

LAST WEEK

Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006),

1. **SUNDAY - The First Day in Jerusalem - Palm Sunday**

The last week of Jesus life is a week of extraordinary importance for Christians. With its climax on Good Friday and Easter, it is "Holy Week," the most sacred time of the Christian year.¹

The word "Passion" is from the Latin noun *passio*, meaning "suffering." But in everyday English we also use "passion" for any consuming interest, dedicated enthusiasm, or concentrated commitment. In this sense, a person's passion is what she or he is passionate about.²

The first passion of Jesus was the kingdom of God, namely, to incarnate the justice of God by demanding for all a fair share of a world belonging to and ruled by the covenantal God of Israel. It was that first passion for God's distributive justice that led inevitably to the second passion by Pilate's punitive (형벌의) justice.³

Before Jesus, after Jesus, and, for Christians, archetypically (전형적으로) in Jesus, those who live for nonviolent justice die all too often from violent justice. And so in this book we focus on "what Jesus was passionate about" as a way of understanding why his life ended in the passion of Good Friday. To narrow the passion of Jesus to his last twelve hours - arrest, trial, torture, and crucifixion - is to ignore the connection between his life and his death.⁴

This book tells and explains, against the background of Jewish highly-priestly collaboration with Roman imperial control, the last week of Jesus' life on earth as given in the Gospel According to Mark. Mark is chosen because it is the earliest gospel, the first narrative account of Jesus' final week. Written some forty years after the life of Jesus, Mark tells us how the story of Jesus was told around the year 70. ... Mark alone went out of his way to chronicle Jesus' last week on a day-by-day basis, while the others kept some but not all of those indications of time.⁵

| | |
|------------|---|
| Sunday: | "When they were approaching Jerusalem" (Mark 11:1) |
| Monday: | "On the following day" (11:12) |
| Tuesday: | "In the morning" (11:20) |
| Wednesday: | "It was two days before the Passover" (14:1) |
| Thursday: | "On the first day of Unleavened Bread" (14:12) |
| Friday: | "As soon as it was morning" (15: 1) |
| Saturday: | "The Sabbath" (15:42; 16:1) |
| Sunday: | "Very early on the first day of the week" (16:2) ⁶ |

Two processions entered Jerusalem on a spring day in the year of 30. It was the beginning of the week of Passover, the most sacred week of Jewish year. In the centuries since, Christians have celebrated this day as Palm Sunday, the first day of Holy Week. With its climax of Good Friday and Easter, it is the most sacred week of the Christian year.⁷

One was a peasant procession, the other an imperial procession. From the east, Jesus rode a donkey down the Mount Olives, cheered by his followers. Jesus was from the peasant village of Nazareth, his message was about the kingdom of God, and his followers came from the peasant class. They had journeyed to Jerusalem from Galilee, about a hundred

¹ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), viii.

² Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), viii.

³ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), viii.

⁴ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), viii.

⁵ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), viii-ix.

⁶ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), ix-x.

⁷ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 2.

miles to the north, a journey that is the central section and the central dynamic of Mark's gospel. Mark's story of Jesus and the kingdom of God has been aiming for Jerusalem, pointing toward Jerusalem. It has now arrived.⁸

On the opposite side of the city, from the west, Pontius Pilate, the Roman governor of Idumea, Judea, and Samaria, entered Jerusalem at the head of a column (종렬) of imperial cavalry (기병대) and soldiers. Jesus' procession proclaimed the kingdom of God; Pilate's proclaimed the power of empire. The two processions embody(구체화) the central conflict of the week that led to Jesus' crucifixion. Pilate's military procession was a demonstration of both Roman imperial power and Roman imperial theology. Though unfamiliar to most people today, the imperial procession was well known in the Jewish homeland in the first century. It was the standard practice of the Roman governors of Judea to be in Jerusalem for the major Jewish festivals. They did so not out of empathetic reverence for the religious devotion of their Jewish subjects, but to be in the city in case there was trouble. There often was, especially at Passover, a festival that celebrate the Jewish people's liberation from an earlier empire (from the Egyptian bondage).⁹

Pilate, like his predecessors and successors, went to Jerusalem. Imagine the imperial procession's arrival in the city. A visual panoply of imperial power cavalry on horses, foot soldiers, leather armor, helmets, weapons, banners, golden eagles mounted on poles, sun glinting on metal and gold. Sounds: the marching of feet, the creaking of leather, the clinking of bridles, the beating of drums. The swirling of dust. They eyes of the silent onlookers, some curious, some awed, some resentful.¹⁰

Pilate's procession displayed not only imperial power, but also Roman imperial theology. According to this theology, the emperor was not simply the ruler of Rome, but the Son of God. It began with the greatest of the emperors, Augustus, who ruled Rome from 31 BCE to 14 CE. His father was the god Apollo, who conceived him in his mother, Atia. Inscriptions refer to him as "son of God," "Lord " and "Savior," one who had brought "peace on earth." After his death, he was seen ascending into heaven to take his permanent place among gods. His successors continued to bear divine titles, including "Tiberius, emperor from 14 to 37 CE and thus emperor the time of Jesus' public activity. For Rome's Jewish subjects, Pilate's procession embodied not only a rival social order, but also a rival theology.¹¹ 로마황제가 하나님의 아들이라는 사상은 주전 31년 부터 14년까지 로마를 다스린 Augustus 황제 때 부터 시작되었다. 그의 아버지는 신 아폴로였는 그의 어머니 아티아가 그를 뱐다. 그의 비문에 "하나님의 아들, 주, 땅에 평화를 가져온 구세주"라고 적혀있다. 그가 죽은 후에 하늘로 승천해서 모든 신가운데 영원히 거한다고 했고, 예수님당시의 로마 황제였던 Tiberius 를 포함해서 그후의 계승자들도 같은 호칭을 가지게 되었다. 그래서 빌라도의 행렬은 사회질서와 신학에 있어서 까지 예수님의 경쟁상대였다.

It was an anti-imperial entrance affirming nonviolence that countered the violence-based triumphal entrance of imperial power, namely, of Pilate.¹²

As Mark tells the story in 11:1-11, it is a prearranged "counterprocession." Jesus planned it in advance. As Jesus approaches the city from the east at the end of the journey from Galilee, he tells two of his disciples to go to the next village and get him a colt they will find there, one that has never been ridden, that is, a young one. They do so, and Jesus rides the colt down the Mount of Olive to the city surrounded by a crowd of enthusiastic followers and sympathizers, who spread their cloaks, strew leafy branches on the road, and shout, "Hosanna ! Blessed is the one who come in the name of the Lord! Blessed is the coming kingdom of our ancestors David! Hosanna in the highest heaven!"¹³

The meaning of the demonstration is clear, for it uses symbolism from the prophet Zechariah in the Jewish bible. According to Zechariah, a king would be coming to Jerusalem (Zion) "humble, and riding on a colt, the foal of a donkey" (9:9). In Mark, the reference to Zechariah is implicit. Matthew, where he treats Jesus' entry into Jerusalem, makes the connection explicit by quoting the passage: "Tell the daughter of Zion, look, your king is coming to you, humble, and mounted on a donkey, and on a colt, the foal of a donkey (Matt. 21:5, quoting Zech. 9:9). The rest of the Zechariah passage details what *kind* of king he will be:

He will cut off the chariot from Ephraim and the war-horse from Jerusalem;
the battle bow shall be cut off, and he shall command peace to the nations (9:10).

and

⁸ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 2.

⁹ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 2.

¹⁰ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006),3.

¹¹ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006),3.

¹² Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 111.

¹³ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006),4.

This king, riding on a donkey, will banish war from the land - no more chariots, war-horses, or bows.

Commanding peace to the **nations**, he will be a king of peace. ¹⁴ Here "the nations" are the gentile nations, especially by the gentile empires that had ruled over the Jewish people. ¹⁵ **Jesus' procession** deliberately countered what was happening on the other side of the city. **Pilate's** procession embodied the power, glory, and violence of the empire that ruled the world. **Jesus' procession** embodied an alternative vision, the kingdom of God.

This contrast - between the kingdom of God and the kingdom of Caesar - is central not only to the gospel of Mark, but to the story of Jesus and early Christianity. ¹⁶

The confrontation between these two kingdom continues through the last week of Jesus' life. As we all know, the week ends with Jesus' execution by the powers who ruled his world. Holy Week is the story of this confrontation. But before we unfold Mark's story of Jesus' last week, we must first set the stage. For this, Jerusalem is central. ¹⁷

JERUSALEM

Jerusalem was not just any city. By the first century, it had been the center of the sacred geography of the Jewish people for a millennium. And ever since, it has been central to the sacred imagination of both Jews and Christians. Its associations are both positive and negative. It is the city of God and the faithless city, the city of hope and the city of oppression, the city of joy and the city of pain. 예루살렘은 그냥 도시가 아니었다. 천년간 유대인의 성지였습니다. 그 후 예루살렘은 유대인과 기독교인들에게도 성스러운 환상의 도시였다. 그러나 그 도시는 하나님의 도성이면서 불성실한 도시였고, 소망의 도시이면서 압박의 도시였고, 환희의 도시이면서 고통을 주는 도시였다고 학자들은 말한다. ¹⁸

Jerusalem became the capital of ancient Israel in the time of King David, around 1000 BCE. David's reign in particular was seen not only as a time of power and glory, but also of justice and righteousness in the land. David was the just and righteous king. He became associated with goodness, power, protection, and justice; he was the ideal shepherd-king, the apple of God's eye, even God's son. The time of glory, the ideal time, was remembered. So revered did David become that the hoped-for future deliverer, the messiah, was expected to be a "son of David," a new David, indeed greater than David. And this new David, this son of David, would rule a restored kingdom from Jerusalem. ¹⁹ Jerusalem was thus associated with Israel's hope of future glory - a glory involving justice and peace as much or more than it involved power. ²⁰

David's son Solomon built the temple in Jerusalem in the 900s BCE. It became the sacred center of Jewish world. Within the theology that developed around it, it was the "navel of the earth" connecting this world to its source in God, and here (and only here) was God's dwelling place on earth. Of course, ancient Israel also affirmed that God was everywhere. Heaven and the highest heaven could not contain God, and God's glory filled the earth, but God was especially present in the temple. To be in the temple was to be in God's presence. 솔로몬왕이 지은 예루살렘 성전은 하나님의 지상의 거처이고, 하나님께서 그 성전안에 항상 계셔서 그 성전에 들어감은 하나님의 면전으로 들어가는 것으로 생각했다. ²¹

But Jerusalem the city of God also acquired negative associations, because, beginning in the half century after King David, it became the center of "domination system. The phrase "domination system" is shorthand for the most common form of social system - away of organizing a society - in ancient and premodern times, that is, preindustrial agrarian

¹⁴ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 4.

¹⁵ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 217.

¹⁶ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 4.

¹⁷ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 5.

¹⁸ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 5.

¹⁹ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 5.

²⁰ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 6.

²¹ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 6.

societies. It names a social system marked by three major features: 1) Political oppression. In such societies the many were ruled by the few, the powerful and wealthy elites; the monarchy, nobility, aristocracy, and their associates. Ordinary people had no voice in the shaping of the society. 2) Economic exploitation. A high percentage of the society's wealth went into the coffers of the wealthy and powerful - between one-half and two-thirds of it. They managed to do so through the structure and laws about land ownership, taxation, indenture of labor through debt, and so forth. 그러나 예루살렘은 부정적 연관성도 얻었으니 이는 "지배체제"가 되었기 때문이었다. 이 체제는 다음의 세가지가 그 중심을 이룬다: 1) 첫째는 정치적 압박 Political oppression. 소수의 권력가진 부자층이 다수를 다스리고 일반백성은 목소리를 못내는 제도. 2) 둘째는 경제적 착취: 사회의 2/3의 부는 토지소유권, 세금제도, 부채를 통한 노동계약서 같은 법을 만들어서 합법적으로 부당하게 재물은 부자와 권력가들의 손으로 들어가게 했다. ²²

3). Religious legitimation. These societies, these systems were legitimated, or justified, with religious language. The people were told the king ruled by divine right, the king was the Son of God, the social order reflected the will of God, the powers that be were ordained by God. Of course, religion sometimes became the source of protest against these claims. In most premodern societies known to us, religion has been used to legitimize the place of the wealthy and powerful in the social order over which they preside. 3) 셋째는 종교적 합법화였다: 위의 억압적이고 착취하는 제도는 종교가 합법화해 주었다. 잉금은 하나님의 아들이고 사회의 질서는 하나님의 뜻을 반영한다고 하고복종을 강요. ²³

Under David's son and successor of Solomon, power and wealth were increasingly concentrated in Jerusalem. In effect, Solomon had become a new Pharaoh and Egypt had been recreated in Israel. 다윗의 아들 솔로몬과 솔로몬의 후계자들 밑에서 권력과 재물은 집중적으로 예루살렘에 모이게 되게 되고 결과적으로 솔로몬은 새로운 바로가 되고 애굽이 이사라엘에 재 창조되었다. ²⁴

It was the form of social system confronted by Jesus and early Christianity. 예수님과 초대교회는 이런 사회제도에 대결하였다. ²⁵

As the home of monarchy aristocracy, of wealth and power, Jerusalem became the center of injustice and of betrayer of God's covenant. God's passion for justice had been replaced by human injustice. Prophet Micah, an eighth-century BCE prophet, indicts Jerusalem: What is the sin of Judah? "Is it not Jerusalem?" (1:5). The sin of Judah is a *city*, indeed the city of God. His indictment of the rulers is explicit:

Listen, you heads of Jacob and rulers of the house of Israel! Should you not know justice?-
you who hate the good and love the evil, who tear the skin off my people, and the flesh off their
bones ...Here this, you rulers .. who abhor justice and pervert all equity, who build Zion with blood and
Jerusalem with wrong (3: 1-2, 9-10). ²⁶

In the same century, the prophet **Isaiah** indicted the rulers of Jerusalem as "rulers of Sodom" and its

inhabitants as "people of Gomorrah," two ancient cities legendary for their injustice (1:10). His language is shocking and harsh:

How the faithful city has become a whore! She that was full of justice, righteousness lodged in her - but now murderers! ... You princes are rebels and companions of thieves. Everyone loves a bribe and runs after gifts. They do not defend the orphan, and the widow's cause does not come before them (1: 21, 23). ²⁷

Jeremiah also indicted: "This is the city that must be punished; there is nothing but oppression within her (5:1; 7:11; 6:6). ²⁸

²² Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 7.

