
TITLE "An Analysis of, and the Construction of a
model Curriculum for the Teaching About the
Crucifixion in Jewish Religious Schools."

Master's [] Prize Essay []

- Note:** The Library shall respect restrictions placed on theses or prize essays for a period of no more than ten years.

3. The Library may sell photocopies of my thesis. X yes no

Shanne Stasel
Signature of Author

Microfilmed _____
Date _____

Signature of Library Staff Member

An Analysis of, and the Construction of a Model Curriculum
for the Teaching About the Crucifixion of Jesus
in Jewish Religious Schools

by

Suzanne D. Kassel

Submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for Ordination

Hebrew Union College - Jewish Institute of Religion

1984

Referee, Professor Ellis Rivkin

Referee, Professor Samuel K. Joseph

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Title	Page
I	Historical Analysis of the Crucifixion	1
II	Analysis of Religious School Textbooks	51
III	Adolescent Psycho-Social and Cognitive Development	92
IV	Model Unit for Teaching the Crucifixion	117
	Bibliography	170

Thesis Digest

The Crucifixion of Jesus is a major event in Christian theology. It has affected Christian attitudes towards Jews and Judaism. For centuries the debate has raged. "Is the Jewish community responsible in any way for Jesus' death?" Jews, especially youngsters, rarely learn about Jesus' crucifixion in any systematic fashion and are consequently ill-equipped to discuss, and if need be counter statements which implicate the Jews. Such information should be a requisite aspect of Jewish education especially for Jewish youth reared in the predominately Christian United States.

The purpose of this thesis is to analyze the Jewish role in the crucifixion of Jesus and present a model instructional design geared to the needs of the ninth grade Jewish religious school student. The curriculum will be constructed to emphasize both content, the historical circumstances of the time period, and the way historians determine the historicity of information obtained from primary source material. This paradigm will be designed with consideration of the adolescent's cognitive and psycho-social development in mind.

In Chapter One, we will analyze the historical circumstances surrounding the crucifixion of Jesus. In an attempt to confute the stereotypical Christian view that the Jews were responsible for Jesus' crucifixion, we will review such aspects as: The historicity of the gospels; The nature of Roman rule, the Pax Romana and its enforcement; Disparity between the social classes aggravated by Roman domestic and foreign policies; The wave of false prophets - it's cause and effect;

The Court Procedure and Jesus' indictment.

In Chapter Two, we evaluated a sampling of existing textbooks which contain material concerning the crucifixion of Jesus. These textbooks are currently used in Jewish and Christian religious schools.

In Chapter Three, we review the stages of adolescent cognitive and psycho-social development. We identify the rationale for deciding the developmental stages most appropriate to the nature of the material.

Chapter Four provides a model unit with lesson plans designed to teach the Crucifixion of Jesus to ninth graders in the Jewish Religious School setting.

Chapter I

For centuries the Jews have been accused of the crucifixion of Jesus. This accusation of deicide has legitimized the torture and murder of Jews in Christendom for nearly two thousand years.¹ It has served as the foundation for anti-Semitic ritual murder charges, riots, boycotts, exclusionary quotas, pamphlets, newspaper attacks, and academic treatises.² Yet what has been the basis for the assertion that the Jews killed "Christ"? Where have Christian scholars found the evidence to entitle them to blame the Jews?

If one reads the New Testament, it is easy to see why the Jews are incriminated. One need only read the Gospels to get a picture of Jewish complicity. A composite reconstruction of the Gospel's description of the events surrounding Jesus' crucifixion easily implicates the Jews. During Passover, an angry crowd sent by Jewish leaders came to seize Jesus while he celebrated with his followers. Jesus willingly went with the crowd and questioned their need for violence or force. The crowd led Jesus to the palace of the High Priest, Caiaphas, where many Jewish officials had assembled. Some sort of questioning occurred in which Jesus was accused of blasphemy, an offense punishable by death. Jesus was then taken to Pontius Pilate, the Roman procurator, who was portrayed as a humane man chiefly concerned for Jesus' welfare. Pilate asked Jesus whether he is King of the Jews. Jesus answered evasively. Pilate, confused by the anger of the crowd and Jesus' vague answer, was uncertain of the next course of action. He turned to the crowd for coun-

sel. They angrily demanded crucifixion. Although Pilate disagreed with their demand, he was forced to comply, and reluctantly sent Jesus off to be crucified.

Upon first glance it appears as if Jewish leaders conspired to have Jesus killed. They fabricate a charge which warrants the death penalty. Jesus is then taken to the Roman procurator who reluctantly carries out the capital punishment.

At face value, the Gospels do incriminate the Jews. If one reads the materials literally with the assumption that each statement reflects true historical accuracy, then it is easy to assume that the Jews are guilty of Jesus' death. Yet are the gospels true histories which reflect objective reports of the events? Do they legitimately incriminate the Jews? This chapter will explore the culpability of the Jews with respect to the crucifixion of Jesus. It will do so by contrasting the account of Jesus found in the Gospels with other historical information of that time period. This will be done by examining the historicity of the gospels, the historical setting of Judea, the nature of Roman rule, the nature of Jewish society during the time of Jesus, Jesus' perceived source of contention with the Pharisees, and a possible motivation for Jesus' death.

Historicity of the Gospels

There are four gospels in the New Testament, each of which gives a different account of the crucifixion of Jesus. Details, episodes, dialogue, and arrangement of stories found in one account vary among the others. Although Matthew, Mark and Luke seem to be the most similar, they too contain details which contradict each other. These

differences have led scholars to question the accuracy of the information given in the gospels. Is there an authentic account? Is one Gospel more accurate than another? Who wrote the Gospels and why? These are the questions which scholars have tried to answer in order to reconstruct the truth. In order to piece together some semblance of an historical picture, scholars have dissected the accounts and tried to analyze their historicity in context with other historical, literary, theological and linguistic information of the times. This chapter will discuss the historicity of the Gospels in order to evaluate whether or not the Gospels' accounts can be viewed as historically accurate. Since the subject material of this chapter is vast enough to be a thesis unto itself, we will review some of the literature with the purpose of sampling a variety of opinions.

Matthew

The author of Matthew and his motivation are uncertain. Matthew contains 600 of the 661 verses found in Mark. This has led scholars to believe that Matthew was written after Mark and its dates range from 70 to 100 A.D. It includes anti-Jewish elaborations not found in Mark. This additional anti-Jewish material has led scholars to speculate as to the motivation of the author.³

Matthew has characteristics which distinguish it from the other Gospels. Matthew has a strong Jewish coloring:

1. Matthew proves that Jesus is of Davidic descent by tracing his legal descent back through David to Abraham, and by stressing the fact that he is the son of David, and a King. Whereas, in Mark, the title 'son of David,' is given only once to Jesus, namely, by Bartimaeus; in the first Gospel he is

described as such by the Canaanitish woman (15:22), the multitudes (21:15)

As regards the title of King, the wise men came from the East seeking him, 'that is born the King of the Jews' (2:2), and having found Jesus they 'fell down and worshipped him' (2:11). The advent of his kingdom is announced by John the Baptist (3:2) and by the King himself. (4:17) In his triumphal entry into Jerusalem Jesus is represented as coming to claim his kingdom (21:1-2), and in discourse on the last judgment as judging all nations as their king (25:32). Even the title on the cross bears witness to his kingship.

2. He shows that Jesus is the fulfillment of the Messianic prophecy. Quotations from the Old Testament are far more numerous than in Mark and Luke put together. Among the many prophecies are those which foretell the birth of Jesus (1:23), the return of Joseph and Mary from Egypt (2:15), the murder of the innocents (2:18), the preaching of John the Baptist (3:3), the triumphal entry into Jerusalem (2:15), the rejection of Jesus by the Jews (21:42), and the purchase of the potters field (27:9-10).

3. He emphasizes the relation of Christianity to the Law. Luke says that it is a new law, promulgated on Mt. Sinai by divine authority.⁴ Jesus has come not to destroy the law but to fulfill it. The most trivial detail in it can never be changed. His followers must render such obedience to it that their righteousness shall exceed that of the scribes and the Pharisees.

Otherwise they shall 'in no wise enter into the kingdom of Heaven (5:20). 'He who breaks the least commandment and teaches men so is least in the Kingdom (5:19).' The old law is valid but the new both completes and transcends it.

4. He represents Jesus as saying, "I was not sent but unto the lost sheep of the Household of Israel' (15:24), and as commanding his disciples to confine their ministry to preaching and healing those lost sheep (10:6).
5. He makes frequent allusions to Jewish customs, without explaining them, assuming that his readers, being chiefly Jews, would be familiar with them.
6. . . . Throughout the gospel, the comparison between the great lawgiver Moses, and his supposed successor are too apparent to be accidental. Both are saved at birth from the machinations of a wicked and suspicious king, both had given their God-inspired legislation from the mountain top. . . .

7. Use of Rabbinic material and eschatological utterances which indicate interest in Jewish values, ideas, and customs, e.g. (5:18-19; 8:11, 10:5b,6; 13:52; 23:2).
8. Matthew's aim was to justify the transition from the chosen people, the Temple and the law into higher uses as a result of the life of Jesus.
9. The Book is arranged into five blocks:
 1. Sermon on the Mount (5-7).
 2. Directions to Disciples (10).
 3. Parables of King (13).
 4. Sayings on Greatness and Forgiveness (18).
 5. Sayings and Parables on the Last Things (24-25).

It seems possible that the author may have had in mind an arrangement similar to the Five books of the Pentateuch, the Five books of Psalms, the Five Megilloth, etc. There is also the possibility that the book was arranged this way for liturgical purposes. . . in such an orderly fashion; it seems that the author had a fondness for the numbers 3 and 7. It has been stated that these arrangements make it easier for memory and church instruction.

10. . . . It made ample use of an Aramaic original. This is evidenced by the use of the terms, "kingdom of heaven", found exclusively in Matthew, a translation of the Hebrew original *מְלְכֻתָּא שְׁמַיָּא*; your heavenly father, or your father in the heavens, (5:16; 6:14; etc.), son of David for the Messiah (9:27); the city of the great King of Jerusalem; the 'God of Israel', the oft repeated phrase that 'it might be fulfilled', which was spoken of the Lord by the Prophet; the retention of Judea-Christian conceptions (5:17; 10:6; 15:24); the geneology of Jesus, based upon specific Haggadic views concerning Tamar, Ruth and Bath-Sheba, so drawn as to make the assumption of his Messianic character plausible (1:10-16) and the assignment of the twelve seats of judgement to the twelve apostles in representation of the twelve tribes of Israel (19:28).

It has embodied other Jewish apocalyptic material, and the source states, goes on to use rabbinic phraseology, even though, on the other hand, it manifest extreme hostility toward the Jews in the Crucifixion story.⁵

Although references to the Davidic lineage and comments about the law may appear to be more obviously Jewish than the five book form intent to deliberately imitate other Jewish traditional works, it is

clear that Matthew does have a strong Jewish coloring which contrasts to extreme Jewish hostility. Does such Jewish coloring reflect Jewish authorship or Jewish readership? Scholars disagree.

Many scholars feel that Matthew was written by a Jew for Jewish Christians.⁶ Because Matthew stresses Jesus' Davidic lineage, he appears to those who expect a Messiah from the House of David. The image of Jesus in Matthew is not of a person who brings a new tradition, but of someone who will purify the present one. "Think not that I am come to destroy but fulfill. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled."⁷ (Matthew 5:17-18)

Shapero feels "that the scriptural quotations employed in Matthew point neither to any use of the Hebrew text nor to a Jewish author."⁸ In his thesis entitled "The Jewishness of the Author of the Gospel of Matthew - A Study of Rabbinic and Matthean Scriptural Exegesis", he concludes that the Matthean author did not consult or probably was not acquainted with the rich treasure of Rabbinic material. Many of the quotes are used irrelevantly and do not rely on the Rabbinic traditions which are clearer and more concise. He feels that the scriptural quotes are based upon the LXX which does not preclude a knowledge of Hebrew or a familiarity with the Hebrew scriptures. There existed a massive amount of Rabbinic materials which were obviously not used by the author which suggests an ignorance of the existence of the material. In the passages where the interpretation seems to be in the same spirit as that of the Rabbis, the material is all eschatological or apocalyptic. Such apocalyptic imagery had been fully learned

and accepted by Gentile Christians as well and therefore does not prove the author to be Jewish. Shapero feels that Matthew was a Gentile, trying to create a new law for the Gentiles. Because the LXX was used in place of the Hebrew original, the Book of Matthew completely lacks any parallel to Rabbinic usage:

From the arguments presented and the materials studied in this endeavor; the usage of the LXX in the place of the Hebrew original; a complete lack of parallels to Rabbinic usage, and marked reaction to the Gentile bias of the time: I feel it plausible to present this material with the opinion that the Matthean author was not of the Jewish people but was a Gentile writing and preaching in the spirit of the Christians amongst whom he lived outside of the Holy Land.⁹

According to Shapero, the author of Matthew was not Jewish nor did he write for Jewish readers.

Matthew's message emphasized an apocalyptic-minded Christianity emerging from Judaism in the direction of a universalizing Catholicism.¹⁰ Shapero assumes this message was intended for Gentiles. The Christian gospels had originally been delivered to the Jews. They had rejected it, so God now had turned His back on Judaism and had chosen the largely Gentile Christianity. The Jewish coloring reflects Jesus' background and his initial appeal for a Jewish following. The hostile anti-Jewish element which blames the Jews for Jesus' death reflects the Gentile displacement of the Jews. Consequently, he feels Matthew was written for a Gentile Christian community.

Cohn uses the Jewish coloring and Jewish hostility to prove the opposite. He feels Matthew was Jewish and wrote for a Jewish readership. Pilate's washing of his hands as a declaration of innocence of bloodshed is an act which would appeal only to Jews, not to Romans. A

Roman dignitary would never wash his hands to declare his innocence of bloodshed because the rite and its symbolism would be meaningless. Not only would such an act be strange, but it would also demean his gubernatorial authority to allow the masses to judge his actions.¹¹

According to Cohn, Matthew lived and wrote in Alexandria with his eyes on the Jews. Matthew took over Mark's intention of whitewashing the Roman governor of any responsibility with the explicit purpose of blaming the Jews. The Jews were angered by the disloyalty of the Christians who had forsaken Jerusalem during the Roman Wars. They saw the Christians as dissidents in matters of religion, transgressors of the law, and now traitors to the national cause. Matthew not only wanted to continue the Markan tradition of making the Jews the scapegoat for absolution of the Romans, but wanted to furnish the Jews with conclusive testimony that the destruction of the Temple was divine punishment for the murder of Jesus.¹² To do this he had to firmly establish the guilt of the Jews.

Not only does Matthew blame the Jews, but claims the Jews are destined to carry the guilt forever. Furthermore Matthew extends Jewish responsibility for the death of Jesus to all of the Jews. Matthew interprets the wicked tenants of the Markan parable to represent Israel as a whole, not only its religious leaders. (Matt 21:38ff, Mark 12) Matthew enlarges upon the Markan deprivation of the privilege of leadership to include the loss of the status of being God's special people. "The Kingdom of God" refers not to the eschatological kingdom of heaven, but to that special relationship to God's rulership. Israel's failure to respond to God's will manifested in the

killing of the Messiah will be punished. This distinguished privilege will be transferred to a different, more worthy nation.¹³

Clearly the Gospel of Matthew uses more Jewish references than any other of the Gospels. One can only speculate whether or not this proves the author to be a Jew, familiar with Hebraic tradition, or a Gentile with access to the fashionable apocalyptic material of the times. Is the blatantly anti-Jewish material intended to woo the Gentiles or to chastise the Jews for their rejection of the newly-emerging truth? Matthew portrays Jesus as a great teacher, the Messiah who fulfills the prophecies and lays the basis for a new faith which springs organically out of the old. When the text's Jewish coloring, Jewish hostility, and message of the newly evolving truth as rightful replacement of the past traditions are examined with respect to the issues of the time periods and their historical setting, one can see how easily details, episodes, narrative explanations, and dialogues may be used to enhance the authors ultimate message. Elaboration or omission depend upon the ultimate message, moral, or intent of the author. They do not reflect a literal truth, a representation or recording of events, but an emotion laden work wherein characters and actions are carefully colored to portray a truth beyond the literal meaning of the words.

Mark

The principal thought of Mark's gospel is that Jesus is the prophetic fulfillment of the Messiah. It begins with a quote from Isaiah "Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, who shall prepare thy way; the voice of one crying in the wilderness: prepare the way of

the Lord, make his paths straight." (Mark 1:2-3) John the Baptist then announces that "One more powerful than I is to come after me," and presents Jesus being baptized by John, an act which signifies the beginning of Jesus' mission as Messiah. The next several chapters give a series of events presenting what Jesus did and said, each event illustrating the mission of Jesus as Messiah. The last part of Mark's gospel (Chapters 11-16) deals with the sufferings, death, and resurrection of Jesus, again presented in the light of the basic theme that Jesus is the promised Messiah.

Mark is universally acknowledged as having written the first of the four gospels.¹⁴ Many scholars consider it an edited version of written material based on oral traditions concerning Jesus. It is the shortest of the gospels, but in many ways the most dramatic for its language is direct, abrupt, and picturesque. Without apology or excuse it presents Jesus as the messenger and spokesman for the Kingdom of God (1:14,15) who came to found a "new Kingdom".

Scholars do not agree as to whether Mark was written for the Roman Gentile community, Jerusalem community of Christians, or Jews. Interestingly, they come to different conclusions from the same evidence.¹⁵

Some scholars maintain that Mark was written for Gentiles. They base their contention on the fact that Mark explains Hebrew terms, customs, and geographical places in Judea with descriptive remarks. Zeitlin does not feel this is adequate proof; for such clarification could have been directed towards the Diaspora Jewish community who were not well acquainted with the new Jewish laws and customs of

Judea. Zeitlin also feels that Mark freely uses idioms without explanation because he was writing for Jews who would understand his use of these expressions. For example, Mark used the right hand of power taking for granted that fact the Jews would know power as gevurah or God.¹⁶

Brandon feels it was certain that Mark wrote for a Roman Gentile community because Mark emphasizes the transition of salvation from the Jews who did not accept Jesus to Gentiles who did. Cohn concurs that Mark lived and wrote in Rome. Mark had damned the Jews with responsibility for Jesus' death because he wanted to exonerate the Roman governor of any blame. He deliberately intended to explain away the contradiction of Jesus' crucifixion, a Roman punishment used in spite of Jesus' innocence under Roman law. According to Cohn, Mark wrote with an eye on the Romans.¹⁷

Sloyan disagrees. All references attributed to Roman readership (1. Jewish payment of tribute to Rome, (12-13); 2. the parenthetical reference to the "abominable and destructive presence" as Roman (13:4); 3. statement "I am he" as a reference to Vespasian) cannot be interpreted as an apologetic to Roman Christians and imperial authorities. It is certain that Mark engages in polemic against the Jews who do not accept Jesus (3:22, 7:1, 8:15, 10:33, 14:10, 11:43, 53, 15:11). Yet Mark's setting is not Rome, but a Palestinian province. The contrast between Galilean and Judean Christian groups as the setting for Mark's division of his materials, makes a Palestinian province more likely for a setting than a Roman one. The numerous Latin loan words often used to prove Roman origin (e.g. dinarion, kentyrion,

kodrantes, krabattos, legion, and spekoilator) do not prove Roman origin for they were common knowledge wherever Greek was spoken.¹⁸

Some people hold that Mark's major target is the Jerusalem community of Christians. This supposedly explains the story of the entry into Jerusalem (11:1-19) and his downplay of the David kingship and the Temple, both of which were favored by the Jerusalem Christians.¹⁹

Scholars do not agree as to the author or readership of Mark. Mark does not stress Jesus' lineage as does Matthew. According to Mark, Jesus is the fulfillment of the prophet Isaiah. Both Cohn and Sloyan feel Mark was written as a polemic against the Jews. Consequently, the Romans are exonerated from the guilt of Jesus' death and the Jews are implicated. Mark blames the Jew but does not include the heavily anti-Jewish material of Matthew.

Luke

Luke begins his gospel with a statement of his intent.

It seemed good to me also, having followed all things closely (or accurately) for some time past, to write an orderly account for you, most excellent Theophilus, that you may know the truth concerning the things of which you have been informed (1:3-4).

The Gospel according to Luke is an attempt to give the story of Jesus an authentic historical context. He refers to contemporary persons and events (some of whose authenticity may be doubted) in order to give the story a truthful flavor. He attempts to legitimize Jesus through the documentation of historical events. He is the only evangelist to report John's counsel to tax-collectors and soldiers (3:12-14). He is not convinced that Herod would suppose John has risen from the dead; consequently he ascribes this opinion to others

(9:7-9). He restates Mark's initial citation of Isaiah as a precursor for Jesus, the fulfillment of prophecy, by having Jesus read Isaiah in the synagogue and state that the prophecy had been fulfilled (4:21). He lists the precise charges brought against Jesus (overturning the nation, forbidding the payment of taxes to Caesar, and calling himself an anointed King (23:2)). Since Jesus was a Galilean, he must have been investigated by Herod (23:6-12).²⁰ All these "facts", changes and additions serve to add to the historicity of the story and appeal to the readership's sense of truth. For some, an historical account is more accurate than any other.

Luke has a more extensive Greek vocabulary than the other Gospels. He eliminated the use of foreign words and foreign phrases. This has led many to feel Luke was written in Greek for a Greek community. Luke has been dated to sometime after 70 B.C.E. and before 90 B.C.E. It was an attempt to explain the faith of the Christian people in terms that Greeks would understand, appealing to Greek rather than Hebrew concepts and interest. Luke stresses Jesus' humanity, compassion, sympathy, understanding, patience, love, personal joy and sorrow, and his grief for his own death. Jesus was savior not simply of the Jewish people or an elitist group, but of all people everywhere.²¹

Zeitlin disagrees. He feels Luke was written by a Jew for Jewish Christians. Like Matthew, Luke stresses the importance of the observance of the law. "And it is easier for heaven and earth to pass than for one word of the law to fail."²²

The theological thrust of blame shifts in Luke. Luke qualifies

Jewish guilt in bringing about the condemnation and crucifixion of Jesus by explaining that the Jews might have acted out of ignorance or delusion. In Luke only, Jesus says "Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do." (23:34) Luke may have abandoned the Matthean tale of the self-arraignment of the Jews because of the contradiction of their ignorance of their actions and a purposeful assumption of full responsibility. Several manuscripts of the Gospel of Luke do not include Jesus' request for forgiveness for the Jews, which in fact implies an editor or copiest problem with the tenor and sense of the prayer and with the guilt and responsibility to which the Jews themselves are said to have confessed.²³

Luke's "historical emphasis" and Jesus' compassionate request for forgiveness suggest a change of emphasis. Luke's reorganization of material appeals to a mentality which regards history as a true representation of the past. Jesus is no longer the fulfillment of prophetic prophecy or the Davidic messiah. He becomes an historical figure whose life's work justifies a following. Luke does not seem particularly intent on blaming the Jews. References in which Matthew and Mark carefully qualify Jewish responsibility for Jesus' death become to a more generalized crowd. The crowd that comes to take away Jesus in Luke is just a crowd (22:47). In Matthew and Mark it is a crowd armed with weapons sent by the chief priests and elders (Matt 26:47, Mark 14:43). Although the crowd is asked three times by Pilate to relieve Jesus, the crowd is still vaguely referred to as a crowd. His choice of dialogue to describe this particular scene certainly gives the reader a vivid picture of the cruelty of the crowd. Yet

Luke does not describe the crowd as Jewish. The conspiracy scenes of Matthew and Mark are omitted. The "court room" scene where the priests and Jewish officials attempt to falsify the testimony is substituted for a mockery scene in which "the men who were holding Jesus", not described as Jews, taunt him with "Prophecy" (22:63). This author is not as concerned with accurate details which would implicate the Jews. Consequently he does not account for the requirement by Jewish court procedure for corroborating testimony from two witnesses. Instead, Luke appeals to the reader's sense of justice by describing Jesus' inhumane treatment. Jesus is killed by villains whose Jewishness is not emphasized. The statement "Father, forgive them for they know not what they do," continues this motif but from a divergent almost contradictory point of view. It assumes Jewish guilt which is inconsistent with the intent of the above mentioned stylistic omissions. It is almost an afterthought, an addition used to negate a commonly held premise of Jewish guilt. Yet in order to request forgiveness one must assume the presence of guilt. Therefore, the request's inclusion contradicts it's purpose for it presents an assumption of guilt not previously present.

John

John is a gospel with quite a different emphasis than the other three synoptic gospels. John:

does not begin with a prophetic proclamation, as does Mark; or with a genealogy, as does Matthew; or with an assurance that his Gospel can be relied upon as accurately portraying Jesus' words and deeds, as does Luke. Instead, John begins with an outright declaration that God and the Logos, the Word of God, are one and the same and that they are the source of light and life (1:1-4).²⁴

According to John, Jesus was the fulfillment of the "Word" (1:1,14, 18:9, 18:32).

Word is translated from the Greek logos which had become a concept laden with meanings. It developed from early Greek philosophical thought signifying reason, the vital force of nature which gives things a purpose and later became a divine-like redemptive intermediary. Heraclitus describes the Logos as a pre-existing truth:

Though the word always exists men are without understanding, both before they hear it, and after they have heard it the first time. For though all things happen in accordance with this word men seem as if they had no acquaintance with them.²⁵

The concept of logos played a considerable part in the Stoic account of the universe. The Stoics speak of a *λόγος ἐμμετρίως* (seminal reason) which is the life-giving, constitutive factor in all existence. Only through it do living things have the essential life-giving property. "But the primal force subsists in it like a kind of seminal fluid, containing in itself the formulas (*λόγος*) and causes of all the things which have been and are and shall be."²⁶ The Stoics also speak of a *λόγος ἐνδεδυμένος* (immanent reason) and a *λόγος προφορετικός* (expressed reason). These may belong to God or man. The fact that people think and communicate their thoughts to others is the very faculty which relates them to God. What imparts existence, meaning, and law to the universe must be the same for man. The reason (*λόγος*) which constitutes the universe must equally constitute human existence. Reason (*λόγος*) gives the universe its form and must be the essential principle which directs man. Logos, for the Stoics is a quasi-physical principle of

life which can be concretized into expressions of life. It is Reason, Purpose, Divinity and it pervades everything.

Plato's concept of form also influenced the concept of logos. Behind the physical universe there rises to mind the thought of an ideal universe. The physical universe is but a copy of the ideal form of the universe which existed before the creation of the visible world.

Philo combines Plato's concept of the ideal form with Aristotle's concept of the First Cause and suggests an existence of the universe prior to our thought of it. "It is in fact the thought of the divine mind which was before the creation of the visible world and was the means by which the visible world was made."²⁷ This "archetypal seal" may be called *ὁ πρὸ Θεοῦ λόγος*, the Logos of God.

To his Word, his chief messenger, highest in age and honour, the Father of all has given the special prerogatives, to stand on the border and separate the creature from the creator. This same Word both pleads with the immortal as suppliant for afflicted mortality and acts as ambassador of the ruler to the subject. He glories in this prerogative and proudly describes it in these words 'and I stood between the Lord and you', that is neither uncreated as God, nor created as you, but midway between the two extremes, a surety to both sides; to the parent, pledging the creature that it should never altogether rebel against the reign and choose disorder rather than order; to the child, warranting his hopes that the merciful God will never forget his own work. For 'I am the harbinger of peace to creation from that God whose will is to bring wars to an end, who is ever the guardian of peace.'²⁸

This logos certainly fits the description of Jesus in the Gospel of John:

In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. He was in the beginning with God; all things were made through him, and without him was not anything made that was made. In him was life, and the life was the light of men. (1:1-4)

And the Word became flesh and dwelt among us, full of grace and truth; we have beheld his glory, glory as of the only Son from the Father. (1:14)

And from his fullness have we all received grace upon grace. For the law was given through Moses; grace and truth came through Jesus Christ. (John 1:16-17)

The next day he saw Jesus coming toward him, and said, 'Behold the Lamb of God, who takes away the sin of the world!' (1:29)

Jesus becomes the manifestation of the logos, a divine intermediary brought to earth to help man reach salvation.

John is also affected by Gnostic religious tradition. Gnostic belief holds that man is a prisoner of the self. The primary means of escape is through the knowledge of God. To know truth (God) sets man free. Influenced by Hellenistic thought, Jesus becomes the redemptive figure described by terms derived from the mysteries. He is the Lord worshipped in the cults. Through the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's supper, the initiated participate in his death and resurrection. Jesus also is interpreted in terms of the Gnostic redemption myth. Jesus becomes "a divine figure sent down from the celestial world of light; the Son of the most High coming forth from the Father, veiled in earthly form and inaugurating the redemption through his work."²⁹

For John, Jesus is the pre-existent Son of God, the Word who exists with him from all eternity. God has sent him into the world, as its light, to give sight to the blind, and to blind those who see (9:39). Jesus becomes not only the light, but also the life and truth. He is an agent of revelation who recruits all "those who are" of the truth. After completing his Father's mission, he returns to

heaven to prepare a way for his own so that his followers may join him in heaven.³⁰

According to Zeilin, John was written for Gentile Christians. Expressions such as "the Son of God" or the "Lamb of God" replace references to the "Son of David". When Jesus speaks to the Pharisees or disputes with the Jews, John has Jesus use the expression "your law". The Synoptic Gospels do state "your" with respect to tradition. According to Zeitlin, this fits because the Jewish Christians accepted the Bible as authoritative but rejected the teachings of the sages or tradition. Only John includes such phrases as the "Jewish Passover" and the Jewish Feast of Tabernacles" (8:17, 10:34, 15:25).³¹

John may have been intended to furnish support and authority to the established Church and its practices. It has been dated to sometime toward the end of the first century. The Gnostic redemption myth offered the early church a terminology in which the redemption of Jesus was understood as a present reality. The eschatological event was already being realized in the present. This gospel minimizes the importance of John the Baptist by emphasizing that he was not himself the Christ, only a witness (1:8, 1:15). It adds the logos doctrine to the Synoptic conception of Jesus (1:1-5). It further elevates the character of both Jesus and the disciples (13:16). John gives divine basis to the sacrament of baptism and eucharist (6:35, 6:41, 6:55), and to the beginnings of the sacrament of penance. It legitimizes the rejection, persecution and suffering of the early church and turns them into treasured criteria necessary for membership. The writer has a cordial dislike for the Jews. The enemies of Jesus are always the

Jews. They are stubborn; they refuse to accept the numerous signs which Jesus offers, and finally they put him to death.³²

John differs from the other three gospels in form and substance:

John's gospel sees Jesus almost exclusively in the light of the resurrection, rather than in the light of history. What Jesus actually said and did while he was alive was significant, in John's view, only to the degree that it reflected or illuminated Christ's divine (not human) destiny. For John Jesus is the divine light whose humanity reflects his divinity.³³

The Jews are but a means to an end. Their responsibility for Jesus' death is part of God's total plan for redemption. Through them, Jesus becomes the "lamb of God".

