

Study notes on
The Last Week

Marcus Borg and John Dominic Crossan

SPCK 2008

Edward James Lent 2014
edwardian@technocom.com

Notes on *The Last Week*

The objective of these notes is to provide a terse summary of the contents of the book by Borg and Crossan. I hope that it will help in your own study, and maybe also provide you with a background for leading study sessions and discussions.

Why is *The Last Week* important to me?

I have found that it helps me to make better sense of the events as we follow Jesus through the story of what we call Holy Week, from his entrance into the Jerusalem area for the last time, his execution and through the remarkable experience we call His resurrection.

What about the authors?

The authors of the book are Marcus Borg and John Dominic Crossan, American theologians.

Marcus Borg is Canon Theologian at Trinity Episcopal Cathedral in Portland, Oregon, and a retired Professor of Bible studies.

John Dominic Crossan is a theologian, formerly a Catholic priest, later Professor in the Department of Religious Studies, DePaul University, Chicago. Both have spent their lives in Jesus studies.

What is significant to me about this book?

It makes full use of the enormous increase in knowledge about life in New Testament times and the meanings of the words used at that time. We now have available written accounts of some events contemporary with Jesus and we can amplify the meaning of events in the New Testament by relating them to those reports. For example, the meaning of 'Messiah' and 'Son of God', which we know now, were both applied to the Emperor in Rome during the lifetime of Jesus.

Is this approach the right one?

This is for you to decide. I might stress that the stories of Jesus' Last week in the New Testament were set down many years after the events described, and were based on stories circulating mainly in oral form around a small group of Jesus followers in a particular place. I can make no claims for the historical veracity of what is said, I can only offer some views and encourage discussion as you continue on your Jesus journey.

Is this sort of thinking a good idea?

I think that we may all tend to retain ideas about Jesus which we first heard when children, and which have never developed. It is naturally disturbing to be presented with ideas which may be a long way from those we are familiar with. It could be natural to oppose those ideas, and hope that they would go away.

But I will assume that we have an ecumenical outlook, and might call ourselves liberal. It is certain that we are all deeply concerned with Jesus, as are the book's authors.

Why this particular book?

I use this book because I believe that it looks more carefully at the traditional Easter story than most other commentaries on the Easter week. But

remember that both the traditional Jesus story and our study book are the products of particular people with particular backgrounds. You may learn from both but you need not accept the interpretation given here as the only possible view. Interpret it as you can, which is all that we can do with everything we read.

Some may say that the Bible does not err. What they usually mean is that *their* interpretation of what the Bible seems to say brooks no discussion.

So I have found it stirring to look at *The Last Week*, and hope it will help you to develop your understanding of Jesus for yourself.

What is in the book?

The authors have chosen to follow the framework provided in the Gospel of Mark. This is the earliest, and simplest of the Gospels. The other gospels tell a similar story, but add extra material of their own.

Mark is unique in providing a solid time frame to the events of Holy Week. So we can divide our study into events on each day of the week.

We start with *Palm Sunday*.

Session One: Palm Sunday

Mark 11.1-11

Two processions enter Jerusalem on this day. The *first* contains Jesus, seated on an ass, welcomed by his supporters. The *second* contains Pontius Pilate, the Roman governor, coming in to ensure no trouble during Passover celebrations.

Jerusalem is central to the history of the Hebrews, and central for Mark. He wrote close to its destruction by Rome because of rebellion, and his account is influenced by that later event.

For Mark, Jesus' message is about the Kingdom of God, and the Way to reach it.

What is God's type of Kingdom? It is the Kingdom of *this* world, when all injustice will be put right. Achieved by *repentance*. Repentance is not about sins, a later obsession of the Church, based on the idea of final judgement after death; it is about a change of mind, producing a return to the Right Way towards the Kingdom.

To whom did Jesus talk? Peasants in rural Galilee, not to cities, even in Galilee. His message was to the country poor. Mark says the message immediately put up the backs of Scribes, Pharisees and Herodians, the power elites living in the cities.

What fellowship with Jesus means: Following Jesus on the *Way*, the Way of achieving the Kingdom. For Jesus this is a physical journey to Jerusalem, to confront the central powers, Rome and the priestly families, their collaborators. Almost certain to lead to his death. Mark portrays him as foreseeing this.

The Last Week details His final journey to Jerusalem.

What the confrontation was NOT.

It was not with *Judaism*. The followers of Jesus on The Way formed an *internal* sect of Judaism until expelled much later. The Jewish Bible, our OT, is the basis of understanding the history of developing ideas about God for all Jews, and for us.

