

GOD & EMPIRE

Crossan, John Dominic. *GOD & EMPIRE: Jesus Against Rome Then and Now* (New York: HarperCollins, 2007),

America is a new empire: There are two insistent claims from across the spectrum of our religio-political life. The first one claims that America is now – and may always have been – an empire and that, in fact, the virus of imperialism came on those first ships from Europe. The second subsidiary claim is that America is Nova Roma, the New Roman Empire, Rome on the Potomac. ¹ 여기에 대해 P. 2-4 를 더 읽을 것.

³⁶**Jesus answered, 'My kingdom is not from this world.' (John 18:36)**

First, Jesus opposes the Kingdom of God to the kingdom of "this world." "Empire and the Barbarism of Civilization," is of the "this world" of Jesus. The violence of Roman imperialism was but one incarnation at that first-century time and in that Mediterranean place of "this world."

Second, Jesus condemned to death by Roman Pilate, in Roman Judea, in the eastern reaches of the Roman Empire.

Third, Your Roman Empire, Pilate, is based on the injustice of violence, but my divine kingdom is based on the justice of nonviolence.

Fourth, the crucial difference between the Kingdom of God and the Kingdom of Rome is Jesus' nonviolence and Pilate's violence.

Fifth, the most important interpreter of Jesus in the entire New Testament is Pilate. He clearly recognizes the difference between Barabbas and Jesus. Barabbas is a violent revolutionary who "was in prison with the rebels who had committed murder during the insurrection (Mark 15:7). Pilate arrested Barabbas along with those of his followers he could capture. But Jesus is a nonviolent revolutionary, so Pilate has made no attempt to round up his companions. Both Barabbas and Jesus opposed Roman injustice in the Jewish homeland, but Pilate knows exactly and correctly how to calibrate their divergent oppositions.²

For Mann, social imperial power is combination of four types of force and violence; *military* power, the monopoly or control of force and violence; *economic* power, the monopoly or control of labor and production; *political* power, the monopoly or control of organization and institution; and *ideological* power, the monopoly or control of interpretation and meaning. ³ 설명을 더 읽을 것

Roman Imperial Theology

Roman imperial theology is the ideological power of the Roman Empire.

First, the Romans spoke of itself in transcendental terms as an empire divinely mandated to rule without limits of time and place. It did not simply proclaim domination around the Mediterranean Sea. It announced world conquest, global rule, and central sovereignty.

Second, when Jesus of Nazareth, Paul of Tarsus, and John of Patmos came against the Roman Empire, they did so not with military, economic, or political power but exclusively with ideological power. ⁴

Since Rome had many gods and goddesses, there was always the danger that the divine Augustus might be seen as but one more god among the many – or worse still, that he might be seen as rather belated divinity. ⁵ At the start, in 31 BCE, Rome was about "victory ... [with] peace secured on land and sea," and at the end, in 14 CE, Rome was still about "peace secured by victories on land sea." Religion, war, victory, and peace - this was the Roman

¹ Crossan, John Dominic. *GOD & EMPIRE: Jesus Against Rome Then and Now* (New York: HarperCollins, 2007), 2.

² Crossan, John Dominic. *GOD & EMPIRE: Jesus Against Rome Then and Now* (New York: HarperCollins, 2007), 4.

³ Crossan, John Dominic. *GOD & EMPIRE: Jesus Against Rome Then and Now* (New York: HarperCollins, 2007), 12.

⁴ Crossan, John Dominic. *GOD & EMPIRE: Jesus Against Rome Then and Now* (New York: HarperCollins, 2007), 15.

⁵ Crossan, John Dominic. *GOD & EMPIRE: Jesus Against Rome Then and Now* (New York: HarperCollins, 2007), 19.

imperial theology, easily summarized as "peace through victory." ...The emperor's divinity was the incarnate heart of Roman imperial theology and stayed as such long after Augustus was dead.⁶

In conclusion, imagine this question. There was a human being in the first century who was called, "Divine," "Son of God," "God," and "God from God," whose titles were "Lord," "Redeemer," "Liberator," and "Savior of the World." Who was that person? Most people who know the Western tradition would probably answer Jesus of Nazareth. And most Christians probably think that those titles were originally created and uniquely applied to Christ. But before Jesus ever existed, all those terms belonged to Caesar Augustus. To proclaim them of Jesus the Christ was thereby to deny them of Caesar the Augustus. Christians were not simply using ordinary titles applied to all sorts of people at that time, or even extraordinary titles applied to special people in the East. They were taking the identity of the Roman emperor and giving it to a Jewish peasant. Either that was a peculiar joke and a very low lampoon, or it was what the Romans called *majestas* and we call high treason.⁷

