue. Perhaps it is only a matter of how things are worded.

Norwood, Frederick Hudson — 27 Apr 2015, 17:13 · in reply to Lee

I no longer go to church, but when I did the sermons were mostly about the importance for Christians to always vote for the Republican party. I remember one sermon about the camel passing through the eye of a needle. The preacher explained that "the eye of a needle" was the name of the gate that the rich used to enter Jerusalem and so the point of the parable is that naturally the rich would use that gate to enter heaven.

Rick

-----Original Message-----

From: Urth [mailto:urth-bounces at lists.urth.net] On Behalf Of Lee

Sent: Monday, April 27, 2015 1:08 PM

To: urth at urth.net

Subject: (urth) Latro

Dan'l Danehy-Oakes: Lee, Jesus' concern/love for the poor/common man was actually a continuation/ confirmation of what several of the Prophets in the Old Testament had said on the subject.

Sure, of course. Makes sense.

It would not be at all accurate to say that Second Temple Judaism was centered on "reverence for

wealth, power, and inherited social status." Indeed, the Law made a number of exceptions, especially in the matter of required sacrifices, for the poor.

Not to be argumentative, but as you note, these were "exceptions" for the poor. Meaning the general rule was that sacrificing a portion of your wealth WAS an essential part of being a good Jew, at the time.

And who got that portion of your wealth? The ruling class of the priesthood.

Concomitantly, if the admiration of personal wealth and power and status wasn't an important part of Judaic religion at the time, why would Jesus spend so much time preaching against it, especially the role of the priestly castes?

Aren't such things a part of human nature? Don't we still hear sermons against worshipping money and power? I can't imagine that Judean Hebrews were so different about that than everyone else, including we of modern society.

I suspect we are not really in disagreement on this issue. Perhaps it is only a matter of how things are worded.

Dan'l Danehy-Oakes — 27 Apr 2015, 17:23 · in reply to Norwood, Frederick Hudson

I've heard that about the needle's eye gate, too, but according to Wikipedia (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Eye_of_a_needle#Gate), there's no real evidence for it.

On Mon, Apr 27, 2015 at 10:13 AM, Norwood, Frederick Hudson <NORWOODR@mail.etsu.edu> wrote:

I no longer go to church, but when I did the sermons were mostly about the importance for Christians to always vote for the Republican party. I remember one sermon about the camel passing through the eye of a needle. The preacher explained that "the eye of a needle" was the name of the gate that the rich used to enter Jerusalem and so the point of the parable is that naturally the rich would use that gate to enter heaven.

Rick

-----Original Message-----

From: Urth [mailto:urth-bounces@lists.urth.net] On Behalf Of Lee
Sent: Monday, April 27, 2015 1:08 PM
To: urth@urth.net
Subject: (urth) Latro

Dan'l Danehy-Oakes: Lee, Jesus' concern/love for the poor/common man was actually a

continuation/ confirmation of what several of the Prophets in the Old Testament had said

on the subject.

Sure, of course. Makes sense.

It would not be at all accurate to say that Second Temple Judaism was centered on "reverence for

wealth, power, and inherited social status." Indeed, the Law made a number of exceptions, especially

in the matter of required sacrifices, for the poor.

Not to be argumentative, but as you note, these were "exceptions" for the poor. Meaning the general

rule was that sacrificing a portion of your wealth WAS an essential part of being a good Jew, at the time.

And who got that portion of your wealth? The ruling class of the priesthood.

Concomitantly, if the admiration of personal wealth and power and status wasn't an important part of

Judaic religion at the time, why would Jesus spend so much time preaching against it, especially the role

of the priestly castes?

Aren't such things a part of human nature? Don't we still hear sermons against worshipping money and

power? I can't imagine that Judean Hebrews were so different about that than everyone else, including

we of modern society.

I suspect we are not really in disagreement on this issue. Perhaps it is only a matter of how things are

worded.

Marc Aramini — 27 Apr 2015, 17:33 · in reply to Norwood, Frederick Hudson

It was still supposed to be a tight fit even if it was a gate ... the point is you can't get through if you are encumbered with stuff ... maybe that preacher needs some reading comprehension lessons ... not sure which denomination you were, but possibly the most infuriating thing to me about some fundamentalists is they have very poor basic reading skills ... even if one buys into inerrancy (which I certainly don't) it doesn't mean you can't misread ...

Ask a fundamentalist if the good Samaritan was a real person who actually lived.

On Apr 27, 2015 10:13 AM, "Norwood, Frederick Hudson" <NORWOODR@mail.etsu.edu> wrote:

I no longer go to church, but when I did the sermons were mostly about the importance for Christians to always vote for the Republican party. I remember one sermon about the camel passing through the eye of a needle. The preacher explained that "the eye of a needle" was the name of the gate that the rich used to enter Jerusalem and so the point of the parable is that naturally the rich would use that gate to enter heaven.

Rick

-----Original Message-----

From: Urth [mailto:urth-bounces at lists.urth.net] On Behalf Of Lee

Sent: Monday, April 27, 2015 1:08 PM

To: urth at urth.net

Subject: (urth) Latro

Dan'l Danehy-Oakes: Lee, Jesus' concern/love for the poor/common man was actually a

continuation/ confirmation of what several of the Prophets in the Old Testament had said

on the subject.

