

Chapter 1 : context | Definition of context in English by Oxford Dictionaries

However, identifying the specific historical circumstances requires an abundance of conjecture; thus, interpreters should use this information with caution when interpreting the book's message. Presuppositions Before an investigation is possible, analysts must first determine the plausibility of identifying the original readers.

Yaoi Yuri Click to include a genre to your search. If you include Comedy, it will filter only mangas with comedy genre. You can include multiple genres Double Click to exclude a genre. Action One or more heroes is thrust into a series of challenges that require physical feats, extended fights and frenetic chases. Adventure Exciting stories, with new experiences or exotic locales. Adventure manga are very similar to the action genre, in that they are designed to provide an action-filled, energetic experience for the manga reader. Comedy Main emphasis is on humour Also, mangas in this style typically have a happy ending. Demons Manga sets story on demonic beings. Drama Depends mostly on in-depth development of realistic characters dealing with emotional themes. Ecchi Manga including nudity. Usually it is used in works that have a focus on comedy and is often described as its own genre, depicting the typical elements. Fantasy Involving magic, supernatural events, make-believe creatures, or exotic fantasy worlds. The genre is considered to be distinct from Sci-fi and Horror, although the genres do overlap. Gender Bender Dressing in the opposite sex, wearing make-ups, or even switching bodies in some cases. Harem The most common and practically tantamount scenario is a male surrounded by a group of females; when this is reversed it is informally referred to as a reverse harem. Historical Tells a story that is set in the past. That setting is usually real and drawn from history, and often contains actual historical persons, but the principal characters tend to be fictional. Horror Horror manga are unsettling mangas that strive to elicit the emotions of fear, disgust and horror from readers. Josei Target demographic of manga created mostly by women for late teenage and adult female audiences. The male equivalent to Josei is seinen. Magic Manga includes elements such as wizards or characters with magic ability. Mature May be too extreme for people under the age of Mecha Mecha manga cover all series that revolve around the use of piloted robotic armors in battle. Military Contain elements from army. Story may be set in future or past. Mystery Mysterious circumstances of a crime by means of clues, investigation, and clever deduction. One Shot Manga usually consisting of one chapter or very short. Psychological Relies on character fears, guilt, beliefs, and emotional instability to build tension and further the plot. May contain some disturbing contents. Romance Manga have some aspect of romance between characters. School Life School Life manga are set in a school or university campus, and deals primarily with the life of students. Seinen Seinen manga is a subset of manga that is generally targeted at an 18-30 year old male audience. Shoujo Refers to manga marketed to a female audience roughly between the ages of 10 and Smut Contain offensive contents, especially sexually profane materials. Sports Story centers around sports such as baseball, basketball etc. Superpower A very likely genre to supernatural. Supernatural Powers or things that do not happen in nature. Tragedy Form of drama based on human suffering. Vampire Manga set on the story about vampire myths Blood sucking supernatural beings.

Chapter 2 : John Locke (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)

The Historical Context of Paul's Letters To the Galatians and Romans By Andrew S. Kulikovsky
calendrierdelascience.com(Hons) April 8, 1. INTRODUCTION Not many letters have had such a great impact on the western world as the letter of Paul.

In the end, analysis of the book of Hebrews reveals that it is a homily addressed to a particular group of Hellenist Jewish-Christians. Written prior to AD 70, the original recipients required strong encouragement to combat spiritual lethargy, immaturity, and the threat of persecution. Presuppositions Before an investigation is possible, analysts must first determine the plausibility of identifying the original readers. This requires examining the title of the book, its genre, and the date of composition. Baker Academic, , Carson and Douglas J. Moo, *An Introduction to the New Testament*, 2nd ed. Zondervan, , Paul Ellingworth explains that the title likely refers to a Jewish audience as opposed to Gentiles. Likewise, Adolf Deissman distinguishes between a letter and an epistle, commenting that an epistle gives the impression it 3 Paul Ellingworth, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*: Eerdmans Publishing Company, , Scribner, , Its true intention, however, is to address a larger audience. Both argue that Hebrews was not meant for anyone specific. William Lane explains that the book is actually an ancient homily. Lane explains that the author gives the impression that he is present with his audience as though he were delivering a speech directly to the group cf. In fact, the author describes his writing as a speech rather than a formal document cf. For instance, if the writer wrote prior to the Roman siege of Palestine in AD 70, then the author could have been addressing members of Jerusalem or even Qumran. However, if the author wrote after AD 70, then interpreters can no longer consider these two groups. Kistemaker and Hendriksen hypothesize that the author was exhorting his audience during a time of peace rather than persecution. It was because of the surrounding tranquility that the audience became spiritually lazy. Also, the author boldly writes against the Levitical priesthood and never mentions the temple in Jerusalem. Kistemaker and Hendriksen conclude a date of AD Likewise, the absence of mentioning the Jerusalem temple is an argument from silence. *Notes and Essays on the Greek Text*, 3d ed. MacMillan, , xxxvii. Kistemaker, *Baker New Testament Commentary*: Baker Books, , Second, the author suggests that he and his audience were second-generation Christians 2: The comment that a lengthy amount of time has elapsed since the audience first converted to Christianity 5: Also, the verses do not preclude other lesser-known trials that occurred throughout the Roman Empire by different antagonistic groups. In the end, Ellingworth concludes that determining a precise date is almost impossible. The author states in 8: Both verbs are present participles, indicating that the process of dismantling the old rituals was still underway but not yet completed. This would be a strange statement if the old system, as operated under the Jerusalem temple, had already been destroyed. These suggestions are unverifiable and cannot be determined with any certainty. For instance, Mal Couch attributes an apologetic and polemical value to the book of Hebrews. He believes the homily 17 Ibid. See, also, George H. *Hebrews* Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, , n8. The book was then later used by Christians to combat other doubting Jews. As Decker explains, the author reports in his homily that the readers formerly confessed faith in Christ 4: Paul Tanner argues that the author believed his readers made a genuine profession of faith, some interpreters doubt the genuineness of this confession cf. Realistically, it seems more plausible that the author was unable to discern genuine believers from nominal Christians. While some appear to have lost their association with the church Ellingworth acknowledges that this does not necessarily mean they were second-generation Christians, though it is obvious that they were not new believers, either cf. Jewish-Christians and Gentle-Christians cf. Those who argue for a Gentile audience recognize that the allusions to Jewish rituals are dependent on a literary knowledge of the Old Testament rather than any personal experience. Nonetheless, as Decker explains, these arguments do not prove the audience was pagan. It merely allows for the possibility of a Gentile presence. They reason that a Jewish-Christian audience, if they regressed back to Judaism, would still know the one true God. On the other hand, only a Gentile-Christian audience would abandon the living God if they lapsed back into paganism. *Word Books*, , 47A: For a list of interpreters who ascribe to a Gentile audience, see Decker, 25n For the author, Christ is the direct revelation of