Meaning of the Sabbath and Fall P. 54-

Meaning of prophecy - 74

Triumphant Entry P/ 132

"Kingdom of God" – in Greek it is actually "Kingdom of Heaven"- is all too often misinterpreted as the Kingdom of the future, of the next world, of the afterlife. For Matthew, "Heaven" was simply a euphemism for "God," the Dwelling used interchangeably with the Dweller, as when we say, "The White House announces...." When we mean, "The president announces.." In other words, "Kingdom of Heaven" meant exactly the same as "Kingdom of God." "The Kingdom of God" was a standard expression for the Great Diving Cleanup of this world. It was what this world would look like if and when God sat on Caesar's throne, or if and when God lived in Antipa's palace. That is very clear in these parallel phrases of the Lord's Prayer in Matthew 6:10: "Your Kingdom come. Your will be done, on *earth* as it is in heaven."⁸ The Kingdom of God is about the Will of God for this world here below. .. It is about the transformation of this world into holiness, not the evacuation of this world into heaven.⁹

It is clear that the Kingdom of God is inextricably and simultaneously 100 percent political and 100 percent religious. "Kingdom" is a political term, "God" is a religious term, and Jesus would be executed for that "of" in a world where, for Rome, God already sat on Caesar's throne because Caesar was God. Earliest Christianity was absolutely both [religious and political] at the same time because nobody in the first century made a distinction. The Caesar's coin said he was Divi F, that is, Son of God; how could one distinguish politics from religion in that title? For Jesus, "the Kingdom of God" raised a politico-religious or religio-political question.¹⁰

There was one major difference between John and Jesus: To stop his movement, Antipas had only to execute John. His movement might linger on in memory, nostalgia, and sorrow for one or two generations, but since it depended on John's life, it ended with John's death. Here is how Jesus' strategy differed from John's.¹¹ First of all, Jesus announced the presence of the Kingdom of God by inviting all to come and see how *he and his companions* had already accepted it, had already entered it, and were already living in it. To experience the Kingdom, he asserted, come, see how *we* live, and then live like us. This invitation presumes that Jesus was promulgating not just a vision or a theory but a praxis and a *communal* program, and that this program was not just for himself but for others as well. What was it?¹²

Basically it was this; *heal the sick, eat with those you heal, and announce the Kingdom's presence in that mutuality.* You can see that communal program at work in such texts as Mark 6:7-13, Luke 9:1-6, Matthew 10:5-14, and Luke 10:1-11. Notice some unusual features of these texts. First, Jesus does not settle down at Nazareth or

⁶ Crossan, John Dominic. *GOD & EMPIRE: Jesus Against Rome Then and Now* (New York: HarperCollins, 2007), 25.

⁷ Crossan, John Dominic. *GOD & EMPIRE: Jesus Against Rome Then and Now* (New York: HarperCollins, 2007), 28.

⁸ Crossan, John Dominic. *GOD & EMPIRE: Jesus Against Rome Then and Now* (New York: HarperCollins, 2007), 116.

⁹ Crossan, John Dominic. *GOD & EMPIRE: Jesus Against Rome Then and Now* (New York: HarperCollins, 2007), 117.

¹⁰ Crossan, John Dominic. *GOD & EMPIRE: Jesus Against Rome Then and Now* (New York: HarperCollins, 2007), 117.

¹¹ Crossan, John Dominic. *GOD & EMPIRE: Jesus Against Rome Then and Now* (New York: HarperCollins, 2007), 117.

¹² Crossan, John Dominic. *GOD & EMPIRE: Jesus Against Rome Then and Now* (New York: HarperCollins, 2007), 118.

Capernaum and instruct his companions to bring people to him as monopolist of the Kingdom. Second, he tells others to do exactly what he himself is doing - healing the sick, eating with the healed, and proclaiming the Kingdom's presence. Third, he does not tell them to heal in his name or even to pray to God before they heal - nor does he himself pray before he heals....can only be explained by the Kingdom's presence and our participation in it - if we are in the already- present Kingdom, we are already in union with God and can act accordingly. ¹³

The logic of Jesus' Kingdom program is a mutuality of healing (the basic spiritual power) and eating (the basic physical power) shared freely and openly. That program built a *share*-community from the bottom up as a positive alternative to Antipas' Roman *greed* - community established from the top down. That food is the material basis of life and that the control of eating controls all else. First and foremost, with no food, there is no life. So eating as a basic physical power is relatively clear, but healing as a spiritual power is much more difficult to understand. ... Jesus was a great healer. This passage from Arthur Kleinman's famous 1980 book *Patients and Healer in the Context of Culture* helps us to understand the effectiveness of Jesus' healing: ¹⁴