The Historical Setting of Ancient Judea

The Nature of Roman Rule

The political climate in Judea proceeding the birth of Jesus was fickle and indecisive. In the early 60's B.C.E., Rome began usurping Judean sovereignty and autonomy. Pompey had just finished putting an end to the remnants of Seleucide rule, annexed Syria to the Roman empire, and could not turn his full attention toward Judea which was in the midst of a domestic conflict. After the death of Salome Alexandria, her two sons Aristobulus II and Hyracanus II fought for the throne. Pompey saw the struggle as a perfect opportunity for Roman intervention and demanded that both brothers state their claims before him in Damascus. When Pompey opted for Hyracanus, Aristobulus fled to Jerusalem pursued by the Romans. Pompey, publically supported his choice, Hyracanus, by accompanying him to Jerusalem with his army. When Aristobulus demonstrated his refusal to comply with Pompey's decision, Pompey attacked the Temple Mount which had been Aristobulus'

holdout. After three months' siege, Pompey occupied the Temple and turned it over to Hyracanus whom he made High Priest. Judea had lost her right to choose who would sit upon her throne. She had lost her political autonomy, and her status remained precarious.³⁴

Pompey declined the request of Jewish citizens to re-establish the theocracy, yet refused to make Judea a Roman province. The Romans preferred to dominate the countries they conquered with the help of native kings and princes, rather than rule themselves. This prevented the outbreak of revolts and lessened the tax burden of the Romans. Consequently, Pompey appointed Hyracanus as High Priest and not as King. He reduced the size of Judea and required an annual tribute.³⁵

After the conquest of Judea by Pompey, civil war raged in Judea.³⁶ Hyracanus, the High Priest was not the real power head. He was overshadowed by Antipater who by schemes and machinations had exacerbated the original conflict between Hyracanus and his brother. Antipater was a man of great political acumen and savvy. He was appointed procurator and his sons, Phasaël and Herod became governors of Jerusalem and Galilee, respectively. When the second son of Aristobulus, Antigonus, attempted to regain the throne, Hyracanus was taken captive and Herod escaped to Rome. Herod returned with a Roman army and captured Jerusalem. He was appointed King, rex socius. He was entrusted with the Kingdom only as long as he lived. When he died, the Roman Emperor had the power to decide his successor.³⁷

Herod retained the authority to rule his people, but his foreign policy was determined by Rome. He had no power to engage in foreign wars, alliances, or treaties and his right to coin money was restric-

ted. As a vassal to Rome, Herod was obligated to supply Rome with auxiliary weapons whenever Rome requested.³⁸ Jews had lost control of their land and their king had become a puppet of the Roman Empire.

Herod

Herod was one of the most efficient and hated of the Jewish Kings.³⁹ The Jews hated him for "his Idumaeen origin, his pagan tastes and his ruthless suppression of all who opposed him or incurred his suspicion".⁴⁰ Yet he was a shrewd and resolute ruler, whom the Romans appreciated as a reliable and efficient administrator of a land which was of great strategic importance to their power in the Middle East. Herod pursued a policy designed to assimilate Jewish Hellenized society into the Roman Empire. He was part of a growing Jewish elite whose power was based upon cooperation with Roman rule.⁴¹ Although Herod made great efforts to gain the support of his nation (built a magnificent temple, occasionally reduced taxes, and in times of starvation sold the crown jewels to buy grain), he was not able to gain their sympathy. His nouveau-riche passion for imitating Hellenistic society antagonized the people:

The non-Jewish atmosphere prevailing at his court, the pursuit of conspicuous splendour, his complete alignment with the ideology of the Roman principate, to the extent of introducing the cult of the emperor and building temples in his honour (outside the areas of Jewish settlement), his unlimited admiration of physical strength and his lack of consideration for human life in the pursuit of selfish political aims⁴²

offended the sensibilities of the people. The Romans ignored his unpopularity with the people because they found him to be an effective ruler and administrator who was capable of preserving the existing order and at the same time remained unflinchingly loyal and dependent

upon (to) Rome.⁴³ So intense was the dislike and accumulated bitterness for Herod's oppressive rule that his death triggered an uprising spurred by pent up bitterness, anger and frustration.

On the eve of Herod's death. . . two respected men spurred the youth to take the votive eagle from off the great gate of the Temple which Herod had placed as a votive offering. So these scholars ordered [their disciples] to pull the eagle down, saying that even if there should be some danger of their being doomed to death, still to those about to die for the preservation and safe-guarding of their father's way of life the virtue acquired by them in death would seem far more advantageous than the pleasure of living. . . At midday therefore, the youths went up [to the roof of the Temple] and pulled down the eagle and cut it up with axes before the many people who were gathered in the Temple. And the officer of the King -- for the attempt had been reported to him --, suspecting that something more serious was involved than what was being done, came up with a force large enough to meet the crowd of men who were intent upon pulling down the image that had been set up. Upon these he fell unexpectedly, for as is usual with a crowd, they had taken this daring step on a foolish whim rather than with the caution of foresight, and were therefore in disorder, not having looked around beforehand for a way to help themselves. He seized no fewer than forty of the young men, who had courageously awaited his attack while the rest of the multitude took to flight, and he also captured Judas and Matthias, the instigators of the daring deed, who thought it inglorious to give way on his approach.⁴⁴

Herod punished these young instigators along with the sages who inspired them. He had them burnt alive. At first the people did not show their anger, but immediately after Herod's death, large masses gathered at the Temple area to publically bemoan the fate of the young men.⁴⁵

At this time there came round the festival during which it is the ancestral custom of the Jews to serve unleavened bread. It is called Passover, . . . They celebrate it with gladness, and it is their custom to slaughter a greater number of sacrifices at this festival than at any other, and an innumerable multitude of people came down from the country and even from abroad to worship God. Now the fermentors of disorders, who were mourning for Judas and Matthias, the interpreters of the laws, stood together in the temple and

provided the dissidents with plenty of food, for they were not ashamed to bet for it. And Archelaus, fearing that something dangerous might grow out of their fanaticism, sent a cohort of legionaries under a tribune to suppress the violence of the rebels before they should infect the whole crowd with their madness. And he said, if there were any who clearly stood out from the rest in their eagerness to rebel, they were to be brought to him. By this act the rebellious followers of the interpreters (of the laws) and the crowd were infuriated, and uttering cries and exhortations, they rushed upon the soldiers and after surrounding them stoned most of them to death, but a few of them and the tribune escaped with wounds. When they had done these things the rebels began to busy themselves with their sacrifices again. Archelaus, however, thought it impossible to save the situation unless he checked the impetuosity of the multitude in its present state, and so he sent out his whole army, including the cavalry, in order that they might prevent the people encamped there from helping those in the Temple, and might catch any who evaded an infantry and believed themselves to have reached a safe place. His cavalry killed some three thousand men but the rest got away by making for the neighboring hills. Then Archelaus issued a proclamation that everyone should return to his own home. So they left the scene of the festival and went away in fear of a greater evil to come even though they had the rash temper that is due to lack of discipline.⁴⁶

This passage from Josephus not only illustrates the intense anger and bitterness felt by the people, but that the Romans viewed large assemblies of Jews as a threat. The Romans feared a potential tumult, so they responded with a preventative action which only aggravated the situation. The result was that hundreds were killed in an inhumane, callous way and the pilgrimage was disbanded. The cutting down of the eagle and the violence of the mourners reflect Jewish dissatisfaction, frustration and anger with Herod's repressive government. The response by the authorities reflects the fear of the Romans and the heavy-handed method used to handle such actions.

After Herod's Death

Herod considered this demonstration an affront to his political

power. The eagle symbolized his loyalty to Rome. For Herod, cutting down the eagle was an act of treason. Yet the Jewish agitators looked at it from another perspective. The golden eagle was an image of the emperor and could be perceived as an object of divine worship. They were defending their religious beliefs.⁴⁷

Although the majority of religious leaders may have sided with Herod's right to execute the troublemakers (Josephus does not document an official objection or protest), the people at large were clearly outraged. Whether this outrage was political anger at the injustice of Herod's anger or religious rage geared towards the offensive violation of the Second Commandment can not be deciphered. Antipater describes the Temple scene; which may be his slightly biased bid for a political office:

But it was especially the slaughter in the Temple and impiety of Archelaus that he made seem so terrible in his speech, for this had happened during the festival, and the people had been slaughtered just like sacrificial victims, though some were foreigners and others natives. And the Temple had been filled with corpses, not indeed by an alien but by one who had sought to undertake the act with the lawful title of king in order that he might fulfill his tyrannical nature in an act of injustice abhorrent to all mankind.⁴⁸

After Herod's death, Judea was in turbulence:

. . . and a letter came from Varus, the governor of Syria announcing a revolt of the Jews, for after Archelaus had sailed the whole nation became unruly. Varus himself, being on the scene, inflicted punishment upon those responsible for the uprising, and after suppressing the rebellion, which was a serious one, for the greater part, he departed for Antioch, leaving one legion of his army in Jerusalem to curb the revolutionary activity of the Jews. He did not, however, succeed at all in putting a stop to their rebellion. For when Varus had gone, Sabinus, the procurator of Caesar, who had remained there, greatly harassed the rebels, being confident that he would overcome them with the army that had been left behind and with a large number of his own slaves, for he had armed many of these and used

them as terrorists, thereby goading and disturbing the Jews to the point of revolting. He also tried to take over the citadels by force and undertook a search for the royal treasures, being eager for gain and greedy in his desire.⁴⁹

When Pentacost came round - this is how one of our ancestral festivals is called - a great many tens of thousands of men gathered (in Jerusalem) who came not only for the religious observances but also because they resented the reckless insolence of Sabinus. There were Galileans and Idumaeans and a multitude from Jericho and from those who lived in Transjordan, and there was a multitude from Judea itself who joined all these, and they were much more eager than the others in their desire to punish Sabinus. Being divided into three groups, they took their positions in three different places. The first group took possession of the hippodrome; of the other two groups, one went to the north quarter of the Temple, and facing south, held the eastern part, while the third group held the western part, where the palace was. All this was done by the rebels in order to be able to besiege the Romans after they were invested by them on all sides. And Sabinus - for he was afraid of their numbers and of the spirit shown by men who thought little of death in their desire not to be defeated in a battle in which they counted it a virtue to be victorious - immediately began to send letters to Varus and, as was usual (in such circumstances), was insistent in telling him to come to his help quickly because a very great danger threatened the army that had been left there, for they expected to be captured and be cut to pieces in a short time. Then he himself seized the highest of the towers in fortress, Phasaël - it had been built in honour of Herod's brother Phasaël and had been given his name after after he met death at the hands of the Parthians -, and signalled to the Romans to attack the Jews, for he did not dare go down to his friends himself but thought it perfectly right for others to die for the sake of satisfying his greed. And when the Romans boldly sallied out, a fierce battle ensued, in which the Romans were superior to the enemy in effectiveness, but yet the Jews did not lose courage at the sight of the terrible loss of many men. Instead, by a roundabout way they mounted the porticoes that surrounded the outer court of the Temple, and while a heavy fight was going on, they threw down stones, hurling some with their hands and others from slings, for they were well trained in this kind of fighting. And all the archers, who were stationed beside them, inflicted severe losses on the Romans because they were on higher ground and not easy to attack since they were not within reach of those who tried to hurl javelins at them, and so they had the enemy in a position where he could easily be defeated. In this fashion the battle went on for a long time, but eventually the Romans became desperate at their situation and set fire to

the porticoes without being noticed by the Jews who had mounted them. And the fire, being fed by many hands and with very combustible materials, very quickly reached the roof. This contained woodwork quickly reached the roof. This contained woodwork quickly reached the roof. This contained woodwork filled with pitch and wax, and also had gold smeared with wax and so it at once yielded (to the flames). This was how those great and most notable structures were completely destroyed. And those who were on the porticoes were caught in this unexpected destruction, for when the roof fell down, they were carried along with it, and others were struck down from all sides by the enemy. Many, in despair of being saved and in dismay at the awful fate that confronted them, either threw themselves into the fire or escaped it only by turning their swords on themselves. And all those who tried to save themselves by retreating along the passage by which they had climbed up were killed by the Romans, for they were unarmed and crushed in spirit, and not even desperation - since they lacked arms - was able to help them. And so not a single one of those who had gone up to the roof escaped death. And the Romans by pushing their way through the fire wherever it left room for them got possession of the treasury where the sacred funds were kept, and a great part of these was stolen by the soldiers, while Sabinus openly took four hundred talents for himself.

(3) As for the Jews, they were grieved by the sad fate of their friends who had fallen in this battle, and they were also grieved by the carrying off of the dedicatory offerings. However, the most compact and valiant group among them surrounded the palace and threatened to set fire to it and kill all those inside. Then they told them to get out as quickly as possible, promising that they, and Sabinus along with them, would suffer no harm if they did as they were told. Actually most of the royal troops had deserted to their side. But Rufus and Gratus together with three thousand of the best fighters in Herod's army, men who could use their bodies effectively, adhered to the Romans. And there was a cavalry force under Rufus' command which had also been added to the Roman strength. The Jews did not press the siege less vigorously but proceeded to undermine the walls, and they told the men ready to change sides not to interfere now that at last they had the opportunity to recover their country's liberty. And Sabinus would have liked nothing better than to get away with his troops, but he could not trust (the Jews) because of the things he had done (to them), and he held the enemy's too great generosity to be a reason for rejecting their offer. At the same time he was expecting Varus to come, and so he held out under the siege.

(4) Meanwhile continuous and countless new tumults filled Judaea, and in many quarters many men rose in arms either in hope of personal gain or out of hatred for the

Jews. For example, two thousand of the soldiers who had once campaigned with Herod and had been disbanded, now assembled in Judaea itself and fought against the king's troops. These were led against them by Achiab, a cousin of Herod, but he was forced out of the plains into higher country by the enemy, who were very experienced in warfare, and by retreating to an inaccessible position, he saved what he could.⁵⁰

The Nature of Jewish Society

Judea was a volcano ready to erupt. The people were angry and agitated, for Roman rule had been oppressive. The political situation was further exacerbated by the social and economic strife among the Jews themselves. During the past several years, Judea had changed from a country based on small farming communities to a nation in which trade and commerce flourished. The urban population increased and new social classes emerged. In the past, Judean society consisted mainly of a priestly and Levitical class and a farming class, which Zeitlin calls Ame Ha-aretz. The priestly class was supported by the farmers who tithed regularly. With the increase of trade and commerce, a more influential class of merchants, artisans and city-dwellers developed. Dissention developed between the Haberim (urbanites) and the Ame Ha-aretz. The agriculturalists, according to Zeitlin resented the fact that the urban population did not share in the costs of maintenance of the clergy. They began to withhold their tithes so that the priests did not receive their due allotment of sustenance. Since the high priests considered the tithe their personal due, oftentimes they used force to procure it from the unwilling farmers. This increased the farmer's hostility toward the priests, whom they began to regard as hirelings of Rome. To combat their lack of income, the leaders of the

Jews ruled that anyone who purchased from a farmer must tithe. This presumed all farmers were not to be trusted with respect to the tithe. Since the ordinance applied only to items bought for personal consumption, it did not affect the merchants. This rule served to further aggravate the hostile relations between the urbanites and the farmers. The antagonism became so great that city-dwellers refused to eat with farmers because they suspected the Ame Ha-aretz of not tithing their allotment, thus making their food impure.

This antagonism was manifested particularly towards the Galileans who were ridiculed for their lack of sophistication. They were spoofed as country bumpkins, yokels who could not speak Aramaic correctly and were considered ignorant of the law. A Judean proverb states, "Out of Galilee art sent no prophet." These feelings of economic exploitation along with the burden of political oppression created a climate ripe for movements which offered some sort of salvation or redemption.⁵¹

Classes, Sects and False Messiahs

People turned toward a variety of philosophies to help provide a rationale for life in such harsh times. Josephus, the primary source of information about the different sects which existed during the Second Commonwealth, writes about three haereseis (schools of thought): Sadducees, Pharisees, and the Essenes.

Sadducees

Originally this term applied to the descendants of the high priestly family of Zaddok. They included the upper classes whose interests were similar to those of the high priest. During the Helle-

nistic period, the Sadducees became associated with those who supported Greek assimilation. Moved by the desire to enhance their financial well-being, they were eager to adopt the customs of their conquerors. During the Maccabean Revolt, they had lost their wealth and influence to the Hasmoneans who then made their own appointment to the high priesthood. Under the reign of John Hyrcanus, they regained their influence. Because the Pharisees refused to acknowledge Hyrcanus' self-appointment of king, he forbade the Jews to observe the laws ordained by the Pharisees. Sadducee then became the name used to describe all those who rejected Pharisaic doctrine. They supported a strong, nationalistic state, with imperialistic tendencies and supported Hyrcanus' intention to conquer countries in order to enlarge Judea. With the encroachment of Rome, the Sadducees lost some power. From the time of Herod, the high-priesthood ceased to be hereditary. It became a Roman appointment.⁵²

About the Sadducees, Josephus wrote that they denied predestination and divine influence on man's acts, whether they be good or bad. Everything, according to them, lies in man's hands, and man alone is responsible for his happy or adverse lot in life. They believed only in the Torah, the Written Law; and they denied the validity and binding power of the Tradition of the sages, the Oral Law. Unlike other religious sects, the Sadducees denied the existence of angels. They were of the opinion that the soul dies with the body. Justice and punishment they held, must be administered in this world since they did not believe in reward and punishment in the world beyond the grave. Josephus describes the Sadducees as rude in their behavior among themselves, and with people outside their group. They were harsh in their judgments. They had no followers among the populace, though some officials and wealthy Jews were influenced by their teachings. . . . they denied that God made a covenant with David that the Kingdom should belong to his children.⁵³

Pharisees

The term Pharisee means separatist and was coined by the Sadducees to describe a group of people who set themselves apart from the Sadducees. During the Hasmonian Revolt the office of High Priesthood was taken from the descendants of Zaddok and became the domain of the Hasmonian family.⁵⁴ During the reign of Antiochus IV, Jason bought the office of High Priest and had the legitimate High Priest Orias III removed. Jason introduced Hellenistic reforms which did not compromise the religious sensibilities of the Jews. Later, Jason was removed from the High Priesthood by Meneleus. Meneleus, in the interests of achieving full Hellenistic polis' rights, was willing to sacrifice swine on the altar and to dedicate the Temple to Zeus. Disgusted by the corruption and blatant sacrilegious acts, the Jews successfully revolted and appointed a Hasmonian as High Priest. From then on "the High Priesthood was no longer the prerogative of the Aaron-Eleazar -Phenehas-Zaddok line. It was now vested in the Hasmonian family until a true prophet would arise in Israel."⁵⁵ The people who initiated this transformation of power were the Pharisees. They "felt free to legitimate a new High Priest line on the basis of laws not written down in the laws of Moses."⁵⁶

The Pharisees had internalized attractive Greek ideas, reinterpreted them within a Jewish context and created a vibrant new form of Judaism which made sense to the Jews living in Hellenistic Judea. Such Greco-Roman concepts as philosopher-sage, the teacher-disciple relationship, unwritten laws, law-making institutions, laws formulated as individual items - freed of any narrational connection, life-after-

death, and use of proof texting, all found their way into Pharisaic Judaism.⁵⁷

The thrust of Pharisaic contribution was to make the law more consonant with Hellenistic life. While the Sadducees demanded rigid observance of the Pentateuchal law, the Pharisees interpreted the law to make it more liveable. Through the use of oral tradition, the law evolved from a rigid literal-Pentateuchal command whose observance often violated the original intent to a more flexible system which was in consonance with the requirements and demands of an everchanging life. For example, according to the Bible, no Jew was allowed to go out from his "place" on the Sabbath: "abide ye every man from his place." (Ex 16:29) The word "place" had been interpreted to mean "house." The Pharisees, in order to make the laws of the Sabbath less cumbersome, reinterpreted the word "place" to mean "city" and defined "city" as a distance of two thousand cubits from a man's abode. Thus one had the right to walk two thousand cubits outside the city limits on the Sabbath.⁵⁸

The Pharisees democratized Judaism. They increased the involvement of individual Jews and lessened the responsibility of the priests. By instituting the Maamadot which allowed communal representation to substitute for the individual obligation, they allowed all Jews, rich and poor, to participate equally in the daily sacrifices.⁵⁹

This process of democratization took away authority from the High Priesthood:

The cultus, the priesthood, the Temple, ceased to be the focus and the essential concern. The laws regulating the sacrifices were no longer the simple written laws; they were the halakhoth. Discriminating between the clean and the unclean, the holy and the profane, was no longer an exclusive priestly prerogative, for it was the scholar class who

prescribed the criteria. The sons of Aaron might still exercise the priestly monopoly, but the procedures they were to carry out were fairly set down by the Scribes-Pharisees. The total cultic system was subordinated to the teachings of the Oral Law. To offer sacrifices was no more or less elevated a commandment of God than reciting the Shema twice daily. The High Priest's entry into the Holy of Holies on Yom Kipper was neither more nor less salvational than the carrying out of any number of acts rendered sacred by the twofold Law. God's ultimate judgment would follow from a judicious weighing of all the Halakhoth one had carried out, alongside of all the averoth, "transgressions," one had committed. A High Priest who failed to follow the prescribed procedures on Yom Kipper was as culpable as an individual who prepared a fire on the sabbath. A Jew living in Rome who could not participate in the Temple worship, but who carried out whichever of the halakhoth were doable in the Diaspora, was as certain of the world to come and the resurrection as his Judean counterpart who carried out the halakhoth that were applicable to those who resided in the Holy Land. God the Father's ultimate decision was dependent on the totality of his relationship to each and every individual. Loyalty to the politeuma within, not⁶⁰ intermediation from without, was what tipped the scales.

According to Josephus, the Pharisees had the full support of the masses:

And so great is their influence with the masses that even when they speak against a king or high priest, they immediately gain credence.⁶¹

These men. . . had so much influence with their fellow-Jews that they could injure those whom they hated and help those to whom they were friendly; for they had the complete confidence of the masses when they spoke harshly of any person, even when they did so out of envy.⁶²

The Pharisees were influential among the Jews. They were a scholar class committed to the unwritten law. When allowed religious autonomy, they did not interfere with the ruling powers:

The Pharisees clearly had no principled objection to state power as such. They did not hesitate to wield it or influence it whenever they could. They were not committed to any specific form of government. They did not oppose a strong state with a powerful army, even if a good part of it was

made up of mercenaries. They did not have any principled objections to a vigorous foreign policy. Nor did they have an enduring loyalties to a specific family. They both supported and opposed the Hasmoneans. They were loyal to Herod, but equally loyal to the procurators. They at times favored rebellion against constituted authority, and at times they denounced it.⁶³

The Pharisees thus had no hard and fast position on the state. They had apparently a single concern, and this alone determined their policy of action. This concern was the status of the unwritten laws. The state that left them untouched deserved support; the state that tampered with them courted rebellion.⁶⁴

Essenes

The political and economic climate also spawned sects, some of which dealt with the oppression by withdrawal and some by aggressive revolt. Josephus describes a third group called the Essenes. They were an ascetic semi-monastic order who isolated themselves in little communities. Their main concern was religious purity:

The doctrine of the Essenes is wont to leave everything in the hands of God. They regard the soul as immortal and believe that they ought to strive especially to draw near to righteousness. They send votive offerings to the temple, but perform their sacrifices employing a different ritual of purification. For this reason they are barred from those precincts of the temple that are frequented by all the people and perform their rites by themselves. Otherwise they are of the highest character, devoting themselves solely to agricultural labour. They deserve admiration in contrast to all others who claim their share of virtue because such qualities as theirs were never found before among any Greek or barbarian people, nay, not even briefly, but have been among them in constant practice and never interrupted since they adopted them from of old. Moreover, they hold their possessions in common, and the wealthy man receives no more enjoyment from his property than the man who possesses nothing. The men who practise this way of life number more than four thousand. They neither bring wives into the community nor do they own slaves, since they believe that the latter practice contributes to injustice and the former opens the way to a source of dissension. Instead they live by themselves and perform menial tasks for one another. They elect by show of hands good men to

receive their revenues and the produce of the earth and priests to prepare bread and other food. Their manner of life does not differ at all from that of the so-called *Cristae* among the Dacians, but is as close to it as could be.⁶⁵

Josephus also describes a fourth philosophy as established by

Judas the Galilean:

This school agrees in all other respects with the opinions of the Pharisees, except that they have a passion for liberty that is almost unconquerable, since they are convinced that God alone is their leader and master. They think little of submitting to death in unusual forms and permitting vengeance to fall on kinsmen and friends if only they may avoid calling any man master. Inasmuch as most people have seen the steadfastness of their resolution amid such circumstances, I may forgo any further account. For I have no fear that anything reported of them will be considered incredible. The danger is, rather, that report may minimize the indifferences with which they accept the grinding misery of pain.⁶⁶

During the tumultuous times it was not uncommon for a charismatic leader to arise promising salvation. Sometimes these men were political rebels promising freedom from the yoke of the Romans, sometimes false messiahs promising religious redemption.

Josephus speaks of Judas, the son of the Brigand chief Ezekias, who amassed a large number of people at Sepphoris in Galilee, assaulted the royal palace there, armed every one of his men, and ransacked all the property which had been seized there. He became "an object of terror to all men by plundering those he came across in his desire for great possessions and his ambition for royal rank."⁶⁷

After Herod's death arose Simon, originally a slave of King Herod. He placed the diadem on his own head and gathered his own following who proclaimed him king:

After burning the royal palace in Jericho, he plundered and carried off the things that had been seized there. He also set fire to many other royal residences in many parts of the country and utterly destroyed them after permitting his fellow-rebels to take as booty whatever had been left in them.⁶⁸

The royal palace at Ammatha on the river Jordan was also burnt down by some rebels, who resembled those under Simon. Such was the great madness that settled upon the nation because they had no king of their own to restrain the populace by his re-eminence, and because the foreigners who became among them to suppress the rebellion were themselves a cause of provocation through their arrogance and their greed.⁶⁹

There was also Athrongeus, an unknown shepherd. He "donned a diadem and led raiding expeditions throughout the country. His victims, according to Josephus, were not only Romans and royalists, but any wealthy Jews who had the misfortune to fall into his clutches."⁷⁰ He was caught only after great difficulty.

There was Theudas who promised religious redemption.

During the period when Fadus was procurator of Judea, a certain imposter named Theudas persuaded the majority of the masses to take up their possessions and to follow him to the Jordan River. He stated that he was a prophet and that at his command the river would be parted and would provide them an easy passage. With this talk he deceived many. Fadus, however, did not permit them to reap the fruit of their folly, but sent against them a squadron of cavalry. These fell upon them unexpectedly, slew many of them and took many prisoners. Theudas himself was captured, whereupon they cut off his head and brought it to Jerusalem.⁷¹

Josephus discusses an Egyptian false prophet:

A still worse blow was dealt at the Jews by the Egyptian false prophet. A charlatan, who had gained for himself the reputation of a prophet, this man appeared in the country, collected a following of about thirty thousand dupes, and led them by a circuitous route from the desert to the mount called the mount of Olives. From there he proposed to force an entrance into Jerusalem and, after overpowering the Roman garrison, to set himself up as tyrant of the people, employing those who poured in with him as his bodyguard. His

attack was anticipated by Felix, who sent to meet him with the Roman heavy infantry, the whole engagement was that the Egyptian escaped with a few of his followers; most of his force were killed or taken prisoners; the remainder dispersed and stealthily escaped to their several homes.⁷²

Judea was filled with saviors. Many arose for religious reasons, others for political ones. They promised the people relief from the harsh circumstances of the times. To the Romans, any large gathering of people looked the same. Rome perceived such leaders and their followings as a threat to her political stability. As such these leaders and their followers were to be destroyed.

Jesus' Perceived Source of Contention with the Pharisees

The only substantive information about Jesus comes from the New Testament. From the Gospels we can glean the image of a charismatic, outspoken man of courage, whose primary concern was one of morality.

As Rivkin portrays:

And that historical Jesus who peers forth in the Gospel stories is the same Jesus who followed John the Baptist; who reached lovingly to the poor and the wretched; who healed the sick, exorcised demons, broke bread with sinners, stood his ground against the Scribes-Pharisees, spoke in parables, preached an ethic and morality that seemed to defy human nature; who proclaimed that the Kingdom of God was at hand and that the time for making oneself ready was short; who intimated that he might indeed be the Son of Man, the Messiah whom God had selected to usher in his kingdom and had invested with an authority that freed him from the strictures of the Scribes-Pharisees; who cried out against all those who blocked the way for God's kingdom and turned over the tables of the money-changers in the Temple in a fit of religious zeal; who attracted crowds with the eloquence of his teachings and preaching and stirred up the fears of the high priest that these crowds might get out of hand; who was arrested by orders of the high priest and was tried by the high priest's Sanhedrin on the political implications of his nonviolent, nonpolitical teaching and preaching; who was brought before Pontius Pilate, the only authority with the power to determine his ultimate fate; who died an agonizing death on the cross, positioned between two revolutionaries,

with the words, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" on his lips; who was seen risen from the dead by his faithful disciples who had heard him speak time and time again of the resurrection that awaited all those who heeded God's Word; and who, once risen, was proclaimed to be the Christ who would soon be bringing the Kingdom of God.⁷³

According to the material in the Gospels, Jesus' major source of conflict was with the Pharisees. They seem to be the archenemies of Jesus. The gospels portray the Pharisees as "hypocritical, cunning, selfish, proud, opinionated, intolerant, and unscrupulous."⁷⁴ Yet does this picture reflect historical accuracy or is it a deliberate caricature designed to compliment Jesus' goodness in contrast to Pharisaic cruel strictness?