divinity 1: The evidences for a Jewish ethnicity are more concrete. To begin, the author assumed that the original readers accepted the Old Testament as divinely inspired cf. Jesus is compared only to Jewish themes, such as angels 1: Finally, the author believed his audience could personally relate to ancient Israel cf. Decker points out that the book does not mention anything about Gentile 28 Ellingworth, See, also, John V. Instead, Christianity is repeatedly compared to Judaism. For instance, the book parallels oral traditions concerning tithes 7: Julius Scott reflects, intertestamental Judaism developed a variety of sects and parties that excluded the chance for a homogenous society in the first century. For those who accept a Jewish ethnicity, the text readily depicts a disassociation from the traditional Hebraic Jews of Palestine. Interpreters have suggested three primary affiliations: Sandegren explains 31 Decker, Bruce, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, rev. Eerdmans Publishing Company, , 27n, n Sandegren cites James 3: He insists that the author naturally thought of his readers as teachers, as opposed to being farmers or some other occupation. Similarly, Sandegren believes the exhortation to be hospitable Thus, after facing the confiscation of their property There is no reason that only priests could become teachers. In fact, many of the early church leaders became instructors without mention of their former priestly roles. Likewise, hospitality does not require owning land or property. Similarly, it would be strange for the author to address former priests and yet make no mention of the Jerusalem temple or its institution. Instead, the author alluded only to the tabernacle, something that former priests would have had no direct experience personally. Qumran Sect A popular suggestion is that the readers either belonged to or were converts from the Qumran sect. Daryl Charles explains, the Qumran community viewed Michael the 35 C. As Decker reveals, this can hardly be the case. The earliest manuscripts do not support this contention and the two titles are not easily confused; Decker, See, also, Ellingworth, The author of Hebrews directly refutes each of these themes, indicating that the audience likely shared similar beliefs with the Qumran community. As Bruce concludes, mere affinities cannot determine the particular target audience. Besides, all of these elements were present in many Jewish groups from the first century, not just Qumran. Many of the connections are loose and not strongly attested in either sectarian literature or the book of Hebrews. There is simply no strong evidence to suggest that the recipients were ever part of the Qumran community. The readers were likely not adherents to the traditional, Hebraic form of worship. Hellenist Jews The best evidence involves the readers association with the broader, Hellenistic culture. Lane provides a defense for a Hellenistic Jewish-Christian audience. He comments that the author not only assumed authority in the Old Testament Scriptures, but he assumed authority specifically in the Greek Septuagint, which was the main Bible for Jews in the Diaspora. For instance, the introduction of Hebrews reflects Hellenistic wisdom literature by referencing Jesus as a royal son, royal priest, and His role in creation, revelation, and redemption. Hellenistic Judaism also maintained the tradition that angels mediated the Law and placed Moses as a central figure. All of these elements are assumed true in the book of Hebrews. It can be argued that these details merely reflect the background of the author rather than the culture of the recipients. The author simply assumes the readers share in the same knowledge. Both conclude that the author was a Hellenist preacher.

Historical context is an important part of life and literature and without it, memories, stories and characters have less meaning. What exactly is historical context? It's essentially the details that surround an occurrence. In more technical terms, historical context refers to the social.

I read the Psalms for love, the Proverbs for wisdom and the book of Acts for power. These three things—love, wisdom and power have for years been on the top of my prayer list. One day while meditating on one of the Psalms, I found myself wondering where the author was when he wrote it, what the circumstances were surrounding its writing and what exactly prompted the author to compose such a masterpiece. I fled to the library of my memory and the refuge of my commentaries until my temporary search became long research. This venture was so enjoyable that I traveled the historical path of another Psalm, then another, then another, which soon led to a series of Bible studies at the First Baptist Church of Hammond on the conditions and circumstances surrounding the writing of each of the Psalms. It makes our study richer as we stand beside the author as he writes and as we feel his heartbeat, watch his tears, enjoy his laughter and join in his praise. May the author beg scholastic mercy of the reader. The following words were not penned to be examined by the microscope of the scholar but rather to be enjoyed by the study of the saint. With lovingkindness, a prayerful spirit and a desire to bless, let me lead you into the Psalms, the songbook of Israel, that we together may enjoy the stories behind the Psalms.

Solomon There is no definite evidence to his authorship of this Psalm, but there are strong grounds for suspicioning such. Even the casual reader will note a strong similarity between the Proverbs and the first Psalm. **The Story Behind the Psalm** The father is talking to his son. Perhaps this father is Solomon. Perhaps the son is Rehoboam, who succeeded him on the throne. Solomon is teaching Rehoboam the way to blessedness and is warning him about the destruction of those who follow evil. In some ways it may be regarded as a preface to the rest of the Psalms. Perhaps it is a summary of what is to come later, for is it not true that all of the Psalms teach us the blessedness of living a holy and righteous life and the danger of living a life for self and sin. It was memorized by each child and quoted and sung over and over again. Wise parents teach this Psalm to their children unto this day. Fathers gather the family together and explain the beautiful recipe for success given in this Psalm, as follows: Walking not in the counsel of the ungodly, plus standing not in the way of sinners, plus sitting not in the seat of the scornful, plus delighting in the law of the Lord, plus meditating in the Word of God day and night equals success. It is interesting to note that the word "blessed" in verse 1 is a plural word in the original. It means that there are a multiplicity of blessings which rest upon the person who observes the five conditions for prosperity and success. The Psalm should be read with a mental picture of a father talking with his son, counseling with him and advising him about life. Emphasis should be placed upon seeking counsel only from the saved, running with the right crowd, not developing a critical tongue, enjoying the Word of God and meditating therein. Then, a warning should be given concerning the instability and tragic results of sin.

David This is beautifully verified in Acts 4: He gathered an army and a following and led in an attempt to overthrow David and to make himself the king. Notice this implication in verse 2. When the civil war began, David refused to fight against his son. He fled the city to a place called Mahanaim and there watched the dust of battle rise, realizing that his own son had marshalled an army against the king. Notice his unwillingness to retaliate. He left revenge to the Lord, and the Lord adequately took care of this duty. Victory did come to David, but it was accompanied by tragedy, for his son was killed in the battle. You will find the victory mentioned in verses 6, 8 and 9. They turned to it when good seemed to turn out bad and bad seemed to turn out good. Every Christian has faced such times. There are occasions when it seems that no matter how sincere one is or how hard he works for God, those who live unrighteous lives seem to be on the mountaintop while we are in the valley. When such feelings arise, what a comfort it is to have the second Psalm to which to flee. When you are living righteously in poverty, want, illness, etc. Right will turn out right, and right is its own reward. Victory will come if we will wait on the Lord and not take matters into our own hands. Once a unsaved farmer came to the preacher and said, "Reverend, this year I plowed my field on Sunday, I planted seed on Sunday, I chopped weeds on

Sunday, and I harvested my crop on Sunday, and this October 1 had the best crop I have ever had. What do you say to that, Reverend? With that mental image, read the Psalm.

