

Crossan, John Dominic & Reed, Jonathan L. *In Search of Paul*. New York: HarperCollins, 2004.

John Dominic Crossan & Jonathan L. Reed. *In Search of Paul* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004),

### **Paul and Roman Empire:**

Where does archaeology uncover most clearly Rome's imperial theology, which Paul's Christian theology confronted nonviolently but opposed relentlessly? In Paul's lifetime Roman emperors were deemed divine, and, first and foremost, Augustus was called Son of God, God, and God of God. He was Lord, Redeemer, and Savior of the world. People knew that both verbally from Latin authors like Virgil, Horace, and Ovid and visually from coins, cups, statues, temples, and forums; from ports, roads, bridges, and aqueducts; from landscapes transformed and cities established. It was all around them everywhere, just as advertising is all around us today. Without seeing archaeology of Roman imperial theology, you cannot understand any exegesis of Pauline Christian theology. <sup>1</sup> 바울의 기독교 신학은 로마의 제국신학과 항상 비폭력적으로 맞섰다. 바울의 일생동안 로마황제는 신으로 간주되었다. 무엇보다 먼저 Augustus 황제는 하나님의 아들, 하나님, 신중의 신으로 불리웠다. 그는 주, 속죄주, 세상의 구세주였다. 사람들은 여러 라틴계 저자들을 통해서 그리고 눈에 보이는 동전, 컵, 동상 (statue), 신전, 광장 (forum), 항구, 도로, 다리, 수로관 (aqueducts), 풍경화( landscape), 도시에서 그가 신이라는 사실을 볼 수 있었다.

Some scholars of Paul have already emphasized creatively and accurately the confrontation between Pauline Christianity and Roman imperialism. That clash is the core of this book... What is *newest* about this book is our insistence that Paul opposed Rome with Christ against Caesar, not because that empire was particularly unjust or oppressive, but because he questioned *the normalcy of civilization itself*, since civilization has always been imperial, that is, unjust and oppressive.

바울은 그리스도를 택하고 시자를 반대하면서 로마를 반대했다. 왜냐하면 로마제국이 딱히 불의하고 포악해서가 아니나 바울은 근본적으로 문명의 정상상태(normalcy)를 의심했기 때문이었다. 왜냐하면 문명은 항상 부당하고 포악한 제국(imperial)이었기 때문이었다. <sup>2</sup>

The Roman Empire was based on the common principle of *peace through victory* or more fully, on a faith in the sequence of *piety, war, victory, peace*. Paul was a Jewish visionary following in Jesus' footsteps, and they both claimed that the Kingdom of God was already present and operative in this world. He opposed the mantras of Roman normalcy with a vision of *peace through justice* or more fully, with a faith in the sequence of *covenant, nonviolence, justice and peace*. <sup>3</sup>

로마제국은 **승리를 통한 평화** 라는 원칙위에, 더 정확하게 **충성, 전쟁, 승리, 평화의** 순으로 이런 일반원칙 위에 세워졌다. 바울은 예수의 발자취를 따르는 유대의 이상가 (visionary) 였다. 바울과 예수 둘다 하나님의 나라는 이미 이세상에 도래해서 활동하고 있다고 믿었다. 바울은 정의를 통해 평화, 더 정확히 말하면 계약, 비폭력, 정의, 평화의 순으로 믿음과 이상을 가지고 로마의 모토를 반대했다 (mantras).

<sup>1</sup> John Dominic Crossan & Jonathan L. Reed. *In Search of Paul* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004), Preface, x.

<sup>2</sup> John Dominic Crossan & Jonathan L. Reed. *In Search of Paul* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004), Preface, x.

<sup>3</sup> John Dominic Crossan & Jonathan L. Reed. *In Search of Paul* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004), Preface, xi.

A subtext of *In Search of Paul* is, therefore: To what extent can America be Christian? We are now the greatest postindustrial civilization as Rome was then the greatest preindustrial one. That is precisely what makes Paul's challenge equally forceful for now as for then, for here as for there.

본 바울 연구의 숨은 의미는 어느정도까지 미국이 기독교인이겠는가 하는 것이다. 그당시 로마가 전산업화 문명시대 (preindustrial civilization)였던 것처럼 지금은 후 산업화 문명시대이다. 그러므로 바울의 도전은 그 때 거기서와 마찬가지로 현재 여기서도 강력하다. <sup>4</sup>

### **Paul and the Jewish Covenant**

In an ancient world divided between Jews and Gentiles, there was also a third, in-between category of pagans sympathetic to Judaism. In the New Testament, the Acts of the Apostles calls them “God-fearers” or “God-worshippers.” They remained pagans, but they admired Jewish culture, attended synagogue services on the Sabbath, and were a very important buffer zone against any localized anti-Judaism. What is *new* in this book is our claim that those pagan sympathizers are absolutely crucial for understanding both Paul's mission and message. Paul went to Jewish synagogue to “uncover” their pagan sympathizers. First, his Gentile converts could readily understand his theology, because they were already familiar with Jewish practice, traditions and scriptures. Second, such convert poaching would have generated stiff opposition, not only from other local Jews, but also from those local sympathizers who stayed loyal to Judaism. Third, that explains Paul's polemical descriptions of Judaism in his letters. In his fight to obtain and hold on to his God-worshippers, Paul fiercely but unfairly – is polemics ever fair? – attacks the quite normal Judaism of his opponents. Fourth, that explains why Paul could move so fast from one major provincial capital to another and could consider his work in the eastern Mediterranean finished when he wrote his letter to the Romans in the mid 50s. <sup>5</sup>

### **Paul and Christian Community:**

The authentic and historical Paul, author of the seven New Testament letters he actually wrote (Romans, 1-2 Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians, 1 Thessalonians, Philemon), held that *within Christian communities* it made no difference whether one entered as a Christian Jew or a Christian pagan, as a Christian man or a Christian woman, as a Christian freeborn or a Christian slave. All were absolutely equal with each other. But in 1 Timothy, a letter attributed to Paul by later Christians though not actually written by him, women are told to be silent in church **and pregnant at home** (2:8-15). And a later follower of Paul inserted in 1 Corinthians that it is shameful for women to speak in church, but correct to ask their husbands for explanations at home (14:33-66).

신약성서에서 로마서, 고린도 전, 후서, 갈라디아서, 빌립보서, 데살로니가 전서, 빌레몬서 등 일곱권의 실제 저자인 진정한(authentic) 그리고 역사적인 (historical) 바울은 **기독교인 공동체 안에서는** 사람들이 기독교인 유대인으로 들어왔거나 혹은 기독교인 이방인으로 들어왔거나, 기독교인 남자로 혹은 기독교인 여자로 들어왔거나 기독교인 자유인으로 혹은 기독교인 노예로 들어왔거나 상관없다고 믿었다. 남녀 모두가 절대적으로 서로에게 동등했다. 그러나 바울이 썼다고 알려졌으나 그가 쓴 것이

<sup>4</sup> John Dominic Crossan & Jonathan L. Reed. *In Search of Paul* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004), Preface, xi.

<sup>5</sup> John Dominic Crossan & Jonathan L. Reed. *In Search of Paul* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004), Preface, xi.

아니라 후대 기독교인들이 쓴 디모데 전서에서는 여자는 교회에서 잠잠하고 집에서 아이를 낳은 일로 인해 구원을 받을 수 있다고 했다. 그후에 바울의 후계자들이 고린도 전서에다 여자는 교회에서 말하는 것은 부끄러운 일이고 질문은 집에가서 남편에게 물어보라는 구절을 삽입했다. <sup>6</sup>

Those pseudo-Pauline, post-Pauline, and anti-Pauline obliteration(제거/삭제) of female authority are verbal and canonical equivalent of that visual and iconographic (초상화) obliteration of Theoklia's eyes and hand in that hillside cave. But both defacements(말소) also bear witness to what was there before the attack. Pauline equality was negated by post-Pauline inequality. Our book is about the actual and historical Paul, about the radical apostle who was there before the reaction, revision, and replacement began. <sup>7</sup> He did not think in terms of political democracy or universal human rights. He only said what Christianity has never been able to follow, that *within it* all are equal and this is to be its witness and challenge to the world outside. <sup>8</sup>

바울의 유사인물, 바울의 후대인물, 바울 반대 인물 등이 바울이 주장한 여성의 권위를 부정했다. 바울의 동등성은 바울후대 인물들에 의해 말살 되었다. <sup>9</sup> 본연구는 바울에 대한 반발과 수정(교정)과 대치등이 시작되기 전 급진적인 사도, 역사적인 바울에 대한 책이다. 바울은 정치적인 민주주의나 만인의 인권을 생각하지 아니했다. 그는 단지 기독교가 한번도 실천한 일이 없는, 기독교 안에서 모든사람이 동등하다 는 것을 말했을 뿐이다. 그래서 이것이 세상에 증인이 되고 도전이 될 것이다.