Sure, of course. Makes sense.

It would not be at all accurate to say that Second Temple Judaism was centered on "reverence for

wealth, power, and inherited social status." Indeed, the Law made a number of exceptions, especially

in the matter of required sacrifices, for the poor.

Not to be argumentative, but as you note, these were "exceptions" for the poor. Meaning the general

rule was that sacrificing a portion of your wealth WAS an essential part of being a good jew, at the time.

And who got that portion of your wealth? The ruling class of the priesthood.

Concomitantly, if the admiration of personal wealth and power and status wasn't an important part of

Judaic religion at the time, why would Jesus spend so much time preaching against it, especially the role

of the priestly castes?

Aren't such things a part of human nature? Don't we still hear sermons against worshipping money and

power? I can't imagine that Judean Hebrews were so different about that than everyone else, including

we of modern society.

I suspect we are not really in disagreement on this issue. Perhaps it is only a matter of how things are

worded.

Marc Aramini: It was still supposed to be a tight fit even if it was a gate ... the point is you can't get through if you are encumbered with stuff ... maybe that preacher needs some reading comprehension lessons ...

I think that preacher knew what he was doing Marc. Rick noted that the main point of the sermons was to "Vote Republican". Reinterpreting the "Camel through the eye of a needle" parable was this preacher's way of undercutting the obvious meaning of Jesus' words and saying "Hey, don't worry if you are rich. You can still go to heaven as easily as anyone else".

">This is an impressive crowd -- the haves and the have-mores. Some people call you the elite;

I call you my base."

-GEORGE W. BUSH, speech to Al Smith Dinner for charity, Oct. 20, 2000

David Stockhoff — 27 Apr 2015, 19:45 · in reply to Norwood, Frederick Hudson

Riding a camel, I'm sure. Makes sense!

On 4/27/2015 1:13 PM, Norwood, Frederick Hudson wrote:

I no longer go to church, but when I did the sermons were mostly about the importance for Christians to always vote for the Republican party. I remember one sermon about the camel passing through the eye of a needle. The preacher explained that "the eye of a needle" was the name of the gate that the rich used to enter Jerusalem and so the point of the parable is that naturally the rich would use that gate to enter heaven.

Rick

-----Original Message-----

From: Urth [mailto:urth-bounces at lists.urth.net] On Behalf Of Lee

Sent: Monday, April 27, 2015 1:08 PM

To: urth at urth.net

Subject: (urth) Latro

Dan'l Danehy-Oakes: Lee, Jesus' concern/love for the poor/common man was actually a continuation/ confirmation of what several of the Prophets in the Old Testament had said on the subject.

Sure, of course. Makes sense.

It would not be at all accurate to say that Second Temple Judaism was centered on "reverence for wealth, power, and inherited social status." Indeed, the Law made a number of exceptions, especially in the matter of required sacrifices, for the poor.

Not to be argumentative, but as you note, these were "exceptions" for the poor. Meaning the general

rule was that sacrificing a portion of your wealth WAS an essential part of being a good Jew, at the time.

And who got that portion of your wealth? The ruling class of the priesthood.

Concomitantly, if the admiration of personal wealth and power and status wasn't an important part of

Judaic religion at the time, why would Jesus spend so much time preaching against it, especially the role

of the priestly castes?

Aren't such things a part of human nature? Don't we still hear sermons against worshipping money and

power? I can't imagine that Judean Hebrews were so different about that than everyone else, including

we of modern society.

I suspect we are not really in disagreement on this issue. Perhaps it is only a matter of how things are worded.

Fernando Q. Gouvea — 28 Apr 2015, 14:55 · in reply to Dan'l Danehy-Oakes

And in fact plenty of evidence against it, including in ancient (but post-New Testament) Christian writings.

I'll restrain myself from commenting on those sermons. Sheesh.

Fernando

On 4/27/2015 1:23 PM, Dan'l Danehy-Oakes wrote:
I've heard that about the needle's eye gate, too, but according to Wikipedia (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Eye_of_a_needle#Gate), there's no real evidence for it.

On Mon, Apr 27, 2015 at 10:13 AM, Norwood, Frederick Hudson
<NORWOODR at mail.etsu.edu <<mailto:NORWOODR at mail.etsu.edu>>> wrote:

I no longer go to church, but when I did the sermons were mostly about the importance for Christians to always vote for the Republican party. I remember one sermon about the camel passing through the eye of a needle. The preacher explained that "the eye of a needle" was the name of the gate that the rich used to enter Jerusalem and so the point of the parable is that naturally the rich would use that gate to enter heaven.

Rick

=====

Fernando Q. Gouvea <http://www.colby.edu/~fqgouvea>
Carter Professor and Chair
Dept. of Mathematics and Statistics
Colby College Editor, Carus Mathematical Monographs
5836 Mayflower Hill Editor, MAA Reviews
Waterville, ME 04901 <http://www.maa.org/publications/maa-reviews>

When a nation's chief domestic product consists of greed, lust, oppression, cruelty, and lies, it needs to be salted until every green thing has withered.

-- Peter Leithart