²³ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 8.

²⁴ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 8.

²⁵ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 9.

²⁶ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 9.

²⁷ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 9.

Yet even among the prophets who indicted it so sharply, Jerusalem also retained positive associations as the city of God and city of hope (Isa. 2:2-3; 2:4; Micah 4:1-3; 4:4).

JERUSALEM IN THE CENTURIES BEFORE JESUS

Jerusalem was conquered by the Babylonians in 586 BCE. The city and temple were destroyed, and many of the Jewish survivors of the war were taken into exile in Babylon, where they lived in conditions of virtual slavery. It looked like the end of the Jewish people. But even in exile, the yearning for Jerusalem remained. In ps. 137 are poignant words filled with grief and resolve:

By the rivers of Babylon, there we sat down and there we wept when we remembered Zion..... .. our captors asked us for songs ... How could we sing the Lord's song in a foreign land?²⁹

After about fifty years in exile, the Jewish people were permitted to return to their homeland. In the late 500s, within a few decades of their return, they rebuilt the temple.³⁰

For several centuries Judea with its capital in Jerusalem was ruled by foreign empires. Under the Persian Empire and its Hellenistic successors, the temple in Jerusalem was the center of local government in Judea. The high priest and the temple authorities were in effect the rulers of the Jewish people, though of course they owed allegiance and tribute to their imperial overlords. This state of affairs continued into the second century BCE, when the Jewish people gained their independence from Hellenistic empire of Antiochus Epiphanes around 164 BCE. The successful revolt was led by a Jewish family known as Maccabees. Also known as the Hasmoneans, they ruled the Jewish homeland from Jerusalem for about a hundred years, until it fell under the control of Rome in 63BCE.³¹

After abolishing the Jewish monarchy, Rome initially ruled through the high priest, the temple, and a local aristocracy centered in the temple. This was Rome's traditional practice throughout its territory; appointing local collaborators from the indigenous population to rule on Rome's behalf. The primary qualification was wealth - Rome trusted wealthy families. These local collaborators were given a relatively free hand in their rule of their population, so long as they were loyal to Rome and maintained order. There was one additional condition: they were responsible for collecting and paying the annual tribute owed to Rome.³²

However, in the decades after Rome took control of the Jewish homeland, there were power struggles among the Jewish aristocratic families, and so Rome appointed as king of the Jews a man named Herod, an Idumean whose family had only recently converted to Judaism. Herod had a long reign, until 4 BCE, and eventually became known to history as Herod the Great.³³

Herod was a man of great ability, though ruthless. Early in his reign, he ordered the execution of many of the traditional aristocracy in order to secure himself against power struggles and also perhaps to confiscate their land and wealth. Though according to Jewish law, the high priest was to serve for life, Herod appointed and deposed even high priests during his thirty-three years as king. He restricted their role to their narrowly religious functions in the temple.³⁴

He rebuilt temple and a luxurious palace for himself. To pay for the building projects and his opulent life style, and to collecting taxes and pay tribute to Rome he extorted from wealthy families. Herod was not popular with many Jews. Some called him "Herod the Monstrous." He was profligate in his spending, brutal in his oppression, when he died in 4 BCE, revolts erupted throughout his kingdom. It was so serious that in Galilee, the Romans burned and destroyed the city of Sephoris, four miles from Nazareth, and sold many survivors into slavery. After Jerusalem was retaken, the Romans crucified two thousand of its defenders en masse. The suppression of the revolts of 4 BCE was the first direct Jewish experience of Roman military power in several decades. Herod had ruled the whole of the Jewish homeland.

²⁸ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 10.

²⁹ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 12.

³⁰ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 12.

³¹ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 12.

³² Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 12-13.

³³ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 13.

³⁴ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 13.

After his death, Rome divided his kingdom into three parts, each ruled by one of his sons. Galilee and trans-Jordanian Perea were assigned to Herod Antipas, the area northeast of the Jordan to Philip, and Judea and Samaria to Archelaus. But in 6 CE, Rome removed Archelaus from his throne and began to rule his portion of Herod's kingdom with governors sent from Rome.³⁵

JERUSALEM IN THE FIRST CENTURY

The events of 6 CE significantly changed political circumstances for Jerusalem and the temple. Rome assigned the role of local administration to the temple and its authorities. Though the temple had always been religiously important, it now became the central economic and political institution in the country. the temple Herodian rule as the center of the local domination system. The temple was the center of local collaboration with Rome. It had the defining features of ancient domination system: *rule by a few, economic exploitation, and religious legitimation*. And it was a two-layered domination system: the local domination system centered in the temple was subsumed under the imperial domination system that was Roman rule. As such, it owed "tribute" to the emperor, both loyalty and money, and was thus a tributary domination system. 제 일세기 예루살렘에는 많은 변화가 있었다. 유다의 점령군인 로마는 유다의 지역 행정권을 예루살렘 성전지도자들에게 맡겼다. 항상 종교적으로 귀중했던 이제 예루살렘 성전은 이제 경제, 정치의 중심단체가 되어버렸다. 지역 통치체제의 중심부가 된 것이다. 예루살렘 성전은 로마협력자/압잡이의 중심부가 되어버렸다. 소수가 다스리고, 경제적 착취, 종교적 합법화등을 그대로 받아드리는 고대의 통치체제가 되었다. 소수가 유다를 통치했으니 그들은 성전의 권력자들이었다. 로마의 통치밑에 성전 통치가 이루어진 2 중통치체제가 되었다. 로마황제에게 조공과 충성을 바치는 속국이 된 것이다.³⁶

The few who ruled at the top of the local system were the temple authorities, headed by the high priest, including members of aristocratic families. Mark's terminology for the temple authorities is "the chief priests, the elders, and the scribes" (e.g. 14:35)³⁷

With regard to *economic* conditions, the temple authorities, priestly and lay, came from wealth families, many of whom were large landowners. Even many high-priestly families owned land, despite the Jewish law's prohibition of ownership of land by priests. Because they lived in Jerusalem away from their lands, they were also absentee landlords. In order to accumulate land, the wealthy, whether lay or priestly, had to subvert laws about land in the Jewish Bible. Among those laws was one that said agricultural land could not be bought or sold. The reason for the law was to try to ensure that every family had its own plot of land in perpetuity. Thus land could be acquired only by confiscation, which occurred in at least two forms. First, land could be confiscated by a king. Herod had large "royal states," royal lands, and presumably he didn't buy all these. He also gave land to the new elites he created. Indeed, having land is what made them elite. The second form of land acquisition by confiscating was foreclosure because of debt. Though land could not be bought or sold, it could be used as collateral for a loan. Then, if the loan was not repaid, the land could be confiscated. These are the two primary way that powerful and wealthy elites acquired land and thus more wealth. The reign of Herod brought an explosion of large estates and concentration of wealth and many peasants were displaced and the conditions of peasant life were worsening. Peasants who had owned their own land became tenant farmers or sharecroppers. Landless peasants had few options: day labor, emigration, working on building projects in a city, begging.³⁸

³⁵ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 14-15.

³⁶ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 15..

³⁷ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 16.

³⁸ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 16-17.

Jerusalem was not only the home of large landowners who received wealth from their estates. **The temple was the center of both a local and an imperial tax system.** The local taxes, commonly called "tithes," were on agricultural production. The tithes amounted to over 20 percent of production. Beginning in the 6 CE, the temple and **temple authorities were also the center of imperial tax system.** They had the responsibility for collecting and paying the annual tribute to Rome. Also, as the economic center of the domination system, records of debts were stored in the temple. 성전은 유다의 세금과 로마제국의 세금제도의 중심부다 되었다. ³⁹

The temple's role as the center of domination system was legitimated by theology: Its place in the system was said to have been given by God. This is the Jerusalem that Jesus entered on Palm Sunday. His message was deeply critical of **the temple and its role in the domination system collaborating with an** imperial domination system. Among other voices were the Essenes. They rejected the legitimacy of the present temple and priesthood. Much of the passion of violent Jewish revolutionary movement was directed against Jerusalem and the temple because of its collaboration with the domination system. The great Jewish revolt that broke out in 66 CE was directed as much against the Jewish collaborators in Jerusalem as it was against Rome itself. ⁴⁰

Like John the Baptizer, Jesus pronounced forgiveness of apart from temple sacrifice. In Mark 2, Jesus forgives the sins of a paralyzed man and empowered him to walk. Some scribes object to his action because God has provided a way to forgive sins through temple sacrifice. Here Jesus, like John, proclaimed forgiveness apart from the temple. **This means that John and Jesus deny the temple's role as the essential mediator of forgiveness and access to God.** ⁴¹

Jerusalem and the temple did not survive the first century. In the year 70 CE, Roman legions shattered the great revolt by reconquering the city. They tore down the temple. The destruction of the temple changed Judaism forever. Sacrifice ceased, the role of the priesthood was eclipsed, and the central institutions of Judaism became scripture and synagogue. The Gospel of Mark was written very near the time of the temple's destruction. ⁴²

JERUSALEM IN THE GOSPEL OF MARK

According to Mark, Jesus' core message is "Repent and believe in the good news" (1:15). **The word "repent" has two meanings, both quite different from the later Christian meaning of contrition of sin. From the Hebrew Bible, it has the meaning of "to return," especially "to return from exile," an image also associated with "way," "path," and "journey."** The roots of the Greek word for **"repent"** mean "to go beyond the mind that you have." To repent is to embark upon a way that goes beyond the mind that you have. So also the word **"believe"** has a meaning quite different from the common Christian understanding. For Christians, "to believe" often means thinking that a set of statement, a set of doctrines, is true. But the ancient meaning of the word "believe" has much more to do with trust and commitment. **"To believe in the good news,"** as Mark puts it, means **to trust in the news that the kingdom of God is near and to commit to that kingdom.** ⁴³

To whom did Jesus direct his message about the kingdom of God and the "way"? Primarily to *peasants*. As we use the term, it is a large social category that includes not only agricultural laborers, but the rural population as a whole in preindustrial agrarian societies. About 90 percent of the population was rural, living on farms or in hamlets, villages, and small towns. Jesus seldom went to large cities. He stayed in the region of Galilee. Instead, Jesus speaks in the countryside and in small towns like Capernaum, because Jesus saw his message as to and for peasants. Jesus' message

³⁹ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 18.

⁴⁰ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 20.

⁴¹ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 21.

⁴² Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 22.

⁴³ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 25.

and activity immediately involved him in conflict with authorities. His opponents were scribes, Pharisees, and Herodians (2:1-36).⁴⁴

- Jesus' journey from Galilee to Jerusalem.
- Following Jesus means following him *on the way*.
- *The way* leads to Jerusalem.
- Jerusalem is the place of *confrontation with the authorities*.
- Jerusalem is the place of *death and resurrection*.

On the way to Jerusalem, Jesus told his disciples what it means to go to Jerusalem. It means death. He said "If any want to become my followers, let them deny themselves and take up their cross and follow me (8:34). In the first century Christianity, **the cross** had a twofold meaning. On the one hand, it **represented execution by the empire**; only the empire crucified, and then for only one crime; denial of imperial authority. The cross had not yet become a generalized symbol for suffering as it sometimes is today, when one's illness or other hardship can be spoken of as "the cross I've been given to bear." Rather, **it meant risking imperial retribution**. On the other hand, **the cross** by the time of Mark's gospel had also become a **symbol for the "way or the "path" of death and resurrection, of entering new life by dying to an old life**. The cross as the "way" of transformation is found in Paul, and it is also present in Mark. Mark wants us to understand that **the way of the cross is the path of personal transformation** (9:23).⁴⁵

Jesus asked, "what were you arguing about *on the way*?" They argued about **who among them was the greatest**. Jesus said, "Whoever wants to be first must be last of all and servant of all" (9:33-35). The contrast of first and last correlates with another paradoxical contrast in the teaching of Jesus: Those who exalt themselves will be humbled, and those who humble themselves will be exalted. Those who puff themselves up, make something great of themselves, will be humiliated. And those who humble themselves, who make themselves empty, will be filled, exalted (Matt. 23:12). This is the way of following Jesus.⁴⁶

What it means to follow Jesus: James and John, two of the inner circle of his followers, ask for place of honor in the kingdom they believe is coming. Jesus responds, "Are you able to drink the *cup* that I drink, or be baptized with the *baptism* that I am baptized with? (10:38). Both cup and baptism are images of death. Later in Mark, as Jesus faces his own death, he speaks of it as his "cup" (14:36). And baptism in early Christianity was seen as a ritual enactment of dying and rising. Jesus' question means, "Are you willing to follow me on the path of death and resurrection."⁴⁷

As Jesus passes through Jericho and nears Jerusalem, Bartimaeus, a blind beggar, beseeches Jesus: "My teacher, let me see again. "Immediately he **regained his sight and followed Jesus on the way** (8:22-26; 10: 46-52). The framing is deliberate, the meaning is clear: *to see* means to see that *the way* involves following Jesus to Jerusalem.⁴⁸

Thus we have the **twofold theme** that leads to Palm Sunday. Genuine discipleship, following Jesus, means following him to Jerusalem, the place of (1) confrontation with the domination system and (2) death and resurrection. These are the two themes of the week that follows, Holy Week. Indeed, these are the two themes of Lent and of the Christian life.⁴⁹

We must understand Jesus within Judaism, not against Judaism. Jesus was a *part* of Judaism, not *apart* from Judaism. Jesus was not against Judaism. The conflict is also not about priests and sacrifice. Jesus' protest was against a domination system legitimated in the name of God, and domination system radically different from what the already present and coming kingdom of God, the dream of God, would be like. It was not Jesus against Judaism, or Judaism against Jesus. Rather, his was a Jewish voice, one of several first-century Jewish voices, about what loyalty to God of Judaism meant. And for Christians, he is the decisive Jewish voice.⁵⁰

⁴⁴ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 26.