Chapter 4 : Niccolò Machiavelli (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)

History (from Greek ἱστορία - historia, meaning "inquiry, knowledge acquired by investigation") is the discovery, collection, organization, and presentation of information about past events.

It is speculated that he attended the University of Florence, and even a cursory glance at his corpus reveals that he received an excellent humanist education. It is only with his entrance into public view, with his appointment as the Second Chancellor of the Republic of Florence, however, that we begin to acquire a full and accurate picture of his life. For the next fourteen years, Machiavelli engaged in a flurry of diplomatic activity on behalf of Florence, travelling to the major centers of Italy as well as to the royal court of France and to the imperial curia of Maximilian. We have letters, dispatches, and occasional writings that testify to his political assignments as well as to his acute talent for the analysis of personalities and institutions. Florence had been under a republican government since 1494, when the leading Medici family and its supporters had been driven from power. During this time, Machiavelli thrived under the patronage of the Florentine gonfaloniere or chief administrator for life, Piero Soderini. Machiavelli was a direct victim of the regime change: His retirement thereafter to his farm outside of Florence afforded the occasion and the impetus for him to turn to literary pursuits. The first of his writings in a more reflective vein was also ultimately the one most commonly associated with his name, *The Prince*. Written at the end of 1513 and perhaps early 1514, but only formally published posthumously in 1532, *The Prince* was composed in great haste by an author who was, among other things, seeking to regain his status in the Florentine government. Many of his colleagues in the republican government were quickly rehabilitated and returned to service under the Medici. He wrote verse, plays, and short prose, penned a study of *The Art of War* published in 1520, and produced biographical and historical sketches. Most importantly, he composed his other major contribution to political thought, the *Discourses on the Ten Books of Titus Livy*, an exposition of the principles of republican rule masquerading as a commentary on the work of the famous historian of the Roman Republic. Unlike *The Prince*, the *Discourses* was authored over a long period of time commencing perhaps in 1517 and completed in 1526, although again only published posthumously in 1791. The book may have been shaped by informal discussions attended by Machiavelli among some of the leading Florentine intellectual and political figures under the sponsorship of Cosimo Rucellai. Near the end of his life, and probably as a result of the aid of well-connected friends whom he never stopped badgering for intervention, Machiavelli began to return to the favor of the Medici family. Other small tasks were forthcoming from the Medici government, but before he could achieve a full rehabilitation, he died on 21 June 1527.

Analyzing Power

It has been a common view among political philosophers that there exists a special relationship between moral goodness and legitimate authority. Many authors especially those who composed mirror-of-princes books or royal advice books during the Middle Ages and Renaissance believed that the use of political power was only rightful if it was exercised by a ruler whose personal moral character was strictly virtuous. Thus rulers were counseled that if they wanted to succeed—that is, if they desired a long and peaceful reign and aimed to pass their office down to their offspring—they must be sure to behave in accordance with conventional standards of ethical goodness. In a sense, it was thought that rulers did well when they did good; they earned the right to be obeyed and respected inasmuch as they showed themselves to be virtuous and morally upright. It is precisely this moralistic view of authority that Machiavelli criticizes at length in his best-known treatise, *The Prince*. For Machiavelli, there is no moral basis on which to judge the difference between legitimate and illegitimate uses of power. Rather, authority and power are essentially coequal: *The Prince* purports to reflect the self-conscious political realism of an author who is fully aware—on the basis of direct experience with the Florentine government—that goodness and right are not sufficient to win and maintain political office. Machiavelli thus seeks to learn and teach the rules of political power. For Machiavelli, power characteristically defines political activity, and hence it is necessary for any successful ruler to know how power is to be used. Only by means of the proper application of power, Machiavelli believes, can individuals be brought to obey and will the ruler be able to maintain the state in safety and security. Nowhere does this come out more clearly than in his treatment of the relationship between law and force. Machiavelli

acknowledges that good laws and good arms constitute the dual foundations of a well-ordered political system. But he immediately adds that since coercion creates legality, he will concentrate his attention on force. In other words, the legitimacy of law rests entirely upon the threat of coercive force; authority is impossible for Machiavelli as a right apart from the power to enforce it. Consequently, Machiavelli is led to conclude that fear is always preferable to affection in subjects, just as violence and deception are superior to legality in effectively controlling them. As a result, Machiavelli cannot really be said to have a theory of obligation separate from the imposition of power; people obey only because they fear the consequences of not doing so, whether the loss of life or of privileges. And of course, power alone cannot obligate one, inasmuch as obligation assumes that one cannot meaningfully do otherwise. Concomitantly, a Machiavellian perspective directly attacks the notion of any grounding for authority independent of the sheer possession of power. For Machiavelli, people are compelled to obey purely in deference to the superior power of the state. If I think that I should not obey a particular law, what eventually leads me to submit to that law will be either a fear of the power of the state or the actual exercise of that power. He substantiates this assertion by reference to the observable realities of political affairs and public life as well as by arguments revealing the self-interested nature of all human conduct. For Machiavelli it is meaningless and futile to speak of any claim to authority and the right to command which is detached from the possession of superior political power. The ruler who lives by his rights alone will surely wither and die by those same rights, because in the rough-and-tumble of political conflict those who prefer power to authority are more likely to succeed. Without exception the authority of states and their laws will never be acknowledged when they are not supported by a show of power which renders obedience inescapable. The methods for achieving obedience are varied, and depend heavily upon the foresight that the prince exercises. Hence, the successful ruler needs special training. For the circumstances of political rule are such that moral viciousness can never be excluded from the realm of possible actions in which the prince may have to engage. Machiavelli sees politics to be a sort of a battlefield on a different scale. Fortuna is the enemy of political order, the ultimate threat to the safety and security of the state. While human Fortuna may be responsible for such success as human beings achieve, no man can act effectively when directly opposed by the goddess Machiavelli, "Machiavelli reinforces the association of Fortuna with the blind strength of nature by explaining that political success depends upon appreciation of the operational principles of Fortuna. Throughout his corpus, Fortuna is depicted as a primal source of violence especially as directed against humanity and as antithetical to reason. Thus, Machiavelli realizes that only preparation to pose an extreme response to the vicissitudes of Fortuna will ensure victory against her. For many, his teaching adopts the stance of immoralism or, at least, amoralism. Moral values have no place in the sorts of decisions that political leaders must make, and it is a category error of the gravest sort to think otherwise. Concentrating on the claim in *The Prince* that a head of state ought to do good if he can, but must be prepared to commit evil if he must Machiavelli, 58, Skinner argues that Machiavelli prefers conformity to moral virtue *ceteris paribus*. Jean-Jacques Rousseau long ago held that the real lesson of *The Prince* is to teach the people the truth about how princes behave and thus to expose, rather than celebrate, the immorality at the core of one-man rule. Various versions of this thesis have been disseminated more recently. Some scholars, such as Garrett Mattingly, have pronounced Machiavelli the supreme satirist, pointing out the foibles of princes and their advisors. The fact that Machiavelli later wrote biting popular stage comedies is cited as evidence in support of his strong satirical bent. Thus, we should take nothing Machiavelli says about moral conduct at face value, but instead should understand his remarks as sharply humorous commentary on public affairs. Machiavelli was no friend of the institutionalized Christian Church as he knew it. The *Discourses* makes clear that conventional Christianity saps from human beings the vigor required for active civil life Machiavelli, " And *The Prince* speaks with equal parts disdain and admiration about the contemporary condition of the Church and its Pope Machiavelli, 29, 44"46, 65, 91" For others, Machiavelli may best be described as a man of conventional, if unenthusiastic, piety, prepared to bow to the externalities of worship but not deeply devoted in either soul or mind to the tenets of Christian faith. *The State and the Prince: Machiavelli* is at best a transitional figure in the process by which the language of the state emerged in early modern Europe, as Mansfield concludes. Thus, the Machiavellian prince can count on no pre-existing structures of

