

Repent, for the Dictatorship of God is at Hand!

James G. Crossley

IN A RECENT WEBCHAT on the *Guardian* website, the Marxist-Lacanian celebrity philosopher Slavoj Žižek argued that while he supports a boycott of Israel's state institutions, he "totally" rejects any boycott which would involve "not visiting [Israel], not having contact with people there." He added that there are two reasons for limiting a boycott to state institutions: due to a new wave of European antisemitism and because such a limited boycott would then be "a common project of Palestinians and Jewish progressive critics of Zionism," attaining the unity which is "absolutely crucial." For Žižek, "Palestinian resistance" needs to be nonviolent and also must form part of a "modern universal emancipatory project."¹ While my knowledge of individual views on boycotts is not extensive, the idea of locating Palestinian resistance in a broader emancipatory context clearly echoes the views of a number of participants in the BZP conference and contributors to this volume. Moreover, the importance of nonviolence is also emphasized, at least in the sense that, in some of the exegetical debates concerning a future for Palestinians, Jesus was invoked on the side of a peaceful inauguration of a new homeland. A powerful example is found in this book in the essay by Mary Grey where she presents Jesus's vision of the kingdom in terms of a subversive, nonviolent, anti-imperial colonial resistance against inequalities of wealth and resources and the rule of Antipas and the Roman Empire, all framed in the context of Palestinian resistance. In this respect, it is worth adding that Grey's essay has been influenced by Marxist and Marxist-influenced exegesis of the New Testament associated with Ched Myers, John Dominic Crossan, and Richard Horsley.

While there may be specific points to dispute, the general picture put forward by

¹ Slavoj Žižek, "Slavoj Žižek Webchat," *Guardian* (Oct 8, 2014), <http://www.theguardian.com/books/live/2014/oct/06/slavoj-zizek-webchat-absolute-recoil>.

Grey may well be accurate, as we will see below. What I want to do instead of a direct response is to look to the potential danger in using the figure of Jesus and his vision for the kingdom: the danger of what might be labelled “Bonapartism” or “Stalinism”: of the revolution turning into a dictatorship. This sort of warning levelled at Marxism or Marxist-influenced thinking is hardly new. Mikhail Bakunin, for instance, foresaw what might happen to Marxism when he predicted that the revolutionary state will appropriate all land and property and will thus be a highly centralized and powerful “red bureaucracy.” For Bakunin, this “despotic” state would entail slavery and a regimented workforce where “workingmen and women will sleep, wake, work, and live to the beat of a drum; where the shrewd and educated will be granted government privileges.”² Such criticisms may have become the staple of liberal discourses but, as with Bakunin, they are also central to criticisms from the anti-authoritarian Left. Rudolf Rocker would develop this line of thinking in the socialism of the Jewish East End of London before World War I; Rosa Luxemburg made similar points in her criticism of the Russian Revolution; George Orwell reflected on revolution, totalitarianism and the Stalinist delusions of British intellectuals, most famously in *Animal Farm* (1946) and *1984* (1949); and Noam Chomsky has reviewed the Left of the previous century in such a light while noting contemporary manifestations of such authoritarianism, including in theological reasoning.³ This is not to say that Grey’s thinking is along these lines (on the contrary) but rather that the Gospel and New Testament texts may be more problematic and theocratic—and even contain the seeds of dictatorship.⁴ After all, Žižek—himself well aware of issues surrounding totalitarianism—put forward a more dictatorial reading of Christian origins than Grey’s analysis when he presented “Paul as a Leninist” and implied Jesus was the betrayed Marx figure. “Paul goes on to his true Leninist business,” Žižek claimed:

that of organizing the new party called the Christian community... Was not Paul, like Lenin, the great “institutionalizer,” and, as such, reviled by the partisans of “original” Marxism-Christianity? Does not the Pauline temporality “already, but not yet” also designate Lenin’s situation in between two revolutions, between February and October 1917? Revolution is already behind us, the old regime is out, freedom is here—*but* the

² Mikhail Bakunin, *Selected Works* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1972), 283–84.

³ Rudolf Rocker, *The London Years* (Los Angeles: Robert Anscombe, 1956); Rosa Luxemburg, *The Russian Revolution and Leninism or Marxism?* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1970 [1918]), 24; Noam Chomsky, *Understanding Power: The Indispensable Chomsky*, ed. Peter R. Mitchell and John Schoeffel (New York: New Press, 2002), 222–66.

