






Date:	Day 1	Day 2	Day 3	Day 4	Day 5
Bible¹					
<i>Institutes of Biblical Law</i>	Introductory Comments in Bible Study Guide pp. i-iv		pp. 651-655 "The Use of the Law"	pp. 302-308 "Christ and the Law"	pp. 698-702 "Christ and the Law"
<i>Tools of Dominion</i>		pp. 27-30 (end of para. that spans pp. 29-30); 36-41 (end)			
Memorization	You may, of course, memorize anything you want. However, for the first two weeks, we recommend Deuteronomy 4: 5-8.				
History/Civics and Historical Fiction¹					
<i>Basic American Government²</i>	Introductory Comments in History/Civics and Historical Fiction Study Guide, pp. i-ii	p. xi-para. that spans pp. xi-xii; pp. 215-218	pp. 347-350 (very end)	pp. 351-355	pp. 4 (last para.)-10 (para. that spans pp. 9-10)
<i>Shadow of the Almighty</i>	Preface, Introduction, Prologue	chaps. 1-2	chap. 3	chap. 4	chap. 5
Current Events  ³	Check boxes when you have completed each assignment: <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>				
American Literature¹					
<i>The Scarlet Letter</i>	chaps. 1-3	chaps. 4-6	chaps. 7-8	chaps. 9-11	chaps. 12-13
<i>100 Best-Loved Poems</i>	"Lord Randal" p. 1		"Sir Patrick Spens" pp. 2-4		"The Lover ..." pp. 4-5
Language Arts					
Creative Expression⁴	This week is so full of other things, I'm going to let you off of an additional assignment here in Creative Expression. We'll be making up for "lost time" soon enough! Enjoy your freedom while you have it 😊.				
Math					
Other Notes					
Foreign Language					

©2012 by Sonlight Curriculum, Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Study Guides: Additional information for each book is located in the corresponding subject's Study Guide: Bible, History/Civics and Historical Fiction, and American Literature. The sections are ordered alphabetically by book title.
2. **Note to Mom or Dad:** Read the Introductory Comments for *Basic American Government* on p. 1 in the History/Civics and Historical Fiction Study Guide.
3. The  symbol means there is a note for this assignment in the notes section immediately following the schedule page.
4. Please look for your Creative Expression assignment in the Notes section immediately following the schedule page.

Key: Check off when complete  See Notes following Schedule  Map Assignment  Timeline Suggestion

Week 1—Notes

Current Events

Note to Mom or Dad: We believe students need to learn that world affairs—matters of social, political, economic, and cultural concern—are appropriate for their interest: they should be informed about these matters, and they ought to be forming biblically-appropriate opinions about them. As citizens of God’s Kingdom, they are called upon to be gracious (and, therefore, informed) ambassadors to the peoples and kingdoms of this world.

The “textbook” for your children’s study of current events should be articles found in current newspapers and magazines. This year, we think a daily newspaper would be more appropriate for at least two out of three of each week’s reports.

Students must prove that they are informed by telling you¹ about articles they have read in a newspaper or magazine and then going on to add a statement of their own position on what it is they have reported. They must also explain why they believe and feel as they do.

To Student: Someone has said that the last 100 years have marked the era of politics. One of the best means I have found for learning about what is going on in the world of politics—government—is to read the “Commentary” or “Op-Ed” (Opinion-Editorial) pages in our newspaper. In most papers, you will find an assortment of opinions, liberal and conservative, informed and ignorant, well-stated and some that are just plain awful.

This year I would like you to read and comment on at least one professional column (i.e., not just a letter to the editor) each week. Much as it may tend to make you want to gag, if you report on the comments of a columnist with whom you agree one week, I want you to find the next week a columnist with whose views you tend sharply to *disagree* ... and comment on that columnist’s viewpoint.

Our purpose, here, is to give you practice at accurately and fairly *summarizing* a person’s viewpoint (a difficult task!), then *analyzing* the relative strengths and weaknesses of that person’s position, and, finally, stating how and why you would *improve* on his or her viewpoint (if you think you can).

Let me attempt to illustrate—through general examples—how and why I think this exercise is so valuable.

I am, personally, of a libertarian bent. Put in other words, I believe in “free minds (i.e., the free and open exchange of ideas and information) and free markets (i.e., buying and selling with as little government interference as possible).”

When I read articles or commentaries that advocate for and extol the virtues of minimal government interference in the lives of normal, everyday human beings, my heart exults. And I would be a *happy* hardcore libertarian if I would only read libertarian journals.

The problem is, I read conservative papers and liberal works as well. And I am left with questions about the all-encompassing wisdom and truth of libertarian policies. I wonder: would the United States today—or even in a hundred years—be anywhere near so wealthy if President Theodore Roosevelt had pursued conservative rather than “Progressive” (really *socialist*) policies back in the period 1901 to 1909? *Would* “the market,” alone, have permitted poor children in the early 1900s to acquire the education they needed to better themselves and escape the grinding poverty that their parents suffered? What is the proper role of government?—Without the alternative commentaries, I would have no doubts. I would be a self-assured man. And, I’m afraid, I would be wrong about too many things.

By reading the alternative viewpoints, I see the weak spots within my own philosophy, among “my own” people. I learn what issues concern other people and how they express their concerns. If I listen *very* carefully, I may even be able to learn how to express my own viewpoints more forcefully and effectively than I would be able to if I had never listened to “the other side.” ...

Please. Take the time. Endure the frustration. Discipline yourself and learn!

Timeline

You should either use the timeline sold by Sonlight Curriculum, or make a timeline for the wall of your room using 8½" x 11" paper (taped sideways, end to end), one inch for every five years.

Timelines are helpful because not every book we read will be in chronological order. When we read them and mark dates on our timeline, we are better able to understand how events fit together: which things occurred at the same time, which things came first, and which things came later.

You may wish to trace pictures from standard references, or draw them. Some people prefer a less graphic approach and simply use color markers, pens, and pencils to write on their timeline the names and dates of significant events, persons, etc.

Whatever method you use, we believe your sense of history will be enhanced if you maintain this discipline throughout the year.

You will find key events and people listed in the Study Guide for each book you are reading as well as on the Timeline Figure Schedule in the Introduction.

Markable Map

Use your markable map to indicate the places you are ... ■

1. And I do mean *telling* you, orally, *not* in writing!

Introductory Comments

As I was preparing for this year's studies of civil government, I found myself struggling with several problems. The most difficult was this. Some people—actually, a very large number—say that Christians have no business getting involved in civil government.

Elisabeth Elliot says concerning her slain husband, Jim: "He believed that the church of Christ ... has abandoned national and political ties. In the words of the writer of Hebrews: 'But we are citizens of Heaven.' ... [Therefore,] a follower of Jesus [sh]ould not participate in war or politics. ... "1) Or, as one of our customers wrote, "I have always believed the Christian was to stand apart from the systems of this world, praying for leaders, calling them to account and to repentance, exercising a prophetic voice, but not directly participating in government by way of voting, involving themselves in politics, holding public office, joining the military, etc. Jesus' kingdom, he said, is not of this world, else would his servants fight. We are pilgrims, strangers, sojourners, not citizens of any earthly kingdom, as I see it. Just as I wouldn't vote or enlist in the army or run for office if I should be spending a long vacation in, say, France, neither would I do those things in this country."

One of the corollary ideas that many people—especially those in the Anabaptist movement—believe is this: "The principle of nonresistance which Jesus demonstrated once and for all on the Cross ... must be obeyed, in public life as well as in personal."²) In other words, Christians have no business using weapons of any type either in aggression or in self-defense.

As someone else has expressed it: "The rulers of the gentiles lord it over them," said Jesus to His disciples, "and their leaders enslave them. But it shall not be so among you. For whoever would be first among you, let him be your servant. ... " Here I believe Jesus was exhorting his disciples and, by inference, us, not to fall to the temptation to construct hierarchies and authoritarian structures, like the nations do, but to let all of our relationships on this earth be characterized by mutuality, respect, service and love."

I could go on with definitions and explanations of these viewpoints, but I think you know what I am talking about.