⁴⁵ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 28.

⁴⁶ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 28.

⁴⁷ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 29.

⁴⁸ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 30.

⁴⁹ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 30.

⁵⁰ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 30.

Two processions entered Jerusalem on the day. The same question, the same alternative, faces those who would be faithful to Jesus today. Which procession are we in? Which procession do we want to be in? This is the question of Palm Sunday and of the week that is about to unfold.⁵¹

2. **MONDAY - Second Day**

Scripture Text: Mark 11: 15-18

15. Then they came to Jerusalem. And he entered the temple and began to drive out those who were selling and those who were buying in the temple, and he overturned the tables of the money changers and the seats of those who sold doves;

16. and he would not allow anyone to carry anything through the temple. 17. He was teaching and saying, "Is it not written, 'My house shall be called a house of prayer for all the nations'? But you have made it a den of robbers." 18. And when the chief priests and the scribes heard it, they kept looking for a way to kill him; for they were afraid of him, because the whole crowd was spellbound by his teaching.

There is no reason to think that Jesus' action in the temple was caused by any rejection of blood sacrifice or, had anything to do with sacrifice as such.⁵²

Theme: Temple Incident 성전에서 일어난 사건

Prophet's indictment:

⁵¹ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 30.

⁵² Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 38.

*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,
and if you do not go after other gods to your own hurt,
then I will dwell with you in this place, in the land that I gave of old to your ancestors forever and ever Has
this house, which is called by my name, become a den of robbers in your sight?
(Jer. 7:5-7, 11)*

In that context the meaning of the phrase "den of robbers" is very clear.

- **The people's everyday injustice makes them robbers, and**
- **they think the temple is their safe house, den, hideaway, or place of security.**
- **The temple is not the place where the robbery occurs, but the place the robbers go for refuge.... God repeatedly said, "I reject your worship because of your lack of justice," but never, ever, ever, "I reject your justice because of your lack of worship."⁵³**

강도들의 소굴: 사람들의 불의한 일상생활이 사람을 도둑으로 만든다. 성전에서 강도질이 행해지는 것이 아니라 도둑들은 성전을 자기들이 안전하게 숨는 장소, 소굴, 은신처로 생각했다. 하나님은 "정의를 행치 않기 때문에 너희들의 예배를 거부하신다; 찬양과 기도와 찬양과 집회 모두를 거부하신다" 고 누누히 말씀하셨다 (렘 7:5-7, 11; 암 5:21-24; 미 6:6-8; 사 1:11-17).

I hate, I despise your festivals, and I take no delight in your solemn assemblies. Even though you offer me your burnt offerings and grain offerings, I will not accept them; and the offerings of well-being of your fatted animals I will not look upon. Take away from me the noise of your songs; I will not listen to the melody of your harps. But let justice roll down like waters, and righteousness like an ever-flowing stream. (Amos 5:21-24).⁵⁴

I desire steadfast love and not sacrifice, the knowledge of God rather than burnt offerings (Hos. 6:6)

What shall I come before the Lord, and bow myself before God on high? Shall I come before him with burnt offerings, with calves a year old? Will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rams, with ten thousands of rivers of oil? Shall I give my firstborn for my transgressions, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul? He has told you, O mortal, what is good; and what does the Lord require of you but to do justice, and to love kindness, and to walk humbly with your God? (Mic. 6:6-8)

What to me is the multitude of your sacrifices? says the Lord: I have had enough of burnt offerings of rams and the fat of fed beasts; I do not delight in the blood of bulls, or of lambs, or of goats. when you stretch your hands, I will hide my eyes from you; even though you make many prayers. I will not listen; your hands are full of blood. Wash yourselves; make yourselves clean; remove the evil of your doings from before my eyes; cease to do evil, learn to do good; seek justice, rescue the oppressed, defend the orphan, plead for the widow. (Is. 1:11-17)⁵⁵

- Since God is justice and the world belongs to God, worship cannot be separated from justice because worship or union with a God of justice empowers the worshipper for a life of justice.
- Jeremiah utters a terrible *threat* in the name of God. What will happen if worship in the house of God continues as a substitute for justice in the land of God?
예배와 정의: 하나님은 정의이시 때문에 예배는 정의에서 분리될 수가 없다. 왜냐하면 사람들은 예배에서 하나님과 연합되고 정의로운 생을 살게된다.
- This is what will happen:

⁵³ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 44.

⁵⁴ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 44.

⁵⁵ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 45.

I spoke to you persistently, you did not listen, and when I called you, you did not answer, therefore, 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 (Jer. 7:12-14).

- Shiloh, which was later destroyed by the Philistines.⁵⁶
- What does it mean that Jesus has interrupted the temple's perfectly legitimate sacrificial and fiscal activities? It means that Jesus *has shut down the temple*. But it is a symbolic rather than a literal "shutdown."⁵⁷
- It is recorded in Matthew 11:17: "He was teaching and saying, 'Is it not written, "My house shall be called a house of prayer for all the nation"? But you have made it a den of robbers.'" Source of house of prayer comes from Isaiah. 56:7; for the den of robbers from Jeremiah 7:11. "Robbery" refers to what is going on in the outer Court of the Gentiles - the changing of money and the selling of animals. From the quotation's context in Jeremiah 7 and 26, a "den" is a hideaway, a safe house, a refuge. It is not where robbers rob, but where they flee for safety after having done their robbing elsewhere.⁵⁸

내집은 기도하는 집:

기도하는 집이란 말은 사 56:7 에서 왔고, 도둑의 소굴이란 말은 렘 7:11 에서 온 말이다. "도둑"이란 말은 돈을 바꾸어 주는 일, 동물을 파는 일등 이방인이 모이는 성전 밖알뜰에서 일어나는 일들을 이른다. 렘 7 장과 27 장의 상황에서 "소굴"은 "숨는곳, 안전한 곳, 피란처"를 말한다. 이곳은 도둑들이 강도질을 하는 곳이 아니라 강도들이 다른 곳에서 강도질을 하고 피신하여 숨는 곳이란 뜻이다.

There is nothing wrong with prayer and sacrifice - they are commanded in Torah. That is not the problem. But God is a God of justice and righteousness and when worship substitutes for justice, God rejects God's temple - or for us today, God's church.⁵⁹

기도나 희생제물을 바치는 일이 잘못되었거나 문제된 것이 아니다. 이는 오히려 명한일이기 때문이다. 그러나 하나님은 정의로우시고 공의로우신 분이시 때문에 예배가 정의를 대신한다고 생각했을 때 하나님은 그 당시의 성전을, 그리고 오늘의 교회를 거부하신다는 뜻이다.

Herod the Great undertook two of the greatest construction project of his time. .. one of them was the new Court of Gentiles separated from that of the Jews. Therefore, in 30 CE neither Jesus nor anyone else could stand where the money changers sat and the pure animals were sold and say that the temple was not open to all people, that it was not "a house of prayer for all the nations."⁶⁰

헤롯대제는 자기 당대에 두개의 큰 건축을 완성하게 되었는데 그중의 하나가 유대인들이 예배를 드리는 [안]뜰과 구별되는 새로운 이방인의 [밖알] 뜰을 건축하는 일이었다. 그래서 30 년경에는 예수님이건, 그 누구도 돈을 바꿔주는 사람들이 앉고, 동물을 파는 그 곳에 들어갈 수가 없었고, 그 [밖알] 뜰은 모든사람에게 열려있는 곳이 아니고 "만민이 와서 기도하는 곳이 아니다"라고 했다.

The word translated in the Greek of Jeremiah 7:11 and Mark 11:17 as "robbers" is actually *lestes*. The term more properly means "bandit," "brigand," "rebel," or any form of armed resistance to established control. For some Jews under imperial control, *lestes* might designate a freedom fighter, but for all Romans it meant an insurgent.⁶¹

렘 7:11 과 막 11:17 에 사용된 "도둑"이란 단어는 레스테스(*lestes*)였다. 이 단어의 뜻은 "산적, 도둑, 모반자," 혹은 정착된 지배에 대해 무력으로 저항하는자들을 의미했다. 로마제국의 제재하에서 어떤유대인들에게는 레스테스 (*lestes*)가 해방투쟁가를 의미했으나 모든 로마인에게는 폭도를 의미했다.

⁵⁶ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 44.

⁵⁷ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 48.

⁵⁸ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 49.

⁵⁹ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 49.

⁶⁰ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 50.

⁶¹ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 51.

Jesus' action entering Jerusalem on a donkey and incident at the temple - these action-word combinations proclaim the *already present* Kingdom of God against both the *already present* Jewish high-priestly collaboration. Jerusalem had to be retaken by a nonviolent messiah rather than by a violent revolution, and the temple ritual had to empower justice rather than excuse one from it. What is involved for Jesus is an absolute criticism not only of violent domination, but of any religious collaboration with it. In that criticism, he stands *with* the prophets of Israel such as Zechariah for the anti-imperial entry against violence and Jeremiah for the anti-temple action against injustice, but he also stands *against* those forms of Christianity that were used throughout the centuries to support imperial violence and injustice.⁶²

3. **TUESDAY the Third day. (March 11)**

Mark 12: 13-17 Paying taxes (P. 60-65)

Issue with the understanding the question: "Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's" was understood as a solemn statement about the relationship between civil and religious authority, between politics and religion, or, in Christian terms, between "church and state." It has been most commonly understood to mean that there are two separate realms of human life, one religious and one political. In the first, we are to "render to God," and in the second, we are to "render to Caesar."⁶³

What this means in practice has varied considerably. It has been understood to mean absolute obedience to the state, notoriously by the majority of German Christians during the Hitler years. But the attitude is far more common. Long before the modern era, monarchs and their supporters used this verse to legitimate their authority: their subjects were to obey them because Jesus said that their political obligation belonged to the ruler's realm. More recently, many American Christians used it during the civil rights era to criticize acts of civil disobedience. This verse, they argued, means that we are to be obedient to civil authority, even if we might also want to modify its laws.⁶⁴ Other Christians do not argue for absolute obedience to government,

⁶² Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 53.

⁶³ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 61.

⁶⁴ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 61.

regardless of its character, but nevertheless think that the verse does not mean that religious obligation and political obligation are basically separate.⁶⁵

Who were trapping Jesus?: [In the narrative], people identified as "some Pharisees" and "some Herodians" are sent to Jesus by the authorities. The Pharisees were a Jewish movement committed to an intensification of traditional religious practices, including Sabbath observance and purity laws. Not only were these part of the covenant with God given to Moses at Mt. Sinai, but they were a form of resistance to assimilation to Hellenistic and Roman cultural imperialism. Though we know very little about the Herodians, they were, as the name implies, supporters of the Herods, the royal family of client-ruler appointed by Rome. In his gospel (3:6; 8:15), Mark reports that these two groups were allied with each other and in league with the authorities.⁶⁶

Tax to Rome by Jews: They ask Jesus a question intended to trap him. Is it lawful to pay taxes to the emperor or not? Is it lawful to pay taxes to Caesar? "Should we pay them, or should we not?" It was a volatile question. Ever since the Jewish homeland had been added to the Roman Empire in 63 BCE, Rome had required a large annual "tribute" from the Jewish people. Rome did not collect tribute directly from its individual subjects. Rather, local authorities were responsible for its payment and collection (and in our passage, it is they who send the Pharisees and Herodians to Jesus).⁶⁷

Though tribute included the per capita, or "head," tax levied on all adult Jewish men, the annual due to Rome included much more. Most of this was gathered through taxes on land and agricultural production. All of this together contributed to "tribute" to Rome. It was the way the empire profited its possessions. Roman taxation was onerous not only because it was economically burdensome. It also symbolized the Jewish homeland's lack of sovereignty. It underlined the oppression of the Jews by an alien lord, as the word "tribute" itself suggests.⁶⁸

What was the trap?: The spokesmen of the authorities set the trap skillfully. Either answer would get Jesus in trouble. If Jesus were to answer no, he could be charged with advocating denial of Roman authority - in short, with sedition. If he were to answer yes, he risked discrediting himself with the crowd, who for both economic and religious reasons resented Roman rule and taxation. Most likely, this was the primary purpose of the question: to separate Jesus from the crowd by leading him into an unpopular response.⁶⁹

Jesus' Response and His countertrap: Jesus' response is masterful. He turns the situation back on his opponents. He sets a countertrap when he asks to see a denarius. A denarius was a silver coin equal to approximately a day's wage. His interrogators produce one. Jesus looks at it and then asks, "Whose head is this, and whose title?" Or in the words of an older translation, "Whose image and inscription is this?" We all know their answer: "The emperor's." Jesus' strategy has led his questioners to disclose to the crowd that they have a coin with Caesar's image on it. In this moment, they are discredited. Why? In the Jewish homeland in the first century, there were two types of coins. One type, because of the Jewish prohibition of graven images, had no human or animal images. The second type (including Roman coinage) had images. Many Jews would not carry or use coins of the second type. But Jesus' interrogators in the story did. The coin they produced had Caesar's image along with the standard and idolatrous inscription heralding Caesars as divine and Son of God.

⁶⁵ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 62.

⁶⁶ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 62.

⁶⁷ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 63.

⁶⁸ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 63.

