

Chapter 1 : Book Review: Jesus of Nazareth by Pope Benedict XVI « Theophile

*An Evolutionary Approach to Jesus of Nazareth (Jesus of Nazareth Yesterday and Today) (English and Spanish Edition) [Juan Luis Segundo] on calendrierdelascience.com *FREE* shipping on qualifying offers.*

From the earliest days of the Christian movement the followers of Jesus attempted to say something meaningful about how they assessed his significance in their lives, their community, and, ultimately, the wider world. They used a variety of methods to express their deepest convictions regarding the one they believed had conquered death and would come again. If the literature they produced provides any clue, it is clear that they employed titles, told stories, developed liturgies, and reinterpreted their sacred scriptures and traditions to articulate their beliefs. These attempt to describe and, in some sense, synthesize the various ways in which NT writers express their understanding of Jesus and his significance see Bauer and Powell In fact, many scholars e. Lincoln and Paddison explores the interdisciplinary nature of christological readings of scripture. Matera emphasizes the descriptive value of narratives, whereas de Jonge situates Christology as early Christian responses to Jesus. For a literary-critical approach, see Richard Nonspecialists may wish to consult Brown Westminster John Knox, Many of the essays address the Christology of specific books e. Other essays deal with Christology in general and its implications for theology, ethics, and pastoral matters. An Introduction to New Testament Christology. The Earliest Christian Response to Jesus. Library of New Testament Studies. London and New York: The Christologies of the New Testament. Neyrey proposes to take these portraits as reflecting the Sitz im Leben of the writers and their communities. Christology and the New Testament: Jesus and His Earliest Followers.

Chapter 2 : Jesus of Nazareth - Biblical Studies - Oxford Bibliographies

Note: Citations are based on reference standards. However, formatting rules can vary widely between applications and fields of interest or study. The specific requirements or preferences of your reviewing publisher, classroom teacher, institution or organization should be applied.

Ratzinger wants to take us from the quest for the historical Jesus to the request for authentic exegesis. Proposing the Methodological Synthesis Ratzinger only articulates what he considers a viable alternative methodology for biblical interpretation after first criticizing what he considers to be the dominant methodology: Thus, his articulation has two aspects: The latter should be understood in light of the former. The problem, as Ratzinger sees it, with the dominant methodology is at least twofold. First, the historical-critical method, although yielding great insights, has an inherent limitation: Ratzinger believes that the dominant methodology in biblical interpretation, taking its direction from the historical-critical methodology, attempts to impose the scientific method of natural sciences on biblical interpretation. After all, this is the way the church—who accepted the canonical literature as a whole—understood it. With these principles at work, the process of exegesis is twofold. First one must interpret the text in light of its historical origins and proper historical context. He understands the genealogies, as well as the baptism of Jesus, to have a universal scope—and this places Jesus as the centerpiece of real history. There is a considerable gap, then, between the ambitious exegetical points that Ratzinger wants to make here, and the legwork he exercises to establish his points well. Other problems appear with his exegesis. For example, he supports his claim that Jesus descended into hell by citing Cyril of Jerusalem, [23] but this is neither a responsible Christological hermeneutic or historical-critical method—it is an appeal to a church father. Ratzinger also fails to seriously engage the historical-critical method. When he seeks to support his claims by appealing to others scholars, this is the exception. In fact, it is so rare that it appears random. For the most part, he simply makes all sorts of associations and claims about the text without taking the time to carefully explain how he is confident that his interpretation is well supported. He bases a great deal of his analysis on his understanding of the ritual of Baptism during Jesus time. He does not take the trouble to give the reader indication of whether there are differences or uncertainties among biblical critics about the symbolism of baptism in Second Temple Judaism or among the Essenes. He treats them as certain and uncontroversial, then bases his further conclusions on them. He simply tells us that the water of baptism was a symbol of death because the waters were associated with the destructive powers of ocean floods, and yet it was also a symbol of life since rivers were a source of life. But how do we know that this is how John the Baptist was likely to understand his baptism? How likely is it that John the Baptist—possibly being an Essene—would have incorporated all these possible symbolisms some of which are opposite in meaning into his water baptism? Ratzinger gives us no confidence that he is grounding what he says on careful study. The answers to these questions, however, are assumed: Not once does Ratzinger really call into question the truth of their accounts. For example, he makes passing mention of Jesus being equal to God. The Disciples Chapter six is full of digressions that do not appear to relate to the text Ratzinger hopes to exegete. After pointing out that Jesus sent the disciples to preach and cast out demons, he somehow winds up making the point that when we belong to Jesus the allure of everything else in the world loses its power. They are more like devotional meditations than an exegesis of the passages under consideration. That is not to say that I cannot see the purported connections that Ratzinger is trying to make—they just do not seem appropriate for someone attempting an exegetical approach to scripture read: I find him in a similar excursion when after noting that Jesus gave the apostles power to heal the sick and blind, he explains how becoming spiritually one with God is true healing, which is a process. If so, it is not obvious, and Ratzinger does not make any such argument. This is not to say that Ratzinger makes no effort at interacting with scholarly work in this chapter. He deviates from the exegetical task so often and for so long that he has to keep writing: This makes his engagement with exegesis superficial. One sometimes gets the impression that he only interacts with exegetical points long enough to springboard into a devotional thought. He grounds this premise in the structure of the synoptic gospels, and therefore in the text. One is left to