If these views are correct, then it seems to me that we should recognize and act upon an immediate and inescapable implication. In its starkest terms: to engage in studies of civil government is either, at best, to waste our time (for civil government is of no concern to us as Christians) or, at worst, to engage ourselves in an activity that is morally wrong (because we truly are, at this point, becoming entangled in "the world").

If either of these conclusions is correct—if we are either wasting our time or engaging in a morally wicked activity, then, though the civil government under which we live

may require us as homeschoolers to do an academic study of American civil government, we ought either to do such studies in the quickest, most perfunctory manner possible, or we should simply refuse to engage in the moral evil ... because we ought, indeed, to "obey God rather than men" (Acts 5:29).

I will state here that I do not agree with Jim Elliot or with the radical Anabaptists. I believe that, as the Apostle Paul says concerning governing authorities (Romans 13:1–6), civil government is "God's servant ["minister"] to do you good" and that it "bear[s] the sword" (i.e., lethal power) under God's authority and for a godly purpose (v. 4).

Having said this, I feel strongly impelled to add all kinds of caveats and limitations. But we will be discussing those matters later in the year. Please permit me simply to go on with the subject at hand.

A second problem I felt I had to overcome: the belief on the part of many—probably the vast majority of—conservative Christians in the West today that Scripture really has nothing to say about civil government in today's world. "Yes, we can find references to civil government in the Bible, but those references have no binding authority in today's world; they ought not to be studied in some vain hope that we can discover how civil government 'ought to be.' Your opinion about how government 'should' run is as good as my opinion, and our opinions are no better than the next person's."

These two problems—the belief that Christians ought not to be involved in government and the conviction that Scripture really has nothing to say to us about how civil governments ought to be run today—flow together to create a third problem.

There is a group of Christians today who claim that Christians ought to be involved in politics and ought to be willing to fight wars. Moreover, the members of this group say, the Bible has a lot to say about civil government. These people then go on to say that we ought to obey the Scriptures in what they teach us!

I have included in our Bible curriculum this year two books written by members of this latter group. The problem is, people who oppose this viewpoint (and, as I said, people who oppose this viewpoint are in a striking majority among Christians today) ...—people who oppose this viewpoint are afraid that, because I have included these books in the curriculum, I am trying to subvert their beliefs.

Let me state right here: I am Catholic enough to note that, from the early 300s until the Anabaptist movement of the mid-1500s, the Church was *universally* and *inescapably* involved in politics. Historically, it is the "apolitical" or "antipolitical" Christians who must prove their case.

On the other hand, I am Protestant enough to assert that, the prejudices and demands of various statements of faith notwithstanding, it is the *Word of God* that should direct our thinking, *not the traditions of men*.

1. Elisabeth Elliot, *Shadow of the Almighty: The Life & Testament of Jim Elliot* (San Francisco, CA: HarperCollins, 1979), p. 33.

2. *Ibid.*

The authors of the two books I have chosen for this year's Bible program, I believe, must prove their case from Scripture. If they are unable to do so, then you should ignore them. If they are able to prove their theses, however, then you need to obey what God tells you to do.

But I have chosen these men's books *not* because of their overarching theses (that the Old Testament civil laws are still, by and large, judicially binding), *but* for other reasons.

- 1) The Rev. Rousas J. Rushdoony and Dr. Gary North are two of only a very few people I know who actually try to interpret and make practical sense of the passages of Scripture (Old Testament) that talk about civil government.
- 2) They often demonstrate how Old Testament laws might be applied in our own circumstances. This makes the laws that much more understandable to us.
- 3) They present a wealth of data about actual government policies and practices throughout history both within and outside of Bible times. Since the broad purpose of our studies this year has to do with civil government and civil law, it seems to me that their scholarly contributions *outside of or beyond* the Scriptures may be extremely valuable to us.
- 4) These men challenge my thinking; I hope they will challenge yours, too. I know of few authors who get into the nitty-gritty (and I mean, often, truly *gritty*) details of how law works. They speak of broad *principles*, but they also force us to think through how those principles would/could/should impact detailed *reality*.
- 5) If YHWH is God, and He spoke in the Old Testament, then it seems to me that we today should be able to gain *some* kind of wisdom and insight from looking at His Word(s) and seeking to understand His meaning. I believe King David was correct "way back then," and his words are still valid for today: "[God's] commands make me wiser than my enemies. . . . I have more insight than all my teachers: for I meditate on [God's] statutes. I have more understanding than the elders, for I obey [God's] precepts" (Psalm 119:98–100). As the Apostle Paul also exhorted us: "All Scripture is God-breathed and is useful for teaching, rebuking, correcting and training in righteousness, so that the man of God may be thoroughly equipped for every good work" (2 Timothy 3:16–17). It seems to me that we ought to gain what we can from these Scriptures. I believe Rushdoony and North can help us.
- 6) Whether you agree with these men's suggested practical applications or not, their works will cause you to think deeply about what legitimate govern-

ment policies and practices *ought* to be . . . and *why*. And, at root, *that* kind of thinking is truly what this year's overarching theme is all about.

* * *

While we are on the topic of objections to North's and Rushdoony's work, let me throw in this last one.

Several parents wrote to me with more or less the same comment. More or less, they objected that they believe Rushdoony and North were seeking to "bring in God's Kingdom"—i.e., transform the world, make it holy and pure—by subjecting all the nations to God's Law. But, as one parent wrote, "by what means does God transform a stony heart into a heart of flesh, a suitable vessel for His intimate abiding presence? By means of Law or by its enforcement? I don't believe so. 'The law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope did, by the which we draw nigh unto God' (Hebrews 7:19). 'What the law could not do, given the weakness of our flesh, God did by sending his Son . . .' (Romans 8:3)."

Before we get into the text of the books, I believe I should honor the number of parents who expressed their concerns about these books the moment they saw that we were carrying them.

In the following couple of pages, I want to permit these parents to "speak their mind," as it were, about why, *specifically*, they object to Dr. North's and the Rev. Rushdoony's overarching theses. I want no one to charge me with having downplayed the significant opposition Rushdoony and North have faced (and still face) from the Christian community at large. You will find that Rushdoony and North attempt to summarize and reply to these charges within their books themselves. I would like to permit the objectors to state their objections in a fuller manner here, before we get going.

The first objection is this. From a Protestant perspective, the earliest leaders of the Protestant movement had extremely harsh things to say against the use of Old Testament law within a New Testament (i.e., modern day) context.

The following quotes come from a sermon preached by Martin Luther on August 27, 1525.³ It was sermon #29 in a series of seventy-seven sermons on the book of Exodus. The sermon was later reworked and issued as a pamphlet. The title is "How Christians Should Regard Moses."⁴

Luther was a strong believer in "natural law" (as was Calvin)—the idea that everyone has within himself an understanding of general morality and the sense that there is a God to be worshipped and obeyed. Luther taught that this is why nearly everyone everywhere is religious, though most are wrong about the gods they worship. He also taught that ideas about morality and ethics are universal:

3. I wish to thank Mrs. Corrie Marnett for providing all of the following material concerning Luther and Calvin.

4. This was the *first* published English translation of the sermon. The sermon is found on pages 161–174 of Vol. 35 of *Luther's Works*, translated by E. Theodore Bachman, edited by Helmut T. Lehmann and E. Theodore Bachman (Philadelphia: Concordia Publishing House and Muhlenberg Press, 1960).

that everyone understands that murder, adultery, stealing, lying, etc., are morally wrong.

But, argued Luther, specific rituals and rules and restrictions—such as tithing, sabbath-keeping, animal sacrifices, food laws, and the like—are *not* based on universal morality, but instead, are based on direct revelation from God. No one would have been obligated to do any of these things unless God had told them to, and God only told the *Jews* to do so.

The *other* commands—the ones concerning “morality”—are universal and universally understood, without the necessity of the law of Moses to teach anyone about them.

Here are some excerpts from the sermon:

Now the first sermon, and doctrine, is the law of God. The second is the gospel. These two sermons are not the same. Therefore we must have a good grasp of the matter in order to know how to differentiate between them. We must know what the law is, and what the gospel is.

The law commands and requires us to do certain things. The law is thus directed solely to our behavior and consists in making requirements. For God speaks through the law, saying “Do this, avoid that, this is what I expect of you.”

