

Why wouldn't Jesus have
spoken to them? If they were

(10)

It is hard to swallow that
Jesus would be shamed by the
hypocrite. Saddened, maybe, but
he can't reach him, but not the
word changed

(144)

Really, must we have
a bucking colt? Can't he
have a little dignity? He was
the colt for me???

too modern

It is as hard to believe that
Jesus flaked two little for

Don

(159)

Don't you know how
hard it is to be a man?

Did it he give them the Lord's
This is what I think

It seems to me that you are

This is such an unhappy,
weak response from one
who was restored to life. Why
it be a triumph for Jesus
on the eve of so much trouble

but he is a good person
and it is a good thing
that he is a good person

What's there to love?
speech here? "How often I would
have gathered you to me... but
you would not" & something -

(199)

Mammon is a place
in the sea

Can't see what Mammon is -
thought it was a term for money
but is it a place, or a professor "M
of mammon"? Were they selling anything
in the very Temple, also?

say!

Enough, plenty with the
uncomprehension of what he is

look it over
249

- He was speaking in metaphor
of himself - destroyed Crucified
and rebuilt (risen) in three days

unusual idea
(247)

I think that too many times
He is amazed by what he has
just said. Why must he be

Could he have been writing in the
last the names of their own
adulterous companions?

Consider

(245)

Do we need the clouds of
glory speech again?

check against other
(251)

This meeting of Jesus and the Devil is
terrific...

This is an amazing chapter, and I feel
that it began brilliantly - I love

- (the image of Satan seched out in velvet
- and gold - I can actually hear his
- soothing, oily voice, and feel the glow
- (of the fire, ~~smell~~ the lambard the
- wine. I also think that having the

nd New York

Devil talk about how blood thirsty
and lascivious God was in the Old
Testament is great. I got a little
lost in the passage ^{in the passage}
so long, and even though
you are bound by the
in the text, I felt

was rather weak in
to Satan. The rest
of the world, etc. I
rushed and not at

(90) The beginning. In
detail, a bigger -

A more resounding defeat for the
Devil, and a more definite beginning
since this is, in effect the beginning
of Jesus' ministry —

(90)

It is thought that the
Jesus

(19)

He was not seen to address
If an angel can come to many,
Why not to the shepherds?

I like the Angel announcing
the birth —

(19)

Is that true? Wasn't Mary
of the lineage of David?

(30)

This is confusing. Where is it from?
Is God saying he would kill off
Mankind if he wasn't afraid of an
enemy? Is the enemy of God the
savior of mankind, henceforth?

(31)

The book has stayed with me all night, and troubled me a great deal. Obviously, new ideas concerning Jesus are going to be troubling to me, since I have been indoctrinated since I was a babe in arms by the Baptist church, but even given this, and what I consider the relative openness of my mind relating to the veracity of the Bible and its authors, still there are several points you make that I can't reconcile to either my heartfelt "beliefs" or my rational assessment of the story. You mention the supposition that somehow Jesus failed and let God down. You contend, even though God allows Jesus to sit on the throne, I don't know how you come to this conclusion. What constituted Jesus' success? The Jews were angry with Him because He expected Him to overthrow the Roman Empire and establish His Kingdom here on Earth for the Jews. They expected Him to establish His Heavenly kingdom, and the afterlife. As you can see, I can't come up with no satisfactory answer, the Jews were not sure what exactly they do believe, but they were angry with Him. So there is that. Then they were angry with Him because He was associated with the riffraff, the sinners, the dregs of society, and the observance of the Jewish tradition. He was in their eyes. And he was egotistical--something they were, but in the safe remove of their hypocrisy. Jesus was not a hypocrite. He pointed out their failings. They didn't like criticism. Etceteras, etceteras. He was doomed because they just didn't get what He was saying. God knew this, ostensibly, since He is supposed to be able to see, if not perfectly control, the future.

Not
true
in Jesus
time

My
Are you sure you want to
point Mary as being so
apostate?

So what, in your opinion, was God doing when He went to all the trouble of making Jesus a human being, knowing full well He would fail? And if He knew in advance that Jesus would fail, why was He so mad at Him, in your view, that He would refuse to speak to Him all through eternity? None of this makes any sense. I admit that the Christian litany that everything was "God's plan"--the birth, the ministry, the crucifixion--Jesus "dying for our sins" makes no real sense. We are saved if we believe that Jesus was the Son of God, trust in Him, and repent of our sins. Why couldn't we believe all this without Him having to go through the agony of the crucifixion? When we ask these questions of the Christian establishment, they say we have to accept it all on faith (faith is the substance of things hoped for--the evidence of things not seen). It is a large morass of ignored contradictions, and you, in trying to address them, to make sense out of them, raise even more *more!* contradictions. The meeting of Jesus and Satan in the wilderness is probably one of the more successful things in your book, but instead of allowing Jesus to overcome Satan, you suggest that in allowing Satan to touch his (middle, no less) finger He somehow received Satan as part of Him, and Satan was, in part running the show. I am willing to accept that Satan was always trying to seduce and influence Jesus, but I can't reconcile Jesus as a puppet who was always befuddled as to where the power was coming from--God or Satan. I also have trouble with your re-writing the miracles. Especially the walking on water. The astral Jesus hovering over the swimming Jesus is ludicrous. If you accept the possibility--actuality!--of the healings, raisings from the dead, etc., why must you dilute the walking on water? It would be better to delete it altogether. Also, the resurrection is *✓* neither fish nor fowl. You should either negate it, as the Jews did, or treat it as fact, as the

*what
where is the fact?*

Christians do. In obfuscating it, you do disservice to both points of view, and since you accept most of the other premises of the Christian theology--the Virgin birth, Divinity of Jesus, miracles, etc., you, logically, should continue to the finish.

I hope you don't think I am hostile to you in these criticisms. Obviously, I want you to succeed in this project, and I know the God and Devil theme has obsessed you to a degree all your life. In fact, I quite agree with most of your premises concerning the war being waged between them. Otherwise, it is too horrendous to think of a God in charge who allows--orchestrates!--hideousities such as the holocaust and cancerous babies. No, better to think of a supremely evil being such as the Devil who gets in a lick from time to time. But I am just not sure if this is the way to work out your theories. I fear you are unwittingly walking into a swamp of quicksand between the Jews and Christians, and even though you might think it bravery to wade in, I think it is a bit naive. If I, who am so ready to support you, am this bothered, what will the ones who wish you ill do? Yes, I do care how your work is perceived. It wounds me when you are unfairly criticized, and I think that has been the rule rather than the exception in all the years I have known you. I know you don't believe it, but I do think you are a genius, and no one, living or dead, has ever been able to manipulate the language in quite the way you do. But I also think your powerful talents sometimes are slightly askew, and this, my dear, may be one of those times.

Shakespeare,
Melville,
Dickens
Pausanias
and Saucier

Here he is again not knowing
why he said something! But
overall, This is a satisfying
piece - beautifully written

Too much not knowing (278)

Concupiscence again - I am
not sure what it means.

Check it out

(293)

To say that God is only a
god among other gods
is pretty loaded —

17. in heels

(315)

Why would God not
often speak to Jesus?

(323)

That makes no sense —

Consider