The major source of contention revolves around observance of the law. The stories in the gospel illustrate Jesus' or his disciples' deliberate disregard for the law in order to achieve a more humane goal. Consequently, Jesus heals on the Sabbath with a comment that could be interpreted as sarcastic: "I will ask you one thing: Is it lawful on the Sabbath day to do good, or to do evil? To save life, or to destroy it? (Luke 6:9) or "What man shall there be among you, that shall have one sheep, and if it falls into a pit on the Sabbath day, will he not lay hold on it, and lift it out? How much than is a man better than a sheep? Wherefore it is lawful to do well on the Sabbath days." (Matt 12:11-12) The first comment satirizes a disrespect for the Sabbath by implying that strict observance of the law allows evil to exist by commanding non-intervention; the second comment satirizes a disregard for human life, implying that strict observance of the law commands better treatment for animals than people. The irony is

especially biting on the Sabbath, the Day of Peace, the observance of which requires a special reverence for life. Both clearly illustrate a case where observance of the law violates the actual intent of the law.

The same moral can be drawn from the story in which the Pharisees criticize Jesus for eating with the tax-collectors. Here Jesus disregards not a law, but a social convention in order to achieve a more humane purpose. "They that are whole have no need of the physician, but they that are sick: I come not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance." (Mark 2:17; similarly, Matt 9:12-13; Luke 5:31-32). Jesus breaks the social convention because it is an obstacle to the achievement of humanistic goals. Here strict observance of the rule prevents redemption for those who most need it.

The same is true with respect to the incident in which the Pharisees criticize Jesus' disciples for plucking an ear of corn on the Sabbath. Jesus responds by citing a Biblical precedent to illustrate that the circumstances legitimize the action. He highlights the discrepancies between the purpose of the law and the consequences of its implementation.

This point is further emphasized when the Pharisees criticize Jesus for not washing his hands. The story offers Jesus an opportunity to comment on hypocrisy by discussing the nature of real pollution. "These (list of ethical sins) are what defile a man; but to eat with unwashed hands does not defile a man." (Matthew 15:20) Jesus' concern for man's actions contrast with the Pharisaic preoccupation for ritual: "there is nothing outside a man which by

going into him can defile him; but the things which come out of a man are what defile him". (Mark 7:15,16) Dirt and purity serve as symbols to differentiate and separate a ritual from its raison d'etre. "You fools: Did not he who made the outside make the inside also?" (Luke 11:40) Jesus criticizes a preoccupation with ritualistic law which overlooks the law's original purpose.

These conflicts all serve to illustrate one point, the evil of hypocrisy. Jesus criticizes preoccupation with a law, rule, or ritual at the expense of its original intent. Would such incidents offend the Pharisees? The Pharisees were proponents of the oral law. The oral law tended to liberalize the written law. Through interpretation, the oral law made the law more feasible and more in consonance with everyday life. (See section on Pharisees). Were the Pharisees more attached to the law itself or to a "spirit" of interpretation?

Although the oral law existed, it did not become codified until 200 A.D. Before laws are written, they go through a process of adaptation and flux in response to critical issues which require legal clarification. Cohn suggests that:

Not that it is inconceivable that at the time of the ministry of Jesus the question of the permissibility of sabbatical healing was still unresolved. It could well be that this was one of the countless legal-religious issues yet to be discussed and determined, and that the Pharisaic law which has been preserved belongs to a subsequent period.⁷⁵

Since this might be an area open for disputation, the law was not yet settled:

In an indeterminate legal situation such as this, the Pharisaic rule is that each may act as he thinks right; and in the formation of Jewish law, a particular rule is

crystallized time and again by virtue of a scholar's behaving in practice as if it were already operative."⁷⁶

Such was the case for the law regarding the washing of the hands. It was first set down as a rule of law by Al'azar ben Arakh, who taught more than 50 years after Jesus' death. Long afterwards, scholars disagreed as to whether or not it was obligatory. Thus it was not law during the time of Jesus. The issue existed during the time of the evangelists and offers marvelous material in which to illustrate a story emphasizing the evils of hypocrisy. What better way to discuss evil than through the use of dirt and impurity?

Jesus was a Pharisee par excellence. He responds in the Rabbinic tradition. When his disciples are criticized for plucking corn on the Sabbath, Jesus cites the case of David in order to legitimate their action. His response presumes a knowledge of David's hunger which was the traditional Pharisaic interpretation of David's misdeed. So, "in good Pharisaic manner," he "adduced it as a precedent for his own indulgence."⁷⁷ Jesus spoke in the Rabbinic tradition and could not have said anything legally antagonistic to the Pharisees. They would not have composed the angry crowd described by the Gospels, nor have sent a crowd to take away Jesus.

The gospels recount a scene at the home of the High Priests which has led scholars to conclude Jesus was tried by the Sanhedrin (Matt 26:57-58; Mark 14:53-65). Yet the stories are incompatible with the following provisions in Jewish law:

1. No Sanhedrin was allowed to sit as a criminal court and try criminal cases outside the temple precincts, in any private house.

2. The Sanhedrin was not allowed to try criminal cases at night; criminal trials had to be commenced and completed during daytime.
3. No person could be tried on a criminal charge on festival days or the eve of a festival.
4. No person may be convicted on his own testimony or on the strength of his own confession.
5. A person may be convinced of a capital offense only upon the testimony of two lawfully qualified eye witnesses.
6. No person may be convicted of a capital offense unless two lawfully qualified witnesses testify that they had first warned him of the criminality of the act and the penalty prescribed for it.
7. The capital offense of blasphemy consists in pronouncing the name of God. Yahweh, which may be uttered only once a year by the high priest in the innermost sanctuary of the temple; and it is irrelevant what "blasphemies" are spoken so long as the divine name is not enunciated.⁷⁸

The account of the gospels does not portray a Sanhedrin which ran according to Jewish legal procedure. A Jewish Sanhedrin did not try and convict Jesus for blasphemy.

Motivation For Jesus' Death

In order to better understand the interrogation scene by Caiaphas, the High Priest, let us contrast the Gospels' depiction of Pontius Pilate with that of Josephus. The Gospels portray Pontius Pilate as humane and deeply concerned for Jesus' welfare:

Then Pilate said to him (Jesus), 'Do you not hear how many things they testify against you?' But he gave him no answer, not even to a single charge; so that the governor wondered greatly. (Matt 27:13,14)

And Pilate again asked him, 'Have you no answer to make? See how many charges they bring against you? But Jesus made no further answer, so that Pilate wondered. (Mark 15:4-5)

And Pilate said to the chief priests and the multitudes, 'I find no crime in this man'...'You brought me this man as one who was perverting the people, and after examining him before you, behold, I did not find this man guilty of any of your charges against him, neither did Herod, for he sent him back to us. Behold, nothing deserving death has been done by him, therefore I will chastise him and release him. (Luke 23:4,13,15,16).

These selections depict Pilate as a compassionate man who is concerned for justice and for the due process of law.

The image of Pilate that emerges from the works of Josephus is one of a calculating, ambitious man who would let nothing interfere with his political success. To be successful required an ability to maintain law and order in a land fraught with dissidence, disorder, and violence.

Tiberius (A.D. 14-37), who had succeeded Augustus as emperor and had appointed Pilate, was scarcely in the mood for a repetition of the years of turbulence that has shaken Judea after the death of Herod. Unless, then, Pontius Pilate were shrewd enough to govern this unruly people, his tenure as procurator was bound to be extremely short.⁷⁹

At times this required harsh actions:

(2) Pilate, being sent by Tiberius as procurator to Judaea, introduced into Jerusalem by night and under cover the effigies of Caesar which are called standards. This proceeding, when day broke, aroused immense excitement among the Jews; those on the spot were in consternation, considering their laws to have been trampled under foot, as those laws permit no image to be erected in the city; while the indignation of the townspeople stirred the country-folk who flocked together in crowds. Hastening after Pilate to Caesarea, the Jews implored him to remove the standards from Jerusalem and to uphold the laws of their ancestors. When Pilate refused, they fell prostrate around his house and for five whole days and nights remained motionless in that position.

(3) On the ensuing day Pilate took his seat on his tribunal in the great stadium and summoning the multitude, with the apparent intention of answering them, gave the arranged signal to his armed soldiers to surround the Jews. Finding themselves in a ring of troops, three deep, the Jews were struck dumb at this unexpected sight. Pilate, after threatening to cut them down if they refused to admit Caesar's images, signalled to the soldiers to draw their swords. Thereupon the Jews, as by concerted action, flung themselves in a body on the ground, extended their necks, and exclaimed that they were ready rather to die than to transgress the law. Overcome with astonishment at such intense religious zeal, Pilate gave orders for the immediate removal of the standards from Jerusalem.⁸⁰

He could be callous and inhuman:

(2) He spent money from the sacred treasury in the construction of an aqueduct to bring water into Jerusalem, intercepting the source of the stream at a distance of 200 furlongs. The Jews did not acquiesce in the operations that this involved; and tens of thousands of men assembled and cried out against him, bidding him relinquish his promotion of such designs. Some too even hurled insults and abuse of the sort that a throng will commonly engage in. He thereupon ordered a large number of soldiers to be dressed in Jewish garments, under which they carried clubs, and he sent them off this way and that, thus surrounding the Jews, whom he ordered to withdraw. When the Jews were in full torrent of abuse he gave his soldiers the prearranged signal. They, however, inflicted much harder blows than Pilate had ordered, punishing alike both those who were rioting and those who were not. But the Jews showed no faint-heartedness; and so, caught unarmed, as they were, by men delivering a prepared attack, many of them actually were slain on the spot, while some withdrew disabled by blows. Thus ended the uprising.⁸¹

Pilate was successful as evidenced by his ten years in office. "His key to effective governance was to nip revolutions in the bud."⁸²

The Gospel's depiction of Pilate is incongruent with that of Josephus. A literal interpretation of the Gospels does not depict Pilate as the calculating, shrewd operator, whose primary concern was his political office. Placed into historical context, Pilate emerges as a man who might be disturbed by Jesus' charisma and his title, "King of the Jews". Such a concern would not warrant counsel with the masses or such excruciating contortions to exonerate Jesus. Pilate's concern for political stability would more likely induce Pilate to dispose of Jesus as quickly and as soon as possible.

Since the time of Herod, the High Priest had been appointed by the Roman ruler. It was a position which demanded loyalty to the Roman ruler. Caiaphas must have possessed special qualities for he held the office of the High Priesthood for ten years under two procurators. Such a feat must have required sophisticated political acumen.

and savvy. To successfully serve under Pilate, Caiaphas must have loyally implemented Pilate's will. Consequently, the High Priesthood represented Roman interests in contrast to Jewish interests. Such an historical perspective adds a dimension to the interrogation scenes described by the Gospels (Matt 26:57-58; Mark 14:53-65, Luke 22:65-71). Jesus is questioned by Caiaphas who is the Priest. Jewish officials, described differently in each Gospel (chief priests and elders, Matt 26:47)(scribes and elders, Matt 26:57)(chief priests, scribes, and elders, Mark 15:43)(chief priests, captains of the temple and elders, Luke 22:52)(chief priests and scribes, Luke 22:66) take Jesus to Caiaphas and participate in the verdict. The inconsistent descriptions suggest a concern by each writer to depict a scene which involves Jews in authority. All the Jews are massed together with no distinction made of each group's particular concern. The fact that there are Jews in positions of authority seems more important than who they are. Since Jesus did not antagonize the Pharisees (Scribes),⁸³ it is highly unlikely they would have comprised the council. They represented the majority of the Jewish people. More likely, the council was comprised of a group appointed by Caiaphas to execute his will. Consequently, the council represented the High Priest and his Temple authority. The appointees would appear to have authority, by virtue of the Roman establishment, rather than the authority of the Jewish people; authority to carry out the will of Rome not the authority of the Jewish people.

Conclusion

Jesus did not antagonize the Jews. He spoke in the Pharisaic

tradition which emphasized morality and ethics. Highly charismatic, Jesus appealed to the masses. His teaching inspired a following which threatened Roman rule.

It was a time of turmoil when many charismatic leaders arose promising salvation. The people, oppressed by the tyrannical rule and economic uncertainty, hungered for relief from their suffering. They eagerly clung to any promise of salvation.

Crowds scared Rome. Rome's main interest was to preserve her empire at any cost. Consequently, any threat to her political stability was squelched. Any gathering of the masses around a charismatic leader quickly aroused the suspicion of Rome. This forced the Roman government to crush any effort which it suspected to be a challenge to her sovereignty. Such was the case with Jesus. An outspoken idealist, Jesus and his followers were perceived as a serious threat to Roman political stability. When Pontius Pilate, the Roman procurator, questioned Jesus' role, he saw him as a political agitator, as "King of the Jews". For this Jesus was crucified.

Footnotes

- ¹Dennis Prager and Joseph Telushkin, Why the Jews?, (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1983) pp.90-109.
- ²Robert M. Seltzer, Jewish People Jewish Thought: The Jewish Experience in History, (New York: MacMillian Publishing Company, 1980), p.632.
- ³Robert M. Grant, Historical Introduction to the New Testament (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1963), pp.127-132.
- ⁴Zeitlin disagrees, please refer to section on Luke.
- ⁵Sanford Marvin Shapero, "The Jewishness of the Author of the Gospel of Matthew" (Rabbinic Thesis, Hebrew Union College, 1955), pp.13-16.
- ⁶Solomon Zeitlin, Who Crucified Jesus?, (New York: Bloch Publishing Company, 1964) p.108.
- ⁷Zeitlin, p.108.
- ⁸Shapero, p.96.
- ⁹Ibid., p.97.
- ¹⁰Grant, p.132
- ¹¹Haim Cohn, The Trial and Death of Jesus (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1963), pp.261-262.
- ¹²Ibid.
- ¹³Douglas R.A. Hare, "The Rejection of the Jews in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts", in Alan T. Davies, ed., Anti-Semitism and the Foundations of Christianity (New York: Paulist Press, 1979), p.39.
- ¹⁴Gerard S. Sloyan, Jesus on Trial (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1973), p.36.
- ¹⁵Zeitlin, p.220.
- ¹⁶Ibid., p.108-109.
- ¹⁷Cohn, p.261-262.
- ¹⁸Sloyan, p.40.
- ¹⁹Ibid.
- ²⁰Grant, p.137
- ²¹Ibid.

- ²²Zeitlin, p.108
- ²³Cohn, p.274
- ²⁴Ellis Rivkin, What Crucified Jesus? (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1984), p.92.
- ²⁵Heraclitus, Fragment I cited in R. Walzer, Eraclito: raccolta dei Frammenti (Firenze, 1939), cited in C.K. Barrett, The New Testament Background (New York: Harper and Row, 1961), p.55
- ²⁶Zeno, Fragment 98, cited in J. von Arnim, Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta, I (1938), cited in Barrett, p.62.
- ²⁷Barrett, p.184.
- ²⁸Philo Quis R. d. Heres? 205f, cited in Barrett, p.184.
- ²⁹Rudolf Bultmann, Primitive Christianity (New York: Meridan Books, 1967), p.196.
- ³⁰Ibid., pp.196-197.
- ³¹Zeitlin, pp.110-111.
- ³²Bultmann, pp.196:197.
- ³³Rivkin, What Crucified Jesus?, p.33.
- ³⁴Ibid., p.16; Zeitlin, pp.38-39; Seltzer, pp.182-183; Josephus Jewish Antiquities, XVI:188-201, trans. Ralph Marcus, Ph.D. (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1963), pp.285-289.
- ³⁵Ibid.
- ³⁶Zeitlin, p.40.
- ³⁷Ibid., p.41
- ³⁸Ibid., p.42
- ³⁹S.G.F. Brandon, The Trial of Jesus of Nazareth (New York: Stein and Day, 1968), p.25.
- ⁴⁰Ibid.
- ⁴¹M. Stern, "The Period of the Second Temple" in H.H. Ben-Sasson, ed., A History of the Jewish People (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1976), p.243.
- ⁴²Ibid., pp.244-245.
- ⁴³Ibid., p.239.

- ⁴⁴Josephus, Jewish Antiquities XVII:152-158.
- ⁴⁵Rivkin, What Crucified Jesus? p.17.
- ⁴⁶Josephus, Jewish Antiquities XVII:471-473.
- ⁴⁷Rivkin, What Crucified Jesus? pp.18-19.
- ⁴⁸Josephus, Jewish Antiquities XVII:237.
- ⁴⁹Ibid., 250-253.
- ⁵⁰Ibid., 254-270.
- ⁵¹Zeitlin, pp.61-67; Eurubin 53a; Palestinian Talmud Shabbath 16:8, 7:41.
- ⁵²Zeitlin, pp.34-35.
- ⁵³Ibid., pp.85-86.
- ⁵⁴Ellis Rivkin, A Hidden Revolution (Nashvile: Abingdon, 1978), p.219.
- ⁵⁵Ibid.
- ⁵⁶Ibid., pp.219-220.
- ⁵⁷Ibid., pp.242-243.
- ⁵⁸Zeitlin, p.29.
- ⁵⁹Ibid., pp.25-26.
- ⁶⁰Zeitlin, pp.297-298.
- ⁶¹Rivkin, A Hidden Revolution, p.31.
- ⁶²Ibid., p.43.
- ⁶³Ibid., p.63.
- ⁶⁴Ibid., p.64.
- ⁶⁵Josephus, Jewish Antiquities XVIII:18-22.
- ⁶⁶Ibid., 23-24.
- ⁶⁷Ibid., XVII:271-272.
- ⁶⁸Ibid., 273-277.
- ⁶⁹Ibid., 277-278.

- ⁷⁰ Rivkin, What Crucified Jesus?, p.20.
- ⁷¹ Josepheus, Jewish Antiquities XX:97-99.
- ⁷² Josepheus, Jewish Wars II:261-263, trans. H. ST. J. Thackeray, M.A. (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1967), p.425.
- ⁷³ Rivkin, What Crucified Jesus, pp.110-111.
- ⁷⁴ Cohn, pp.38-39.
- ⁷⁵ Ibid., p.43.
- ⁷⁶ Ibid.
- ⁷⁷ Ibid., p.45.
- ⁷⁸ Ibid., p.98.
- ⁷⁹ Rivkin, p.23.
- ⁸⁰ Josepheus, Jewish War II:169-174.
- ⁸¹ Idem. Jewish Antiquities XVIII:60-62.
- ⁸² Rivkin, What Crucified Jesus?, p.27.
- ⁸³ See Rivkin, "Scribes, Pharisees, Lawyers, Hypocrites: A Study in Synonymity", HUC-JIR Annual, Vol.49, 1978.

Chapter II

For centuries the Jews have been accused of the crucifixion of Jesus. This accusation of deicide has legitimized the torture and murder of Jews in Christendom for nearly two thousand years.¹ It has served as the foundation for anti-Semitic ritual murder charges, riots, boycotts, exclusionary quotas, newspaper attacks, pamphlets and academic treatises denouncing the inferiority of the Jew.² Since the Jews rejected the Christian changes of the nature of God, the messianic and divine claims made for Jesus, and the Christian elimination of law and peoplehood, in Christians' eyes Jews denied the validity of Christianity. Furthermore, because Jesus addressed the Jews, their rejection of his message was viewed as threatening the legitimacy of the Church.

In order to permanently discredit the Jews, the founders of Christianity promulgated a number of theological doctrines.³ It was not sufficient to refute Jewish arguments opposing the divine claims made for Jesus. "The Jews, not their arguments, had to be permanently discredited."⁴ This Jewish rejection of Jesus became the murder of God, the blame generalized from one group of Jews to the entire Jewish nation. "Let his blood be on our heads and the heads of our children." (Matthew 27:25).

These anti-Jewish doctrines permeated the writings of the early Church fathers and became a part of the New Testament.⁵ Later, when the New Testament became the authoritative record of early church history, the accusation of deicide once necessary for theological justi-

fication, became confused with historical accuracy.

This premise became a major part of Catholic and Protestant theology and the source of much anti-Semitism. When the Catholic Church was Europe's most influential force, church law was Europe's law. Many of its laws were directed against the Jews. In fact, in The Destruction of the European Jews, Hilberg concludes that Nazi Germany drew a blueprint from Church anti-Jewish legislation. He constructed this chart to substantiate his thesis:

CHURCH LAW

Jews and Christians not permitted to eat together, Synod of Elvira, 306.

Jews not allowed to hold public office, Synod of Clermont, 535

Jews not allowed to show themselves in the street during Passion Week, Third Synod of Orleans, 538.

Burning of the Talmud and other Jewish books, 12th Synod of Toledo, 681.

Christians not permitted to patronize Jewish doctors, Trullan Synod, 692.

Jews obliged to pay taxes for the support of the Church to the same extent as Christians, Synod of Gerona, 1078.

The marking of Jewish clothes with a badge, Fourth Lateran Council, Canon 68 (copied from Islamic legislation which had decreed that Christians wear

NAZI LAW

Jews barred from dining cars (Transport Minister to Interior Minister), Dec. 30, 1939.

Law for the Re-establishment of the Professional Civil Service, April 7, 1933.

Decree authorizing local authorities to bar Jews from the street on certain Nazi holidays Dec. 3, 1938.

Book Burnings in Nazi Germany.

Decree of July 25, 1938.

The "Sozialgleichsabbgabe" which provided that Jews pay a special income tax in lieu of donation for party purposes imposed on Nazis, Dec. 24, 1940.

Decree of Sept. 1, 1941, authorizing that Jews are required to wear yellow star.

blue belts and Jews, yellow belts).

Christians not permitted to attend Jewish ceremonies, Synod of Vienna, 1267.

Friendly relations with Jews prohibited, Oct. 24, 1941.

Jews not permitted to dispute with simple Christian people about the tenets of the Catholic religion, Synod of Vienna, 1267.

Compulsory ghettos, Synod of Breslau, 1267.

Order by Heydrich for ghettoization of Jews, Sept. 21, 1939.

Christians not permitted to sell or rent real estate to Jews, Synod of Ofen, 1279.

Decree providing for compulsory sale of Jewish real estate Dec. 3, 1938.

Jews not permitted to obtain academic degrees, Council of Basel, Sessio XIX.

Law against Overcrowding of German Schools and Universities, April 25, 1933.⁶

Such anti-Semitism was not only indicative of the Catholic Church. Martin Luther, founder of Protestantism, was a vicious anti-Semite. He depicted Jews as "a plague, pestilence, pure misfortune for our country"⁷ and proposed similar anti-Jewish legislation to that of the Medieval Church. In a pamphlet published toward the end of his life, Concerning the Jews and Their Lies, he outlined these actions against the Jews.

Burn all synagogues
Destroy Jewish dwellings
Confiscate the Jews' holy books
Forbid rabbis to teach
Forbid Jews to travel
Forbid Jews to charge interest on loans to non-Jews
and confiscate Jewish property
Force Jews to do physical labor
Expel the Jews from provinces where Christians live.⁸

Since anti-Semitism, based upon the assumption of deicide, has been such a rampant part of Christian theology and legislation, one

would logically deduce that anti-Semitic doctrines have entered into the textbooks used to educate Christian youth.

Methodology

In order to see whether or not 9th grade curricula blame the Jews, this chapter will review a sampling of 9th grade Jewish and Christian curricula concerning the crucifixion of Jesus. We will evaluate accuracy with respect to the historical analysis of the first chapter of this thesis. Although generally Christianity is most guilty of misrepresenting the gospels as literally accurate, this chapter will also review Jewish textbooks to see how the authors handle a sensitive issue. The following books will be examined:

Protestant - From research done at the resource center at the Green Hills Community Presbyterian Church, used by all Protestant denominations, review of publisher catalogues, and discussion with the Director of the resource center, it was determined that 9th grade Protestant religious schools do not concentrate on Jesus or his death. The following materials were found:

Garrison, Webb
Jesus: God's Man for Others
Part 1 From Galilee to Ceasarea Philippi
The United Methodist Publishing House, Nashville TN 1973
Leader's Guide

Garrison, Webb
Jesus: God's Man for Others
Part 1 From Galilee to Ceasarea Philippi
The United Methodist Publishing House, Nashville TN 1973

Garrison, Webb
Jesus: God's Man for Others
Part 2 From the Mountain Top to Emmaus
The United Methodist Publishing House, Nashville TN 1973

These are workbook/textbooks. Each chapter contains several assignments to be completed in the book, explanatory material, and pictures.

Judas: A Friend Who Betrayed
Pub. for Bible Stories
Cooperative Uniform Series
Christian Education: Shared Approaches
June-August, 1982

This is one chapter in a series of values studies. Each value is approached from the perspective of a Biblical personality.

Catholic - The following texts were found on the high school shelves in the Media Center of the Archdiocese of Cincinnati. According to Sister Mary D. Schmidt, Director of the Media Center, the Catholic curriculum is currently being revised. Presently teachers are left to their own discretion to determine appropriate lesson plans by means of their own individual evaluation of their student needs. The goal is to fill in the gap left by previous training and to strengthen the commitment adolescents have for their church. Teachers do this by teaching Sex Education, Marriage and Family Life, Morality, Sacraments, Church History and Jesus.

In reality, according to Sister Mary Schmidt, few teachers focus upon Church History of Jesus during the 9th grade, although the choice is left up to the teacher's discretion. No one textbook is recommended or used, nor are textbooks systematically reviewed or evaluated because of the enormity of the task. The following textbooks are available for any teacher who desires to use them, either in their entirety or as a lesson supplement:

Coleman, William V. and Patricia R. Coleman.
Jesus: His Basic Teachings.
Twenty-third Publications, West Mystic, CT, 1978.

Crowley, Jacquelin Shehl and Marygrace Peters, O.P.
Jesus God's Son With Us.
Sadlier, New York, 1981

Finley, James and Michael Pennock.
Jesus and You.
Ave Maria Press, Notre Dame, IN, 1977.

Geissler, Eugene
Jesus Our Brother.
Ave Marie Press, Notre Dame, IN, 1970

Gilmour, Peter.
The Jesus Book - Teaching Manual.
Religious Education Division, Wm. C. Brown Co., Publ, 1979)

McKenna, Megan and Darryl Durote
New Testament: Understandings of Jesus.
Vol II of Followers of the Way Series.
Paulist Press, New York, 1978

Smith, Thomas J.
Jesus Alive : The Mighty Message of Mark.
St. Mary's College Press, Winowa, MN, 1978

Wilkins, Ronald J.
The Jesus Book.
Wm. C. Brown Co. Publishers, Dubuque, Iowa 1978

Jewish:

Miller, Milton G. and Sylvan D. Schwartzman.
Our Religion and Our Neighbors.
Union of American Hebrew Congregations, New York, 1971
Miller and Schwartzman wrote this book in response to the opinions and interests of Jewish religious school students. It concentrates on the beginnings of religion, the development of Christianity, the beliefs and practices of the Protestant and Roman Catholic, and the similarities and differences between Judaism and Christianity. It is used by many Reform Religious Schools during the 9th Grade.

Silverman, William.
Judaism and Christianity What We Believe.
Behrman House, Inc., New York, 1968
Silverman uses a comparative technique to teach the

basic beliefs of Judaism, to afford a glimpse into the Christian tradition, and to stimulate learning on the part of the student to respect faiths other than her/his own. He includes an entire chapter entitled "Who Killed Jesus?"

Our purpose is not to provide the reader with a systematic examination of all the material found in each textbook. However, a careful reading of the contents of the books revealed some common themes in the treatment of the subject. These issues will now serve as the focus of our investigation:

1. How the pharisees are portrayed
2. Jewish responsibility for the crucifixion
3. The role of the Romans concerning Jesus' death.

The analysis of the material pertaining to these issues and the conclusions derived from the texts will be supported by documentation from the textbooks themselves.

Our task will be:

1. To evaluate the extent to which these accounts are faithful to the historical account found in primary sources as it was discussed in the previous chapter.
2. In cases where misrepresentation is found, to evaluate the nature of the misrepresentation and its impact on the conclusions that may be derived by the learner.
3. To draw conclusions regarding the overall position held by Jewish textbooks and Christian textbooks on the subject.
4. To draw conclusions regarding the effectiveness of the text as instructional material for the teaching of the crucifixion of Jesus.

How the Pharisees are Portrayed

Christian Textbooks

This issue became a topic of analysis only after a careful reading of the materials revealed a common misrepresentation in the image of the Pharisees as strict legalists preoccupied with executing the letter of the law at the expense of human welfare. They reject Jesus for he profanes the Sabbath (Matt 12:10-14; Mark 3:1-6; Luke 6:6-11) and cites himself as an authority (Matt 12:1-8; Mark 2:23-28; Luke 6:1-5). This is an inaccurate representation of the truth for the Pharisees were the keepers of the oral Law. The oral law, by definition, expanded the written law to provide a more livable legislation. For example the lex talionis, the law demanding an eye for an eye, may seem harsh, cruel and inhuman. The Pharisees did not abolish it, but interpreted it in such a way as to prevent its implementation. They developed a "legal fiction which limited the right of the man who suffered the loss of an eye to take out an eye exactly like his own in size and color. Since it was impossible for two men to have precisely the same organs in every respect, the injured could not make use of the law of talio."⁹ Taken at face value, it is a strict literal interpretation of the law. In actuality, this legal fiction prevents the law's implementation and even abolishes the law.

It is easy to see how one with a superficial understanding could conclude the Pharisees to be legal literalists, but a more complete perspective shows the contrary to be true. As discussed in the first chapter, the New Testament depictions of the Pharisees' may be caricatures designed to complement the humanness and goodness of Jesus or

they may be retroactive additions designed to portray a theological message. None of the Gospels single out the Pharisees as solely responsible for Jesus' death. The Pharisees become part of a large amorphous crowd composed of chief priests and other Jewish officials. Yet most of the Christian textbooks single out the Pharisees as unusually harsh, cruel and inhumane.

The majority of the Christian textbooks reviewed exaggerate the image of the Pharisees portrayed in the New Testament. They depict the Pharisees as legalistic literalists obsessively concerned with the exact observance of the law often at the expense of human life and other virtues. The textbook imagery is vivid making the Pharisees more alive and 3-dimensional and therefore it is even more dishonest in its distortion. Most of the textbooks depicted the Pharisees along the line of Coleman who states that the Pharisees are noted for their "inflexibility and almost furious devotion to the dictates of the Law." (Coleman, p.81) "Furious devotion" implies a passion for the rule itself, and totally neglects the aspects of a respect for the principles behind the law.

Many of the Pharisees proudly set themselves off as the religious experts. In his travels, especially to Jerusalem, Jesus saw some of them being pompous, looking down on the common folk, the sick, and sinners. Keeping laws only served to make many Pharisees proud and unsympathetic toward other people. They generally had no time for the ordinary working person, who was often too uneducated or too busy to be able to keep all the complicated interpretations of the law. (Crowley, p.37)

In other words, the Pharisees were overly preoccupied with the law. They were arrogant, haughty and looked with disdain upon the "ignorant" masses. Such descriptions are used throughout to perpetuate the

negative stereotype of the Pharisees.