The gospel, however, does not preach what we are to do or to avoid. It sets up no requirements but reverses the approach of the law, does the very opposite, and says, “This is what God has done for you; he has let his Son be made flesh for you, has let him be put to death for your sake.”

So, then, there are two kinds of doctrine and two kinds of works, those of God and those of men. Just as we and God are separated from one another, so also these two doctrines are widely separated from one another. For the gospel teaches exclusively what has been given us by God, and not—as in the case of the law—what we are to do and give to God.⁵

THE LAW OF MOSES BINDS ONLY THE JEWS AND NOT THE GENTILES

Here the law of Moses has its place. It is no longer binding on us because it was given only to the people of Israel. And Israel accepted this law for itself and its descendants, while the Gentiles were excluded. To be sure, the Gentiles have certain laws in common with the Jews, such as these: there is one God, no one is to do wrong to another, no one is to commit adultery or murder or steal, and others like them. This is written by nature into their hearts; they did not hear it straight from heaven as the Jews did.

This is why this entire text [the law in *Exodus*] does not pertain to the Gentiles. . . . [The enthusiasts] desire to govern people according to the letter of the law of Moses, as if no one had ever read it before. But we will not have this sort of thing. We would rather not preach again for the rest of our life than to let Moses return and to let Christ be torn out of our hearts. We will not have Moses as ruler or lawgiver any longer. Indeed God himself will not have it either.

Moses was an intermediary solely for the Jewish people. It was to them that he gave that law. We must therefore silence the mouths of those factious spirits who say, “Thus says Moses,” etc. Here you simply reply: “Moses has nothing to do with us. If I were to accept Moses in one commandment, I would have to accept the entire Moses. Thus the consequence would be that if I accept Moses as master, then I must have myself circumcised, wash my clothes in the Jewish way, eat and drink and dress thus and so, and observe all that stuff.”

So then, we will neither observe nor accept Moses. Moses is dead. His rule ended when Christ came. He is of no further service.

That Moses does not bind the Gentiles can be proved from *Exodus* 20:1, where God himself speaks, “I am the Lord your God, who brought you out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage.” This text makes it clear that even the Ten Commandments do not pertain to us. For God never led us out of Egypt, but only the Jews.

The sectarian spirits want to saddle us with Moses and all the commandments. We will just skip that. We will regard Moses as a teacher, but we will not regard him as our lawgiver—unless he agrees with both the New Testament and the natural law. Therefore, it is clear enough that Moses is the lawgiver of the Jews and not of the Gentiles.⁶

Again one can prove it from the third commandment that Moses does not pertain to Gentiles and Christians. For Paul [Col. 2:16] and the New Testament [Matt. 12:1–2; John 5:16; 7:22–23; 9:14–16] abolish the sabbath, to show us that the sabbath was given to the Jews alone, for whom it was a stern commandment. The prophets referred to it too, that the sabbath of the Jews would be abolished.⁷

It is true that God has commanded this of Moses, and spoke thus to the people; but we are not that people. God spoke also to Adam, but that does not make me Adam. God commanded Abraham to put his son to death, but that does not make me Abraham and obligate me to put my son to death.

God spoke also with David. It is all God’s word. But let God’s word be what it may, I must pay attention, and understand to whom God’s word is addressed. You are still a long way from being the people with whom God spoke. The false prophets say, “You are that people; God is speaking to you.” You must prove that to me.⁸

One must deal cleanly with the scriptures. From the very beginning the word has come to us in various ways. It is not enough simply to look and see whether this is God’s word, whether God has said it; rather we must look and see to whom it has been spoken, whether it fits us. That makes all the difference between night and day. . . .

The word in scripture is of two kinds; the first does not pertain or apply to me, the other kind does. And upon that word which does pertain to me I can boldly trust and rely, as upon a strong rock. But if it does not pertain to me, then I should stand still.⁹

One must distinguish well whether the word pertains to only one or to everybody. . . . Thus what God said to Moses by way of commandment is for the

6. *Ibid.*, pp. 164–165.

7. *Ibid.*, p. 165.

8. *Ibid.*, p. 170.

9. *Ibid.*

5. *Ibid.*, p. 162.

Jews only. But the gospel goes through the whole world in its entirety; it is offered to all creatures without exception.¹⁰

* * *

John Calvin, too, has several things to say about Old Testament law that sound much the same. The following quotations are from his *Institutes of the Christian Religion*¹¹

I shall in but a few words, and as in passing, note what laws can piously be used before God, and be rightly administered among men.

I would have preferred to pass over this matter in utter silence if I were not aware that here many dangerously go astray. For there are some who deny that a commonwealth is duly framed which neglects the political system of Moses, and is ruled by the common laws of nations. Let other men consider how perilous and seditious this notion is; it will be enough for me to have proved it false and foolish.

We must bear in mind that common division of the whole law of God published by Moses into moral, ceremonial, and judicial laws. And we must consider each of these parts, that we may understand what there is in them that pertains to us, and what does not.¹²

Equity, because it is natural, cannot but be the same for all, and therefore, this same purpose ought to apply to all laws, whatever their object. . . .

It is a fact that the law of God which we call the moral law is nothing else than a testimony of natural law and of that conscience which God has engraved upon the minds of men. Consequently, the entire scheme of this equity of which we are now speaking has been prescribed in it. Hence, this equity alone must be the goal and rule and limit of all laws.

Whatever laws shall be framed to that rule, directed to that goal, bound by that limit, there is no reason why we should disapprove of them, howsoever they may differ from the Jewish law, or among themselves.

God's law forbids [many different offenses]. The penalties [for these offenses] in the Jewish state are to be seen in [Scripture]. . . . Against [these same offenses] some nations levy severer, others, lighter punishments. Yet we see how, with such diversity, all laws tend to the same end. For, together with one voice, they pronounce punishment against those crimes which God's eternal law has condemned, namely, murder, theft, adultery, and false witness. But they do not agree on the manner of punishment. Nor is this either necessary or expedient. . . . There are ages that demand increasingly harsh penalties. If any disturbance occurs in a commonwealth, the evils that usually arise from it must be corrected by new ordinances. In time of war, in the clatter of arms, all humanness would disappear unless some uncommon fear of punishment were introduced. In drought, in pestilence, unless greater severity is used, everything will go to in. There are nations inclined to a particular vice, unless it be most sharply repressed. How malicious and hateful toward public welfare would a man be who is offended by such diversity, which is per-

fectly adapted to maintain the observance of God's law?

For the statement of some, that the law of God given through Moses is dishonored when it is abrogated and new laws preferred to it, is utterly vain. For others are not preferred to it when they are more approved, not by a simple comparison, but with regard to the condition of times, place, and nation; or when that law is abrogated which was never enacted for us for the Lord through the hand of Moses did not give that law to be proclaimed among all nations and to be in force everywhere; but when he had taken the Jewish nation into his safekeeping, defense, and protection, he also willed to be a lawgiver especially to it; and—as becomes a wise lawgiver—he had a special concern for it in making its laws.¹³

With all of these words and more, I have been warned: the views of the Rev. Rousas John Rushdoony and Dr. Gary North are clearly in the minority among Christians today.

Having been warned—and now with *you* having been warned—I want to proceed with our studies.

Keep in mind the dissenting opinions (Rushdoony and North will refer to them often in their books!), and consider for yourself what the Scriptures say and whether there is something of value to be gained by studying the Old Testament civil laws and comparing them to the civil government under which we live today.

Dr. North challenges us: "If Caesar gets converted to Christ, should he change his ways? If not, why not? If the answer is 'yes,' then *there must be God-required ways for Caesar to change. . . .* [I]f there are no God-required standards of righteousness in politics, then there can be no historical judgment by God over politics. If God has imposed *no law* over something, then He exercises *no jurisdiction* over it. God does not hold anyone responsible for what [s/he] does if He has not placed that person under the specific terms of His covenant. The Bible is quite clear on this point: ' . . . sin is not imputed when there is no law' (Romans 5:13b). So, if we argue that men are responsible for their evil deeds as politicians, then we must also accept the fact that *there must be God-given standards of righteousness that they have violated.*"¹⁴

I hope you will be as inspired as I have been by these men's books to study diligently, think deeply, and pray fervently about the true meaning, purpose, and practical application of the word of God. ■

10. *Ibid.*, p. 172.