⁶⁹ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 63

They are exposed as part of the politics of collaboration. Jesus' rhetorical strategy is brilliant : their trap has been evaded, his own countertrap set and sprung.⁷⁰

Thus, even before the famous words about rendering to Caesar, Jesus has won the encounter. His response is in two parallel halves:

1. Give to the emperor the things that are emperor's.
2. Give to God the things that are God's.

Following immediately upon the disclosure that they are carrying a coin with Caesar's image, the first half of the saying means simply, "It's Caesar's coin - give it back to him." This is in effect a nonanswer to the larger question, "Should we pay taxes to Caesar?" It cannot be seen as an endorsement of paying taxes to Rome or Rome's rule. If Jesus had wanted to say, "Pay taxes to Caesar," he could simply have answered yes to their question. There would have been no need for the scene with the coin, the central elements of the story.⁷¹

The nonanswer is not simply a dismissal of the issue, however. **The second half of Jesus' response is both evocative and provocative.** "Give to God the things that are God's." It raises the question, "What belongs to Caesar, and what belongs to God?" For Jesus and many of his Jewish contemporaries, everything belongs to God. So their sacred scripture affirmed. The land of Israel belongs to God - recall Leviticus 25:23, which says that all are tenant farmers or resident aliens on land that belong to God. .. The vineyard belongs to God, not to the local collaborators, not to Rome. Indeed, the whole earth belongs to God: "The earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof" (Ps. 14:1). What belongs to Caesar? The implication is, nothing.⁷²

Scripture Text: Mark 12:28-34 (Matt. 22:34-40; Luke 10:25-28)

The Great Commandment

- One of the scribes asked Jesus "Which commandment is the first of all?" Jesus answered, "The first is, 'You shall love your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your mind, and with all your strength.' The second is this, 'You shall love your neighbor as yourself.' There is no other commandment greater than these." Then the scribe said, "this is much more important than all whole burnt offerings and sacrifices." Jesus responded, "You are not far from the kingdom of God." (Mark 12:28-34).
- "Which commandment is the first of all? It's an important question. What is most central? What matters most?"
- According to a story reported in the Talmud, A Gentile asked two of the best-known Pharisaic teachers in the first century, Shammai and Hillel, to teach him the whole of the Torah. Hillel responded, "What is hateful to you, do not do to your neighbor. That is the whole Torah, while the rest is commentary thereon; go and learnt it." Jesus quoted the text "You shall love the Lord your

⁷⁰ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 64.

⁷¹ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 64.

⁷² Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 65.

God with all your heart, with all your soul, and with all your mind, and with all your strength" from Deut. 6:5-6. Jews recited this text twice daily during morning and evening prayers. Jesus quoted a second passage, from Leviticus (19:18); "You shall love your neighbors as yourself." ⁷³

- The twofold great commandment - to love God and love our neighbor - is so familiar to us that it has become a Christian cliché. But behind the familiarity is their radical meaning as Jesus' summary of his message. To love God above all else means giving to God what belongs to God; our heart, soul, mind, and strength. These belong to God. To love one's neighbor as one's self means to refuse to accept the divisions rendered by the normalcy of civilization, those divisions between the marginalized, righteous and sinners, rich and poor, friends and enemies, Jews and Gentiles. ⁷⁴
- Jesus radical combination of these two commands from Jewish scripture elicits a positive response from the scribe: "You are right, Teacher." in the midst of this series of conflict stories, we are reminded that not all scribes were opposed to Jesus, just as not all Pharisees and aristocrats were. Later in Mark's gospel Joseph of Arimathea, a wealthy member of the council, arranged for the burial of Jesus. Moreover, Luke reports some friendly Pharisees as well as women supporters who were wives of high-ranking members of Herod's court (13: 31; 8:1-3). ⁷⁵
- To return to the scribe of Mark's story, Jesus affirms his affirmation .. and said to him: "You are not far from the kingdom of God" (12:34). He is not far from it because he knows its heart, but he is not in it. To be in it means more than knowing this. It means living it. ⁷⁶

4. **WEDNESDAY, the Fourth Day in Jerusalem (March 18)**

Mark 14: 1-11

- In the midst of plotting to kill Jesus by chief priest, elders and scribes and (14: 1-2) and Judas' betrayal of Jesus (14: 10-11), in the Bethany a woman break her alabaster jar and give Jesus her best (14: 3-9).
- This passage shows contrast between **believer** and **traitor** and **the best** and **the worst**. Betraying Jesus represents the worst action possible, but why does anointing Jesus imply the best? ⁷⁷

Questions:

- Why the Jewish crowd was so against Jesus, was it necessary to arrest him in the darkness of night with the help of a traitor from among Jesus' followers? Why not arrest him in broad daylight? And why do they need Judas? (Mark 14:48-49). ⁷⁸

⁷³ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 70.

⁷⁴ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 71.

⁷⁵ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 71.

⁷⁶ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 71.

⁷⁷ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 86.

On Sunday,

- Jesus' anti-imperial entry into Jerusalem evoked great enthusiasm: "Many people spread their cloaks on the road, and others spread leafy branches and followed Jesus shouting "Hosanna!."

On Monday,

- Jesus went into the Temple and cites Jeremiah (den of robbers) during the symbolic destruction. When the chief priests and scribes heard it, they kept looking for a way to kill him.⁷⁹

On Tuesday,**Why they killed Jesus?**

- The concern of those collaborative leaders said in John 11:48: "If we let him go on like this, everyone will believe in him, and the Romans will come and destroy both our holy place and our nation." Even apart from the content of any message from Jesus subversive of Roman law and order, however nonviolent it might have been, the very presence of enthusiastic crowds listening to whatever it was he said would have been deemed dangerous at any time, but especially Passover.⁸⁰
- The only reason given by Josephus for Antipa's execution of John the Baptizer in his *Jewish Antiquities* is not the content of John's message, but the size of John's crowd: "When others too joined the crowds about him, because they were aroused to the highest degree by his sermons, Herod became alarmed...".⁸¹
- In Mark's story, by Monday, the Jewish religious authorities want to have Jesus executed, but are deterred from action because "the whole crowd was spellbound (홀린) by his teaching." That is after those two prophetic symbolic actions; first, his entrance into Jerusalem to establish God's nonviolence against imperial domination and, second his entrance into the temple to establish God's justice against high priestly collaboration.⁸²
- On Tuesday, they were afraid of the crowd (Mark 11:32). The crowd stands with both John and Jesus against their own religious authorities, who oppose them both. Next, Jesus tells the parable of the wicked tenants who murder the vineyard owner's son, "when they realized that he had told this parable against them, they wanted to arrest him, but they feared the crowd. So they left him and went away (12:12). Finally, Jesus challenges "the scribes" on how the Messiah can be both David's son and David's Lord at the same time," and the large crowd was listening to him with delight" (12:37).⁸³
- Wednesday morning, [the fourth day of Jesus in Jerusalem] it was two days before Passover and the festival of Unleavened Bread. The chief priests and the scribes were looking for a way to arrest Jesus by stealth (비밀리에) and kill him; "Not during the festival, or there may be a riot among the people" (14: 1-2). In effect, the high-priestly authorities give up. They cannot arrest Jesus during the festival,

⁷⁸ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 87.

⁷⁹ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 88.

⁸⁰ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 88.

⁸¹ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 89.

⁸² Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 89.

⁸³ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 89.

and after it he will be gone - unless, of course, they can learn where he is apart from the crowd, arrest him apart from the crowd, And execute him before the crowd knows what is happening. Stealth is the last chance left. And that leaves 14:2 hanging for the arrival of Judas, the stealthy one, in 14:10.⁸⁴

- We note that the same distinction between the pro-Jesus Jewish crowd and the anti-Jesus Jewish authorities is cited in Josephus' comment about Jesus' life in his *Jewish Antiquities*. Jesus, he says, "won over many Jews and many of the Greeks. When Pilate, upon hearing him accused by men of the highest standing among us, had condemned him to be crucified, **those who had in the first place come to love him did not give up their affection for him**" (18:63-64).⁸⁵

THE TWELVE AS FAILED DISCIPLES

- For Mark, "Lent" was a transformative journey in space from Caesarea Philippi to Jerusalem. During that journey, in Mark's story, Jesus tried to prepare his disciples for what would happen to him when he demonstrated against Roman imperial power concerning its violence and against Jewish high-priestly authority concerning its injustice. Jesus also attempted to prepare them for their individual and communal participation in that death and resurrection, that end-as -beginning. But Peter, James, and John, then the Twelve as a group, and finally Judas all fail tragically but not irrevocably (except for Judas) to accept their destiny alongside Jesus.⁸⁶
- We emphasize and cannot emphasize enough one point about this very, very prominent theme in Mark. *His story of failed disciples is his warning gift to all who ever hear or read his narrative*. We must think of Lent today as a penitential season because we know that, like those first disciples, we would like to avoid the implications of this journey with Jesus. We would like is Holy Week conclusion to be about the interior rather than exterior life, about heaven rather than earth, about the future rather than the present, and, above all else, about religion safely and securely quarantined from politics. Confronting violent political power *and* unjust religious collaboration is dangerous in most times and most places, first century and twenty-first century alike.⁸⁷
- Mark emphasizes Jesus' insistence on what is to happen (*prophecy*), the failure to understand or accept it fully (*reaction*), and Jesus' explanation of what is involved for himself, for them, and for all his follower (*response*).

First Prophecy, Reaction, and Response:

Mark's Lenten journey starts at Caesarea Philippi, the capital city of Herod Philip's territories. *Peter confesses that Jesus is the Messiah*. Jesus "sternly order them not to tell anyone about him" (8:29-30). Such injunctions to silence in Mark usually do *not* mean, "You have it right, but keep it secret," *but* rather, 'You have it wrong, so keep it quite.' Peter and the others may well have been imagining Jesus as a militant messiah who would free Israel Roman oppression using violent means, and it was that notion that Jesus wanted to discourage.⁸⁸

- Then Jesus began to teach them that the Son of Man must undergo great suffering, and he rejected by the elders, the chief priests, and the scribes, and be killed, and after three days rise again (8:31-32).⁸⁹

⁸⁴ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 90.

⁸⁵ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 90.

⁸⁶ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 91.

⁸⁷ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 91.

⁸⁸ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 93.

⁸⁹ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 93.

- In 8:31-32, complete dismissal as "Peter took him aside and began to rebuke him" (8:31). And Jesus' response is quite blunt: "Get behind me, Satan! For you are setting your mind not on divine things but on human things" (8:32). That verb "rebuke," used first by Peter to Jesus and then by Jesus back to Peter, is a very, very strong one. It is, for example, the same verb used by Jesus against demons in 1:25 and 9:25. This is a very serious matter. Any attempt to deter Jesus from his destiny is, in effect, demonic and Satanic. That counter-rebuke by Jesus is not just addressed to Peter; Jesus turns and looks at his disciples, so that **all of them are brought under that counter-rebuke**. It is not just for Peter, but for all the twelve disciples, and it is not just for them, but **for everyone**. Mark proposes Jesus' Lenten journey as an open invitation for all.⁹⁰

The Second Prophecy, Reaction, and Response

They went on from there and passed through Galilee. He said, "The Son of Man is to be betrayed into human hands, and they will kill him, and three days after being killed, he will rise again (Mark 9:30-31)"⁹¹ Then they came to Capernaum; and Jesus asked, "What were you arguing about on the way?".... on the way they argued with one another who was the greatest. ...He said to them, "Whoever wants to be first must be last of all and servant of all (:33-35)

They completely ignore Jesus' admonition about becoming the first of all by being the servant of all, and he has to say it all over again.⁹²

The Third Prophecy, Reaction, and Response

This is the final, climactic, and most detailed of Mark's three prophecies. Jesus said to them, "See, we are going up to Jerusalem, and the Son of Man will be handed over to the chief priests and the scribes, and they will condemn him to death; then they will hand him over to the Gentiles; they will mock him, and spit upon him, and flog him, and kill him; and after three days he will rise again" (10:32-34).

On the "road" (*hodos*) can be translated "way" - they are all *on the way*, or at least supposed to be *on the way*, to death and resurrection. And then Judas' story follows (14: 10-11)⁹³

Two symbolic demonstrations on Sunday and Monday, that confrontation is with oppressive foreign empire (against violence) and its collaborative local religion (against injustice), with any religio-political combination that establishes injustice on an earth that belongs to a God of justice. Finally, after each prophecy, Mark reports an absolute failure by the twelve disciples, and these failures are as repetitively significant as Jesus' prophecies. Here is what happens this time.⁹⁴

James and John came forward to him and said to him, "Teacher, we want you to do for us whatever we ask of you." "Grant us to sit, one at your right hand and one at your left, in your glory." "You do not know what you are asking. Are you able to drink the cup that I drink, or be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with? They replied, "We are able."(10: 35-40)James and John skip easily over Jesus' death to concentrate on Jesus' glory and their own future participation in it.⁹⁵

⁹⁰ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 94.

⁹¹ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 95.

⁹² Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 96.

⁹³ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 97.

⁹⁴ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 99.

⁹⁵ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 99.

... They are like the lords, rulers, and tyrants of the gentile world, and it is precisely against that world of domination that Jesus will demonstrate in Jerusalem.⁹⁶

Atonement - P. 102-103

UNNAMED WOMAN WITH HER ETERNAL ALABASTER JAR OF OINTMENT

In Remembrance of Her

While he was at Bethany in the house of Simon the leper, as he sat at the table, a woman came in with an alabaster jar of very costly ointment of nard, and she broke open the jar and poured ointment on his head (14: 3). "She has done what she could" (14:8), says Jesus, "she has anointed my body beforehand for its burial (14:8). She alone, of all those who heard Jesus' three prophecies of his death and resurrection, believed him and drew the obvious conclusion. *Since you are going to die and rise, I must anoint you now beforehand, because I will never have a chance to do it afterward.* She is, for Mark, the first believer. She is, for us, the first Christian. And she believed from the word of Jesus before any discovery of an empty tomb. *The unnamed woman is not only the first believer; she is also the model leader.*⁹⁷

Jesus has been telling the Twelve what leadership entails from Caesarea Philippi to Jerusalem and has gotten nowhere with them. But this unnamed woman believed him and, presumably, Mark locates her among those others beside the Twelve who have been accompanying him *on the way*. "There were also women looking on from a distance, among them were Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James the younger and of Joses, and Salome. These used to follow him and provided for him when he was in Galilee; there were many other women who had come up with him to Jerusalem" (15:40-41). She was both one of those "many other women" and the first and only one who believed what Jesus had been telling them repeatedly. Hence that supreme and unique praise for her as the first believer and the model leader, Mark's intercalation, or frame, is also now clear. The unnamed woman represents the perfect disciple-leader and is contrasted with Judas, who represents the worst one possible.⁹⁸

It is also very important, by the way, not to confuse that story in Mark 14:3-9 about the woman who anointed Jesus "in the house of Simon the leper" in Judea with the other story in Luke 7:36-50 about the woman who anointed Jesus "in the Pharisee's house" in Galilee. That is different story - different in place, time and meaning. But, for Mark, that unnamed woman is, in our terms, the first Christian, and she believed, again our terms, even before the first Easter.⁹⁹ **중요해.**

THE MOTIVE OF JUDAS

Mark gives absolutely no hint of Judas' motive in betraying Jesus. The other gospels, however, let alone later Christian imagination, were not content to leave the story there. Matthew retells Mark 14:11 by saying that, when Judas went to the high priests, he asked them, "What will you give me if I betray him to you?" They paid him thirty pieces of silver (Matt. 16:15). And, since he did it for money, they

⁹⁶ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 101.