Is Theoklia still departing or now returning? Does a search for Paul push female leadership, authority, and apostolicity off to the side and finally off that cover, or does a search for Paul bring Theoklia, women, and equality back steadily and inevitably into the light until female and male stand together side by side in the full life of the center? Theoklia 는 떠나고 있는가 돌아오고 있는가?

바울에 대한 수색이 여성의 지위, 권위, 사도직을 점점더 옆으로 밀어낼 것인가 아니며 바울에 대한 수색(search)이 점차 불가피하게 남,녀가 함께 충만한 생의 중심에 나란이 설 때 까지 Theoklia 와 여성과 동등성을 가져다 줄 것인가? <sup>10</sup>

### **Prologue: The Hope of a Peaceful Earth P. 1**

The interest of Rome lies in its imperialism. It was one of the most successful conquering states in all history, but it was *the* most successful *retainer* of conquest. Rome institutionalized the rule of its legions more stably and over a longer period than any other society before or since ... This empire of domination eventually became a true *territorial* empire, or at least had about as high a level and intensity of territorial control as could be attained within the logistical constraints imposed on all agrarian societies .. What Rome acquired, Rome kept .. and in so doing it produced the highest level of ideological, economic, political , and military collective power yet seen in the nonsegmental extensive society, at least in its highest reaches. <sup>11</sup>

<sup>6</sup> John Dominic Crossan & Jonathan L. Reed. *In Search of Paul* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004), Preface, xiii.

<sup>7</sup> John Dominic Crossan & Jonathan L. Reed. *In Search of Paul* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004), Preface, xiii.

<sup>8</sup> John Dominic Crossan & Jonathan L. Reed. *In Search of Paul* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004), Preface, xiii. –xiv.

<sup>9</sup> John Dominic Crossan & Jonathan L. Reed. *In Search of Paul* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004), Preface, xiii. –xiv.

<sup>10</sup> John Dominic Crossan & Jonathan L. Reed. *In Search of Paul* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004), Preface, xiv.

<sup>11</sup> John Dominic Crossan & Jonathan L. Reed. *In Search of Paul* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004), 1.

로마의 관심은 제국주의에 있었다. 로마는 인류역사상 최고로 정복을 많이하고 정복한 것을 지킨 나라였다. 로마는 그 전후 어느나라 어느 사회 보다 정복한 지역을 가장 오래 안전하게 다스리고 제도화했다. 그래서 그 지역의 제국이 되어 통솔했다. 그래서 로마는 가장 고도의 이념과 경제와 정치, 군권을 장악했었다.

Roman civilization eventually appeared everywhere, as one single thing, so far as it was ever achieved. Never, however, was there greater progress made toward one single way of life, a thing to be fairly called “Roman civilization of the Empire,” than in lifetime of Augustus ... The natives would be taught that they could be better rise into the ranks of the master race by reforming themselves –by talking, dressing, looking, and in every way resembling Romans. They would and did respond as ambition directed. They pulled Roman civilization to them – to their homes, their families, their world.<sup>12</sup>

로마 문명은 어디에든지 나타났다. 이렇게 하나의 단순한 생활 형식으로 세계에 나타난 일이 없을 정도로 Augustus 의 일생을 넘어 “로마 제국의 문명”이라 불리우는 이름으로 나타났다. 토착민 (natives)들에게 자신들도 말이나, 옷입는 것이나, 모습이나, 모든면에서 master race 인 로마인을 닮아 그들같이 보이도록 행세하라고 가르쳤다. 그래서 그렇게 했다. 가정에서나 가족들과 세상에서 로마 문명을 끌어드렸다.

### **A fervent Jew:**

Both Paul’s letters and Luke’s Acts of the Apostles agree that Paul was a fervent [eager/passionate] Jew. “I was,” says Paul, “<sup>5</sup>circumcised on the eighth day, a member of the people of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, a Hebrew born of Hebrews; as to the law, a Pharisee; <sup>6</sup>as to zeal, a persecutor of the church; as to righteousness under the law, blameless.” (Phil. 3:5-6). Furthermore, “<sup>14</sup>I advanced in Judaism beyond many among my people of the same age, for I was far more zealous for the traditions of my ancestors.” (Gal. 1:14). He asks polemically about some Jewish opponents, “Are they Hebrews? So am I. Are they Israelites? So am I. Are they descendants of Abraham? So am I. (2 Cor. 11:22). He concludes, “I ask, then, has God rejected his people? By no means! I myself am an Israelite, a descendant of Abraham, a member of the tribe of Benjamin. (Rom. 11:1). Even when he talked about his opponents, he did not say “Jews” And “Gentiles,” but spoke of “danger from my own people, danger from Gentiles” (2 Cor. 11:26). Paul was Jewish born and bred, understood Hebrews, was a Pharisee, and was proud of all that lineage. He identified himself as a Jew within Judaism. Luke in the Acts of the Apostles agrees with that general picture, but he also adds some details better taken as enthusiasm rather than a history. He has Paul declare, “I am a Jew” (21:39); “I am a Jew, born in Tarsus in Cilicia, but brought up in this city [Jerusalem] at the feet of Gamaliel, educated strictly according to our ancestral law, being zealous for God, just as all of you are today (22:3); “I am a Pharisee, a son of Pharisees” (23:6); and, finally, “I have belonged to the strictest sect of our religion and lived as a Pharisee” (26:5).<sup>13</sup>

### **A zealous Persecutor**

<sup>12</sup> John Dominic Crossan & Jonathan L. Reed. *In Search of Paul* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004), 1.

<sup>13</sup> John Dominic Crossan & Jonathan L. Reed. *In Search of Paul* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004), 4-5.

Paul and Luke agree that he persecuted the early church: “I was violently persecuting the church of God and was trying to destroy it ... I was far more zealous [enthusiastic/ passionate] for the tradition of my ancestors” (Gal. 1:13-14). “As to zeal [enthusiasm/ passion] [I was] a persecutor of the church (Phil. 3:6). “Zeal” indicates religious vigilantism [watchful/ observant] based on personal and individual responsibility after the model and in the tradition of Phineas, who, in Numbers 25:6-8, slew an Israelite and Midianite woman he had married. That’s how, for example, the treatise [dissertation/ essay] *The Special Laws* by the contemporary Jewish philosopher Philo understands such religious “zeal.” It allows *any* outraged person “to exact the penalties offhand and with no delay without bringing the offender before jury or council or any kind of magistrate at all” (1.55). Luke agrees on Paul as persecutor, but adds that he went from the high priest at Jerusalem with authority to punish Christians at Damascus (Acts 9:1-2). Still, apart from the historical implausibility [improbability/ unlikelihood] of such Jewish authority exercised in Nabatean Damascus, Acts has the same combination of zeal and violence (or zeal as violence) found in Paul. Luke has Paul say, “Being zealous for God ... I persecuted this way up to the point of death by binding both men and women and putting them in prison” (Acts 22:3-4).<sup>14</sup> Neither Paul nor Luke tells us exactly what precise aspect of Christianity made Paul want to “destroy it.” What was it? Our best guess, and it can be no more than that, is that Paul persecuted precisely that to which he was later called. He reacted violently to those fellow Jews who claimed that pagans [Gentiles] could now be full and equal members of God’s people alongside Jews –without circumcision for males and purity rules for anyone. [This means that there already was practice of equality between Jews and Gentiles in the first century churches, which they might have gotten from Jesus while he was on earth]. In other words, Paul converted 180 degrees from his former to his latter position. [He seemed to come to his sense that the equality that the first church was practicing was the right thing]. He could have simply stayed a fervent Jew and left Christian Jews alone, or converted from Pharisaic Judaism to Christian Judaism (as, for instance, James and members of the Jerusalem church did), or proclaimed Jesus as Messiah only to his fellow Jews. Instead, he converted [called] *not from Judaism to Christianity*, of course, but *from violent opponent and persecutor of pagan inclusion to nonviolent proponent and persuader of pagan inclusion*. That which he persecuted *for* God was exactly that to which he was called *by* God.<sup>15</sup>

### **A Chosen Apostle**

Both his own letter to the Galatians (1:17) and Luke’s Acts of the Apostles (9:3; 22:6; 26:12) agree that Damascus was the inaugural moment of apparition, revelation, conversion [calling], and vocation for Paul. Paul’s vocational mandate is first told by Jesus to Ananias to Paul (Acts 9: 15), then by Ananias to Paul (Acts 22:14-15) and finally by Jesus directly to Paul (Acts 26: 16-18). And Paul himself tells his story (Gal. 1:11-12, 15-16); *For I want you to know, brothers and sisters, that the gospel that was proclaimed by me is not of human origin;*<sup>12</sup>*for I did not receive it from a human source, nor was I taught it, but I received it through a revelation of Jesus Christ* (1:11-12);<sup>15</sup>*But when God, who had set me apart before I was born and called me through his*

<sup>14</sup> John Dominic Crossan & Jonathan L. Reed. *In Search of Paul* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004), 5.