Finley describes the Pharisees as a "hard-nosed group strictly Jewish and opposed to both the Romans and the Greek style of thought and life." (Finley, p.185) This implies a mutual exclusion between Jewish and Roman or Greek thought and life, i.e. the Jews rejected any sort of advance in civilization and clung to their outmoded traditional beliefs. This distaste for acculturation is perceived to be a negative trait. No contextual explanation explores the tenuous political circumstances of Jewish life in Judea, the harsh Roman rule which contributed to the Jewish and Pharisaic distaste for assimilation. Nor does such a perception take into consideration the Pharisaic use of Greco-Roman institutions to create a more vibrant form of Judaism (See Chapter 1 - The Pharisees)

Generally the word Pharisees in Christian textbooks is equated with hypocrisy. The two words Pharisee and hypocrites could be used interchangeably. In fact, one lesson whose subject was hypocrisy used the Pharisees as the primary example to explain the term. The purpose of the lesson was to "make it clear that one may be sincerely religious without any hint of hypocrisy." (Coleman, p.83) The lesson explains, "no discussion of hypocrisy in religion can avoid the Pharisees. They have become synonymous with formalism, legalism, a short-sightedness." (Coleman, p.83) This position may sound extreme, but it encapsules the views held by the majority of the Christian textbooks reviewed. McKenna describes the Pharisees as "proud, intelligent, narrowminded and cold." (McKenna, p.28) The "narrowminded" implies a blind and

obsessive adherence to the law without consideration of the purposes underlying the law. "Cold" intimates an inhuman rigidity which does not consider the needs of human beings. The Pharisees are portrayed as hypocritical for their actions betray their words. Their legalistic adherence to the letter of the law violates the original intent of the law.

Another example of an exaggerated misrepresentation almost to the level of a comical caricature occurs in Garrison's, Jesus: God's Man for Others. This book describes Pharisaic tradition by criticizing the Pharisees for scolding Jesus - "because he and his disciples didn't follow age-old customs about washing their hands." Garrison trivializes the Pharisaic concern for ritual purity:

He (Jesus) told people that food can't make your dirty. This was hard for the Pharisees to accept, because they spent a lot of time dealing with the laws about clean and unclean food. (Garrison, Leader's Guide, p.47)

Yet the leaders guide warns:

Try not to go overboard in pointing out the errors of Pharisees. Remember that Jesus over and over said he came 'not to abolish the law, but to fulfill it.' (Garrison, Leaders Guide, p.48)

The warning would be unnecessary if the author had represented the Pharisees more accurately.

I did not find one text which carefully differentiated between the minority mentioned in the Gospels and Pharisees in general. McKenna and Ducote, in the New Testament: Understanding of Jesus, devote an entire chapter entitled "The Jewishness of Jesus." The teacher's manual explains the Pharisees as "separated" or "set aside...they themselves pursued holiness with a passion." (McKenna,

p.34) The book continues:

It is a caricature to imagine that all or even most of the Pharisees were unworthy of the high respect accorded them. This is a common misunderstanding in Christian minds because of the Gospel condemnation of the Pharisees. We must remember though that the Gospels speak only of a minority of Pharisees. (McKenna, p.35)

This explanation was found in only this book. The authors continue to explain that Jesus spoke like a Pharisaic Rabbi and "probably found fault only with a minority of Pharisees." (McKenna, p.35) More importantly, this explanation puts both Jesus and the Pharisees into proper historical perspective by interpreting the material with respect to other historical evidence. The text's information is not simply an elaboration of material pulled directly from the New Testament and understood at face value. It is an interpretation of the material using information gleaned from other sources which indicate that Jesus was a good Pharisaic Jew. (See Thesis Chapter 1).

Crowley's Jesus God's Son With Us has an interesting twist. Jesus was seen to be influenced by Pharisaic teachings. He spoke favorably of them and distinguished between their ideology and behavior.

Jesus was influenced by these Jewish leaders in establishing his own identity . . . But while Jesus advised the crowds to listen to their teaching, at the same time he cautioned them not to follow their hypocritical example. He said:

'The teachers of the Law and the Pharisees are the authorized interpreters of Moses' Law. So you must obey and follow everything they tell you to do; do not, however, imitate their actions, because they don't practice what they preach.'
(Matthew 23:2-3)

Jesus saw some of them being pompous, looking down on the common folk, the sick, and sinners. Keeping laws had only served to make many Pharisees proud and unsympathetic toward other people. They generally had no time for the ordinary

working person, who was often too uneducated or too busy to be able to keep all the complicated interpretations of the law." (Crowley, p.37)

This is one of the most favorable descriptions of the Pharisees that I have read, for it states that Jesus was influenced by Pharisaic teachings. The so called "hypocrites" who followed the law too strictly are not generalized to include the entire population. Hence the reader might infer that some Pharisees were humane or that Pharisaic law was good and the Pharisees were bad. Either way, the Pharisees still remain the villains. They become hypocrites even more when Jesus preaches to do as they say, not as they do (or to do as they teach, but do not imitate their actions. (See Matthew 23:2-3)

Jewish Textbooks

Miller does not mention the Pharisees as a separate Jewish group the Jews are referred to as one group and no distinctions are made. Miller does attempt to highlight Jesus' Jewish background. "Jesus was born of Jewish parents," (Miller, p.56) "By and large, the form and substance of Jesus' message were completely within the spirit of the biblical writers, prophets, and rabbis. In fact, there are parallels to most of Jesus' teaching in Jewish literature." (Miller, p.56) "Jesus was nonetheless a loyal Jew whose most intimate disciples and followers were also Jewish." (Miller, p.59)

Silverman, too, does not single out the Pharisees as a separate group and emphasizes Jesus' Jewishness. "It is from these three points of view, his parents, his birth, and his religious training, that we must agree that Jesus was a Jew. It is to the Jews that the

Christians owe this peerless leader and founder of their faith."

(Silverman, pp.79,80)

Neither textbook used in Jewish schools singles out the Pharisees as a separate group. They emphasize Jesus' Jewish background but do not differentiate the different groups of Jews living in Judea during the time of Jesus.

Jewish Responsibility for the Crucifixion

Most Christian textbooks in this study considered the Jews responsible for Jesus death and describe it as a Jewish conspiracy to rid themselves of a moral gadfly or dangerous heretic. Geissler in his Jesus Our Brother exemplifies this position:

The religious leaders of the Jewish nation decided in solemn conclave that this dangerous prophet must be eliminated and eliminated as quickly as possible.
. . . they pushed and demanded that Jesus be put to death. The Jewish leaders wanted to end the short career of this fearless prophet who so undermined their power and prestige. (Geissler, p.61)

Jesus' teachings alienated the Jewish leaders. Smith in Jesus Alive: The Mighty Message of Mark explains:

The struggle is mounting in intensity; the condemnations are stronger. Jesus becomes more and more fearless, and the Jewish leaders become more and more drastic in their designs to destroy him. (Smith, p.179)

Smith continues to explain that the leaders are so angered by Jesus they plan his demise.

The Jewish leaders leave and plot their next move. They have been embarrassed and challenged, and realize they have to be very clever to trap Jesus. They decide to send two opposing groups to him, the Pharisees who are probably more tolerant of the Romans and the Herodians who object to the Roman occupation. They try to flatter Jesus in an attempt to catch him off guard. They pose a problem to him, one which appears to be impossible to answer correctly. If he gives one answer, then the Pharisees will object; if he

gives the other response, the Herodians will attack him. Armed with this strategy they approach Jesus. He sees through their flattery and dismisses it immediately. He pulls the rug out from under their whole plot by giving a response they haven't even thought about. They're left speechless and defeated once again. (Smith, pp.180,181)

These three passages distort Jewish responsibility for the crucifixion by elaborating on the theme of a Jewish conspiracy. As my material in Chapter One indicates, there was no Jewish conspiracy. Jesus said nothing that was antagonistic or alienating to Jewish groups, he was a Pharisee par excellence. The only possible Jewish complicity was that of the High Priest who was in reality a puppet for the Roman government. These above passages and others similar (Wilkins, p.115; McKenna 31-35) elaborately enhance the few lines in the Gospels which hint of the existence of a Jewish organized-planned action. Only Matthew blatantly states the existence of a Jewish plot (Matt 26:3). Haim Cohn consider this an addition, part of the heavily anti-Jewish schematic theme unique to Matthew, which out of theological necessity sought to blame the Jews. All gospels, except Luke, suggest a possibility of a Jewish plot by describing the crowd as sent from the Jewish officials (Matt 26:47, Mark 14:43, John 18:3) and imply an organized assembly of Jewish officials awaited Jesus' arrival at the house of Caiphas, the High Priest (Matt 26:57, Mark 14:53). These few hints of a Jewish organized action do not reflect historical accuracy, but are later retroactive additions designed to help create a theological message which necessitated Jewish complicity. (See Chapter 1 - Historicity of the Gospels)

These textbooks (Finley, Coleman, Garrison, McKenna, Crowley, Smith) have elaborated on those few literal phrases without giving any

explanation or interpretation. Indeed the literal meaning was exaggerated by the textbooks use of detail which emotionally colors the distortion and thereby intensifies it.

Jewish complicity is further magnified by the omission of the role of the Romans and their impact upon the circumstances of the times. The Romans were not responsible in any way for Jesus' crucifixion because they had no influence in ancient Judea. Since they had no impact, they were not a major part of the population in Judea. "Not that the Romans were everywhere; no, actually, in terms of the total population, there weren't that many Romans living in Israel." (Smith, p.185) Smith, in Jesus Alive, omits the fact that Judea was ruled by a Roman procurator who was directly responsible to the Roman Senate. He continues to explain:

And as we saw earlier, Roman policy was to allow its conquered nations a surprising degree of independence. . . No, the presence of Rome in Jerusalem was crucial not because of any policy or practice, it was crucial because of the Jewish view of their own identity as a 'religious' nation." (Smith, p.185)

Smith overgeneralizes and vaguely assumes that the nature of Roman foreign policy did not affect Judean society. On the contrary the Pax Romana, peace at any price, was the major factor in Jesus' death. The crucifixion of Jesus was a response by Rome to a perceived threat to her political stability. Rome can be seen as a major factor in Jesus' crucifixion. This omission of Roman responsibility and the minimization of Roman influence intensifies the previous accusation of the Jews. It does not allow for any Roman responsibility and places the burden of the guilt entirely upon the Jews. It is a distortion by

omission.

The ramifications drawn from the minimization of the extent of Roman power are also misleading. Since Jews were allowed to rule their own land, religious law became political law - crimes against God became crimes against the state. "To betray the country was to betray God. To be a 'fallen-away' Jew was not only heresy but treason as well." (Smith, p.233) This is not true. Religious offenses were not crimes against the state. The Jews did have some religious autonomy but ultimately they were responsible to the Roman authorities. The High Priest was appointed by the Romans. The Romans allowed the Jews religious autonomy but quickly squelched any threat to Roman political stability. The Romans handled any political crime. The Jews dealt with religious offenses. (See Chapter 1-Nature of Roman Rule)

So Jesus was convicted of blasphemy by a Jewish court which violated all rules of due process.

Smith in his Jesus Alive states:

The High Priest rents his garment, a sign of formal disapproval and judgment against the defendant. The charge is blasphemy, ordinarily punished by stoning. The agreement by the rest of the Sanhedrin implies that the whole nation of Israel was rejecting Jesus. They immediately begin to punish him. (Smith, p.233)

He continues: "The overall impression of this 'trial' as recorded in Mark is that Jesus didn't have a chance." (Smith, p.233)

Crowley, in the same vein, elaborately retells the Passion narrative as a conspiracy in which the Jewish leaders break all Jewish law in order to incriminate Jesus:

The Jewish leaders must have really wanted Jesus out of the way. To get a conviction and have Jesus condemned to death,

they had to break many of the laws of their own legal procedures. First of all, the Sanhedrin, the "supreme court" of the Jews acted contrary to its proper function. The Sanhedrin was supposed to serve as the "counsel for the defense" and try hard to find some reason for mercy toward the defendant. The defendant, as in our courts, was considered innocent until proven guilty. But at Jesus' trial, he was presumed guilty, and the Sanhedrin actually served as the "counsel for the prosecution." They did everything they could to prove that Jesus was guilty. No one stood for the accused.

Secondly, Jewish law required that the evidence of two witnesses was necessary to condemn someone. The witnesses had to be people of outstanding honesty, and they were warned that false witness made them as guilty as the person on trial.

At Jesus' trial many false witnesses were brought forth and no two could agree on their testimony. In the midst of all this confusion, the prosecutors finally came up with evidence that Jesus had said that he would destroy the temple and rebuild it in three days. But this evidence was not even used in the charge against Jesus.

There was a third abuse of justice. According to Jewish law, it was illegal to require the prisoner to answer questions by which he would condemn himself. At this so-called trial, the high priest asked Jesus whether he claimed to be the Messiah:

The High Priest questioned him, 'Are you the Messiah, the Son of the Blessed God? 'I am,' answered Jesus. (Mark 14:61-62)

With this reply he was charged with blasphemy and condemned. Not only was the procedure illegal, but the charge itself was absurd. According to Jewish laws, blasphemy was a misuse of Yahweh's name. Claiming to be the Messiah was not considered to be blasphemy!

Legal procedure did not seem important to the Jewish leaders, and they got their conviction any way they pleased. But now they had a problem: the Jews did not have the authority to execute. Only the Roman authorities could put a person to death. They took Jesus to Pilate, the Roman procurator, and they requested the death sentence.

The Jewish leaders knew that a charge of blasphemy would not make much impression on a Roman who did not believe in their God, so new charges were made up on the spot. They said that Jesus was a political agitator who set himself up as a

king and forbade the Jews to pay taxes to the emperor. Pilate did not seem to believe these charges: otherwise he would have condemned Jesus immediately. He tried ways to satisfy the angry Jewish leaders. He had Jesus whipped, sent him off to Herod for a decision and then gave them a choice between releasing Barabbas, a terrorist, and Jesus. (Crowley, pp.131,132)

In other words, the Jews violated their own due process of law by withholding a proper defense and making the Sanhedrin a kangaroo court. When no reliable witness could be found they dredged up a false charge. They illegally cross-examined the accused and unjustly convicted him of blasphemy. Since they had no power to execute him, they forced the Romans to carry out the punishment.

Jews violated their own due process of law by withholding proper defense and making the Sanhedrin a kangaroo court; when no reliable witnesses could be found they dredged up a false charge and by, illegally cross-examining the accused. They unjustly convicted him of blasphemy. Since they had no power to execute him, they forced the Romans to carry out the punishment.

Crowley elaborately details the narrative to portray a trial by the Jewish Sanhedrin. He assumes Jesus was illegally tried by the Sanhedrin for the crime of blasphemy. This is inaccurate for reasons stated in the first chapter.

The Jews convicted Jesus of a crime which warranted the death penalty, yet they were unable to carry out the death sentence. In order to follow through with Jesus' death, they convinced the Romans of Jesus as a danger, for blasphemy was not a crime against Rome.

These passages assume Jesus was tried by the Sanhedrin for the crime of blasphemy according to court procedure. This is inaccurate for reasons stated in the first chapter.

Since the Jews could not carry out capital punishment, they must convince the Romans of Jesus' danger.

The Sanhedrin now moves to Pilate, in order to get his permission to kill Jesus. Pilate asks Jesus if he is the king of the Jews . . . The stress here is on the political overtones connected with the title of king - politics was a concern of Pilate particularly if the possibility of rebellion was involved. The answer that Jesus gives is a little vague, but it probably amounts to an admission that he is king... (Smith, p.233)

So the Romans kill Jesus, but only after careful persuasion by the Jews.

Although Roman responsibility for the crime is mentioned here, it does not diminish the impression already made of Jewish culpability. In fact, here the Romans simply serve as executioners. They carry out the punishment for the Jews are not able.

The influence of the Romans is distorted in other ways. The Romans are not portrayed as the powerful conquerors with strict domestic policies, but rulers who can be bullied by the Jews. Wilkins writes, "But how, you might wonder, could the Romans be duped into putting Jesus to death?" (Wilkins, p.115) The Romans were not weaklings. They were ruthless rulers whose main concern was the maintenance of an empire.

Another form of misrepresentation distorts the image of Pontius Pilate. Crowley, in her Jesus God's Son With Us, states, "The Jewish leaders know that they now had Pilate cornered...Pilate gave in to save his own skin and ordered the crucifixion of Jesus. (Crowley,

p.132) This is not the picture we have of Pilate according to Josephus. Pilate was known for his vicious conniving in order to achieve his high political aspirations.

Garrison propagates Pilate's distorted image through work with the text. Students are asked to read a few lines from the gospels.

After reading such texts as:

And they cried out again, 'Crucify him.' And Pilate said to them, 'Why, what evil has he done?' But they shouted all the more, 'Crucify him.' So Pilate, wishing to satisfy the crowd, released for them Barabbas; and having scourged Jesus, he delivered him to be crucified (Mark 15:13-15)

Students are asked to write a description of Pilate. The workbook then asks "If it hadn't have been for the crowd, Pilate would have released Jesus. What is your feeling about rule by public opinion?" (Garrison, p.40) This could teach the lesson that one, rule by public opinion can be unjust, or two, Pilate made a mistake. Yet the emotional picture obtained by the reader is that the Jewish crowd hungered for the taste of blood.

The next question asks "How do you explain the mood of the crowd at the trial..." (Garrison, p.40) This not only reinforces the image of the angry crowd, but suggests it had a reason. The picture of an angry, blood thirsty crowd overshadows any lesson about the nature of justice. This lesson reinforces the literal New Testament view as a truthful representation. Students are not asked to question the accuracy of the material itself. The work with the text only reinforces an inaccurate perception of the historical event.

Interestingly, after a detailed explanation of the circumstances, Smith then asks:

Who is responsible for Jesus' death and does it make any difference? Why even ask the question in the 20th Century. Perhaps historians or Scripture scholars would be interested in the details of the death of Jesus, but that's their job. Who really cares, when it comes to their personal, practical lives? (Smith, p.242)

Smith does not mention that Jesus' death was essential for Christian theology. After vivid descriptions which incriminate the Jews beyond the shadow of a doubt and minimize the role of the Romans, Smith questions the need for blame. His statement does not demonstrate the contribution of Jesus' death to Christian theology, and in fact does not counteract the damage already done by the text. He dismissed the concern as an issue for historians or scholars. This seems a half-hearted attempt to prevent anti-Semitism. Its effect is similar to a trial in which the judge asks the jury to disregard an emotional outburst by a witness. Although improper evidence, the outburst has already impressed the jurors. They can disregard it rationally, but not overlook its emotional impact.

One textbook gives a gruesome description of crucifixion. Using the latest medical evidence, the author illustrates how painful such a death would be considering the positions of the nail, body weight, and muscle alignment. (Geissler, p.61) It illustrates the cruelty of the Jews who could destine a man to such a punishment. It is an appeal to the emotions in the guise of scientific evidence which again reinforces a negative picture of the Jews.

Not every textbook blames all of the Jews. Wilkins clarifies that Jesus was never rejected by the Jewish nation as a whole. The common people recognized him as their prophet. Only the Pharisees

were responsible for the "opposition and enmity that eventually led to Jesus' crucifixion." (Wilkins, The Jesus Book, p.123) Wilkins sees the Pharisees as an influential minority. No blame falls on the Sadducees, who tended to be "egotistical, arrogant, and disdainful of the people." (Wilkins, p.121)

Jesus alienated the Pharisees:

Jesus was brought before the Jewish court because he was accused of being an enemy of the Jewish Law - the Torah, or way of life of the Jewish people. He was accused and convicted of corrupting the religious life of the people and of blasphemy, both of which were capital offenses...He was sentenced to be crucified because the Jewish leaders, pressing as strong a case as they could, gave "evidence" that Jesus was inciting rebellion against the Roman emperor.

But the majority (of Jews) were good, honest, religious men. (Wilkins, p.115)

If any Jewish group worked with the Roman authorities, it was the Sadducees, not the Pharisees. Here Wilkins attributes power to the Pharisees which they did not have. The Sadducees worked with the Romans and they were the high priests. It is another example of a distortion of Jewish responsibility for Jesus' death for it blames the wrong group.

Gilmour, in his The Jesus Book, tried to place the crucifixion in perspective with its greater significance.

Yet Jesus' death must be seen and understood in the light of God's overall plan of creation. If Jesus had not died, he would not have been human. "The conflict between Jesus, the Scribes, Pharisees and Sadducees, the Jewish leaders and Roman officials are the historical circumstances which surround Christ's death. (Gilmour, p.99)

This alleviates some of the guilt for the crucifixion for it makes the executioners a means to a greater end. They are part of some divine plan and therefore did not commit an atrocity.

Finley tries to explain the hostility between the Jews and the Christians:

. . . during the quiet rebellion of the Jews against the Romans in 66-70 A.D. Christians refused to fight in this war. As a result, the Jewish people felt betrayed and had little affection . . . for the name (Christianity) (Finley, p.189)

This explains early Jewish-Christian hostility and gives the student a more accurate picture of the times.

There was one 9th grade curriculum which used Judas, the betrayer of Jesus as a lesson on betrayal. Interestingly, there was not one implication of Jewish complicity, nor was Judas mentioned as a Jew.

Judas was one Bible personage used to examine villains of the Scripture, to explore motives for evil acts, and to consider the personal implications of betrayal. There is no mention of Jewish communal responsibility. The character Judas is used to show the personal ramifications. Why did Judas betray Jesus? Three explanations follow none of which implicate the Jews or the Romans. 1. "Someone had to do it and Judas was picked for the job because he was a scoundrel from the beginning." (p.35) 2. "To force Jesus into declaring his messiahship." (p.35) 3. Judas shared the Jewish traditional point of view of the Messiah as an earthly ruler and he "saw Jesus as a false messiah." (p.35)

The Role of the Romans Concerning Jesus' Death

Christian Textbooks

The Christian textbooks underestimate the role of the Romans by neglecting to emphasize the power Rome had over Judea, and by exaggerating the power of the Jews. This is explained more fully in a pre-

vious section.

Jewish Textbooks

Both Jewish texts explained elaborately that Jesus' death was not caused by the Jews, but by the Romans.

Silverman differs from Miller and Schwartzman as to the reasons the Jews did not accept Jesus. Silverman feels that "Jesus separates himself from tradition for he no longer quotes in the name of God or his teachers. 'It has been said in older times, but I say unto you.'" (Silverman, p.93) Although some Jews hailed him as the Messiah, Jewish leaders did not. They worried about Roman reaction to a person hailed as king of the Jews. They also worried about Jesus teaching that obedience to the Torah was no longer necessary. When he let others acclaim him as the messiah, the Son of God, he spoke blasphemy."

Miller feels that,

Jesus is portrayed as a Pharisee par excellent - Yet he antagonized various groups of Jews. "The more observant Jews looked upon him as one who encouraged breaking the laws of the Torah. Those who sought to overthrow the Romans objected to his warning that 'all who take the sword will perish by the sword.' Nor did the priests and other Jewish officials look favorably upon this man who seemed to be disputing their authority." (Miller, p.58)

Miller suggests other reasons for the Jewish discord:

When Jesus saw that his disciples were excited about his revelation of being the Messiah, he decided that all people must know. The Jews 'expected a Messiah who would put an end to the injustices of Roman rule. Instead, he insisted that the people should continue to submit to Roman authority and pay their taxes. Reports were also circulated that he advocated the destruction of the Temple itself, which incurred the anger especially of the priestly class whose religion centered around the Temple and its worship.' (Miller, p.58)

Yet, neither of the authors feel Jesus antagonized the Jews enough to precipitate a revengeful action.

Silverman explains how the Romans were responsible for Jesus' death. His chapter "Who Killed Jesus", begins with a quote from Joel Carmichael, a Christian scholar. Carmichael describes crucifixion as a characteristic Roman execution, never used by Jews as capital punishment. Jesus "was executed as king of the Jews, that is, as a contender for power. This was not a religious matter at all, but it was of direct concern to the Roman state. (Silverman, p.90) The Romans put him to death, not because he was a political rebel, but because "they thought he was an agitator and was setting himself up as king of the Jews." (Silverman, p.92)

Silverman uses Christian evidence to support his point. Silverman discusses the double entendre meaning to the charge of being the Messiah. "You have said it."

You have said it - (I am the Messiah)

You have said it - (not I, believe what you want).

He reminds us that there are conflicting verses in the gospels concerning whether or not Jesus wants us to believe he is the Messiah.

He places Pilate's character into historical perspective. "Wasn't Pilate the one who crucified rebels and those who were against Rome?" "It is difficult to understand why Pontius Pilate should change his whole character all of a sudden, and out of kindness want to save Jesus, who was supposed to be king of the Jews." (Silverman, p.95)

Silverman points out that Pilate was not interested in the reli-

gious arguments of the Pharisees or Sadducees. "...he was very interested and very much concerned about any hint of a political revolt against the power of Rome." (Silverman, p.96)

Silverman then explains Jewish legal procedure. "Anyone who studies Jewish law soon is convinced that the Jews couldn't possibly be guilty of the charge of crucifying Jesus." (Silverman, p.98) Silverman then proceeds to explain the theories which exonerate Jewish responsibility. 1. "It was against Jewish law to have a trial on a Jewish festival, or to execute anyone on the day before a holiday. (Silverman, p.98) 2. Many scholars believe that no Jewish court had the power to sentence anyone to death. 3. It was highly unlikely that a Jewish court would turn a Jew over to the Romans for punishment or to be put to death.

Silverman details Pharisaic tradition as a humane approach to capital punishment which used safeguards to prevent the application of capital punishment in reality. "In the few cases where the death sentence was carried through, the criminal was always given a drug to deaden his senses before the execution." (Silverman, p.94) He mentions that a Sanhedrin which put one person to death in seven years was considered bloody. Eleazor ben Azuryah considered one death in seventy years a bloody Sanhedrin. "Rabbi Akiba and others were opposed to capital punishment at any time or for any reason." (Silverman, p.99)

Silverman explains the procedure of the Sanhedrin but does not interpret the procedure so that readers can understand it with respect to Jesus. One must be fully familiar with the details of the Passion

Narratives in order to recognize the discrepancies between the Sanhedrin's regular procedure and the proceedings with Jesus. He does end the explanation with:

If that same kind of trial had been given to Jesus it would have been impossible for the Sanhedrin to meet the night of Passover, go through all this and hand Jesus over to the Romans to be crucified. . . . The reason we have considered so much of Jewish laws and in such detail is to make it clear to you how ridiculous it is to even believe that the Jews were responsible for the crucifixion of Jesus. (Silverman, pp.100,101)

This makes it all very clear that Jesus was crucified for political reasons and not because of any religious differences. There were always differences of opinion among the Jews, with many opposing factions, groups and sects, but the Jewish authorities never turned opponents over to the enemy to be killed. (Silverman, p.97)

Silverman explains the Jewish hostility in the Gospels:

Most scholars agree that when the Gospels were written, the writers regarded it as dangerous to blame the Romans, and so they put the blame on the Jews. From everything the historians tell us about the Roman procurators, it is difficult to believe that things happened the way the Gospels say they did. (Silverman, p.96)

Silverman concludes his chapter with a several page explanation of anti-Semitism. Blaming Jesus' death on the Jews is part of a total historical perspective and fits into the history of anti-Semitism.

Miller agrees inspite of Jewish opposition, the Romans were completely responsible for Jesus' death.

The Romans knew from previous experience how easily the Jews could be stirred up into a riotous mob that might destroy their garrison in Jerusalem . . . Therefore, Jesus was promptly arrested and charged with treason. . . . The official (Pontius Pilate) promptly condemned him to death as a revolutionary, self-styled 'King of the Jews'. According to the Roman practice of the times, Jesus was taken out and crucified. (Miller, p.59)

Jesus could not have been punished for his teachings:

. . . though somewhat of a mystic, Jesus was nonetheless a loyal Jew whose most intimate disciples and followers were also Jewish. (Miller, p.59)

The gospels are a distortion of the truth. "We also know that Pontius Pilate was scarcely the kind of sympathetic individual pictured by the Gospels. Roman records tell us that he was later removed from his position by the Roman government itself because of his excessive cruelty. (Miller, p.60)

Both of these texts stress Roman responsibility. They do so by explaining accurately how Jesus may have affected various Jewish people in Judea. Yet such teachings were not sufficient to bring about a murder charge. They interpret the New Testament image of Pilate by bringing in other historical information concerning his character. Jewish legal procedure is documented in detail to show how the Jews could not have tried and sentenced Jesus to death. Additional information such as: 1. Many scholars believe that no Jewish court had the power to sentence anyone to death; and, 2. It is highly unlikely that a Jewish court would turn a Jew over to the Romans for punishment or to be put to death, are added to further exonerate Jewish complicity. Miller adds an historical explanation of anti-Semitism to further buttress his case.

Both use historical information in order to interpret the trial and crucifixion story from the New Testament. Often more than one hypothesis is suggested and they may contradict each other (i.e. rationale for no Jewish trial). Yet the conclusions are congruent with the historical analysis found in my first chapter.

Conclusions

Christian Textbooks

All of the textbooks evaluated implicate the Jews as responsible for the crucifixion of Jesus. They do so in both a cognitive and affective way. The most common error is the misrepresentation of the gospel stories as a literal historical truth. Most of the books reviewed elaborate on and enhance the Gospel version of the passion narrative with vivid descriptions and imagery which add to the distortion. In other words, they make the narratives become more than alive for the students. They offer no other explanation or information now available to promote student curiosity as to the reliability of the stories portrayed in the Gospels. Consequently, the Pharisees are portrayed as stubborn literalists preoccupied with the law. The exaggeration of the Gospel caricature becomes so extreme that in some texts Pharisees become synonymous with hypocrites who were overly preoccupied with washing their hands.

The same misrepresentation distorts the image those books portray of Roman influence. Pontius Pilate, for example, is portrayed as humane or scared. This stated role of the Romans is totally inaccurate. The Romans are seen as disinterested, uninvolved, or easily intimidated and this distortion adds to and increases the responsibility of the Jews.