Session Two: Monday

Mark 11:12-19 "On the following day, Monday..."

The New Testament is full of symbolic *stories*, just as in the OT. The stories are not necessarily history, but they are *parables*. These are stories which are *always* true and significant, not limited to descriptions of historical events.

The Fig Tree is cursed for not producing fruit and the Disciples hear Jesus angry. This is not the tree's fault, it is not in season. So it is *symbolic* story. What happens to those of us who don't produce the right results? We are not following the right way.

Note on Mark's method. Only the first half of the Fig story is given here, the second half not until Tuesday. *Why? Because Mark uses frames.* The Fig tree story *frames* the temple incident before and after it. The *Temple* is not producing the goods, so it will have to go. What happens to the non-producing tree is told later on Tuesday.

The incident in the temple. Is it a 'Den of Robbers'? Background: The Temple was the centre of collaboration with Rome. Rome ruled *through* the Priestly families. Jesus is not against the existence of the Temple: as a Jew, he was proud of the Temple and paid taxes to it. Problem was the collusion of Rome and High Priestly families to maintain the wrong sort of Kingdom. 'Den of Robbers' quote is from Jeremiah. Worship in the Temple and Justice, meaning fairness for all, *should* go together, but is not happening.

Traditional misunderstanding of the overthrown tables. Worshippers are not being cheated. But the Temple is being used as a hideout, where the chief priests go after they have robbed the people. Ambiguity of the Priesthood, and of the Temple which are also symbols of Roman control. The collaborators think themselves safe in the Temple after failing to provide Justice to the people.

Problem. 'For all the nations' quote is suggested as a Marcan addition to Jesus' original symbolic action. When Court of Gentiles in full swing, then all could go in. But when Mark wrote c. AD 70, Temple was close to destruction. 'Robbers' meaning revolutionaries, were holding out in the Temple against Rome. It was a den of violent people, not following Jesus' Way of non-violence.

Were 'The Jews' to blame for Jesus' death? No. Mark keeps saying that the High Priest couldn't get rid of Jesus 'because they feared the people'.

Ambiguous position of the High Priests. The High Priests and elders were appointed as Roman agents, to collect taxes. We blame postmen for lateness of mail, builder for fault in house design..... Mark blames them for Jesus' death.

It was not *the ordinary Jewish people*, they valued Jesus' concern for them and for the Jewish religion.

Weren't the money-changers crooks? Why? Perfectly reasonable that they should change money so people could pay temple tax in right coinage. *Question.* Was Jesus looking for trouble?

Session Three Tuesday

Mark 11:20-25 Returns to previous story, what happened to the Fig tree from Monday. The fig tree (which represents the Temple) has gone by AD 70. Mark says that Jesus foretold it. It did not satisfy the new needs of the Jesus movement.

Jesus arrives in Jerusalem, in Temple area. Large open-air courts at entrance. During passover, packed with pilgrims. Good stage for disputes with authority (the collaborators, not 'The Jews', the people were with Jesus).

Mark 11.27-33 Jesus is challenged: 'By what authority'?

His question: 'John the Baptizer?...' reverses the challenge.

12.1-12 Jesus indicts the authorities with parable of the Vineyard.

12.13-17 Give taxes to Caesar? 'Whose head..?' he replies.

12.18-27 Relations after death? 'Not God of the dead, but the living' (Sadducees were wealthy: if life is good, who needs an afterlife?)

12.28-34 The greatest commandment? 'You shall love...' Enquirer told 'You are not far from the Kingdom...'

12.35-44 Jesus takes initiative: He questions Scribal authority, praises the Widow and her mite.

13.1-3 What about the Temple?

The Temple seemed undestroyable, but Mark knew that it had gone by 70CE, and reports that Jesus foreknew this.

Mark 13.5-37 The Little Apocalypse, expounds current Jewish expectations, based on Daniel. 'The Son of Man, coming in clouds.' Mark identifies Jesus with the 'Son of Man'. We may not share the same expectation of divine intervention. But we can share the same passion, and hope and work for a better world.

Session 4 Wednesday.

Mark 14.1-11 The need for a traitor frames the Alabaster Jar story

The Chief Priests and collaborators needed to stop Jesus but Mark tells many times that they dare not openly arrest him 'because of the crowd' who vigorously supported him.

Mark continually stresses the failure of the *disciples* to realise that Jesus is going to his death. They expect success and squabble for good positions. This is a warning to *all of us* who follow.