<sup>15</sup> John Dominic Crossan & Jonathan L. Reed. *In Search of Paul* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004), 6.

grace, was pleased <sup>16</sup>to reveal his Son to me, <sup>8</sup> so that I might proclaim him among the Gentiles, I did not confer with any human being (11: 15-16). <sup>16</sup>

#### **Paul's conversion story is recorded in Acts 9:1-22:**

Meanwhile Saul, still breathing threats and murder against the disciples of the Lord, went to the high priest <sup>2</sup>and asked him for letters to the synagogues at Damascus, so that if he found any who belonged to the Way, men or women, he might bring them bound to Jerusalem. <sup>3</sup>Now as he was going along and approaching Damascus, suddenly a light from heaven flashed around him. <sup>4</sup>He fell to the ground and heard a voice saying to him, 'Saul, Saul, why do you persecute me?' <sup>5</sup>He asked, 'Who are you, Lord?' The reply came, 'I am Jesus, whom you are persecuting. <sup>6</sup>But get up and enter the city, and you will be told what you are to do.....'

Scholars imagine that Paul already knew enough about the life, death and resurrection of Jesus to persecute Christians must have understood, then, that to proclaim Jesus as Son of God was deliberately denying Caesar his highest title and that to announce Jesus as Lord and Savior was calculated treason. <sup>17</sup>

#### **The influence of Judaism in the Roman world:**

The influence of Judaism on non-Jews in the Roman Empire was profound and lasting. This is paradoxical. For the exclusiveness of Jewish worship, and the strictness of the Jewish food laws, served as a barrier between Jew and Gentile. Moreover the Jews do not as a rule appear to have actively propagated their religion. So evidently there was something in the nature of Jewish religion, and of the Jewish community, which satisfied a need felt by many within and even beyond the frontiers of the Empire. Judaism throughout the Hellenistic and Roman periods and even after the triumph of Christianity showed tremendous vigor not only in strengthening itself internally with the development of that remarkable document, the Talmud, but also in reaching out to pagans and later to Christians and winning large numbers as proselytes and as "sympathizers" ... Even after the three great revolts of 66-74, 115-17, and 132-35, the Jews were hardly powerless and indeed continued to win proselytes and especially "sympathizers." Judaism, by the early third century, may well have been a more popular religion among the pagans, and therefore a more powerful rival to Christianity in the race for the soul of the Roman world. This helps us understand the tension between the Church and the Synagogue in the first few centuries A.D. <sup>18</sup>

#### **Roman Reaction**

Roman officials repeatedly declare Paul innocent of any crime against Rome, but Paul was repeatedly accused. In other words, Luke both reveals and conceals, admits and denies, that there were constant troubles between Paul and Rome. <sup>19</sup>

There was a clash between those alternative visions of world peace. One is Augustus' vision of *peace through victory*. The other is Paul's vision, following Jesus' radicality, a *peace through justice*. There was crucial element in each visionary program –on *hierarchy* within the scenario of global victory and on *equality* within that of global justice. The Roman imperial theology celebrated the war god as "avenger" and divinized Julius

<sup>16</sup> John Dominic Crossan & Jonathan L. Reed. *In Search of Paul* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004), 6-7.

<sup>17</sup> John Dominic Crossan & Jonathan L. Reed. *In Search of Paul* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004), 11.

<sup>18</sup> John Dominic Crossan & Jonathan L. Reed. *In Search of Paul* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004), 13.

<sup>19</sup> John Dominic Crossan & Jonathan L. Reed. *In Search of Paul* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004), 33.

Caesar. So the Altar of Augustus Peace celebrating the *Pax Romana* as *Pax Augustea*. We turn from Roman imperial thology to Pauline Christian theology and confront immediately the objection that Paul is just as chauvinistic, misogynistic, patriarchal, and hierarchical as Augustus except on a much smaller scale, as apostle, not emperor, and in text, not on edifice. In basic rebuttal we distinguish the earlier and authentic Pauline letters from the later and nonauthentic pseudo-Pauline (maybe even anti-Pauline) ones –but all attributed to him within the present New Testament. We focus on two examples in Paul, slavery and patriarchy, to match those two examples of Augustus, forum and altar.<sup>20</sup>

Our argument is that the historical Paul insisted on equality *among Christians* over against the hierarchical normalcy of Roman society. First, a *Christian* mistress or master should and could not have a *Christian* slave. Second, *Christian* women and *Christian* men were *as such* equal in marriage, assembly, and apostolate. How could one be equal and unequal at the same time, since *in Christ* all were equal before God?<sup>21</sup> 첫째로, 기독교인 남, 녀 주인은 기독교인 노예를 가질 수도 가져서 도 안되었다. 둘째로 기독교인 여성들과 기독교인 남자들은 이와같이 결혼관계에 있어서나 교회 에서나 사도직에 있어서 동등 했다. 그리스도 안에서 모두 동등하다고 했는데 어떻게 사람이 동등했다가 동등하지 않았다 할 수 있는가? 라고 반문하면서 Crossan 은 역사적인 바울은 로마사회의 계급제도에 반해(against) 기독교인들간의 동등을 주장했다고 한다.

The later pseudo-Pauline inserts or texts asserting inequality for women in marriage, assembly, and apostolate. Those changes deliberately muted the radicality of Paul’s Christian equality back to inequality for women in marriage, assembly, and apostolate. The presence of leaders like Thecla, who were female, celibate, and ascetic, developed an opposition whose leaders had to be male, married, and fertile. It was all done in Paul’s name, but it negated Paul’s example and silenced Paul’s challenge.<sup>22</sup>

후대의 가짜 바울의 삽입이나 본문들이 여성들이 결혼에서나, 교회에서나, 사도직에 있어서 동등하지 않다고 주장했다. 그런 변경들이 의도적으로 바울의 동등성을 잠재워 결혼에 있어서나 교회에서나 사도직에 있어서 여자는 동등하지 않다고 만들어 버렸다. 후대에 여성이고, 독신이고, 수도사이인 Thecla 같은 지도자들 이 자신들의 지도자는 남성이고 기혼이고 출산력이 있는 사람들이어야한다는 것을 반대하게 되었다.

### **Synagogue Situations**

The synagogue was a publically visible place serving as the religious, political, legal, social, and economic center of Jewish life in the pagan cities of the diaspora. Speaking of the economic benefits, the first-century historical Josephus says, “No one need wonder that there was so much wealth in our temple, for all the Jews throughout the habitable world, and worshippers of God, even those from Asia and Europe, had been contributing to it for a very long time.”<sup>23</sup>

### **Devout Greeks**

<sup>20</sup> John Dominic Crossan & Jonathan L. Reed. *In Search of Paul* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004), 74.

<sup>21</sup> John Dominic Crossan & Jonathan L. Reed. *In Search of Paul* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004), 75.

<sup>22</sup> John Dominic Crossan & Jonathan L. Reed. *In Search of Paul* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004), 75.

<sup>23</sup> John Dominic Crossan & Jonathan L. Reed. *In Search of Paul* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004), 35.

Throughout Acts, Luke not only speaks of “Jews” and “pagan Gentiles,” but also of a third group, an in-between group who are both/and rather than either/or. He calls those ambiguous individuals or groups “those fearing God” or “God-fearers” (Acts 10:2; 22:35; 13:16); “those worshipping” or “worshippers” (Acts 13:43, 50; 17:4, 17); and “those worshipping God” or “God-worshippers” (Acts 16: 14; 18:17). They are clearly distinguished from Jews. These people, as a buffer zone of sympathizers, offered not only economic assistance but also political protection.<sup>24</sup>

### **Leading Women P. 37**

Luke’s Acts often notes that the sympathizers were of high standing in their communities and that they involved both women and men. .. Paul met Lydia, a worshipper of God. The Lord opened her heart to listen to what was said by Paul (Acts 16:14). [In regard to Lydia (Acts 16:14) “worshipper of God” (NRSV) in Acts 16] the term “devout” is always literally “worshiping ones” or “worshippers,” from the Greek verb *sebomai*, and means that in-between group of God-fearers, God-worshippers, or Jewish sympathizers, that intermediate class who were neither full Jews nor pure pagans. .... circumcision did not apply to women. For that reason found more women than men among those sympathizers [to Christian faith]. Also, it was especially wealthy sympathizers who furnished political protection as well as economic assistance for any threatened Jewish minority within those pagan cities. Here are two examples of such female pagan sympathizers from inscriptional evidence. First, in the 50s or 60s C.E., Julia Severa, a member of a priestess of the imperial cult at Acmonia, an important Phrygian city on the ancient east-west road across Asia Minor. A synagogue inscription from the 80s or 90s proclaimed, “This building was erected by Julia Severa.”<sup>25</sup>

Second, a third-century – C.E. inscription from the synagogue at Tralles in Caria, today’s Aydin, on the northern side of the Meander Valley east of Ephesus announced, “I, Capitolina, worthy and God-worshiper (*theosebēs*), have made all the platform and the inlaying of the stairs in fulfillment of a vow for myself and my children and my grandchildren.” Claudia Capitolina was from an aristocratic pagan family as important or maybe even more important than that of Julia Severa, and she is explicitly called a God-worshiper. Of all the Jewish practices that pagan sympathizers adopted, synagogue support and attendance were probably the most theologically acceptable, economically helpful, politically important, and socially evident.<sup>26</sup>

### **Paul and Patriarchy P. 110**

The basic Pauline principle of equality among Christians applies not just to slavery, but to patriarchy as well. In Paul’s theology, Christian gender inequality can no more exist than can Christian class inequality. Females and males are therefore equal in family, assembly, and apostolate within Christianity. Indeed, the historical Paul opposes *any* superiority, inferiority, or inequality within Christianity.<sup>27</sup> 바울의 신학에 있어서, 기독교

<sup>24</sup> John Dominic Crossan & Jonathan L. Reed. *In Search of Paul* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004), 36.