legitimation, as discussed above. This is a precarious position, since Machiavelli insists that the throes of fortune and the conspiracies of other men render the prince constantly vulnerable to the loss of his state. Yet Machiavelli himself apparently harbored severe doubts about whether human beings were psychologically capable of generating such flexible dispositions within themselves. The Discourses on Livy: The Discourses certainly draw upon the same reservoir of language and concepts that fed *The Prince*, but the former treatise leads us to draw conclusions quite different from “many scholars have said contradictory to” the latter. A minimal constitutional order is one in which subjects live securely *vivere sicuro*, ruled by a strong government which holds in check the aspirations of both nobility and people, but is in turn balanced by other legal and institutional mechanisms. In a fully constitutional regime, however, the goal of the political order is the freedom of the community *vivere libero*, created by the active participation of, and contention between, the nobility and the people. Only in a republic, for which Machiavelli expresses a distinct preference, may this goal be attained. Machiavelli adopted this position on both pragmatic and principled grounds. Although Machiavelli makes relatively little comment about the French monarchy in *The Prince*, he devotes a great deal of attention to France in the Discourses. Why would Machiavelli effusively praise let alone even analyze a hereditary monarchy in a work supposedly designed to promote the superiority of republics? Machiavelli asserts that the greatest virtue of the French kingdom and its king is the dedication to law. The explanation for this situation Machiavelli refers to the function of the Parlement. These laws and orders are maintained by Parlements, notably that of Paris: These passages of the Discourses seem to suggest that Machiavelli has great admiration for the institutional arrangements that obtain in France. Specifically, the French king and the nobles, whose power is such that they would be able to oppress the populace, are checked by the laws of the realm which are enforced by the independent authority of the Parlement. He concludes that a few individuals want freedom simply in order to command others; these, he believes, are of sufficiently small number that they can either be eradicated or bought off with honors. By contrast, the vast majority of people confuse liberty with security, imagining that the former is identical to the latter: Although the king cannot give such liberty to the masses, he can provide the security that they crave: And once a prince does this, and the people see that he never breaks such laws, they will shortly begin to live securely *vivere sicuro* and contentedly Machiavelli, The law-abiding character of the French regime ensures security, but that security, while desirable, ought never to be confused with liberty. This is the limit of monarchic rule: Machiavelli holds that one of the consequences of such *vivere sicuro* is the disarmament of the people. This all comes from having disarmed his people and having preferred “to enjoy the immediate profit of being able to plunder the people and of avoiding an imaginary rather than a real danger, instead of doing things that would assure them and make their states perpetually happy. This disorder, if it produces some quiet times, is in time the cause of straitened circumstances, damage and irreparable ruin Machiavelli, A state that makes security a priority cannot afford to arm its populace, for fear that the masses will employ their weapons against the nobility or perhaps the crown. Yet at the same time, such a regime is weakened irredeemably, since it must depend upon foreigners to fight on its behalf. In this sense, any government that takes *vivere sicuro* as its goal generates a passive and impotent populace as an inescapable result. Confirmation of this interpretation of the limits of monarchy for Machiavelli may be found in his further discussion of the disarmament of the people, and its effects, in *The Art of War*. Addressing the question of whether a citizen army is to be preferred to a mercenary one, he insists that the liberty of a state is contingent upon the military preparedness of its subjects. In his view, whatever benefits may accrue to a state by denying a military role to the people are of less importance than the absence of liberty that necessarily accompanies such disarmament. The problem is not merely that the ruler of a disarmed nation is in thrall to the military prowess of foreigners. More crucially, Machiavelli believes, a weapons-bearing citizen militia remains the ultimate assurance that neither the government nor some usurper will tyrannize the populace. Machiavelli is confident that citizens will always fight for their liberty “against internal as well as external oppressors.

Chapter 5 : Historical background of the New Testament - Wikipedia

History of Western Philosophy: And Its Connection with Political and Social Circumstances from the Earliest Times to the Present Day - Kindle edition by Bertrand Russell. Download it once and read it on your Kindle device, PC, phones or tablets.

