Was the historical Jesus an anarchist? Anachronism, anarchism and the historical Jesus

Justin Meggitt
University of Cambridge, UK

The claim that Jesus was an anarchist has been made by a variety of individuals and movements throughout history. Although there have been significant differences in what has been meant, it is possible to determine the validity of such a judgement. Once initial questions about historicity, methodology, and definition have been addressed, it is apparent that there are a number of recurrent, dominant, motifs within our earliest sources about the figure of Jesus that can legitimately be judged anarchist. The 'Kingdom of God' for example, a concept that pervades the earliest data, includes the active identification and critique of coercive relations of power, and the enactment of new, egalitarian and prefigurative modes of social life, as well as a reflexive, undetermined, and self-creative praxis. The pedagogy of the historical Jesus also appears to have been predominately prefigurative and non-coercive. Although the picture certainly is not uniform, and there are early motifs that can be judged authoritarian and hierarchical, claims that the historical Jesus was an anarchist are legitimate, defensible and valuable.

It is true that if we could follow the precepts of the Nazarene this would be a different world to live in. There would then be no murder and no war; no cheating and lying and profit-making. There would be neither slave nor master, and we should all live like brothers, in peace and harmony. There would be neither poor nor rich, neither crime nor prison, but that would not be what the church wants. It would be what the Anarchists want.[1]

How to cite this book chapter:
Meggitt, J. 2017. Was the historical Jesus an anarchist? Anachronism, anarchism and the historical Jesus. In: Christoyannopoulos, A. and Adams, M. S. (eds.) *Essays in Anarchism and Religion: Volume 1*. Pp. 124–197. Stockholm: Stockholm University Press. DOI: https://doi.org/10.16993/bak.e. License: CC-BY

1. Preliminary issues

The claim that Jesus was an anarchist is one that has been made by a variety of individuals and movements since the term "anarchist" itself first began to be commonly used from the 1840s onwards.[2] Nietzsche,[3] is probably amongst the most culturally significant to have given Jesus this label, though other prominent figures have made more or less the same claim, including Berdyaev,[4] Tolstoy,[5] and Wilde,[6] as have a host of lesser known figures. It has been most common amongst groups and networks that are overt in their espousal of some form of Christian anarchism, such as the Catholic Worker Movement,[7] the Jesus Radicals,[8] the Brotherhood Church,[9] and the Union of the Spiritual Communities of Christ,[10] but could also be said to be implied in movements that have been identified as containing implicit anarchist characteristics, such as those associated with some forms of liberation theology[11] and related contextual theologies.[12] The anarchist potentiality of the historical Jesus was even recognised by classical anarchist thinkers, most prominently Proudhon,[13] but also, to varying degrees, Bakunin,[14] Kropotkin,[15] and Stirner.[16]

Of course, what exactly is meant when someone calls Jesus an "anarchist" is not self-evident and there is sometimes little, if anything, that such claims have in common. Authors assume a range of different interpretations of the figure of Jesus and also of anarchism itself in making their judgments. This paper is not a criticism of any such estimations of Jesus but rather an attempt to bring a little more clarity to the subject and to see if, historically speaking, there is any analytical value in talking in such a way about Jesus. More specifically, I would like to examine whether the historical Jesus can legitimately be called an anarchist.

By using the expression "the historical Jesus" I am assuming a distinction, common in Biblical scholarship since the nineteenth century,[17] between the historical figure of Jesus and the Christ of Christian faith, a distinction that assumes that the two are not necessarily the same (a distinction that not all the writers that might be labeled Christian anarchist would share). My concern is not whether the Christ of Christian faith, that believers claim is known from the Christian Bible, doctrine and experience was (or

indeed, for them, *is*) an anarchist but whether the man called Jesus of Nazareth, who lived and died about two thousand years ago, could usefully be called such.

I should also make it clear that I am specifically interested in whether Jesus can be called an "anarchist". This is not necessarily the same as saying that he simply had anti-authoritarian tendencies nor that he was a violent insurrectionist of some kind – something that received considerable attention some decades ago and which has recently been revived.[18] Nor is it the same as deciding that he was a "revolutionary" of some other kind, something that has been a particular interest in contemporary scholarship, especially amongst those concerned with trying to demonstrate that the historical Jesus was an "inclusive" figure of some sort.[19] Ideas about what might constitute "politics" have become increasingly nuanced, under the influence of such things as postcolonial and gender theory,[20] and the ideological contexts of both the historical Jesus and New Testament scholars themselves have come under extensive scrutiny.[21]

However, before we can attempt to answer the question we have posed, there are a number of preliminary matters that need to be addressed. In asking whether the historical Jesus can be usefully labeled an anarchist I am conscious that many anarchists may be familiar with material, academic and otherwise, which maintains that Jesus of Nazareth never existed,[22] and they may think that my question is a pointless one to try to answer. Although no questions should be ignored in the critical study of religion, the arguments of those who doubt the existence of the historical Jesus are unpersuasive.[23] None of the opponents of early Christianity, although they found numerous grounds for criticising the life and teaching of Jesus, doubted his existence,[24] and, to put the matter concisely, the existence of Jesus of Nazareth is by far the most plausible way of explaining the traditions we have about a first-century, charismatic, Jewish peasant of that name. Traditions that, culturally speaking, cohere with what we know about the religious and cultural environment of Palestine at the time and which combine to form a picture of a specific and distinctive individual within it – not a banal and fanciful composite. Of course, these sources need to be handled with critical caution,

as they have been since the Enlightenment, as most are composed by followers of Jesus.[25] However, this in itself is not surprising: the poor in the Roman empire – and pictures of Jesus from antiquity are universal in placing him in this category[26] – like the poor in most of history, had little and left less behind. Very few, mostly through accident rather than design, left anything, so thoroughgoing has been what E. P. Thompson called "the enormous condescension of posterity".[27] Jesus' significance, to those other than his immediate followers, was only evident in retrospect and so we should not be surprised that there is little in the way of non-Christian documentary or literary evidence for this life and that our analysis will have to rely on extensive and diverse but largely Christian sources.[28]

However, having accepted that it is possible to talk about a historical Jesus, how should we go about determining whether it is reasonable to label him an anarchist or not? The current literature that has touched on this is of little assistance. Many of those claiming that Jesus was an anarchist are often doing little more than constructing a mythology to give authority to a movement, as Woodcock has suggested.[29] Some have arrived at their interpretation of Jesus through a more critical, ostensibly historical approach to the sources; Tolstoy's anti-supernaturalist reading of the gospels, which had no place for the miraculous "rotten apples"[30] is perhaps the most famous example. However, there has been little systematic or coherent engagement with critical scholarship concerned with the study of the historical Jesus and the problems it has tried to address, and most readings by those who want to label Jesus an anarchist are characterised by rather literalistic and hermeneutically naive approaches to Biblical texts,[31] as the analysis of Christoyannopoulos has recently demonstrated.[32] The teachings of the historical Jesus are, for example, often assumed to be easily accessible. For some, this is just a matter of rescuing Jesus from Paul (and often, by implication, the later church), but however rhetorically appealing it is to many Christian anarchists for whom Paul can be a rather uncomfortable figure,[33] this is not a defensible approach as Paul is the author of the earliest Christian literature that we possess and provides us with data about the historical Jesus, which, limited though it is, actually predates the gospels.[34]

A number solve the conundrum by giving priority to the Sermon on the Mount (Matthew 5.3–7.27), seeing it as the authoritative epitome of Jesus' teaching,[35] but in so doing they ignore its redactional character; it is, to a large extent, the construction of the author of the gospel in which it is found and cannot be said to go back to the historical Jesus.[36] Even if the sermon is composed of elements that early Christians thought originated with Jesus, many of which are paralleled in the so-called Sermon on the Plain (Luke 6:20–49), and can also be seen in the epistle of James and the early Christian text, the *Didache*,[37] there is much about its structure and content that clearly owes itself to the author of the Gospel of Matthew and those who brought together and transmitted the sources from which he created his final text. Of course, there has been a handful of scholars who have been practitioners of critical biblical scholarship and who have also shown an interest in Christian anarchism, most notably Vaage[38] and Myers,[39] but these are relatively few and, to date, there has been no critical and programmatic attempt to answer the question we have asked. In the light of this it is necessary to sketch, in a little detail, a valid method for scrutinizing the sources we have for the historical Jesus that might provide us with some plausible results.

But before I do this, I should add some caveats about my own historical approach here. I am very conscious that in asking questions about the historical Jesus I might well be doing something that strikes some as epistemologically naive – even if a lot of people do it – and I could be accused, along with others who engage one way or another with the "Quest"[40] for the historical Jesus, of making oddly positivist assumptions about the nature of historical knowledge and how it can be arrived at.[41] However, my aims are quite modest: I am not claiming to uncover the "real" Jesus,[42] nor even a useful one, but to make some provisional but, I hope, plausible suggestions about how this figure could be understood if examined in the light of the assumptions, aspirations, and praxis characteristic of anarchism. In asking this question I am not assuming anything about the significance of what follows or its implications: my interest in the historical Jesus is not in uncovering a figure, or an aspect of a figure, that is somehow determinative for Christians or anyone else. The shifting sands of historical

reconstruction are not really a very useful foundation for anything much that matters – though many biblical scholars enjoy their time in the sandpit and make quite remarkable claims about the ephemeral edifices that they fashion.[43]

Before I turn to the question of historical method it is also important to address an initial objection to the question this paper tries to answer, which might, in the eyes of some, like the question of Jesus' existence, prevent them proceeding any further: the problem of Jesus' theism. I am conscious that it might be argued that the theism of the historical Jesus precludes him from being considered an anarchist. Most of the words or actions ascribed to him, in one way or another, either reference or are predicated upon belief in God.[44] For example, the arrival of God's rule and its implication for humans seems to have preoccupied him and is at the heart of whatever socio-political vision he may have had, as we shall see.[45] However, it is not the case that anarchism necessarily implies atheism. Atheism is central to many forms of classical anarchism. One need only think of Bakunin's famous *God and the State,* Faure's *Les douze preuves de l'inexistence de dieu*[46] or the infamous anti-clerical massacres carried out by anarchist units in the Spanish Civil War.[47] Such atheism is often predicated upon the need to reject the tyranny assumed to be inherent in the idea of an omnipotent God (powerfully expressed in Bakunin's famous remark, "If God really existed, it would be necessary to abolish him").[48] However, it is also driven by the desire to oppose the oppression that is thought to result from the social consequences of belief in God, both that oppression caused by religious institutions themselves and the power that they exert, and also the oppression which results from the support such religious institutions, in turn, provide to the state, the prime focus of the anarchist critique of exploitation (Bakunin famously called the state, "the Church's younger brother").[49] Indeed, the apparent demise of religion – even if anarchism has often been rather premature in its claims about this – has been taken by some anarchists as evidence of the likely demise of the state:

> The history of religion is a model for the history of government. Once it was thought impossible to have a society without God;

> now God is dead. It is still thought impossible to have a society without the state; now we must destroy the state.[50]

The atheism of anarchism can be so intense as to spill over into misotheism, not just a denial of the existence of God but an active hatred of God.[51] However, as the influential chronicler of anarchism, Peter Marshall has noted, "Anarchism is not necessarily atheistic any more than socialism is."[52] And it is clear from the existence of religious anarchists of various kinds, some of which we have already mentioned, that this is the case.[53] However eccentric they might appear, religious anarchists are not normally considered outside the anarchist fold in studies of the field (unlike, for example, anarcho-capitalists[54] or far-right national anarchists[55]). It would be, for example, an unusual history of anarchism that did not make at least some mention of Tolstoy or the Catholic Worker Movement.[56] Therefore the theism of Jesus should not preclude him from being labelled an anarchist.

These observations aside, let us now turn to the question of historical method.