Motivation and power are ascribed to the Jews which does not concur with the historical information. This stems from the Gospel accounts of Pharisaic rejection of Jesus and the scenes which describe Jesus' arrest and questioning. The authors of the textbooks embellish

these incidents to create the existence of an organized, carefully planned, Jewish conspiracy. This conspiracy has the strength to convince or force the Romans to execute its plans. The Gospel text is no longer exaggerated, but used to rewrite history. Through misrepresenting the Gospels as historically accurate, the authors exaggerate untrue caricatures, teach incorrect information, and rewrite their own histories.

These textbooks also supply colorful tidbits which appeal to the emotions of the students. Adjectives such as "hardnosed" and "stubborn" and accounts explaining the gruesome nature of crucifixion, all elicit a response which intensifies the emotional reaction of the student. The student is led to believe the account from both a cognitive and affective perspective. So the misrepresentations used appeals to both reason and the emotions.

A few of the books do try to add material which places the traditional account into perspective. One text called the image of the Pharisees an unfair caricature. Another warned against the assumption that all Pharisees were guilty of the stereotypical image. These instances were few and did little to detract from the total impression of the Jews. They are a start in the right direction.

Students who read these books cannot help but conclude that the Jews killed Jesus. The textbooks distort and misrepresent history and therefore should not be used.

Jewish Textbooks

Clearly the material in these two textbooks was written to exonerate any Jewish responsibility for Jesus' death. Consequently the

story is not reconstructed to tell us what happened, instead they emphasize what did not happen. They offer a list of reasons which prove that Jewish Jesus did not have a Jewish trial. The reasons often are mutually exclusive, yet all are given to prove the innocence of the Jews. The premise seems to be that the Jews are guilty until proven innocent.

The role of the Romans is emphasized with a great deal of explanatory information. This puts the story into proper perspective.

The writers do not deal with the Pharisees at all, because the different segments of Jewish society are grouped together into one. Yet they do explain Jesus' appeal to some Jews and his being a source of antagonism to others. These segments of the society are not named. One would think that this time period could not be explained adequately without a description of Jewish society especially an explanation of the differences between the Sadducees and Pharisees. On the other hand these textbooks devote only a section on Jesus' crucifixion or one chapter, while the entire textbooks focus on a range of other subjects. From that perspective, they have handled the problem nicely. Without making the information too complicated or confusing, they supply enough information for students to understand the nature and the cause of Jesus' crucifixion. A more thorough study would differentiate between the different Jewish sects in order:

1. to show Jesus was a Pharisee and therefore would not alienate the Pharisees;
2. to show the only possible complicity was that of the Jewish High Priest who depended upon Rome to keep his position.

3. to use primary sources to help students better understand the dynamics of the crucifixion.

The study of anti-Semitism present in Christian textbooks is a vast field in and of itself. See Appendix A for a list of themes, misconceptions, exaggerations and omissions which occur in Christian textbooks and contribute to the negative image of the Jew. Appendix B presents a list of themes overlooked or distortions which contribute to the negative image of the Jew. "Themes to be stressed" are themes which are often overlooked and distort the historical time period by their omission. "Themes to be avoided" are common historical misrepresentations. Together, they illustrate some of the distortions which have been perpetuated throughout the years.

APPENDIX A

Significant advances in Roman Catholic relations with Jews are unrecognized in The Word is Life series of Catholic education materials published by Benziger and used in the Archdiocese of Cincinnati. They reflect the historic "teaching of contempt" identified by Jules Isaac in his moving and effective presentation to Pope John XXIII before Vatican II. Careful reading of the texts and teachers' guides uncovers these lapses from official Church pronouncements and practices today:

- * Judaism is negated or belittled through omission or distortion of history. Most references to Jews and Judaism are in the past tense, as though neither lives today. The People of God only is in the Church now.

- * Hebrew Scripture (Old Testament) is not portrayed as a series of affirmations of the devotion of man to God and God to man. Instead, it is portrayed as a series of incidents which demonstrate the weak and sinful nature of the Israelites who never live up to the Covenant. For some mystery of history, God continued to care for the Jews.

- * The true nature of Judaism is not acknowledged.

- * The divisions within Judaism when Jesus lived are not described adequately. Political and social events surrounding Jesus' life, death and resurrection are not included.

- * Roman rule goes unnoticed.

- * Jesus is not presented as a Jew throughout the series. Jesus was an educated, religious, practicing Pharisee who preached to Jews

in a Pharisaic fashion, documented in the Gospels and this is absent from the series.

* Most of the Apostles are not identified as Jews, they were.

* Mary and Joseph are not identified as Jews, they were.

* Judaism, as a positive, living faith for Jews after 100 B.C.E., rarely is mentioned.

* No effort is made to see Jews as Jews see themselves.

Each of these omissions exists in texts used today despite official Church teachings to the contrary in Vatican II documents and those which followed: Nostra Aetate (4), 1965; Guidelines and Suggestions for Implementing the Conciliar Declaration Nostra Aetate (4), by the Commission for Religious Relations with the Jews, 1974; and the Document on Ecumenical and Interfaith Relations of the Sixth Synod of the Archdiocese of Cincinnati, 1971.

Harriet Kaufman, 1977

366 Terrace Ave.

Cincinnati, Ohio 45220

513-751-6381

APPENDIX B

Jesus and His Apostles

1. How is Judaism of Jesus' time described?

a. To be stressed

- 1) Judaism was a diverse and dynamic religion.
- 2) Judaism consisted of many sects and divisions, among the Pharisees. *
 - a) Pharisees grew into an identifiable movement by 150 B.C.
 - b) The focal points for their service to God were worship, study and acts of loving kindness in every sphere of life including the synagogue.
 - c) Pharisees made pilgrimages in Jerusalem to the Temple.
 - d) Pharisees taught an intermediary is not necessary to reach God; each person can pray directly to God and the prayer will be effective.
 - e) Pharisees taught one can have an intimate, personal relationship with God. The father-son expression comes into use during this period.
 - f) Belief in Oral Torah was essential to the Pharisees.
 - (1) Oral Torah is an authoritative way to open written Scripture to continuous development and application; it is used to determine what should be done to be in accord with God's will.
 - (2) People can read and interpret written Scripture and apply it to new circumstances with fidelity.
 - (3) The application of The Written and Oral Torah contains divine revelation.

- b. To be avoided:
 - 1) Teaching that Judaism outlived its usefulness after the Prophets.
 - 2) The falsehood that Judaism was cold and lifeless when Jesus lived.
 - 3) Stereotypes which portray all Pharisees as "blind", and solely following the letter of the law in the practice of their religion.
- 2. What is said about Jesus' and the Apostles' religion, which is Judaism?
 - a. To be stressed:
 - 1) Jesus, His family and His disciples were observant Jews and remained so all their lives.
 - 2) Jesus taught as a Pharisee, was involved in Pharisaic debates, and would have been seen as a Pharisee by his audiences.
 - b. To be avoided:
 - 1) Taking Jesus and His Apostles out of their Jewish context.
 - 2) Bypassing what and how Jesus learned, what His traditions were, which religious observances were special to Him, His family, and His disciples when Jesus' humanity is discussed.
 - 3) Showing Jesus' teaching as opposed to that of the Pharisees, when in fact it is based on Pharisaism and was Pharisaic both in tone and in content.
- 3. What is the relationship of the teaching of Jesus to Judaism?
 - a. To be stressed:
 - 1) His teachings were Jewish; most of what He taught were teachings of the Pharisees:
 - a) Worth of the individual person in God's sight. (Matt. 7:26-34)
 - b) Opposition to the primacy of priestly, cultic system. (John 4:23-24)

- c) A direct relationship of each individual to God the Father. (Matt. 6:5-25)
 - d) Scripture as the constitutional base for the corporate life of the Jewish community. Scholars of the Torah were encouraged.
- 2) Jesus used Jewish methods of teaching: reading Scripture, homilies, and parables. (i.e.: Lev. 19:17, Deut: 6:5, 10:12, 15; 11:1, 13, 22;; 30:6, 16, 20)
 - 3) Jesus' condemnation of some Jewish practices sound unusually harsh but such criticism is in prophetic tradition of Judaism.
- b. To be avoided:
- 1) The impression that all Jesus' teachings were totally new and different from or even opposed to Judaism of his time.
 - 2) Failure to recognize contributions of the Pharisees to Judaism and to Jesus.
 - 3) Failure to acknowledge Jesus had close friends among the Pharisees.
4. How is Jesus' death treated?***
- a. To be stressed:
- 1) Crucifixion was a Roman punishment, not Jewish.
 - 2) Jesus' healing was not defiance but application of the principle of primacy of the person -- a Jewish belief.
 - 3) Most Jews in Jesus' time lived outside the Holy Land and never knew Jesus, and they could not have "rejected" Him and His teaching.
 - 4) Jesus was crucified by the Romans because he was a threat to the Romans and the Sadducean Jewish priestly elite (the Temple party who were collaborators).
 - 5) Christian Scripture, especially John and Acts, come out of painful separation of the Jewish and Christian communities so Christians are seen as heroes and the Jews as villains.***

b. To be avoided:

- 1) The impression that masses of Jews or Jewish religious leaders were enemies of Jesus. (Opposition was political and limited to a small group within the Temple party).
- 2) The idea Jews are the "bad guys" in the Passion story.
- 3) Using "the Jews" in statements where "some of the Jews" should be used.
- 4) The idea "blindness" was the reason most Jews did not follow Jesus.
- 5) The impression Jesus was killed for religious rather than political reasons.

* See Ellis Rivkin, The Shaping of Jewish History (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons), 1971.

** See Eugene Fisher, Faith Without Prejudice, "Who Killed Jesus?" (New York: Paulist), 1977, p.76-88

*** Ibid, p.54-75.

Footnotes

- ¹Dennis Prager and Joseph Telushkin, Why the Jews? (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1983), p.18.
- ²Robert Seltzer, Jewish People Jewish Thought: The Jewish Experience in History (New York: MacMillian Publishing Company, Inc., 1981), p.632.
- ³Praeger, p.92.
- ⁴Ibid.
- ⁵Ibid.
- ⁶The Destruction of the European Jews, n. 30, quoted in Praeger, pp.105-106.
- ⁷Ibid., p.107.
- ⁸Ibid., pp.107-108.
- ⁹Solomon Zeitlin, Who Crucified Jesus? (New York: Bloch Publishing Company, 1964), p.120.

Chapter III

What special considerations are necessary in designing a course of study for Jewish adolescents concerning the crucifixion of Jesus? This chapter will review adolescent psycho-social and cognitive development in order to determine the stage most appropriate to the nature of the material.

Any subject matter cannot be effectively learned, unless the student is ready. Readiness implies a biological capability of learning the material with relative ease and an interest which requires a certain psychological and social readiness. The material must be interesting yet familiar enough to be comprehensible. If overly familiar, it will not motivate the student to further exploration. If too difficult to comprehend, it will overwhelm and frustrate the student.¹

When reviewing the developmental stages of adolescence, it is important to remember that the study of the crucifixion of Jesus is of such a nature as to effect both the cognitive and affective domain of the student. The subject matter is one of historical analysis which lends itself to certain cognitive processes. The study of history requires the ability to conceptualize, understand the relationship between cause and effect, analyze, problem-solve, and test hypotheses in a systematic way. All of the above processes require a level of cognitive development generally reached in adolescence. Under the subject of cognitive development, this chapter will detail which stages of adolescent cognitive development are particularly efficacious for the study of history.

Also, inherent in the topic are areas which can have an impact upon the affective realm of the adolescent. The reactions are not predictable, but depend upon each adolescent's individual sense of identity. Since the United States is predominantly Christian, the Jewish youth is raised as a minority. Does minority status affect the development of identity especially that of the Jewish adolescent who is in the midst of identity formation? Do constant reminders of exclusion erode at or contribute to feelings of self-esteem and self-worth? How are these feelings affected by implications of Jewish responsibility for the crucifixion, often a major part of Christian theology?² Although the ramifications of growing up Jewish in the Christian United States are a thesis by itself, and beyond the scope of this paper, it is important to note as a factor in the psycho-social development of the Jewish adolescent in the United States. Since it is impossible to divorce the study of the crucifixion from the Jewish adolescent's personal feelings about his/her Jewish identity in relation to Christianity, this chapter will also mention some of the effects minority status can have upon identity formation.

"The concept of adolescence is ours."³ Most cultures have a distinct rite of passage accompanying puberty which demonstrates to all members of the society that this person is no longer a child and must accept the responsibilities and privileges of adulthood. In our society, adolescence has become an extended transition period where the psycho-social developmental tasks have been superimposed into a necessary economic dependency necessitated by our highly technical and specialized society.

Erikson discusses the task of adolescence as the attainment of a sense of age identity. During adolescence, sexual changes and other physiological maturation force reorganization of the self-concept. During this time, the adolescent uses his/her experiences to help clarify his/her own self identity.⁴ Erikson calls the task of adolescence "identity vs. role confusion." A person must resolve the conflicts and problems brought about by his 1) physiological changes, 2) family relations, 3) same-and-opposite-sex peer relations, 4) cognitive and intellectual growth, and 5) personal identity.⁵ At this time a person must integrate the data from his/her outside world with the meaningful experiences of his past to create a new self-concept or identity workable in the world as he sees it now.

1) Physiological changes.

The adolescent begins to experience physical sexual maturity. This phenomenon is of universal importance. Many cultures have puberty rites and initiation rituals which mark the transition from childhood to adulthood.⁶ Since economic survival in the United States requires a prolonged maturation process, the transition from childhood to adulthood becomes a kind of limbo. The body is biologically ready for adulthood, yet the psyche and the mind are constantly reminded of their dependence. They are immature compared to cultural standard. This conflict produces a tension - the resolution of which contributes to adolescent emotional growth.

During adolescence the body changes causing the need for the adolescent to re-adapt his/her self-concept to fit a changed body and a new image. This can produce a preoccupation with self. Most adoles-

cents carefully review their bodies only to confirm their worst suspicions of inadequacy. Scrutiny of appearance, dissatisfaction with self, efforts to change, and a preoccupation with culturally determined standards of judgement constitute a sizable chunk of adolescent life. Puberty changes cause changes in the body image which force changes in the self-concept.⁷ Once the initial impacts of puberty changes are accepted, various social psychological processes allow the changes to be integrated into a reorganized self-concept. These changes may bring about a confusion about sex and the adolescent's expected role. Traditional social, cultural or family values may conflict with our rational ethos where through the media, sex is considered a prize commodity, an end in itself.⁸

2) Family Relations

During adolescence, the adolescent tries to emancipate himself from his parents to achieve independence. S/he tries to withdraw from adult benevolent protection. In this task, the adolescent moves away from dependence upon his family to interdependence 1) with his peers, 2) with his elders, who may now try to control and direct the adolescent even more than before, which results in active rebellion by the adolescent, and 3) with younger children on a "beginning-to-care-for-and-nurture level."⁹ Douvan and Adelson describe the effort toward independence as the keystone of adolescent family relations, and give this phenomenon the status of a traditional, mythical model for adolescent behavior.

In folklore and in heroic fiction, we find the recurring pattern - the adolescent hero, having received some sign, and inner stirring or an outer call, gets ready to leave the family. The paths to departure vary. Some must struggle to leave, others must flee for their lives; some leave vindictively, full of hate, thrashing the father or mother,

while others carry themselves beaten or betrayed before they leave; some leave in high expectation, carrying the family's hope for fortune or redemption, and others leave at dead of night, in disgrace, bearing the family's curse. The hero's journey begins with an ending - the breaking of the connection to home.¹⁰

This quest for independence is complicated by an ambivalence, the desire for independence, and at the same time a fear of not being ready. Such ambivalence creates additional tension and conflicts which complicate the process.

3) Same-and-Opposite-Sex Peer Relations

Intimate friendships help the teenager explore and define his/her own self concept. During this time, adolescents seek out relationships with other teenagers. They spend hours sharing, exploring ideas and values. Relationships with others, especially of the opposite sex are projections of his/her own confused image, a kind of sounding board for the development for his/her ideas. It is an opportunity for the adolescent to develop increased feelings of self-esteem.¹¹

4) Cognitive and Intellectual Growth

To recreate the historicity of the crucifixion from the existing evidence requires the mental agility which develops and becomes more refined during adolescence. Piaget calls this stage of development "Era IV" or the development of "formal-operational thought." True formal thought is the process of problem solving in its most sophisticated sense. It is the ability to think about thinking.¹² The attainment of this stage of true formal thought requires the acquisition of a combination of many finely tuned cognitive skills.

Grasp of Metaphor

Adolescents, unlike children, are able to understand metaphors and

symbols. They no longer understand everything literally, but are able to sense the multiple meanings inherent in a given word, picture, gesture and idea. An awareness develops of the nuance and possibility of multiple meanings and interpretations. Children, on one hand, have difficulty understanding that the term rat or dog can be applied to people because they cannot grasp that a person can be like a rat or dog in some respects and not in others. That is why they do not understand the point of political or satirical cartoons nor grasp the metaphorical social significance of stories like Gulliver's Travels and Alice in Wonderland. Adolescents, on the other hand, can grasp the deeper meanings embedded in these metaphorical tales.¹³

This ability to understand metaphor considerably expands the adolescent's range of understanding. It is particularly necessary for the historical analysis of the time period during the crucifixion of Jesus. Such historical analysis requires that the student look at the only remaining historical evidence (Gospels and Josephus) and place them in perspective by considering the possibility of multiple meanings and interpretations. Narrative statements and quotations must be evaluated through the systematic consideration of the possibility of multiple meanings ranging from the literal to sarcastic irony, often in direct contradiction to the face value meaning of the words. To be able to do this, the student must be aware of the range of possibilities; that statements can be literal, satirical, evasive, eulogical, sarcastic, and tongue-in-cheek. The content of this course fits naturally into the adolescent's ability to understand metaphor and will help the student better refine this ability through analysis of historical materials.

Ability to Reason Through the Use of Symbols

During adolescence, the teenager moves from the stage of concrete operations, the ability to constitute a logic of objects and of the relationship between objects to one of formal operations where 1) he can constitute a logic of propositions. Concrete operations manipulate objects, formal operations manipulate concepts about objects and their relationships.¹⁴ The adolescent need not learn only through direct experience (enactive), nor by their imitation of observation (iconic), but by the use of symbols.¹⁵ This means that the adolescent need not directly experience the circumstances of the time of Jesus to understand them, nor must s/he learn through the aid of her/his senses such as visual representation. S/he can rely totally on symbolic representation. "Thus one might learn the concept of swimming through doing it (enactive), through viewing a filmstrip on swimming techniques (iconic), or through reading a book on the topic (symbolic)."¹⁶ During adolescence symbolic representation dominates.

The adolescent, from age 11 and beyond, can reason about verbal propositions. This means he can come to logical conclusions through the use of symbols. S/he can manipulate ideas without actually seeing the objects or situations they represent.

This skill is particularly necessary for the study of history where the student must recreate situations which have already occurred.

Ability to Conceptualize

During adolescence the ability to conceptualize becomes more refined. Concepts are categories of objects or events which share a particular relationship, pattern, or sequence. Concepts expediate the

study of history for they provide an organized framework on which to hook facts and information. Concepts facilitate learning for they provide a schema which helps organize material into meaningful information which the mind can digest. During adolescence, the student begins to conceptualize through the use of symbols and consequently is ripe for the study of history.

For example, an island consists of the following critical attributes: land, water and surrounding body. To be an island the land must be surrounded by the water; hence the rule or relationship. Water surrounded by land is not an island, but a lake. Although many concepts share critical attributes, they often differentiate with respect to the rule (pattern, sequence, relationship).¹⁷ The development of awareness of such distinctions helps prepare a student to observe the world with a critical eye. The study of history requires an analysis of such relationships, patterns, and sequences and is particularly appropriate on the adolescent who is beginning to finely tune such skills.

Ability to Understand Cause and Effect

This ability requires an ability to analyze the relationship between objects, events, or situations. It requires the ability to reason, use logic and conceptualize - pull similarities and generalities. To do this the student must fully comprehend the idea and be able to translate it from one medium to another. S/he must be able to dissect the idea into its basic components and understand the relationship of the parts to the whole. This requires the ability to identify motives, reasons or causes. From analysis the student will be able to conclude, infer, generalize, support or refute.¹⁸

Since the adolescent's reasoning ability has developed to allow him/her to understand and manipulate information through the use of symbols, his/her cognitive development is ripe for the analysis of the historical circumstances surrounding the death of Jesus. Through reason and logic the student must be able to understand what was offensive about Jesus, who Jesus offended and who had power to implement any sort of punishment. To speculate about the motives of Pontius Pilate and the jurisdiction of the Sanhedrin, one need understand the nature of Roman rule and its policies towards conquered territories. One need understand Roman treatment of non-Roman citizens and the nature of perceived threats to its power.

This material meets the adolescent at his cognitive developmental level and helps develop his/her skill even more.

Ability to Think in Terms of Ideals and Contrary-to-Fact Conditions

In addition to being able to grasp the relationship between cause and effect, the adolescent can for the first time, think in terms of ideals and of contrary-to-fact-conditions. Now s/he can think of all possible situations and events and nuance of those which have never existed. Unlike the child who lives in the present and who is concerned with what is rather than with what might be, the adolescent can accept the contrary-to-fact proposition and reason from it.¹⁹

This is a necessary skill for the study of history. Systematic problem-solving requires the testing of various hypotheses. To do so accurately, one must be able to construct multiple hypothetical situations from the existing information and compare the results in order to accurately analyze the conclusions. Only by testing all feasible solu-

tions does validity result. This requires an ability to conceptualize ideal relations and their causes and to actively consider propositions which might first appear to be contrary to fact.

The material of our course demands an ability to separate interpretations which have been perceived as reality traditionally, and to critically examine the material through the use of reason using the source materials. To do so requires the ability to reconstruct the material actively by concluding from propositions which may seem contrary to fact.

Introspection

In addition to being able to reason about verbal propositions, the adolescent is able to examine his own thinking. They re-evaluate their values by introspectively reviewing their own mind, beliefs, ideals, and hunches. The adolescent may choose to disclose this part of himself or herself or keep it private. At times to maintain privacy, the adolescent may say one thing while thinking another. Unlike the child who says whatever pops into his or her mind, the adolescent can be more tactful. But the adolescent can also be more given to intentional manipulations of the truth.²⁰

Since this course content material deals with what could be perceived as a scar on Jewish history, the course offers the Jewish adolescent an opportunity to examine his/her tradition with respect to ideals and hopefully will help build affection for Judaism through the act of appraisal of this difficult question. The religious school setting which permits such a critical analysis offers value for by condoning ethical questioning and examination it affirms the adolescent

for the processes which are a part of himself or herself. (There is no penalty for thinking abnormally nor prize for results). The course structure and content will emphasize the process which is particularly congruent with the adolescent's cognitive and emotional development. Encouragement to question encourages the adolescent to openly express issues on his/her mind and does not promote the creation of a pretext to conform to a preconceived study. Such a setting which imbues such values, will later be valued by the adolescent, not so much for the cognitive content, but the affective nastaesla associated with the affirmation and not denial of self at his/her most critical time. Its a subtle way of building good, strong Jews.

Adolescent's exhibit remarkable changes in their ability to problem-solve. A child can not distinguish clearly between hypothesis and facts. The adolescent, on the other hand, gives priority to facts over the hypotheses, because s/he can distinguish between his/her "own guesses" and the facts of the case. This is demonstrated by the experiment in which both children and adolescents read a paragraph about Stonehedge, in England. The formations of boulders are considered to be the work of prehistoric people. The children and adolescents were asked to evaluate, on the basis of the information given, whether the formations were created as a fort or as a religious shrine. The children based their decision upon a single bit of evidence. When challenged, they did not change their interpretations, but instead tried to re-evaluate the facts. They tried to change the facts to fit the interpretation rather than the opposite. Adolescents, on the other hand, immediately gave up an interpretation which seemed to contradict the

evidence and devised a new interpretation.²¹

This skill is necessary for our material because it helps the student evaluate the accuracy of hypothesis. It is necessary for good scientific method for testing hypotheses systematically.

Not only is the adolescent able to distinguish between facts and hypotheses, he is able to deal with complex problems involving many factors simultaneously...for example, the impact of a moving object will depend upon its mass, its rate of speed and the object that it hits. In order to study any one of these variables, the others have to be held constant, yet the adolescent must be aware that the impact is a result of all factors involved. Children can deal with situations in which two factors play a part, but only in adolescence can a young person deal with causal situations in which there are multiple determinants.²²

The development of all these cognitive processes culminate in the maturation of what Piaget describes as "formal-operational thought."

Inferences through logical operations upon suppositions or 'operations upon operations'. Reasoning about reasoning. Construction of systems of all possible relations of implications. Hypothetico-deductive isolation of variables and testing of hypotheses.

Substate 1. Formation of inverse of the reciprocal. Capacity to form negative classes (for example, the class of not all crows) and to see relations as simultaneously reciprocal (for example, to understand that liquid in a U-shaped tube holds an equal level because of counter-balanced pressures).

Substate 2. Capacity to order triads of propositions of relations) for example, to understand that if Bob is taller than Joe and Joe is shorter than Dick, Then Joe is the shortest of the three).

Substate 3. True formal thought. Construction of all possible combinations of relations, systematic isolation of variables and deductive hypothesis-testing.²³

The first stage of these formal operations is considered to develop between the ages of 10-13, the second, 13-14, and third formal operation develops between the ages of 15-16 years.²⁴

Personal Identity

During adolescence the resolution of the conflicts presented by physiological changes, family relations, same-and-opposite sex relations, and cognitive intellectual growth all contribute to the adolescent's sense of personal identity. This is the main task of adolescence and all the other dimensions revolve around resolution of this main issue.

Personal identity stands as the central feature of the self-concept. Identity is at first shaped by experiences influencing the self-concept. Later on, as the sense of identity is more developed, the identity begins to shape experiences influencing the self-concept. Interests, moral and religious values, vocational choices or predispositions, and related achievement motives are sorted out and organized in terms of personal identity. The different dimensions of the self are drawn together to form a unitary centering on the person's core sense of him/herself as an individual. The adolescent begins to sense he/she's place in perspective with his/her environment. The orientation is to a larger, more realistic understanding of his/her environment. This identity is accompanied by a new, more realistic world view. His/her sense of identity is associated also with the priorities and interpretations given to various experiences. The adolescent's sense of him/herself as a unique individual can be seen as an emerging organizing force, which draws together various dimensions of the self, and enables him/her to begin resolving the conflicts and confusions characteristic of personality development during this period. The storm and stress of adolescence is ultimately

resolved by the emergence of a unifying sense of personal identity:

Identity seems to be the oil that calms the rolling waters of adolescent personality. We get that soothing oil by slowly and painfully wringing it out of our experience - a drop at a time, like as not, as we face and work through the problems of this period.²⁵

This experience is characterized by certain features which help the adolescent become more aware of his/her place in the universe. The adolescent becomes more conscious of his/her self in interaction. The adolescent must find meaning for his experience in the world. The meaning must be congruent with his feelings of self.²⁶ This process can be painful depending upon the adolescent's strength, of the adolescent's prior ego development and his interpretation of the world's discrepancies.

The conscious awareness of self in interaction helps the adolescent place his/her own perceptions into perspective. The adolescent becomes aware of his/her own subjectivity. The developed ability to reason from the contrary now gives the adolescent the option of thinking in ideals. This can be a potential source of conflict. Now the adolescent can distinguish between the "real" and "ideal". Upon comparison, the "real" often comes up short whether the adolescent be evaluating self, family, school or society.²⁷

During adolescence:

One is able to imaginatively transcend empirical evidence to construct ideal states or regulative norms. With the ability to extrapolate or imagine perfection, the adolescent mind can be quite harsh in judging friends, parents, social or political conditions generally or the self. Now able to conceive of the possibility of an infinity of perspectives on a problem, the adolescent shows a marked improvement in taking the perspective of others and a tendency to an overconfident distortion of other's perspectives through over-assimilation of them into his or her own.²⁸

So adolescence becomes a time of constant re-evaluating of values:

Though the formation of values is a lifelong developmental process, it peaks in adolescence, it is related to both thinking and feeling, and is influenced by human interaction. In our culture where young people are likely to be exposed to a variety of contradictory values, questioning begins even in childhood. The adolescent engages in re-evaluation of values that have been either accepted at an earlier age or simply rejected because of individual resistance. He moves beyond simple perception (if I burn my hand and it hurts) and sees things in a moral framework as "good" and "bad". He is consciously searching for value clarification. He becomes a moral philosopher concerned with "shoulds" and "oughts". Given the inconsistency of a society whose institutions frequently do not follow the general intent of the ideological system, value confrontations are inevitable.²⁹

The adolescent preoccupation with ideologies, moral creeds and personal values cause the adolescent to experiment.³⁰ Experimentation is an adolescent's way of learning about his own and the surrounding reality. The adolescent must experiment with other circles of life in order to understand his own. This experimentation includes a feeling of risk.³¹

The need to experiment compounded with the fragile nature inherent in this prolonged transition from childhood towards adulthood causes the adolescent to be moody. Certain feelings accompany the resolution of the tasks of adolescence. A mixture of audacity and insecurity accompany the need to experiment. Loneliness and psychological vulnerability are two other qualities of adolescence. If the outcome of an experiment is negative, the experience can be painful. Adolescents do not have a "bank" of positive experiences to draw from when defeat occurs. Enormous mood swings are another quality of

adolescence. Several factors contribute to these swings. Physiological changes affect emotional changes. Tension and conflicts are caused by the process of moving from dependence to interdependence. The impact of peers is intensified. The adolescent suffers from ambivalence caused by a desire to be an adult and the desire to have things stay as they are. Feelings of omnipotence conflict with feelings of helplessness and inadequacy. Adolescents are expected to act as adults yet often are treated as children. seeing parents as frail humans instead of all-wise can be terrifying. Adolescents have a strong need for peers. A peer group gives the adolescent support while he is going through the traumatic experience of adolescence. Adolescents are both argumentative and emotional while testing out their own value systems and relationships with the outer world.³² As the adolescent does not have a solid foundation of emotional stability to quiet his/her fears and resolve the tensions, but a flaky set of mood swings which at times can only exacerbate the problems.

These needs are more complex when the adolescent comes from a minority cultural group. Jews are minorities in the United States and this can be viewed as either advantageous or disadvantageous. Perceptions differ among Jews. Our society perpetuates myths which exaggerate stereotypes.³³ These myths contribute to the formation of attitudes and to the deliverance of moral judgements and explanations about Jewish lifestyles. Negative stereotypes do exist about Jews in the United States. Jews can be pushy, stingy.