Archived from the original on Moving Toward a Consensus? Cadbury thinks the author is closest to being a historian, but writes on a popular level. Donelson characterizes the author as a cult historian who travels from place to place gathering traditions, setting down the origin of the sect. Pervo observes that even scholars such as Haenchen who rate the author as highly unreliable nevertheless classify him as a historian. Burkitt *The Gospel History and its Transmission*, pp. In addition it is often alleged that he made use of the writings of Josephus and the letters of Paul. The use of the LXX is not debatable, but the influence of Josephus and Paul has been and is subjected to considerable debate. University of California Press. A characteristic conglomerate of details, which in part agree, in part reflect great similarity, but also in part, appear dissimilar and to stem from different provenances, accords with this analysis. I do not believe that any such dependence can be proved. The fact is, as Schurer has said: What is clear is that Luke-Acts and Josephus shared some common traditions about the recent history of Palestine. Continuum International Publishing Group. An Introduction to the New Testament Chapter He constructed a lengthy list of inaccuracies Harnack, Acts pp. German scholarship has, for the most part, evaluated negatively the historical worth of Acts, from Baur and his school to Dibelius, Conzelmann, and Haenchen. North American scholars show a range of opinion. Mattill and Gasque align with the British approach to Acts. Cadbury and Lake take a moderate line and to some degree sidestep the question of accurate historicity. In my view this presupposes a relatively early date for Acts, when there was still a vivid memory of Paul the missionary, but the letter-writer was not known in the same way. In other words, as at least in part an eye-witness account for the late period of the apostle, about which we no longer have any information from the letters, it is a first-hand source. As Matthew and John attest, that was no longer the case around 15–25 years later; one need only compare the historical errors of the former Platonic philosopher Justin from Neapolis in Samaria, who was born around CE. This does not mean, though, that the Jerusalem Christians Matthias and Joseph were not historical figures" *ibid*. The upper room is the place for prayer and conversation The list of names agrees with Luke 6: So Paul can speak of those who were apostles before him in Jerusalem! It is, for instance, highly probable that the earliest community was taught by the apostles 2: At the same time it might seem unnecessary to deny another feature of the account in Acts, namely that the first followers of Jesus also attended the worship of the Temple 2: For without question they would have felt themselves to be still part of Israel. We should probably answer this in the affirmative, because his description of the conflict between the earliest community and the priestly nobility rests on correct historical assumptions. For the missionary activity of the earliest community in Jerusalem not long after the crucifixion of Jesus may have alarmed Sadducean circles For a start it is not clear whether he envisages property being sold and the proceeds distributed to the needy so in 2: If Barnabas possessed a field 4: This is depicted as an internal squabble which had to be settled within the Christian community and that implies that the earliest Christian community already had its own poor-relief system. Some have doubted that and therefore regard this account as anachronistic. *Jesu*", ZDPV, 63, pp. *A Mediterranean State in the Classical World*", p. *Pentecost and the Spread of Christianity*", p. If a *cohors Italica civium Romanorum* is meant, i. Haenchen, Acts, n. Speidel actually identifies a *cohors II Italica* c. The unit is not mentioned by Josephus nor is there epigraphical evidence for it at Caesarea nor anywhere in Judea. It is possible that the unit did not exist or was a later Syrian unit displaced to a different place and earlier time. *The Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary*", p. If so, the *cohors Italica* may have come in with the reconstitution of the province in 44 below, p. *From Pompey to Diocletian: Italica and, possibly also, the Coh. Augusta were prestigious regiments. Their operation in Judaea cannot be placed before AD 40 on the evidence available, but it is of course possible that they had been sent there before that, even under the first prefect after the fall of Archelaus. The Early Roman Period*", volume 3, p. For a robust defence of its historicity, see Bauckham, "James", and the relevant literature cited

there. Peabody, Massachusetts, , pp.

Chapter 6 : Historical reliability of the Acts of the Apostles - Wikipedia

15 Ordinary People Who Changed History. J. K. Rowling: Inspired a new generation of readers. the first in the company's entire history. She has changed the way the world imagines ballerinas.

Locke grew up and lived through one of the most extraordinary centuries of English political and intellectual history. It was a century in which conflicts between Crown and Parliament and the overlapping conflicts between Protestants, Anglicans and Catholics swirled into civil war in the s. This period lasted from to It was marked by continued conflicts between King and Parliament and debates over religious toleration for Protestant dissenters and Catholics. His father was a country lawyer who served in a cavalry company on the Puritan side in the early stages of the English Civil War. In Locke went to Westminster School in London. From Westminster school he went to Christ Church, Oxford, in the autumn of at the age of twenty. As Westminster school was the most important English school, so Christ Church was the most important Oxford college. Education at Oxford was medieval. Locke, like Hobbes before him, found the Aristotelian philosophy he was taught at Oxford of little use. There was, however, more at Oxford than Aristotle. The new experimental philosophy had arrived. The group around Wilkins was the nucleus of what was to become the English Royal Society. The Society grew out of informal meetings and discussion groups and moved to London after the Restoration and became a formal institution in the s with charters from Charles II. The program was to study nature rather than books. Locke received his B. His career at Oxford, however, continued beyond his undergraduate days. The rank was equivalent to a Fellow at any of the other colleges, but was not permanent. Locke had yet to determine what his career was to be. At this point, Locke needed to make a decision. The statutes of Christ Church laid it down that fifty five of the senior studentships should be reserved for men in orders or reading for orders. Only five could be held by others, two in medicine, two in law and one in moral philosophy. Thus, there was good reason for Locke to become a clergyman. Locke decided to become a doctor. The new leader of the Oxford scientific group was Robert Boyle. Boyle was, however, most influential as a theorist. He was a mechanical philosopher who treated the world as reducible to matter in motion. Locke read Boyle before he read Descartes. When he did read Descartes, he saw the great French philosopher as providing a viable alternative to the sterile Aristotelianism he had been taught at Oxford. In the Epistle to the Reader at the beginning of the Essay Locke remarks: The commonwealth of learning is not at this time without master-builders, whose mighty designs, in advancing the sciences, will leave lasting monuments to the admiration of posterity: Newton, with some others of that strain, it is ambition enough to be employed as an under-labourer in clearing the ground a little, and removing some of the rubbish that lies in the way to knowledge. Sydenham was an English physician and Locke did medical research with him. Presumably this will reveal the degree of certainty of the knowledge based on such ideas. David Thomas was his friend and collaborator. Locke and Thomas had a laboratory in Oxford which was very likely, in effect, a pharmacy. In Lord Ashley, one of the richest men in England, came to Oxford in order to drink some medicinal waters there. He had asked Dr. Thomas to provide them. Thomas had to be out of town and asked Locke to see that the water was delivered. As a result of this encounter, Ashley invited Locke to come to London as his personal physician. Living with him Locke found himself at the very heart of English politics in the s and s. Lord Ashley was one of the advocates of the view that England would prosper through trade and that colonies could play an important role in promoting trade. Ashley persuaded Charles II to create a Board of Trade and Plantations to collect information about trade and colonies, and Locke became its secretary. In his capacity as the secretary of the Board of Trade Locke was the collection point for information from around the globe about trade and colonies for the English government. In his capacity as the secretary to the Lords Proprietors, Locke was involved in the writing of the fundamental constitution of the Carolinas. There was a monetary crisis in England involving the value of money, and the clipping of coins. Locke wrote papers for Lord Ashley on economic matters, including the coinage crisis. While living in London at Exeter House, Locke continued to be involved in philosophical discussions. He tells us that: Were it fit to trouble thee with the history of this Essay, I should tell thee, that five or six friends meeting at my chamber, and discoursing on

a subject very remote from this, found themselves quickly at a stand, by the difficulties that rose on every side. After we had awhile puzzled ourselves, without coming any nearer a resolution of those doubts which perplexed us, it came into my thoughts that we took a wrong course; and that before we set ourselves upon inquiries of that nature, it was necessary to examine our own abilities, and see what objects our understandings were, or were not, fitted to deal with. This I proposed to the company, who all readily assented; and thereupon it was agreed that this should be our first inquiry. Some hasty and undigested thoughts, on a subject I had never before considered, which I set down against our next meeting, gave the first entrance into this Discourse; which having been thus begun by chance, was continued by intreaty; written by incoherent parcels; and after long intervals of neglect, resumed again, as my humour or occasions permitted; and at last, in a retirement where an attendance on my health gave me leisure, it was brought into that order thou now seest it.