11. John T. McNeill, ed., *Calvin: Institutes of the Christian Religion* (Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Press, 1960)

12. *Ibid.*, IV:XX:14.

13. *Ibid.*, IV:XX:16.

14. Gary North, "Editor's Introduction," in George Grant, *The Changing of the Guard* (Ft. Worth, TX: Dominion Press, 1987), pp. xiv–xv.

Introductory Comments

In his book, *Tools of Dominion*, (pp. 97–99), North tells us that Rushdoony subsumes virtually all the case laws of the Old Testament under one of the Ten Commandments. North himself would prefer that we recognize that quite a few case laws can be subsumed under more than one each of the Ten Commandments, but he points out that the case laws are, indeed, detailed *examples* or *illustrations* of what the more general Ten Commandments are really all about.

With that in mind, please pay attention to “where you are” as you read Rushdoony’s book. All of his comments in each section are at least moderately related to one of the Ten Commandments. Before you begin reading, you may want to remind yourself of what the subject for the day really is. In today’s reading, Rushdoony is trying to explain one of what he believes is a further important point related to the Second Commandment. And do you remember what the Second Commandment is all about? It is the one that tells us not to make idols and not to worship or bow down to them.

pp. 88–95

Vocabulary Development

Turning to such instances, first, the **ephod** and the **breastplate** of the high priest is of significance. (**ephod**: a vestment worn by ancient Hebrew priests; **breastplate**: a square piece of cloth set with 12 precious stones representing the 12 tribes of Israel worn over the breast by ancient high priests)

Questions and Comments

1. What is the problem with the idea of total toleration? ➔ *it means anarchy—no law!*
2. According to Rushdoony, what is the difference between a sinner and an enemy of the law? ➔ *a sinner was to bring an offering to God’s house; an outlaw was forbidden from bringing such a gift*
3. Rushdoony believes that Scripture makes a sharp and very important distinction between prostitution and the practice of homosexuality. What distinction does he think he sees? ➔ *prostitutes, he says, are still considered human beings, but practicing homosexuals are called “dogs”—i.e., not even worthy of being called human*
4. He goes on to say something about criminals and citizenship. What is that? ➔ *that, in societies that are influenced by Scripture, criminals have always been considered outcasts from society, no longer worthy of citizenship, without legal existence*

5. Rushdoony says there are three ways in which a society may regard outlaws and dissenters. What are they? ➔ *1) as having no rights before the law; 2) as having special rights before the law; 3) as innocent until proven guilty*
6. Rushdoony says law is a form of warfare. In what sense does he say this is true? ➔ *in the sense that law establishes a certain order and it wages warfare against anything and everything that seeks to upset that order*
7. Do you agree or disagree that this is the way things are? Why? Do you agree or disagree that this is the way things should be? Why?

pp. 96–100

Vocabulary Development

In biblical law, neither **egalitarianism** nor an **oligarchy** have any standing. (**egalitarianism**: the doctrine of the equality of mankind; **oligarchy**: government by a few)

... **eunuchs** were excluded, whether eunuchs by an accident or by act of man. (*castrated men*)

Questions and Comments

8. Rushdoony quotes from James M. Gray’s *Limitations of the Taxing Power Including Limitations upon Public Indebtedness*. In the major quote on p. 98, Gray makes a number of claims about the limits of legitimate governmental powers. Discuss what Gray says and whether you agree with him or not ... and why. ➔ *because that would mean absolutely no court of law would be possible. I cannot keep myself from at least noting this: I absolutely disagree that “the institution of property ... depend[s] upon the existence of the state.” Property existed—and had a moral right to exist—long before any modern concept of “state” came along—and people who live beyond the borders or practical reach of a modern state will own and utilize their personal property without the aid or the hindrance of the state*
9. Rushdoony distinguishes between residency and citizenship. 1) What is the difference between these two concepts? 2) Do you think the distinction is legitimate and ought to be maintained, or should it be abolished? Why? 3) What is the general attitude toward citizenship in the United States today? Do you agree with that attitude or disagree, and why?
10. Rushdoony says, “The heresy of democracy has ... worked havoc in church and state, and it has worked towards reducing society to anarchy.” Do you agree? Disagree? Why?

Questions and Comments

130. Rushdoony says that the Old Testament dietary laws were meant as *principles* of life, but people normally view them as *restraints* upon life. What does he mean by this? ➔ *that we should gain direction both for good health and for honoring God, but we ought not to view these laws as somehow restricting our ability to enjoy life; indeed, we ought to enjoy our food and not approach it as somehow something we ought to abstain from as much as possible*
131. Is there biblical warrant for abstaining from meat? Is there biblical warrant for opposing a radical vegetarianism (i.e., for opposing someone who says, say, that “Jesus was a vegetarian” or that, to follow the principles of Scripture, you ought to be a vegetarian)? If so, on what grounds? If not, what do you do with Genesis 9:3 and 1 Timothy 4:1, 3?
132. What are the main “rules” concerning foods that the Jews were forbidden to eat? ➔ *blood; animals that are found dead; animal fats; scavenger animals and the parts of non-scavengers that, as Rushdoony expresses it, “scavenge” the body’s wastes and poisons (kidneys, especially, though portions of the liver, too); carnivorous animals*
133. Rushdoony says that “the dietary laws are not legally binding on us, but they do provide us with a principle of operation [a moral rule].” What does he mean by this? ➔ *the civil government has no business entering into judgment over us if we fail to follow these rules, but we ourselves would be well-served to obey them as we do other moral rules of conduct*

pp. 302–308

Questions and Comments

134. According to Rushdoony, in what sense is the law dead—or even wrong—and in what sense does it still stand? ➔ *1) the law as a death sentence is “dead” (i.e., inoperative) once we have died in Christ and are recipients of His new life; 2) the “ceremonial” aspects of the law—those portions that pointed in unique ways toward Christ (the sacrificial and priestly laws)—have been replaced; 3) the civil and moral aspects of the law are still in force; 4) the law is (and always has been) useless as a means of justification or salvation; 5) the law is very useful as a means of sanctification: it provides a measuring stick and guideline; 6) it is sinful to use the law as a means of salvation*
135. What does Rushdoony believe an attitude or belief in “salvation by law” leads to? ➔ *totalitarianism, statism*
136. According to Rushdoony, what is law good for? ➔ *to reveal God’s holiness—His separateness or “other” ness; to reveal God’s righteousness—that which is just and good; to provide a standard by which we can measure our own*

conformity to God’s ways—i.e., as a means of revealing our sanctification (or lack thereof)

137. Do you think the ceremonial law can be—and/or ought to be—distinguished from the civil and moral aspects of the Old Testament law? Why or why not? What about civil from moral law?⁷
138. In what sense do you believe the Old Testament law is dead or alive, useful or useless? And why? (We will come back to this question several times over the course of the year, I’m sure!)
139. Rushdoony attacks the traditional Pentecostal doctrine of perfectionism. Why? Do you think his criticisms are legitimate? Why or why not?
140. What do you think of Rushdoony’s argument that “When God the Father regarded the law as so binding on man that the death of God’s incarnate Son was necessary to redeem man, He could not regard that law as something now trifling, or null and void, for man”?

Work: pp. 308–312

Questions and Comments

141. Rushdoony says that “[w]ith the fall came a curse on man’s work, but work is not a curse.” Explain what he means and why he says this.
142. On what grounds does Rushdoony say that “work . . . is a religious and moral necessity”?
143. Rushdoony makes rather lengthy references to the Hutterites and work. What does he say about the Hutterites? ➔ *that, as a result of their culture of work, they suffer far fewer psychological difficulties than do other populations in the United States today*
144. On what grounds does Rushdoony object to the idea that true freedom involves freedom from work? ➔ *he goes into a rather long excursus about actors, actresses, and make-believe, but his primary point is this: it is our responsibility under God to advance God’s kingdom; and to extend His rule and to honor His Name, we must work; that is part of what it means to be properly obedient to God; work is what enables us to fulfill our purpose on earth*

The Amalekites and Godly Warfare: pp. 312–318

145. **Summary:** Why do you think Rushdoony talks about the Amalekites the way he does? What “lessons” do you take away from today’s reading?