wonder. Whether Ratzinger has the right rules for properly authentic exegesis is one question, whether he has played the game well by them well is quite another. In order for Ratzinger to play well by the rules he has set out, he must first do justice to the insights of the historical-critical method step one and then surpass these insights through a faith-wrought Christological hermeneutic that does justice to the *analogia scripturae*. As my analysis shows, Ratzinger delivers on his promise to employ a Christological hermeneutic step 2. Still one might wish at times that he would employ this hermeneutic more responsibly, and it should be clear that there will be a wide range of understandings about how this part of his synthesis is to be executed. The question of whether he delivers on his promise to give serious attention to the historical-critical method is more debatable. This indicates that the bulk of his book is an attempt to harvest the fruits of his understanding of the Christological hermeneutic. Since whatever insights appear to require faith, according to his terms, should not be counted as insights proper to the historical-critical method, it should be clear that while Ratzinger has included this step in his methodology, he has used it only sparsely. This raises a further question. Does Ratzinger intend to ground his Christological method in some way on the historical-critical method? Since the methodology as Ratzinger lays it out has numbered steps, we should be inquiring about whether he applies these steps in their numerical order. In fact, however, it does not appear that he has even remotely attempted to systematically begin with the historical-critical method before moving to draw his Christological insights. Therefore, either he has failed his own method or—what is more likely—the numbering of his steps was not intended to be understood as an ordering of the steps. Can the authentic exegete get carried away with drawing all sorts of Christological points in his exegesis while paying scarce attention to the historical-critical method? Review of *Jesus of Nazareth: Modern Theology* 24, no. *Expository Times*, no. *A Journal of Religion and Public Life*. Ignatius, , xvi. But it is likewise true that their basic methodological approaches continue even today to determine the methods and procedures of modern exegesis. Their essential elements underlie more than their own historical and theological judgments and, to be sure, these have widely achieved an authority like unto dogma. He is certain that it cannot be the way it is depicted in the Bible, and he looks for methods to prove the way it really had to be. He may not exclude that God himself could enter into and work in human history, however improbable such a thing might at first appear.

