

This feature is not available right now. Please try again later.

There is no new theology. There are new books published every month. How well do we give to God? Further, it speaks to the people of God about the true nature of giving. The second theme is the coming judgment upon the nation of Israel. The days of covenant-breaking Israel are numbered, and all that remains for what is left of the theocracy is covenant curse. After all, the preceding verse Is it one final lesson concerning the nature of true faith and piety, added to reinforce lessons previously given to the disciples? She possesses what God loves: She believes he will meet all of her needs. We are able to see a thematic bridge between scribal avarice and the pronouncement of ultimate curse on the nation: Will God abandon Israel and destroy his dwelling place, the temple? Therefore we will attempt to understand both the meaning of the pericope itself i. In order to understand the pericope itself we must first examine the preceding context They contain a harsh denunciation of the scribes in the form of a warning to the listening multitude v. The condemnation of the scribes is primarily concerned with their preoccupation with the mere appearance of godliness. The extent of their faith runs no deeper than religious displays: But Jesus singles out one particular sinister activity of the scribes that reveals the horrendous nature of their hypocrisy: Neither are the details of this practice delineated in the Biblical text. Scholarly opinion is divided. Manson is more specific, believing that this practice referred to the mismanagement of the property of widows who had dedicated themselves to the service of the temple. Derrett sees it as a practice of lawyers who were entrusted with the oversight of properties. This is true of its literal use in the NT the birds eating the seed in Luke 8: The reader should expect that whoever or whatever is the object of the devouring, it will be completely consumed as a result. In financial matters, a devoured victim would be left penniless. Further, within this context it is the single sin of the scribes apart from their preoccupation with the appearances of piety for which Jesus condemns them Mark Yet it is also the only sin that has a direct impact on the economic welfare of the people. In this sense it resembles the notorious Corban tradition, for which Jesus vilifies the Pharisees in the strongest terms 7: The effect of Corban was disobedience to the Torah, which in turn could result in destitution for the parents of anyone who would honor it. They compounded their sin of hypocrisy by actually overturning the Law of Moses, thus robbing those in society who were the most needy and vulnerable. So by reading Mark Within the pericope the contrast between the many rich people and the one poor widow is most easily seen in the structure of two sentences in the passage itself: She also makes her contribution, but by any normal standard it is an insignificant amount. Solemnly he calls his disciples to himself in order to instruct them. He then explains that the value of the offering is best measured against the financial worth of the offerer we might say, somewhat crudely perhaps, that the quality of an offering is best measured as a percentage of total assets. The poor widow has embodied that teaching in her own sacrificial giving. How different she is from the wealthy, who give only from their surplus after their own needs are satisfied and thus never feel the joyful pinch of self-denial in the cause of love note As noted above, there is a second contrast: It is a matter of genuine faith, which the widow expresses by the generosity of her offering she trusts that the God of Israel will meet her needs , versus unbelief, which the scribes express by exploiting their office for their own financial gain. Hers was a faith working through love, theirs was a hollow religion. The forms were present, but their religion had been emptied of its spiritual content. To many readers this second contrast may provide all the explanation that is needed as to why Mark included this account in his gospel. It is not simply a teaching on self-denying service though it is that. The latter is simply new material. A more careful look at the flow of thought from On this understanding, the widow herself stands as a symbol. Her impoverished condition alone is a scandal in Israel in the light of Torah. But the circumstances of her poverty make the scandal far more grievous, for it has come at the hands of those who are teachers in Israel: That is why it is proper to view the widow as an important redemptive-historical symbol. Her entrance into the court of the women with her offering described so carefully by Mark is also the entrance of a figure who carries with her some meaningful imagery right out of the Hebrew Scriptures. In the OT, widows, along with the fatherless and aliens, were the most vulnerable and dependent class of people in