Epistle to the Reader, N: He recalls the discussion being about the principles of morality and revealed religion Cranston Thus the Oxford scholar and medical researcher came to begin the work which was to occupy him off and on over the next twenty years. In after Shaftesbury had left the government, Locke went back to Oxford, where he acquired the degree Bachelor of medicine, and a license to practice medicine, and then went to France Cranston The Edict of Nantes promulgated by Henry IV in was in force, and so there was a degree of religious toleration in France. Louis XIV was to revoke the edict in and French Protestants were then killed while some , went into exile. In Shaftesbury was imprisoned in the tower. His imprisonment lasted for a year. In , after the mysterious murder of a London judge, informers most notably Titus Oates started coming forward to reveal a supposed Catholic conspiracy to assassinate the King and put his brother on the throne. This whipped up public anti-Catholic frenzy. Though Shaftesbury had not fabricated the conspiracy story, nor did he prompt Oates to come forward, he did exploit the situation to the advantage of his party. In the public chaos surrounding the sensational revelations, Shaftesbury organized an extensive party network, exercised great control over elections, and built up a large parliamentary majority. As the panic over the Popish plot receded, Shaftesbury was left without a following or a cause. Shaftesbury was seized on July 21, and again put in the tower. He was tried on trumped-up charges of treason but acquitted by a London grand jury filled with his supporters in November. At this point some of the Country Party leaders began plotting an armed insurrection which, had it come off, would have begun with the assassination of Charles and his brother on their way back to London from the races at Newmarket. The chances of such a rising occurring were not as good as the plotters supposed. Memories of the turmoil of the civil war were still relatively fresh. Eventually Shaftesbury, who was moving from safe house to safe house, gave up and fled to Holland in November He died there in January Locke stayed in England until the Rye House Plot named after the house from which the plotters were to fire upon the King and his brother was discovered in June of Locke left for the West country to put his affairs in order the very week the plot was revealed to the government and by September he was in exile in Holland. He also wrote and published his *Epistola de Tolerentia* in Latin. The English government was much concerned with this group. They tried to get a number of them, including Locke, extradited to England. In the meanwhile, the English intelligence service infiltrated the rebel group in Holland and effectively thwarted their efforts“at least for a while. The revolt was crushed, Monmouth captured and executed Ashcraft Ultimately, however, the rebels were successful. This became known as the Glorious Revolution of It is a watershed in English history. For it marks the point at which the balance of power in the English government passed from the King to the Parliament. Locke returned to England in on board the royal yacht, accompanying Princess Mary on her voyage to join her husband. It is worth noting that the *Two Treatises* and the *Letter Concerning Toleration* were published anonymously. Locke had met Damaris Cudworth in and became involved intellectually and romantically with her. She was the daughter of Ralph Cudworth, the Cambridge Platonist, and a philosopher in her own right. During the remaining years of his life Locke oversaw four more editions of the *Essay* and engaged in controversies over the *Essay* most notably in a series of published letters with Edward Stillingfleet, Bishop of Worcester. In a similar way, Locke defended the *Letter Concerning Toleration* against a series of attacks. Nor was Locke finished with public affairs. In the Board of Trade was revived. Locke played an important part in its revival and served as the most influential member on it until The new Board of Trade had administrative powers and was, in fact, concerned with a

wide range of issues, from the Irish wool trade and the suppression of piracy, to the treatment of the poor in England and the governance of the colonies. During these last eight years of his life, Locke was asthmatic, and he suffered so much from it that he could only bear the smoke of London during the four warmer months of the year. Locke plainly engaged in the activities of the Board out of a strong sense of patriotic duty. After his retirement from the Board of Trade in , Locke remained in retirement at Oates until his death on Sunday 28 October

The Limits of Human Understanding Locke is often classified as the first of the great English empiricists ignoring the claims of Bacon and Hobbes.

Because of the historical allusions found in the Gospel of Mark to the events of the First Jewish Revolt, the period of five years between 70 and 75 CE is the most plausible dating for the Gospel of Mark within the broader timeframe indicated of 65 to 80 CE.

Visit Website But when the Mayflower landed in Massachusetts instead of Virginia, discord began before the colonists even left the ship. The strangers argued the Virginia Company contract was void. The defiant strangers refused to recognize any rules since there was no official government over them. What Was the Mayflower Compact? Pilgrim leaders wanted to quell the rebellion before it took hold. After all, establishing a New World colony would be difficult enough without dissent in the ranks. The Pilgrims knew they needed as many productive, law-abiding souls as possible to make the colony successful. With that in mind, they set out to create a temporary set of laws for ruling themselves as per majority agreement. Who Wrote the Mayflower Compact? One now-famous colonist who signed the Mayflower Compact was Myles Standish. He was an English military officer hired by the Pilgrims to accompany them to the New World to serve as military leader for the colony. Standish played an important role in enforcing the new laws and protecting colonists against unfriendly Native Americans. What Was the Purpose of the Mayflower Compact? No one knows exactly what happened to the original Mayflower Compact. The Mayflower Compact created laws for Mayflower Pilgrims and non-Pilgrims alike for the good of their new colony. It was a short document which established that: They elected John Carver governor on November 21, Carver had helped secure financing for the Mayflower expedition and served in a leadership role during the voyage to America. Search parties then went ashore to find an ideal place to settle. They decided on Plymouth, where the colonists endured a brutal winter. Ravaged by starvation, disease and lack of shelter, more than half of the colonists died, yet Plymouth Colony survived. John Carver survived the hard winter of but died in April , and the colonists chose William Bradford to replace him. Under his leadership, Plymouth Colony started to thrive. As more and more settlers arrived and colonized the surrounding areas, a General Court was established. Each town elected representatives to attend the court, thereby creating an early representative government. Why Was the Mayflower Compact Important? The Mayflower Compact was important because it was the first document to establish self-government in the New World. The Mayflower Compact was an early, successful attempt at democracy and undoubtedly played a role in future colonists seeking permanent independence from British rule and shaping the nation that eventually became the United States of America. A Foundation for Our Constitution. Of Plymouth Plantation by William Bradford.