2. Constructing the historical Jesus

Until recently there was a general agreement on the historical method used by most of those studying the figure of Jesus.[57] There was a rough consensus on the range of historical-critical tools that should be employed and the sources that were deemed relevant.[58] In addition, most scholars also agreed on the need to apply so-called "criteria of authenticity" to the data in order to distinguish between "authentic" and "inauthentic" traditions about Jesus.[59] Five criteria were given particular weight in reconstructions: embarrassment, dissimilarity, multiple attestation, coherence and crucifiability, and these, explicitly or implicitly, have underpinned most of the critical studies of Jesus that have appeared in the last few decades.[60] However, the field is now experiencing something of a crisis. Consensus on historical method has not produced agreement on the results[61] and we have, instead, seen a proliferation of widely divergent reconstructions of the historical Jesus.[62] There is a growing recognition that, despite attempts to rectify

their weaknesses,[63] some of which have long been noted,[64] the criteria of authenticity are inadequate for the task, and should be abandoned. The discipline is now (or perhaps, once again) much more alert to the challenges posed by such things as memory[65] and has a greater awareness of the problems inherent in talking about "authenticity". A recent essay by Dale Allison, a leading historical-Jesus scholar, in which he chronicled his own growing disillusionment with the way in which the subject has been approached, is emblematic of the current state of the field.[66]

My own position is similar to that at which Allison has recently arrived.[67] There is much about Jesus that remains impossible to substantiate if we treat it with the same kind of scepticism that one would responsibly use if you were, for example, trying to establish the details of the life of other figures who were significant in antiquity, such as Socrates,[68] Apollonius of Tyana,[69] or Rabbi Akiva,[70] and to say with any certainty what they may have said or done or what ideas that they might have had. Only a limited amount of information can be ascertained about the historical Jesus with anything approaching confidence, and that, for the most part, is of a general rather than specific kind. The significant creativity evident amongst those who first repeated and recorded traditions about Jesus, and the lack of evidence that the early Christians were discerning in their transmission of stories about him,[71] makes such a position unavoidable. Most of the data we have about Jesus can only provide us with *impressions* of the man but these impressions are relatively trustworthy and reflect the enduring effect he had upon his earliest followers. They remain valid irrespective of the historicity of any particular unit of tradition, regardless of the abbreviation, elaboration, conflation, embellishment and fabrication evident within the sources.[72] So, for example, as I have noted elsewhere, when we look at the relevant texts:

> The virtues that Jesus exhibited in the face of death, of both forebearance and submission, and his refusal to return violence with violence, seem to have been recurring motifs in the pictures of Jesus that emerge from these traditions and tell us something about the enduring impression his personality made on his followers.[73]

And there are, I believe, many larger patterns evident in the sources, patterns that are sufficiently robust so as to still hold true even if the data that they are derived from includes material that was invented. Indeed, as Allison has said, even "fiction can bring us facts … some of the traditions about Jesus which are, in the strict sense, not historical, surely give us a faithful impression of the sort of person he was or the sort of thing he typically did."[74] The temptation narratives, for example, despite being highly legendary depict Jesus as someone who shows disdain for personal political power, a motif that recurs a number of times in our sources.[75] And so I would go along with Allison, albeit for slightly different reasons, and say:

> So, in the matter of Jesus, we should start not with the parts but with the whole, which means with the general impression that the tradition about him, *in toto*, tends to convey. The criteria of authenticity are, for this endeavour, simply in the way.[76]

It is the working assumption of this text that beyond a small cluster of incidents – such as his crucifixion – the details of the life of Jesus are historically elusive although the general picture, and recurrent motifs, are discernible and historically reliable.

It follows, therefore, that I am not going to engage in detailed exegesis of specific texts, even those that look particularly relevant to our theme. For example, the "Render unto Caesar" incident,[77] something central to most studies of the politics of Jesus,[78] will not be the focus of detailed scrutiny because the best that can be said about individual traditions of this kind is that they were the kind of thing Jesus' followers[79] thought Jesus might have said. Our business is about seeing the patterns and determining what was characteristic of the figure, not to be too concerned with the historicity of the details. Such an approach also has the advantage of resembling the way that ancient biographies – which to a large extent the gospels are[80] – would have been understood in antiquity.[81]

3. The meaning and utility of the term "anarchist"

If we want to determine whether the historical Jesus can be termed an "anarchist" we need to determine not only how we can

arrive at knowledge about the figure than might allow us to make such a judgement but also what we mean by the term "anarchist" when we attempt such an evaluation. In addition, we will need to address two potential criticisms of the business of determining whether the term "anarchist" is a fair one to apply to Jesus: that the term "anarchist" is anachronistic and ethnocentric.

Any attempt to define anarchism has to deal with the problem of its popular image. The notion that anarchism is about the absence of order rather than the absence of government, that it is synonymous with chaos and senseless violence, has persisted since the Victorian period[82] and was made famous by such works as Joseph Conrad's *The Secret Agent*.[83] Of course, there are some forms of insurrectionary anarchism that appear to fit this stereotype – one needs only think of the recent activities of the *Federazione Anarchica Informale*[84] – but counter to the popular image, the use of violence[85] is, for most anarchists, subject to considerable constraints, and most would eschew anything that could be deemed to be coercive violence against persons, even if outright pacifism is a minority position.[86] Far from being senseless and destructive, most anarchists would consider themselves engaged in a constructive project consisting of "reconstructive visions, prefigurative politics and self-organisation".[87]

But once we move past the problem of the popular image of anarchism, and try to define anarchism more accurately, we still face a number of acute challenges. There are, for example, a range of terms commonly used to qualify the word "anarchist", such as collectivist, communist, individualist, liberal, life-style, mutualist, poststructuralist, primitivist, social, and syndicalist, the diversity of which seems, at first sight, to indicate something that is so pluriform that it resists definition. But whilst such labels, and more, are clearly significant, it is possible to have what has been called "an anarchism without adjectives",[88] some kind of anarchism that is roughly representative of what most forms of anarchism have in common and true to its varied but essentially ecumenical character.[89] Although it is customary to begin such fundamental definitions with an etymological point about the Greek word *anarchos,* from which the term anarchism is derived,[90] and to point out that it means "without a ruler", this does not get us

very far, and saying something more is challenging, not least because anarchism is profoundly anti-dogmatic.[91] Nonetheless, the definition of the anthropologist Brian Morris is one that is helpful for our purposes, encapsulating both its critical and constructive programme.

> Anarchists are people who reject all forms of government or coercive authority, all forms of hierarchy and domination [...] But anarchists also seek to establish or bring about by varying means, a condition of anarchy, that is, a decentralised society without coercive institutions.[92]

However, it might also be helpful to keep in mind, in what follows, the suggestion by David Graeber, that any definition of the term anarchist has to encompass a range of interrelated and overlapping meanings. He notes that generally speaking, people, ideas or institutions are labelled anarchist if they endorse an explicit doctrine, display a particular attitude, or engage in specific practices. That is, anarchists include those who are heirs of the intellectual tradition that began in the nineteenth century which is characterised by "a certain vision of human possibilities";[93] those that display a particular "attitude" which "reject[s] government and believe[s] that people would be better off in a world without hierarchies";[94] and those that engage in practices and forms of social organisation that are broadly egalitarian in ethos[95] (seen, for example in what Evans-Pritchard called the "ordered anarchy" of the Nuer).[96] No definition of "anarchist" will ever be satisfactory but Graeber's remarks remind us that whilst we should be careful not to make our understanding of the term so broad as to be meaningless (it will not do, for example, to label anyone who is anti-authoritarian an anarchist) we should be aware that the term is an expansive, dynamic and necessarily malleable one.

However, having briefly explored the question of what an "anarchist" might be usefully said to be, we now need to address whether it is anachronistic or ethnocentric to ask if the historical Jesus can be usefully described in this way.

The charge of anachronism seems, at face value, a damning one. To many anarchism may seem clearly wedded to a specific historical moment, its character determined by its formal origins in the

nineteenth century, or the brief periods of prominence it enjoyed with the Maknovists in Ukraine,[97] the CNT-FAI in Republican Spain,[98] its prominence in events in France in May 1968,[99] or its more recent re-emergence within anti-capitalist and anti-globalisation movements, and anarchist volunteers contributing to the defense of the Rojava revolution in north Syria/West Kurdistan.[100] All these are a long way from first-century Palestine and so it seems legitimate to ask whether it is just downright anachronistic to even pose the question whether the historical Jesus was an anarchist. If it is then we are wasting our time.

However, the problem of using contemporary terminology to describe and elucidate past realities is not a new one and obviously not limited to the study of the historical Jesus (although scholars of the historical Jesus often behave as though they were engaged in a unique endeavour). Given the opprobrium that has faced those who have maintained that the historical Jesus can be usefully described as a Jewish Cynic,[101] a not unreasonable suggestion given the clear resemblances between Jesus and the philosophical movement of that name active in the early Roman empire, and a suggestion that at least had the virtue of applying to the historical Jesus a term that was current in the first-century world,[102] to ask whether Jesus could usefully be called an "anarchist" seems unwise. However, it is a term that is, generally speaking, particularly amenable to being used of a figure in the past. As Graeber has noted, the founding ideologues of anarchism, such as Proudhon, "did not think of themselves as having invented anything particularly new. The basic principles of anarchism – self-organization, voluntary association, mutual aid – referred to forms of human behaviour they assumed it had been around about as long as humanity."[103] It is certainly a less problematic term to use than, say, "Marxist". The latter has always been associated with high theory and the fundamental project of analysis begun with Karl Marx, whilst anarchism is, again in the words of Graeber, "more a moral project"[104] and the only thing that really changed in the nineteenth century was that it acquired a name.[105] Such thinking lies behind, for example, Robert Graham's recent documentary chronicle of anarchism, which begins at 300CE,[106] or Peter Marshall's *Demanding the Impossible*, a substantial and influential history of anarchism that traces the origins of anarchism

back to Taoism and the sixth century BCE, and, like Graham, contains extensive discussion of pre-nineteenth century movements. Indeed, not just historians of anarchism but historians working in other fields have believed that anarchism can have analytic purchase when talking about the past. Patricia Crone, for example, a key figure in the study of Islamic origins, has argued that some Mu'tazilites and members of the Najadāt sub-sect of Khārijites, should be termed anarchists and included in histories of anarchism as they believed that society could, indeed *should,* function without a government or what we would call a state.[107] Similarly, Norman Cohn used it to describe various millenarian movements in medieval Europe, most notably Taborites of Bohemia.[108] Likewise, the anthropologist James C. Scott has used the term in his history of the peoples of Zomia, a region of upland Southeast Asia which has, until relatively recently, resisted the "internal colonialism" of state-making in the area and whose inhabitants had successfully practiced the art of not being governed for centuries.[109] And similarly, fellow anthropologist Brian Morris has considered it an appropriate designation for Lao Tzu.[110] We should not, therefore, be reluctant to use the term "anarchist" to describe the figure of Jesus, if he merits such a designation.

Nonetheless, the problem of anachronism is not necessarily dealt with so easily: for much of its history anarchism has been associated with opposition to both capitalism and the state, which are usually seen as inseparable objects that mutually re-enforce one another, are irredeemably coercive,[111] and neither of which might strike someone as obviously present in the first-century, pre-industrial world; something that might undermine its utility for our purposes. However, anarchists have not always seen capitalism and the state as the sole causes of inequalities of power and creations of hierarchy,[112] and critiques of all forms of domination, whatever their source and in whatever domain, are common, something particularly evident in the articulations of anarchism that have come to the fore in recent years. It is also the case that the terms "capitalism" and "state" can have some explanatory power for making sense of antiquity and the world within which the historical Jesus lived. First, it has proven useful for those engaged in the study of antiquity to characterise the economy of

the early Roman empire as one of political capitalism,[113] in the Weberian sense, an economy that consisted of "the exploitation of the opportunities for profit arising from the exercise of political power";[114] it may have been a market economy of sorts[115] but profit-making was in the hands of the political elite within the empire and its retainers. Secondly, whilst there was little analogous to the modern state in antiquity, the Roman government did monopolise ultimate military, fiscal, legislative and judicial power within the regions it ruled (even if also allowed considerable autonomy). Although the Roman empire of the first century CE was relatively light on administrative functionaries[116] and military personnel,[117] given the extent of territory controlled,[118] it certainly meets a minimal definition of a state where a state is understood as a social organization "capable of exerting a considerable degree of power [...] over large numbers of people, and for sustained periods".[119] Indeed, the Rome empire fulfilled the classic definition of the state as that which "lays claim to the monopoly of legitimate physical violence within a territory".[120]

We also need to address the related problem of ethnocentrism. If we call Jesus an "anarchist" are we employing a term that has no interpretative value outside of the modern European or North American context within which anarchism first emerged as a self-conscious movement, employing a concept that impedes rather than assists our understanding of a figure from a different cultural and historical context?[121] One that might be said to carry with it the superior presumptions of Western modernity (or, indeed, post-modernity) within which anarchism was born and thrives? Not only would such a judgment be wrong because anarchism itself has a long history of formal existence outside of Europe or North America (one thinks, for example, of the history of formal anarchist movements in Africa,[122] China,[123] Korea, Japan[124] and elsewhere),[125] but also because, as we have noted, it has been used by those engaged in the description and interpretation of non-European cultures, famously by Evans-Pritchard but also by other anthropologists acutely aware of such criticisms.[126] Harold Barclay has made perhaps the most thoroughgoing defence of the use of the term cross-culturally. He recognises that it the use of the term "anarchy" might be viewed as:

> Ethnocentric and confuses ideology with social classification. It is to take a highly emotionally charged word, one with a very clear ideological connotation, identified with Euro-American cultural traditions, and to apply it cross-culturally, when those in other cultures would clearly lack the ideology and values of the anarchist. Thus, not only is the word distorted but also is the meaning of those cultures.