the land. If a widow was afflicted it was her privilege to appeal directly to Yahweh for justice. Israel is reminded that the Sovereign and Almighty God, who does not show partiality or accept a bribe, will certainly execute justice for the widow Deut An Israelite widow was particularly vulnerable and dependent because of her inability to provide for herself. A woman without a husband or sons particularly if she were advanced in age would be unable to support herself e. Naomi in the book of Ruth. To remedy this, the Law of Moses included all sorts of safeguards—“social nets”—designed to ensure that a widow would not become destitute and starve. For example, there was the provision of the triennial tithe. It is important to note that obedience to this command would not deprive the Israelites of adequate food supplies for their own families. Generosity in the tithe would result in God blessing his people in all the works of their hands Instead of being overlooked they were to receive special and unique compensation. So at harvest time a landowner was not to return to his field for a forgotten sheaf, nor was he to go over his olive tree a second time once it had been beaten, nor was a vineyard to be picked twice. In each case whatever remained after the first act of harvesting was to be left for the widow Likewise they were to be gracious and compassionate in their dealings with the needy and vulnerable in their midst. The point is this: Presumably the majority of Israelites would be well fed as a result of their prosperity. But there would always be a minority in the land, including widows, who would be weak and reliant. This group was to be cared for by the larger community. Because Yahweh would generously supply the land with an abundance of food, there was no need to be greedy in the harvest and exhaustively gather from every tree, field or vineyard. Trust in Yahweh, manifested by obedience to his Law, would only bring more blessing. If the promise of blessing or the memories of captivity were not incentive enough, however, there was still the threat of covenant curse. In the covenant renewal of Deuteronomy 27 Yahweh promised curse for the man who withholds justice from the widow v. As we saw in Exodus 22 , if justice was not carried out by the leaders of the community the offender was liable to receive judgment directly from Yahweh himself. The prophets reveal to us that Israel and Judah were unmoved by either the promise of blessing or the threat of curse. The treatment of widows is a regular theme in the prophetic writings, so much so that it seems to be a sort of thermometer that measured the spiritual health of the nation. The welfare of widows in the northern kingdom was no better. For this Isaiah pronounces a woe upon them Thus the promise and certainty of judgment stand: The fact that the widow of Mark What is worse, however, is that her indigence is linked to the evil practice of the scribes, those who were the interpreters and teachers of the Law in Israel we are reminded of Isa The nation is apostate. Both widows are living in poverty, each in a time of national apostasy for the people of God though of course the widow of Zarephath is a Gentile who resides outside of the borders of Israel. Both widows are characterized by their faith. The widow in the temple also gives up all that she has to live on, believing that Yahweh will care for her according to his word Exod In this way the widow bypasses human judges and makes her appeal directly to God. Finally, each of these widows serves as a rebuke to the apostate nation: As a result, judgment is coming swiftly. The reader is brought from the impoverished widow to the description of the judgment of the temple in Mark The Lord of the temple had suddenly come to the temple, but he came bringing judgment Mal 3: It is no coincidence, then, that Mark He has found it to be thoroughly corrupted and apostate. It will be left desolate. First, the theme of true piety i. The quality of her faith stands in sharp contrast to the false piety of the hypocrites, who are more concerned with appearances than godliness. Further, they should shun any temptation to pursue their religion in a way that sets a premium on the approval of men rather than the approval of God cf. Second, the widow is a symbol: She represents one of the last nails in the coffin of national Israel. The Evangelical Theological Society. Box , Overland Park, KS —”

Chapter 2 : 38 Rimless Ammo

Licensed to YouTube by UMG (on behalf of Wind Up); Abramus Digital, SOLAR Music Rights Management, CMRRA, Reservoir Media (Publishing), ASCAP, Broma 16, Sony ATV Publishing, and 18 Music Rights.