A key to axiom in medical anthropology is the dichotomy between two aspects of sickness: disease and illness: *Disease* refers to a malfunctioning of biological and/or psychological processes, while the term *illness* refers to the psychological experience, and meaning of perceived disease. Illness includes secondary personal and social responses to the primary malfunctioning (disease) in the individual's physiological and psychological status (or both) .. Viewed from this perspective, illness is the shaping of disease into behavior and experience. It is created by personal, social, and cultural reactions to disease. ¹⁵

Thus, diseases are cured, while illness are healed. Sometimes a disease can be cured, but very often the best that can be done is to heal the illness, that surrounds it.When curing is not available, but healing is still possible. (Refer to movie "Philadelphia").¹⁶

Another book by Arthur Kleinman, "The Illness Narratives"- Social, economic, and political causes of disease.

According to an internist, Light,What is killing her is her world, not her body. In fact, her body is the product of her world. ... What she needs is not medicine but a social revolution. ...

What we need is prevention, not the Band-Aids. Healing is what happens within a community of concern, support, and assistance, and that is a sociosomatic and not just a psychosomatic reality.

The healing of illness by Jesus and his companions must be understood in the framework of a preventive social revolution, in Light's term (Internist), and in the framework of the Kingdom of God's Great Divine Cleanup of the world, in the even more radical terms of Jesus and his followers. ¹⁷

There has always been controversy about whether Jesus proclaimed the Kingdom as *future-only* - even if imminent - or as *already-present*- even if still to be consummated. My argument so far is that Jesus differed precisely from John in emphasizing not the *future-presence* but the *already-presence* of God's Kingdom as the Great Divine Cleanup of the world. ¹⁸

God has given the Kingdom to Jesus, and all are invited to enter it - but that involves following Jesus through death into resurrection and a life here below absolutely opposite to the way of the world's imperial normalcy. ¹⁹

Jesus' story reported by historians: At the end of the first century, the Jewish historian Josephus, in his *Jewish Antiquities*, and at the start of the second century the Roman historian Tacitus, in his *Annals*, agreed on four details concerning Jesus.

¹³ Crossan, John Dominic. *GOD & EMPIRE: Jesus Against Rome Then and Now* (New York: HarperCollins, 2007), 118.

¹⁴ Crossan, John Dominic. *GOD & EMPIRE: Jesus Against Rome Then and Now* (New York: HarperCollins, 2007), 118,

¹⁵ Crossan, John Dominic. *GOD & EMPIRE: Jesus Against Rome Then and Now* (New York: HarperCollins, 2007), 119.

¹⁶ Crossan, John Dominic. *GOD & EMPIRE: Jesus Against Rome Then and Now* (New York: HarperCollins, 2007), 119.

¹⁷ Crossan, John Dominic. *GOD & EMPIRE: Jesus Against Rome Then and Now* (New York: HarperCollins, 2007), 120.

¹⁸ Crossan, John Dominic. *GOD & EMPIRE: Jesus Against Rome Then and Now* (New York: HarperCollins, 2007), 126.

¹⁹ Crossan, John Dominic. *GOD & EMPIRE: Jesus Against Rome Then and Now* (New York: HarperCollins, 2007), 127.

First, there has been a *movement* over there in Judea. Second, its founder, Jesus or Christ, was executed under Pontius Pilate. Third, despite the execution of Jesus, the movement *continued*. Fourth, it had now *spread* widely because, as Josephus puts it neutrally, "those who had in the first place come to love did not give up their affection for him," and as Tacitus puts it nastily, "the pernicious superstition was checked for the moment, only to break out once more, not merely in Judaea, the home of disease, but in capital itself, where all things horrible or shameful in the world collect and find a vogue." **Josephus** mentions two further details. Jesus "won over many Jews and many of the Greeks," and Pilate crucified him "upon hearing him accused by men of the highest standing among us." Those twin aspects of Jesus' fate are also basic to Mark's story. Jesus has the crowd on his side but is opposed by a collaboration of Jewish and Roman authority.²⁰

Jesus went to Jerusalem that one (or last) time because it was a *capital* city where religion and violence - conservative religion and imperial oppression - had become serenely complicit. .. Jesus went to Jerusalem because that was where his deliberate double demonstration against both imperial injustice and religious collaboration had to be made.²¹ ...This double demonstration was not against Judaism as such, not against Jerusalem as such, not against the Temple as such, not against the high priesthood as such. ***It was a protest from the legal and prophetic heart of Judaism against Jewish religious cooperation with Roman imperial control.*** It was, at least for Christian followers of Jesus, then or now, a permanently valid protest demonstration against any capital city's collusion between conservative religion and imperial violence at any time and in any place.²²