But quite rightly he notes that:

> If this is true of the word 'anarchy', it applies equally to the use of such words as 'democratic', 'government', 'law' [...] and a host of others employed daily by social scientists, yet derived from ordinary speech. Social sciences is full of terms in common usage which are applied to social contexts in other cultures. There are certainly dangers to such a procedure. It is easy to carry extraneous ideological baggage along with the term. On the other hand, if we cannot at all make such cross-cultural transfers, we are left with a proliferation of neologisms which become pure jargonese, enhancing obfuscation rather than clarification.[127]

So the question of whether the historical Jesus was an anarchist is one that can be asked and one to which we can expect a meaningful answer of some kind. Let us now sketch a response.

4. Was the *historical* Jesus an anarchist?

As we discussed earlier, any attempt to talk about the *historical* Jesus will need to concern itself with impressions and motifs rather than detailed exegesis of specific traditions. Even within these constraints there is much that could be said but for the purposes of this essay I would like to focus a prominent motif present within a large quantity of traditions associated with the figure of Jesus: the kingdom of God. A "kingdom", of whatever kind, does not, of course, sound a very anarchist thing but it should be noted, from the outset, that the Greek term *basileia*, which is translated into English as "kingdom", can be understood as having a territorial or geographical meaning but it can also refer to royal power or sovereignty; it can be understood as "reign" or "rule" as well as "realm". This is also true of the Hebrew and Aramaic word

malkūth which probably underlies the use of the Greek term.[128] So, although we shall use the expression "kingdom of God", as this phrase remains the best-known rendering into English of the Greek phrase *basileia tou theou* found in early Christian sources and associated with the figure of Jesus, it can also be thought of as the "reign of God" or "rule of God".

In our sources, references to the kingdom of God saturate not just Jesus' teaching but his activity too.[129] The phrase, or the term "kingdom" by itself, is prominent in the canonical gospels of Matthew, Mark and Luke (customarily referred to as the Synoptic gospels) and the non-canonical gospel of Thomas,[130] a text which is considered by most scholars in the field to contain early traditions about Jesus comparable to those of the Synoptics[131] (the gospel of John is usually judged to be somewhat later and of little value in the study of the historical Jesus).[132] The "kingdom" is all pervasive. It appears at the outset of accounts of the life of Jesus, as the subject of his preaching, and remains a preoccupation throughout his ministry. For example, at the beginning of his public activity, according to Matthew and Mark, Jesus proclaims:

> The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God has come near; repent, and believe in the good news.[133]

And, it remains a preoccupation to the end, a subject of discussion at his final meal[134] and even his words from the cross.[135] It was determinative of the content and character of his ethics. For example, renunciation of wealth appears a prerequisite for entrance to the kingdom.

> It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle that for someone who is rich enter the kingdom of God.[136]

The kingdom is also directly linked to Jesus' role as a healer and exorcist, something that is a particularly prominent characteristic of his portrayal in our sources (and although unusual, not exceptional, in the cultural context of the early empire and first-century Judaism).[137] He is presented, for example, as declaring that his exorcisms are proof of the kingdom's arrival:

> But if it is by the Spirit [finger] of God that I cast out demons, then the kingdom of God has come to you.[138]

The theme of the kingdom is also present in a range of forms of tradition from which our sources about Jesus are composed, including aphorisms, apocalyptic sayings, pronouncement stories, miracle stories, legends and parables.[139] Indeed, parables, "the characteristic form of Jesus' teaching",[140] seem particularly associated with this idea. Not only are we told that the interpretation of the parables requires hearers to know "the secret of the kingdom of God"[141] but a number of parables are introduced with direct reference to the kingdom and most function to explicate some aspect of its character.[142] The Gospel of Thomas, for example, regularly presents the parables it contains as concerned with the nature of the kingdom. In a tradition that does not have a direct parallel with anything in the Synoptic tradition, the reader is told:

> (97) Jesus said: The kingdom of the [Father] is like a woman, carrying a jar full of meal and walking a long way. The handle of the jar broke; the meal poured out behind her on the road. She was unaware, she knew not her loss. When she came into her house, she put down the jar (and) found it empty.

Whilst the introductions to the parables, which tie them so clearly to the theme of the kingdom, might well be redactional and not go back beyond the final composition of the gospels themselves, they are so commonplace that it seems fair to conclude that the parables – or at least most of them – were central to whatever Jesus wished to convey about the kingdom of God.

So we seem on safe grounds in saying that the kingdom or reign of God reflects the main concern of the historical Jesus, as most historical Jesus scholars agree, even if they disagree quite sharply about what exactly this might imply.[143] As Markus Bockmuehl puts it, "The favourite and important subject of Jesus' teaching is clearly the Kingdom of God."[144]

What exactly the historical Jesus may have had in mind when he spoke of the kingdom is notoriously difficult to determine definitively not just because close antecedents to this idea are not easy to identify, even if it clearly draws upon concepts common in

the Hebrew Bible and later Jewish literature,[145] but also because the form of teaching used by Jesus to talk about the kingdom of God, the parable,[146] is both terse and figurative – most parables appear to be extended metaphors or similes[147]– and, as a result their meaning is, to an extent, open and polyvalent (though clearly not arbitrary).[148] Their meaning cannot be crudely reduced to a single referent or point;[149] the symbol of the kingdom in the parables of Jesus is allusive, tensive and experiential.[150] But the meaning of the kingdom in the teaching of Jesus has also been hampered by the preoccupations of scholarship. Discussion of the theme of the kingdom in the study of the historical Jesus is often effectively constrained by questions of chronology that are often rather narrowly conceived. Did he believe its arrival was imminent?[151] Or that it was already present?[152] Or both?[153] Or are such temporal judgments predicated on culturally inappropriate assumptions about the nature of time and language?[154] This is not the place to rehearse such debates which have preoccupied scholars of the historical Jesus since the inception of the so-called "Quest",[155] though I would say that both tendencies can be found throughout the data, and so it seems unreasonable to deny that one or other did not go back in some form to the figure of Jesus, as has recently been the fashion.[156] Rather, I am here more interested in the question of the *character* of the reign of God envisioned by Jesus (although I am aware that this is deeply entwined with the question of eschatology).[157] That is, I would like to make some observations about what the historical Jesus is likely to have understood by the rule of God and the nature of human response to it, and in particular, a number of motifs that may legitimately and usefully be described as anarchist – although what follows is not a comprehensive analysis of the possibilities but an indicative treatment of the subject.

a. The kingdom of God is characterized by the active identification and critique of coercive relations of power, and the enactment of new, egalitarian modes of social life.

This is seen, perhaps most acutely, in the recurrent, general motif of reversal which is typical of traditions associated with Jesus. The

theme of reversal is more than a rhetorical characteristic of his teaching. As the leading scholar of New Testament ethics, Richard Hays, has noted:

> The theme of *reversal* seems to have been pervasive in his thought […] This reversal motif is built into the deep structure of Jesus' message, present in all layers of the tradition […] a foundational element of Jesus' teaching.[158]

The socio-political nature of much of this reversal[159] is obvious to a modern reader without knowledge of the specific political, religious and cultural context of first-century Palestine – though such knowledge is necessary for a fuller exploration of its implications.[160] In Jesus' vision, the kingdom belonged to the poor, not the rich;[161] to the hungry, not those who were full;[162] to the tax-collectors and prostitutes not chief priests and the aristocrats;[163] to children not adults;[164] to sinners and not the righteous.[165] Its values were exemplified by foreigners,[166] beggars,[167] and impoverished widows not the religiously, politically and economically powerful.[168] We find this theme in aphorisms,[169] commandments,[170] and sayings[171] ascribed to the historical Jesus, but, perhaps above all, in the parables. For example, in the Parable of the Wedding Feast,[172] the eventual guests at the banquet are those that one would least expect to be there – in Luke's version it is "the poor, the crippled, the blind and lame."[173] In the Parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, it is the beggar Lazarus who "longed to satisfy his hunger with what fell from the rich man's table" who goes to be with Abraham and the angels, whilst the rich man who has "dressed in purple and fine linen and who feasted sumptuously every day" is in Hades.[174] In the Parable of the Sheep and the Goats, the manner in which someone has treated the "least" in society, those who are hungry, thirsty, naked, imprisoned, sick, or foreign, provides the criterion by which their life is ultimately judged.[175] In the Parable of the Rich Fool, the selfish accumulation of wealth during his life leaves the rich man impoverished when he dies.[176] But perhaps the most compelling evidence of socio-political reversal in traditions associated with Jesus is the recurrent portrayal of his own praxis, as someone who lived with the outcasts and the socially marginal,[177] and in an almost constant state

of conflict with those who were not.[178] The theme of reversal functions not just to expose a number of inequitable relationships, but also to make visible and valorise the powerless within them, and their needs and their desires.

In addition to the theme of reversal we can see a significant cluster of traditions in which exploitation, whether economic,[179] legal,[180] theocratic,[181] military,[182] or medical,[183] is exposed and condemned, and responses advocated or made available that affirm both the agency of the oppressed and their capacity to resist such oppression. An example of this is seen, for example, in the tradition of how one should respond to being pressed into service by the occupying forces in Judea to carry their equipment.[184] The command that the victim carry the equipment further than was demanded, if acted upon, would have resulted in striking and unexpected behaviour that could function not just to restore the power of agency to the victim but also to non-violently undermine the assumption, on the part of the soldier, that he, and the colonial regime which he represented, had ultimate authority – a response that could be seen to enact the command to love enemies,[185] an idea particularly associated with Jesus in our sources.[186] The concern to restore agency to those deprived of it can also be seen, though in a rather different way, in the stories in which individuals gain healing from Jesus by actively demanding it from him or even seizing it for themselves – tactics which he seems to not just to have tolerated but to have encouraged.[187]

New models of social relationship are enacted that present alternative, largely egalitarian ways of living. For example, there are a number of traditions associated with historical Jesus that contain sharp criticisms of familial relationships and obligations,[188] and whilst it would be wrong to see these as part of a programmatic attack on patriarchy (significant numbers of women were drawn to the movement but there is no evidence of a "critical feminist impulse" in traditions about Jesus),[189] the traditional form of the family is eclipsed and a much more inclusive, fictive, family, where membership is not conditional on ties of marriage and blood, but on shared purpose, is advocated and comes into being amongst Jesus' followers.[190] Social relations and obligations are no longer structured according to reciprocity, whether

symmetrical or asymmetrical, which requires someone to have the means to "repay"[191] but instead an ethos of generosity is expected, where debts are forgiven and those with resources are told to be free with them and not to keep account.[192]

Traditions of Jesus' teaching and praxis also regularly involve a distinctive approach to dining, something that was central to the literal and symbolic maintenance of inequitable relationships of power in antiquity, and also, in the case of first-century Palestine, created significant, inequitable divisions.[193] He advocated and demonstrated what Crossan calls "open commensality",[194] that is "eating together without using table as a miniature map of society's vertical discriminations and lateral separations."[195] This was a significant motif in Jesus' practice,[196] so much so that he was mocked as "a glutton and a drunkard"[197] and someone who ate with "tax collectors and sinners",[198] but it is also present in the teaching traditions ascribed to Jesus,[199] particularly the parable traditions,[200] as well as miracle traditions,[201] and is even in an apocalyptic vision of the future kingdom: "I tell you, many will come from east and west and will eat with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven"[202] – something that indicates that the aspirations and concerns of the kingdom envisaged by the historical Jesus were ultimately universal[203] and could even be said to come close to a form of cosmopolitanism,[204] a concept central to anarchism.[205]

The historical Jesus also appears to have modelled a form of social interaction that ignored expectations of deference,[206] probably rooted in the expectation that the behaviour of those in the kingdom should reflect the character of God, and God was for Jesus, and other Jews of the time, "no respecter of persons".[207] This was something both egalitarian in itself but also revealed and challenged the structures and presumptions of power symbolised by such deference; to those who were beneficiaries of stratification and hierarchy, it presented a disruptive rhetoric of impoliteness.[208]

However, whilst there are sufficient clusters of data to make it plausible to see the historical Jesus as a figure known for confronting coercive and hierarchical relationships, and advocating alternative models of social life, there are aspects of the teaching

and actions of Jesus that do not easily fit with this picture, are equally prominent in our sources, and need to be addressed.