Minority status can imply a deficiency inherent in non-membership of the dominant cultural group. Jewish adolescents, who may be parti-

cularly sensitive, may feel deficient because they do not belong to the majority. They may feel defective because they are not Christian. The feelings felt by a subordinate minority group are expressed extremely well in the following passage by G.E. Von Grunebaum. The writer was commenting on the feelings expressed by the Arab population when conquered by European colonial powers. It has universal implications. The subordinate cultural group:

always want to imitate the victor in his distinctive marks, his dress, his occupation, and all his other conditions and customs. The reasons for this is that soul (psyche) always sees perfection in the person who is superior to it and to whom it is subservient. It considers him perfect, either because the respect it has for him impresses it, or because it erroneously assumes that its own subservience to him is not due to the nature of defeat but to the perfection of the victor. If that erroneous assumption fixes itself in the soul (psyche), it becomes a firm belief. The soul, then, adopts all the manners of the victor and assimilates itself to him. This, then, is imitation.

Or, the soul (psyche) may possibly think that the superiority of the victor is not the result of his group feeling, or great fortitude, but of his customs and manners.

...the (subordinate cultural group) can always be observed to assimilate themselves to the victor in the use and style of dress...³⁴

The group may react by deliberately copying superficial behaviors or perceived values - for example, by assimilation. People may also react to the "attraction-repulsion" conflict by overtly behaving in a manner distinctly different than that of the dominant group. The differences between the two groups are emphasized with an accent on the innate goodness of the qualities of the subordinate group. These distinctions can be made on a superficial, material level (clothes, hairstyles, possessions) or on a deeper, more substantial level (behavior, values). This is exemplified by the word goyisha, which

for many Jews has the implication of inferior because of not being Jewish.

This phenomenon is limited to areas of the members "perceived" distinctions. The perceived difference may not accurately reflect the nature of the actual difference and will therefore distort the perception of the changed behavior.

This perceived inferior status results in the damage to self-esteem, destruction or elimination of ethnic or religious ritual, incorporation of foreign cultural traits, disintegration of the family unit as the younger generations become more and more assimilated, and finally, loss of social cohesion among the so-called groups because of their inability to retain their own culture, or their desire to escape completely into the mainstream.

Such issues which question the validity of his/her identity of question inherent goodness of his/her background strive as one more complication in the adolescent's search for identity.

Moral Development

Formal-operational thought makes a re-evaluation of values possible. The adolescent begins to be able to reflect on the life course from "above" or "beside" it. Formal operational thought brings the ability to construct a personal past and to anticipate a personal future, based on expected or projected developmental transformations of the self. It is the beginning of a disciplined and conscious effort at shaping one's life in accordance with self-discerned patterns and aspirations.³⁵

Almost parallel with the appearance of early formal operations (usually about eleven) there emerges a new dimension in which adoles-

cents consider the perspective of others. With the earlier concrete operational form a child develops the ability to see the perspective of another and compare it to his/her own. This ability enhances knowledge of the object, for the child can compare and contrast the two perspectives which expands his/her awareness of the object. During adolescence when formal-operational thinking develops, the adolescent cannot only perceive another's perspective, but can also construct the perspective of the other on the self. "Put in personal terms again, 'I see you seeing me; I construct the me I think you see.' This interpersonal perspective becomes mutual and is understood as such. "When I begin to construct your perspective on me, I soon recognize that you, likewise, are constructing my perspective on you. Hence, 'I see you seeing me; I see you seeing me seeing you.'" ³⁶

The ability to perceive mutual interpersonal perspective creates an ability to regard self or others more objectively. The coordination of those two objective perspectives on self and others makes for the creation of what may be called a "third-person" perspective. It creates a more dispassionate perspective, inclusive of the perspectives of both the self and other, but not identical with or under the control of either. The third person perspective is potentially a shared construction, something both or several partners cooperate in. ³⁷

The capacity for perception of the third-person perspective greatly strengthens the ability to judge justice and fairness required in a situation of interpersonal conflict. During this stage "being good" is important and means that one's intentions should show concern for others. It means valuing trust, loyalty, respect, and gratitude

within mutual relationships. The need to be a good person stems from the desire to maintain rules and authority which support stereotypical good behavior. No longer is the adolescent primarily concerned with fulfillment of his/her own needs. Goodness is recognized as a virtue, in and of itself. Goodness is understood by placing self in the other's position and has not yet been generalized into an awareness of universal moral principles.³⁸

During adolescence the adolescent must integrate his/her newly developing cognitive skills and physical changes with a psychological structure which fits into his/her environment. This transition occurs over a period of several years. The rate of development varies among adolescents and is influenced by individual genetic structure, personality predisposition and particular environment. Yet one can find common development of characteristics which pertain to the various age levels. For this reason this course is recommended for the 14 year old, 8th grader who is in the Pre-Confirmation class. The reasons follow:

The 14 year old has moved from the sensitive stage of introspection and become open, enthusiastic and eager to express their feelings, fears and worries.³⁹ This is ideal for a class based upon discussion and the comparison of perspectives. Fourteen year olds have an increased emotional maturity which allows them to plan ahead for the future.⁴⁰ They are able to delay gratification for later rewards. So the 14 year old can discuss issues that do not have immediate resolutions without an undue sense of frustration. S/he is interested in learning on his/her own and has an eagerness to explore.

S/he can tolerate failure if it is not accompanied with criticism. The 14 year old is interested in social studies, politics, psychology, anthropology⁴¹ all disciplines which lend themselves to the orientation of this course. Therefore, 14 year old's will be interested in the politics of Judea and Rome, motives of Pontius Pilate and Jesus, and the Gospels as literary works which reflect values of a particular time and setting.

Fourteen year olds are beginning to form their own moral code. They are concerned with social issues such as society and the church. It is a time of integration of the attitudes and ideas from experience, reading, and other people with their own.⁴² A course which analyzes the issues of Jesus' crucifixion will help them clarify their values. Why kill a man who espoused values of love and peace? How did Christians differ from Jews? Were the Pharisees hypocrites? All are issues which demand an investigation into values and a clarification of subtle distinctions which are not black and white. This will be helpful for the student who is busy working out his own values concerning morality.

Fourteen year olds are becoming aware of issues such as prejudice, discrimination, and exclusion. They are tolerant and do not understand the lack of tolerance they all evidenced around them. They have respect for and interest in other people. This is also a time when interdating becomes an issue.⁴³ Although such a course is not a comparative religious course, it will better help the Jewish adolescent understand the differences between Christianity and Judaism by looking at the historical setting which gave birth to Christianity.

Fourteen year olds are still in the process of acquiring true formal thought. They can be expected to be able to reason from a set of data and form logical operations upon the data such as grouping it into classes that are similar or dissimilar. Furthermore, they can arrange data in terms of any given variable. Fourteen year olds are able to formulate and test hypotheses with a particular goal in mind, but they are not yet able to deal with all possible combinations or interpretations of the data. This means they can logically test out hypothesis concerning the crucifixion of Jesus with direction. They are not ready to deal with such a multi-variable, open-ended question as whom crucified Jesus. They can, on the other hand, think through hypotheses logically if it is structured and well-directed.⁴⁴ The course must be arranged with a particular goal in mind such as: Were the Jews responsible for the crucifixion of Jesus? Were the Romans responsible for the crucifixion of Jesus?

Footnotes

- ¹ Thomas L. Good and Jere E. Brophy, Educational Psychology - A Realistic Approach, (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1980), p.40-50.
- ² Alan T. Davies, Anti-Semitism and the Foundations of Christianity, (New York: Paulist Press, 1979); Dennis Prager and Joseph Telushkin, Why the Jews?, (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1983) p.92.
- ³ Robert Coles M.D., "Growing Up in America - Then and Now," Time 106 (26) (December 1975) p.28.
- ⁴ Leon Rappaport, Personality Development The Chronology of Experience, (London: Scott, Foresman & Co., 1972) pp.319-320.
- ⁵ Ibid. pp.290-292.
- ⁶ Aisela Konopka, D.S.W., "Requirements for Healthy Development of Adolescent Youth," Adolescence (Fall 1973) p.298.
- ⁷ Rappaport, pp.290-292.
- ⁸ Konopka, p.298.
- ⁹ Ibid., pp.298-299.
- ¹⁰ E. Douvan and J. Adelson, The Adolescent Experience (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1966) p.119.
- ¹¹ Rappaport, pp.319-320.
- ¹² James W. Fowler, Stages of Faith (San Francisco: Harper & Row, Publishers) p.69.
- ¹³ David Elkind, A Sympathetic Understanding of the Child: Birth to Sixteen (Boston: Allyn & Bacon, Inc., 1975) p.176.
- ¹⁴ Fowler, p.70.
- ¹⁵ Peter Martorella, "Teaching Concepts," Classroom Teaching Skills, ed. James M. Cooper (Lexington, Massachusetts: D.C. Heath & Co., 1982) pp.198-199.
- ¹⁶ Ibid, p.199.
- ¹⁷ Ibid, p.192.
- ¹⁸ Myra Sadker and David Sadker, "Question Skills," Classroom Teaching Skills, ed. James M. Cooper (Lexington, Massachusetts: D.C. Heath & Co., 1982) pp.147-187.

- ¹⁹Elkind, p.177.
- ²⁰Elkind, p.176.
- ²¹Elkind, pp.177-178
- ²²Elkind, p.178.
- ²³Lawrence Kohlberg and Carol Gilligan, "The Adolescent as a Philosopher," 12-16: Early Adolescence, eds. Jerome Kagen and Robert Coles (New York, 1972) p.156.
- ²⁴Ibid, p.156.
- ²⁵Rappaport, p.311.
- ²⁶Konopka, p.299.
- ²⁷Elkind, p.176.
- ²⁸Fowler, p.71.
- ²⁹Konopka, p.300.
- ³⁰Rappaport, p.320.
- ³¹Konopka, p.300.
- ³²Ibid. p.301.
- ³³Praeger, p.17.
- ³⁴G.E. Von Grunebaum, Modern Islam The Search for Cultural Identity (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1962) p.168.
- ³⁵Fowler, p.71.
- ³⁶Ibid. pp.72-73.
- ³⁷Ibid. pp.73-74.
- ³⁸Lawrence Kohlberg, Stages of Moral Development, Class Chart.
- ³⁹Elkind, pp.185-188.
- ⁴⁰Ibid.
- ⁴¹Ibid.
- ⁴²Arnold Gesell, Frances Ilg, and Louse Ames, Youth: The Years from Ten to Sixteen (New York, 1956) p.209.

⁴³ Elkind, pp.185-188.

⁴⁴ Kohlberg, pp.154-156.

Chapter IV

Purpose

The purpose of this chapter is to design a course of study about the Crucifixion of Jesus for ninth grade religious school students.

It intends to meet the following criteria and goals:

1. to learn the historical circumstances surrounding the crucifixion of Jesus;
2. to learn to critically evaluate written materials;
3. to acquaint students with an approach for studying history;
4. to equip students to dialogue in our predominately Christian society.

Approach

This program uses study units that will enable the students to learn various facets about the Crucifixion of Jesus. The program will place heavy emphasis upon the use of primary Jewish and Christian New Testament source work. This approach serves several purposes:

- 1) it enables the student to start from the particular text and work towards a general understanding of the subject matter;
 - 2) the students will see the source for themselves and not have to rely on the teacher's analysis of the subject;
 - 3) to give the students exposure to the sources which they might otherwise never encounter so that they can refute conclusions which are misinterpretations of the material.
- After initial contact with the appropriate text, the class or individual student will have an opportunity to discover and discuss for themselves the text, its importance, its implications, and its

historical/religious ramifications. Once the students have thought through their positions, the authoritative Jewish explanation will be presented to the class for further consideration and discussion. Wherever possible, the class should be encouraged to develop their own theories, beliefs, and speculations. It will be the responsibility of the insightful teacher to point out to the class of individuals where their opinion stands with regard to the Jewish analysis.

The Students

The ninth grade population in the Religious School usually represents a pre-Confirmation age group. Some students will continue past confirmation on their own volition, others will be attending school only because their parents wish them to be confirmed. Thus the motivation and receptiveness will vary from student to student. It may be assumed that the students have minimal familiarity with Jesus from their experience in the secular world. Their informal knowledge of Jesus may be derived from T.V., Christmas celebrations in school, conversations with Christian friends, and tidbits gleaned from mass media.

This program is designed to meet the needs of the fourteen year old Jewish religious school student. Since fourteen year olds are still in the process of acquiring true formal thought, they can be expected to be able to reason from a set of data and form logical operations upon the data such as grouping it into classes that are similar or dissimilar. Furthermore, they can arrange data in terms of any given variable. Fourteen year olds are able to formulate and test hypotheses with a particular goal in mind, but they are not yet able

to deal with all possible combinations or interpretations of the data. This means they can logically test out hypothesis concerning the crucifixion of Jesus with direction. Keeping this in mind, each lesson is based upon one issue. Students are asked to critically evaluate the given texts and form logical operations upon their conclusions in order to formulate and test the hypotheses concerning the Jews' responsibility for the crucifixion of Jesus. The issues discussed are:

- | | |
|--------------|--|
| Lesson 1 | Scientific "Truth" vs. Religious "Truth" |
| Lesson 2 | The Gospels as History |
| Lesson 3 | The Pharisees (Jewish Perspective) |
| Lesson 4 | The Pharisees (The Gospel's Perspective) |
| Lesson 5 & 6 | Judea Under Roman Rule and the Pax Romana |
| Lesson 7 | Life in Judea |
| | A. Socio, economic, and political characteristics. |
| | B. Jewish communal responses |
| | C. False Messiahs |
| Lesson 8 | Pontius Pilate |
| Lesson 9 | Jewish Religious Autonomy under the Pax Romana |
| Lesson 10 | Blasphemy |
| Lesson 11 | Court Procedure |
| Lesson 12 | The Crucifixion |

Lesson Plan #1

Scientific "Truth" vs. Religious "Truth"

- Rationale:** The written word may be understood and interpreted in a variety of ways. The author's point of view, frame of reference, and purpose effect the selection of material, the method of delivery, and the conclusions that may be reached by the reader. Students will be introduced to three different types of material in order to enable the students to critically evaluate the nature of the information shared or concealed, its credibility, the author's motivation, and his intended readership.
- Objectives:** By the end of this lesson all students will be able to:
1. identify the passages given by the teacher as a newspaper article, advertisement, and a Biblical passage.
 2. draw a hypothesis regarding the intent of the writer.
 3. draw conclusions regarding the differences between scientific truth and religious truth (objective account and subjective account).
 4. be sensitive to the approach used by historians.
- Activities:** Whole class activity.

Materials: Magazine advertisement
Newspaper article
Biblical passage

Comments: Suggested classroom methodology: Inquiry Model.

Stages of Inquiry

1. Students will formulate a problem on the basis of examination of different passages (handouts).
2. Draw hypotheses as to the intent of the authors and the nature of the readers.
3. Modify the hypothesis in light of additional data.
4. Draw conclusions.

Lesson Plan #2

The Gospels As History

- Rationale:** The gospels serve as the basis for information about Jesus. In order to determine the historical accuracy of the information given in the gospels, one must critically evaluate the motivation of the author and his concerns. Appropriate conclusions should be derived.
- Objectives:** By the end of this lesson all students will be able to:
1. compare how the four different introductory verses of the gospels portray Jesus.
 2. conclude how the information given reveals the frame of reference and point of view of the author.
- Activities:** In small groups, each group will examine all four introductory verses (Objectives #1 & #2).
- Materials:** Selected verses from the gospels
(See Appendices 2-A, 2-B, 2-C).
- Comments:**
1. Matthew - Jesus is the Jewish Messiah who comes from the house of David.
 2. Mark - Jesus is the prophetic fulfillment of

the Messiah.

3. Luke - Historical accuracy (Jesus historical figure).
4. John - Jesus is the fulfillment of the word (logos).

For further reference see: Sloyan, Jesus on Trial

Appendix 2-A

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO
MATTHEW

THE book of the genealogy of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham.

2 Abraham was the father of Isaac, and Isaac the father of Jacob, and Jacob the father of Judah and his brothers, ³ and Judah the father of Perez and Zerah by Tamar, and Perez the father of Hezron, and Hezron the father of Ram, ⁴ and Ram the father of Amminadab, and Amminadab the father of Nahshon, and Nahshon the father of Salmon, ⁵ and Salmon the father of Bo'az by Rahab, and Bo'az the father of Obed by Ruth, and Obed the father of Jesse, ⁶ and Jesse the father of David the king.

And David was the father of Solomon by the wife of Uri'ah, ⁷ and Solomon the father of Rehobo'am, and Rehobo'am the father of Abi'jah, and Abi'jah the father of Asa, ⁸ and Asa the father of Jehoshaphat, and Jehoshaphat the father of Joram, and Joram the father of Uzzi'ah, ⁹ and Uzzi'ah the father of Jotham, and Jotham the father of Ahaz, and Ahaz the father of Hezeki'ah, ¹⁰ and Hezeki'ah the father of Manas'seh, and Manas'seh the father of Amos, ¹¹ and Amos the father of Josi'ah, ¹² and Josi'ah the father of Jechoni'ah and his brothers, at the time of the deportation to Babylon.

12 And after the deportation to Babylon: Jechoni'ah was the father of She-al-ti-el, ¹³ and She-al-ti-el the father of Zerub'babel, ¹⁴ and Zerub'babel the father of Abi'ud, and Abi'ud the father of Eli'akim, and Eli'akim the father of Azor, ¹⁵ and Azor the father of Zadok, and Zadok the father of Achim, and Achim the father of Eli'ud, ¹⁶ and Eli'ud the father of Eleazar, and Eleazar the father of Matthan, and Matthan the father of Jacob, ¹⁷ and Jacob the father of Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom Jesus was born, who is called Christ.

17 So all the generations from Abraham to David were fourteen generations, and from David to the deportation to Babylon fourteen generations, and from the deportation to Babylon to the Christ fourteen generations.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO

MARK

THE beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God.^a
2 As it is written in Isaiah the Prophet,^b
"Behold, I send my messenger before thy face,
who shall prepare thy way;
3 the voice of one crying in the wilderness:

Prepare the way of the Lord,
make his paths straight—"

4 John the baptizer appeared^c in the wilderness, preaching a baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins. 5 And there went out to him all the country of Judaea, and all the people of Jerusalem; and they were baptized by him in the river Jordan, confessing their sins. 6 Now John was clothed with camel's hair, and had a leather girdle around his waist, and ate locusts and wild honey. 7 And he preached, saying, "After me comes he who is mightier than I, the thong of whose sandals I am not worthy to stoop down and untie. 8 I have baptized you with water; but he will baptize you with the Holy Spirit."

9 In those days Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee and was baptized by John in the Jordan.

Mark 1:1-9

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO

LUKE

INASMUCH as many have undertaken to compile a narrative of the things which have been accomplished among us, 2 just as they were delivered to us by those who from the beginning were eyewitnesses and ministers of the word, 3 it seemed good to me also, having followed all things closely^a for some time past, to write an orderly account for you, most excellent Theophilus, 4 that you may know the truth concerning the things of which you have been informed.

Luke 1:1-4

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO
JOHN

IN the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. ² He was in the beginning with God; ³ all things were made through him, and without him was not anything made that was made. ⁴ In him was life, and the life was the light of men. ⁵ The light shines in the darkness, and the darkness has not overcome it.

⁶ There was a man sent from God, whose name was John. ⁷ He came for testimony, to bear witness to the light, that all might believe through him. ⁸ He was not the light, but came to bear witness to the light.

⁹ The true light that enlightens every man was coming into the world. ¹⁰ He was in the world, and the world was made through him, yet the world knew him not. ¹¹ He came to his own home, and his own people received him not. ¹² But to all who received him, who believed in his name, he gave power to become children of God; ¹³ who were born, not of blood nor of the will of the flesh nor of the will of man, but of God.

¹⁴ And the Word became flesh and dwelt among us, full of grace and truth; we have beheld his glory, glory as of the only Son from the Father. ¹⁵ (John bore witness to him, and cried, "This was he of whom I said, 'He who comes after me ranks before me, for he was before me.'") ¹⁶ And from his fulness have we all received, grace upon grace. ¹⁷ For the law was given through Moses; grace and truth came through Jesus Christ. ¹⁸ No one has ever seen God; the only Son,^a who is in the bosom of the Father, he has made him known.

John 1:1-16

Lesson Plan #3

The Pharisees

Rationale: The purpose of this class is to sensitize the student to the approach of the Pharisees towards Jewish law. This will provide historical information about the nature of the Pharisees from a Jewish perspective. The material presented in class will enable the students to appreciate the nature of oral law in Judaism as a humanizing force. Furthermore, the student will become aware of the danger embedded in a literalistic approach to the material. The gap between the literal meaning and its application to daily life situations will become obvious through a thorough analysis.

Objectives: By the end of this lesson all students will be able to:

1. state the practical problem concerning retribution (compensation, restitution) applied in the passage.
2. compare the conclusions stated by the Pharisees to what you know from common legal practice today.
3. apply some of the underlying principles of the Pharisees to three legal cases.

Activities: Class will discuss selection from the Talmud.
(Objectives #1, #2).

In groups of four, each group will examine the three
case studies (Objective #3).

Materials: Selection from Talmud (See Appendix 3-A).
Handout of Case Studies (See Appendix 3-B).

Comments: Besides the Pharisaic approach to the law, the teacher
might want to discuss the difference between:

1. retribution
2. compensation
3. restitution

For further reference see: Zeitlin, Solomon, Who
Crucified Jesus?, pp.25-31, pp.120-121.

Appendix 3-A

Talmud

It was taught: R. Dosthai b. Judah says: *Eye for eye* means pecuniary compensation. You say pecuniary compensation, but perhaps it is not so, but actual retaliation [by putting out an eye] is meant? What then will you say where the eye of one was big and the eye of the other little, for how can I in this case apply the principle of *eye for eye*? If, however, you say that in such a case pecuniary compensation will have to be taken, did not the Torah state, *Ye shall have one manner of law*,¹ implying that the manner of law should be the same in all cases? I might rejoin: What is the difficulty even in that case? Why not perhaps say that for eyesight taken away the Divine Law ordered eyesight to be taken away from the offender?² For if you will not say this, [84a] how could capital punishment be applied in the case of a dwarf killing a giant or a giant killing a dwarf,³ seeing that the Torah says, *Ye shall have one manner of law*, implying that the manner of law should be the same in all cases, unless you say that for a life taken away the Divine Law ordered the life of the murderer to be taken away?⁴ Why then not similarly say here too that for eyesight taken away the Divine Law ordered eyesight to be taken away from the offender?

Baba Kama 83b

R. Zebid said in the name of Raba: Scripture says, *Wound for wound*.⁵ This means that compensation is to be made for Pain even where Depreciation [is separately compensated].⁶ Now, if you assume that actual Retaliation is meant, would it not be that just as the plaintiff suffered pain [through the wound], the offender too would suffer pain through the mere act of retaliation?⁷ But what difficulty is this? Why, perhaps, not say that a person who is delicate suffers more pain whereas a person who is not delicate does not suffer [so much] pain, so that the practical result [of the Scriptural inference] would be to pay for the difference [in the pain sustained]?

Baba Kama 84a

Case Studies

Case #1

Larry and Stuart were playing baseball with their respective school teams. In the course of the game, Larry was at bat and Stuart was defending third base. When Larry batted the ball, it hit Stuart in the eye. Stuart was taken to the hospital and after complicated surgery, was diagnosed by an expert ophthalmologist as blind in one eye. Stuart's parents sued Larry's parents. What would the verdict be?

Case #2

Laurie borrowed her friend Lucy's necklace to wear to the prom. It was Lucy's favorite necklace which she got as an heirloom from her grandmother. When Laurie returned from the prom, she looked down at her neck and realized the necklace was gone. Lucy's parents were very upset and took Laurie and her parents to court. What would the verdict be?

Case #3

Dr. Cohn is an Orthodox Jew and therefore does not practice medicine on the Sabbath. One wintery Shabat morning as he was walking to the neighborhood synagogue, Dr. Cohn saw a man slip and fall on the ice. The man cried out in pain, "My leg? I think it's broken." What do you think Dr. Cohn did? How would his Orthodox Rabbi advise him to behave?

Lesson Plan #4

The Pharisees

Rationale: As a result of the previous activity, the students have gained insights into the nature of the Pharisee's approach to the oral law and the humanizing spirit of its interpretation. They will now be introduced to the Gospel's perceived conflict between Jesus and the Pharisees concerning legal matters.

Objectives: By the end of this lesson all students will be able to:

1. describe the situations in each pattern and state the nature of the conflict.
2. state the Pharisees' approach.
3. state Jesus' approach.
4. contrast the Gospel's representations of the Pharisees to the picture of the Pharisees in the Jewish sources they have learned.
5. Draw conclusions as to the intent of the authors.

Activities: Small group presentations. (Objectives #1,2,3,4).
Class discussion (Objective #5).

Materials: Passages from the Gospels
(See Appendices 4-A, 4-B, 4-C, 4-D).

Comments:

Appendix 4-A

Heal on Shabat

9 And he went on from there, and entered their synagogue. 10 And behold, there was a man with a withered hand. And they asked him, "Is it lawful to heal on the sabbath?" so that they might accuse him. 11 He said to them, "What man of you, if he has one sheep and it falls into a pit on the sabbath, will not lay hold of it and lift it out? 12 Of how much more value is a man than a sheep! So it is lawful to do good on the sabbath." 13 Then he said to the man, "Stretch out your hand." And the man stretched it out, and it was restored, whole like the other. 14 But the Pharisees went out and took counsel against him, how to destroy him.

15 Jesus, aware of this, withdrew from there. And many followed him, and he healed them all, 16 and ordered them not to make him known. 17 This was to fulfill what was spoken by the prophet Isaiah:

Matthew 12:9-17

3 Again he entered the synagogue, and a man was there who had a withered hand. 2 And they watched him, to see whether he would heal him on the sabbath, so that they might accuse him. 3 And he said to the man who had the withered hand, "Come here." 4 And he said to them, "Is it lawful on the sabbath to do good or to do harm, to save life or to kill?" But they were silent. 5 And he looked around at them with anger, grieved at their hardness of heart, and said to the man, "Stretch out your hand." He stretched it out, and his hand was restored. 6 The Pharisees went out, and immediately held counsel with the Herodians against him, how to destroy him.

Mark 3:1-6

6 On another sabbath, when he entered the synagogue and taught, a man was there whose right hand was withered. 7 And the scribes and the Pharisees watched him, to see whether he would heal on the sabbath, so that they might find an accusation against him. 8 But he knew their thoughts, and he said to the man who had the withered hand, "Come and stand here." And he rose and stood there. 9 And Jesus said to them, "I ask you, is it lawful on the sabbath to do good or to do harm, to save life or to destroy it?" 10 And he looked around on them all, and said to him, "Stretch out your hand." And he did so, and his hand was restored. 11 But they were filled with fury and discussed with one another what they might do to Jesus.

Luke 6:6-9

Appendix 4-B

Pick Corn on Shabat

12 At that time Jesus went through the grainfields on the sabbath; his disciples were hungry, and they began to pluck ears of grain and to eat. ² But when the Pharisees saw it, they said to him, "Look, your disciples are doing what is not lawful to do on the sabbath." ³ He said to them, "Have you not read what David did, when he was hungry, and those who were with him: ⁴ how he entered the house of God and ate the bread of the Presence, which it was not lawful for him to eat nor for those who were with him, but only for the priests? ⁵ Or have you not read in the law how on the sabbath the priests in the temple profane the sabbath, and are guiltless? ⁶ I tell you, something greater than the temple is here. ⁷ And if you had known what this means, 'I desire mercy, and not sacrifice,' you would not have condemned the guiltless. ⁸ For the Son of man is lord of the sabbath."

Matthew 12:1-8

23 One sabbath he was going through the grainfields; and as they made their way his disciples began to pluck ears of grain. ²⁴ And the Pharisees said to him, "Look, why are they doing what is not lawful on the sabbath?" ²⁵ And he said to them, "Have you never read what David did, when he was in need and was hungry, he and those who were with him:

²⁶ how he entered the house of God, when Abiathar was high priest, and ate the bread of the Presence, which it is not lawful for any but the priests to eat, and also gave it to those who were with him?"

²⁷ And he said to them, "The sabbath was made for man, not man for the sabbath; ²⁸ so the Son of man is lord even of the sabbath."

Mark 2:23-28

6 On a sabbath, while he was going through the grainfields, his disciples plucked and ate some ears of grain, rubbing them in their hands. ² But some of the Pharisees said, "Why are you doing what is not lawful to do on the sabbath?" ³ And Jesus answered, "Have you not read what David did when he was hungry, he and those who were with him: ⁴ how he entered the house of God, and took and ate the bread of the Presence, which it is not lawful for any but the priests to eat, and also gave it to those with him?" ⁵ And he said to them, "The Son of man is lord of the sabbath."

Luke 6:1-5

Appendix 4-C

Wash Hands

15 Then Pharisees and scribes came to Jesus from Jerusalem and said, 2 "Why do your disciples transgress the tradition of the elders? For they do not wash their hands when they eat." 3 He answered them, "And why do you transgress the commandment of God for the sake of your tradition? 4 For God commanded, 'Honor your father and your mother,' and, 'He who speaks evil of father or mother, let him surely die.' 5 But you say, 'If any one tells his father or his mother, What you would have gained from me is given to God,' he need not honor his father." 6 So, for the sake of your tradition, you have made void the word of God. 7 You hypocrites! Well did Isaiah prophesy of you, when he said: 8 "This people honors me with their lips, but their heart is far from me; 9 in vain do they worship me, teaching as doctrines the precepts of men." 10 And he called the people to him and said to them, "Hear and understand: 11 not what goes into the mouth defiles a man, but what comes out of the mouth, this defiles a man." 12 Then the disciples came and said to him, "Do you know that the Pharisees were offended when they heard this saying?" 13 He answered, "Every plant which my heavenly Father has not planted will be rooted up. 14 Let them alone; they are blind guides. And if a blind man leads a blind man, both will fall into a pit." 15 But Peter said to him, "Explain the parable to us." 16 And he said, "Are you also still without understanding? 17 Do you not see that whatever goes into the mouth passes into the stomach, and so passes on?" 18 But what comes out of the mouth proceeds from the heart, and this defiles a man. 19 For out of the heart come evil thoughts, murder, adultery, fornication, theft, false witness, slander. 20 These are what defile a man; but to eat with unwashed hands does not defile a man."