⁴ I am working with broad themes in the Gospel tradition. For those interested in issues relating to the historical Jesus (and Grey’s essay goes along these lines), I think that these themes probably reflect the earliest Gospel tradition, even if we cannot be sure about precise passages. See James G. Crossley, *Jesus and the Chaos of History: Redirecting the Life of the Historical Jesus* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), ch. 3.

hard work still lies ahead.⁵

The Snowball Effect

A strong case can be made for a revolutionary or subversive Jesus whose message was anti-imperial, generated by vast inequalities of wealth and resources. Running throughout the Gospel tradition is the idea that the imperial authorities, including those authorities perceived to be unjust, will be overthrown. Rome will not be ruling forever, at least not in Israel. This would have been obvious from the book of Daniel as it would have been re-read in light of first-century history and culture (see, e.g., Jos. *Ant.* 10.10.4, 10.11.7):⁶ “And in the days of those kings the God of heaven will set up a kingdom that shall never be destroyed, nor shall this kingdom be left to another people. It shall crush all these kingdoms and bring them to an end, and it shall stand for ever” (Dan 2.44). Not only can such Gospel themes be read as “anti-imperial” but there is a distinctive class aspect present, including economic reversal (e.g., Luke 6.20; cf. Matt 5.3). In Mark 10.17–31, a rich person has as much chance of entering the kingdom as a camel has of passing through the eye of a needle, which functions partly as a critique of the idea of earthly wealth being understood as a divine reward.⁷ The idea that wealth effectively leads to sin (cf. CD 4.15–19; IQS 11.1–2; Ps. Sol. 5.16), or that reward is to be found in the end times (cf. 1 En. 96.4; 103.5–8; Dan 12; 2 Macc 7), is arguably more explicit still in the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus (Luke 16.19–31). Only one reason is given for the dramatic role reversal of class in that parable: “Child, remember that during your lifetime you received your good things, and Lazarus in like manner evil things; but now he is comforted here, and you are in agony” (Luke 16.25).⁸ From this sort of perspective, God and Mammon cannot both be served (Luke 16.13//Matt 6.24). Such issues relating to class are especially common across the Synoptic tradition in a range of different literary contexts (e.g., Luke 6.20–26//Matt 5.3–12; Matt 6.24//Luke 16.13; Luke 14.12–24//Matt 22.1–14; Luke 4.18; 12.13–21) as are concerns about debt (e.g., Luke 12.57–59//Matt 5.25; Luke 6.35; 16.1–8; Matt 5.40–42; 6.12; 18.23–35), food, clothing, drink, and community (Matt 25.31–46; Luke 6.20–21), hostility to wealth and the concerns of the wealthy (e.g., Matt 11.8//Luke 7.25; Matt 6.25–34//Luke 12.22–31; Luke 6.24–25; cf. 1 En. 98.2; 102.9–11), and issues relating to a stark contrast of rich and poor (Luke 6.20–26//Matt 5.3–12; Luke 14.12–24//Matt 22.1–14). Challenging the status quo on issues of class, economic reversal, and injustice is obviously a major

⁵ Slavoj Žižek, *The Puppet and the Dwarf: The Perverse Core of Christianity* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2003), 9.

⁶ See further Craig A. Evans, “Daniel in the New Testament: Visions of God’s Kingdom,” in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*, ed. John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 490–527.

⁷ For a full discussion see James G. Crossley, “The Damned Rich (Mark 10.17–31),” *Expository Times* 116 (2005): 397–401.

⁸ See especially Richard J. Bauckham, “Rich Man and Lazarus: The Parable and the Parallels,” *NTS* 37 (1991): 225–46.

concern in the Gospels and those using Jesus in such a manner are hardly building upon sand.

“Welcome to 1984”

But if a “revolutionary” Jesus is easily rediscovered then so are the seeds of a “Stalinist” or “imperialist” future. Rather than escaping imperialist ideology, the Gospel tradition embraces it and reinscribes it. This is clearest in the theocratic language of the kingdom of God. As has long been established, the language of a “kingdom” (βασιλεία/מלכות) concerns both God’s rule or kingship while incorporating spatial dimensions in terms of what is deemed God’s territory. God’s kingdom in heaven was presented with the imperial imagery of a throne or chariot and warrior-like angels. Of some difficulty for Palestinian reclamations of Jesus is the earthly kingdom-of-God language which might, of course, involve a Davidic king.