First, it is quite clear that although the figure of Jesus is characteristically associated with the powerless, he enjoyed the support of those who facilitated and benefited from political and economic exploitation, supported by the largess of the rich and socializing with the agents of imperial rule, such as tax-collectors and the military – something sufficiently prominent in our sources that it cannot be dismissed as redactional, an invention of Christians who were comfortable within the empire and wished to legitimate their experience.[209] Such a picture is difficult to reconcile with a figure engaged in a thoroughgoing and confrontational response to non-egalitarian forms of social life. Was he, perhaps, so inclusive that this somehow transcended, or less positively, undermined the political vision we have observed? This seems unlikely. As Bockmuehl quite rightly notes, Jesus was *not* an inclusive figure. "Jesus of Nazareth includes a remarkably wide diversity of the marginalized, yet he also marginalizes an uncomfortably diverse range of the religiously or socio economically included."[210] It is probably best to explain this apparent tension by reference to the theme of repentance, something regularly associated with the notion of the kingdom of God. Repentance was not concerned with contrition but rather the idea that individuals should return to God[211] and do what God expects of those who wish to be righteous.[212] In our sources those responding to the call of Jesus, whoever they are, are expected to imitate Jesus' praxis, including such things as open commensality, and there is also evidence, from the story of Zaccheus, the tax collector but also in the story of the rich ruler, that the rich were also expected to make restitution and return what they had extracted by exploitation.[213]

Secondly, it should be noted that the historical Jesus does not appear straightforwardly or consistently anti-authoritarian or anti-hierarchical. It would be unfair to ignore the considerable range of data where Jesus is presented as either claiming an authoritative or pivotal role,[214] or where it is implied,[215] and this observation stands regardless of other questions about Jesus self-estimation and "Christology" which have attracted so much attention because of their obvious theological consequences.[216] Of

course, anarchists have not been averse to leaders, albeit often for tactical reasons, one thinks of the prominence of Nestor Makhno, Errico Malatesta, or Emma Goldman, but this claim appears to be of a rather different kind. The historical Jesus initiated a hierarchical organisation through the appointment of twelve disciples, something which he did not envisage as temporary[217] and his own authority was predicated upon coercion through the pronouncement of future judgement upon those who rejected it.[218] It is usually assumed that where leadership exists within anarchism it is "a continual exchange of mutual, temporary, and, above all, voluntary authority and subordination"[219] but evidently the type of leadership modelled and advocated by the historical Jesus was somewhat different.

In response to this it could be said that the nature of the leadership shown by Jesus and expected of the Twelve was, somewhat paradoxically, an inversion of hierarchical expectations, epitomized in the repeated motif that leaders must be servants and the deliberate contrast of the model of power within the community with that which was characteristic of the empire, indeed, on which the empire was built and sustained, to the detriment of the latter.[220] And so, in Mark, chapter ten, we read:

> 42 So Jesus called them and said to them, 'You know that among the Gentiles those whom they recognize as their rulers lord it over them, and their great ones are tyrants over them. 43 But it is not so among you; but whoever wishes to become great among you must be your servant, 44 and whoever wishes to be first among you must be slave of all.[221]

It could also be said – though this is perhaps a little less evident – that in choosing twelve disciples the historical Jesus was using a symbol of a pre-monarchical Israel, when it existed as a confederation of tribes, to represent his vision of the kingdom, something that Ched Myers has said "bears some resemblance to 'anarcho-syndicalist' vision in modernity";[222] recalling a time before the people of Israel decided to be like other nations and have a king, rejecting God's direct rule.[223]

The activities of healing and teaching that are so characteristic of the representation of Jesus in our sources also have little to do

with authoritarian forms of kingly, messianic leadership that were dominant at the time.[224] Indeed, given that the historical Jesus seems to have expected those around him to be empowered to carry out similar actions,[225] it might not be too fanciful to agree with Gerd Theissen that the historical Jesus may well have envisaged his followers collectively taking on messianic tasks, enacting a kind of group messiahship. If this is the case, it would have meant that the historical Jesus effectively played down his own significance and so could be seen as advocating a kind of distributed, non-authoritarian form of leadership.[226]

Similarly, the traditions about his death are uniform in presenting a figure who remained consistent in not using or endorsing violence against enemies and for whom physical violence by humans against humans was anathema.[227] It was not a form of leadership in which authority was equated with a superior sense of personal value. Indeed, it appears to have been the opposite.

b. The kingdom of God is prefigurative.

As we have noted, the kingdom motif is not just associated with judgement but also with new forms of social life, and these are not just advocated but practiced. It can therefore be usefully understood as prefigurative and, more specifically, prefigurative in a way that resembles anarchist ethics. In most forms of anarchist ethics, the means are consistent with the desired ends, that is "the outcomes are *prefigured* by the methods".[228] The practice of anarchists is assumed to have immediate consequences and to resemble the outcome that is desired. As James Guillaume, a colleague of Bakunin, said, in his famous critique of statist socialists, "How could one want an egalitarian and free society to issue from authoritarian organisation? It is impossible."[229]

The ethics of Jesus could be seen as analogous to this and in many ways this helps makes sense of the notion that the kingdom is already present, and being enacted, even if in an initially insignificant way, in a manner that resembles and is related to its final form. One thinks, of example, of the Parable of the Mustard Seed[230] or the practice of open commensality we have touched upon.

Indeed, I do not think it is pushing things too far to speak of the prefigurative ethics of the kingdom as necessitating a form of direct action, something characteristic of anarchism and something that involves "acting as if the state's representatives have no more rights to impose their views of the rights or the wrongs of the situation than anybody else."[231] A number of the activities of Jesus seem to have this characteristic, whether it is the tradition of his action in the Temple,[232] or his response to the question about the payment of taxes to Caesar,[233] or his behaviour at his trial,[234] in all of which he appears to show no concern for the consequences of his actions. Indeed, just as direct action is sometimes "playful and the carnivalesque",[235] so, often, are the forms of behaviour ascribed to Jesus or advocated by him.[236] As Peter Marshall rightly observes, Jesus consistently "held political authority up to derision",[237] demystifying and mocking the power it claimed.

c) The vision of the kingdom is not utopian but reflexive, undetermined, and self-creative

It is surprisingly difficult to describe, with any detail, the forms of social life expected within the new reality enacted and proposed by the historical Jesus. Although, as we have noted, it can be characterised by certain practices, such as open commensality, there is much that is not spelled out. There certainly is no obvious utopian blueprint, and despite the arguments of Mary Ann Beavis, it is not useful to characterise the vision of the kingdom held by the historical Jesus as utopian.[238] As we have noted, the main mode of teaching employed by Jesus, the parable, is figurative and by its nature allusive, resisting simple explanation and allowing a range of indeterminate, experiential responses. Parables do not communicate a specific plan. Indeed, it seems more helpful to think of Jesus as anti-utopian, a quality that resonates with anarchist thinking even if anarchists are popularly assumed to be driven by utopian visions. Although utopias can have their uses – they can inspire, encourage, provide a pleasurable escape[239] – they can also be coercive and that is why, on the whole, they have been resisted by anarchists; utopianism enforces others to live in a certain way, and a utopia envisaged as a single, totalising endpoint will

necessitate manipulation to fit a predetermined plan. As Marie Louise Berneri demonstrated in her analysis of utopian thought from Plato to Huxley, they are inherently authoritarian.[240] For anarchists, the details of such social order need to be determined by those that that are dominated. Their ethics are:

> Reflexive and self-creative, as they do not assess practices against a universally prescribed end-point, as some utopian theorists have done, but through a process of immanent critique.[241]

Some might feel uneasy about this alleged similarity between the historical Jesus and anarchism because it is often assumed that the historical Jesus had a clear idea of his intentions and understanding of the implications of the kingdom of God from the outset. However, such thinking is an imposition upon the records of subsequent doctrinal assumptions. Our sources indicate a figure open to reflection and revision in the light of events and encounter with others. An example of this is the story of the Syrophoenian woman in which a gentile argues a reluctant Jesus into healing her daughter,[242] and the incidents at Nazareth[243] and Caesarea Philippi[244] which likewise seem to indicate moments which were critical in his self-understanding.[245] The possibility that the historical Jesus' own life was one characterised by reflexivity and a mutable understanding of his mission, should not come as a surprise even if it may be surprising to some. As Henry Cadbury observed many decades ago:

> Probably much that is commonly said about the general purpose of Jesus' life and the specific place in that purpose of detailed incidents is modern superimposition upon a nearly patternless life and upon nearly patternless records of it.[246]

d. The pedagogy of the kingdom is prefigurative and non-coercive.

There are also significant parallels between the distinctive pedagogy associated with the kingdom and the non-coercive, prefigurative pedagogy of anarchism. Although the latter is, as Judith Suissa has argued, surprisingly under theorised,[247] pedagogy has been something of considerable significance in anarchism. This is largely, as Justin Mueller has suggested, because unlike other political philosophies

aimed at social transformation, "education has never been simply the means to achieve a new social order"[248] but rather part of the prefigurative practice that is central to all forms of anarchism, a prefigurative practice characterised by non-coercion, and the inculcation of solidarity and fellow-feeling, rather than competition and domination, the encouragement of active empathy and identification with others.[249] Some of Jesus' teaching does seem to have taken the form of commands, such as the command to love enemies[250] or the prohibition on divorce,[251] but by far the largest quantity of his teaching comes in the form of parables, which are figurative and affective, a form that does not compel the hearer to arrive at a narrowly predetermined understanding of what is being conveyed. Many parables could also be said to function in some way to directly encourage empathy and identification with others,[252] and most could be said to contribute to this indirectly by, amongst other things, intensifying the significance placed upon the praxis of the kingdom.

However, before we conclude our discussion it is important to note that some grounds on which Jesus is often considered an anarchist should not be part of any attempt to answer the question, despite their popularity. For example, some might be surprised that there has been no mention of Jesus' death in the preceding analysis. As Christoyannopoulos has noted, this is often seen as the climax of Jesus' ministry, as confirmation of the character of his mission:

> For most Christian Anarchists, Jesus is the saviour precisely because he accepted the cross – *that* is the revolution. He is the messiah because he consistently responds to injustice with unwavering love, forgiveness and non-resistance. He does not seek to lead yet another revolutionary government, but instead points to the true kingdom beyond the state. Therefore the crucifixion is indeed the glorious climax of Jesus' messianic ministry.[253]

For many, there is something "inevitable" about this conclusion to the life of Jesus, it is "the concrete consequence" of his teaching and practice.[254] Christian anarchists and others who believe that Jesus deserves the label of anarchist, are not so unusual in seeing Jesus' death as a necessary consequence of his teaching. In modern

historical-Jesus scholarship, as we have mentioned, one of the criteria used to determine which traditions are likely to go back to the historical Jesus is the criterion of 'crucifiability'[255] – that is, if a tradition can explain Jesus' execution then it is judged likely to be "authentic". However, given the ubiquity of crucifixion in the empire, and the casual manner in which it could be imposed on the poor and inconsequential, it is likely that the Roman authorities did not give the killing of Jesus much thought and he need not have done anything much, in their eyes, for them to put him to death. For example, as A. E. Harvey plausibly suggested:

> Jesus could have been one of those innocent victims who are picked up by police action at a time when peace-keeping has become difficult and the forces of law and order are over-stretched, and then arbitrarily put to death.[256]

The *titulus*,[257] placed on the cross by the Romans, which seems to indicate that Jesus was killed because of a kingly claim of some kind, might well be no more than evidence that, from the perspective of the Romans, they were executing a deluded madman who talked of invisible kingdoms – something that would be in keeping of what we know about their treatment of others they believed to fall into this category.[258]

5. Conclusion

To return to our question: was the historical Jesus an anarchist? Any answer depends upon the definition of "anarchist" used and how much room such a definition has for anarchism to be judged to exist outside of a formal political movement composed of self-declared anarchists. It would, however, be an inadequate definition that limited itself solely to the likes of Proudhon – and one that would not be true to their own understanding of the perennial nature of the doctrine they espoused. Instead, the suggestion of Graeber, that definitions of anarchism should also be inclusive of those who display anarchist attitudes and practices, as well as those who endorse a specific ideological position, has far more merit.