Matthew 15:1-20

37 While he was speaking, a Pharisee asked him to dine with him; so he went in and sat at table. 38 The Pharisee was astonished to see that he did not first wash before dinner. 39 And the Lord said to him, "Now you Pharisees cleanse the outside of the cup and of the dish, but inside you are full of extortion and wickedness. 40 You fools! Did not he who made the outside make the inside also? 41 But give for alms those things which are within; and behold, everything is clean for you."

Luke 11:37-41

Appendix 4-D

Wash Hands

⁷ Now when the Pharisees gathered together to him, with some of the scribes, who had come from Jerusalem, ² they saw that some of his disciples ate with hands defiled, that is, unwashed. ³ (For the Pharisees, and all the Jews, do not eat unless they wash their hands, observing the tradition of the elders; ⁴ and when they come from the market place, they do not eat unless they purify themselves; and there are many other traditions which they observe, the washing of cups and pots and vessels of bronze.) ⁵ And the Pharisees and the scribes asked him, "Why do your disciples not live according to the tradition of the elders, but eat with hands defiled?" ⁶ And he said to them, "Well did Isaiah prophesy of you hypocrites, as it is written,

"This people honors me with their lips, but their heart is far from me;

⁷ in vain do they worship me, teaching as doctrines the precepts of men."

⁸ You leave the commandment of God, and hold fast the tradition of men."

⁹ And he said to them, "You have a fine way of rejecting the commandment of God, in order to keep your tradition!"

¹⁰ For Moses said, 'Honor your father and your mother'; and, 'He who speaks evil of father or mother, let him surely die'; ¹¹ but you say, 'If a man tells his father or his mother, What you would have gained from me is Corban' (that is, given to God); ¹² then you no longer permit him to do anything for his father or mother, ¹³ thus making void the word of God through your tradition which you hand on. And many such things you do."

¹⁴ And he called the people to him again, and said to them, "Hear me, all of you, and understand: ¹⁵ there is nothing outside a man which by going into him can defile him; but the things which come out of a man are what defile him." ¹⁶ ¹⁷ And when he had entered the house, and left the people, his disciples asked him about the parable. ¹⁸ And he said to them, "Then are you also without understanding? Do you not see that whatever goes into a man from outside cannot defile him, ¹⁹ since it enters, not his heart but his stomach, and so passes on?" ²⁰ (Thus he declared all foods clean.) ²¹ And he said, "What comes out of a man is what defiles a man. ²² For from within, out of the heart of man, come evil thoughts, fornication, theft, murder, adultery, ²³ coveting, wickedness, deceit, licentiousness, envy, slander, pride, foolishness. ²⁴ All these evil things come from within, and they defile a man."

Lesson Plan #5 and #6

Judea Under Roman Rule and Pax Romana

- Rationale:** In order to fully understand the circumstances leading to Jesus' death, one must first understand the nature of Roman rule. This class will provide a concrete image of life under Roman rule and serve as the basis for the next class discussion.
- Objectives:** By the end of this lesson all students will be able to:
1. state Roman values as portrayed by the movie.
 2. describe the ways in which the Romans treated their subjects.
 3. compare their findings with the historical account of Josephus.
- Activities:** Show movies: Ben Hur
Sparticus
Massada (Objectives #5).
- Whole class discussion (Objective #2).
- In pairs, each group will examine the passage from Josephus (Objective #3).
- Materials:** Movies.
Passage from Josephus (see Appendix 6-A).

Comments: It is very important not to be concerned with the plot, but rather with the portrayal of values. Do not keep it on the level of fiction.

When discussing Josepheus, point out the cause of Jewish anger.

Appendix 6-A

Judea Under Roman Rule

(3) At this time there came round the festival^a during which it is the ancestral custom of the Jews to serve unleavened bread. It is called Passover, being a commemoration of their departure from Egypt. They celebrate it with gladness, and it is their custom to slaughter a greater number of sacrifices at this festival than at any other, and an innumerable multitude of people come down from the country and even from abroad to worship God. Now the fomentors of disorder, who were mourning for Judas and Matthias, the interpreters of the laws,^b stood together in the temple and provided the dissidents with plenty of food,^c for they were not ashamed to beg for it. And Archelaus, fearing that something dangerous might grow out of their fanaticism, sent a cohort of legionaries under a tribune to suppress the violence of the rebels before they should infect the whole crowd with their madness. And, he said, if there were any who clearly stood out from the rest in their eagerness to rebel, they were to be brought to him. By this act the rebellious followers of the interpreters (of the laws) and the crowd were infuriated, and uttering cries and exhortations, they rushed upon the soldiers and after surrounding them stoned most of them to death, but a few of them and the tribune escaped with wounds. When they had done these things the rebels began to busy themselves with their sacrifices again. Archelaus, however, thought it impossible to save the situation unless he checked the impetuosity of the multitude in its present state, and so he sent out his whole army, including the cavalry, in order that they might prevent the people encamped there^d from helping those in the Temple, and might catch any who evaded the infantry and believed themselves to have reached a safe place. His cavalry killed some three thousand men but the rest got away by making for the neighbouring hills. Then Archelaus issued a proclamation that everyone should return to his own home. So they left the scene of the festival and went away in fear of a greater evil to come even though they had the rash temper that is due to lack of discipline.

^a Disturbances in the Temple during Passover.

Lesson Plan #7

Life in Judea

and

False Messiahs

Rationale: Life in Judea was harsh. The people suffered from political oppression and economic exploitation. Consequently, the people responded to different philosophies and charismatic leaders which offered relief from their suffering. These responses varied in nature:

Essenes - isolate from an inherently evil society.

4th Philosophy - violent, aggressive action.

Pharisees - spiritual rewards of an afterlife.

Sadducees - collaboration with the conqueror.

Charismatic leaders - political freedom

- spiritual salvation

Objectives: By the end of this lesson all students will be able to:

1. state the religious, socio-economic, and political characteristics of life in Judea under Roman rule.
2. explain how the political oppression and economic exploitation would affect the communal and individual responsiveness to charismatic leadership who promised relief from suffering.

3. compare the answer of the Essenes, 4th Philosophy, Sadducees, and the Pharisees to the prevailing climate.

Activities: Lecture (Objectives #1, #2).
Divide in small groups, each group will act out one response. (Objective #3).

Materials: Passages from Josepheus (See Appendices 7-A, 7-B, 7-C).
Passages from Josepheus (See Appendices 7-D, 7-E, 7-F, 7-G).

Comments: Two types of leadership should be discussed:
political and spiritual.

For further reference see: Zeitlin, pp.84-100.
Rivkin, What Crucified Jesus? pp.38-70.

Appendix 7-A

Theudas

(v. 1) During the period when Fadus ^a was procurator of Judaea, a certain impostor ^b named Theudas ^c persuaded the majority of the masses ^d to take up their possessions and to follow him to the Jordan River. He stated that he was a prophet and that at his command the river would be parted and would provide them an easy passage. With this talk he deceived many. Fadus, however, did not permit them to reap the fruit of their folly, but sent against them a squadron ^e of cavalry. These fell upon them unexpectedly, slew many of them and took many prisoners. Theudas himself was captured, whereupon they cut off his head and brought it to Jerusalem.^f These, then, are the events that befell the Jews during the time that Cuspius Fadus was procurator.

The false prophet Theudas is executed by Fadus.

Jewish Antiquities XX 97-98

Judas

(5) Then there was Judas,^a the son of the brigand chief Ezekias, who had been a man of great power and had been captured by Herod only with great difficulty. This Judas got together a large number of desperate men at Scpphoris in Galilee and there made an assault on the royal palace, and having seized all the arms that were stored there, he armed every single one of his men and made off with all the property that had been seized there. He became an object of terror to all men by plundering those he came across in his desire for great possessions and his ambition for royal rank, a prize that he expected to obtain not through the practice of virtue but through excessive ill-treatment of others.

The brigand Judas, son of Ezekias.

Jewish Antiquities XVII
271-272

Appendix 7-B

Egyptian False Prophet

(5) A still worse blow was dealt at the Jews by the Egyptian false prophet. A charlatan, who had gained for himself the reputation of a prophet, this man appeared in the country, collected a following of about thirty thousand dupes, and led them by a circuitous route from the desert to the mount called the mount of Olives. From there he proposed to force an entrance into Jerusalem and, after overpowering the Roman garrison, to set himself up as tyrant of the people, employing those who poured in with him as his bodyguard. His attack was anticipated by Felix, who went to meet him with the Roman heavy infantry, the whole population joining him in the defence. The outcome of the ensuing engagement was that the Egyptian escaped with a few of his followers; most of his force were killed or taken prisoners; the remainder dispersed and stealthily escaped to their several homes.

Jewish War II 261-263

Simon

(6) There was also Simon,^b a slave of King Herod but a handsome man, who took pre-eminence by size and bodily strength, and was expected to go farther. Elated by the unsettled conditions of affairs, he was bold enough to place the diadem on his head, and having got together a body of men, he was himself also proclaimed king by them in their madness, and he rated himself worthy of this beyond anyone else. After burning the royal palace in Jericho, he plundered and carried off the things that had been seized there. He also set fire to many other royal residences in many parts of the country and utterly destroyed them after permitting his fellow-rebels to take as booty whatever had been left in them. And he would have done something still more serious if attention had not quickly been turned to him. For Gratus, the officer of the royal troops, joined the Romans and with what forces he had went to meet Simon. A long and heavy battle was fought between them, and most of the Peracans, who were disorganized and fighting with more recklessness than science, were destroyed. As for Simon, he tried to save himself by fleeing through a ravine, but Gratus intercepted him and cut off his head. The royal palace at Ammatha^c on the river Jordan was also burnt down by some rebels, who resembled those under Simon. Such was the great madness that settled upon the nation because they had no king of their own to restrain the populace by his pre-eminence, and because the foreigners who came among them to suppress the rebellion were themselves a cause of provocation through their arrogance and their greed.

Appendix 7-C

False Prophets

Athronges

(7) Then there was a certain Athronges, a man distinguished neither for the position of his ancestors nor by the excellence of his character, nor for any abundance of means but merely a shepherd completely unknown to everybody although he was remarkable for his great stature and feats of strength. This man had the temerity to aspire to the kingship.

The
pretender
Athronges.

thinking that if he obtained it he would enjoy freedom to act more outrageously ; as for meeting death, he did not attach much importance to the loss of his life under such circumstances. He also had four brothers, and they too were tall men and confident of being very successful through their feats of strength, and he believed them to be a strong point * in his bid for the kingdom. Each of them commanded an armed band, for a large number of people had gathered round them. Though they were commanders, they acted under his orders whenever they went on raids and fought by themselves. Athronges himself put on the diadem and held a council to discuss what things were to be done, but everything depended upon his own decision. This man kept his power for a long while, for he had the title of king and nothing to prevent him from doing as he wished. He and his brothers also applied themselves vigorously to slaughtering the Romans and the king's men, toward both of whom they acted with a similar hatred, toward the latter because of the arrogance that they had shown during the reign of Herod, and toward the Romans because of the injuries that they were held to have inflicted at the present time. But as time went on they became more and more savage (toward all) alike. And there was no escape for any in any way, for sometimes the rebels killed in hope of gain and at other times from the habit of killing. On one occasion near Emmaus * they even attacked a com-

pany of Romans, who were bringing grain and weapons to their army. Surrounding the centurion Arius, who commanded the detachment, and forty of the bravest of his foot-soldiers, they shot them down. The rest were terrified at their fate but with the protection given them by Gratus and the royal troops that were with him they made their escape, leaving their dead behind. This kind of warfare they kept up for a long time and caused the Romans no little trouble while also inflicting much damage on their own nation. But the brothers were eventually subdued, one of them in an engagement with Gratus, the other in one with Ptolemy. And when Archelaus captured the eldest, the last brother, grieving at the other's fate and seeing that he could no longer find a way to save himself now that he was all alone and utterly exhausted, stripped of his force, surrendered to Archelaus on receiving a pledge sworn by his faith in God (that he would not be harmed). But this happened later.

(8) And so Judaea was filled with brigandage. Any one might make himself king as the head of a band of rebels whom he fell in with, and then would press on to the destruction of the community, causing trouble to few Romans and then only to a small degree but bringing the greatest slaughter upon their own people.

Brigandage
in Judaea.

Appendix 7-D

Sadducees

The Sadducees, the second of the orders, do away with Fate altogether, and remove God beyond, not merely the commission, but the very sight, of evil. They maintain that man has the free choice of good or evil, and that it rests with each man's will whether he follows the one or the other. As for the persistence of the soul after death, penalties in the underworld, and rewards, they will have none of them.

Jewish War II 164-166

(4) The Sadducees hold that the soul perishes along with the body. They own no observance of any sort apart from the laws^a; in fact, they reckon it a virtue to dispute with the teachers of the path of wisdom that they pursue.^b There are but few men to whom this doctrine has been made known, but these are men of the highest standing. They accomplish practically nothing, however. For whenever they assume some office, though they submit unwillingly and perforce, yet submit they do to the formulas of the Pharisees, since otherwise the masses would not tolerate them.^c

Jewish Antiquities XVIII 16-17

Appendix 7-E

Pharisees

(3) The Pharisees simplify their standard of living, making no concession to luxury.^b They follow the guidance of that which their doctrine^c has selected and transmitted as good, attaching the chief importance to the observance of those commandments which it has seen fit to dictate to them. They show respect and deference to their elders, nor do they rashly presume to contradict their proposals. Though they postulate that everything is brought about by fate,^d still they do not deprive the human will of the pursuit of what is in man's power,^e since it was God's good pleasure that there should be a fusion and that the will of man with his virtue and vice should be admitted to the council-chamber of fate.^a They believe that souls have power to survive death and that there are rewards and punishments under the earth^b for those who have led lives of virtue or vice: eternal imprisonment is the lot of evil souls, while the good souls receive an easy passage to a new life.^c Because of these views they are, as a matter of fact, extremely influential among the townsfolk: and all prayers^d and sacred rites of divine worship are performed according to their exposition. This is the great tribute that the inhabitants of the cities, by practising the highest ideals both in their way of living and in their discourse, have paid to the excellence of the Pharisees.

Jewish Antiquities XVIII 12-15

2 (14) Of the two first-named^e schools, the Pharisees, who are considered the most accurate interpreters of the laws, and hold the position of the leading sect, attribute everything to Fate and to God; they hold that to act rightly or otherwise rests, indeed, for the most part with men, but that in each action Fate co-operates.^d Every soul, they maintain, is imperishable, but the soul of the good alone passes into another body,^a while the souls of the wicked suffer eternal punishment.

Jewish War II 162-163

Appendix 7-F
Fourth of the Philosophies

(6) As for the fourth of the philosophies,^b Judas the Galilaeen^c set himself up as leader of it. This school agrees in all other respects with the opinions of the Pharisees, except that they have a passion for liberty that is almost unconquerable, since they are convinced that God alone is their leader and master. They think little of submitting to death in unusual forms and permitting vengeance to fall on kinsmen and friends if only they may avoid calling any man master. Inasmuch as most people have seen the steadfastness of their resolution amid such circumstances, I may forgo any further account. For I have no fear that anything reported of them will be considered incredible. The danger is, rather, that report may minimize the indifference with which they accept the grinding misery of pain. The folly that ensued began to afflict the nation after Gessius Florus,^d who was governor, had by his overbearing and lawless actions provoked a desperate rebellion against the Romans. Such is the number of the schools of philosophy among the Jews.

Jewish Antiquities XVIII 23-25

Appendix 7-G

Essenes

The Essenes have a reputation for cultivating peculiar sanctity.⁶ Of Jewish birth, they show a greater attachment to each other than do the other sects. They shun pleasures as a vice and regard temperance and the control of the passions as a special virtue. Marriage they disdain, but they adopt other men's children, while yet pliable and docile, and regard them as their kin and mould them in accordance with their own principles. They do not, indeed, on principle, condemn wedlock and the propagation thereby of the race, but they wish to protect themselves against women's wantonness, being persuaded that none of the sex keeps her plighted troth to one man.

(1.) The
Essenes.
Their
asceticism,
simple life
and com-
munity of
goods.

(3) Riches they despise, and their community of goods is truly admirable; you will not find one among them distinguished by greater opulence than another. They have a law that new members on admission to the sect shall confiscate their property to the order, with the result that you will nowhere see either abject poverty or inordinate wealth; the individual's possessions join the common stock and all, like brothers, enjoy a single patrimony. Oil they consider defiling, and anyone who accidentally comes in contact with it scours his person; for they make a point of keeping a dry skin and of always being dressed in white. They elect officers to attend to the interests of the community, the special services of each officer being determined by the whole body.

(4) They occupy no one city, but settle in large numbers in every town. On the arrival of any of the sect from elsewhere, all the resources of the community are put at their disposal, just as if they were their own; and they enter the houses of men whom they have never seen before as though they were their most intimate friends. Consequently, they carry nothing whatever with them on their journeys, except arms as a protection against brigands. In every city there is one of the order expressly appointed to attend to strangers, who provides them with raiment and other necessities. In their dress and deportment they resemble children under rigorous discipline. They do not change their garments or shoes until they are torn to shreds or worn threadbare with age. There is no buying or selling among themselves, but each gives what he has to any in need and receives from him in exchange something useful to himself; they are, moreover, freely permitted to take anything from any of their brothers without making any return.

Their
settlements.

Appendix 7-G

Essenes

(10) They are divided, according to the duration of their discipline, into four grades;^b and so far are the junior members inferior to the seniors, that a senior if but touched by a junior, must take a bath, as after contact with an alien. They live to a great age—most of them to upwards of a century—in consequence, I imagine, of the simplicity and regularity of their mode of life. They make light of danger, and triumph over pain by their resolute will; death, if it come with honour, they consider better than immortality. The war with the Romans tried their souls through and through by every variety of test. Racked and twisted, burnt and broken, and made to pass through every instrument of torture, in order to induce them to blaspheme their lawgiver or to eat some forbidden thing, they refused to yield to either demand, nor ever once did they cringe to their persecutors or shed a tear. Smiling in their agonies and mildly deriding their tormentors, they cheerfully resigned their souls, confident that they would receive them back again.

The four grades of Essenes.

Their endurance of persecution.

(11) For it is a fixed belief of theirs that the body is corruptible and its constituent matter impermanent, but that the soul is immortal and imperishable.^c Emanating from the finest ether, these souls become entangled, as it were, in the prison-house of the body, to which they are dragged down by a sort of natural spell; but when once they are released from the bonds of the flesh, then, as though liberated from a long servitude, they rejoice and are borne aloft. Sharing the belief of the sons of Greece, they maintain that for virtuous souls there is reserved an abode beyond the ocean, a place which is not oppressed by rain or snow or heat, but is refreshed by the ever gentle breath of the west wind coming in from ocean; while they relegate base souls to a murky and tempestuous dungeon, big with never-ending punishments. The Greeks, I imagine, had the same conception when they set apart the isles of the blessed^d for their brave men, whom they call heroes and demigods, and the region of the impious for the souls of the wicked down in Hades, where, as their mythologists tell, persons such as Sisyphus, Tantalus, Ixion, and Tityus are undergoing punishment. Their aim was first to establish the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, and secondly to promote virtue and to deter from vice; for the good are made better in their lifetime by the hope of a reward after death, and the passions of the wicked are restrained by the fear that, even though they escape detection while alive, they will undergo never-ending punishment after their decease. Such are the theological views of the Essenes concerning the soul, whereby they irresistibly attract all who have once tasted their philosophy.

Their belief in the immortality of the soul.

Lesson Plan #8

Pontius Pilate

Rationale: Pontius Pilate was the Roman procurator responsible for the crucifixion of Jesus. The Gospels depict Pilate as humane and deeply concerned for Jesus' welfare. This description is incongruent with other historical accounts of Pilate. In order to fully understand the role of Pontius Pilate, an historical account of Pilate by Josepheus and that of the Gospels will be presented.

Objectives: By the end of this lesson all students will be able to:

1. describe the personality of Pontius Pilate, his concerns, his modes of operation, and his motivations.
2. contrast the image presented in Josepheus to that of the Gospels and draw conclusions as to the intent of the authors.

Activities: Small groups will draw list of differences.

Materials: Passage from Josepheus (See Appendix 8-A).
Passage from the Gospels (See Appendix 8-B, 8-C, 8-D).

Comments:

Appendix 8-A
Pontius Pilate

(2) Pilate, being sent by Tiberius as procurator to Judaea, introduced into Jerusalem by night and under cover the effigies of Caesar which are called standards.¹ This proceeding, when day broke, aroused immense excitement among the Jews; those on the spot were in consternation, considering their laws to have been trampled under foot, as those laws permit no image to be erected in the city; while the indignation of the townspeople stirred the country-folk, who flocked together in crowds. Hastening after Pilate to Caesarea, the Jews implored him to remove the standards from Jerusalem and to uphold the laws of their ancestors. When Pilate refused, they fell prostrate around his house and for five whole days and nights remained motionless in that position.

PILATE
(26-36 A.D.)
excites the
Jews by
(1.) the
affair of the
standards;

(3) On the ensuing day Pilate took his seat on his tribunal in the great stadium and summoning the multitude, with the apparent intention of answering them, gave the arranged signal to his armed soldiers to surround the Jews. Finding themselves in a ring of troops, three deep, the Jews were struck dumb at this unexpected sight. Pilate, after threatening to cut them down, if they refused to admit Caesar's images, signalled to the soldiers to draw their swords. Thereupon the Jews, as by concerted action, flung themselves in a body on the ground, extended their necks, and exclaimed that they were ready rather to die than to transgress the law. Overcome with astonishment at such intense religious zeal, Pilate gave orders for the immediate removal of the standards from Jerusalem.

Jewish War II 169-174

(2) He spent money from the sacred treasury² in the construction of an aqueduct to bring water into Jerusalem, intercepting the source of the stream at a distance of 200 furlongs.³ The Jews did not acquiesce in the operations that this involved; and tens of thousands of men assembled and cried out against him, bidding him relinquish his promotion of such designs. Some too even hurled insults and abuse of the sort that a throng will commonly engage in. He thereupon ordered a large number of soldiers to be dressed in Jewish garments, under which they carried clubs, and he sent them off this way and that, thus surrounding the Jews, whom he ordered to withdraw. When the Jews were in full torrent of abuse he gave his soldiers the prearranged signal. They, however, inflicted much harder blows than Pilate had ordered, punishing alike both those who were rioting and those who were not. But the Jews showed no faint-heartedness; and so, caught unarmed,⁴ as they were, by men delivering a prepared attack, many of them actually were slain on the spot, while some withdrew disabled by blows. Thus ended the uprising.

Pilate uses
money be-
longing to
the temple
for an
aqueduct.

Appendix 8-B

Pontius Pilate

11 Now Jesus stood before the governor, and the governor asked him, "Are you the King of the Jews?" Jesus said to him, "You have said so." 12 But when he was accused by the chief priests and elders, he made no answer. 13 Then Pilate said to him, "Do you not hear how many things they testify against you?" 14 But he gave him no answer, not even to a single charge; so that the governor wondered greatly.

15 Now at the feast the governor was accustomed to release for the crowd any one prisoner whom they wanted. 16 And they had then a notorious prisoner, called Barab'bas. 17 So when they had gathered, Pilate said to them, "Whom do you want me to release for you, Barab'bas or Jesus who is called Christ?" 18 For he knew that it was out of envy that they had delivered him up. 19 Besides, while he was sitting on the judgment seat, his wife sent word to him, "Have nothing to do with that righteous man, for I have suffered much over him today in a dream." 20 Now the chief priests and the elders persuaded the people to ask for Barab'bas and destroy Jesus. 21 The governor again said to them, "Which of the two do you want me to release for you?" And they said, "Barab'bas." 22 Pilate said to them, "Then what shall I do with Jesus who is called Christ?" They all said, "Let him be crucified." 23 And he said, "Why, what evil has he done?" But they shouted all the more, "Let him be crucified."

24 So when Pilate saw that he was gaining nothing, but rather that a riot was beginning, he took water and washed his hands before the crowd, saying, "I am innocent of this man's blood; see to it yourselves." 25 And all the people answered, "His blood be on us and on our children!" 26 Then he released for them Barab'bas, and having scourged Jesus, delivered him to be crucified.

Matthew 27:11-16

15 And as soon as it was morning the chief priests, with the elders and scribes, and the whole council held a consultation; and they bound Jesus and led him away and delivered him to Pilate. 2 And Pilate asked him, "Are you the King of the Jews?" And he answered him, "You have said so." 3 And the chief priests accused him of many things. 4 And Pilate again asked him, "Have you no answer to make? See how many charges they bring against you." 5 But Jesus made no further answer, so that Pilate wondered.

6 Now at the feast he used to release for them one prisoner whom they asked. 7 And among the rebels in prison, who had committed murder in the insurrection, there was a man called Barab'bas. 8 And the crowd came up and began to ask Pilate to do as he was wont to do for them. 9 And he answered them, "Do you want me to release for you the King of the Jews?" 10 For he perceived that it was out of envy that the chief priests had delivered him up. 11 But the chief priests stirred up the crowd to have him release for them Barab'bas instead. 12 And Pilate again said to them, "Then what shall I do with the man whom you call the King of the Jews?" 13 And they cried out again, "Crucify him." 14 And Pilate said to them, "Why, what evil has he done?" But they shouted all the more, "Crucify him." 15 So Pilate, wishing to satisfy the crowd, released for them Barab'bas; and having scourged Jesus, he delivered him to be crucified.

Mark 15:1-15

Appendix 8-C

Pontius Pilate

23 Then the whole company of them arose, and brought him before Pilate. 2 And they began to accuse him, saying, "We found this man perverting our nation, and forbidding us to give tribute to Caesar, and saying that he himself is Christ a king." 3 And Pilate asked him, "Are you the King of the Jews?" And he answered him, "You have said so." 4 And Pilate said to the chief priests and the multitudes, "I find no crime in this man." 5 But they were urgent, saying, "He stirs up the people, teaching throughout all Judea, from Galilee even to this place." 6 When Pilate heard this, he asked whether the man was a Galilean. 7 And when he learned that he belonged to Herod's jurisdiction, he sent him over to Herod, who was himself in Jerusalem at that time. 8 When Herod saw Jesus, he was very glad, for he had long desired to see him, because he had heard about him, and he was hoping to see some sign done by him. 9 So he questioned him at some length; but he made no answer. 10 The chief priests and the scribes stood by, vehemently accusing him. 11 And Herod with his soldiers treated him with contempt and mocked him; then, arraying him in gorgeous apparel, he sent him back to Pilate. 12 And Herod and Pilate became friends with each other that very day, for before this they had been at enmity with each other.

13 Pilate then called together the chief priests and the rulers and the people, 14 and said to them, "You brought me this man as one who was perverting the people; and after examining him before you, behold, I did not find this man guilty of any of your charges against him; 15 neither did Herod, for he sent him back to us. Behold, nothing deserving death has been done by him; 16 I will therefore chastise him and release him."

18 But they all cried out together, "Away with this man, and release to us Barab'bas"—19 a man who had been thrown into prison for an insurrection started in the city, and for murder. 20 Pilate addressed them once more, desiring to release Jesus; 21 but they shouted out, "Crucify, crucify him!" 22 A third time he said to them, "Why, what evil has he done? I have found in him no crime deserving death; I will therefore chastise him and release him." 23 But they were urgent, demanding with loud cries that he should be crucified. And their voices prevailed. 24 So Pilate gave sentence that their demand should be granted. 25 He released the man who had been thrown into prison for insurrection and murder, whom they asked for; but Jesus he delivered up to their will.

76 A-1

Appendix 8-D

Pontius Pilate

28 Then they led Jesus from the house of Ca'aphas to the praetorium. It was early. They themselves did not enter the praetorium, so that they might not be defiled, but might eat the passover. 29 So Pilate went out to them and said, "What accusation do you bring against this man?" 30 They answered him, "If this man were not an evildoer, we would not have handed him over." 31 Pilate said to them, "Take him yourselves and judge him by your own law." The Jews said to him, "It is not lawful for us to put any man to death." 32 This was to fulfil the word which Jesus had spoken to show by what death he was to die.

33 Pilate entered the praetorium again and called Jesus, and said to him, "Are you the King of the Jews?" 34 Jesus answered, "Do you say this of your own accord, or did others say it to you about me?" 35 Pilate answered, "Am I a Jew? Your own nation and the chief priests have handed you over to me; what have you done?" 36 Jesus answered, "My kingship is not of this world; if my kingship were of this world, my servants would fight, that I might not be handed over to the Jews; but my kingship is not from the world." 37 Pilate said to him, "So you are a king?" Jesus answered, "You say that I am a king. For this I was born, and for this I have come into the world, to bear witness to the truth. Every one who is of the truth hears my voice." 38 Pilate said to him, "What is truth?"

After he had said this, he went out to the Jews again, and told them, "I find no crime in him. 39 But you have a custom that I should release one man for you at the Passover; will you have me release for you the King of the Jews?" 40 They cried out again, "Not this man, but Barab'bas!" Now Barab'bas was a robber.

19 Then Pilate took Jesus and scourged him. 2 And the soldiers plaited a crown of thorns, and put it on his head, and arrayed him in a purple robe; 3 they came up to him, saying, "Hail, King of the Jews!" and struck him with their hands. 4 Pilate went out again, and said to them, "Behold, I am bringing him out to you, that you may know that I find no crime in him." 5 So Jesus came out, wearing the crown of thorns and the purple robe. Pilate said to them, "Here is the man!" 6 When the chief priests and the officers saw him, they cried out, "Crucify him, crucify him!" Pilate said to them, "Take him yourselves and crucify him, for I find no crime in him." 7 The Jews answered him, "We have a law, and by that law he ought to die, because he has made himself the Son of God." 8 When Pilate heard these words, he was the more afraid; 9 he entered the praetorium again and said to Jesus, "Where are you from?" But Jesus gave no answer. 10 Pilate therefore said to him, "You will not speak to me? Do you not know that I have power to release you, and power to crucify you?" 11 Jesus answered him, "You would have no power over me unless it had been given you from above; therefore he who delivered me to you has the greater sin."