Chapter 8 : Chapter 13 - Argument: Convincing Others | CourseNotes

The historical reliability of the Acts of the Apostles, the principal historical source for the Apostolic Age, is of interest for biblical scholars and historians of Early Christianity as part of the debate over the historicity of the Bible.

Literary works can be entertaining, beautiful, funny, tragic, informative or meaningful. They take us beyond the limited experience of our lives to show us the lives of others, giving us experiences we may not face in our own lives. It leads us intellectually and emotionally, and deepens our understanding of our history, society and our individual lives. This connection between people and literature works both ways: History plays a fundamental role in shaping literature: How can we even consider reading literature without understanding the work through its historical context? Roland Barthes, in *The Death of the Author*, acknowledges that an author is always a product of his time: Historicism argues that literature is a product of its age and the meaning of a text can only be discovered by fitting it around other discourses from the same period. The author writes only what he or she has learnt from that particular time in history, and the messages their work conveys are inextricably linked to the society in which it is written. Literature tells us about contextual society, widening what literature is: One can gain a much wider and deeper understanding through looking at a piece from a historicist perspective. Although this may leave a little less room for interpretation, contextual exploration allows one to comprehend certain ideas that may not have been clear if one did not consider the time in which the text was written. It was undoubtedly a successful exploration of the time, however, by formalist standards, we should disregard it as bad literature as it has lost relevance in needing its contextual setting to be understood. In great writing from the past we find ancestors, and we not only see the country and the people as they were, but we also soak up the climate of the times through the language, characters, tones and settings. Chaucer is a brilliant social commentator, and his works provide one of the reliable sources of knowledge of medieval society that we have. Through it, we learn a lot about the estates in medieval society. If we were to read *The Canterbury Tales* from a purely formalist viewpoint, we would disregard this rich source of art and knowledge. Literature allows us to understand the political, cultural and philosophical movements and ideas that dominated particular cultures at a particular times. This alone should prove that context is imperative in determining the meaning of a literary text. When one ignores context, one may completely disregard a particular influence or aspect of the text and consequently the true sense of the piece will be missed. It is possible to develop meaning from literature without context, but context can still be used on the same piece to create a different outcome. It is important to explore context, but not necessarily vital.

Chapter 9 : Read Manga Online for Free. Search Manga

Most scholars who study the historical Jesus and early Christianity believe that the canonical gospels and life of Jesus must be viewed within his historical and cultural context, rather than purely in terms of Christian orthodoxy.

According to the Jewish-Roman historian Flavius Josephus , the three parties in contemporary Judaism were the Pharisees , the Sadducees and the Essenes , the last of these three being apparently marginalized and in some cases retired to quasi-monastic communities. The ancient synagogue at Capernaum The Pharisees were a powerful force in 1st-century Judea. Early Christians shared several beliefs of the Pharisees, such as resurrection, retribution in the next world, angels, human freedom, and Divine Providence. Some scholars speculate that Jesus was himself a Pharisee. They accepted the written Law only, rejecting the traditional interpretations accepted by the Pharisees, such as belief in retribution in an afterlife, resurrection of the body, angels, and spirits. After the fall of Jerusalem, they disappeared from history. Among these scholars is Pope Benedict XVI , who supposes in his book on Jesus that "it appears that not only John the Baptist, but possibly Jesus and his family as well, were close to the Qumran community. Sadducees and Pharisees in the Roman period[edit] This section does not cite any sources. Please help improve this section by adding citations to reliable sources. Unsourced material may be challenged and removed. March Learn how and when to remove this template message During this period serious theological differences emerged between the Sadducees and Pharisees. Whereas Sadducees favored a limited interpretation of the Torah , Pharisees debated new applications of the law and devised ways for all Jews to incorporate purity practices hitherto limited to the Jerusalem Temple , see also Ministry of Jesus Ritual cleanliness in their everyday lives. Unlike the Sadducees, the Pharisees also believed in and introduced the concept of the Resurrection of the Dead in a future, Messianic Age or World to Come. New prophets[edit] During this time a variety of other religious movements and splinter groups developed. The Talmud provides two examples of such Jewish miracle workers around the time of Jesus. On one occasion when God did not answer his prayer, he drew a circle in the dust, stood inside it, and informed God that he would not move until it rained. When it began to drizzle, Honi told God that he was not satisfied and expected more rain; it then began to pour. He explained that he wanted a calm rain, at which point the rain calmed to a normal rain. A later story In the Babylonian Talmud , Berakot 33a tells of a lizard that used to injure passers-by. Hanina ben Dosa came and put his heel over the hole; the lizard bit him and died. Such men were respected for their relationship with God but not considered especially saintly; their abilities were seen as one more unknowable thing and not deemed a result of any ultra-strict observance of Jewish law. Messiah in Judaism and Jewish Messiah claimants The literal translation of the Hebrew word mashiach messiah is "anointed", which refers to a ritual of consecrating someone or something by putting holy anointing oil upon it. It is used throughout the Hebrew Bible in reference to a wide variety of individuals and objects; for example, a Jewish king, Jewish priests and prophets, the Jewish Temple and its utensils, unleavened bread, and a non-Jewish king Cyrus the Great. He is considered to be a great military and political leader descended from King David, well versed with the laws that are followed in Judaism. Most Jews believed that their history was governed by God, meaning that even the conquest of Judea by the Romans was a divine act. Pilate blocked their route and killed their leaders. Josephus, who elsewhere expressed the common Judean prejudice against Samaritans, suggested that they were armed. According to historian H. Another such prophet was Theudas , who, sometime between 44 and 46 led a large group of people to the Jordan river, which he claimed he could part. Cuspius Fadus , a procurator after Pilate, blocked their route and killed Theudas. An "Egyptian Prophet" led thirty thousand around the Mount of Olives and sought to enter Jerusalem until stopped by Antonius Felix , a procurator after Fadus. Zealots, Sicarii and bandits[edit] This section does not cite any sources. March Learn how and when to remove this template message Judean hills of Israel When Herod was still military governor in the Galilee, he spent a good deal of time fighting bandits under the leadership of Ezekias. These bandits are best understood as a peasant group whose targets were local elites both Hasmonean and Herodian rather than Rome. Ventidius Cumanus procurator 48 to 52 CE often retaliated against brigandry by punishing peasant communities he believed to be