However, if we decide that Jesus might well meet the rather broader definition of "anarchist" of the kind offered by Graeber,

we will need to accept some things that, at least to many contemporary anarchists, appear incompatible with anarchism. For example, as Kathleen Corley has noted, Jesus does not appear to have criticised patriarchy,[259] and our sources are silent about his thoughts on slavery, something ubiquitous in the empire. Even his proclamation of the kingdom of God could be seen to replicate elements of the imperialism that appears anathema to it.[260] But such problems should not preclude us using the label "anarchist" for Jesus. As Harold Barclay has observed in his study of ethnographic accounts of stateless and governmentless societies, we cannot expect contemporary anarchists to necessarily approve of such societies, which though highly decentralised, can, for example, be highly conformist, patriarchal, gerontocracies,[261] yet the use of the term anarchist is clearly legitimate for them. So, our use of the term "anarchist" outside of the modern context, where individuals and movements may display characteristics that are similarly unappealing to contemporary anarchists, has to be generous.

There is enough in what we can know about the historical Jesus, of the impressions of the man and his vision that have left their mark on our sources, to reveal someone not just intensely anti-authoritarian but also concerned with a prefigurative, non-coercive reality which would both confront existing inequity and be transformative of the lives of those oppressed by it. It may be pushing the evidence too far to say that Jesus of Nazareth was "a major political thinker",[262] but it is no surprise, to return to the quote with which we began, that Alexander Berkman believed Jesus to be an anarchist. He was right.[263]

Notes

1. Alexander Berkman, *Now and After: The ABC of Communist Anarchism* (New York: Vanguard Press, 1929), p. 61.

2. The term "anarchist" had been used before this date but was employed solely to refer to someone who sought to create disorder rather than an advocate of a political ideology. It acquired the additional meaning following the publication of Pierre-Joseph Proudhon, *Qu'est-ce que la propriété? Ou recherches sur le principe du droit et du gouvernment* (Paris: Librairie de Prévot, 1840).

3. Friedrich Wilhelm Nietzsche, 'Der Antichrist', in *Nietzsches Werke: Der Fall Wagner; Götzen-Dämmerung; Nietzsche contra Wagner; Der Antichrist; Gedichte* (Leipzig: C. G. Naumann, 1895), VIII, 211–313.

4. See, for example, Nicolai Berdyaev, *Slavery and Freedom* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1944), pp. 140–148.

5. See, for example, Leo Tolstoy, '*The Kingdom of God Is within You': Christianity Not as a Mystic Religion but as a New Theory of Life*, trans. by Constance Garnett, 2 vols. (London: William Heinemann, 1894). However, it is important to note that Tolstoy did not explicitly call Jesus an "anarchist". This is probably explained by the close association between anarchism and violence in Tolstoy's mind, something that almost certainly accounts for his reticence in using the label for himself too. See Brian Morris, *Ecology and Anarchism: Essays and Reviews on Contemporary Thought* (Malvern: Images Publishing, 1996), p. 159.

6. Likewise, Wilde did not use the term "anarchist" for Jesus but that he believed him to be such is a reasonable inference from such works as *The Soul of Man Under Socialism* (London: Privately Printed, 1891), in which Jesus is presented as the model of socialist individualism. See Kristian Williams, 'The Soul of Man Under . . .Anarchism?', *New Politics*, 8 (2011) <http://newpol.org/content/soul-man-under-anarchism> [accessed 31 July 2015]. For the anarchism of Wilde see David Goodway, *Anarchist Seeds Beneath the Snow: Left-libertarian Thought and British Writers from William Morris to Colin Ward,* 2nd edn (Oakland: PM Press, 2011), pp. 62–92.

7. Mary C. Segers, 'Equality and Christian Anarchism: The Political and Social Ideas of the Catholic Worker Movement', *The Review of Politics*, 40 (1978), 196–230 and Frederick Boehrer, 'Christian Anarchism and the Catholic Worker Movement: Roman Catholic Authority and Identity in the United States' (unpublished PhD, New York: Syracuse University, 2001).

8. See www.jesusradicals.com (accessed 31 July 2015).

9. Charlotte Alston, *Tolstoy and His Disciples: The History of a Radical International Movement* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2014).

10. See, for example, the official website of the Union of the Spiritual Communities of Christ, the main body of Doukhobors today (http://www.usccdoukhobors.org/faq.htm#faq2. Accessed 31 July 2015).

11. Linda H. Damico, *The Anarchist Dimension of Liberation Theology* (Pieterlen: Peter Lang, 1987).

12. See, for example, Keith Hebden, *Dalit Theology and Christian Anarchism* (London: Ashgate, 2011).

13. Proudhon's most substantial work on the subject was *Jésus et les origines du christianisme* (Paris: G. Havard fils, 1896), though see also *Ecrits sur la religion*, ed. by M. Ruyssen (Paris: M. Rivière, 1959). For a comprehensive treatment of Proudhon's views on Jesus see Georges Bessière, *Jésus selon Proudhon: la « messianose » et la naissance du christianisme* (Paris: Cerf, 2007) and Henri de Lubac, *Proudhon et le christianisme* (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1945).

14. Mikhail Bakunin, *God and the State* (London: Freedom Press, 1910 [1882]), p. 54.

15. Peter Kropotkin, *Ethics: Origin and Development* (Bristol: Thoemmes Press, 1993 [1924]), pp. 118–119.

16. Max Stirner, *The Ego and His Own* (New York: Benj. R. Tucker, 1907), pp. 178–179,

17. This distinction is usually attributed to Martin Kähler, and became common following the publication of his *Der sogenannte historische Jesus und der geschichtliche, biblische Christus* (Leipzig: A. Deichert, 1892), although it was employed to describe something that most scholars of the historical Jesus would argue was common from the work of Herman Reimarus and the posthumous publication of his *Fragmente eines Ungenannten* beginning in 1774.

18. See, for example, S. G. F. Brandon, *Jesus and the Zealots: a Study of the Political Factor in Primitive Christianity* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1967) and the comprehensive response edited by Ernst Bammel and C. F. D. Moule, *Jesus and the Politics of His Day* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984). Amongst recent contributions those of Fernando Bermejo-Rubio are of greatest consequence; see, for example, 'Jesus and the Anti-Roman Resistance', *Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus*, 12 (2014), 1–105 and 'Jesus as a Seditionist: The Intertwining of Politics and Religion in his Teaching and Deeds', in *Teaching the Historical Jesus: Issues and Exegesis,* ed. by Zev Garber (London: Routledge, 2015), pp. 232–243.

19. See, for example, John Dominic Crossan, *The Historical Jesus: The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1991), and *Jesus: A Revolutionary Biography* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1994), Richard A. Burridge, *Imitating Jesus: An Inclusive Approach to New Testament Ethics* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007) and Marcus Borg, *Jesus in Contemporary Scholarship* (London: Continuum, 1994), pp. 97–126. For a trenchant critique of attempts to present the historical Jesus as "inclusive" see Markus Bockmuehl, 'The Trouble with the Inclusive Jesus', *Horizons in Biblical Theology*, 33 (2011), 9–23.

20. See, for indicative examples, Colleen M. Conway, *Behold the Man: Jesus and Greco-Roman Masculinity* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008); Anna Runesson, *Exegesis in the Making: Postcolonialism and New Testament Studies* (Leiden: Brill, 2010) and Michael J. Sandford, *Poverty, Wealth, and Empire: Jesus and Postcolonial Criticism* (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2014).

21. For significant contributions in this area see *Jesus Beyond Nationalism: Constructing the Historical Jesus in a Period of Cultural Complexity*, ed. by Ward Blanton, James G. Crossley and Halvor Moxnes (London: Equinox, 2010), James G. Crossley, *Jesus in an Age of Terror: Scholarly Projects for a New American Century* (London: Equinox, 2008) and *Jesus in an Age of Neoliberalism: Quests, Scholarship and Ideology* (London: Equinox, 2012).

22. For the most recent, comprehensive statement of this position see Richard Carrier, *On the Historicity of Jesus: Why We Might Have Reason for Doubt* (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2014). See also *Is This Not the Carpenter?: The Question of the Historicity of the Figure of Jesus,* ed. by Thomas L. Thompson and Thomas S. Verenna (Sheffield: Equinox, 2012).

23. See, for example, Maurice Casey, *Jesus: Evidence and Argument or Mythicist Myths?* (Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2014) and Bart D. Ehrman, *Did Jesus Exist?: The Historical Argument for Jesus of Nazareth* (San Francisco: HarperOne, 2012).

24. See, for example, Craig A. Evans, 'Jesus in Non-Christian Sources', in *Studying the Historical Jesus: Evaluations of the State of Current Research*, ed. by Bruce Chilton and Craig A. Evans (Leiden: Brill, 1998), pp. 443–478. See also John Granger Cook, *The Interpretation*

of the New Testament in Greco-Roman Paganism (Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 2002).

25. For a useful survey of non-canonical sources of various kinds see James H. Charlesworth and Craig A Evans, 'Jesus in the Agrapha and Apocryphal Gospels', in *Studying the Historical Jesus: Evaluations of the State of Current Research*, ed. by Bruce Chilton and Craig A. Evans (Leiden: Brill, 1994), pp. 479–534.

26. See, for example, the pagan critic Celsus in Origen, *Contra Celsum* 1.28.

27. E. P. Thompson, *The Making of the English Working Class* (London: Victor Gallancz, 1963), p. 12.

28. For the inconsequential nature of Jesus' life from the perspective of the Romans see Justin J. Meggitt, 'The Madness of King Jesus', *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, 29 (2007), 379–413.

29. George Woodcock, *Anarchism*, 2nd edn (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1986), p. 36.

30. Alexandre Christoyannopoulos, *Christian Anarchism: A Political Commentary on the Gospel* (Exeter: Imprint Academic, 2010), p. 19.

31. Few, if any, have paid attention to non-canonical sources despite their significance in contemporary scholarship concerned with the figure of the historical Jesus. For example, as Patterson rightly notes, "anyone who writes today on the historical question of what Jesus said or did must deal with the issue of the Gospel of Thomas" (Stephen J. Patterson, 'The Gospel of Thomas and Historical Jesus Research', in *Coptica – Gnostica – Manichaica*, ed. by Louis Painchaud and Paul-Hubert Poirier [Quebec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval, 2006], p. 663).

32. Christoyannopoulos, *Christian Anarchism,* pp. 15, 295.

33. Tolstoy, for example, called him "the lover of authoritarian teaching" and held him chiefly responsible for Christianity's departure from Jesus' vision. See Leo Tolstoy, *Church and State and Other Essays: Including Money; Man and Woman: Their Respective Functions; The Mother; A Second Supplement to the Kreutzer Sonata* (Boston: B. R. Tucker, 1891), p. 17.

34. James D G. Dunn, 'Jesus Tradition in Paul', in *Studying the Historical Jesus: Evaluations of the State of Current Research*, ed. by Bruce Chilton and Craig A Evans (Leiden: Brill, 1994), pp. 155–178.

35. Christoyannopoulos, *Christian Anarchism,* pp. 43–81.

36. See, for example, Hans Dieter Betz and Adela Yarbro Collins, *The Sermon on the Mount: A Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount, Including the Sermon on the Plain (Matthew: 5:3–7:27 and Luke 6:20–49)* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1995); W. D. Davies and D. C. Allison, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew. Volume I. Introduction and Commentary on Matthew I-VII* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1988), pp. 429–731; Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 1–7: a Commentary*, 2nd edn (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007).

37. Huub van de Sandt and Jürgen K. Zangenberg, *Matthew, James, and Didache: Three Related Documents in Their Jewish and Christian Settings* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008); *Matthew and his Christian Contemporaries*, ed. by David C. Sim and Boris Repschinski (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2008). It is no surprise that Tolstoy was keen on the Didache which was only rediscovered in his lifetime. See E. B. Greenwood, 'Tolstoy and Religion', in *New Essays on Tolstoy*, ed. Malcolm Jones (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978), pp. 149–74 (p. 166).

38. See, for example, Leif E. Vaage, 'Beyond Nationalism: Jesus the "Holy Anarchist"? : the Cynic Jesus as Eternal Recurrence of the Repressed', in *Jesus Beyond Nationalism: Constructing the Historical Jesus in a Period of Cultural Complexity*, ed. by Halvor Moxnes, Ward Blanton and James G. Crossley (London: Equinox, 2009), pp. 79–95.

39. Although I am not aware of Ched Myers identifying himself as a Christian anarchist, his commentary on Mark's gospel, *Binding the Strong Man: A Political Reading of Mark's Story of Jesus* (Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1988), has been extremely influential on a number of contemporary Christian anarchists (Christoyannopoulos, *Christian Anarchism,* pp. 39–40), and in the supportive preface that he recently wrote to Van Steenwyk's primer on Christian anarchism he endorses the notion that the Bible contains "anarchist tendencies" (*That Holy Anarchist: Reflections on Christianity & Anarchism* [Minneapolis:

Missio Dei, 2012], p. 9) and suggests that "the anarchist vision may yet be a key to the renewal of church and society" (*Holy Anarchist,* p. 11).