Occupation of Israel and ownership of all lands are standard assumptions concerning the kingdom and kingship of God (e.g., Obad 1.19–21; Zech 14.9; Ps 47.2–3; Dan 7.27). On Daniel, Maurice Casey pointed out, “If this was reapplied to the time of Jesus... it was bound to mean that the Romans would be driven out of Israel and made subject to the Jewish people” (cf. Jos. *Ant.* 10.10.4, 10.11.7).⁹ To make this more complicated still for a Palestinian reclamation of Jesus, Dale Allison has shown that the idea of “inheriting the kingdom” in the Gospel tradition “is like taking possession of the land” (with reference to LXX Exod 12.25; Lev 19.23; Num 15.2; 20.24; Deut 1.8; 4.1, 21; 6.18; 16.20; 27.3; Judg 18.9; Ezek 13.9; 20.38; *T. Mos.* 2.1; *T. Levi* 12.5).¹⁰ Related imperialistic and even “Zionist” concerns are found across the Gospel tradition, including the idea of Jesus and his followers sitting on twelve thrones “judging the twelve tribes of Israel” (Matt 19.28; Luke 22.29–30). Further examples of the interaction of power, authority, and hierarchy are common, including in relation to the kingdom of God (e.g., Mark 11.10; Matt 21.5, 9; Luke 19.38).

One of the warning signs for those wanting to appropriate Jesus for the cause of liberation is that the kingdom of God has been appropriated for ecclesiastical, national, and pan-national authority throughout the history of Christianity.¹¹ What such appropriations partly do is to replicate, re-inscribe, and buy into imperialism, domination, and authority. Indeed, even the theme of radical economic reversal still assumes related power structures, even when reward is reversed in the end times (see e.g., 1 En. 92–105; cf. Job 42.10–17). In the case of the rich man in the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, the same hierarchical structure of privilege remains and is thus not ultimately

⁹ Maurice Casey, *Jesus of Nazareth: An Independent Historian’s Account of His Life and Teaching* (London: T&T Clark, 2010), 215.

¹⁰ Dale C. Allison, *Constructing Jesus: Memory, Imagination, and History* (London: SPCK, 2010), 180–81. On Jesus and territory see now Karen J. Wenell, *Jesus and Land: Sacred and Social Space in Second Temple Judaism* (London: T&T Clark, 2007).

¹¹ Allison, *Constructing Jesus*, 184–86.

dismantled. But such issues cannot be dismissed as abstract “structural” similarities or restricted to something that will happen in the future. In the case of Mark 10.17–31 and those who have more chance of passing through the eye of the needle than the rich man, rewards (including “houses,” family, and “fields”) are even expected in “this age” and not just “the age to come.” The imagined alternative to the power of the present world clearly has its limits in the Gospel tradition—and the coming kingdom of God might even be seen as little more than a changing of the guard.

This sort of thinking may also be implicit in the Gospel sayings about the present and growing kingdom (e.g., Mark 4.26–32; Luke 13.20–21; Matt 13.33; Matt 13.44; Luke 17.20–21). The idea of the “good” kingdom mimicking the “bad” kingdom, including more “presentist” concerns, is found in the dispute about casting out demons (Mark 3.22–30) where it is further claimed that “if a kingdom is divided against itself, that kingdom cannot stand” (see also Matt 12.28; Luke 11.20; cf. Mark 10.14–15; 12.34). The popular Book of Daniel, which looks to the future kingdom, tells us who is really ruling in the present and tellingly does so by having a monarch do the explaining: “I, Nebuchadnezzar, lifted my eyes to heaven, and my reason returned to me. I blessed the Most High, and praised and honoured the one who lives for ever. For his sovereignty is an everlasting sovereignty, and his kingdom endures from generation to generation” (Dan 4.34).