⁹⁷ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 104.

⁹⁸ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 104-105.

⁹⁹ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 105.

had to pay up front. That allows Matthew to conclude the story of Judas in 27:3-10 and to connect that sum of "thirty pieces of silver" with Zechariah 11:12.¹⁰⁰

John goes even further in explaining Judas' motivation. On a theological level, according to John, he was either a devil or at least under diabolical influence. But Jesus always knew what Judas would do: "Did I not choose you, the twelve? Yet one of you is a devil." He was speaking of Judas son of Simon Iscariot, for he, though one of the twelve, was going to betray him" (John 6:70-71). Next, during that unnamed women's anointing at Bethany, the protest does not come from a vague "some" as in Mark 14:4, but specifically from "Judas Iscariot, one of his disciples (John 12:4). And John explains his protest with this parenthetical comment: "He said this not because he cared about the poor, but because he was a thief; he kept the common purse and used to steal what was put into it" (John 12:6). Finally, on the night of Jesus' arrest, John mentions the devil twice in connection with Judas: "The devil had already put it into the heart of Judas son of Simon Iscariot to betray him" (13:2); "After he received the piece of bread, Satan entered into him. Jesus said to him, "Do quickly what you are going to do" (13:27).¹⁰¹

All of that is simply standard imagination: Judas did it for money; Judas did it because he was a thief, and so forth. **Scholars and novelists have added several other reasons.** For example, Judas had become convinced that nonviolent resistance would not work and ultimately foolish. Or, again, he became afraid that he would be arrested with Jesus and the best solution was to betray Jesus and save himself.¹⁰²

But Mark's emphasis is not on Judas' motive, whatever it was, but on Judas' membership in the Twelve. Notice how he uses it almost like a little every time he mentions Judas after 3:19 (14:10-43). He is always "Judas-one-of-the Twelve" just in case we might ever forget it. Judas' identity among the Twelve, not Judas' motive for betraying Jesus, is Mark's emphasis. His betrayer is simply the worst example of how those closest to Jesus failed him dismally in Jerusalem. The traitor has entered into an agreement with those who collaborate with imperial rule. And so Wednesday ends and the plot set in motion.¹⁰³

5. **THURSDAY, the Fifth Day (March 25) - LAST SUPPER (14: 12-25)**

Mark's story of Jesus' last week moves toward its climax. For most Christians, the liturgical observance of "Maundy Thursday," as it is commonly known, begins the most solemn part of the most sacred week of the Christian year. Along with Palm Sunday, Good Friday, and Easter, it is the best-known day of Holy Week.¹⁰⁴

Holy Thursday is full of drama. In the evening, Jesus eats a final meal with his followers and prays for deliverance in Gethsemane; He is betrayed by Judas, denied by Peter, and abandoned by the rest of his disciples. Arrested in the darkness, he is then interrogated and condemned to death by the high priest and his council, the local collaborators with imperial authority. All of this happens before daybreak of Friday. Mark's

¹⁰⁰ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 105-106.

¹⁰¹ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 106.

¹⁰² Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 106.

¹⁰³ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 107.

¹⁰⁴ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 109.

story of this day is very different from the story of this day in John's gospelsee page 110.¹⁰⁵

Calling this day "**Maundy Thursday**" is based on John's story: "Maundy" derives from the Latin word for the "**mandate**" - **the new commandment** - that Jesus gives his followers in John 13:34: "I give you a new commandment, that you love one another. Just as I loved you, you also should love one another."¹⁰⁶

The final meal that Jesus shared with disciples has multiple resonances of meaning. It connects backward into the public activity of Jesus and forward into his death and the post-Easter life of Christianity. Jesus' last supper was to be the First Supper of the future.¹⁰⁷

A Continuation of the Meal Practice of Jesus

According to the gospels, including Mark, shared meals were one of the most distinctive features of Jesus' public activity. He often taught at meals, banquets were topics of his parables, and his meal practice was often criticized by his opponents. Scribes and Pharisees aggressively ask, "Why does he eat with tax collectors and sinners?" (Mark 2:16); see also Matt. 11:19; Luke 7:34; 15:1-2). The issue is that Jesus eats with "undesirables," the marginalized and outcasts, in a society in which the people with whom one shared a meal was hugely significant. Jesus' meal practice was about inclusion in a society with sharp social boundaries. It had both religious and political significance: religious because it was done in the name of the kingdom of God; political because it affirmed a very different vision of society.¹⁰⁸

An analogy close to our own time would be a religious leader in the American South prior to the antisegregation legislation of the 1960s holding a public integrated meals and declaring, "*This* is the kingdom of God - and the divided world that you see around you is not."¹⁰⁹

But meals were not just about inclusion. They were also, and crucially, about food. The meals of Jesus were not ritual meals in which food had only or primarily symbolic meaning. They were real meals, not a morsel and a sip as in our observance of the Eucharist. For Jesus, real food - bread - mattered. In his teaching, "bread" symbolized the material basis of existence, as in the Lord's Prayer, or the "Our Father," Immediately after the petition, "Your kingdom come, your will be done on earth, as it is in heaven," is "Give us this day our daily bread." For Jesus' peasant audience, bread - enough food for the day - was one of the two central survival issues of their lives (the other was debt). The last supper continues and culminates in Jesus' emphasis upon meals and food as God's justice.¹¹⁰

An Echo of the Feeding of the Five Thousand (Loaves and Fishes)

Jesus uses four verbs: *took, blessed, broke, and gave*. These four key words refer us back to an earlier scene concerning food in Mark, in which Jesus feeds five thousand people with a few loaves and fishes: "*Taking* the give loaves and the two fish, Jesus looked up heaven, and *blessed and broke* the loaves, and *gave* them to his disciples to set before the people; and he divided the two fish among them all" (Mark 6:41). Why this cross-reference from the Last Supper back to the loaves-and-fishes meal?¹¹¹

¹⁰⁵ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 110.

¹⁰⁶ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 110.

¹⁰⁷ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 113.

¹⁰⁸ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 113.

¹⁰⁹ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 114.

¹¹⁰ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 114.

¹¹¹ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 114.

Mark's story of the multiplication of the loaves and fishes begins by establishing two divergent solutions to a hunger situation. People (five thousand, Mark says) have listened to Jesus all day in a deserted place, it now late, and they are hungry. The solution from the disciples is quite reasonable: "*Send them away* so that they may go into the surrounding country and villages and buy something for themselves to eat" (6:36). The alternative solution from Jesus seems quite impossible, "*You give them* something to eat" (6:37), to which the disciples respond. "Are we to go and buy two hundred denarii worth of bread, and give it to them to eat? This difference between Jesus and his disciples is established, yet as the story proceeds Jesus forces them to participate step by step as intermediaries in the entire process. Jesus has them find what food is available (6:38), make the people sit down in groups (6:39), distribute the food (6:41), and pick up what is left over afterward (6:43). In other words, they are forced to accept and participate in Jesus' solution (*give them food*) and not in their own (*send them away*).¹¹²

Note that Jesus does not bring down manna from heaven or turn stone into food. He takes what is already there, the five loaves and two fishes, and when it passes through *Jesus'* hands, there is more than enough, much more than enough, for everyone present. The point of the story is not multiplication, but distribution. The food already there is enough for all when it passes through the hands of Jesus as the incarnation of divine justice. The disciples - think of them as the *already present* kingdom community in microcosm, or as the leaders of that community -do not see that as their responsibility and are forced to accept it by Jesus. Behind that, of course, is an entire theology of creation in which God owns the world, demands that all get a fair share of its goods, and appoints human as stewards to establish God's justice on earth.¹¹³

Mark's emphasis on a just distribution of what does not belong to us in the incident of the loaves and fishes links, therefore, to shared among all at the New Passover meal. Once again, Jesus distributes food already present to "all" who are there. A shared meal of what is already there among all those present becomes both the great sacramental symbol and the primary practical program of the kingdom movement.¹¹⁴

THE CONNECTION OF JESUS' LAST SUPPER TO A Passover Meal

As a Passover meal, Jesus' Last Supper resonates with the story of the exodus from Egypt, his people's story of their birth as a nation. A story of bondage, deliverance, and liberation, it was their primordial narrative, the most important story they knew. Passover was (and is) the great annual Jewish celebration of God's greatest act of deliverance. The first Passover (Ex. 12) occurred on the evening before the tenth plague to strike Pharaoh and Egypt, namely, the death of the firstborn in every household in Egypt. That plague was the hammer that broke Pharaoh's will, and the Hebrew slaves were finally liberated. In this narrative context, the Passover lamb had two primary meanings. First, some of the blood from the Passover lamb was to be put on the doorposts of the house of the Hebrew slaves so that the angel of death, "the destroyer," would pass over those houses and not kill the firstborn in them. They shall take some of the blood and put it on the two doorposts and the lintel of the houses in which they eat itFor the Lord will pass through to strike down the Egyptians; when he sees the blood on the lintel and on the two doorposts, the Lord will pass over that door and will not allow the destroyer to enter your houses to strike you down (Ex. 12:7, 23). Second, each family was then to eat their Passover lamb, gird their loins, put on their sandals, and be ready to leave. The Passover lamb was thus also food for the journey. Moreover the first Passover was also the last supper in Egypt, the land of bondage.¹¹⁵

¹¹² Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 114.

¹¹³ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 115.

¹¹⁴ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 115.

¹¹⁵ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 116.

We note that the Passover lamb is a sacrifice in the broad sense of the word, but not in the narrow sense of substitutionary sacrifice. Its purpose is twofold: protection against death and food for the journey. The story makes no mention of sin of guilt, substitution or atonement.¹¹⁶

Connection of the Passover story to Jesus' Last Meal:

The Passover meal, the *seder*, memorialized the first Passover and the exodus by bringing it into the present. The elements of the meal embody central elements in the story, and the words make clear that the story is not simply about the past, but is also about the present: "It was not only our fathers and mothers who were Pharaoh's slaves in Egypt, but we, all of us gathered here tonight, were Pharaoh's slaves in Egypt; and it was not only our fathers and mothers who were liberated by the great and mighty hand of God, but all of us here have been liberated by God." For the empire of Pharaoh, substitute the Roman Empire or any other empire, and the subversive nature of this story is not difficult to discern.¹¹⁷

LAST SUPPER CONNECTS TO JESUS DEATH -

Body and Blood and the Death of Jesus

Mark's story of the Last Supper leaves the connection to Pass Over implicit. What it makes explicit is the connection of Jesus' impending death. It does so with the "words of institution," familiar to Christians because of their use in the Lord's Supper:

He took a loaf of bread, and after blessing it he broke it, gave it to them, and said, "*Take; this is my body.*" Then he took a cup, and after giving thanks he gave it to them, and all of them drank from it. He said to them, "*This is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many.*" (14: 22-24).

[In Paul's account (1 Cor. 11:23-25)

On the night when he was betrayed took a loaf of bread, and when he had given thanks, he broke it and said, "This is my body that is for you. Do this in remembrance of me." In the same way he took the cup also, after supper, saying, "This cup is the new covenant in my blood. Do this as often as you drink it, in remembrance of me."] [\[Read commentary on 1 Cor. 11:23-25\]](#)

In Matthew, Luke, and Paul, the italicized words spoken over the bread and cup appear in slightly different form (and they are not in John at all).¹¹⁸

Paul's account, written earlier than any of the gospels, has the remembrance theme in both parts, and closest to Luke: "This [bread] is my body that is for you. Do this in remembrance of me ... This cup is the new covenant in my blood. Do this, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of me" (1 Cor. 11:24-25). ...

What, then, is Mark adding here that was not present before? First, the point of Jesus' meals is to insist on shared meals as the mandate of divine justice in a world not our own. If, as God asserts in Lev. 25:23, "The land is mine; with me you are but aliens and tenants," then of course the food the land produces belongs likewise to God. If we are all tenant farmers and residents alien on an *earth* not our own, then we are also invitees and guests at a table not our own. But if one lives for divine justice in a world that belongs to God, one will usually die a violent death from human injustice in a world that refuses recognition of such ownership. The language of body and blood points to a violent death. When a person dies nonviolently we

¹¹⁶ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 117.

¹¹⁷ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 117.