7. My own two cents on this one: it is clear that most (all?) of the case laws included civil sanctions, others—primarily the Ten Commandments—included no specific civil sanctions. Those laws that include no civil sanctions are what we would call “moral” laws: they point to the right way, God’s way. But they do not tell the civil government what to do. Similarly, in the New Testament, we find Jesus preaching the moral law (“he who looks at a woman with lust” is under God’s condemnation). I find it interesting that He seems to take the civil/case laws as the basis for His moral preaching.

318. Do you think it is true, as some say, that you cannot legislate morals? Why or why not?
319. Do you agree with Rushdoony's statement that if men will not obey God, they will not obey men? Why or why not? What is the point of his statement? ➔ *that God and his law-word must be central in any society for law to have any power*

The Procedure of the Court: pp. 622–625

Questions and Comments

320. In your opinion, what would be modern counterparts to, and what are the implications of each of the following nine aspects of Israel's court, as described by Rushdoony? 1) the location of the court at the city gates; 2) mandatory written records; 3) prohibition of contempt; 4) the requirement of oaths; 5) the right to appeal to the highest court of the land; 6) no trials on the Sabbath; 7) the right to a speedy trial; 8) the highest office in the land was inseparable from the judicial system; 9) the active concern of the judge to bring God's justice to bear on every situation in court.

The Judgment of the Court: pp. 625–628

Questions and Comments

321. Do you agree with Rushdoony that in biblical law the judgment of the court is the judgment of God, whenever faithfully delivered? Why or why not? Do you consider the judgment of the courts of your land to be the judgment of God? Why or why not?
322. Rushdoony says that God wrote his word in large measure for judges. Do you think he is right? Why or why not? How would you reconcile his statement with the words of John in John 20:30–31?
323. According to Rushdoony, Scripture declares that judges are true judges only if they are faithful to God's law. Do you agree? Why or why not? Can you give an example of Rushdoony's point that a judge may be legitimate and still not be a person of integrity? ➔ *many examples of such judges can be found in Scripture, including the officials who condemned Jesus to die on the cross; they were legitimate rulers, but not people of integrity*
324. Do you think you are obligated to follow legitimate leaders whether or not they are people of integrity? Why or why not?
325. What is Rushdoony's point in the illustration about Al Capone?¹⁵ ➔ *Al Capone was concerned about law and order as long as it did not interfere with his unlawful activities, which, according to Rushdoony, is characteristic of most reform movements*

15. To read Al Capone's history, go to: www.chicagohs.org/history/capone.html.

326. What do you think: are most reform movements unlawful? According to Rushdoony, where does true reform begin?¹⁶ ➔ *with regeneration and then submission of the believer to the whole law-word of God*
327. Can you think of any modern politicians who want to apply the law to everyone but themselves?

The Law in Force: pp. 636–639

Vocabulary Development

... its principle of gaining wealth will increasingly become **expropriation**. (*depriving an owner of property by taking it for public use*)

Questions and Comments

328. According to Rushdoony, what are some sins as stated in the Sermon on the Mount (see Matthew 5, 6, 7) that are not within the scope of civil law? ➔ *hate; lust*
329. Can you think of others? According to Rushdoony, when do these matters of the heart come into the scope of civil law? ➔ *when they show themselves in action*
330. Can you give an example? ➔ *when hatred becomes murder*
331. Do you agree with Rushdoony that failure to pay debts is a form of theft and perjury? Why or why not?
332. According to Rushdoony, how can a company defraud an individual? ➔ *through the fine print in dishonest contracts*
333. According to Rushdoony, why and how can such contracts be dishonest? Can you give some examples of dishonest contracts? ➔ *because they take advantage of individuals who are not knowledgeable enough to know the pitfalls of the contract; they use a form of deception*
334. Do you agree with Rushdoony that the reforms of a state which denies God are no more to be trusted than the reforms of a man with a gun in his hand who robs you of your money? Why or why not?
335. Rushdoony says that a society established on a lawless, anti-God foundation will inevitably make civil covetousness a way of life. What does that mean? Do you think he is correct? Why or why not? What do you think will be the outcome of such a society?

pp. 651–655

Questions and Comments

336. According to Rushdoony, why did Luther denigrate the value of the law in a Christian's life? ➔ *in order to elevate the doctrine of justification—i.e., salvation—by faith, faith alone*

16. Jesus condemned the Pharisees of his day on this very point (see: Matthew 23:1–4).

337. Why is Rushdoony convinced that the “Great Exhortation” of Leviticus 26:3–45, though addressed to Israel, can be (or, actually, *is*) applicable to Christians today? ➔ 1) *for the same reason that the Sermon on the Mount and the letters to the various churches are applicable to Christians today*; 2) *because, according to Hebrews 12:18–29, God will judge the world in the same way He judged Israel*; 3) *because of the manner in which Old Testament law is referenced as authoritative authentication of a New Testament message (see, for example, 1 Cor. 9:9 and 1 Tim. 5:18): the Apostle did not merely restate Old Testament law, but referred to it as proving the validity of his advice*

pp. 679–684

Questions and Comments

338. What is Melancthon’s view of “the law of nature”? ➔ *it is “a common judgment to which all men give the same consent”; a judgment that “is suitable for the shaping of morals”*
339. Rushdoony vociferously denies Melancthon’s viewpoint. Why? ➔ 1) *because, according to Romans 1:18, unregenerate man “suppresses the truth of God in unrighteousness”*; 2) *because some of Melancthon’s so-called “natural” laws were really Scriptural laws*; 3) *because some of his “natural” laws (such as the idea that “nobody must be harmed” or that “those who disturb the public peace ... must be ... taken away”) would hurt the Christian religion and would have been used against the preaching of the Gospel in the first place*; 4) *because, if Melancthon is correct, then God saves men so that we can live according to nature’s law rather than according to God’s law (and that doesn’t make much sense: how, then, is God a great King?)*; 5) *because this “natural” law is based on Plato and other pagan sources, not on the Bible*; 6) *because it makes us subject to totalitarian governments*; 7) *because it replaces the world in which we see things interpreted according to God’s word with a world in which we see things interpreted in some “neutral,” “brute factual” manner*

Condensed Version

Page 681: next to last line, **add** the following *italicized* text: “The main purpose of God’s law through Moses, according to Melancthon, would appear to be...”

Page 682: second line, after “... God to nature,” **add** the phrase, *Some further foolishness*: and then **note** where, logically, Rushdoony meant to break the statements that follow. *One* piece of foolishness was the idea that “The law demands impossible things ...” (etc.). *Another* piece: “Some of the Anabaptists practiced what Melancthon preached but were only damned by Melancthon for it.” And a *third* piece: “The Spirit leads Christians ‘to do the law’ even though the law is now abrogated! (The Holy Spirit is thus obviously more law-minded than Melancthon.)”

Page 684: End *before* the next-to-last complete para, i.e., *before*: “The only tenable approach to the laws...”

pp. 684–686

Questions and Comments

340. To what does Rushdoony object about natural law philosophy? ➔ 1) *it rests not on God or on God’s law, but on compromise; the basis of authority, then, is relativism, not truth*; 2) *if natural man can work out a universal law, then he doesn’t (i.e., we don’t) need God*; 3) *the source of law in any system is that system’s god; if man is the source of law, then man is god*

pp. 689–693

Vocabulary Development

... godly men will **mediate** that law to each new generation ... (*act between parties*)

Questions and Comments

341. What does tora mean? ➔ *instruction, teaching, direction*
342. According to Rushdoony, what is the duty of a person or agency that mediates God’s tora to a child or any person under that person’s or agency’s authority? ➔ *to faithfully apply it; i.e., to faithfully show how it is supposed to be worked out in day to day life*
343. What do you think?
344. “[T]o pray to the God whose direction we despise is to add insult to our offenses.” Do you agree? Disagree? Why?
345. **Summary:** How does Rushdoony compare the word tora and Jesus’ claim that He is “the way.” Do you think Rushdoony may have a point, or is he just blowing smoke?