<sup>25</sup> John Dominic Crossan & Jonathan L. Reed. *In Search of Paul* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004), 37.

<sup>26</sup> John Dominic Crossan & Jonathan L. Reed. *In Search of Paul* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004), 38.

<sup>27</sup> John Dominic Crossan & Jonathan L. Reed. *In Search of Paul* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004), 110.

안에서는 여자와 남자는 가정에서, 교회에서 그리고 사도직에서 동등하다. 진실로 역사적인 바울은 기독교 안에서 어떤 우월성, 열등성, 부동등성도 반대한다.

**Equal in the Family** (가정에서의 동등성): When he talks about marriage and ascetic abstentions and permissible marriage and preferable celibacy in I Corinthian 7 there is consistent equality of female with male or male with female throughout Paul's discussion in Corinthian 7. Whatever he says of one spouse, he then says of the other: the wife does this, the husband does the same; the husband does that, the wife does the same. Watch the persistence of this mutuality as equality over four subtopics: on intercourse (7:3-5), on divorce (7:10-16), on virginity (7: 25-28), and on worries and anxieties (7:33-34). In summary, therefore, and on every subtopic concerning celibacy and marriage, Paul speaks deliberately and overtly in terms not just mutuality, but of equality. As far as we can see from 1 Corinthian 7, Paul ultra deliberately and over emphatically treats female and male alike: as for female, so for male: as for male, so for female: what is right for one is right for the other: what is wrong for one is wrong for the other.

바울이 고린도 전서 7 장에 결혼과 금욕주의 절제나 그리고 결혼과 독신을 말함에 있어서 통틀어서 일괄적으로 여자와 남자, 남자와 여자 식으로 남녀간의 동등성을 과시하고 있다. 무엇을 말하던지 간에 남자에 대해 말했으면 여자에 대해 말하고, 여자에 대해 말했으면 남자에 대해 말하고: 아내가 이렇게 하라고 말했으면 남편도 그와같이 하라고 했고; 남편이 이렇게 하라 했으면 반드시 아내도 그와같이 하라했다; 성관계 (7:3-5), 이혼 (7: 10-16), 처녀성 (7:25-28), 그리고 걱정 근심 (7:33-34) 등 4 가지 부제(subtopic) 에서 상호성(mutuality) 만큼 동등성(equality)을 끊임없이 과시함을 볼 수 있다. 요약하면, 그러므로 바울은 금욕과 결혼에 대한 모든 부제에서 고의로 그리고 명백하게 상호성 (mutuality) 뿐만 아니라 동등성 (equality) 을 말하고 있다. 고린도 전서 7 장에서 볼 수 있는대로 바울은 여성과 남성을 차별없이 (똑같이) 극단적으로 고의로 (ultra deliberately) 그리고 초과 강조 (over emphatically) 로 취급하고 있다: 여자에 대해서 남성도, 남성에 대해서 여성, 한쪽에게 옳은 것은 다른 한쪽에다 옳은 것으로, 한쪽에 틀린 것은 다른 한 쪽에도 틀린 것으로 똑 같이 취급하고 있다.<sup>28</sup>

**Equality in the Assembly**(교회에서의 동등성): There is, however, one section in I Corinthian that seems to silence women within the Christian assembly, which would certainly exalt men over women with regard to their ecclesiastical status. That, of course, would be a strange dichotomy, given what Paul says in Galatians 3:28, that there is neither male nor female in Christ. How, therefore, are we to understand Corinthians 11: 3-16?

그러나 고린도 전서 한 군데에 바울이 남자를 여자보다 높이면서 교회에서 여자를 사도직에서 잠잠케 하는 구절이 있는데 갈 3:28 에 그리스도 안에서는 남자도 여자도 없다고 한 바울이 어떻게 이런 이상한

<sup>28</sup> John Dominic Crossan & Jonathan L. Reed. *In Search of Paul* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004), 111-112.

[의견의] 양분(dichotomy)을 보일 수 있는가? 그러면 우리는 고린도 전서 11:3-16 을 어떻게 이해할 것인가?<sup>29</sup>

*Any man who prays or prophesies with something on his head disgraces his head but any woman who prays or prophesies with her head unveiled disgraces her head--it is one and the same thing as having her head shaved..... Nevertheless, in the Lord woman is not independent of man or man independent of woman. For just as woman came from man, so man comes through woman; but all things come from God.*

남자가 머리에 무엇을 쓰고 기도하거나 예언하면 그는 자기 머리를 부끄럽게 하는 것입니다. 그러나 여자가 머리에 무엇을 쓰지 않은 채로 기도하거나 예언하면, 그는 자기 머리를 부끄럽게 하는 것입니다. ....그러나 주님 안에서는 남자 없이 여자가 있을 수 없고, 여자 없이 남자가 있을 수 없습니다. 여자가 남자에게서 난 것과 마찬가지로 남자도 여자의 몸에서 났습니다. 그리고 모든 것이 다 하나님에게서 생겨났습니다.

On the one hand, if you focus only on the women, it is plausible to argue that Paul is subordinating them to men (based on scriptural texts, social dress, and church custom). On the other, if you focus only on the men and realize Roman males normally covered their heads for worship, as with the statue of Augustus as a priest at sacrifice, it is plausible to argue that Paul is opposing pagan religious practice.

한편 우리가 고린도 전서 11:3-16 본문에서 여자에게만 집중해서 생각하면 마치 바울이 여자를 남자에게 예속시키는 것처럼 주장할 수 있겠으나 또한편 남자에게 집중해서 생각하면 제사지낼 때 머리에 수건을 쓴 Augustus 처럼 그당시 남자들이 예배시에 머리에 수건을 썼다는 사실을 인정하면 바울이 이방종교 의식 [남자가 머리에 수건을 쓰는]을 반대하고 있는 것처럼 해석할 수가 있다. 말하자면 예배시에 남자는 머리에 수건을 쓰고 여자는 수건을 안쓰고.<sup>30</sup>

Paul takes for granted that both women and men pray and prophesy in liturgical assembly. That is not the problem of this text. Its problem concerns the proper head covering for each of them in that situation. But why was that so important an issue? At Corinth, presumably as a defiant challenge to inequality and a dramatic statement of equality, men and women had *reversed* modes of head covering in prayer, so that men worshiped with covered heads and women with uncovered heads. In other words, *Paul was confronted with a negation not just of gender hierarchy, but of gender difference, and he stutters almost incoherently in trying to argue against it.* Of course, women and men were equal “in the Lord” and from God,” but there should be no denial of ordinary dress code or standard head covering. The *difference* between women and men, however that was customarily and socially signified, must be maintained, even while *hierarchy* or subordination was negated. The passage in I Corinthians 11:3-16 is the best Paul can do on that subject. But the text is emphatically not

<sup>29</sup> John Dominic Crossan & Jonathan L. Reed. *In Search of Paul* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004), 112.

<sup>30</sup> John Dominic Crossan & Jonathan L. Reed. *In Search of Paul* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004), 113.

about hierarchical inequality, but about differential equality. Paul presumes equality between women and men in the assembly, but absolutely demands that they follow the socially accepted dress codes of their time and place.

Difference, yes. Hierarchy, no. That interpretation of a very difficult passage is strongly confirmed by the next section for, if women are silenced in the assembly, how can they be prominent in the apostolate?

고린도 전서 11 장 3-16 본문에서 바울은 교회안에서 남녀 모두 동등 하게 예배시에 기도하고 예언할 수 있음을 인정하고 들어가는 것이다. 그래서 여기서의 남녀 동등성의 문제가 아니라 남녀의 옷입는 풍습과 남녀의 머리 모양에 대한 풍습의 문제를 다루고 있는 것이다. 바울은 남녀간에 동등성을 인정하지만 남녀가 똑같은 옷을 입을 수 없고 머리모양을 똑같이 할 수 없고 달라야 함을 말하고 있는 것이다. 즉 옷입는 법과 머리모양은 그당시 사회적으로 인정된 의복과 머리모양 규례를 지킬 것을 요구하고 있는 것이다. <sup>31</sup>

**Equal (and more) in the Apostolate:** His letter to Romans concludes in 16:1-15 with mention of twenty-nine named individuals. Of those persons two are pagan householders some of whose present or freed slaves are Christians and greeted as “those in the Lord who belongs to the family” of Aristobulus and Narcissus(16:10-11). That leaves twenty-seven named Christians. In what follows, watch the statistics, the details, and the names, especially which names are female and which are male.