The first demonstration was what we mistakenly call "the Triumphant Entry into Jerusalem." It was actually an anti-triumphal entry, a calculated alternative to imperial normalcy with a prophetic pedigree going back to an oracle added to the book of Zechariah in the fourth century BCE.²³

The second demonstration was what we mistakenly call "the Cleansing of the Temple." It was actually a symbolic destruction of the Temple, and it too had an ancient prophetic pedigree going back to Jeremiah at the end of the seven century BEC. In Jeremiah 7 and 26, the prophet is ordered by God to warn worshippers in the Temple not to think that the practice of worship excuses them from the practice of justice. Only, says God, "***if*** you truly amend your ways and your doings, ***if*** you truly act justly one with another, ***if*** you do not oppress the alien, the orphan, and the widow, or shed innocent blood in this place" (7:5-6), will God continue to dwell with them in the Temple. Otherwise, warns God, "I will do to the house that is called by my name, in which you trust, and to the place that I gave to you and to your ancestors, just what I did to Shiloh" (Jeremiah 7:14). In other words, the great Temple in Judea will be destroyed just as was the older shrine in Samaria. Their use of divine worship to avoid divine justice had turned the Temple into a safehouse, a refuge, a hideaway, a "den of robbers (7:11). What Jesus did, then, was to fulfill this prophecy of Jeremiah's... He shut down, symbolically and prophetically, the perfectly valid fiscal, ritual, and administrative operations of the Temple [Mark 11:15-17; Isaiah 56:7; Jeremiah 7:11].²⁴

PAUL and EQUALITY

The concept [equality] not from democratic values but from family values. "In Christ Jesus," says Paul in Galatians 3:26, "You are all *children of God* through faith." Equality under God as divine Father was modeled and understood to be like that in the family under a human father. Equality did not mean everyone getting the exact same amount, but rather everyone getting what they need - everyone getting enough. It meant no child left behind in all the global family of God. Another example of equality-thinking in the earlier-seen *Sibylline Oracles*, a Jewish text that, like the quotation from Philo, was contemporary with Jesus and Paul. It imagined the establishment of God's justice on earth with this description.

The earth will belong equally to all, undivided by walls or fences. It will then bear more abundant fruits spontaneously. Lives will be in common and wealth will have no division. For there will be no poor man there, no rich, and no tyrant, no slave. Further, no one will be either great or small anymore. No kings, no

²⁰ Crossan, John Dominic. *GOD & EMPIRE: Jesus Against Rome Then and Now* (New York: HarperCollins, 2007), 129.

²¹ Crossan, John Dominic. *GOD & EMPIRE: Jesus Against Rome Then and Now* (New York: HarperCollins, 2007), 131.

²² Crossan, John Dominic. *GOD & EMPIRE: Jesus Against Rome Then and Now* (New York: HarperCollins, 2007), 132.

²³ Crossan, John Dominic. *GOD & EMPIRE: Jesus Against Rome Then and Now* (New York: HarperCollins, 2007), 132.

²⁴ Crossan, John Dominic. *GOD & EMPIRE: Jesus Against Rome Then and Now* (New York: HarperCollins, 2007), 134.

leaders. All will be on a par together (2. 319-24) ²⁵

But *if* one saw God's earthly kingdom as one of equality, and *if* one held that God's Kingdom was already here, then the position of a Jesus or a Paul was almost inevitable: equality now. Looking next at Paul's equality-as-justice or justice-as-equality in the *already-present* Kingdom of God here on earth, I begin with a general programmatic statement - probably a baptismal formula - from Paul's letter to Galatians 3:27-29. Pay special attention to the frames about *Christ*:

As many of you as were baptized into *Christ* have clothed yourselves with *Christ*.
There is no longer Jew or Greek, there no longer slave or free,
there is no longer male and female; for all of you are one in *Christ* Jesus. And if you belong to *Christ*²⁶

To understand Paul, the three central negation must never be read apart from the doubled frames that mention *into* Christ, *with* Christ, *in* Christ, and *to* Christ. Paul was speaking to those already Christian and saying that, whether they came into the community as Jew or Greek, slave or free, male or female, they were all equal inside the new community. Ethnic identity, social standing, and gender status do not establish any superiority among Christians - all are equal in Christ. ²⁷

²⁵ Crossan, John Dominic. *GOD & EMPIRE: Jesus Against Rome Then and Now* (New York: HarperCollins, 2007), 159.

²⁶ Crossan, John Dominic. *GOD & EMPIRE: Jesus Against Rome Then and Now* (New York: HarperCollins, 2007), 159.

²⁷ Crossan, John Dominic. *GOD & EMPIRE: Jesus Against Rome Then and Now* (New York: HarperCollins, 2007), 160.