The Great Leader and the Vanguard

The mimicking of kingdoms also involves the mimicking of leadership and authority. In Matt 16.19, for instance, Jesus says to Peter: “I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatever you bind on earth will be bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth will be loosed in heaven.” Luke 22.29–30 provides a telling addition to the saying concerning the judging of the twelve tribes, implying some form of human ownership or stewardship: “I confer on you, just as my Father has conferred on me, a kingdom, so that you may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and you will sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel.” Given that Jesus was remembered as Messiah, king of the Jews, the Son of Man who will return, equal with God, judge of the twelve tribes, and millenarian prophet, the world to come in this tradition must involve a violent seizure of power (even if God was expected to lead the way). Eternal rule is thus intertwined with the conventional imperialist and dictatorial propagandist promises of peace.¹² Relevant ideas in a number of texts explicitly point in this direction (Ps. Sol. 17; 4Q246 II 1–9; IQM VI 4–6; 4Q252 V 1–4; 4Q521 frag. 2 II 1–13; 11Q13 2.13; 2 Bar. 72.2–73.2).

¹² Compare the postcolonial readings of Mark and Revelation in this respect. See e.g. Tat-siong Benny Liew, “Tyranny, Power and Might: Colonial Mimicry in Mark’s Gospel,” *JSNT* 73 (1999): 7–31; *Politics of Parousia: Reading Mark Inter(contextually)* (Leiden: Brill, 1999); Simon Samuel, *A Postcolonial Reading of Mark’s Story of Jesus* (London: T&T Clark, 2007); Stephen D. Moore, *Empire and Apocalypse: Postcolonialism and the New Testament* (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2006).

Perhaps the Gospel tradition simply could not conceive an alternative which did not involve domination, subjugation, imperialism, and theocracy. Paul certainly could not. He may not have used precisely the same language but the imperialist ideas are likewise present: the one who humbled himself would become so exalted “that at the name of Jesus every knee should bend, in heaven and on earth and under the earth and every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord” (Phil 2.10–11). Seemingly more benignly, Paul could impose dominance in the removal of particular identities in Christ (Gal 3.28). Paul is likewise explicit about eschatological change in power relations: “When any of you has a grievance against another, do you dare to take it to court before the unrighteous, instead of taking it before the saints? Do you not know that the saints will judge the world? And if the world is to be judged by you, are you incompetent to try trivial cases? Do you not know that we are to judge angels—to say nothing of ordinary matters?” (1 Cor. 6.2).

But what the discussion so far reveals is that we should not simply blame Paul (or indeed the Gospel writers) for somehow “betraying” the millenarian and egalitarian peasant Jesus. Millenarianism is quite able to promote exalted claims on the part of the great millenarian leader alongside claims of egalitarianism. An ability to hold together seemingly contradictory ideas of subversion, egalitarianism, and authoritarianism should not be a surprise—neither today nor 2,000 years ago. One of the most pertinent examples would be the phenomenon of banditry. Like Jesus, bandits could be remembered as a product of social upheaval (e.g., Jos. *Ant.* 17.10.4–7; 18.8.3–4; *War* 2.4.2–3; 2.21.1; *Life* 35, 66) and celebrated as attacking power, wealth, and Rome (Jos. *War* 2.17.6–9; *Ant.* 18.8.3–4; *War* 2.31; *Ant.* 20.5.4; *Life* 126–27), while still mimicking the world of kings and kingship (*War* 2.5; *Ant.* 17.10.6–7; Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.9).

Whatever the earliest realities, the Gospels present Jesus as Lord, Messiah, king of the Jews, eschatological Son of Man, and, in the case of John’s Gospel, Son of God in the sense that he identified closely and strongly with God. In John 5.1–18 there is a close connection between Jesus and his “father.” This meant, according to John, that “the Jews” wanted to kill Jesus because “he was also calling God his own Father, thereby making himself equal to God” (John 5.18). There are similar sentiments in John 10.30–33 where the Johannine Jesus claims that “the Father and I are one” and “the Jews” are presented as wanting to stone Jesus for blasphemy “because you, though only a human being, are making yourself God.” Given what we know about the range of elevated figures in early Jewish thought, John must be elevating Jesus especially highly to present this as a deadly dispute. Of course, it might reasonably be argued that this is a Johannine innovation, but the earliest Christian tradition presents a Jesus with such a potential. One of the most significant moments in the development of Christology must have been the visions of Jesus shortly after his death and which clearly goes back to a relatively widespread pre-Pauline tradition (1 Cor 15.3–9; to 500 followers). This earliest development of Christology was interpreted to involve a blazing “light from heaven” (Acts 9.3). This heavenly Christ presumably had the imperial trappings of heaven which we know from texts such as 1 Enoch—hence the relatively standard heavenly vision in