pp. 698–702

Questions and Comments

346. According to Rushdoony, in what way(s) did Christ “[declare] afresh the validity of the law and His purpose to put it into force”? ➔ *by speaking of God’s judgment and wrath on the basis of law; by responding to Satan’s temptations by use of the law; by identifying Himself, through the Sermon on the Mount, as the “second Moses,” the “Lawgiver”; by actually strengthening the impact of the law*

pp. 702–706

Questions and Comments

347. According to Rushdoony, why must John 8:7 not mean that “he who is *sinless* should cast the first stone”?

Date:	Day 1 <small>86</small>	Day 2 <small>87</small>	Day 3 <small>88</small>	Day 4 <small>89</small>	Day 5 <small>90</small>
Bible					
<i>Institutes of Biblical Law</i>	pp. 504–510	pp. 510–514	pp. 514–522	pp. 522–525	pp. 525–530
History/Civics and Historical Fiction					
<i>Basic American Government</i>	Constitution: Art. III, Sec. 1 (p. 542)	Constitution: Art. III, Sec. 2 (p. 542)	Constitution: Art. III, Sec. 3; Art. IV, Sec. 1–2, para. 1 (pp. 542–543)	Constitution: Art. IV, Sec. 2, para. 2–Sec. 4 (p. 543)	Constitution: Arts. V–VII (pp. 543–544)
<i>The Jungle</i>	pp. 111–120	pp. 121–128	pp. 128–136	pp. 136–147	pp. 147–158
Current Events	Check boxes when you have completed each assignment: <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>				
American Literature					
<i>Moby-Dick</i>	chaps. 52–54 🌐 <input type="checkbox"/>	chaps. 55–61 (skim chaps. 55–57) 🌐 <input type="checkbox"/>	chaps. 62–69	chaps. 70–74 🌐 <input type="checkbox"/>	chaps. 75–81 🌐 <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>100 Best-Loved Poems</i>	“Ode to a Nightingale” pp. 43–45		“Bright star ...” (In the American Literature Study Guide)		“Ode on Grecian ...” pp. 45–46
Memorization	“If” (see <i>100 Best-Loved Poems</i> in the American Literature Study Guide).				
Language Arts					
Creative Expression	Character Development, Part I <input type="checkbox"/>				Poetic Response <input type="checkbox"/>
Math					
Other Notes					
Foreign Language					

©2012 by Sonlight Curriculum, Ltd. All rights reserved.

Key: Check off when complete See Notes following Schedule 🌐 Map Assignment 🕒 Timeline Suggestion

Week 18—Notes

Creative Expression

Day 1: Character Development, Part I

Way, way back, we discussed how an author *introduces* a character.

I have found Melville/Ishmael's character introductions quite interesting.

On the one hand, the first time we meet each character, he seems to give us a very thorough picture of what the man thinks and believes, and how he behaves. Yet throughout the book he returns to the various primary characters and shows them to us once more, in a different setting, in a slightly different light. These recurrent "reintroductions," if you will, give us greater insight into the men, they "develop" the characters so we understand them better.

Yet when literary critics speak of character development, they usually mean to talk about how a character *changes* within him- or herself over time. In other words, "character development" refers not so much (if at all) to the ever-improved vision we, as readers, gain. Rather, it has to do with how the character's outlook on life, their values, beliefs, actions, or other characteristics change as a result of the experiences the character has over the course of the story.

As I look at *Moby-Dick*, I get the feeling that there is very little character development. Just about every character we meet is the same at the end of the book as we saw him when Melville/Ishmael first introduces him to us. Ahab is just as terrifying and crazy at the end of the story as he is when we first meet him. Starbuck is just as religious, Stubb is just as carefree, Queequeg is just as heroic and noble as ever...

There is only one character whose character itself seems to change. And though the change is mostly internal, Ishmael permits us to catch a glimpse of that change as it happens.

If you guessed that I am speaking of Ishmael himself, you are correct.

I don't think we see him change much after about Chapter 28, so I don't think I am making this assignment too early in your reading of the novel.

I would like you to look back on chapters 1 through 24 and describe how Ishmael is changed: in what *ways* is he changed and *why*? What experiences does he have that most alter his impressions of the world? What interactions with other characters (and with *which* characters) change his outlook on life?

As in past literary analysis assignments, I want you to either *demonstrate* how these changes in character—how this *character development*—affect and bolster Melville's literary purpose (as much as you can discern of his purpose). Or, if you can't discern his purpose, then *hazard a guess* as to his purpose, and show how Ishmael's changed

character fits with what you guess is Melville's literary purpose.

Does this make sense? I hope so! This is the kind of assignment that your peers in public school are being given. I have full confidence that you can do it.

Quote from the book. Show what events or experiences change Ishmael's thoughts, feelings, or outlook on life, then seek to suggest *how* this character development (or, as I think I would prefer to call it in Ishmael's case: his character degradation!) ...—seek to show how this change in character fits with what you believe you perceive of Melville's broader literary purpose.

Note: This paper is supposed to be *analytical*. It is *not* supposed to be personally reflective. What I mean by that is that you are supposed to focus firmly on what the *author* is trying to say and how the *author* is trying to say it. You are *not* supposed to interact with the author's viewpoints by telling us what *you* think about his ideas, whether you agree with him or not. You will have plenty of time for that kind of interaction at some other date. Now is the time for you to hone and sharpen your basic analytical skills.

Day 5: Poetic Response



You have been asked (we have asked of you) to memorize several poems so far this year. In the last couple of weeks alone, you have been asked to memorize Kipling's "If" and Milton's "On His Blindness."

When we memorize stylized verbal expressions such as these poems, our brains often begin to *think* in similar forms. We can begin to express ourselves in much the same way as those whose words we have memorized. We don't have to say the same things, but we will be able to express our new and different thoughts in the same manner.




I would like you to "respond" to either of these two men's poems by using their same style. If you agree with their sentiments, then express your agreement in poetic manner, using the same style of expression as the poem whose sentiments you want to laud. If you think the poet was full of crock and you want to mock his ideas, then mock them ... making use of the same poetic form.

If you'd like to do the same kind of assignment with someone else's poem, that is fine. Or if you would like to respond to anything else that has grabbed your attention as deserving reply, feel free to do that, if you would prefer. Simply use the literary form of whatever poem (and poet) you choose.

If your poem is one stanza long, that is long enough. If you can sustain your poetic output for several stanzas, that will be even better (as long as you say something worthwhile in all those words!). ■

Date:	Day 1 <small>176</small>	Day 2 <small>177</small>	Day 3 <small>178</small>	Day 4 <small>179</small>	Day 5 <small>180</small>
Bible					
<i>Tools of Dominion</i>	pp. 861–867	pp. 867–873	pp. 928–935	pp. 936–942	pp. 942–949
History/Civics and Historical Fiction					
<i>Basic American Government</i>	pp. 453–458	pp. 459–464	pp. 465–469 (just above midpoint, ending: "... three million illegal aliens.")	pp. 469–474	pp. 475–480
Current Events	Check boxes when you have completed each assignment: <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>				
American Literature					
<i>The Giver</i>	chaps. 1–4	chaps. 5–9	chaps. 10–13	chaps. 14–18	chaps. 19–23
<i>100 Best-Loved Poems</i>	"The Charge of ..." p. 62		"Do Not Go Gentle ..." p. 93		
Memorization	"To a Louse" by Burns, last verse only (see <i>100 Best-Loved Poems</i> in the American Literature Study Guide).				
Language Arts					
Creative Expression	Analyzing Plot, Part II 				Write Me a Letter 
Math					
Other Notes					
<i>Dating with Integrity</i>		pp. 221–224	pp. 225–229	pp. 231–234	
	Make sure you take the time to <i>answer questions</i> at the end of each chapter!				
Foreign Language					
You're all done!					

©2012 by Sonlight Curriculum, Ltd. All rights reserved.

Key: Check off when complete  See Notes following Schedule  Map Assignment  Timeline Suggestion

Creative Expression

Day 1: Analyzing Plot, Part II

Really, this week's assignment is no different from last week's. I want you to do the same kind of plot analysis you did last week, only instead of going back through *The Outsiders*, I want you to analyze *The Giver*.

Do you see any similarities in the plot twists of the two books? Any fairly consistent differences? If so—similarities or differences—how do they show themselves?