their base of support. When a Galilean pilgrim on the way to Jerusalem was murdered by a Samaritan, the bandit chief Eliezar organized Galilleans for a counter-attack, and Cumanus moved against the Jews. The Emperor Claudius took the Jewish side, and had the Samaritan leaders executed and exiled, and turned one named Veler over to the Jews who beheaded him. Thus, widespread peasant unrest of this period was not exclusively directed against Rome but also expressed discontent against urban elites and other groups; Roman policy sought to contain the power of the bandits while cultivating Jewish support. He raised an army primarily of local bandits who pillaged nearby Greek and Roman cities including ones occupied by Jewish elites, including the administrative centers of Sepphoris, Tiberias, and Gabara sometimes Gadara. This suggests that they were concerned primarily with gain or social insurrection against local elites, rather than a political revolution against Roman occupation. When Roman legions arrived from Syria, the bandit army melted away. The Romans employed a scorched earth policy in its fight in the north, driving thousands of peasants southwards towards Jerusalem. Between 67 and 68, these peasants, perhaps led by bandits, formed a new political party called the Zealots, which believed that an independent kingdom should be restored immediately through force of arms. It is unclear whether their leaders made messianic claims. The Zealots imprisoned members of the Herodian family, killed the former high priests Ananus ben Artanus and Joshua ben Gamaliel, and put on trial the wealthiest citizens. It is possible that they believed they were purging elements whom they believed would have surrendered to the Romans. But these purges also reveal the great social divide between Jewish peasants and aristocrats at this time. They formed part of a social revolution: Analysis of the gospels[edit] See also: Development of the New Testament canon Most historians view the gospels not as an objective account of Jesus, but as the product of men writing at a particular period, and grappling with particular theological as well as political issues. As these two documents circulated among Christians, other historical narratives were edited and organized. The four gospels ascribed to Matthew, Mark, Luke and John were regionally authoritative by proto-orthodoxy by the 2nd century. According to historian Paula Fredriksen Nevertheless, she argues, If something stands in the gospels that is clearly not in the interests of the late 1st-century church – disparaging remarks about Gentiles, for example, or explicit pronouncements about the imminent end of the world – then it has a stronger claim to authenticity than otherwise. Stated briefly, anything embarrassing is probably earlier. Even these criteria are not sufficient to recover "what really happened. According to Fredriksen, two events in the Gospels probably happened: These events are mentioned in all four gospels. Moreover, they do not conform to Jewish tradition in which there are no baptized and crucified messiahs. They are also embarrassing to the early Church. According to scholars such as Geza Vermes[citation needed] and E. Sanders,[citation needed] Jesus seems not to have belonged to any particular party or movement; Jesus was eclectic and perhaps unique in combining elements of many of these different – and for most Jews, opposing – positions. See Names and titles of Jesus Historians also often note that as Jesus was Jewish, his life, words, and teachings must be understood in the context of 1st century Judaism, his native culture, see for example Aramaic of Jesus. Moreover, they highlight 1st and 2nd century Judaism – especially after the destruction of the Temple – as being in a state of flux, consisting of a variety of sects. As the Gospel accounts are generally held to have been composed in the period immediately following the revolt of , it has been suggested that Christians had to refashion their theological and apocalyptic claims given that Jesus did not immediately return to restore the Jewish kingdom. Moreover, as Christianity emerged as a new religion seeking converts among the gentiles, and eventually as the religion of the emperor himself, it needed to assure both Roman authorities and prospective Gentile audiences that it neither threatened nor challenged imperial sovereignty. Split of early Christianity and Judaism As with many religions, no precise date of founding is agreed by all parties. Historians continue to debate the precise moment when Christianity established itself as a new religion, apart and distinct from Judaism. Some Christians were still part of the Jewish community up until the time of the Bar Kochba revolt in the s, see also Jewish Christians. As late as the 4th century, John Chrysostom strongly discouraged Christians from attending Jewish festivals in Antioch, which suggests at least some ongoing contact between the two groups in that city. Similarly for the Council of Laodicea around According to historian Shaye J. Cohen, The separation of Christianity from Judaism was a process, not an event. The essential part of this process was that the church

was becoming more and more gentile, and less and less Jewish, but the separation manifested itself in different ways in each local community where Jews and Christians dwelt together. In some places, the Jews expelled the Christians; in other, the Christians left of their own accord. By 66 CE, Jewish discontent with Rome had escalated. At first, the priests tried to suppress rebellion, even calling upon the Pharisees for help. After the Roman garrison failed to stop Hellenists from desecrating a synagogue in Caesarea, however, the high priest suspended payment of tribute, inaugurating the First Jewish-Roman War. In 70, the Temple was destroyed. The destruction of the Second Temple was a profoundly traumatic experience for the Jews, who were now confronted with difficult and far-reaching questions: How to explain the disastrous outcome of the rebellion? How to live in the post-Temple, Romanized world? How to connect present and past traditions? How people answered these questions depended largely on their position prior to the revolt. But the destruction of the Second Temple by the Romans not only put an end to the revolt, it marked the end of an era. Revolutionaries like the Zealots had been crushed by the Romans, and had little credibility the last Zealots died at Masada in The Sadducees, whose teachings were so closely connected to the Temple cult, disappeared. The Essenes also vanished, perhaps because their teachings so diverged from the issues of the times that the destruction of the Second Temple was of no consequence to them; precisely for this reason, they were of little consequence to the vast majority of Jews. Two organized groups remained: Some scholars, such as Daniel Boyarin and Paula Fredricksen, suggest that it was at this time, when Christians and Pharisees were competing for leadership of the Jewish people, that accounts of debates between Jesus and the apostles, debates with Pharisees, and anti-Pharisaic passages, were written and incorporated into the New Testament. Loss of records[edit] The siege of Jerusalem in 70 CE included a major fire at the Temple which destroyed all except the Western Wall ; what remained including the altar tablet was taken by Titus to Rome as trophies. March Learn how and when to remove this template message Following the destruction of the Temple, Rome governed Judea both through a Procurator at Caesarea, which had always been the Roman provincial capital, and through a Jewish Patriarch. A former leading Pharisee, Yohanan ben Zakkai, was appointed the first Patriarch the Hebrew word, Nasi, also means prince, or president, and he reestablished the Sanhedrin at Javneh under Pharisee control. Instead of giving tithes to the priests and sacrificing offerings at the Temple, the rabbis instructed Jews to give money to charities and study in local synagogues, as well as to pay the Fiscus Judaicus. In, the Emperor Hadrian threatened to rebuild Jerusalem as a pagan city dedicated to Jupiter, called Aelia Capitolina. Some of the leading sages of the Sanhedrin supported a rebellion and, for a short time, an independent state led by Simon bar Kochba; some, such as Rabbi Akiva, believed Bar Kochba to be messiah, or king. Up until this time, a number of Christians were still part of the Jewish community. However, they did not support or take part in the revolt. Whether because they had no wish to fight, or because they could not support a second messiah in addition to Jesus, or because of their harsh treatment by Bar Kochba during his brief reign, these Christians also left the Jewish community around this time.