¹¹⁸ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 117.

speak of a separation of body and soul. But when a person dies violently we speak of a separation of body and blood.¹¹⁹

Second, that separation of Jesus' body and blood by violent death is the absolutely necessary basis for another level of meaning in Mark. ...The point is neither suffering nor substitution, but participation with God through gift or meal.¹²⁰ [Read commentary on 1 Cor. 11:24-25 and Luke account]

Finally, he has all the Twelve (including Judas) actually partake of the food and drink - they all participate in the bread-as-body and blood -as - wine. It is a final attempt to bring all of them with him through execution to resurrection, through death to new life. It is, once again, about *participation* in Christ and not *substitution* by Christ. And we, like they, are invited to travel with Jesus through execution to resurrection. The Last Supper is about bread for the world, God's justice against human injustice, a New Passover from bondage to liberation, and participation in the path that leads through death to new life.¹²¹

Gethsemane, Prayer, and Arrest (14: 32-42)

Betrayal:

As the meal ends, Jesus and the disciples sing a hymn and depart from the upstairs room. They leave the city and go to an area at the foot of the Mount of Olives known as Gethsemane, a hundred yards or so outside the east wall of the city. Jesus tells his disciples that they will all become deserters. After Jesus and his disciples arrive in Gethsemane, Jesus goes a short distance away from them in order to pray, taking Peter and James and John with him. Mark's spare description of Jesus as "distressed," "agitated," "deeply grieved, even to death," and throwing himself upon the ground, is filled with anguish:¹²²

Jesus said to disciples, "I am deeply grieved, even to death; remain here, and keep awake." And going a little farther, he threw himself on the ground and prayed that, if it were possible, the hour might pass from him. He said, "Abba, Father, for you all things are possible; remove this cup from me; yet, not what I want, but what you want."¹²³ In Mark, Jesus is a vulnerable human being.¹²⁴

He came and found them sleeping; and he said to Peter, "Simon, are you asleep? Could you not keep awake one hour? Keep awake and pray that you may not come into the time of trial; the spirit is willing, but the flesh is weak."¹²⁵

While he was still speaking, Judas, one of the twelve arrived; with him there was a crowd with swords and clubs, from the chief priests, the scribes, and the elders. Now the betrayer had given them a sign, saying, "The one I will kiss is the man; arrest him and lead him away under guard." So when he came, he went up to him at once and said, "Rabbi!" and kissed him. Then they laid hands on him and arrested him.¹²⁶

According to Crossan and Borg, it is never God's will that the righteous suffer. It was not God's will that Jesus died. Yet we may imagine them handing over themselves over in the way that Jesus did, from Peter and Paul to Dietrich Bonhoeffer and the nuns in El Salvador. Jesus' prayer reflects not a fatalistic resignation to the will of God, but a trusting in God in the midst of the most dire of circumstances.¹²⁷

¹¹⁹ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 118.

¹²⁰ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 118.

¹²¹ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 120.

¹²² Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 122.

¹²³ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 120.

¹²⁴ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 125.

¹²⁵ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 121.

¹²⁶ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 121.

¹²⁷ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 123.

The "crowd" with swords and clubs, from the chief priest, the scribes, and elders" refers to a group of temple police or temple soldiers. As local collaborators, the temple authorities were permitted by the Romans to have a small military force, more than a police force but less than an army. It is easy to imagine that they would not have known which one Jesus was. [This is the reason why Judas identified Jesus by kissing for the soldiers].¹²⁸ In John, six hundred imperial soldiers arrive to arrest Jesus.¹²⁹

[While Jesus was being arrested, "All of them deserted him and fled. (14:50). Disciples deserted Jesus.] Conclude this section with the role of the disciples. Failed disciples is the central theme to Mark's gospel and to Thursday in particular. Judas betrays Jesus, Peter denies him, and the rest flee. They now disappear from the story of Holy Week. Mark does not mention them again until Easter. But, with the exception of Judas, Peter and the rest of the disciples are restored to relationship and community by Jesus.¹³⁰

Interrogation and Condemnation

They took Jesus to the high priest; all the chief priests, the elders, and the scribes were assembled. They were looking for testimony against Jesus but found none. Many false testimony against Jesus didn't agree with each other. Then the high priest asked him directly, "Are you the Messiah?" Jesus answered, "I am; and 'you will see the Son of Man seated at the right hand of the Power,' and 'coming with clouds of heaven.'" Then the high priest tore his clothes and said, "Why do we still need witness? You have heard his blasphemy! What is your decision?" All of them condemned him as deserving death. The guards took him over and beat him. (Mark 14:53-65).¹³¹

Now Jesus is taken to the temple authorities, whom Mark names as "the high priests, and all the chief priests, the elders, and the scribes" (14:53) and as "the chief priests and the whole council" (14:55). What follows is often called "the Jewish trial of Jesus" before "the high priest" and "the whole council," resulting in Jesus' condemnation to death. As narrated in Mark and the other gospel, it has led most Christians throughout the centuries to assign primary responsibility for the death of Jesus to the highest-ranking members of the Jewish nation and thus, uncritically, to the Jews." The story of Jesus' interrogation and condemnation by the high priest and his council has often become a text of terror for Jews in subsequent centuries.¹³²

Thus we need to pause for some historical comments. (**Argument on Jesus' trial**).

- Most likely, Mark (and other early Christians) did not know exactly what happened. ... no followers of Jesus was present with him subsequent to his arrest (they all fled). Though it is possible to imagine that somebody within the high priest's circle later disclosed what happened, we cannot be at all certain of this. This the trial scene may represent a post-Easter Christian construction and not history remembered. This is the way Mark tells the story around the year 70.
- It is unclear whether we should think of Mark as presenting a formal "trial" or an informal but deadly "hearing." "Trial" implies a legal procedure that follows the accepted rules of the time; "hearing" implies a para-legal or even extra-legal procedure. The "council" referred to by Mark may not have been the Sanhedrin of later centuries, but a "privy council" consisting of the high priest and his circle of advisers.
- The temple authorities did not represent the Jews. Rather than representing the Jewish people, they were, as local collaborators with imperial authority, the oppressors of the vast majority of the Jewish

¹²⁸ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 124.

¹²⁹ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 125.

¹³⁰ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 126.

¹³¹ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 127.

¹³² Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 127.

people. They did not represent the Jewish people any more than the collaborationist governments of Europe during World War II or during the time of the Soviet Union resented their people.¹³³

Mark's story of Jesus' trial before the temple authorities has three stages, a first one with testimony against Jesus in 14:55-59, a second one with witness by Jesus in 14:60-62, and a final one with the verdict and abuse in 14:63-65.¹³⁴

The question, "Are you the Messiah?" was not about the *person* of Jesus, but about the *kingdom of God*, which challenges the normalcy of domination system and empires.¹³⁵

Jesus' response - "I am" (Mark 14:62). In Greek *ego eimi* can be translated "I am" or "Am I?" Matthew and Luke both read it as ambiguous. Matthew has "You have said so" (26:64); Luke has "You say that I am" (22:70). Nevertheless, the high priest apparently hears it as an affirmation, for **it is the basis of his guilty** verdict. It is noteworthy that Jesus is convicted on the basis of what looks like a post-Easter Christian confession of the significance of Jesus: **he is the Messiah, the Son of God**, who will come again.¹³⁶

The rest of Jesus' response **shifts** the topic to the **"Son of Man."** We also recall that when Peter confessed Jesus as the Messiah in 8:29, Jesus did not deny it, but reinterpreted or replaced that title immediately with another one, the Son of Man destined for execution and resurrection in 8:31. Perhaps for Mark the title "Messiah" presumed a leader who would use violence to liberate Israel from the military power of Roman imperial oppression. That was not Mark's vision of Jesus, so "Son of Man" was his preferred replacement to avoid any ambiguity between a violent and nonviolent messiah.¹³⁷

Son of Man: Mark's quotation from Daniel 7:13-14 (kingship) - "the Son of Man coming with the clouds"

In 167 BC the Syrian ruler Antiochus IV Epiphanes launched a religious persecution against Jews who refused to accept full acculturation into his Hellenistic empire. Some Jews (Macabees) turned to arms and fought a successful military war on earth against *his empire*, while other Jews turned to visions and the hope for an absolute divine judgment against *all empires* past, present, and future. The empire are associated with chaos, the sea, and bestial powers. The transcendental judgment of God involved a triumph of order over chaos, of sky over sea, and human over the bestial.¹³⁸

Daniel 7 records one such vision and interpretation in which God conducts a divine court case or heavenly trial against all major empiresas written in Dan. 7:13-14.¹³⁹

Daniel 7 is an anti-imperial vision and an anti-imperial text: the empires that have oppressed the people of God throughout the centuries are all judged negatively, and positive affirmation is given to the Son of Man, a symbol for the people of God, to whom is given the everlasting kingdom of God. All of that is presumed behind the extraordinary usage of the phrase "Son of Man" for Jesus in Mark... It is to Jesus, then, that God's kingdom on earth has been assigned on behalf of those designated as the people of the holy ones of God. Jesus as the Son of Man must be read against the general background of Daniel 7 and the specific background of Mark's usage of that title for Jesus up to that climax in 14:62.¹⁴⁰

Jesus has been condemned to death and he will now be handed over to Pilate. It is not yet daybreak. When day dawns on Friday, Jesus will be handed over to the Roman governor. The end - and the beginning - are near.¹⁴¹

¹³³ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 128.

¹³⁴ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 129.

¹³⁵ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 129.

¹³⁶ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 130.

¹³⁷ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 130.

¹³⁸ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 131.

¹³⁹ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 131.

¹⁴⁰ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 132.

¹⁴¹ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 134.

Confession and Denial

Peter denied Jesus (Mark 14:66-72).

After his denials, "Peter remembered that Jesus had said to him, 'Before the cock crows twice, you will deny me three times.' And he broke down and wept" (14:72). Neither denials nor even betrayals are the worst sin against Jesus or God. The worst sin is despair - loss of faith that repentance will *always obtain forgiveness*. Had Judas broke down, wept, and repented, he too would have been forgiven. But although Peter reappears in 16:7, Judas never reappears in Mark's story. ¹⁴² 회개가 언제든지 용서를 받을 수 있다는 믿음을 상실한 절망이 가장 큰 죄이다. 유다가 회개했더라면 그도 용서를 받았을 텐데 그러지 않았다.

6. FRIDAY, the Sixth Day (April 8)

Crucifixion of Jesus (15: 21-32) - The most painful death.

¹⁴² Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 135.

Good Friday: The day of Jesus' crucifixion is the most solemn day of the Christian year. In Greek Christianity it is called "the Holy and Great Friday," in Romance language, "Holy Friday," and in German, "Sorrowful Friday." In the English speaking world, it is, of course, "Good Friday." The origin of the English designation is uncertain; it may derive from "God's" Friday or may have begun as "Good" Friday. In either case, it may come from German, where the day was also known as *Gottes Freitag* ("God's Friday") and as *Gute Freitag* ("Good Friday").¹⁴³

Why they wanted to kill him?

Why Jesus had to die?

Theological reason why they tried to kill Jesus? - atonement

The most familiar understanding of Jesus' death emphasizes its substitutionary sacrificial nature: He died for the sins of the world. All of us are sinners. In order for God to forgive sins, a substitutionary sacrifice must be offered. But it would not be adequate for an ordinary human being to be the sacrifice, for such a person would be a sinner and would only be dying for his or her own sins. Only Jesus, who was not only human but also the Son of God, was perfect, spotless, and without blemish. Thus he is the sacrifice, and Good Friday is the day that makes our forgiveness possible.¹⁴⁴

Another understanding such as Anselm's argument using a legal framework for understanding our relationship with God. Our sin, our disobedience, is a crime against God. Disobedience requires punishment, or else it is not being taken seriously. Hence God must require a punishment, the payment of a price, before God can forgive our sins or crimes. Jesus is the price. The payment has been made, the debt has been satisfied. And because Jesus is provided by God, the system also affirms grace - but only within a legal framework.¹⁴⁵

Authors of New Testament also see it as the domination system's "no" to Jesus (and God), as the defeat of the powers that rule this world by disclosing their moral bankruptcy, as revelation of the path of transformation, and as disclosure of the depth of God's love for us.¹⁴⁶

St. Paul, whose genuine letters were written before any of the gospels. Paul refers to the fact of Jesus' crucifixion many times: he speaks again and again of Jesus' death, of the cross and Christ crucified. It is "the wisdom of power of God," though it is "a stumbling block" to Jews and "foolishness" to Gentiles. It is the demonstration of God's love for us, the sacrifice that makes our redemption possible, and the path of personal transformation as dying and rising that lies at the heart of the Christian life (1 Cor. 1:23-24; Rom. 5:8; 3:24-25; Gal. 2:19-20; Rom. 6:3-4). God "disarmed the rulers and authorities and made a public example of them, triumphing over them in it" (1 Cor. 15:3-4; 2:8; Col. 2:15)¹⁴⁷

Crowd: When Pilate asked, "Do you want me to release for you the King of the Jews [that is Jesus]?" But, Mark tells us, the temple authorities "stirred up the crowd to have him release Barabbas for them instead" (15:11). Almost certainly, this is not the same crowd that heard Jesus with delight during the week; Mark gives no reason to think *that* crowd has turned against Jesus. Moreover, it is highly unlikely that the crowd from earlier in the week would be allowed into Herod's place, where this scene is set [Roman governor

¹⁴³ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 137.

¹⁴⁴ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 138.

¹⁴⁵ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 138-139.