2 Cor 12.2–4. The Qumran scroll 4Q405 frag. 23 II 8–12 gives us further indication of what this might have involved, particularly in tying together ideas of heaven with kingdom and kingship:

In their wonderful stations there are spirits (with) multi-coloured (clothes), like woven material engraved with splendid effigies. In the midst of the glorious appearance of scarlet, the colours of the light of the spirit of the holy of holies, they remain fixed in their holy station before [the k]ing (לְ[מֶ]לֶךְ), spirits of [pure] colours in the midst of the appearance of the whiteness. And the substance of the spirit of glory is like work from Ophir, which diffuses [lig]ht. All their decorations are mixed purely, artful like woven material. These are the chiefs of those wonderfully clothed for service, the chiefs of the kingdom (מַמְלָכֻת) <of the kingdom> of the holy ones of the holy king (לְמֶלֶךְ) in all the heights of the sanctuaries of the kingdom (מַלְכוּת) of his glory.

From a very early date, the peasant Jesus was deemed to have quickly risen up the theocratic hierarchy.

The Gospel tradition reflects such imperial grandeur and the exaltation of Jesus probably also involved some sort of enthronement. Moreover, there are strong hints of a restoration of the power of *Israel*. As we have seen, there is the Israel-focused enthronement, or at least elevated role of judge, in Matt 19.28 and Luke 22.28–30. We have similar ideas implied in Mark 10.35–45 and the question raised by the sons of Zebedee about sitting at the right and left of Jesus “in your glory” (Mark 10.37). We might add that there may again be a hint of an Israel-centred focus in Mark 10.35–45, which echoes the Maccabean martyr theology of dying for Israel (e.g., 2 Macc 7; 4 Macc 17:20–22), and which can likewise be associated with glorification after death (e.g., Dan 12.2–3). Dying for “the many” could imply Israel if it were being used in the more limited sense of “the many” we find in the Dead Sea Scrolls (1QS 6.1, 7–25; CD 13.7; 14.7). Needless to say, this is problematic evidence for any Palestinian reclamation of Jesus.

The Dictatorship of God in the Making

Nevertheless, the Gospel writers, like most of the other New Testament authors, still saw this in light of a more universal and even emancipatory project. But these traditions of enthronement, judging, and sitting with people at right and left also obviously envision—even in the earliest tradition—something far more hierarchical and less egalitarian than, for instance, John Dominic Crossan’s famous “brokerless kingdom” in which all had equal access to God.¹³ Even scholars whose Jesuses have more “apocalyptic” or “eschatological” traits than Crossan’s Jesus can make similar arguments. For

¹³ John Dominic Crossan, *The Historical Jesus: The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1991): 225–416.

example, Bart Ehrman claimed Jesus's eschatological teachings on the kingdom advocated and predicted "no more war," nonviolence, fair treatment of "all people," and a world free from demonic powers, disease, and poverty.¹⁴ Ehrman is no doubt broadly right in making such claims; but perhaps we might also raise suspicions, as Ehrman himself appears to do, and think more about the ways in which power is involved in such theocratic thinking. The idea that the Gospel contrast of Christ with Caesar involved a non-imperial, non-monarchical, non-dictatorial alternative is prevalent in New Testament scholarship. For instance, Tom Thatcher argues that:

Time and again—so often that it seems to be the rule rather than the exception—rebel leaders with high ideals become oppressive dictators once their movement has dispossessed the old regime. This observable fact of history is a surface manifestation of the many hidden hierarchies of power that operate within the communities of the oppressed before the revolution begins—the rebel leader was already a king of sorts and simply begins to act like one once he officially takes charge.... Viewed in this light, the genius of the footwashing lies in the fact that Jesus anticipates and precludes the emergence of anything like a new imperial order within his eschatological community. No one steps in to take the throne once the ruler of this world is cast out. In fact, there are no thrones, only footstools, and masters find themselves in the place of slaves, washing the filthy feet of the people over whom they have authority.¹⁵