Court of Appeals of Texas, Houston 1st Dist. Sinderson, Houston, for appellant. Don Jackson and Scott A. Hooper, Houston, for appellee. Donate Castro, plaintiff, appeals from a jury verdict that awarded him only actual damages and no punitive damages. Appellee has filed motions for rehearing, to withdraw motion for rehearing, to withdraw our opinion, and to expedite remand. We overrule all motions, except the motion to expedite issuance of remand, which we grant pursuant to Tex. However, we withdraw our earlier opinion, issued on January 31, , and substitute this opinion in lieu thereof. His injuries left him permanently disabled. Scope of admissible evidence Defendant stipulated actual and gross negligence and proximate cause. As a result of the stipulation, the trial court ruled that the only evidence that was probative was evidence of actual and punitive damages. The trial court did not permit any evidence of negligence or gross negligence that did not immediately precede the accident. At the pretrial conference, the trial court defined the scope of admissible evidence: Since negligence and gross negligence have been admitted by the defendants in this caseâ€”I have advised plaintiffs counsel that these witnesses may testify only in three primary areas They can testify about whether or not the defendant was smoking marijuana and if so how much. They can testify about how he drove the vehicle immediately before the accident, whether he was speeding or driving recklessly or weaving or those kind of things. Plaintiff alleged that defendant, by repeatedly violating laws designed to protect the public, showed a disregard for the safety of others, and thus was responsible for punitive damages. When an appellant seeks a reversal on the grounds of improper exclusion of evidence, the appellant must satisfy the requirements in rule 81 b 1 , and show 1. Plaintiff was not required to prove that but for the erroneous exclusion of the evidence, a different judgment would have resulted. Exclusion of evidence Under his sole point of error, plaintiff argues the trial court erred in excluding testimonial and documentary evidence of gross negligence. Exclusion of photographs Under subpart II. Of the 30 photographs plaintiff offered of the accident scene, the trial court admitted only three. The trial court refused to admit the other 27 photographs because defendant had stipulated actual and gross negligence. The court ruled that the photographs were not relevant to any remaining contested issue, that is, the amount and type of damages. The first question this Court must ask is: Was the trial court correct in assuming the photographs were prejudicial? The excluded photographs depict the car in which plaintiff was injured and show how the roof of the car was cut away to rescue plaintiff. Only two of the photographs depict injured persons, neither one the plaintiff, and they were taken from a distance, showing no blood or gore. Rule of the Texas rules of Civil Evidence permits the exclusion of relevant evidence only when its probative value is substantially outweighed by its unfair prejudice. Nothing in these photographs presented an unfair or prejudicial view of the accident. Did the trial court follow any principles or guidelines in finding these photographs had no probative value for damages? In reviewing awards of punitive damages, the supreme court tells us to consider the nature of the wrong, the character of the conduct involved, the degree of culpability of the wrongdoer, the situation and sensibilities of the parties, and the extent to which the conduct offends a public sense of justice and propriety. For these reasons, we hold the trial court should have admitted the photographs and it erred when it excluded them. The last question is: Did the exclusion of that evidence probably result in an improper judgment? This Court has held, if other evidence of the type excluded was admitted into evidence, the error was harmless. Because the excluded photographs vary significantly from the admitted photographs and give a more comprehensive view of the scene, their exclusion could have caused the rendition of an improper judgment. In summary, we hold the exclusion of the photographs was error for the following reasons: Exclusion of testimony Under subpoint II. Plaintiff argues that their testimony should have been allowed under Tex. In the bill of exceptions, Fisk testified that it was common knowledge in the community, not just the school, that defendant used drugs. Fisk testified that she rode with defendant three weeks before the accident and defendant smoked a joint of marihuana while he drove his car. She also testified that after the accident, before the police arrived, defendant