¹⁴⁶ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 139

¹⁴⁷ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 140-141.

usually stayed at the Herod's palace while they were in Jerusalem]. This crowd, the crowd stirred up by the chief priests, must have been much smaller and is best understood as provided by the authorities (somebody had to let them into the palace). When Pilate asks *this* crowd, "Then what do you wish me to do with the many you call the King of the Jews?" They responded, "Crucify him (15: 13). So Pilate releases Barabbas and hands Jesus over to his soldiers to be crucified.¹⁴⁸

How do we understand Barabbas? Mark wrote the gospel of Mark around the year 70. Both Barabbas and Jesus are revolutionaries. Both defied imperial authority. But the first advocated violent revolution and the second advocated nonviolence. By the year 66, the Jerusalem crowd had chosen the way of Barabbas, not the way of Jesus. The events of 66-70 make this story intelligible.¹⁴⁹

Like every political prisoners in those days, he was tortured, humiliated, flogged, undressed, dressed, mocked, stricken, spat, and condemned him to death by crucifixion on the cross.¹⁵⁰

Crucifixion was a form of Roman imperial terrorism. First, Romans reserved it for very special victims. Next, It was not just capital punishment, but a very definite type of capital punishment for those such as runaway slaves or rebel insurgents who subverted Roman law and order and thereby disturbed the Pax Romana (the "Roman peace"). Furthermore, as imperial terrorism, it was always as public as possible - it was a calculated social deterrent and as such it had to be very, very public. Its victims were hung up as a public warning. Finally, along with other supreme penalties, such as being burned alive or eaten alive by beasts, what made it *supreme* was not just the amount of suffering or even humiliation involved, but that there might be nothing left or allowed for burial.¹⁵¹

As a form of public terrorism, the uprights of the crosses were usually permanently in place just outside a city gate on a high or prominent place. The victim usually carried or dragged the crossbar along with notice of the crime to be attached to one of those uprights at the place of execution. The only crucified body ever discovered in the Jewish homeland was a first-century victim whose arms were roped over the crossbar and whose ankle bones were pierced by iron nails on either side of the upright. Although he was given an honorable burial in his family tomb, other victims were often crucified low enough to the ground that not only carrion birds but scavenging dogs could reach them. And they were often left on the cross after death until little was left of their bodies even for a possible burial.¹⁵²

On the cross was an inscription: "The King of the Jews." The inscription is ironic. Pilate intended it as derision and most likely saw it as mocking not only Jesus, but his accusers, as if to say, "This person whom Rome has the power to execute is your king." Yet the inscription, despite its derisory intention, is accurate. Jesus is the true king.¹⁵³

Mark tells us that Jesus was crucified between two "bandits." The Greek word translated "bandits" is commonly used for guerilla fighters against Rome, who were either "terrorists" or "freedom fighters," depending upon one's point of view. Their presence in the story reminds us that crucifixion was used

¹⁴⁸ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 144.

¹⁴⁹ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 144.

¹⁵⁰ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 144.

¹⁵¹ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 146.

¹⁵² Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 146.

¹⁵³ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 147.

specifically for people who systematically refused to accept Roman imperial authority. Ordinary criminals were not crucified. Jesus is executed as a rebel against Rome between two other rebels against Rome.¹⁵⁴

The imperial centurion in command of the soldiers who had crucified Jesus exclaims, "Truly this man was God's Son" (15:30). He is the first human in Mark's gospel to call Jesus "God's Son." Not even Jesus' followers speak of him this way in Mark's story. That this exclamation comes from a centurion is very significant. According to Roman imperial theology, the emperor was "Son of God"- the revelation of God's power and will for the earth. According to the same theology, the emperor was Lord, Savior, and the one who had brought peace on earth. But now a representative of Rome affirms that this man, Jesus, executed by the empire, is the Son of God. Thus the emperor is not. In the exclamation of the centurion responsible for Jesus' execution, who saw him close, empire testifies against itself.¹⁵⁵

There are more witness to Jesus' death. From apart, but close enough to see, his women followers watch: (Mark 15:40-41). The presence of the women reminds us that Jesus' men followers are not present. They have all fled. Perhaps it was safer for women to be nearby; they were less likely to be suspected by the authorities of being dangerous subversives. Whatever the reason, in Mark (and all the gospels) women play a major role in the story of Good Friday and Easter. They witness Jesus' death. They follow his body after his death and see where he is buried. In all the gospels, they are the first ones to go to the tomb on Sunday and experience the news of Easter. In Mark, they are the only ones.¹⁵⁶

The role of women in Mark's story of Good Friday raises an interesting question. Why would first-century Jewish women (and slightly later, gentile women) be attracted to Jesus? For the same reasons that first-century men, were, yes. But in addition it seems clear that Jesus and earliest Christianity gave to women an identity and status that they did not experience within the conventional wisdom of the time. Women in both Jewish and gentile culture were subordinated in many ways. Jesus and the early Christian movement subverted the conventional wisdom about women among both Jews and gentiles. The subversion has been denied by much of Christian history, but it is right here, in a prominent place in the story of climactic event of Jesus' life: Good Friday and Easter.¹⁵⁷

Jesus said, "The Son of Man came not to be served but to serve, and to give his life a *ransom* for many" (10:45). Too many Christians, the word "ransom" sounds like sacrificial language, for we sometimes speak of Jesus as the ransom for our sins. But it almost certainly does not have this meaning in Mark. The Greek word translated as "ransom" (*lutron*) is used in the Bible not in the context of payment for sin, but to refer to payment made to liberate captives (often from captivity in war) or slaves (often from debt slavery). A *lutron* is a means of liberation from bondage. Thus to say that Jesus gave "his life a *ransom* for many" means he gave his life as a means of liberation from bondage. The context of the passage in Mark supports this reading. The rulers of the nations lord it over their subjects, and their great ones are tyrants (10:42). "It is not so among you," Jesus says, and then uses his own path as an illustration. In contrast to rulers of this world, "The Son of Man came not to be served but to serve, and to give his life a *lutron* - a means of liberation - for many." And this is a path for his followers to imitate: so it shall be "among you."¹⁵⁸

Mark does not understand the death of Jesus as a substitutionary sacrifice for sin. Mark sees Jesus' death as an execution by the authorities because of his challenge to the domination system. The decision of the temple

¹⁵⁴ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 147.

¹⁵⁵ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 150.

¹⁵⁶ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 151.

¹⁵⁷ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 152.

¹⁵⁸ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 155.

authorities to take action against him was made after the disruptive act in the temple. These local collaborators handed him over to imperial authority, which then crucified him on a charge that was simultaneously and indissolubly political and religious: "King of the Jews." Mark understands Jesus' death as a judgment on the authorities and the temple. The "chief priests, elders, and scribes" have killed him, just as Jesus said they would. Judgment is indicated by the fact that, as Jesus dies, darkness comes over the city and land, and the great curtain in the temple is torn in two. And a Roman centurion pronounces judgment against his own empire, which has just killed Jesus: "Truly this man - and not the emperor - is God's Son."¹⁵⁹

Jesus' passion, his message, was about the kingdom of God. He spoke to peasants as a voice of peasant religious protest against the central economic and political institutions of his day. He attracted a following and took his movement to Jerusalem at the season of Passover. There he challenged the authorities with public acts and public debates. All of this was his passion, what he was passionate about: God and the Kingdom of God, God and God's passion for justice.¹⁶⁰

Jesus' passion got him killed.

Socio-political economic reason

Jesus was so popular among the poor peasants who were very resentful toward Roman empire due to their exploitation and oppression. The concern of those collaborative leaders said in John 11:48: "If we let him go on like this, everyone will believe in him, and the Romans will come and destroy both our holy place and our nation." Even apart from the content of any message from Jesus subversive of Roman law and order, however nonviolent it might have been, the very presence of enthusiastic crowds listening to whatever it was he said would have been deemed dangerous at any time, but especially Passover.

The only reason given by Josephus for Antipa's execution of John the Baptizer in his *Jewish Antiquities* is not the content of John's message, but the size of John's crowd: "When others too joined the crowds about him, because they were aroused to the highest degree by his sermons, Herod became alarmed...".

The death of Jesus (my God, my God, why have you forsaken me)? (15: 33-41)

Died as a homeless person experiencing what the homeless would experience

All deserted him in fear of losing their own lives.

But women followed Jesus from Galilee (15: 40-41) with there near the cross witnessing to the crucifixion.

we would like to avoid the implications of this journey with Jesus. We would like is Holy Week conclusion to be about the interior rather than exterior life, about heaven rather than earth, about the future rather than the present, and, above all else, about religion safely and securely quarantined from politics. Confronting violent political power *and* unjust religious collaboration is dangerous in most times and most places, first century and twenty-first century alike.

The Motive of Judas

¹⁵⁹ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 155.

¹⁶⁰ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 162.

7. **SATURDAY, the Seventh Day (April 8)**

God's Justice and the Vindication (변호) of the persecuted ones

As Mark and the other evangelists set out to describe Jesus' execution, they were working within a Jewish tradition that had always, emphasized how God vindicated those righteous Jews who remained faithful under persecution and were ready, if necessary, to die as martyrs for their faith in God. There were, in fact, two main models for the divine vindication of those righteous ones in the biblical tradition.¹⁶¹

In one tradition God intervened to prevent their martyrdom, and in the other tradition God rewarded them after their martyrdom.¹⁶²

The classic example of the **first model** of divine vindication, of salvation at the last minute before death under persecution, is the story of **Daniel** in the lion's den (Dan. 5:1-6:28).¹⁶³

The classic example of the **second model** of divine vindication of **salvation but only after death**, appears in Wisdom 2-5, a book written shortly before the time of Jesus and now part of the Apocrypha of the Christian Bible. In that more generalized story, the persecutors intend to oppress the righteous ones because the latter (the righteous ones) oppose their "might makes right" philosophy and accuse them of sin:

Let us oppress the righteous poor man; let us not spare the widow or regard the gray hairs of the aged. But let our might be our law of right, for what is weak proves itself to be useless. Let us lie in wait for the righteous man, because he is inconvenient to us and opposes our actions; he reproaches us for sins against the law, and accuses us of sins against our training. He professes to have knowledge of God, and calls himself a child of the Lord. (2:10-13).¹⁶⁴

Next, the author continues with at least an implicit criticism of that *before-death* model, which replaced with an *after-death* one:

But the soul of the righteous are in the hand of God, and no torment will ever touch them. In the eyes of the foolish they seemed to have died, and their departure was thought to be a disaster, and their going from us to be their destruction; but they are at peace. For though in the sight of others they were punished, their hope is full of immortality (3:1-4).¹⁶⁵

It is that second model that is presumed behind the gospel stories of Jesus' execution and vindication.¹⁶⁶

God's Justice and the Bodily Resurrection of the Dead

If, as in biblical tradition, your faith tells you that this world belongs to and is ruled by a just divinity and your experience tells you that the world belongs to and is ruled by an unjust humanity, *utopia or eschatology* becomes almost inevitable as the reconciliation of faith and experience. **Utopia**, from the Greek for "no place" or "not this place," proclaims an alternative to this present world of *place*. **Eschatology**, from the Greek for "about last things" or "about endings," proclaims an alternative to this present world of *time*. God, you claim, will **transform** this place-time world of violence and injustice into one of nonviolence and justice.

¹⁶¹ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 166.

¹⁶² Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 167.

¹⁶³ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 167.

¹⁶⁴ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 168.

¹⁶⁵ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 169.

¹⁶⁶ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 169.

God, you sing, will **overcome** someday. God will **act**, indeed must act, to make new and holy a world grown old in evil. **Eschatology** is absolutely **not** about the end of this time-space world, but rather about the end of this time-place world's subjection to evil and impurity, injustice, violence, and oppression. It is not about the evacuation of earth for God's heaven, but about the divine transfiguration of God's earth. It is not about destruction, but about transfiguration of God's world here below.¹⁶⁷

As one ever more powerful empire after another took over control of Israel's fate, Jews looked more and more God's *justification*, God's *making just* or of the present world. God's Great Cosmic Cleanup became more and more fervently proclaimed and expected.¹⁶⁸

For Mark, therefore, Jesus as Son of Man has been given the anti-imperial kingdom of God to bring to earth for God's people, for those willing to enter it or take it upon themselves. Mark insists that Jesus as the Human One is already here below with full authority, that he must pass through death to resurrection, and that he will return with full heavenly power and glory. .. The Kingdom of God as already begun through Jesus, the Son of Man as already arrived in Jesus, and the general bodily resurrection as already started with Jesus, intertwined with one another, serve to interpret one another, and, taken together, reveal the heart of Mark's theology.. Future consummation for God's Great Cleanup has already started (Mark 13:26-27);¹⁶⁹

If God's Great Cleanup, God's Eastertide Spring Cleaning of the world, had already begun, then it was as a collaborative a collaborative effort. It is not us without God, or God without us. It is not what we wait for God, but that God wait for us. That is why Jesus does not travel alone, but always, always with those companions who represent us all, the named ones who fail and the unnamed ones who do not.¹⁷⁰

Am I not free? Am I not an apostle? Have I not seen the Lord Jesus? (I Cor. 9:1)

Paul links freedom to an experience of the risen Jesus, even as he also links apostleship to such an experience. We note that for Paul, the "apostles" are a larger group than the Twelve and include women. See Roman 17:7, where a woman named Junia is said to be "prominent among the apostles."¹⁷¹

¹⁶⁷ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 170-171.

¹⁶⁸ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 171.

¹⁶⁹ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 186.

¹⁷⁰ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 187.

¹⁷¹ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 219.

8. **EASTER SUNDAY, the Eighth Day (April 8)**

Without Easter, we wouldn't know about Jesus. If his story had ended with his crucifixion, he most likely would have been forgotten - another Jew crucified by the Roman Empire in a bloody century that witnessed thousands of such executions. So Easter is utterly central. But what are the Easter stories about? On one level, the answer is obvious: God raised Jesus. Yes. And what does this mean? When we think about Easter, we must consider several foundational questions. What kind of stories are the Easter stories? What kind of language are they told in, and how is that language being used? Are they intended as **historical reports** and thus to be understood as history remembered (whether correctly or incorrectly)? Or do they use the language of **parable and metaphor** to express truths that are much more than factual? ¹⁷²

Those of us who grew up Christians have a "preunderstanding" which emphasizes the historical factuality of the stories, in harder or softer forms. The hard form, affirmed by Christians committed to biblical **inerrancy**, sees every detail as factually, and infalibly true. Many other Christians affirm a softer form. Aware of differences in the stories, they do not insist on the factual exactitude of every detail. They know that witnesses to an event can differ on details, but still be reliable witnesses to the basic factuality of the event. So the softer form does not worry about whether there was one angel (Mark and Matthew) or two (Luke) at the tomb, or about how to combine the stories that Jesus' followers experienced him in and around Jerusalem, where they stayed until Pentecost (Luke), with the story that they returned to Galilee, where they first experienced the risen Jesus (Matthew and, implicitly, Mark). ¹⁷³

So central is the historical factuality of the Easter stories for many Christians that, if they didn't happen this way, the foundation and truth of Christianity disappear. To underline this claim, a verse from Paul is often quoted: "If Christ has not been raised, then our proclamation has been in vain and your faith has been in vain" (1 Cor. 15:14). ¹⁷⁴

HISTORY OF PARABLE?