Chapter 3 : Jesus of Nazareth and the doctrine of "God" Â« Tony Equale's Blog

Evolutionary Approach to Jesus of Nazareth Product Reviews: Purchase to review. Evolutionary Approach to Jesus of Nazareth by Segundo, Juan Luis,

The first approach presupposes a critical reading of the primary sources mainly canonical and extracanonical Christian texts in order to retrieve the historical evidence buried beneath layers of Christological interpretations. Conversely, the scope of the second is more exegetical and focuses precisely on the Christological ideas and theological messages that the first Christian thinkers and authors tried to convey in their writings. The second corresponds to the scholarly side of time-honored Christian faith and confession, rooted in the proclamation of Paul and echoed by the authors of the first biographies of Jesus. However, in spite of the apparently irreconcilable opposition between history and theology, in the case of the historical Jesus, specialists of either discipline cannot simply ignore what is accomplished in the other field. On the one hand, an exegetical and theological background is required in order to navigate through the textual complexities of Christian primary sources—a methodological sophistication that is now perfectly encapsulated in the holistic approach of sociorhetorical criticism. On the other hand, the Jewish and Christian religions are based on a special relationship that God has established with his creatures in and through the course of history; the human career of the Christ is not an exception and should not be less relevant than the proclamations of his followers—in fact, the opposite is true. Actually, this is exactly the feeling of the majority of Christian specialists who, in the last years, have devoted themselves to the controversial study of the historical Jesus: From a postmodern point of view, we could say that the large majority of those often self-proclaimed historians had and still have a robustly theological agenda. Because of the vast amount of scholarship on Jesus, including many anthologies and collections of significant essays, articles published in journals or chapters in collective volumes will not be mentioned in this bibliography. Almost all of the books treated here have been published since

Introductory Works General surveys can be found in some recent introductions to the New Testament that are used as standard texts for introductory courses on early Christianity. Conzelmann and Lindemann is an excellent introduction in German. Green, and Marianne Meyer Thompson. *Introducing the New Testament: Its Literature and Theology. An Introduction to the New Testament. Anchor Bible Reference Library.* New York and London: Cambridge, UK, and New York: Cambridge University Press, Conzelmann, Hans, and Andreas Lindemann. *Arbeitsbuch zum Neuen Testament* 14th ed. The fourth part, on Jesus of Nazareth, is a short but exhaustive and invaluable monograph in itself. *Interpreting the New Testament: An Introduction to the Principles and Methods of N. Exegesis*, translated by Siegfried S. Hendrickson, ; based on the eighth edition, *An Introduction to the New Testament: Context, Methods and Ministry Formation.* Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, Devotes four well-documented chapters to research on the historical Jesus and finally refutes the arguments in favor of a sapiential Jesus, instead opting for a prophetic and apocalyptic figure. First edition published in Acknowledges, with reason, that contemporary research tends to see in the historical Jesus either a prophet or a social reformer.

Chapter 4 : CiNii Books - An evolutionary approach to Jesus of Nazareth

An evolutionary approach to Jesus of Nazareth. Juan Luis Segundo ; edited and translated from the Spanish by John Drury i¼ Jesus of Nazareth, yesterday and todayi¼%.