40. It has become customary to refer to the study of the historical Jesus as the "Quest" for the historical Jesus, following the publication of the English translation in 1910 of Albert Schweitzer's influential *Von Reimarus zu Wrede: eine Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung* (Tübingen: Mohr ,1906) which was entitled *The Quest of the Historical Jesus: a Critical Study of Its Progress from Reimarus to Wrede* (London: A. and C. Black, 1910).

41. See, for example, the criticisms of Bernard C. Lategan, 'Questing or Sense-Making? Some Thoughts on the Nature of Historiography', *Biblical Interpretation: A Journal of Contemporary Approaches*, 11 (2003), 588–601.

42. For a still useful, albeit confessional, critique of such undertakings see Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Real Jesus: The Misguided Quest for the Historical Jesus and the Truth of the Traditional Gospels* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1996).

43. See, for example, N. T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God* (London: SPCK, 1996), p. xv.

44. Although characterizing the historical Jesus' understanding of God as a matter of "belief" is, perhaps, unhelpful. "Belief" has a distinctive and specific place in some forms Christianity but cannot be said to be a significant organizing or nodal concept within the religious life of most humans, ancient or modern. See, for example, Malcolm Ruel, *Belief, Ritual and the Securing of Life: Reflective Essays on a Bantu Religion* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), pp. 36–59.

45. For example, Mark 1.15 and Matthew 4.17 (see also Luke 4.43); Luke 17.20–21, Thomas 3, 113; Matthew 11.11–12, Luke 5.28, 16.16, Thomas 46; Mark 10.15, Matthew 18.3, Luke 18.17; Mark 10.23–25, Matthew 19.23–24, Luke 18.24–25; Luke 11.20, Matthew 12.28; Matthew 13.44; Thomas 109; Matthew 13.45–46, Thomas 76; Mark 3.22–27, Matthew 12.29–30, Luke 11.21–23; Mark 9:1 (see also Matthew 16.28, Luke 9.27); Mark 14.25, Matthew 26.29 (cf. Luke 22.18); Matthew 8.11, Luke 13.28–30; Matthew 6.10, Luke 11.2 and Didache 8.2.

46. Sébastien Faure, *Les douze preuves de l'inexistence de Dieu,* (Paris: Librairie sociale, 1908).

47. See, for example, Paul Preston, *The Spanish Holocaust: Inquisition and Extermination in Twentieth-century Spain* (London: HarperPress, 2012), pp. 221–258

48. Bakunin, *God and the State,* p. 28. For similar sentiments see Emma Goldman, *Anarchism and Other Essays* (New York: Mother Earth Publishing Association, 1911), p. 22.

49. Saul Newman, *From Bakunin to Lacan: Anti-Authoritarianism and the Dislocation of Power* (Lanham: Lexington Books, 2001), p. 26.

50. Nicholas Walter, *About Anarchism*, 2nd edn (London: Freedom Press, 2002), p. 43.

51. Bernard Schweizer, *Hating God: The Untold Story of Misotheism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), p. 34.

52. Peter Marshall, *Demanding the Impossible: A History of Anarchism* (Oakland: PM Press, 2010), p. 75.

53. For examples see *Religious Anarchism: New Perspectives*, ed. by Alexandre Christoyannopoulos (Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars, 2009) and Christoyannopoulos, *Christian Anarchism.*

54. Such ideas "are described as anarchist only on the basis of a misunderstanding of what anarchism is" (Jeremy Jennings, 'Anarchism', in *Contemporary Political Ideologies*, ed. by Roger Eatwell and Anthony Wright, 2nd edn [London: Continuum International Publishing Group, 1999], p. 142).

55. Graham D. Macklin, 'Co-opting the Counter Culture: Troy Southgate and the National Revolutionary Faction', *Patterns of Prejudice*, 39 (2005), 301–326.

56. Both are mentioned a number of times in such standard histories as Marshall, *Demanding;* Robert Graham, *Anarchism: From Anarchy to Anarchism (300CE to 1939). Volume 1: A Documentary History of Libertarian Ideas* (Montreal: Black Rose Books, 2005); and Woodcock, *Anarchism*. However, some surveys do pass over Christian anarchism. It is absent from, for example, Michael Schmidt's *Cartography of Revolutionary Anarchism* (Oakland: AK Press, 2013).

57. There are, of course, notable exceptions. See, for example, David Flusser and R. Steven Notley, *The Sage from Galilee: Rediscovering Jesus' Genius*, 4th edn (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007 [1968]).

58. See the survey of the so-called "Third Quest" in John P. Meier, 'The Present State of the "Third Quest" for the Historical Jesus: Loss and Gain', *Biblica*, 80 (1999), 459–487. There have been significant differences of opinion on the relative weight that should be placed upon non-canonical sources in reconstructions. Contrast, for example, the use of non-canonical texts in Crossan, *The Historical Jesus,* with that in John P. Meier, *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus* (New York: Doubleday, 1991).

59. For a useful introduction to these see Meier, *A Marginal Jew* and *Handbook for the Study of the Historical Jesus. Volume 1: How to Study the Historical Jesus*, ed. by Tom Holmén and Stanley E. Porter, 4 vols. (Leiden: Brill, 2010).

60. These criteria are not new but have been used, in various forms, since the 1920s. See Stanley E. Porter, *The Criteria for Authenticity in Historical-Jesus Research: Previous Discussion and New Proposals* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), pp. 63–102.

61. Joel Willitts, 'Presuppositions and Procedures in the Study of the Historical Jesus: Or, Why I Decided Not to Be a Historical Jesus Scholar', *Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus*, 3 (2005), 61–108.

62. For a helpful survey of these see Helen K. Bond, *The Historical Jesus: A Guide for the Perplexed* (London: T&T Clark, 2012), pp. 19–36; David B. Gowler, *What Are They Saying About the Historical Jesus?* (New York: Paulist Press, 2007).

63. Porter, *Criteria*, and Gerd Theissen and Dagmar Winter, *The Quest for the Plausible Jesus: the Question of Criteria* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002).

64. M. D. Hooker, 'Christology and Methodology', *New Testament Studies*, 17 (1971), 480–487.

65. Dale C. Allison, *Constructing Jesus: Memory, Imagination, and History* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010); Anthony Le Donne, *The Historiographical Jesus: Memory, Typology, and the Son of David* (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2009) and *Historical Jesus: What Can We Know and How Can We Know It?* (Grand Rapids:

Eerdmans, 2011); Alexander J. M. Wedderburn, *Jesus and the Historians* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), pp. 189–224.

66. Dale C. Allison, 'It Don't Come Easy: a History of Disillusionment', in *Jesus, Criteria, and the Demise of Authenticity*, ed. by Chris Keith and Anthony Le Donne (London: T&T Clark, 2012), pp. 186–199.

67. Although I place greater weight on the role of invention within the tradition associated with Jesus. See Justin J. Meggitt, 'Popular Mythology in the Early Empire and the Multiplicity of Jesus Traditions', in *Sources of the Jesus Tradition: Separating History from Myth*, ed. by R. Joseph Hoffmann (Amherst: Prometheus, 2010), pp. 53–80.

68. See, for example, Louis-André Dorion, 'The Rise and Fall of the Socratic Problem', in *The Cambridge Companion to Socrates*, ed. by Donald R. Morrison (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), pp. 1–23.

69. See, for example, Maria Dzielska, *Apollonius of Tyana in Legend and History* (Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider, 1986).

70. As Fonrobert and Jaffee note about Rabbi Akiva, one of the key founders of Rabbinic Judaism, the nature of the sources make it impossible to know, "with any degree of historical certainty", whether he really said what is attributed to him (Charlotte Fonrobert and Martin S. Jaffee, 'Introduction: The Talmud, Rabbinic Literature, and Jewish Culture', in *The Cambridge Companion to the Talmud and Rabbinic Literature* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007], pp. 1–14 [p. 2]).

71. Meggitt, 'Popular Mythology'.

72. A similar idea can be found in C. H. Dodd, *History and the Gospel* (London: Nisbet, 1938) although it was passed over by subsequent work in the field.

73. Justin J. Meggitt, 'Psychology and the Historical Jesus', in *Jesus and Psychology*, ed. by Fraser Watts (London: Darton,Longman & Todd, 2007), pp. 16–26 (p. 24). Also quoted in Allison, *Constructing Jesus*, p. 433.

74. Dale C. Allison, 'Behind the Temptations of Jesus : Q 4:1–13 and Mark 1:12–13', in *Authenticating the Activities of Jesus*, ed. by Bruce Chilton and Craig A. Evans (Leiden: Brill, 1999), pp. 195–213.

75. Matthew 4.8–10; Luke 4.5–8 (Mark 1.12–13). See Matthew 20.26–27, 23.11–12, Mark 9.35, 10.43–44, Luke 14.11, 18.14b, 22.26; Matthew 6.29, Luke 12.27; Luke 13.32; Matthew 27.11, Mark 15.2, Luke 23.3; Luke 22.25; Luke 23.9; John 18.33–38; John 6.15.

76. Allison, 'It Don't Come Easy', p. 198. Although it could be said that this approach, albeit in an attenuated form, makes use of two familiar criteria, those of multiple attestation and, to a lesser extent, coherence.

77. Matthew 22.15–22:22; Mark 12.13–17; Luke 20.20–26; Thomas 100.

78. See, for example, Richard Bauckham, *The Bible in Politics: How to Read the Bible Politically*, 2nd edn (London: SPCK, 2011).

79. Or rather the dominant group amongst those claiming this identity and which probably equated, more or less, with what the pagan critic Celsus called the "great church" (Origen, *Contra Celsum* 5.59).

80. For the gospels as biographies see Richard A. Burridge, *What Are the Gospels?: a Comparison with Graeco-Roman Biography*, 2nd edn (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004) and Dirk Frickenschmidt, *Evangelium als Biographie: Die vier Evangelien im Rahmen antiker Erzählkunst* (Tübingen: Francke, 1997).

81. Though obviously there was considerable variation. See Thomas Hägg, *The Art of Biography in Antiquity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012).

82. Haia Shpayer-Makov, 'Anarchism in British Public Opinion 1880–1914', *Victorian Studies*, 31 (1988), 487–516 (p. 487).

83. Joseph Conrad, *The Secret Agent* (London: J. M. Dent, 1907).

84. See, for example, 'Italian Anarchists Kneecap Nuclear Executive and Threaten More Shootings', *The Guardian*, 2012 <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2012/may/11/italian-anarchists-kneecap-nuclear-executive> [accessed 31 July 2015]. See also Richard Bach Jensen, *The Battle against Anarchist Terrorism: An International History, 1878–1934* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013) and John M. Merriman, *The Dynamite Club: How a Bombing in Fin-de-Siècle Paris Ignited the Age of Modern Terror* (London: JR Books, 2009).

85. Though what constitutes "violence" is itself far from self-evident. For a discussion of definitional problems see Willem Schinkel, *Aspects of Violence: A Critical Theory* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2010), pp. 16–83.

86. See Ruth Kinna, *Anarchism: A Beginner's Guide* (Oxford: Oneworld Publications, 2009), pp. 158–164. See also Peter Gelderloos, *How Nonviolence Protects the State* (Cambridge: South End Press, 2007) and Uri Gordon, *Anarchy Alive!: Anti-Authoritarian Politics From Practice to Theory* (London: Pluto Press, 2008), pp. 78–108.

87. See, for example, Cindy Milstein, *Anarchism and its Aspirations* (Oakland: AK Press, 2010).

88. George Richard Esenwein, *Anarchist Ideology and the Working-Class Movement in Spain: 1868–1898* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989), p. 135.

89. Murray Bookchin, *Social Anarchism Or Lifestyle Anarchism: An Unbridgeable Chasm* (Oakland: AK Press, 1996), p. 4.

90. E.g. Woodcock, *Anarchism*, p. 8.

91. A point made by Marshall, *Demanding,* p. 3.

92. Brian Morris, *Anthropology and Anarchism: Their Elective Affinity* (London: Goldsmiths College, 2005), p. 6.

93. David Graeber, *Direct Action: An Ethnography* (Oakland: AK Press, 2009), p. 214.

94. Graeber, *Direct Action,* p. 214.

95. For Graeber, anarchism does not equate to any of these things and is best thought of "as that movement back and forth between these three." (*Direct Action*, p. 215).