Two obvious insight is that parable can be true - truthful and truth filled - independently of their factuality. *The truth of a parable - of a parabolic narrative - is not dependent on its factuality.* Its point is its meaning. And "getting a parable" is getting its meaning - and often there's more than one. Seeing the Easter stories as parable does not involve a denial of their factuality. It's quite happy leaving the question open. What it does insist upon is that *the importance of these stories in their meaning.* To illustrate, an empty tomb without meaning ascribed to it is simply an odd, even it exceptional, event. Seeing the Easter stories as parable, as parabolic narrative, affirms, "Believe whatever you want about whether the stories happened this way - now let's talk about what they mean." If you believe the tomb was empty, fine; now, what does this story mean? ¹⁷⁵

Jesus goes back to Galilee (16: 7) - Started in Galilee and goes back to Galilee.

As some scholars have suggested, the command to "go to Galilee" means, "go back to where the story began, to the beginning of the gospel." And what does one hear at the beginning of Mark's gospel? It is about the *way and the kingdom.* ¹⁷⁶

Emmanuel - Commissioning story(P. 200)

¹⁷² Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 190.

¹⁷³ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 190-191.

¹⁷⁴ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 191.

¹⁷⁵ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 193

¹⁷⁶ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 198.

Emmaus (Luke 24:13-35) P. 200

As they sit at table, the stranger (Jesus) takes bread, blesses it, breaks it, and gives it to them. "Then we are told their eyes were opened and they recognized him." Then he vanished from their sight. ... The risen Jesus opens up the meaning of scripture. **The risen Jesus is known in the sharing of bread. The risen Jesus journeys with us, whether we know it or not. There are moments in which we do come to know him and recognize him.** this story is the metaphoric condensation of several years of early Christian thought into one parabolic afternoon. Whether the story happened or not, **Emmaus always happens. Emmaus happens again and again- this is the truth as parabolic narrative.**¹⁷⁷

John 20-21 Mary Magdalene

Mary Magdalene told the news of resurrection (15: 9-11)

" I have seen the Lord" (John 20: 18)

THE GOSPEL EASTER STORIES TOGETHER

Two themes run through these stories that sum up the central meanings of Easter. **The first**, in a concise phrase, is **Jesus lives**. He continues to be experienced after his death, though in a radically new way. He is no longer a figure of flesh and blood, confined to time and space, but a reality who can enter locked rooms, journey with followers without being recognized, be experienced in both Galilee and Jerusalem, vanish in the moment of recognition, and abide with his followers always, "to the end of the age." Together, the appearance stories in the gospels make explicit what is promised in Mark: "You shall see him." They underline the parabolic meaning of Mark's story of the empty tomb: **Jesus is not among the dead, but among the living. This is the central affirmation of Easter: Jesus lives. He is a figure of the present, not simply of the past. The presence his followers had known in Jesus before his crucifixion continued to be experienced and to operate after it.**¹⁷⁸

Rather, **the truth of the affirmation "Jesus lives" is grounded in the experience of Christians** throughout the centuries. Not all Christians have had such an experience. To quote from one of John's Easter stories, **"Blessed are those who have not seen and yet believe."** But some Christians to the present day have experienced Jesus as a living reality. For us, this is the experiential ground of the first of the central Easter affirmation: Jesus continues to be and to operate. The spirit, the presence, his followers knew in him before his death continues to be known. Jesus lives.¹⁷⁹

To state **the second affirmation** of the Easter stories in an equally concise phrase: **God has vindicated Jesus.** God has said "yes" to Jesus and "no" to the powers who executed him. Easter is not about afterlife or about happy endings. Easter is God's "yes" to Jesus *against* the powers who killed him. The stories underline this in different ways. In Luke and John, the risen Jesus continues to bear the wounds of the empire that executed him. In Matthew, the risen Jesus has been given authority over all the authorities of this world. Mark says, **"You are looking for Jesus of Nazareth, who was crucified; he has been raised."**¹⁸⁰

The authors of the gospels do not speak about Jesus' resurrection without speaking about his crucifixion by the collusion between collaborators and imperial power. Post-Easter affirmation about Jesus in the New

¹⁷⁷ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 200-201.

¹⁷⁸ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 204-205.

¹⁷⁹ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 205.

¹⁸⁰ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 205.

Testament was, *Jesus is Lord*. If Jesus is the Lord, the lords of this world are not. Easter affirms that the domination systems of this world are not of God and that they do not have the final word.¹⁸¹

PAUL AND THE RESURRECTION OF JESUS

Not all vision are hallucinations. They can be disclosure of reality. Moreover, visions can involve not only seeing (apparition) and hearing (audition), but even a tactile dimension, as dreams sometimes do. Thus a story in which Jesus invites his followers to touch him or is seen to eat does not intrinsically point away from a vision. People who have had a vision report that something important and meaningful, often life-changing, had happened to them - they would never consider trivializing it as "only a vision."¹⁸²

Paul came to believe *Jesus is Lord* (second theme), because his experience of the risen Jesus changed his life. Prior to his experience on the Damascus road, he was Saul the Pharisees, a zealous persecutor of the movement that had come into existence around Jesus (Phil. 3:4-6). His experience had a crucial corollary. It generated the conviction not only that "Jesus lives," but that God vindicated Jesus, said "yes" to the one who had been executed by the authorities and whose movement Paul was persecuting.¹⁸³

In short, to use Paul's most concise affirmation, his experience of the risen Jesus led him to the conviction, "Jesus is Lord." And it put him on a collision course not only with the leaders of his own people, but also with imperial authority. To say "Jesus is Lord" meant "Caesar is not the Lord." Imperial power crucified "the Lord of glory" (I Cor.2:8), but God raised him and bestowed upon him the name that is above every name.¹⁸⁴

Since Jesus, Paul and earliest Christianity claimed that *God's transfiguration of this earth has already started*, they also claimed that *the general resurrection has begun with Jesus*. That is why Paul must argue in I Corinthians that if there is not general resurrection, there is no Jesus resurrection, and if there is no Jesus resurrection, there is no general resurrection (I Cor. 15:12-16). They stand or fall together. That is why he can call Jesus' resurrection "the first fruits," or start, of the general resurrection (15:20). St. Augustine said, "We without God cannot, and God without us will not." (collaborative eschatology)¹⁸⁵

EASTER AND CHRISTIAN LIFE TODAY: PERSONAL AND POLITICAL TRANSFORMATION

Easter as the reversal of Good Friday means God's vindication of Jesus' passion for the kingdom of God; for God's justice, and God's "no" to the powers who killed him, powers still very much active in our world. Easter is about God even as it is about Jesus. Easter discloses the character of God. Easter means God's Great Cleanup of the world has begun - but it will not happen without us.¹⁸⁶

Good Friday and Easter, death and resurrection together, are a central image in the New Testament for the path to a transformed self. The path involves dying to an old way of being and being reborn into a new way of being. Good Friday and Easter are about the path of dying and rising, of being born again.¹⁸⁷

After Jesus speaks for the first time about his impending death and resurrection, he says, "If any want to become my followers, let them deny themselves and take up their cross and follow me." (Mark 8:34), thus pointing to participants in his path. It is the path of transformation that Paul had experienced when he wrote,

¹⁸¹ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 205-206.

¹⁸² Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 207.

¹⁸³ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 207-208.

¹⁸⁴ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 208.

¹⁸⁵ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 209.

¹⁸⁶ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 210.

¹⁸⁷ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 210.

"I have been crucified with Christ; it is no longer I who live, but it is Christ who lives in me" (Gal. 2:19-20). He affirms this path for all Christians when he writes about baptism as a ritual enactment of dying and rising, death and resurrection (Rom. 6:1-11). The result is a new self, a new creation: "If anyone is in Christ, there is a new creation (2 Cor. 5:17)." ¹⁸⁸

So there is powerful personal meaning to Lent, Holy Week, Good Friday, and Easter. We are invited into the journey that leads through death to resurrection and rebirth. But when only the personal meaning is emphasized, we betray the passion for which Jesus was willing to risk his life. That passion was the kingdom of God, and it led him to Jerusalem as the place of confrontation with the domination system of his time, execution, and vindication. The political meaning of Good Friday and Easter sees the human problem as injustice, and the solution as God's justice. We Christians have most often overlooked the political meaning of Holy Week. The New Testament and Jesus do not simply speak of dying, but crucifixion. Suppose Jesus had jumped off a high building to illustrate that the path of transformation is dying. To say the obvious, this would have involved a death. But the way Jesus involves not just any kind of death, but "taking up the cross" and following him to Jerusalem, the place not only of dying and rising, but specifically of confrontation with the authorities and vindication by God. ¹⁸⁹

Jesus' passion was the kingdom of God. What life would be like on earth if God were king, and the rulers, domination systems, and empires of this world were not. It is the world that the prophets dreamed of - a world of distributive justice in which everybody has enough and systems are fair. And it is not simply a political dream. It is God's dream, a dream that can only be realized by being grounded ever more deeply in the reality of God, whose heart is justice. Jesus' passion got him killed. But God has vindicated Jesus. This is the political meaning of Good Friday and Easter. ¹⁹⁰

There is thus a strong anti-imperial theology in the gospels. Anti-imperial theology continues in Paul's affirmation that Jesus is Lord and therefore empire and the emperor are not. .. The anti-imperial meaning of Good Friday and Easter is particularly important and challenging for American Christians in our time, among whom we number ourselves. The United States is the world's dominant imperial power. As we reflect about this, it is important to realize that empire is not intrinsically about geographical expansion. As a country, we may not be interested in that. But empire is about the use of military and economic power to shape the world in one's perceived interest. Within this definition, we are the Roman Empire of our time, both in our foreign policy and in the shape of economic globalization that we as a country vigorously advocate. Christians in the United States are deeply divided about this country's imperial role. ¹⁹¹

Just as there is a dangerous distortion when only the personal meaning of Good Friday and Easter is emphasized, so also when only the political meaning is emphasized. When this happens, we forget that Jesus' passion was not just the *kingdom* of God. It was also the kingdom of *God*. They (Kingdom and God) go together: it is never kingdom without God, and it is never God without kingdom. It is deeply religious vision of life under the lordship of God as known in Jesus, which is the same as life under the lordship of Christ. "Jesus is Lord," the most widespread post-Easter affirmation in the New Testament, is thus both personal and political. It involves a deep centering in God, a deep centering in God that includes radical trust in God, the same trust that we see in Jesus. It produces freedom- "For freedom, Christ has set us free;" compassion - the greatest of the spiritual gifts is love; and courage - "Fear not, do not be afraid." Without personal centering in God, Dietrich Bonhoeffer would not have had the freedom and courage to engage in a conspiracy against Hitler within Nazi Germany itself. Without it, Desmond Tutu could not have opposed apartheid with such courage, infectious joy, and a reconciling spirit. Without it, Martin Luther King, Jr., could not have kept on keeping on in the midst of all the threats that he faced. ¹⁹²

¹⁸⁸ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 210-211.

¹⁸⁹ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 211-212.

¹⁹⁰ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 213.

¹⁹¹ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 213.

¹⁹² Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 214.

And this deep centering also involves loyalty, allegiance, and commitment to God disclosed in Jesus. Such loyalty is the opposite of idolatry, of giving one's loyalty to a lesser good. It also involves loyalty and commitment to God's passion as disclosed in Jesus, a passion for compassion, justice, and nonviolence. Compassion - love - is utterly central to the message and life of Jesus, and justice is the social form of compassion. To put the same thought in different language, love is the soul of justice, and justice is the body, the flesh, of love. All of this is what Easter, the ultimate climax of Holy Week, is about. Good Friday, the penultimate climax, discloses how powerful the forces arrayed against the kingdom of God are. Easter affirms, "Jesus is Lord" - the powers of this world are not. Holy Week, Good Friday, and Easter are about the conflict between the radicality of God and the normalcy of domination systems, which is the normalcy of civilization. Jesus' last week challenges the domination systems of this world even as it also invites us upon a journey through death to resurrection, journey with the risen Jesus, the risen Christ.¹⁹³

The personal and political meanings of Holy Week are captured in two nearly identical questions. The first is one that many Christians have heard and responded to: Do you accept Jesus as your personal Lord and Savior? It is a crucially important question, for the Lordship of Christ is the path of personal liberation, return from exile, and conscious reconnection to God. The virtually identical but seldom asked question is: Do accept Jesus as your political Lord and Savior? The gospel of Jesus, the good news of Jesus, which is the gospel of the kingdom of God, involves both questions. The gospel about Jesus, the good news about Jesus, which is the gospel of the Lordship of Christ, involves both questions.¹⁹⁴

Holy Week and the journey of Lent are about an alternative procession and an alternative journey. The alternative procession is what we see on Palm Sunday, an anti-imperial and nonviolent procession. Now as then, that procession leads to a capital city, an imperial center, and a place of collaboration between religion and violence. Now as then, the alternative journey is the path of personal transformation that leads to journeying with the risen Jesus, just as it did for his followers on the road to Emmaus. Holy Week as the annual remembrance of Jesus' last week presents us with the always relevant questions: Which journey are we on? Which procession are we in?¹⁹⁵

¹⁹³ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 215.

¹⁹⁴ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 215.

¹⁹⁵ Marcus J. Borg & John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), 216.

Last week In last week In the last week In a last week. Last April, I have traveled to Antarctica by ship. Is this sentence correct? yes no. Steve and Becky went camping. Last summer In last summer In the last summer In a last summer. In the last two days, my brother has called me four times. Is this sentence correct? yes no. I've worn purple almost every day. Last year In last year In the last year In a last year. Next Question. Comments.