Originally posted Sep 1, 2, words In the narrative of one of the earliest Christian training manuals, the gospel of Luke, Jesus introduces himself publicly for the first time in a local synagogue of Nazareth as the suffering servant of deuterio-Isaiah. It is my contention, that this man had a unique perspective on religion gleaned from his own personal interpretation of the significance of the poetry of Isaiah and other post exilic Jewish writers. We are not under any obligation to deny these reports. So here we have the beginnings of a radically new perspective on religion. Never before had they thought to identify the elements of the human condition itself â€” suffering culminating in death â€” as the force that bound them umbilically to their Source and Sustainer. I believe that the man Jesus had an extraordinary perception of the central place of brokenness and impoverishment in human life, traceable to the insights of Job and the post exilic Hebrew poets as well as his own experience of life under the systemic exploitation of the subjugated Jews by the Roman Empire. That insight was the source of his remarkable compassion for the poor, the sick, the crippled, the lepers, the possessed, the accused, all of whom were considered outcasts by the standards of mainstream Judaism. The ease with which he sided with social rejects suggests that he had seen through the self-deceptions of self-righteousness promoted, perhaps unwillingly but by all calculations inevitably, by the quid pro quo mainstream interpretation of the place of Jewish law and ritual in the contract with Yahweh. I may be forgiven if I find this extraordinary to an extreme degree. Jesus seems not to have believed that. Probably today a majority of people around the world still believe the same thing. How did he get past that? The same convictions held true for individual health and strength, success and good fortune, status and position. Job himself could never get beyond all that; how did Jesus do it? That Jesus was able to see his father in a way that his contemporaries did not, besides the influence of Job and the Jewish poets, remains a mystery; for we do not know what youthful experiences may have contributed to it. He had to know it was not his father who sent the legions of Rome to pollute the Jewish temple with abomination, to plunder and enslave the world, to destroy languages and peoples, creating desolation and calling it peace. His father was the Source of his humanity, and so he called himself the Son of Man. Jesus knew who he was. It appears Jesus had created an insuperable dilemma for his followers. They thought long and hard but they never understood him. In the long run they could not get past the reality of it all. No one could embrace the human condition. No one could embrace death. If death is not overcome in this life then it must be that we finally get beyond it in the next. Some were sure he was a madman. His raving even brought his mother and brothers calling out to him at the edge of the crowds to come home and stop all this nonsense. He knew that what they were saying was right. Jesus, it must be acknowledged, was not entirely free of that misperception, either. It was because he too had come to believe that his insight into the redemptive power of suffering should have made his death an event of unalloyed triumph for him and for all of Israel. At the end, I believe, Jesus saw what we all see. It was the final hurdle. At the end, like all of us, he had nowhere to turn but to his father. His followers were thrown into a panic. Death was no longer a metaphor. They had been so mesmerized by him that they were no longer able to turn back and go the way of Judas. What had following him gotten them? He had left them with nothing but death â€” his humanity shorn of any delusion of a grandiose triumphant messiahship. They convinced themselves that the wisps of stories they were hearing were true: They had no framework in which to insert the raw fact of death and the diminishments that are its equivalent. Resurrection as a symbol would have done that. But it was not taken as a symbol. It was offered as literal reality, eternal life, designed to overcome literal reality, organismic death. It was like the imagined restoration of Job: I believe the entire later development of Christian Doctrine including especially the unconscionable homoousion of Nicaea, promoted over the open protests of the Council Fathers by the emperor of Rome, was the further elaboration of that scaffolding. Like Jesus, we have nowhere else to turn.

Chapter 5 : Golden Rule - Wikipedia

An Evolutionary Approach to Jesus of Nazareth, by Juan Luis Segundo. Jesus of Nazareth Yesterday and Today, Vol. V. Edited and translated by John Drury. Orbis Books, Maryknoll, pp. \$ (paper).