96. E. E. Evans-Pritchard, *The Nuer: A Description of the Modes of Livelihood and Political Institutions of a Nilotic People* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1940), p. 6.

97. Peter Arshinov, *History of the Makhnovist Movement, 1918–21,* 2nd edn (London: Freedom Press, 2005).

98. Murray Bookchin, *To Remember Spain: The Anarchist and Syndicalist Revolution of 1936* (Oakland: AK Press, 1995); Stuart Christie, *We the Anarchists: A Study of the Iberian Anarchist*

Federation (FAI) 1927–1937 (Oakland: AK Press, 2008); José Peirats, *The CNT in the Spanish Revolution*, ed. by Chris Ealham, 3 vols. (Oakland: PM Press, 2011).

99. Michael Seidman, *The Imaginary Revolution: Parisian Students and Workers in 1968* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2004).

100. For the centrality of anarchism in new movements of dissent see Giorel Curran, *21st Century Dissent: Anarchism, Anti-Globalization and Environmentalism* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006). For anarchists fighting in Rojava see http://rabble.org.uk/kobane-interview-with-an-anarchist-fighter/ [accessed 3 August 2015]

101. For a very helpful survey of the debate see F. Gerald Downing, 'Jesus and Cynicism', in *Handbook for the Study of the Historical Jesus. Volume 2. The Study of Jesus*, ed. by Tom Holmén and Stanley E. Porter, 4 vols. (Leiden: Brill, 2010), pp. 1105–1136.

102. For an attempt to explain the vitriolic response that this suggestion has elicited from some historical-Jesus scholars who see it as somehow denying Jesus' Jewishness, see William E. Arnal, *The Symbolic Jesus: Historical Scholarship, Judaism and the Construction of Contemporary Identity* (London: Equinox, 2005) and 'The Cipher "Judaism" in Contemporary Historical Jesus Scholarship', in *Apocalypticism, Anti-Semitism and the Historical Jesus: Subtexts in Criticism*, ed. by John S. Kloppenborg and John Marshall (London: Continuum, 2005), pp. 24–54.

103. David Graeber, *Fragments of an Anarchist Anthropology* (Chicago: Prickly Paradigm Press, 2004), p. 3.

104. Graeber, *Direct Action*, p. 211. It is unsurprising that Kropotkin's final, unfinished work was *Ethics, Origin and Development*.

105. Graeber, *Direct Action,* p. 216.

106. Graham, *Anarchism.*

107. Patricia Crone, 'Ninth-Century Muslim Anarchists', *Past & Present*, 167 (2000), 3–28. See also *Medieval Islamic Political Thought*, 2nd edn (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2005).

108. Norman Cohn, *The Pursuit Of The Millennium: Revolutionary Millenarians and Mystical Anarchists of the Middle Ages* (London: Pimlico, 2004), pp. 214–222.

109. James C. Scott, *The Art of Not Being Governed: an Anarchist History of Upland Southeast Asia* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009).

110. Morris, *Ecology and Anarchism,* p. 51.

111. See, for example, Brian Morris, *Kropotkin: The Politics of Community* (Amherst: Humanity Books, 2003), pp. 202–203.

112. Todd May, *The Political Philosophy of Poststructuralist Anarchism* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1994).

113. See, for example, John R. Love, *Antiquity and Capitalism: Max Weber and the Sociological Foundations of Roman Civilization* (London: Routledge, 1991).

114. Love, *Antiquity and Capitalism,* p. 4. Max Weber, *The Theory of Economic and Social Organizations*, trans. by A. M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons (New York: Free Press, 1964), p. 280.

115. See, for example, Peter Temin, *The Roman Market Economy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012).

116. Particularly in comparison with China. See, Keith Hopkins, *Death and Renewal. Volume 2: Sociological Studies in Roman History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985). However, see Walter Scheidel, 'From the "Great Convergence" to the "First Great Divergence": Roman and Qin-Han State Formation and Its Aftermath', in *Rome and China: Comparative Perspectives on Ancient World Empires*, ed. by Walter Scheidel (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), pp. 11–23 (p. 19).

117. Although its size fluctuated somewhat, the Roman army of the early empire probably numbered around 300,000. Ramsay MacMullen, 'How Big Was the Roman Imperial Army?', *Klio,* 62 (1980), 451–60. See Tacitus, *Annals* 4.5.

118. The population of the Roman empire as a whole is difficult to calculate but a figure of about 50 million would be accepted by most in the field. See Keith Hopkins, 'Taxes and Trade in the Roman Empire (200 B.C.-A.D. 400)', *The Journal of Roman Studies*, 70 (1980), 101–125 (p. 118). However, Frier cautions that estimates of the gross population of the empire can be not more than a guess. See

Bruce W. Frier, 'More Is Worse: Some Observations on the Population of the Roman Empire', in *Debating Roman Demography,* ed. by Walter Scheidel (Leiden: Brill, 2001), pp. 139–160 (p. 139).

119. David Christian, 'State Formation in the Inner Eurasian Steppes', in *Worlds of the Silk Roads: Ancient and Modern*, ed. by David Christian and Craig Benjamin (Turnhout: Brepols, 1998), pp. 51–76 (p. 53).

120. Max Weber, *Weber: Political Writings*, ed. by Peter Lassman and Ronald Spiers (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), p. 310. Although such a definition famously has its weaknesses; see Timothy Mitchell, 'The Limits of the State: Beyond Statist Approaches and Their Critics', *The American Political Science Review*, 85 (1991), 77–96.

121. For the perils of ethnocentrism in historical-Jesus scholarship see Richard L. Rohrbaugh, 'Ethnnocentrism and Historical Questions About Jesus', in *The Social Setting of Jesus and the Gospels*, ed. by Wolfgang Stegemann (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2003), pp. 27–43.

122. Sam Mbah, and I. E. Igariwey, *African Anarchism: A History and Analysis* (Tucson: See Sharp Press, 1997).

123. Arif Dirlik, *Anarchism in the Chinese Revolution* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991); Graham, *Anarchism,* pp. 336–366.

124. Graham, *Anarchism,* pp. 367–89; Sho Konishi, *Anarchist Modernity: Cooperatism and Japanese-Russian Intellectual Relations in Modern Japan* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2013).

125. *No Gods, No Masters, No Peripheries: Global Anarchisms*, ed. by Raymond Craib and Barry Maxwell (Oakland: PM Press, 2015).

126. Evans-Pritchard, *Nuer.* See, for example, Harold Barclay, *People Without Government: An Anthropology of Anarchy* (London: Kahn & Averill, 1990); Scott, *The Art of Not Being Governed;* Joanna Overing, 'Images of Cannibalism, Death and Domination in a "Nonviolent" Society', *Journal de la Société des Américanistes*, 72 (1986), 133–156.

127. Barclay, *People Without Government,* p. 18.

128. Maurice Casey, *Jesus of Nazareth: An Independent Historian's Account of His Life and Teaching* (London: Continuum, 2010), p. 212. For a survey of the kingdom of God in critical scholarship see Bruce Chilton, 'The Kingdom of God in Recent Discussion', in *Studying the Historical Jesus: Evaluations of the State of Current Research*, ed. by Craig A. Evans and Bruce Chilton (Leiden: Brill, 1998), pp. 255–280.

129. A largely comprehensive presentation of the canonical data relating to the kingdom can be found in Joachim Jeremias, *New Testament Theology: The Proclamation of Jesus*, trans. by John Bowden (London: SCM Press, 1971), pp. 31–35. See also Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, pp. 663–670.

130. Thomas 3, 54, 57, 76, 82, 96, 97, 98, 99, 107, 109, 113.

131. For a critical evaluation see Simon Gathercole, *The Gospel of Thomas* (Leiden: Brill, 2014), pp. 112–127.

132. For a critical evaluation of the historicity of John see Maurice Casey, *Is John's Gospel True?* (London: Routledge, 1996). For re-assessments of its historical value see *John, Jesus, and History, Volume 1: Critical Appraisals of Critical Views*, ed. by Paul N. Anderson, Felix Just and Tom Thatcher (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007); *John, Jesus, and History, Volume 2: Aspects of Historicity in the Fourth Gospel*, ed. by Paul N. Anderson, Felix Just and Tom Thatcher (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009).

133. Mark 1.15 and Matthew 4.17; see also Luke 4.43.

134. Matthew 26.29, Mark 14.25.

135. Luke 23.41–42.

136. Matthew 19.24; Mark 10.25; Luke 18.25.

137. For a critical introduction to the evidence and current state of scholarship on the subject, see Eric Eve, *The Healer from Nazareth: Jesus' Miracles in Historical Context* (London: SPCK, 2009). For indicative examples of others believed to be healers and exorcists at the time, see Josephus, *Antiquities* 8.45–8; Lucian, *Philopseudes* 11, 16; Origen, *Contra Celsum* 1.68.

138. Matthew 12.28, Luke 11.20.

139. For a useful introduction to these see James L. Bailey and Lyle D. Vander Broek, *Literary Forms in the New Testament: A Handbook* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1992).

140. Gerd Theissen and Annette Merz, *The Historical Jesus: a Comprehensive Guide* (London: SCM Press, 1998), p. 316.

141. Matthew 13:11, Mark 4:11, Luke 8:10.

142. See, for example, Matthew 13.24, 31, 33, 44, 45, 47; 18.23, 20.1; 22.2, 25.1. The phrase "kingdom of heaven", generally preferred by Matthew to "kingdom of God", is identical in meaning (compare Matthew 13.11, Mark 4.11, and Luke 8.10).

143. For a the surprising degree of agreement on this between scholars with quite different ideological positions, see, for example, Dale C. Allison, *Jesus of Nazareth: Millenarian Prophet* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1998), p. 46; Casey, *Jesus of Nazareth,* p. 212; Crossan, *Historical Jesus,* p. 266; Bart D. Ehrman, *Jesus: Apocalyptic Prophet of the New Millennium* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), p. 142; Paula Fredriksen, *From Jesus to Christ: the Origins of the New Testament Images of Christ*, 2nd edn (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000), p. 3; Robert W. Funk, *Honest to Jesus: Jesus for a New Millennium* (New York: Polebridge, 1996), p. 41; Craig S. Keener, *The Historical Jesus of the Gospels* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), p. 196; Gerd Lüdemann, *Jesus After Two Thousand Years: What He Really Said and Did* (London: SCM Press, 2000), p. 689; E. P. Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism* (London: SCM Press, 1985), p. 139; Geza Vermes, *The Religion of Jesus the Jew* (London: SCM Press, 1993), pp. 119–151; Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God,* p. 11.

144. Markus N. A. Bockmuehl, *This Jesus: Martyr, Lord, Messiah* (Edinburgh: T. &T. Clark, 1994), p. 81.

145. The phrase "kingdom of God" does not appear in the Hebrew Bible. However, the kingship or reign of God is a major theme (e.g. Exodus 15.1–18; Isaiah 6.5–9; Psalm 99.1–5) and is also present in some non-canonical Jewish texts (e.g. *Sibylline Oracles* 3:46f; *Assumption of Moses* 10; Dead Sea Scrolls 1 QM 2.7, 6.6). A related idea, that of the "Day of the Lord", in which God was expected to intervene directly in history to judge both Israel and her enemies is a common motif in prophetic literature (e.g. Isaiah 13.6–9, Joel 2, Malachi 4.1–6).

146. The Greek work for parable, παραβολή, is used in the following texts: Matthew 13.3, 10, 18, 24, 31, 35, 53; 15.15; 21.33, 45; 22.1; Mark 3.23, 4.2, 10, 11, 13, 30, 33, 34; 7.17; 12.1, 12; Luke 5.36; 6.39; 8.4, 9, 10, 11; 12.16, 41; 13.6; 14.7; 15.3; 18.1, 9; 19.11; 20.9, 19; 21.2. Most relate, either directly or indirectly, to the kingdom of God/heaven.

147. This is true of most parabolic material but not all (see, for example Mark 7.17; Luke 14.7). We should be wary of approaches to the parables of Jesus that do not take account of such diversity (see Peter Dschulnigg, 'Positionen des Gleichnisverständnisses im 20. Jahrhundert. Kurze Darstellung von fünf Wichtigen Positionen der Gleichnistheorie (Jülicher, Jeremias, Weder, Arens, Harnisch)', *Theologische Zeitschrift*, 45 (1989), 335–351 (p. 347).

148. Ruben Zimmermann, 'How to Understand the Parables of Jesus: A Paradigm Shift in Parable Exegesis', *Acta Theologica*, 29.1 (2009), 157–182 (p. 175).