Jesus warns at 8.31: "The Son of Man must be rejected and killed" Peter says nonsense, and is told "Get thee behind me, Satan."

Jesus warns again at 9.31: The disciples don't understand, but dare not ask more.

Jesus warns on the way to Jerusalem at 10.33: James and John want to sit beside him in glory! His response: Who wants to be first must be last and servant of all.

The purpose of all this teaching is to explain what Jesus' death and resurrection mean for himself, the disciples, and all his followers.

Not only Jesus and disciples are on the journey, we all are...

Atonement: Substitution or Participation?

Mark 10.45: "The Son of Man came not to be served, but to serve, and to give his life a ransom for many." What does Mark mean?

A common view states: God is offended by human sin. Human punishment is not enough. So 'divine' Son sent to be killed for God to be appeased.

But the Greek 'lutron' means payment to free a slave, not a satisfaction for sins. And Mark stresses throughout the journey that all should *participate with Him*, not be *substituted by Him*. We all share the journey through death of the old life to a new better life here on Earth.

The Alabaster Jar story illustrates what should be done. She was the only one who took his warnings seriously, and she *served* him by anointing him. She was the First Believer and a model Leader.

Where is Judas in all this?

10.33 says only that Jesus was 'handed over to chief priests....'.

Judas is named only later (14.10). And they only *promised* him money, but Matthew and John elaborate the story to denigrate him. Later writers justify his actions in other ways. For Mark, it was just one more failure of the disciples (which includes us).

Session Five Thursday

The preparation for the passover meal in evening is an overture. *Two* disciples are sent to check each other. 'Follow the man with water jug' implies secrecy about where. Judas must not know....

The Last supper, a web of meanings: They eat the Passover meal; Jesus speaks of imminent betrayal; Jesus performs the usual ceremony of sharing out Bread and Wine, our story provides a new meaning about his death. As previously, Jesus uses a *real* meal for fellowship and teaching. He was often criticised for eating with the wrong people. For peasants, enough food and less debt were fundamental in their lives.

Jesus took, blessed, broke and gave the bread, like other feeding stories. And he forces the disciples to do the feeding work, not to send the crowd away to look after themselves. The parable is not about the *multiplication* of loaves but *fair distribution*. When justice is distributed on earth, through God, there is enough for us all.

The meal as Passover commemoration for ever. The Passover Lamb is food for the Exodus. Jesus is the Passover Lamb. Lamb's blood on doorpost gives us safe passage. The meal is the last one in 'Egypt', the place of bondage. *Not substitution*: Protection against death, and food for the journey into a new life in *this* world. Replace Egypt with Rome, or any other Empire since; it is a subversive story.

Body and blood and the death of Jesus: The Exodus is explicit in the Passover meal, but the nature of His death is implicit in the *words of institution*. Body and Blood separately implies violent death, ie sacrificial. Not suffering, not substitution, but participation *with* God through a meal. The 12 partake of the food; Jesus wants his death to take *them* through death to participate in a New world.

Gethsemane, prayer and arrest: Jesus says that all will desert him. Peter vows not to. Jesus says he *will*, before the next dawn.

Jesus asks inner three to keep watch while he prays, but they fail.

Jesus prays for deliverance from coming danger. Uses *Abba*, Daddy, an intimate term. It was not God's will that he should suffer and die, Jesus accepted the inevitability, trusted in God, and went forward.

Judas arrives with temple soldiers, Jesus is arrested, the disciples flee, and disappear from the story until after Easter.

Interrogation and condemnation: We are told that the disciples had fled, so who knows what happened? Possibly it was typical of what would happen at the time Mark wrote. Note: the *temple authorities* did not represent the Jewish people, they were local collaborators with Rome, collecting taxes and keeping order.

Confession and denial: In the trial, the witnesses could not agree that Jesus had claimed any title, so the high priest goes for a straight confession: "Are you the Christ, the Son of God?" Jesus says "I am" but this could mean "Am I?", not definite. *Note:* Jesus is convicted on what looks like a post-Easter confession of his significance for the church.

The rest of His statement is the 'Son of Man' quote from Daniel 7. Here Mark follows the Jews, under continuous tyranny, turning to visions of a heavenly kingdom. The 'Son of Man' is given authority to replace all tyrants with an everlasting reign of Justice for all. The early Church looked to this happening shortly. But in fact Jesus' was *already* in charge, and his kingdom had begun.