Day 5: Write Me a Letter

Please. We would like to know what you liked and what you didn't like about this year's studies. What book(s) especially inspired you? Which notes you found especially helpful; which one(s) you wished I would have left out ... and why. (I want to know what you're really thinking.)

Please: give us an honest "piece of your mind."

Our e-mail address: igsuggestions@sonlight.com.

Our address: Sonlight Curriculum, Ltd., 8042 South Grant Way, Littleton, CO 80122-2705, USA. Thank you for your input! ■

The Giver

Introductory Comments

This book raises some deep questions about freedom to make choices; the appropriate place for rules in a person's life; sameness v. diversity; age milestones in a society; how to deal with unpleasant social issues; the appropriate place and function of family life; cults; utopianism; genetic engineering; the importance of truth.

It's rather bleak, but I think we need to confront these issues. They are "hot" in Western society today.

Too bad most people aren't thinking very deeply about the issues that Ms. Lowry raises.

Chapter 1

Questions and Comments

1. What is the significance of the fact that, at the very beginning of the story, it is almost December? ➔ *the Ceremony of Twelve takes place in December*
2. Why is Jonas apprehensive? ➔ *because of the Ceremony*
3. What does it mean when the community "releases" people? ➔ *it means they let them die*
4. What are the two reasons, other than punishment, for which a person would be "released" from the community? ➔ *1) old age; 2) an ill or defective newborn*
5. What is Jonas' father's title (job)? ➔ *nurturer*
6. What does that job entail? ➔ *responsibility for all the physical and emotional needs of newborns*
7. For whom does Jonas' mother work? ➔ *the Department of Justice*
8. Is there any possibility that Jonas' parents' respective jobs and/or job titles could create any kind of dramatic tension in the book? If so, what ... and why?
9. What specific societal rules can you identify in this chapter? How do you feel about such rules? Are they helpful? Confining? Why?

Chapter 2

Questions and Comments

10. How many new (one-year-old) children does the community allow each year? ➔ *50*
11. What is Jonas' reaction when he learns that his father has actually broken a rule? Why? ➔ *he is awed*
12. What is the name of the baby Jonas' father had taken a special interest in? ➔ *Gabriel, or Gabe*

13. What kind of dramatic meaning might such a name have? (Any literary allusions you can think of?) ... While we're on the subject: can you think of any possible significance to the name *Jonas*? What literary allusions does *that* name represent?
14. What do children in this society receive when they turn nine? ➔ *bicycles*
15. What rule concerning the bicycles was not taken very seriously and often broken? ➔ *you weren't supposed to teach younger siblings how to ride before they were nine*
16. Does this mean, or imply, that there are different varieties of rules? If so, what creates the distinctions among them?
17. How does the community change very important rules? ➔ *the Receiver, the most important of the Elders, must decide if the rule should be changed*
18. What is the Ceremony of Twelve? ➔ *it is when and where twelve-year-olds are given their Assignments*
19. And what are "Assignments"? ➔ *in essence: their lifetime jobs*
20. Who makes the "Assignment" for each twelve year old? ➔ *the Committee of Elders*
21. Over the course of this year—and in your own life experience, too, I'm sure—you have seen several different methods by which a person may be "given" his or her life's assignment: by personal choice; by parental assignment (think of Danny and his siblings in *The Chosen*); by "mere" station in life (you're born of a farmer, you must *be* a farmer; you're born the first son of a king, you must *be* a king; etc.)... What are the advantages and disadvantages you see in the various methods by which a person may be "given" his or her life's assignment? Which one(s) would you prefer ... and why?

Chapter 3

Questions and Comments

22. Where do the children come from in this community? ➔ *birthmothers*
23. Why does Jonas' mother not consider "birthmother" to be an honorable "Assignment"? ➔ *because after three years and three births, the birthmothers are assigned as laborers*
24. What do you make of Jonas' unusual eyes and his vision experience while he plays catch with Asher and his attempt to recreate it later in his room? ➔ *take a guess; the author will explain this in more detail later in the story*

Chapter 4

Questions and Comments

25. What is “The House of Old?” ➔ *the retirement center for older people in the community*
26. Why does Jonas go there? ➔ *to do his “volunteer hours”*
27. Larissa tells Jonas about the celebration of Roberto’s “release.” Was Roberto alive or dead at the time of the ceremony? ➔ *alive*
28. What are your culture’s funeral traditions? How are they the same, and how different from those in Jonas’ culture? What positive things do you see about the “releasing” ceremony? What negative things?

Chapter 5

Questions and Comments

29. What is your impression of the personal interaction that goes on among the members of Jonas’ family during the morning ritual?
30. What were the “first Stirrings?” ➔ *first sexual desires*
31. How does the community handle this matter? Why? ➔ *medical treatment*
32. Does it seem reasonable to you that a society that could get rid of all sexual desire would be much more orderly and peaceful? Why or why not? What would be the advantages and disadvantages of such a society?

Chapter 6

Questions and Comments

33. Describe the primary difference between the jacket Fours, Fives, and Sixes wear and the jackets Sevens wear. ➔ *Fours, Fives, and Sixes wear jackets that button down the back, sevens wear jackets that button down the front*
34. So what difference does this make, and why is it significant? ➔ *the jackets of the Fours, Fives, and Sixes require mutual help to button, while the Sevens are able to button their own jackets; getting such a jacket is the first sign of independence*
35. What are some of the signs of independence in your culture—or, at least, in your family?
36. Though the loss of a child is very rare in the community, what happens when one dies? ➔ *there is a Ceremony of Loss, and at the Ceremony of Naming, the Elders name a replacement*
37. What milestone do the Eights reach? ➔ *they can do voluntary hours for the first time*
38. The Nines? ➔ *they receive bicycles*
39. The Tens? ➔ *they receive an “adult” haircut*

40. The Elevens? ➔ *none*

41. The Twelves? ➔ *they receive their life’s “Assignment”*

42. Do you see any similar “ceremonies” or milestones in your culture? What are they, and what do they mean? Do you think these are legitimate ... or should they be abolished? Why?
43. How do you react to Jonas’ confidence that no one can fail to fit in to the community because it is so meticulously ordered, and the Elders make the choices (assignments) so carefully? Do you think your culture would function better if someone observed each person’s talent and disposition and made life assignments accordingly? What are the pros and cons of such a concept?

Chapter 7

Questions and Comments

44. What does the Ceremony of Twelve acknowledge in the children? ➔ *their differences*
45. Why do you think Asher receives the Assignment of “Assistant Director of Recreation?”
46. What is Jonas’ reaction when the Elder skip over him in the order of assignments? ➔ *he is frightened and puzzled*
47. Why does he have that reaction? ➔ *he is afraid he has done something wrong*
48. What do you think about the “Assignment” process? Do you think a society functions best on “sameness,” “diversity,” or ... ? Explain.

Chapter 8

Questions and Comments

49. Why did the Elders skip Jonas in the order of assignments? ➔ *because they had selected him to serve as the Receiver of Memory*
50. What are the qualifications of “The Receiver of Memory”? ➔ *1) intelligence; 2) integrity; 3) courage; 4) wisdom; 5) the Capacity to See Beyond*
51. What happens during the Ceremony that related to Jonas’ earlier game of pitch with Asher? ➔ *the audience changes when he looks at it*
52. Any idea what that may mean?
53. Does your society have any people, positions, or roles that are viewed with more honor or as having more importance than others? If so, who or what are they? And why are they honored or looked upon as more important? Do you think this is legitimate? Why or why not?

Chapter 9

Questions and Comments

54. What was Jonas' family's reaction to his assignment as Receiver of Memory? Why the fear? ➔ *pride ... and fear*
55. Which of the items on Jonas' list of assignments bothers him the most? ➔ *exemption from being rude; prohibition of medication; and exemption from lying*
56. Why do you think these bother him? Do you think they ought to bother him?
57. At this point in your reading, what do you imagine to be the significance of each the items on Jonas' list?

Chapter 10

Questions and Comments

58. When Jonas enters the Receiver's room, what is the most conspicuous difference he notices? ➔ *the books*
59. Why would these books be significant to someone concerned about memories? Prior to entering the Receiver's room, what were the only books Jonas had ever seen? ➔ *a dictionary; the community volume; the Book of Rules*
60. What is the Receiver's job with respect to Jonas? ➔ *to transmit all his memories to Jonas*
61. Any ideas about what the world would be like without memories?
62. At this point in the story, what do you think *The Giver* is really all about?