12 Upon this Pilate sought to release him, but the Jews cried out, "If you re-

lease this man, you are not Caesar's friend; every one who makes himself a king sets himself against Caesar." 13 When Pilate heard these words, he brought Jesus out and sat down on the judgment seat at a place called The Pavement, and in Hebrew, Gab'batha. 14 Now it was the day of Preparation of the Passover; it was about the sixth hour. He said to the Jews, "Here is your King!" 15 They cried out, "Away with him, away with him, crucify him!" Pilate said to them, "Shall I crucify your King?" The chief priests answered, "We have no king but Caesar." 16 Then he handed him over to them to be crucified.

John 12:28-19:16

Lesson Plan #9

Jewish Religious Autonomy Under the Pax Romana

- Rationale:** During the time of Jesus, Jews had religious autonomy under Roman rule as long as it did not interfere with Roman political control. There is some question as to whether the Sanhedrin existed with its full authority. The High Priest was appointed by the Romans. The Temple existed and was used for daily sacrifices. Jews made their tri-annual pilgrimages to Jerusalem. The events leading to Jesus' crucifixion will be better understood within the above context.
- Objectives:** By the end of this lesson all students will be able to:
1. describe the nature of the High Priesthood.
 2. explain how the court procedures of the Sanhedrin reveal its concern for justice and ethical behavior.
 3. describe the extent of Jewish religious freedom.
- Activities:** Read Josepheus and act out a Roman search committee for High Priest (Objective #1).
Small groups (Objective #2).
On basis of short lecture (Objective #3).
- Materials:** Passage from Josepheus (see Appendices 9-A, 9-B)

Passages from Mishnah (See Appendix 9-C, 9-D, 9-E)

Comments: Teachers should emphasize High Priest's loyalty to
Rome, weak, ambitious, ambitious, willing to compromise.

Appendix 9-A

High Priest

(i. 1) QUIRINIUS,^a a Roman senator who had proceeded through all the magistracies to the consulship and a man who was extremely distinguished in other respects, arrived ^b in Syria, dispatched by Caesar ^c to be governor ^d of the nation and to make an assessment of their property. Coponius,^e a man of equestrian rank, was sent along with him to rule over the Jews with full authority. Quirinius also visited Judaea, which had been annexed to Syria, in order to make an assessment of the property of the Jews and to liquidate the estate of Archelaus.^f Although the Jews were at first shocked to hear of the registration of property, they gradually condescended, yielding to the arguments of the high priest Joazar,^g the son of Boethus, to go no further in opposition. So those who were convinced by him declared, without shilly-shallying, the value of their property.

Assessment
of property
in Judaea
by
Quirinius.

Jewish Antiquities XVIII 1-3

(iii. 1) And so King Herod immediately took the Herod high priesthood away from Ananel, who was, as we said before,^a not a native (of Judaea) but (was descended) from the Jews who had been transported beyond the Euphrates, for not a few tens of thousands of this people had been transported to Babylonia; and Ananel, who came from there, was of a high-priestly family ^b and had long been treated by Herod as a valued friend. Just as he once had honoured him, when he took over the kingship, so he now dismissed him in order to end his domestic troubles. But in this he acted unlawfully, for never had anyone ^c been deprived of this office when once he had assumed it, except that Antiochus Epiphanes had violated this law first when he removed Jesus and appointed his brother Onias ^d; and the next was Aristobulus, who removed his brother Hyrcanus ^e; and the third was Herod when he took the office away (from Ananel) and gave it to the young Aristobulus.

appoints
Aristobulus III
high priest.

Jewish Antiquities XV 39-41

Appendix 9-B

High Priest

(3) When Tabernacles came round—this is a festival observed by us with special care—he waited for these days to pass,^c while he himself and the rest of the people gave themselves up to rejoicing. But it was the envy arising from this very occasion and clearly working within him that led him to carry out his purpose more quickly. For Aristobulus was a youth of seventeen^d when he went up to the altar to perform the sacrifices in accordance with the law,^e wearing the ornamental dress of the high priests and carrying out the rites of the cult, and he was extraordinarily handsome and taller than most youths of his age, and in his appearance, moreover, he displayed to the full the nobility of his descent. And so there arose among the people an impulsive feeling of affection toward him, and there came to them a vivid memory of the deeds performed by his grandfather Aristobulus. Being overcome, they gradually revealed their feelings,^f showing joyful and painful emotion at the same time, and they called out to him good wishes mingled with prayers, so that the affection of the crowd became evident, and their acknowledgment of their emotions^g seemed too impulsive in view of their having a king.^c As a result of all these things Herod decided to carry out his designs against the youth. When the festival was over and they were being entertained at Jericho as the guest of Alexandra, he showed great friendliness to the youth and led him on to drink without fear,^d and he was ready to join in his play and to act like a young man in order to please him. But as the place was naturally very hot, they soon went out in a group for a stroll, and stood beside the swimming-pools,^e of which there were several large ones around the palace, and cooled themselves off from the excessive heat of noon. At first they watched some of the servants and friends (of Herod) as they swam, and then, at Herod's urging, the youth was induced (to join them). But with darkness coming on while he swam, some of the friends, who had been given orders to do so, kept pressing him down and holding him under water as if in sport, and they did not let up until they had quite suffocated him. In this manner was Aristobulus done away with^g when he was at most eighteen years old and had held the high priesthood for a year. This office Ananias again obtained for himself.

Herod has
Aristobulus
murdered
by
drowning.

Appendix 9-C
Court Procedure

Mishnah 5

If they found for his acquittal, they set him free; if not,* they postpone his sentence until the next day.¹ [The judges] went away in pairs [to discuss the verdict], and they indulged in little food and did not drink wine all that day, and they discussed the matter thoroughly the whole night, and rose early the following morning and came to the court.² He that was for acquittal said,³ 'I was in favour of acquittal and I am still in favour of his acquittal;' and he that was for conviction said, 'I found him guilty and I still maintain that he is guilty'. He who argued for conviction may now argue for acquittal, but he who argued for acquittal may not retract and argue for conviction.⁴ If they erred in the matter,⁵ the two scribes of the judges remind them. If they [all] found him innocent, they set him at liberty; but if not,* they stand up to a count: if twelve⁶ declare him innocent and eleven⁷ declare him guilty, he is acquitted; if twelve condemn him and eleven acquit him, or even if eleven favour acquittal and eleven favour conviction, and one other says, 'I do not know', or even if twenty-two are for acquittal or conviction, and one says, 'I do not know,' they must add [to the number of] the judges. How many may they add? By two at a time⁸ up to seventy-one. If then thirty-six be for acquittal and thirty-five favour conviction, he is acquitted; if thirty-six are for conviction and thirty-five favour acquittal, then they must debate one party with the other until one of those who had favoured conviction falls in with the opinion of those who are for acquittal.

משנה ה

אם מצאו לו זכות, * פטרוהו; ואם ילאו מעבירין דינו למחר. היו מודונין זוגות זוגות, וממעטין במאכל, ולא היו שותין יין כל-היום, ונשאין ונותנין כל-הלילה, ולמחרת משכימין ובאין לבית דין. המזכה יאמר אני מזכה ומזכה אני במקומי; והמחייב יאמר אני מחייב ומחייב אני במקומי. המלמד חובה מלמד זכות, אבל המלמד זכות, אינו יכול לחזור וללמד יחובה. טעו בדבר שני סופרי הדין מוכרין אותן. אם מצאו לו זכות, פטרוהו; ואם ילאו עומדין למנן, שנים עשר מזכין, ואחד עשר מחייבין, ובאי שנים עשר מחייבין ואחד עשר מזכין, ואפילו אחד עשר מזכין, ואחד עשר מחייבין, ואחד אומר אני יודע, ואפילו עשרים ושנים מזכין או מחייבין ואחד אומר אני יודע, וסיפו הדינין עד כמה מוסיפין? שנים ימים, עד שבעים ואחד. שלשים וששה מזכין, ושלשה וחמשה מחייבין, ובאי שלשים וששה מחייבין, ושלשה וחמשה מזכין, דנין אלו כנגד אלו, עד שיראה אחד מן המחייבין דברי המזכין.

¹ In order to have time to consider the case carefully. ² And further discussed the matter all day long up to the evening. ³ i.e., he had declared himself in favour for acquittal the preceding day. ⁴ During the proceedings before the final decision. ⁵ Regarding as to who had favoured acquittal and who had favoured conviction. ⁶ Or שני עשר. ⁷ Or עשר. ⁸ So long as there is a majority of only one for conviction (there must be a majority of at least two for conviction). A majority of one only for acquittal is valid. פטרוהו* (in Vilna edition) is grammatically preferable.

Appendix 9-D
Court Procedure

Cases concerning property¹ and capital cases are alike in enquiry and examination,² as it is said,³ *Ye shall have one manner of law*. What difference is there between cases concerning property and capital cases? Cases concerning property [are tried] by three [judges] but capital cases by twenty-three. Cases concerning property may open either [with evidence] for acquittal or for conviction, but capital cases must begin [with reasons] for acquittal and may not commence [with reasons] for conviction. Cases concerning property may be decided by a majority of one [judge] either for acquittal or for conviction, but capital cases are decided by a majority of [even] one for acquittal but by [at least] a majority of two for conviction. Cases concerning property may be retried whether [the verdict was] for acquittal or for conviction, but capital cases may be retried [if the verdict were for conviction] for [obtaining an] acquittal but must not be retried [if the verdict were for acquittal] for [procuring a] conviction. In property cases all⁴ may argue for acquittal or conviction, but in capital cases all may argue for acquittal but not all⁵ may argue for conviction. In property cases one who argues for conviction may [withdraw his opinion and] argue for acquittal, and one who argues for acquittal may [retract and] argue for conviction; [but] in capital cases one who argues for

אחד דיני ממונות, ואחד דיני נפשות
בדרישה ובחקירה, שנאמר משפט
אחד יהיה לכם. מה בין דיני ממונות
לדיני נפשות? דיני ממונות בשלשה,
ודיני נפשות בעשרים ושלשה. דיני
ממונות פותחין בין לזכות בין
לחובה, ודיני נפשות פותחין לזכות
ואין פותחין לחובה. דיני ממונות
מסין על פי אחד בין לזכות בין
לחובה, ודיני נפשות מסין על פי
אחד לזכות, ועל פי שנים לחובה.
דיני ממונות מחזירין בין לזכות בין
לחובה, דיני נפשות מחזירין לזכות
ואין מחזירין לחובה. דיני ממונות
יכול מלמדן זכות וחובה, ודיני
נפשות הכל מלמדן זכות ואין
יכול מלמדן חובה. דיני ממונות
המלמד חובה מלמד זכות, והמלמד
זכות מלמד חובה; דיני נפשות
המלמד חובה מלמד זכות, אבל
המלמד זכות אין יכול לחזור
ללמד חובה. דיני ממונות דנין
ביום ונעמדין בלילה; דיני נפשות

Appendix 9-E
Court Procedure

conviction may argue for acquittal, but one who argues for acquittal can not retract to argue for conviction.

In property cases they conduct the trial by day and may conclude⁴ at night;⁷ [but] in capital cases they hold the trial by day and they must come to a decision during the day-time. In property cases they may arrive at a verdict on the same day

whether for acquittal or for conviction; [but] in capital cases they may reach a verdict for acquittal on the same day, but on the day following [if the verdict were to be] for conviction. Therefore they may not conduct trials on the eve of a Sabbath or on the eve of a Festival-day.⁸

דָּנִן בַּיּוֹם וְנִמְרָן בַּיּוֹם. דִּינִי מִמּוֹעֵז
נִמְרָן בּוֹ בַּיּוֹם בֵּין לְזִכּוּת בֵּין
לְחֻבָּה; דִּינִי וְנִפְשׁוֹת נִמְרָן בּוֹ בַּיּוֹם
לְזִכּוּת, וּבַיּוֹם שֶׁלֹּאֲחֲרָיו לְחֻבָּה.
לְפִיכָךְ אֵין דָּנִין לֹא בְעֶרֶב שַׁבָּת
וְלֹא בְעֶרֶב יוֹם טוֹב.

1 Or money. 2 i.e., cross-examination, examination of witnesses. See 51.
3 *Leviticus* 24, 22. 4 Even the disciples, though they are not among the judges.
See 44, 54. 5 Not even a disciple. 6 i.e., give a decision. 7 The verdict is to be
expedited where possible so as not to hold up business transactions. 8 The death
sentence on a condemned criminal must not be pronounced and executed before the
day following that on which the judges reached the decision, and if this decision
would be arrived at on the eve of the Sabbath or Holyday it would be impossible
to carry out the sentence on the Sabbath or Holyday and an execution was not
permitted to be postponed.

Lesson Plan #10

Blasphemy

Rationale: Jesus was accused by the Jewish officials and sentenced to death. While Biblical law clearly states a prohibition against blasphemy using the root (Lev. 24) and specifies that blasphemy will be punished by stoning, the Mishnah views blasphemy as the formulation may Jose smite Jose, namely an invocation of the tetragram invoking God against The Rabbis. The intent was to do away with the offense of blasphemy all together.

Objectives: By the end of this lesson all students will be able to:

1. state the accusations against Jesus as found in Matthew, Mark, and Luke and examine them against the definition stated in the Mishnah.
2. analyze the nature of Jesus response.

Activities: Class discussion.

Materials: Passages from Matthew, Mark, and Luke
(See Appendix 10-B).
Dictionary definition of blasphemy.
Passages from Mishnah (See Appendix 10-A).

Comments:

Appendix 10-A

Blasphemy

Mishnah 5

The blasphemer¹ is not guilty until he pronounces the Name² [expressly]. R. Joshua ben Karchah said, Every day [during the trial the court] examined⁴ the witnesses with a substitute name³ [such as] *may Jose smile Jose*. When the sentence was to be pronounced they did not condemn⁴ him to death [on the testimony given] with the substitute name, but they sent⁴ forth every person outside, and asked⁴ the chief one among them [namely, the witnesses] and said⁴ to him, 'Say exactly what thou didst hear', and he said⁴ it, and the judges stood⁴ up on their feet and rent⁴ [their garments], but they did not repair⁴ [them]; and the second [witness] said,⁴ 'I also [heard] just as he did'; and the third one⁵ said,⁴ 'I, too, [heard] just as he did'.

משנה ה

הַמְבַּדֵּף אִינוּ חַיִּיב, עַד שֶׁיִּפְרֹשׁ
יְהִשֵּׁם. אָמַר רַבִּי יְהוֹשֻעַ בֶּן קַרְחָה
בְּכָל יוֹם יִדְנִין אֶת-הָעֵדִים בְּכִישִׁי
יֵכָה יוֹסִי אֶת-יוֹסִי. נִגְמַר בְּדִין לֹא
יְהוּרִים בְּכִישִׁי, אֲלָא מוֹצִיאִים
כָּל-אָדָם לַחוּץ, יְשׁוּאִלִים אֶת-
נִגְדוֹל שֶׁבָּהֶן יְהוֹמְרִים לוֹ אָמור
מִה-שֶׁשָּׁמַעְתָּ בִּפְרִוֶשׁ, וְהוּא יֹאמַר,
וְהַדְיָנִים יַעֲמִידִים עַל רַגְלֵיהֶן
וְיִקְרְעוּן, וְלֹא יִמְאַחֲזוּ; וְהַשְׁנִי יֹאמַר
אֵף אֲנִי כְמוֹהוּ; וְהַשְּׁלִישִׁי יֹאמַר
אֵף אֲנִי כְמוֹהוּ.

¹ Leviticus 24, 10ff. ² The Divine Name, the Tetragrammaton itself. Compare יִמָּה 38, 62; סוּטָה 76. ³ i.e., not using the Divine Name itself. ⁴ Literally examine, send, etc., i.e., in the present tense. ⁵ If there was a third witness.

Appendix 10-B

Blasphemy

last two came forward ⁶¹ and said, "This fellow said, 'I am able to destroy the temple of God, and to build it in three days.'" ⁶² And the high priest stood up and said, "Have you no answer to make? What is it that these men testify against you?" ⁶³ But Jesus was silent. And the high priest said to him, "I adjure you by the living God, tell us if you are the Christ, the Son of God." ⁶⁴ Jesus said to him, "You have said so. But I tell you, hereafter you will see the Son of man seated at the right hand of Power, and coming on the clouds of heaven." ⁶⁵ Then the high priest tore his robes, and said, "He has uttered blasphemy. Why do we still need witnesses? You have now heard his blasphemy." ⁶⁶ What is your judgment?" They answered, "He deserves death." ⁶⁷ Then they spat in his face, and struck him; and some slapped him, ⁶⁸ saying, "Prophecy to us, you Christ! Who is it that struck you?"

Matthew 26:61-68

saying, ⁶⁸ "We heard him say, 'I will destroy this temple that is made with hands, and in three days I will build another, not made with hands.'" ⁶⁹ Yet not even so did their testimony agree. ⁷⁰ And the high priest stood up in the midst, and asked Jesus, "Have you no answer to make? What is it that these men testify against you?" ⁷¹ But he was silent and made no answer. Again the high priest asked him, "Are you the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?" ⁷² And Jesus said, "I am; and you will see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of Power, and coming with the clouds of heaven." ⁷³ And the high priest tore his mantle, and said, "Why do we still need witnesses? ⁷⁴ You have heard his blasphemy. What is your decision?" And they all condemned him as deserving death. ⁷⁵ And some began to spit on him, and to cover his face, and to strike him, saying to him, "Prophecy!" And the guards received him with blows.

Mark 14:58-65

⁶⁶ When day came, the assembly of the elders of the people gathered together, both chief priests and scribes; and they led him away to their council, and they said, ⁶⁷ "If you are the Christ, tell us." But he said to them, "If I tell you, you will not believe; ⁶⁸ and if I ask you, you will not answer. ⁶⁹ But from now on the Son of man shall be seated at the right hand of the power of God." ⁷⁰ And they all said, "Are you the Son of God, then?" And he said to them, "You say that I am." ⁷¹ And they said, "What further testimony do we need? We have heard it ourselves from his own lips."

Luke 22:67-71

Lesson Plan #11

Court Procedure

- Rationale:** The purpose of this lesson is to compare the court procedure of the Sanhedrin with the interrogation scene described in the book of Matthew.
- Objectives:** By the end of this lesson all students will be able to:
1. list the stages of events which occurred at the house of the High Priest found in Matthew 26:57-68.
 2. contrast this with the rules governing the court procedure of the Sanhedrin.
 3. draw conclusions.
- Activities:** Whole class discussion.
- Materials:** Passage from Gospel (See Appendix 11-A).
Passage from Mishnah (See Appendices 9-C, 9-D, 9-E)
Chart (See Appendix 11-B).
- Comments:**

Appendix 11-A
Court Procedure

57 Then those who had seized Jesus led him to Ca'iaphas the high priest, where the scribes and the elders had gathered. ⁵⁸ But Peter followed him at a distance, as far as the courtyard of the high priest, and going inside he sat with the guards to see the end. ⁵⁹ Now the chief priests and the whole council sought false testimony against Jesus that they might put him to death, ⁶⁰ but they found none, though many false witnesses came forward. At last two came forward ⁶¹ and said, "This fellow said, 'I am able to destroy the temple of God, and to build it in three days.'" ⁶² And the high priest stood up and said, "Have you no answer to make? What is it that these men testify against you?" ⁶³ But Jesus was silent. And the high priest said to him, "I adjure you by the living God, tell us if you are the Christ, the Son of God." ⁶⁴ Jesus said to him, "You have said so. But I tell you, hereafter you will see the Son of man seated at the right hand of Power, and coming on the clouds of heaven." ⁶⁵ Then the high priest tore his robes, and said, "He has uttered blasphemy. Why do we still need witnesses? You have now heard his blasphemy. ⁶⁶ What is your judgment?" They answered, "He deserves death." ⁶⁷ Then they spat in his face, and struck him; and some slapped him, ⁶⁸ saying, "Prophecy to us, you Christ! Who is it that struck you?"

Matthew 26:57-68

Appendix 11-B
Court Procedure

1. No Sanhedrin was allowed to sit as a criminal court and try criminal cases outside the temple precincts, in any private house.⁹
2. The Sanhedrin was not allowed to try criminal cases at night; criminal trials had to be commenced and completed during day-time.¹⁰
3. No person could be tried on a criminal charge on festival days or the eve of a festival.¹¹
4. No person may be convicted on his own testimony or on the strength of his own confession.¹²
5. A person may be convicted of a capital offense only upon the testimony of two lawfully qualified eyewitnesses.¹³
6. No person may be convicted of a capital offense unless two lawfully qualified witnesses testify that they had first warned him of the criminality of the act and the penalty prescribed for it.¹⁴
7. The capital offense of blasphemy consists in pronouncing the name of God, Yahweh, which may be uttered only once a year by the high priest in the innermost sanctuary of the temple; and it is irrelevant what "blasphemies" are spoken so long as the divine name is not enunciated.¹⁵

Haim Cohn p. 98

Lesson Plan #12

The Crucifixion

Rationale: The purpose of this lesson is to provide students with a meaningful and educated response to anti-Jewish accusations which hold the Jews responsible for Jesus' death. This should help them to be able to dialogue in a non-Jewish world.

Objectives: By the end of this lesson all students will be able to:

1. apply the course material and to formulate a detailed response to the statement: The Jews Killed Jesus.
2. rewrite selected passages from incriminating Christian textbooks

Activities: Paper assignment for homework (Objective #1).
Rewrite passages in class (Objective #2).

Materials: Passages from Christian textbooks
(See Appendix 12-A, 12-B).

Comments: This is a culminating activity and students should draw on material from past lessons.

Appendix 12-A
The Crucifixion

The Jewish leaders must have really wanted Jesus out of the way. To get a conviction and have Jesus condemned to death, they had to break many of the laws of their own legal procedures. First of all, the Sanhedrin, the "supreme court" of the Jews acted contrary to its proper function. The Sanhedrin was supposed to serve as the "counsel for the defense" and try hard to find some reason for mercy toward the defendant. The defendant, as in our courts, was considered innocent until proven guilty. But at Jesus' trial, he was presumed guilty, and the Sanhedrin actually served as the "counsel for the prosecution." They did everything they could to prove that Jesus was guilty. No one stood for the accused.

Secondly, Jewish law required that the evidence of two witnesses was necessary to condemn someone. The witnesses had to be people of outstanding honesty, and they were warned that false witness made them as guilty as the person on trial.

At Jesus' trial many false witnesses were brought forth and no two could agree on their testimony. In the midst of all this confusion, the prosecutors finally came up with evidence that Jesus had said that he would destroy the temple and rebuild it in three days. But this evidence was not even used in the charge against Jesus.

There was a third abuse of justice. According to Jewish law, it was illegal to require the prisoner to answer questions by which he would condemn himself. At this so-called trial, the high priest asked Jesus whether he claimed to be the Messiah:

The High Priest questioned him, 'Are you the Messiah, the Son of the Blessed God? 'I am,' answered Jesus. (Mark 14:61-62)

Appendix 12-A (cont.)

The Crucifixion

With this reply he was charged with blasphemy and condemned. Not only was the procedure illegal, but the charge itself was absurd. According to Jewish laws, blasphemy was a misuse of Yahweh's name. Claiming to be the Messiah was not considered to be blasphemy!

Legal procedure did not seem important to the Jewish leaders, and they got their conviction any way they pleased. But now they had a problem: the Jews did not have the authority to execute. Only the Roman authorities could put a person to death. They took Jesus to Pilate, the Roman procurator, and they requested the death sentence.

The Jewish leaders knew that a charge of blasphemy would not make much impression on a Roman who did not believe in their God, so new charges were made up on the spot. They said that Jesus was a political agitator who set himself up as a king and forbade the Jews to pay taxes to the emperor. Pilate did not seem to believe these charges: otherwise he would have condemned Jesus immediately. He tried ways to satisfy the angry Jewish leaders. He had Jesus whipped, sent him off to Herod for a decision and then gave them a choice between releasing Barabbas, a terrorist, and Jesus. (Crowley, pp.131,132)

Crowley, pp.131-132 (cont.)

Bibliography

Historical Perspective:

- C.K. Barrett. The New Testament Background. New York, Harper & Row, 1961.
- S.G.F. Brandon. The Trial of Jesus of Nazareth. New York, Stein and Day, 1968.
- S.G.F. Brandon. The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church. London, S.P.C.K., 1951.
- S.G.F. Brandon. Jesus and the Zealots. Manchester, University Press, 1967.
- Rudolf Bultmann. Primitive Christianity. New York, Meridan Books, 1967.
- Haim Cohn. The Trial and Death of Jesus. New York, Harper & Row, Publishers, 1971.
- Haim Cohn. "Reflections on the Trail and Death of Jesus." Israel Law Review Association, Jerusalem, 1967.
- Alan T. Davies, ed. AntiSemitism and the Foundations of Christianity. New York, Paulist Press, 1979.
- Austin P. Flannery, O.P., ed. The Documents of Vatican II. New York, Pillar Books, 1975.
- Gerald Friedlander. The Jewish Sources of the Sermon on the Mount. New York, The Bloch Publishing Company, 1911.
- Robert Gordis, ed. "The Trial of Jesus in the Light of History: A Symposium." Judaism 20, 1967.
- Robert M. Grant. Historical Introduction to the New Testament. New York, Harper & Row, Publishers, 1963.
- Martin Hengel. Was Jesus a Revolutionist? Trans. by William Klassen. Philadelphia, Fortress, 1971.
- Martin Hengel. Victory over Violence, Jesus and the Revolutionists. Trans. by David Green. Philadelphia, Fortress, 1973.
- Martin Hengel. Crucifixion in the Ancient World and the Folly of the Message of the Cross. Trans. by J. Bowden. Philadelphia, Fortress, 1977.
- Jules Isaac. The Teaching of Contempt: Christian Roots of Anti-Semitism. New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.

- Josephus. Jewish Antiquities, XV - XVII. Trans. by Ralph Marcus, Ph.D. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1963.
- Josephus. Jewish Antiquities, XVIII - XX. Trans. by Louis H. Feldman, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1965.
- Josephus. Jewish War, I-VII. Trans. by H. ST. J. Thackeray, M.A. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1961.
- Mishnah. Sanhedrin. Trans. by Philip Blackman, F.C.S. Gateshead, Judaica Press, Ltd., 1977.
- Dennis Prager and Joseph Telushkin. Why the Jews? New York, Simon and Schuster, 1983.
- Ellis Rivkin. What Crucified Jesus? Nashville, Abingdon Press, 1984.
- Ellis Rivkin. A Hidden Revolution. Nashville, Abingdon Press, 1978.
- Ellis Rivkin. Who Crucified Jesus? Paul and the Parting of the Ways. Reprint, The Jewish Heritage. Cincinnati, HUC-JIR.
- Ellis Rivkin. "Beth Din, Boule, Sanhedrin: A Tragedy of Errors". HUC-JIR Annual, Vol.46, 1975.
- Ellis Rivkin. "Scribes, Pharisees, Lawyers, Hypocrites: A Study in Synonymity". HUC-JIR Annual, Vol.49, 1978.
- Hugh Joseph Schonfield. The Passover Plot.
- Joel Schwartzman. Jewish Writings on the Trial of Jesus. HUC Rabbinic Thesis, 1975.
- Robert M. Seltzer. Jewish People Jewish Thought: The Jewish Experience in History. New York, MacMillan Publishing Company, 1980.
- Sanford Marvin Shapero. The Jewishness of the Author of the Gospel of Matthew. HUC Rabbinic Thesis, 1955.
- Gerard S. Sloyan. Jesus on Trial: The Development of the Passion Narratives and their Historical and Ecumenical Implications. Philadelphia, Fortress Press, 1977.
- H. Stern. "The Period of the Second Temple". H.H. Ben-Sasson, ed. A History of the Jewish People. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1976.
- Gerald S. Strober. Portrait of the Elder Brother: Jews and Judaism in Protestant Teaching Materials. The American Jewish Committee, National Conference of Christians and Jews, 1972.

- The Holy Bible. Revised Standard Version. New York, Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1952.
- Trude Weiss-Rosmarin, ed. Jewish Expressions on Jesus. yaZ TIDh+ HFoU Publishing House, Inc., 1977.
- W.R. Wilson. The Execution of Jesus. New York, Scribner's, 1970.
- Paul Winter. On the Trial of Jesus. Berlin, DeGruyter, 1974.
- Solomon Zeitlin. Who Crucified Jesus? New York, Bloch Publishing Company, 1964.

Educational Psychology:

- Robert Coles M.D. "Growing Up in America - Then and Now," Time 106 (26), December, 1975.
- E. Douvan and J. Adelson. The Adolescent Experience. New York, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1966.
- David Elkind. A Sympathetic Understanding of the Child: Birth to Sixteen. Boston, Allyn & Bacon, Inc., 1978.
- James E. Fowler. Stages of Faith. San Francisco, CA, Harper & Row, 1981.
- Arnold Gesell, Frances Ilg, and Louse Ames, Youth: The Years from Ten to Sixteen. New York, 1956.
- Thomas L. Good and Jere E. Brophy. Educational Psychology - A Realistic Approach. New York, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1980.
- Ira J. Gordon. Human Development, From Birth Through Adolescence. New York, Harper & Row, 1969.
- Robert J. Havighurst. Developmental Tasks and Education. New York, David McKay Co., 1973.
- Lawrence Kohlberg and Carol Gilligan, "The Adolescent as a Philosopher". 12-16: Early Adolescence, eds. Jerome Kagen and Robert Coles. New York, 1972
- Lawrence Kohlberg, Stages of Moral Development, Class Chart.
- Aisela Konopka, D.S.W. "Requirements for Healthy Development of Adolescent Youth," Adolescence. Fall, 1973.
- Guy R. Lefrancois. Psychology for Teaching. Belmont, CA, Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1982.

Peter Martorella. "Teaching Concepts". Classroom Teaching Skills. James M. Cooper, ed. Lexington, Mass., D.C. Heath & Co., 1982.

Leon Rappaport. Personality Development The Chronology of Experience. Glenview, Scott, Foresman & Co., 1972.

Myra Sadker and David Sadker. "Question Skills." Classroom Teaching Skills. James M. Cooper, ed. Lexington, Mass., D.C. Heath & Co., 1982.

Robert D. Strom and Harold W. Bernard. Educational Psychology. Monterey, CA, Brooks/Cole Publishing Co., 1982.

Teaching Social Studies in Jewish Schools. The Pedagogic Reporter. Vol. 29(2), Winter, 1978.

G.E. Von Grunebaum. Modern Islam The Search for Cultural Identity. Berkeley, University of California Press, 1962.

Dorothy Zeligs. "The New Psychological Approach to the Teaching of History in Intermediate Grades" in Jewish Education. Vol.4(1), Jan-Mar, 1932.