Confession and Denial: The story of Peter's denial of Jesus *frames* Jesus' confession of his identity. As usual, Mark writes specially for those being persecuted during the rebellions of 66-74.

The sequence is:

Peter follows Jesus to high priest's house.

Jesus is interrogated and confesses his purpose.

Peter is interrogated and denies Jesus.

Teaching: those who copy Jesus are applauded: those who copy Peter are consoled by future forgiveness (Peter re-appears as a disciple after Easter): And either of those are better than despair: Judas never appears again in Mark's story.

Session Six Friday

Let us look at Mark's story on its own. It is usually confused with extra bits from the other Gospels.

Apostle Paul tells of this earlier, but not the actual events, only interpretations of what it all meant to him.

Mark's story has retrospective interpretation *combined* with history remembered. His story has precise times, three-hour slots.

Actors: Chief Priests and scribes. These are *collaborators* with Romans, responsible for control in Jerusalem. *They do not represent or act for the Jewish People.*

Dawn, 6am to 9am.

Local collaborators hand Jesus over to Pilate. Jesus: "You say so", mocking? Pilate presses, Jesus shows silent courage; contempt?

Strange *Barabbas* event, crowd says "Crucify". Not the *people*, but imported *Yes-men*? Best explained as time-shift. Mark writes after 66, when many Jews had chosen violence, not the Jesus way.

Jesus handed over to soldiers, tortured, humiliated, taunted, this was normal, "Hail King of Jews". Usually forced to carry crossbar of cross, but too weak already.

9am to Noon

To Golgotha, offered drink, refused, He was crucified, that well-known method for disturbers of the Pax Romana, 'terrorists.'

3pm to 6pm

Jesus: 'My God....' from Ps 22. Then died.

Temple curtain torn in two. Meaning?

1. Judgment against Temple authorities who collaborated with Rome to kill Jesus.
2. Access to God is now open to all, not just through priests and existing domination system.

Another symbol: Roman soldier says 'This is God's Son', the first to say that. Implies that the Roman Emperor is *not* God's Son.

Witnesses: the women supporters only, reminds us that all disciples had fled. *Side effect*: shows equality of women in early days of the movement, later lost to patriarchal rule. But right here, in the main story.

6pm and burial

6pm is start of the Sabbath, so body of Jew must be removed. Not normal, dead body usually left to animals. Joseph story to help decency? Mark needs a good quality burial, to set the scene for Easter morning.

About substitutionary atonement, SA yet again.

First defined precisely in a 1097 book by Anselm, Archbishop Canterbury. He assumed the current English legal framework; something is wrong, so someone must be punished for it.

Not the only possible understanding. We usually get composite story from all Gospels, which need separate study. Let us listen to Mark alone.

SA is part of a larger package; We are all sinners, all need forgiveness, and a judging God needs a sacrifice. All traditional liturgies use this idea. A misunderstanding of the word *Repent*. The Greek means 'Change your mind', see things differently. And misunderstanding of *Ransom*. The Greek 'Lutron' is payment to *liberate* captives from bondage, not payment for sin.

SA theory goes far beyond what the NT says. The NT provides multiple ways of interpreting His death.

Another view: Jesus' death as *sacrifice* is affected by a tradition in the OT, the sacrifice of a perfect lamb at Passover; that *was* substitution, as were all Temple sacrifices.

How does Mark understand the Death of Jesus?

A judgement on the authorities and on the Temple. "The Chief Priests, elders and scribes", the collaborators with the Romans, have killed him, as He said they would. Mark *sees* darkness, and the Temple curtain torn at His death. A *Roman* Centurion says "This was the Son of God", this implied *not* the Emperor, who also claimed the same title.

Mark's use of the Jewish Bible (our Old Testament). There are echoes and quotes from it during the Good Friday account. Many saw the OT as *foretelling* the future events of Jesus' life, forcing the idea that things *had* to happen, were foreordained, especially substitutionary sacrifice (like the Jewish Paschal Lamb). As usual in earlier times, an older story is used inside the new story to strengthen it. Together they show the interpretive framework of the author, how the writer saw it.

Crucifixion cry 'Why hast thou....' uses the words of Psalm 22. Mark uses the words from there to support his story. The key is that Ps. 22 ends with new hope *after* the cry of desolation.

Session Seven Saturday

Mark has nothing on Saturday. What happened?

Look at *Apostles Creed*: On Friday 'crucified, dead, buried'; On Saturday, '*descended into hell*'. On Sunday: 'On *third day*, rose again from the dead'.

Nicene Creed: Friday: "For our sake crucified, dead, and buried".