was concerned about hiding the bag of marihuana and getting it out of the car. Fisk testified that defendant continued to use drugs after the accident, showed no remorse about the accident, and in her opinion, did not learn a lesson from the accident. In the bill of exceptions, Kelley Chambers testified that defendant had a reputation for using and selling drugs in the community. Some of the drugs he used were marihuana, speed, quaaludes, and mandrex. When Chambers was subpoenaed for the grand jury, defendant told her she would be stupid to say anything about marihuana in the car on the night of the accident because no one would ever find out. Chambers testified that defendant did not show any remorse for the accident. After the accident, she heard defendant was still doing drugs. Rule b provides that evidence of other wrongs is not admissible to prove the character of a person in order to show that he acted according to his character. Such evidence is admissible, however, to prove motive, opportunity, intent, preparation, plan, knowledge, identity, or absence of mistake or accident. That defendant regularly smoked marihuana while driving a car was relevant to the determination of punitive damages. To determine if an award for punitive damages was appropriate, plaintiff should have been able to show the jury just how indifferent the defendant was to the danger of driving a car while smoking marihuana. The exclusion of the testimony was calculated to and probably did cause the rendition of an improper judgment. To qualify as a report under rule 8, plaintiff need only show that the document is authentic and that it contains one of the three types of matters specified in the rule. The report may contain one of the following: Only when the sources of the information or other circumstances indicate lack of trustworthiness, should a report be excluded under the rule. The first page of exhibit 11C contains a statement that it is certified by the custodian of the records according to the provisions in Tex. This Court in *Drake v. Texas Department of Public Safety, S.* The report showed a positive test for marihuana. The trial court ruled the urine analysis was not admissible because it was hearsay. Plaintiff claims the urine analysis was not hearsay under Tex. Before a public record can be admitted as an exception under the hearsay rule, the party offering the document must show it is authentic. A document is considered authentic if a sponsoring witness vouches for its authenticity or if the document meets the requirements of self-authentication in Tex. No sponsoring witness attested to the authenticity of exhibit 56 and it was not a self-authenticating document. Exhibit 56 is merely a photocopy of a form entitled "Harris County Adult Probation Department Urine Analysis Request," with certain information entered in handwriting. The form was signed by an officer and an observer, but neither signature identifies the person by title and the document was not under seal. To be a self-authenticating document, a public record must meet one of the requirements listed in Tex. Exhibit 56 did not meet any of the conditions for self-authentication for a public document in rule. The trial court correctly excluded exhibit. The trial court ruled the presentence investigation report was not admissible because it was hearsay. Plaintiff claims that the report was not hearsay under Tex. No sponsoring witness attested to the authenticity of exhibit F and it was not a self-authenticating document. Nothing in the documents attested to the authentication of the document. Exhibit F did not meet any of the conditions for self-authentication of a public document in rule. The trial court properly excluded exhibit F. In the affidavit, McCormack admitted to using illegal drugs with defendant and said defendant regularly drove around smoking marihuana. On the stand, McCormack refused to identify the affidavit because, he said, he lost his memory since making it. Later plaintiff offered the affidavit as a statement against interest, an exception to the hearsay rule. Without authentication, the court could not find the affidavit was a statement made by McCormack, much less a statement made by McCormack against his penal interest. See *Henderson, S.* We overrule subpart II. Exclusion of unidentified witnesses As part of subpart II. Originally, plaintiff included only the passengers in the two cars. At the pretrial conference, plaintiff attempted to add the names of 39 other persons. Rule b 6 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure allows a party to supplement a discovery response less than 30 days before trial only if the court finds good cause exists for permitting later supplementation. At the pretrial conference, plaintiff admitted it was an oversight not to supplement within the time prescribed by the rules. The trial court found this was not a good cause. Forgetfulness, without more, is not a good cause to excuse the failure to supplement answers to interrogatories. Thus, the trial court did not abuse its discretion by excluding the witnesses. D of plaintiffs point of error. Depositions from related cases As part of part II of plaintiffs point of error, plaintiff contends the trial court erred in refusing to admit depositions taken during other proceedings.

Plaintiff claims that all discovery in all the negligence cases brought against the defendant for the same automobile collision are admissible in his suit under the provisions in Tex. We do not have to reach this issue. The trial court excluded the depositions plaintiff offered on the grounds that the witnesses were not properly identified as witnesses in response to interrogatories. Thus, if their live testimony could not be admitted, neither could their deposition. There is a line of cases that suggest that a case should not be reversed unless the whole case turns on the particular evidence admitted or excluded. See, for example, such language in *Texaco, Inc.*

Chapter 3 : La Grande Observer by NorthEast Oregon News - Issuu

Physics 43 HW 2 Chapter 39 Problems given from 7th Edition Problems: 4, 7, 8, 9, 14, 20, 22, 24, 29, 33, 35, 38, 40, 45, 4. How fast must a meter stick be moving if its length is measured to shrink to m?