The Faking and the Flogging of the Shroud of Turin The late Professor Edward Hall was the most openly prejudiced and pugnacious of the scientists involved in the radiocarbon dating of the Shroud of Turin. Of the mysterious, and iconic garment, he once declared Someone got a piece, of linen, faked it up, and the flogged it. This is an unfair description of what occurred several levels. As to the flogging, Geoffrey de Charny, the owner of the Shroud at the time of its first exhibition in was in no position to have purchased so valuable a forgery. The squire of Lirey, a tiny French village, he could not even afford to pay his own ransom when captured by the English. He is completely immune from the modern obsessions with justice, victory, security, or wealth. His sense of the ideal warrior would be a deeply pious man who singlemindedly studies and practices the profession of arms from the earliest age, sticks with it through the best and worst times, and gives little time or thought to anything else other than God. The processed image at the right is the product of the application of digital filters. Digital filters are mathematical functions that do not add any information to the image, but transform it in such a way that information already present in it becomes more visible or easier to appreciate by the naked eye. The processed image was produced by inverting the brightness of the pixels in the positive image but without inverting their hue, and then by increasing both the brightness contrast and the hue saturation. To my knowledge the resulting image is the best available and indeed the only one that reveals the color information hidden in the original. Both eyes appear bruised, but the left eye more heavily so, and we can infer that the condition was caused by trauma to the left eye socket: From the more detailed point of view, this duality is revealed more dramatically: Shroud-face v a synthesis of the face of the oldest known icon of Christ Pantocrator and the Shroud-face: Shroud-face v the portrait by Ariel Agemian called The Face of Christ, a face of Jesus in wide circulation in various forms and attached to various back stories: Shroud-face v the face of a typical Byzantine icon: Shroud-face v a face of Jesus that circulates on the internet in a variety of guises and attached to a variety of stories: Shroud-face v the face of Isaac Newton: The Veil of Veronica is a legendary cloth bearing an image of the face of Jesus. According to the most mature form of this legend, Saint Veronica from Jerusalem encountered Jesus along the Via Dolorosa on the way to Calvary. When she paused to wipe the blood and sweat off his face with her veil, his image was imprinted on the cloth. In , the British television station Channel 5, aired a documentary that claimed the Shroud was forged by Leonardo using his own face as the model. Putting aside the unanswerable objection that Leonardo was yet to be born when the Shroud was first exhibited he was born in , his face is in any case not as good a match to the face on the Shroud as it needs to be. Shroud-face v the face of Leonardo da Vinci: After seeing an array of images of Jesus, Colton Burpo, the subject of the book, identified the Prince of Peace painting by Akiane Kramarik as the Real Face of Jesus as he experienced the Lord while in heaven. In The Daily Mail reported 4: Is this the real face of Jesus? The contours of the face and body were taken from the ghostly face imprinted on the Shroud, the bloodied linen sheet said to have covered the body of Christ in his tomb. Months of painstaking work went into the reconstruction, which is the first of its kind. The face is hidden in there. By imitating those distortions we could take the image and put it back into shape and figure out what the face looked like. Debate has raged for centuries about the authenticity of the Shroud. In , carbon dating tests appeared to show that the material dated back to between and , suggesting that it was a medieval forgery. However, it was subsequently claimed that the results could have been distorted as the linen has been repaired over the centuries due to water or fire damage. Two million people are expected to view the Shroud when it goes on display next month at Turin Cathedral. This means that, assuming the authenticity of the Shroud, the real Jesus of Nazareth could prove his identity by reference to the impeccability of the match between his face and the face on the Shroud. Shroud-face v the face of Brian Leonard Golightly Marshall: The following article appeared in Popular Mechanics in 5: From the first time Christian children settle into Sunday school classrooms, an image of Jesus Christ is etched into their minds. In North America he is most often depicted as being taller than his disciples,