Sunday: "On the third day he rose again in accordance with the scriptures". What has Mark missed out? Is it on purpose?

In the creed, Jesus "*Descended into Hell*" For the Jews = Harrowing of Hell = Robbing of Hell. This is not the later Christian place of punishment, but the Jewish *Sheol*, Greek *Hades*, the place of non-existence, shades.

Jewish traditions on martyrs in persecutions. Two ideas:

1. Divine intervention to save, like Daniel in Lion's Den.
2. Reward *after* death, martyrdom. Necessary if no escape was possible, as with Jesus. He was mocked during his execution, no intervention. But vindicated *afterwards* 'according to the scriptures', that is, existing Jewish traditions.

But 2. is very general. Jews needed to look for a more particular, *apocalyptic eschatology* that is, a general future personal *bodily* resurrection "In the eyes of the foolish, they have died, but they are at peace" until the *final* resurrection of all. So two reasons for rest in death:

- General: The renewal of an all-good creation needed renewed *bodies*.
- Specific: The executed and destroyed bodies of martyrs had to be recovered and renewed, as after the Selucid persecution of Mark's time.

But Jesus had said *the Kingdom is already here*. So Jesus' resurrection and the resurrection of all previous righteous had to happen *together*. He had to *lead* them out of hell.

But how to fit this into the Easter narrative? Watch Matthew trying: Temple curtain torn, earthquake, tombs opened, but at Jesus death, not at his rising. But they couldn't *appear* until *after* his rising. And someone had to *baptise* them. Various explanations in other accounts. But none of this would fit into Jesus, on his own, teaching the disciples *after* his resurrection. So Mark left it out.

Conclusion

The Harrowing of Hell is a Jewish Christian tradition, which did not continue in the Gentile-based church which later developed.

This tradition is not in Mark. His teaching is:

- The Kingdom has already begun.
- The 'son of man' has already arrived in Jesus.
- The bodily resurrection has already started.

The Kingdom, already present, now depends on a clean-up of the *present* Earth by his followers in *collaboration* with God. So Jesus is *always travelling with his group* on the Way.

NOTE. Eschatology is not about the *end* of our space-time world, but about the ending of our subjection to evil in 'this world' of Paul. Not about getting away from Earth, but *transforming* it.

The Jews desperately needed God's direct operation, as empires succeeded each other in persecuting Palestine.

No Gospels refer to the 'End of the World', because their Bible said that God saw that it was *good*. It could not be imagined ever to stop. But *we* see it as clearly possible, quite soon.

Session Eight Easter Sunday

The resurrection events are essential for Mark's story. Jesus' death is meaningless without the resurrection story, which created His continuing community. Most of us have childhood memories of church preaching, teaching, hymns, and liturgy. They often emphasised historical factuality, 'not a Christian if not believed'. Paul said "If Christ is not raised.... then is our faith in vain". Borg and Crossan agree, but for different reasons. The traditional view can get in the way of understanding the meaning of the resurrection *for us*.

History or Parable? Look at it again. If *history*, its purpose is to relate publicly observable events, seen by anybody there. If *parable*, a model is the other parables of Jesus. All agree that a parable's importance is *not* dependent on its actually happening. The *meaning* is what matters. But this is not a *denial* of factuality.

Mark's story of Easter Day. Mark's is the *first* account. Paul, writing earlier, refers to the resurrection, but Mark provides the first *narrative*. He has only 8 verses, no appearances of risen Jesus, only in other gospels. And the original account ends abruptly: "The women fled for they were afraid."

Mark's story as parable Let us consider the empty tomb story as a *parable* of the resurrection.

- Jesus was sealed in the tomb, but it could not hold him, the stone was rolled away.
- Jesus is not to be found in the land of the dead. "He is not here." (Luke adds "Why look for the living among the dead?").
- Jesus is 'raised.' God has said "yes" to him and "no" to the powers which killed him.
- His followers are told: "You will see him."

In the other Gospels: Mark's story of the empty tomb is *expanded*. Result of reflection by followers after His death? As told in different communities?

Matthew: 1. As women leave the tomb, Jesus says "Greetings, do not fear, tell my brothers to go to Galilee, they will see me there".

2. In Galilee, He gathers the disciples and commissions them:

"Go and make disciples of *all* nations.... I am with you always, to the end of the age." So a *universal* extension of His work. The risen Jesus is *Emmanuel*, God's abiding presence with us all.