First, and above all, it is a woman who carried Paul’s letter from Corinth’s eastern port to the Christian groups at Rome. “I commend to you our sister Phoebe, a deacon of the church at Cenchreae, so that you may welcome her in the Lord as is fitting for the saints, and help her in whatever she may require from you, for she has been a benefactor (*prostate*) of many and of myself as well” (16:1-2).

바울이 로마에 보낸 편지[로마서]는 29 명의 이름의 명사와 함께 16:1-15 에서 끝나는데 Crossan 은 Phoebe 가 고린도로 부터 로마의 기독교인들에게 바울의 편지를 전달했다고 믿는다.

16 : 1

겐그레아에 있는 교회의 일꾼이요 우리의 자매인 **뵤뵤**를 여러분에게 추천합니다. (또는 집사. 또는 목사) I commend to you our sister Phoebe, a deacon of the church at Cenchreae, 여러분은 성도의 합당한 예절로, 주 안에서 그를 영접하고 그가 여러분에게 어떤 도움을 원하든지, 도와주시기 바랍니다. 그는 많은 사람을 도와주었고, 나도 그에게 신세를 많이 졌습니다. so that you may welcome her in the Lord as is fitting for the saints, and help her in whatever she may require from you, for she has been a benefactor of many and of myself as well. 그리스도 예수 안에서 나의 동역자인 g) **브리스가와 아굴라에게** 문안하여 주십시오. Greet Prisca and Aquila, who work with me in Christ Jesus, 그들은 생명의 위협을 무릅쓰고 내 목숨을 살려준 사람들입니다. 나뿐만이 아니라, 이방 사람의 모든 교회가 그들에게 감사하고 있습니다.

<sup>31</sup> John Dominic Crossan & Jonathan L. Reed. *In Search of Paul* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004), 113-114.

and who risked their necks for my life, to whom not only I give thanks, but also all the churches of the Gentiles. 그리고 그들의 집에서 모이는 교회에도 문안하여 주십시오. 나의 사랑하는 에베네도에게 문안하여 주십시오. 그는 아시아에서 그리스도를 믿은 첫 열매입니다. Greet also the church in their house. Greet my beloved Epaphroditus, who was the first convert in Asia for Christ. 여러분을 위하여 수고를 많이 한 마리아에게 문안하여 주십시오. Greet Mary, who has worked very hard among you. 나의 친척이 며 한 때 나와 함께 갇혔던 안드로니코와 유니아에게 문안하여 주십시오. 그들은 사도들에게 좋은 평을 받고 있고, 나보다 먼저 그리스도를 믿은 사람들입니다. (b. 또는 동포. c. 다른 고대 사본들에는 율리아) Greet Andronicus and Junia, my relatives who were in prison with me; they are prominent among the apostles, and they were in Christ before I was. 주 안에 있는 나의 사랑하는 암블리아에게 문안하여 주십시오. Greet Ampliatus, my beloved in the Lord. 그리스도 안에서 우리의 동역자인 우르바노와 나의 사랑하는 스타구에게 문안하여 주십시오. Greet Urbanus, our co-worker in Christ, and my beloved Stachys. 그리스도 안에서 인정을 받는 아벨레에게 문안하여 주십시오. 아리스도볼로의 가족에게 문안하여 주십시오. Greet Apelles, who is approved in Christ. Greet those who belong to the family of Aristobulus. 나의 친척인 헤로디온에게 문안하여 주십시오. 주 안에 있는 나깃수의 가족에게 문안하여 주십시오. Greet my relative Herodion. Greet those in the Lord who belong to the family of Narcissus. 주 안에서 수고한 드루배나와 드루보사에게 문안하여 주십시오. 주 안에서 수고를 많이 한 사랑하는 버시에게 문안하여 주십시오. Greet those workers in the Lord, Tryphaena and Tryphosa. Greet the beloved Persis, who has worked hard in the Lord. 주 안에서 택하심을 받은 루포와 그의 어머니에게 문안하여 주십시오. 그의 어머니는 곧 내 어머니이기도 합니다. Greet Rufus, chosen in the Lord; and greet his mother--a mother to me also. 아순그리도와 블레곤과 허메와 바드로바와 허마와 그들과 함께 있는 형제자매들에게 문안하여 주십시오. Greet Asyncritus, Phlegon, Hermes, Patrobas, Hermas, and the brothers and sisters who are with them. 빌롤로고와 율리아와 네레오와 그의 자매와 올림바와 그들과 함께 있는 모든 성도들에게 문안하여 주십시오. Greet Philologus, Julia, Nereus and his sister, and Olympas, and all the saints who are with them.

첫째로, 여성이 바울의 편지를 고린도로 부터 로마의 기독교인들에게 전달한다. 16: 1-2 에 바울은 로마 기독교인들에게 “겐그레아에 있는 교회의 일꾼이요 우리의 자매인 뵘뵘을 여러분에게 추천합니다. (또는 집사. 또는 목사) 여러분은 성도의 합당한 예절로, 주 안에서 그를 영접하고 그가 여러분에게 어떤 도움을 원하든지, 도와주시기 바랍니다. 그는 많은 사람을 도와주었고, 나도 그에게 신세를 많이 졌습니다” 라고 부탁한다.<sup>32</sup>

둘째로, 16:3-4 에 16: 3 ”그리스도 예수 안에서 나의 동역자인 브리스가와 아굴라에게 문안하여 주십시오. 그들은 생명의 위협을 무릅쓰고 내 목숨을 살려준 사람들입니다. 나뿐만이 아니라, 이방 사람의 모든 교회가 그들에게 감사하고 있습니다.” 라고 브리스가(아내) 와 아굴라(남편) 부부를 골라내서 특별나게 칭찬한다. 여기에서 아내 브리스가의 이름이 먼저 나온다.<sup>33</sup>

<sup>32</sup> John Dominic Crossan & Jonathan L. Reed. *In Search of Paul* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004), 114.

<sup>33</sup> John Dominic Crossan & Jonathan L. Reed. *In Search of Paul* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004), 114.

셋째로, 바울의 인사에 나오는 27 명의 기독교인중에서 10 명은 여성이다. (Phoebe, Prisca, Mary, Junia, Tryphaena, Tryphosa, Persis, an unmanned mother, Julia, and an unmanned sister). 그리고 나머지 17 은 남성이다 (Aquila, Epaenetus, Andronicus, Ampliatus, Urbanus, Stachys, Apelles, Herodion, Rufus, Asyncritus, Phlegon, Hermes, Patrobas, Hermas, Philologus, Nereus, and Olympas). 서스름없이 그중에서 다섯 여성(Mary, Tryphaena, Tryphosa, Persis, and that unmanned mother) 과 여섯 남성 (Epaenetus, Ampliatus, Urbanus, Stachys, Apelles, Rufus)은 골라내서 특별히 칭찬한다.<sup>34</sup>

넷째로, 여기에서 주의를 할 점은 특별한 사도직 활동에 대한 바울의 회랍 근본은 (Greek root) 는 “수고한다”는 뜻, *kopiaō* 에 있다. 갈라디아 4:11 과 고전 15:10 에서 바울은 이말을 자신에게 두번이나 사용했는데 로마서에서는 특별히 여성(Mary, Tryphaena, Tryphosa, Persis)에게 이 말을 용했다.<sup>35</sup>

다섯째로, 바울이 직접 아는 사람들이 남녀 균등하게 거의 반반으로 구성되어 있다.<sup>36</sup> 마지막, [여섯째로] Junia 가 있는데 그 이름은 기독교의 처음 1200 년간은 주석학자들이 그를 여성으로, 브리스가와 아굴라의 경우처럼 아마도 Andronicus 의 아내로 (16:7) 인정하는 데에 아무런 어려움이 없었는데 그리스 시대에 와서 그녀의 이름이 Junian 으로 쓰여지면서 Junia(nus) 라는 남성으로 인정된다. 고대시대에 여성 Junia 라는 이름이 250 이상이 있었다.

Junia 는 사도들 사이에서 평판이 높았다고 했다(they are prominent among the apostles). Prominent to the apostles 라고 읽어야 한다. 여자이름을 남성으로 바꾼 것은 여자를 사도로 인정하기 싫어서였을 것이다.

Finally, there is Junia, .... For the first twelve hundred years of Christianity, commentators had no trouble identifying her name as female, presumably the wife of Andronicus (16:7), like Prisca is of Aquila (16:3-4). In Greek, by the way, her name appears in the accusative case as *Junian*. Then the name started to be identified as male – *Junian* was alleged to be the accusative case of the male name Junia(us).<sup>37</sup>

### Unequal in the Family

After those three authentic Pauline texts establishing female and male equality within Christianity in family, assembly, and apostolate, we turn to three inauthentic post-Pauline ones moving in exactly the opposite direction. 기독교에 있어서 가정과 교회와 사도직에 있어서 여자와 남자의 동등성을 확립하는 진정한 바울의 세 본문을 검토한 후 이제 우리는 바울의 사상과 정 반대인 후 바울 시대의 확실히 않은 (inauthentic) 세 본문으로 넘어간다.<sup>38</sup>

Greco-Roman moral thought developed codes for the ethical running of households, which were, then as now, the heart of society's health. Those household codes concerned the proper moral relationship between all members of the extended family, husbands and wives, parents and children, slaves and masters. We look now at

<sup>34</sup> John Dominic Crossan & Jonathan L. Reed. *In Search of Paul* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004), 115.