David resided in a group home in Perrysburg, NY and will be missed by friends and staff. Interment will be in Mt Hope Cemetery West She was born on November 16, in Trachenburg, Germany. Survivors include daughters, Susanne Szelewski Richard Schibler November 9, Thomas H. He was born in Buffalo, the son of the late Henry J. On January 31, he married Angela E. Cuccia at Our Lady of Mt. She was born April 26, in Crofton, Neb. In she married John S. Reid who predeceased her in Estes November 8, Craig A. He was born in Hollywood, Fl. November 8, Richard J. He was formerly employed by Great Lakes Printing, and most recently self-employed. Ortel November 8, Wayne L. Ortel, 53, of Otto, NY passed November 4, Cattaraugus, NY Thursday November 8, from 4 pm to 7 pm where a funeral service He is survived by two brothers, Richard Tyma, Jr. Jones November 8, Jonathan D. Jones, 61 of Jamestown, died Nov. Bleck November 7, Nancy C. Bleck, 78, of Dunkirk, died, Wednesday, October 31, , following a lengthy illness at the Chautauqua Nursing and Rehabilitation in Dunkirk. A graduate of Dunkirk High School Class of Relatives and friends are invited to attend. Gnadzinski Buck November 7, Mary J. She will be remembered forever by her surviving family. Woloszyn November 6, Edward A. He was born Nov. Opacinch Woloszyn of Dunkirk and the late Edward E. A lifelong resident of the Dunkirk-Fredonia A graduate of Dunkirk High School Born April 19, , in Yatesboro, PA. A retired employee of the former Red Wing in Fredonia. Her memberships include Holy Trinity R. Silver Creek, NY when they become Woloszyn November 5, Edward A. Jones November 4, Jonathan D.

Chapter 4 : Observer | Define Observer at calendrierdelascience.com

iii General Observer's Report - 1 iv General Observer's Report - 2 41 v General Observer's Report - 3

From the January Idaho Observer: To Object and Preserve The government builds a story against the accused through something called evidence. A motion to suppress is one example. Such a challenge would not ordinarily warrant appellate review unless facts supporting appeal were discoverable only after trial, i. The first line of defense at trial is through raising an objection. Challenging evidence includes objecting to witness examination: Objections to the substance of the question: The attorney raising this objection is objecting to the answer the question calls for. Objections to the question: An attorney is not allowed to lead his own witness. This is to help ensure the sought for response is not suggested to the witness. The judge has great discretion regarding leading of witnesses. Leading questions are also used during cross examination to test witness credibility and statements made during direct examination. It can be difficult to take in everything happening at trial - tone of voice, questions, body language - and be able to object fast enough to stop the witness from answering. Generally, these objections are for unresponsiveness, an inadmissible opinion or hearsay. Plain-error is one that is clear or obvious and affects the substantial rights of the defendant; see U. Would this objection preserve some sort of issue for appeal? A non-specific objection is preserved for plain-error review. A criminal trial is a serious matter regardless of whether the potential sentence is 30 days or life without parole. All evidence must be tested through objection. Doing so may save your life. Stay tuned for a discussion on Access to the courts.

Chapter 5 : No. 40 Squadron RAF | Military Wiki | FANDOM powered by Wikia

The California Digital Library supports the assembly and creative use of the world's scholarship and knowledge for the University of California libraries and the communities they serve.

Chapter 6 : Obituaries | News, Sports, Jobs - Observer Today

The shooter in the bay next to mine watches skeptically as I load the conventional-looking revolver with an unusual array of ammunition: a ACP, two 9mm Lugers, a rimless cartridge or by pushing against the rim of a revolver cartridge.

Chapter 7 : Idaho Observer: Criminal Law - Part VII: To Object and Preserve

The Observer. Rap Lil Wayne: Tha Carter V review - the beat is (just about) still on 3 / 5 stars 3 out of 5 stars. (Young Money) Kitty Empire. @kittyempire Sun 7 Oct EDT.

Chapter 8 : Lil Wayne: Tha Carter V review – the beat is (just about) still on | Music | The Guardian

In order to understand the pericope itself we must first examine the preceding context () with special emphasis on v. 40, which provides the transitional point to These are the final words of Jesus' public ministry that Mark records, spoken in the temple.

Chapter 9 : Slideshow: Deep Ellum Water Balloon Wars

2A –” THE OBSERVER. FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 28, LOCAL. OREGON. DAtLY PLANNER TODAY Today is Friday, Nov. 28, the nd day of There are 33 days left in the year.