Chapter 11

Questions and Comments

63. What is the first memory that the Receiver imparts to Jonas? ➔ *the memory of sledding down a hill*
64. When the Receiver transfers a memory where does it then reside? ➔ *in Jonas—and only in Jonas—since the old Receiver no longer possesses it*
65. What do you think: is this a good or bad thing? And why?
66. Now that the Receiver is transferring memories to Jonas, by what designation does he say Jonas should address him? ➔ *as The Giver*
67. What do you think it would be like to live in a climate-controlled atmosphere where the weather, or season, never change: would this be a good thing? Bad? Why?

Chapter 12

Questions and Comments

68. What memory does Jonas dream about and cannot get out of his mind? ➔ *the memory of sledding down the hill*
69. What experience does Jonas have with his vision that relates to his earlier vision experiences? ➔ *he sees a change in Fiona's hair*
70. What does the Receiver say is happening to Jonas in these vision experiences? ➔ *he says Jonas is beginning to see color*
71. The Receiver explains to Jonas that when they decided to go to "Sameness" they gained control of some things but let go of other things. Describe what things society would gain in a world of "sameness" and what things it would lose. What do you think it would be like to live in a world without color?

Chapter 13

Questions and Comments

72. According to Jonas, what is one of the major problems with "Sameness"? ➔ *there are no choices*
73. Is this a real problem? Why or why not?
74. To what conclusion does he come regarding the freedom of choice? ➔ *that it is too dangerous for society because people will make wrong choices*
75. What do you think? Should people be given the freedom to make wrong or foolish choices? Why or why not? Should they be given that freedom in *all* areas, just some, or none at all? If only some, then in what areas should their (i.e., *our*) choices be limited? Why?
76. What do you think the Receiver means when he tells Jonas that everyone in the community is well trained for his or her job, but that life without memories was meaningless? Would you agree? Why or why not?
77. What would it be like for you to live in a community where you had no choices to make—where someone made all choices for you?
78. Is this—and if so, *why* is this—a subversive book? (If not, why is it *not* a subversive book?)

Chapter 14

Questions and Comments

79. According to the Giver, what is the purpose for the memories of pain? ➔ *they give wisdom, and wisdom enables him to give good advice to the Elders*

80. In his example of imparting wisdom to the Elders, what memory does the Giver use as the basis for his advice to the Elders against the plan to allow more children into the community? ➔ *the memory of overpopulation and hunger*
81. How does the Giver answer Jonas' question about why everyone in the community can not be permitted to receive the memories? ➔ *he says that would cause pain to everyone, and the community has decided it does not want pain, so they have given all of their memories to the Receiver to let him bear the pain*
82. What do you think? Is this wise? Why or why not? Is it biblical? Why do you think God repeatedly commands His people to "remember" their history: His history with them?
83. Would you like to be relieved of painful memories? Why or why not?

Chapter 15

Questions and Comments

84. What memory does Jonas take from the Giver that causes him great pain? ➔ *the memory of warfare*
85. What useful purpose do you think a painful memory—like the memory of warfare—might serve in a community of people?

Chapter 16

Questions and Comments

86. Jonas comes to a point where he says he does not want any more memories, honor, wisdom, or pain. What does he say he wants instead? ➔ *his childhood*
87. People often speak of "the innocence of childhood." What do you think? What are the advantages and disadvantages?
88. What was the setting for the Giver's favorite memory? ➔ *a family celebration of Christmas*
89. What feeling was the most important from that memory? ➔ *the feeling of love*
90. How does he (or, rather, how did his family) define love? ➔ *enjoyment of another person; pride in another person*
91. Do you think that is an adequate definition of the term? Why or why not?
92. What would your culture be like without love?

Chapter 17

Questions and Comments

93. Jonas' friends are playing a game on the Unscheduled Holiday that greatly disturbs him. What is it? ➔ *they were calling it "good guys and bad guys" but it was playing war*
94. Why does this game disturb Jonas so much? ➔ *because he can remember the "real" thing*
95. We're back to one of the themes we've been attacking before, **but**... Do you think there is a danger to society if or when it dismisses the memory of war? What about the memory of other yucky things—like slavery, or torture, or capital punishment ... or things that used to be considered yucky but seem, now, to be undergoing forms of "rehabilitation": gladiatorial contests, adultery, homosexuality, sado-masochism, prostitution, etc.? What are the dangers to a society of *altering* its collective memories?


Chapter 18

Questions and Comments

96. According to the Giver, what happened to the selected Receiver ten years earlier? ➔ *she asked for Release (death) when he began to give her difficult and painful memories, and the Elders granted it*
97. What was her name? ➔ *Rosemary*
98. Why would it be a disaster for the community to lose Jonas as its new Receiver? ➔ *because they would have to bear all the memories he had received from the Giver; as the Giver said, "Memories are forever"*
99. Are memories "forever" in real life? Why or why not?
100. Who in your society would it be difficult for the whole community to lose?

Chapter 19

Questions and Comments

101. Why do you think Jonas wants to know about the Release? Is this just idle curiosity?
102. Jonas watches his father Release a twin. We call this "euthanasia." What does "euthanasia" mean? ("*good death*") Is it good? Why or why not? Can there ever be a "good death"? Why or why not?
103. Does the Release of the baby bear any resemblance to abortion? How about to Hitler's attempt to rid society of weaker humans in order to establish a superior race of people? Any correlation to America's embracement, before Hitler's time, of eugenics. Visit our IG links web page for a link that will allow you to learn more about this topic .

Chapter 20

Questions and Comments

104. The Giver says the people who perform the Release “can’t help it. They know nothing.” What do you think? Is this a good excuse? Is it valid? Is it a valid excuse for a drunken man who causes a fatal car accident to say, “I’m sorry if my vehicle struck someone so that s/he died. But I was so drunk, I had no control over myself or my vehicle. I should not be held responsible for that over which I had no control”? Is there a parallel between these two “circumstances”? Why or why not?¹
105. What do you make of Jonas’ statement that “The worst part of holding the memories is not the pain. It’s the loneliness of it. Memories need to be shared”? Do memories need to be shared? How and/or why? In what way?
106. Describe the escape plan Jonas and the Giver formulate.
107. Who had Rosemary been? ➔ *the Giver’s daughter*

Chapter 21

Questions and Comments

108. What abruptly changes Jonas’ escape plan? ➔ *hearing that his father is going to release Gabriel the next morning*
109. What kind of life does Jonas leave behind? ➔ *a life where nothing is ever unexpected, inconvenient, or unusual; a life without color, pain, or past*
110. How would you like to live such a life?
111. What rules does Jonas break when he flees the community? ➔ *1) leaving his dwelling at night; 2) stealing food from the community; 3) stealing his father’s bicycle; 4) stealing Gabriel*
112. At what point do you think a situation is bad enough to break the rules . . . and either stay to endure the consequences, or to flee? (By the way: how did the United States come into existence? Was it by people who “followed the rules” or who disobeyed?)

Chapter 22

Questions and Comments

113. What new sights does Jonas begin to see as he journeys farther from the community? ➔ *a waterfall; wild-life; birds; wildflowers*
114. What is his greatest fear at this point? ➔ *that he and Gabriel will starve*
115. In what way does Jonas begin to question himself? ➔ *he had wanted to be free to make a choice, but now he is afraid he has made the wrong choice*
116. The risk of freedom of choice is the possibility of a wrong choice and its consequences. Do you prefer to have everything already chosen for you so you don’t make mistakes, or do you prefer to have freedom of choice, knowing you will make some mistakes and will suffer some difficult consequences? Explain your answer.

Chapter 23

Questions and Comments

117. In what ways are the memories of the top of the hill, the snow, and the sled Jonas’ *own* memories?
118. What do you think is the main point of this book? Do you agree with that point? Why or why not? ■

1. Let me tell you my opinion. I think there *is* a parallel. The community in the case of *The Giver* chose to “forget”—just as the drunken man chose to take the . . . first . . . drink that eventually led to the drink that made him so drunk that he “did not know what he was doing.” I say: no excuse!