<sup>35</sup> John Dominic Crossan & Jonathan L. Reed. *In Search of Paul* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004), 115.

<sup>36</sup> John Dominic Crossan & Jonathan L. Reed. *In Search of Paul* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004), 115.

<sup>37</sup> John Dominic Crossan & Jonathan L. Reed. *In Search of Paul* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004), 115-116.

<sup>38</sup> John Dominic Crossan & Jonathan L. Reed. *In Search of Paul* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004), 116.

two post-Pauline examples of such moral instructions, first in Colossians 3:18-4:1 and then in Ephesians 5:22-6:9, the latter a development of the former commandments. Notice that there is hierarchy both vertically (spouse, parents, owners) and horizontally (husband/wife, parent/child, owner/salve) in these lists.<sup>39</sup> 기독교에 있어서 가정과 교회와 사도직에 있어서 여자와 남자의 동등성을 확립하는 진정한 바울의 세 본문을 검토한 후 이제 우리는 바울의 사상과 정 반대인 후 바울 시대의 확실히 않은 (inauthentic) 세 본문을 넘어간다. 회랍-로마의 도덕사상은 그 때나 현재에 사회의 안녕의 중심이 되는 가정윤리 법도(code)를 개발했다. 그 가정법도는 가족의 일원모두, 즉 남편과 아내, 부모와 자녀, 노예와 주인사이에 [있어야할] 적절한 도덕적 관계에 관심을 가진다. 우리는 이제 이러한 도덕적 교훈에 대한 두개의 후 바울시대의 예를 보려고 한다. 첫째는 골로새서 3:18-4:1 이고 그다음은 에베소서 5:22-6:9 이다. 후자는 전자의 계명으로 부터 개발된 것이다. 부부, 부모, 주인과 남편과 아내, 부모 와 자녀, 주인과 노예 사이에 수직적이고도 횡적인 계급제 도가 있다.

#### 골 3:18-4:1 에

아내가 되신 여러분, 남편에게 순종하십시오. 이것이 주님 안에서 합당한 일입니다. 남편이 되신 여러분, 아내를 사랑하십시오. 아내를 모질게 대하지 마십시오. 자녀가 되신 여러분, 모든 일에 부모에게 복종하십시오. 이것이 주님을 기쁘게 하는 일입니다. 아버지가 되신 여러분, 여러분의 자녀들을 격분하게 하지 마십시오. 그들의 기를 꺾지 말아야 합니다. 종이 되신 여러분, 모든 일에 육신의 c) 주인에게 복종하십시오. 사람을 기쁘게 하는 자들처럼 눈가림으로 하지 말고 주님을 두려워하면서 성실한 마음으로 하십시오. 무슨 일을 하든지 사람에게 하듯이 하지 말고, 주님께 하듯이 진심으로 하십시오. 여러분은 주님께 유산을 상으로 받는다는 사실을 기억하십시오. 여러분은 주 그리스도를 섬기는 분들입니다. 불의를 행하는 사람은, 자기가 행한 불의의 대가를 받을 것입니다. 거기에는 사람의 외모로 차별을 두는 일이 없습니다. 4:1 주인이 되신 여러분, 정당하고 공정하게 종들을 대우하십시오. 여러분도 하늘에 주인을 모시고 있다는 사실을 아시기 바랍니다.

#### 엡 5:22-6:9:

아내이신 여러분, 주님께 순종하는 것같이 남편에게 순종하십시오. 그리스도께서 교회의 머리이심과 같이 남편은 아내의 머리이기 때문입니다. 그리스도께서는 그분의 몸인 교회의 구주이십니다. 교회가 그리스도께 순종하는 것같이 아내들도 모든 일에서 남편에게 순종하십시오. 남편이신 여러분, 그리스도께서 교회를 사랑하셔서 교회를 위하여 자기를 내주신 것같이 아내를 사랑하십시오. 그리스도께서 그렇게 하신 것은 교회를물로 씻고, 말씀으로 깨끗하게 하여서 거룩하게 하시려는 것이며, 티나, 주름이나. 또 그와 같은 것들이 없이 아름다운 모습으로 교회를 자기 앞에 내세우시려는 것이며, 교회를 거룩하고 흠이 없게 하시려는 것입니다. 이와 같이 남편들도 자기 아내를 자기 몸과 같이 사랑하여야

<sup>39</sup> John Dominic Crossan & Jonathan L. Reed. *In Search of Paul* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004), 116.

합니다. 자기 아내를 사랑하는 사람은 자기를 사랑하는 것입니다. 아무도 자기의 육신을 미워하지는 않습니다. 그리스도께서 교회를 기르시고 돌보시는 것처럼, 사람은 자기의 육신을 가꾸고 보살핍니다. 우리는 그리스도의 몸의 지체입니다. 그러므로 사람이 부모를 떠나서, 자기 아내와 합하여 둘이 한 몸이 되는 것입니다. 이 비밀은 큼니다. 나는 그리스도와 교회를 두고 이 말을 합니다. 그러므로 여러분도 각각 자기 아내를 자기 몸과 같이 사랑하고 아내도 자기 남편을 존중하십시오.

#### 엠펙 6: 1-9

자녀이신 여러분, a) 주 안에서 여러분의 부모에게 복종하십시오. 이것이 옳은 일입니다. "네 부모를 공경하여라"한 계명은 약속이 달려 있는 첫째 계명입니다. (b. 출 20:12, 신 15:16) "네가 잘 되고 땅에서 오래 살 것이다"한 약속입니다. 또 아버지이신 여러분, 여러분의 자녀를 노엽게 하지 말고 주님의 훈련과 훈계로 기르십시오. 종이신 여러분, 여러분이 그리스도께 복종하는 것같이, 육신의 주인들에게 두려움과 떨림과 성실한 마음으로 복종하십시오. 사람을 기쁘게 하는 자들처럼 눈가림으로 하지 말고 그리스도의 종들과 같이 진심으로 하나님의 뜻을 실천하십시오. 사람에게가 아니라 주님께 하듯이 기쁜 마음으로 섬기십시오. 선한 일을 하는 사람은, 그가 종이든지 자유인이든지, 저마다 주께로부터 상급을 받게 됨을 여러분은 알아 두십시오. 주인이신 여러분, 종들에게 이와 같이 대하고, 그들을 위협하지 마십시오. 그들의 주님이시요, 여러분의 주님이신 분이 하늘에 계시다는 것과 주께서는 사람을 차별해서 대하지 않으신다는 것을 여러분은 알아 두십시오.

Despite the clear lack of equality between wives and husbands, it seems easier to be a wife"subject" to a husband like church to Christ than a husband "loving" a wife like Christ to church. Self-sacrifice is demanded of husband, not wife. It is usrely terribly and sadly ironic that Christian tradition demanded subjection from wives and then, rather than demanding self-sacrifice from husbands, transferred that to wives as well. <sup>40</sup>여기에서 아내들과 남편들 사이에 동등성은 결여되지만 교회가 그리스도에게처럼 아내가 남편에게 순종하는 것이 그리스도가 교회를 위해 희생한 것처럼 남편이 아내를 위해 희생하라는 요구보다 쉽다. 스스로를 희생하라는 아내에게 아니라 남편에게 요구된 것이다. 그런데 기독교 전통이 남편에게 희생을 강요한 것이 아니라 아내에게 순종을 요구하고 희생도 아내에게 전가하는 것은 매우 모순이다.

#### Unequal in the Assembly

I Timothy 2:8-15

In this text female leadership is absolutely forbidden by this pseudo-Pauline author. Women are not allowed to teach or instruct men. Women are to remain silent. The prohibition tells us that women were praying and teaching within the community's catechetical practice and liturgical worship. But this text dismisses women from those functions and relegates them to home, silence, and childbearing.

본문에서는 가짜 바울계 저자 (pseudo -Pauline author) 에 의해 여성의 지도력이 완전히금지

<sup>40</sup> John Dominic Crossan & Jonathan L. Reed. *In Search of Paul* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004), 117.