lean, with long, flowing, light brown hair, fair skin and light-colored eyes. Familiar though this image may be, it is inherently flawed. A person with these features and physical bearing would have looked very different from everyone else in the region where Jesus lived and ministered. Surely the authors of the Bible would have mentioned so stark a contrast. On the contrary, according to the Gospel of Matthew, when Jesus was arrested in the garden of Gethsemane before the Crucifixion, Judas Iscariot had to indicate to the soldiers whom Jesus was because they could not tell him apart from his disciples. Further clouding the question of what Jesus looked like is the simple fact that nowhere in the New Testament is Jesus described, nor have any drawings of him ever been uncovered. There is the additional problem of having neither a skeleton nor other bodily remains to probe for DNA. In the absence of evidence, our images of Jesus have been left to the imagination of artists. What did Jesus look like? An answer has emerged from an exciting new field of science: Using methods similar to those police have developed to solve crimes, British scientists, assisted by Israeli archeologists, have re-created what they believe is the most accurate image of the most famous face in human history. The Body As Evidence An outgrowth of physical anthropology, forensic anthropology uses cultural and archeological data as well as the physical and biological sciences to study different groups of people, explains A. Midori Albert, a professor who teaches forensic anthropology at the University of North Carolina at Wilmington. Experts in this highly specialized field require a working knowledge of genetics, and human growth and development. In their research they also draw from the fields of primatology, paleoanthropology the study of primate and human evolution and human osteology the study of the skeleton. Even seemingly distant fields like nutrition, dentistry and climate adaptation play a role in this type of investigation. While forensic anthropology is usually used to solve crimes, Richard Neave, a medical artist retired from The University of Manchester in England, realized it also could shed light on the appearance of Jesus. The co-author of *Making Faces: If anyone could create an accurate portrait of Jesus, it would be Neave*. It is clear that his features were typical of Galilean Semites of his era. And so the first step for Neave and his research team was to acquire skulls from near Jerusalem, the region where Jesus lived and preached. Semite skulls of this type had previously been found by Israeli archeology experts, who shared them with Neave. Special computer programs then evaluated reams of information about known measurements of the thickness of soft tissue at key areas on human faces. This made it possible to re-create the muscles and skin overlying a representative Semite skull. The entire process was accomplished using software that verified the results with anthropological data. From this data, the researchers built a digital 3D reconstruction of the face. Next, they created a cast of the skull. Layers of clay matching the thickness of facial tissues specified by the computer program were then applied, along with simulated skin. The nose, lips and eyelids were then modeled to follow the shape determined by the underlying muscles. Drawn before the Bible was compiled, they held crucial clues that enabled the researchers to determine that Jesus had dark rather than light-colored eyes. They also pointed out that in keeping with Jewish tradition, he was bearded as well. While most religious artists have put long hair on Christ, most biblical scholars believe that it was probably short with tight curls. This assumption, however, contradicted what many believe to be the most authentic depiction: Although there is a difference of opinion as to whether the shroud is genuine, it clearly depicts a figure with long hair. In one chapter he mentions having seen Jesus " then later describes long hair on a man as disgraceful. For Neave and his team this settled the issue. Jesus, as drawings from the first century depict, would have had short hair, appropriate to men of the time. From an analysis of skeletal remains, archeologists had firmly established that the average build of a Semite male at the time of Jesus was 5 ft. Since Jesus worked outdoors as a carpenter until he was about 30 years old, it is reasonable to assume he was more muscular and physically fit than westernized portraits suggest. His face was probably weather-beaten, which would have made him appear older, as well. As might well be expected, not everyone agrees. Forensic depictions are not an exact science, cautions Alison Galloway, professor of anthropology at the University of California in Santa Cruz. The details in a face follow the soft tissue above the muscle, and it is here where forensic artists differ widely in technique. Galloway points out that some artists pay more attention to the subtle differences in such details as the distance between the bottom of the nose and the mouth. And the most recognizable features of the face " the folds of the eyes, structure of the nose and shape of the mouth " are left to the artist. *The Face of an Ancient Israelite People*

are indeed want to mistakenly create Jesus in their own image for the African American, the face of Jesus is the face of an African American man, for the European, the face of Jesus is the face of a European man. For those -like Downing- raised in the world dominated by Hollywood, there is no more realistic Jesus-face than a the face of a male Hollywood actor and so Downing offers us Hollywood-Jesus. But while the face of Jesus may bear some resemblance to some of the faces belonging to these groups, it is first and foremost the face of an ancient Israelite. There is some question today as to what the face of an ancient Israelite looks like, but we can get a good idea -not from the pseudo-scientific fantasies of Richard Neave- but from the Samaritan High Priests. Since the time of Alexander the Great the Samaritans have been completely isolated genetically, and the lineage of the High Priests -the most extensively documented Israelite lineage in the world - has according to Samaritan tradition existed continuously since the time of Aaron, the brother of Moses, and has been held by priests in the last thirty-four centuries. Shroud-face v the face of Jacob ben Aaron, a direct descendant of the biblical Aaron: The Money-Changers For centuries, artists not so much iconographers, whose motives are pure and forgers have been producing fake images of Jesus for the purposes of flogging them, and the same criticism that can be levelled at the authors of books on Jesus, most notably those books on the Shroud of Turin that appear around Easter time:

Chapter 6 : Project MUSE - Theology, Praxis, and Ethics in the Thought of Juan Luis Segundo, S.J.

to find the frequency and page number of specific words and phrases. This can be especially useful to help you decide if the book is worth buying, checking out from a library, etc.