Thatcher's argument is one of the rare occasions where a New Testament scholar attempts to come to terms with such language—and he takes seriously the postcolonial reading of John's Gospel by Stephen Moore.¹⁶ However, it is also noticeable that Thatcher cannot escape the language of "authority" in respect of Jesus. Even if Thatcher is right about the absence of someone to take the throne once the ruler of this world is cast out, this does not alleviate the issue of power, at least not in the potential receptions of John. Thatcher is aware of the problems of the uncontrollable nature of reception: "there can be little doubt that the Gospel of John has been read in support of imperial politics—Roman, European, and, more recently, American." But perhaps there are already issues of dominance and power present in the text of John as it stands. This seems clearer still in the case of John 5.1–18 where the Johannine Jesus is in dispute with "the Jews" who, we should recall, want to persecute and kill him because of his view of the Sabbath and because he was "calling God his own Father, thereby making himself equal to God" (John 5.18; cf. John 10.30–33). This may be the language of a

¹⁴ Bart D. Ehrman, *Jesus: Apocalyptic Prophet of the New Millennium* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 181.

¹⁵ Tom Thatcher, *Greater Than Caesar: Christology and Empire in the Fourth Gospel* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2009), 138.

¹⁶ Moore, *Empire and Apocalypse*.

relatively powerless group who, for all we know, may also have experienced some degree of persecution for their high Christological beliefs (cf. John 16.2). In line with Thatcher, it may even be the case that John looked to a peaceful future.

But what happens once the conflict between Jesus and “the Jews” in John 5.1–18 gets placed in a context of Christian power? We need only think of how re-reading this story in light of the history of European Jews might show how narrative power relations can be heightened in light of a change in material power relations.

A particularly apt example of reading John 5.1–18 in changing relations of imperial and material power has been discussed by Mary Huie-Jolly.¹⁷ Huie-Jolly illustrates how in light of the Anglo-Maori wars of the 1860s and early 1870s some indigenous Maori in New Zealand’s Bay of Plenty region began identifying with “the Jews” of John 5 because they were the hostile enemy of Jesus, and thus Christianity. A further reason for such identification with “the Jews” involved the idea of the Israelites as the chosen people who were presumed to be entitled to the land, rather than the Canaanite settlers, that is, the European settlers. This is, of course, a classic case of a resistance to colonialism and the undermining of traditional ways of life and land rights. But Huie-Jolly sees such issues as implicit in John’s argument as the Gospel: “[John] constructs a dominating Christology which has affinities with the universalizing claims of later colonialist Christianity.” In this respect, we might note the shift in John 5 from Jesus as one whom “the Jews” sought to kill (5.18) to the all-powerful judge (5.19–23). The decision to identify with “the Jews” of John 5 was, then, part of “a decision to ‘leave the way of the Son’ and to resist colonial domination.”¹⁸

Conclusion

Paul, or indeed Constantine, were not straightforwardly “betraying” the teaching of Jesus, even if most of the New Testament writers no doubt would have been unimpressed by their version of theocracy being co-opted by Rome. Imperialism, theocracy, empire, and, in modern terms, dictatorship, were as much a part of the Gospel tradition as was hope for the poor or the overthrow of the rich and the fall of Rome. The mimicking of one kingdom with another, one ruler with another, and one reward system with another only shows how the Gospel tradition is constrained by its imperial context. This is, as Roland Boer has pointed out (albeit himself someone who would embrace any potential “Stalinism” in the Gospels), “the tension between reaction and revolution that one so often finds with Christianity.”¹⁹ This is important for the topic that has been implicit throughout this chapter: the relationship to Palestinian resistance and universal emancipatory projects. Of course there are the major well-known issues of what comes

¹⁷ Mary Huie-Jolly, “Maori ‘Jews’ and a Resistant Reading of John 5.10–47,” in *John and Postcolonialism: Travel, Space and Power*, ed. Musa W. Dube and Jeffrey L. Staley (London: T & T Clark, 2002), 94–110.

¹⁸ Huie-Jolly, “Maori ‘Jews,’” 95–96.

¹⁹ Roland Boer, “Apocalyptic and Apocalypticism in the Poetry of E. P. Thompson,” *Spaces of Utopia* 7 (2009), 45, 50.

next—typically concerning the debates over a one- or two-state solution—which dwarfs the issues raised in this essay. But whether in exegesis, theology, or politics, the desire for dominance, power, and control remains strong. Exegetes should heed the warnings of Bakunin, Rocker, Luxemburg, Orwell, and Chomsky—for it is not clear that the Gospels are compatible with this strand of emancipatory thinking.