당했다. 여자들이 남자들을 가르치거나 지시하는 것이 허용되지 않았다. 여자는 잠잠하라 하였다. 이런 금지가 여성들이 공동체의 문답식 교수법(catechetical) 시행(practice)에서 그리고 예배에서 기도하고 가르치고 있었음을 시사한다. 그러나 본문은 여자들을 그런 임무에서 해고시키고 그들을 가정과 침묵과 자녀생산으로 내몰았다(relegate).<sup>41</sup>

#### I Corinthians 14:33b-36

The problem here is not with an inauthentic Pauline letter like 1 or 2 Timothy or Titus, but with an insertion from that later tradition into an original, earlier authentic letter of Paul. In the New Revised Standard Version of the Bible this appears in parentheses: *(As in the churches of the saints, women should be silent in the churches. For they are not permitted to speak, but should be subordinate, as the law also say. If there is anything they desire to know, let them ask their husband at home. For it is shameful for a woman to speak in church. Or did the word of God originate with you? Or are you the only ones it has reached?)*

여기서 문제는 디모데 전서 후서나 디도서 처럼 가짜 바울 편지(inauthentic Pauline letter)와 같은 문제가 아니고 원 바울의 편지에다 후대에 삽입해 넣은 것이 문제이다. NRSV 번역문에는 본문은 괄호 속에 넣어있다: (성도들의 모든 교회에서 그렇게 하는 것과 같이) 여자들은 교회에서 잠잠하십시오.

여자에게는 말하는 것이 허락되어 있지 않습니다. 율법에서도 말한 대로 여자들은 복종하십시오. 배우고 싶은 것이 있으면, 집에서 자기 남편에게 물으십시오. 여자가 교회에서 말하는 것은 자기에겐 부끄러운 일입니다. 하나님의 말씀이 여러분에게서 나왔습니까? 또는 여러분에게만 내렸습니까?)

괄호안에 넣었다는 사실은 초대에 본문을 전달함에 문제가 있음을 강조한다. 첫째로, 본문은 현재의 위치에 있지 아니하고 어떤 성경에는 장의 맨 끝에 붙기도 했다. 둘째로, 모든 회람어 성경에는 별도의 문장으로 따로 떼어 기록 되었다. 셋째로, 그 본문은 매우 일찍부터 문제로 간주 되었다. 그리고 이점이 바울의 원래의 본문에다 후에 삽입했다는 논쟁의 중심이 되는 것이다.<sup>42</sup>

#### **Unequal in the Apostolate**

We saw from I Timothy 2:8-15 in a post-Pauline letter and 1 Corinthian 14:33b-36 as a post-Pauline insertion, that female leadership was crudely denigrated in order to establish exclusive male control of the Christian assemblies. It is no surprise, therefore, to find male status as an absolute condition for Christian leaders. 우리는 후 바울 편지(post-Pauline letter)의 디모데 전서 2:8-15에서 그리고 후 바울 삽입(post-Pauline insertion)인 고린도 전서 14:33-36에서 기독교회에서 남성의 독점적인 지배를 확립하기 위해 여성의 지도력을 노골적으로 지명(designated)했다. 그러므로 기독교 지도자들의 절대적인 조건으로 남자의 위치를 발견함은 전혀 놀랄 일이 아니다.<sup>43</sup> 디모데 전서 3:1-13,

<sup>41</sup> John Dominic Crossan & Jonathan L. Reed. *In Search of Paul* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004), 119.

<sup>42</sup> John Dominic Crossan & Jonathan L. Reed. *In Search of Paul* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004), 119.

<sup>43</sup> John Dominic Crossan & Jonathan L. Reed. *In Search of Paul* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004), 119.

디도서 1:5-9 에 장로나 감독이나 집사가 되는 조건이 남자여야하고, 기혼이고, 자녀들을 잘 다스려야 한다는 세가지 조건이 붙는다. <sup>44</sup>

### **Eschatology Here and Equality Now (233)**

The earth will belong equally to all, undivided by alls 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, no tyrant, no slave. Further no one will be either great or small any more. No kings, no leaders. All will be on a par together. Paul thinks all Christians should be equal with one another. It is God's will for all people to be equal with one another. <sup>45</sup>

### **The Gospel of Caesar Augustus as Lord 236**

### **The Control of Religion in Rome 249**

### **The Unity of Pagans and Jews: Romans 1-8**

Luke's Acts gave Paul certain civil privileges, such as Tarsian and Roman citizenship, and certain religious privileges, such as descent from Pharisees and education under Gamaliel, that Paul probably lacked and certainly never mentioned. What Paul did receive, and it may well have been much more useful for his future, was a first-class education in the synagogue in the synagogue at Tarsus with a strong emphasis on apologetics [sorry/repentant] for Judaism and polemics [passionate/excited] against paganism. He was educated, in other words, not just for debates within Judaism, but for debates with paganism or, better, for debates within Judaism about paganism. <sup>46</sup>

### **God, World, and Judgment:**

God's ideal, says Paul in 1:16 - 3:18, is to create a unity from "the Jew first and also the Greek," a phrase repeated thrice in 1:16 and 2:9-10. But the argument is rather unusual in that it begins with the accusation that "all, both Jews and Greeks, are under the power of sin" (3:9), so that, between them, "there is no distinction, since all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God" (3:22-23). The unity of Jew and Greek, that is, of all the world, is already there, as it were, but it is a unity under sin. Notice that, as Paul argues his case, he looks at the Greek first in 1:16-2:16 and then his fellow Jews in 2:17-3:18. <sup>47</sup>

**THE GREEK (1:16 -2:16).** **First,** Paul appeals to what we might call the *common law of humanity* by postulating that, with regard to idolatry and immorality, the covenantal law of Judaism written on biblical texts reappears as the natural law of paganism (un)written on human hearts, and in both cases, "it is not the hearers of the law who are righteous in God's sight, but the doers of the law who will be justified" (2: 13; read -2:12-16).

<sup>44</sup> John Dominic Crossan & Jonathan L. Reed. *In Search of Paul* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004), 120.

<sup>45</sup> John Dominic Crossan & Jonathan L. Reed. *In Search of Paul* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004), 233.

<sup>46</sup> John Dominic Crossan & Jonathan L. Reed. *In Search of Paul* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004), 379.

<sup>47</sup> John Dominic Crossan & Jonathan L. Reed. *In Search of Paul* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004), 379.

**Second**, in his accusation of sins against pagans in 1:16-2:16 Paul cites the standard polemical apologetics of his native Judaism against paganism. On idolatry: Pagans “exchanged the glory of the immortal God for images resembling a mortal human being or birds or four-footed animals or reptiles” (1:23). On morality: Paul asserts three times that, because of that idolatry, “God gave them up” to immorality (1:24, 26, 28).<sup>48</sup>

**THE JEW** (2:17-3:18). Continuing his accusation of universal sin in 1:16- 3:18, Paul turns from pagans in 1:16-2: 16 to fellow Jews in 2:17 –3:18. It is a rather feeble accusation. You then, that teach other, will you not teach yourself? While you preach against stealing, do you steal? You that forbid adultery, do you commit adultery? You that abhor idols, do you rob temple? You that boast in the law, do you dishonor God by breaking the law? (2:21-23).<sup>49</sup> No doubt some Jews somewhere, sometime, somehow may have done such things. But pagan accusations against Jews were not about hypocrisy of infidelity, but about the stupidity of fidelity. Paul then points his criticism precisely at circumcision, repeating the same equation he made between externally written Jewish law and internally (un)written pagan law in 2:12-16 with regard specifically to circumcision, and he concludes, “A person is a Jew who is one inwardly, and real circumcision is a matter of the heart –it is spiritual and not literal” (2:29; read 2:25-29). But, of course, the obvious answer is that circumcision is both spiritual and literal for Jews, but only spiritual for pagans. The pagan becomes holy with but not by its absence and the male Jew becomes holy with but not by its presence.<sup>50</sup>

*Righteousness, Justification, and Christ*: How can that global unity under human sin be replaced by global unity under some divine alternative? Paul’s basic answer and its first three key words appear in 3:25-26: The *righteousness* of God is granted for the *justification* of humanity through the *sacrifice* of Christ.<sup>51</sup>

### **RIGHTEOUSNESS: DISTRIBUTION, NOT RETRIBUTION [VENGEANCE].**

God does what is *just* by doing what is *right*, and God does what is *right* by doing what is *just*. God is justice = righteousness, so that, in whatever format, the terms justice and righteousness always indicate the very character of God. But, as we turn to Paul on God’s justice and righteousness a giant interpretive shadow falls across the biblical vision of God *in modern confusion between distribution and retribution*. We use the term “justice” primarily if not exclusively for punishment, for retributive justice. .. The primary meaning of justice is not retribute, but distributive justice. If a wrongdoer who is rich, powerful, and important claims that status to avoid retributive justice, we would fall back on distributive justice by saying that legal sanctions have to be distributed fairly, equitably, justly. So also in the Hebrew Scriptures –the primary and basic meaning of God’s justice or righteousness is not retributive but distributive justice. In fact, you might even say that retribution is not so much the intervention of divine punishment as the inevitable result of human *distribution*. But with that *misunderstanding* of divine righteousness as human punishment, humans tend to cower before the fear of divine justice as retribution rather than to celebrate the challenge of divine justice as distribution. And is the former “good news” for anyone? It is that divine insistence on global distributive justice with God’s earthly

<sup>48</sup> John Dominic Crossan & Jonathan L. Reed. *In Search of Paul* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004), 380.