Human rights[edit] According to Marc H. Bornstein , and William E. Paden, the Golden Rule is arguably the most essential basis for the modern concept of human rights , in which each individual has a right to just treatment, and a reciprocal responsibility to ensure justice for others. The development of human "rights" is a modern political ideal that began as a philosophical concept promulgated through the philosophy of Jean Jacques Rousseau in 18th century France, among others. Damrosch argued that to confuse the Golden Rule with human rights is to apply contemporary thinking to ancient concepts. Psychologically, it involves a person empathizing with others. Philosophically, it involves a person perceiving their neighbor also as "I" or "self". In evolution, " reciprocal altruism " is seen as a distinctive advance in the capacity of human groups to survive and reproduce, as their exceptional brains demanded exceptionally long childhoods and ongoing provision and protection even beyond that of the immediate family. The most serious among these is its application. How does one know how others want to be treated? The obvious way is to ask them, but this cannot be done if one assumes they have not reached a particular and relevant understanding. Differences in values or interests[edit] George Bernard Shaw wrote, "Do not do unto others as you would that they should do unto you. Their tastes may be different. Hence, the Golden Rule of "do unto others" is "dangerous in the wrong hands," [79] according to philosopher Iain King , because "some fanatics have no aversion to death: Cannot be a sole guide to action[edit] In his book *How to Make Good Decisions and Be Right All the Time* , philosopher Iain King has argued that " although the idea of mirroring your treatment of others with their treatment of you is very widespread indeedâ€ most ancient wisdoms express this negatively â€ advice on what you should not do, rather than what you should. The positive formulation, meanwhile, can be "incendiary", [82] since it "can lead to cycles of tit-for-tat reciprocity," unless it is accompanied by a corrective mechanism, such as a concept of forgiveness. Their tastes may be different" is no doubt a smart saying. Thus the "golden rule" might still express the essence of a universal morality even if no two men in the world had any needs or tastes in common. In his book on the golden rule, Jeffrey Wattles makes the similar observation that such objections typically arise while applying the golden rule in certain general ways namely, ignoring differences in taste, in situation, and so forth. It follows that we should not do so ourselvesâ€according to the golden rule. In this way, the golden rule may be self-correcting. We would often want other people to ignore any prejudice against our race or nationality when deciding how to act towards us, but would also want them to not ignore our differing preferences in food, desire for aggressiveness, and so on. This principle of "doing unto others, wherever possible, as they would be done by

Chapter 7 : Biblical Faith: An Evolutionary Approach - Gerd Theissen - Google Books

Specifically they both developed an evolutionary approach to Jesus of Nazareth, so helpful in pondering Jesus' death; the evolutionary way of the universe and of humanisation within it is to learn how to die, to live the value of to change and to die unto novelty, thanks to our willingness to take chances.

Chapter 8 : Used Evolutionary Approach to Jesus of Nazareth on OnBuy

Jesus of Nazareth Yesterday and Today, vol. V. TS. Add to Cart. Turn on 1-Click ordering for this browser. Evolutionary Approach to Jesus Paperback - May 1,

Chapter 9 : On the Real Face of Jesus of Nazareth

In the tradition of Karl Rahner and Teilhard de Chardin, this book from renowned New Testament scholar Gerd Theissen

daringly probes the innermost sanctuaries of the biblical tradition through the lens of evolutionary theory.