Luke: 1. Jesus joins two supporters in the walk to Emmaus on Easter evening. They ask: "Stay with us". He takes bread, blesses, breaks and gives to them. They understand, and He is gone.

2. The two return to Jerusalem and tell the 11 and friends. Jesus appears among them: "Touch me and see"; They will be given "power from on high", as later recounted in Acts. Jesus takes them to Bethany, blesses them and "ascends into heaven".

John: Different; 1. The stone is rolled away, the tomb is empty, only Mary Magdalene sees that, she tells Peter and the 'beloved disciple', who run to the tomb, see, and then 'go home'. Mary stays, Jesus appears, tells her to tell the others; "I am ascending to my Father and your Father."

2. The disciples are in a locked room, afraid. Jesus appears, "Peace be with you", shows wounds, and says "Receive the Holy spirit".

3. Thomas, not present earlier, does not believe them. Jesus appears, and Thomas responds with "My Lord and God".

John's Gospel seems to end there, but another story is appended. 4. Seven disciples go fishing. Jesus calls from the shore, "Put down the net", massive catch, Jesus feeds them with it. He asks Peter three times "Do you love me?" Peter is told "Feed my sheep" and "Follow me on the Way."

The Gospel stories all together: Two themes.

1. "Jesus lives". He is experienced after His death in a *new* way. Not confined in space or time, always present for his followers. Only Luke in Acts says he "disappeared into Heaven." Mark says "You will see Him." Which is true for ever.

2. God has vindicated Jesus. Always see the Crucifixion before the Resurrection. Jesus' killers do *not* have the final word.

Paul and resurrection

Paul experienced that Jesus lives in his *vision* on the Road to Damascus. He seems to see all the appearances to others in the same way. Paul's vision turned his life round. The Kingdom of God has already started on Earth. All are called to participate in bringing it in.

Easter and the Christian life today

His *Death* and *Resurrection* need to be affirmed *equally*. *Death without Resurrection* on its own implies we all deserve to suffer, but Jesus was a substitute. *Easter without Good Friday* looks sentimental, good times are coming, no effort needed. But Jesus had a *passion* for the Kingdom of God, and he gave his life in fighting for it.

His path is *our* path of personal transformation, so important to us. But there is a *political* meaning, often ignored. Jesus confronted the 'powers of this world', and so must we. We work for His Kingdom to come on *Earth*, not just in *Heaven*.

Alternative processions.

On Palm Sunday, *two* processions entered Jerusalem: *Pilate's*, to keep order over Passover, to keep up Caesar's Kingdom.

Jesus', to proclaim the Kingdom of God and Justice, and *not* Caesar.

Mark's message

For Mark, Jesus' message is about the Kingdom of God in *this* world, and the Way to reach it.

His question to us is: **Which procession are you in?**

•••

Notes on The Last Week by Borg and Crossan

Version 5: Good Friday 2014

Edward James Contact me at edwardian@technocom.com

Personal note: I retired from Imperial College after a career in teaching and research. Throughout that time I was also a member of regular Christian groups set up by *Ivor Smith-Cameron* the chaplain, who later became Canon Missioner in Southwark. Some members of Imperial continued to study at Ivor's home in Clapham under the direction of *Cecilia Goodenough*. All were influenced by Cecilia, an outstanding theologian, recognised by the Archbishop of Canterbury in her personal appointment as a Doctor of Divinity. The viewpoints which we developed together with Cecilia were very much in sympathy with the views in this book, and have been important to me ever since.

Which is the difference in these two sentences? a) He watched TV every nigh the last week. b) he watched TV every night last week. Thanks in advance. Mar 20 2011 11:30:13. Tenacious Learner. Comments. 'The last week' can be any last week ('I finished the project the last week of June 2007'). 'Last week' is only the last week before now, i.e. the time of utterance. Mar 20 2011 11:32:49. Mister Micawber. How to translate "last week" from English into Russian: translations with transcription, pronunciation, and examples in an online dictionary. Translation of Last week from English into Russian performed by Yandex.Translate, a service providing automatic translations of words, phrases, whole texts and websites. Translations come complete with examples of usage, transcription, and the possibility to hear pronunciation. Last week synonyms, Last week pronunciation, Last week translation, English dictionary definition of Last week. Last week Collins Multilingual Translator © HarperCollins Publishers 2009. A lady in the next ward who walked last week first, peeked into the door, and another one who hopes she can walk next month, was invited in to the party, and she laid on my nurse's bed and clapped her hands. View in context. Their engagements at Rosings were as frequent during the last week of her stay as they had been at first.