<sup>49</sup> John Dominic Crossan & Jonathan L. Reed. *In Search of Paul* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004), 380.

<sup>50</sup> John Dominic Crossan & Jonathan L. Reed. *In Search of Paul* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004), 381.

<sup>51</sup> John Dominic Crossan & Jonathan L. Reed. *In Search of Paul* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004), 381.

administration matching God's heavenly character that Paul refers to as "the righteousness of God .. attested by the law and the prophets" in 3:21.<sup>52</sup>

### **JUSTIFICATION: TRANSFORMATION, NOT IMPUTATION [Charge/accusation]**

Paul's special term for that gift of divine righteousness is *justification* or *making just*, that is the process whereby divinity makes humanity just. Thus, while *justification* and *righteousness* are used essentially of divinity and derivatively [copied/imitatively] of humanity, *justification* is never used of God, but only of us. It is the process whereby the justice and righteousness of divinity becomes the justice and righteousness of humanity. God, therefore, is both the One who is "just" and also the One who justifies" the world (3:26). How is that done?<sup>53</sup> By "Christ Jesus ... whom God put forward as a sacrifice of atonement by his blood"(3:25). Paul repeatedly and redundantly pounds on the reality of global sin and then of holiness as transformation throughout all of Romans 6:11-23. At its start: "You must consider yourselves dead to sin and alive to God in Christ Jesus" (6:11), and as its end: "you have been freed from sin and enslaved to God" (6:22). How does that transformation take place?<sup>54</sup>

### **CHRIST: PARTICIPATION, NOT SUBSTITUTION**

Everyone in Paul's world, Jews and pagans alike, understood that "reconciliation" (5:11) could involve "a sacrifice of atonement by blood" (3:25). Even today we still see and understand the word "sacrifice" when, for example, firefighters rush into a burning house, save a family, but die in the attempt. We say those firefighters gave up their lives to save others, that they sacrificed their lives. On the one hand, all human life and death is sacred but, on the other, the death of those firefighters are especially, peculiarly sacred. Why? Because they died that other might live.<sup>55</sup> In modernity, nobody would ever suggest that God wanted somebody punished by death in that burning house, then those firefighters who would suffice as vicarious substitutes. But what is most interesting is that Paul, having mentioned sacrificial atonement by Christ, does not develop it further in any way, but speaks instead of participation in Christ, which is the heart of his theology. And where *sacrificial atonement* got only one verse (3:5), *participation* gets a whole chapter (6-23). Paul probably saw that sacrificial atonement might explain the death of Jesus, but what about the resurrection? It was necessary to speak of both death and resurrection, of "Jesus our Lord ... who was handed over to death for our trespasses *and* was raised for our justification"(4:25; read 6:3-5). Finally, Paul speaks of the "death" of Christ in, say, 4:25, 5:10, and 6:3-10 rather than of the execution or crucifixion—recall how he emphasized that word throughout 1 Corinthians 1:23 - 28, for example: "Christ crucified ... Jesus Christ, and him crucified .. the rulers of this age ... have crucified the Lord of glory." On the one hand, his theology would not be the same if Christ had simply died in his bed and been raised thereafter by God. Jesus did not simply die; he was publicly, legally, officially executed by the contemporary authority of the Roman Empire, that is, by the normalcy of civilization's permanent violence in his own time and place. It was not simply death and resurrection. It was execution by Rome and therefore resurrection against Rome. It is, there, maybe more than Paul or Christianity wants to consider, that participation will be fully accomplished. On the other hand, the advantage of using "death" rather than execution or

<sup>52</sup> John Dominic Crossan & Jonathan L. Reed. *In Search of Paul* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004), 382.

<sup>53</sup> John Dominic Crossan & Jonathan L. Reed. *In Search of Paul* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004), 382.

<sup>54</sup> John Dominic Crossan & Jonathan L. Reed. *In Search of Paul* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004), 383.

<sup>55</sup> John Dominic Crossan & Jonathan L. Reed. *In Search of Paul* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004), 384.

crucifixion is that he can then contrast not crucifixion and resurrection but *death* and *life*, thereby emphasizing present Christian resurrection life. Paul can then contrast death versus life repeatedly in Romans 4-6 (read 4:17; 5:10, 17, 20, 21; 6:4, 8, 11, 13).<sup>56</sup>

### **Grace, Faith and Works**

**GRACE AS GIFT:** The Greek word *charis*, or “grace,” means a free gift. You can see that juxtaposition [association] of grace and free gift rather clearly when Paul speaks redundantly and emphatically about being “justified by his grace as a gift” (Rom. 3:24), about “the free gift in the grace of the one man, Jesus Christ”(5:15), and, climactically, about “the free gift ..the grace of God dn the free gift .. the free gift .. thhe free gift ... the abundance of grace and the free gift of righteousness” (5:15 -17). Think, for a moment, of a physical example such as air itself. It is there for us all the time, equally available for everyone in every place at every time. We do not need to do anything to obtain it. We could not do anything to obtain it. It is not a question of whether we deserve it or not. It is absolutely transcendent in the sense that we depend on it totally. It is absolutely immanent in the sense that it is everywhere inside and outside us, all around us. And we can hardly notice it unless something goes wrong with us or with it. But air does not demand the reaction of awareness, the reply of acceptable, and the response of cooperation. Or, better, it does not demand that we breathe so much as we need to breathe to avoid asphyxiation [suffocation] or hyperventilation. And, if you choose asphyxiation or hyperventilation, do not say that the air is punishing you. It is only and always a matter of collaboration. A grace gift is like a free upgrade but, of course, there too, you need at least to download it.<sup>57</sup>

Paul’s good news is that God’s righteousness is, like earth’s air, a grace, a free gift offered us absolutely and unconditionally for our justification, for the making of a just world. But, then, like any gift, it is actuated by acceptance, and Paul imagines two possible modes of such acceptance, only one of which is appropriate. The right way he calls *faith*, the wrong way *works*.<sup>58</sup>

**FAITH AS COMMITMENT.** Here comes another major misunderstanding. Faith does not mean intellectual consent to a proposition, but vital commitment to a program. Obviously, one could summarize a program in a proposition, but faith can never be reduced to factual assent [agreement] rather than total dedication.<sup>59</sup> Faith (*pistis*) is not just a partial mind-set, but a total lifestyle commitment. The crucial aspect of faith as commitment is that it is always an interactive process, a bilateral contract, a two-way street. Faith is covenantal and presumes faithfulness from both parties with, of course, all appropriate differences and distinctions. So also for Paul in Romans. God and Christ are faithful to the world and so, in response, is the world to them. God’s righteousness in Christ is faithfully consistent, and Christians are consistently faithful in response to that grace gift. Once again, as with Galatians 3:6-29 in Chapter 4, Abraham is Paul’s model and argument for faith as the primary and essential response to God’s gracious offer of divine righteousness for human justification. Abraham believed God’s promise in Genesis 15 (the covenant) before the command for circumcision came in Genesis 17 (the sign of covenant). A Jewish opponent would have responded that, of course, faith in the covenant was

<sup>56</sup> John Dominic Crossan & Jonathan L. Reed. *In Search of Paul* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004), 384.

<sup>57</sup> John Dominic Crossan & Jonathan L. Reed. *In Search of Paul* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004), 385.

<sup>58</sup> John Dominic Crossan & Jonathan L. Reed. *In Search of Paul* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004), 385.

<sup>59</sup> John Dominic Crossan & Jonathan L. Reed. *In Search of Paul* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004), 385.

primary, but so was circumcision as its sign, just as Christian faith is primary, but baptism is its sign, seal, and sacrament. In Galatians 3:6 Paul cited that key text from Genesis 15:6, “He believed the Lord; and the Lord reckoned [calculate/count] it to him as righteousness” (Rom. 4:3, 9, and 22). In Romans, as distinct from Galatians, Paul insists that Abraham was the common ancestor of Gentiles who live by faith without circumcision as well as Jews who live by faith with circumcision. “Or is God the God of Jews only? Is he not the God of Gentiles also? Yes, of Gentiles also” (Romans 3:29; read 4:11-12).<sup>60</sup>

**WORKS AS POLEMICS** [CONTROVERSIAL]

It was not a two-way but a three-way argument, with a God-worshiper or pagan sympathizers between Paul and his fellow Jews. What the God-worshiper does could very well be described as works before faith rather than works *from* faith. You, Paul would have said to that God-worshiper, are lost between worlds, are working not from pagan faith, from Jewish faith, or from Christian faith. You may be working merely from religious superstition or social association. And there certainly would be a polemical hint from Paul that any opposing Jews might be doing the same. .. *Paul’s antithesis of faith versus works stands on that delicate interface between valid apologetic argument from a Christian to a God-worshiper and invalid polemical argument from a Jew to a fellow Jew.*<sup>61</sup>

---

<sup>60</sup> John Dominic Crossan & Jonathan L. Reed. *In Search of Paul* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004), 386.

<sup>61</sup> John Dominic Crossan & Jonathan L. Reed. *In Search of Paul* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004), 387.