149. The sayings that conclude a number of parables are often allusive and are usually thought to be secondary additions. For example, the saying "the first will be last and the last first" is found as a conclusion to the Parable of the Householder in Luke (13.23–30) but appears as the conclusion to the Parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard in Matthew (20.1–16), as well as in non-parabolic material (Matthew 19.30, Mark 10.31).

150. Bernard Brandon Scott, *Hear Then the Parable: A Commentary on the Parables of Jesus* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1989), p. 58. For surveys of the parables of Jesus in critical scholarship see Dschulnigg, 'Positionen des Gleichnisverständnisses', pp. 335–351; David B. Gowler, *What Are They Saying About the Parables?* (New York: Paulist Press, 2000); Klyne Snodgrass, 'From Allegorizing to Allegorizing: a History of the Interpretation of the Parables of Jesus', in *The Challenge of Jesus' Parables*, ed. by Richard Longenecker (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), pp. 3–29.

151. Indicated by such sayings as: "The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God has come near; repent, and believe in the good news" (Matthew 4.17 and Mark 1.15; see also Luke 4.43) and, "And he said to them, 'Truly I tell you, there are some standing here who will not taste death until they see that the kingdom of God has come with power.'" (Mark 9.1; see also Matthew 16.28, Luke 9.27).

152. Indicated by such sayings as: "Once Jesus was asked by the Pharisees when the kingdom of God was coming, and he answered, 'The kingdom of God is not coming with things that can be observed; 21 nor will they say, "Look, here it is!" or "There it is!" For, in fact, the kingdom of God is among you.'" (Luke 17.20–21; cf. Thomas 3, 113); "But if it is by the Spirit [finger] of God that I cast out the demons, then the kingdom of God has come to you" (Matthew 12:28; Luke 11.20.); and "Truly I tell you, among those born of women no one has arisen greater than John the Baptist; yet the least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he. 12 From the days of John the Baptist until now the kingdom of heaven has suffered violence, and the violent take it by force"(Matthew 11.11–12; Luke 5.28, 16.16; Thomas 46.).

153. For useful surveys of the problem see Heinz Giesen, *Herrschaft Gottes, heute oder morgen?: Zur Heilsbotschaft Jesu und der Synoptischen Evangelien* (Regensburg: Pustet, 1995).

154. Bruce J. Malina, 'Christ and Time: Swiss or Mediterranean?', *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 51 (1989), 1–31. However, *contra* Malina, there is evidence that some people in the early empire were quite literal and linear (or "Swiss" as Malina puts it) in their interpretation of future-oriented language. See, for example, 1 Thessalonians 4.13–18; 2 Peter 3.4; Cook, *The Interpretation of New Testament*, p. 192.

155. See Benedict Viviano, 'Eschatology and the Quest for the Historical Jesus', in *Oxford Handbook of Eschatology,* ed. by Jerry L. Walls (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), pp. 73–90.

156. Contrary to the position of, for example, Crossan, *The Historical Jesus*; Borg, *Jesus*, pp. 47–96; Stephen J. Patterson, *The God of Jesus: The Historical Jesus and the Search for Meaning* (Valley Forge: Trinity Press International, 1998). For a helpful analysis of the question see *The Apocalyptic Jesus: A Debate*, ed. by Robert J. Miller (Santa Rosa, California: Polebridge Press, 2001).

157. The degree of imminence can, for instance, affect both the character and content of the ethical demands of Jesus. For example, Albert Schweitzer claimed that Jesus' ethic was an "interim-ethik", temporary and transitory; "completely negative [...] not so much an ethic as a penitential discipline" undertaken in preparation for

the arrival of the kingdom (*Quest of the Historical Jesus*, p. 239). Peabody's criticisms of Schweitzer remain pertinent: "it is difficult to see in it [Jesus' ethics] a predominating quality of indifference to the world's affairs or of complete preoccupation with a supernatural catastrophe" (Francis Peabody, 'New Testament Eschatology and New Testament Ethics', *Harvard Theological Review*, 2 [1909], 50–57 [p. 54]).

158. Richard B. Hays, *The Moral Vision of the New Testament: Community, Cross, New Creation* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996), p. 163. For the theme of reversal in the ethics of Jesus see Allen Verhey, *The Great Reversal: Ethics and the New Testament* (Exeter: Paternoster, 1984).

159. The theme of reversal is not solely concerned with things that can be reasonably categorized in this way. See, for example, Luke 6.21, 25.

160. For a general guide to the cultural context of the data relating to the historical Jesus see *The Oxford Handbook of Jewish Daily Life in Roman Palestine*, ed. by Catherine Hezser (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010). See also *The Historical Jesus in Context*, ed. by Amy-Jill Levine, Dale C. Allison and John Dominic Crossan (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006).

161. See Luke 6.20, 24 (cf. Matthew 5.3). See also Matthew 19.16–24; Mark 10:17–25; Luke 18.18–25.

162. Luke 6.21; see also Matthew 6.11, Luke 11.3; Matthew 15.32, Mark 8.3;

163. Matthew 21.31–32 (Matthew 9.9, Mark 2.14, Luke 5.28; Luke 18.10, 19.2). The elders were a non-priestly group who, with the scribes and chief priests, made up the Sanhedrin. They were the local aristocracy and consisted of "the heads of the most influential lay families" (Joachim Jeremias, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus: an Investigation into Economic and Social Conditions During the New Testament Period* [London: SCM Press, 1969], p. 223).

164. Matthew 18.3, 19.14; Mark 10.14; Luke 10.21, 18.16.

165. See Luke 15.11–32; Matthew 18.10–14, Luke 15.3–7; Matthew 10.6; Matthew 15.24. The term "sinner" can have a range of meanings but is best understood, in this period, as including those "who

act as if there is no God, people who do not observe the [Jewish] Law (or certain interpretations of the Law), people who were effectively outside of God's covenant with Israel, and people contrasted with the 'righteous'" (James G. Crossley, *Reading the New Testament: Contemporary Approaches* [London: Routledge, 2010], p. 91).

166. Matthew 9.21–22, Luke 10.13–14; Luke 10.25–37; Luke 17.11–19; Matthew 8.5–13, Luke 7.1–10 cf. John 4.1–42; though see Matthew 15.21–28, Mark 7.24–30; Matthew 6.32, Luke 12.30; Matthew 10.5; cf. Luke 9.52.

167. Mark 10.46, Luke 18.35.

168. Mark 12.41–44, Luke 21.1–4.

169. Most famously, "many who are first will be last, and the last will be first" (Matthew 19.30; see also Matthew 20.16; Mark 10.31; Luke 13.30; Mark 9.35; Thomas 4).

170. For example, "When you give a luncheon or a dinner, do not invite your friends or your brothers or your relatives or rich neighbours, in case they may invite you in return, and you would be repaid. 13 But when you give a banquet, invite the poor, the crippled, the lame, and the blind." (Luke 14.12–13).

171. For example, "Truly I tell you, the tax-collectors and the prostitutes are going into the kingdom of God ahead of you." (Matthew 21.31).

172. Matthew 22.1–14, Luke 14:15–24, Thomas 64.

173. Luke 14.21.

174. Luke 16:19–31 – yet a rich person might normally be assumed, like Abraham, to be blessed by God (Genesis 13:2; Proverbs 10:22).

175. See Matthew 25:31–46. For the interpretation of verse 45 see W. D. Davies and Dale C. Allison, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew. Volume III. Commentary on Matthew XIX-XXVIII* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997), pp. 428–429. It should be emphasised that in one sense the reversal here is a typical one within first-century Judaism (see, for example 2 Esdras 2.20–23). Concern for the "least"was a consistent feature of Jewish ethical thinking, from the earliest prophetic texts onwards (see, for example, Amos 2.6–8, 4.1–3, 5.10–13, 8.4–6; Malachi 3.5).

176. Luke 12.16–21; Thomas 63.

177. For example: Mark 2.4, 15–17; Luke 7.36–48, 8.2; 19.2–10; John 7.53–8.11.

178. The theme of conflict is so pervasive that "conflict stories" constitute a distinctive and widely distributed form of the traditions associated with the historical Jesus. See, for example, Arland J. Hultgren, *Jesus and His Adversaries: The Form and Function of the Conflict Stories in the Synoptic Tradition* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1979).

179. There is a pervasive theme of hostility to wealth in the Jesus tradition (see, for example, Matthew 6.24, Luke 16.13; Luke 12.13–21; Matthew 6.29, Luke 12.27; Matthew 19.24, Mark 10.25, Luke 18.25; Matthew 24.17, Mark 13.15; Luke 17.31; cf. Luke 16:14–15). Real treasure is said to be located in heaven (Matthew 6.20; Luke 12.33; Matthew 19.21, Mark 10.21, Luke 18.22; Matthew 6.2, Luke 16.13; Luke 12.13–14, cf. Thomas 72). The recurrent attacks on the rich show that this hostility to wealth is not motivated by asceticism but an assumed relationship between poverty and wealth (see Luke 19.1–9; Matthew 19.21, Mark 10.21, Luke 18.22). An indication of such thinking might be visible in Mark 10.19 where the command not to defraud is added to a series of commandments otherwise taken from the Ten Commandments cf. Luke 19.8; James 5.4; Deuteronomy 5.6–11, Exodus 20.1–17.

180. Matthew 5.40, Luke 6.29 cf. Luke 18.2–6.

181. Matthew 15.5, Mark 7.11; Matthew 23.1–36, Mark 12.37b-40, Luke 20.45–47; Mark 12.41–13.4, 21.1–7.

182. See Matthew 5:41.

183. Note, for example, the destitution that resulted from illness: "She had endured much under many physicians, and had spent all that she had; and she was no better, but rather grew worse" (Mark 5.26, Luke 8.43); "I was a mason, earning a living with my hands; I beg you, Jesus, restore my health to me, so that I need not beg for my food in shame." (Gospel of the Nazareans in Jerome, *Commentary on Matthew* 12.13). The free nature of the healing offered by Jesus and his followers was clearly significant (Matthew 10.5).

184. Davies and Allison, *Matthew. Volume I,* pp. 546–47. Cf. Mark 15.21; Epictetus, *Discourses* 4.1.79.

185. Walter Wink, 'Neither Passivity nor Violence: Jesus' Third Way (Matt 5:38//Luke 6:29–30)', in *The Love of Enemy and Non-Retaliation in the New Testament*, ed. by Willard M. Swartley (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1992), pp. 102–125 (p.111).

186. Matthew 5.44; Luke 6.27, 35; Romans 12.12–21. See William Klassen, 'The Authenticity of the Command : "Love Your Enemies"', in *Authenticating the Words of Jesus*, ed. by Bruce Chilton and Craig A. Evans (Leiden: Brill, 1999), pp. 385–407. Such non-violent resistance was a significant strand within first-century Judaism. See Gordon Zerbe, *Non-retaliation in Early Jewish and New Testament Texts: Ethical Themes in Social Contexts* (Sheffield: JSOT, 1993). For examples, see Josephus, *Antiquities* 18:55–59, *War* 2.175–203.

187. In the case with the woman with the hemorrhage, in the earliest rendering of this tradition, her healing comes about as a result of her own decision and action not that of Jesus (Mark 5.29, Luke 8.44; cf. Matthew 9.22). In the case of the Syrophoencian woman it is her arguments that convince a reluctant Jesus to heal her daughter (Matthew 15.21–28, Mark 7.24–30). See also Matthew 9.1–8, Mark 2.1–12, Luke 5.17–26 ; Matthew 8.28–34, Mark 5.1–20, Luke 8.26–39.

188. See, for example, the command to "hate" families (Luke 14.26–27, cf. Matthew 10.37–39). See also Matthew 12.46–50, Mark 3.31–35, Luke 8.19–21; Matthew 19.29; Mark 10.29, Luke 18.29b; Matthew 8.21–22, Luke 9.59–60. However, cf. Matthew 19.19, Mark 10.19, Luke 18.20; Matthew 15.4, Mark 7.10.

189. Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her*, p. 107. For a persuasive and important criticism of Fiorenza and similar attempts to present the Jesus as a critic of patriarchy, see Kathleen E. Corley, *Women and the Historical Jesus: Feminist Myths of Christian Origins* (Santa Rosa: Polebridge Press, 2002).

190. Matthew 12.46–50, Mark 3.31–35, Luke 8.19–21; Matthew 19.19, Mark 10.30, Luke 18.30.

191. Luke 14.12.

192. Matthew 5.42, Luke 6.30; Matthew 6.12–13, Luke 11.4; Matthew 18.21–35; Luke 12.33; Matthew 19.21, Mark 10.21, Luke 18.22; Luke 14.33, Matthew 6.4, 20; Luke 6.34–35.

193. See David Kraemer, 'Food, Eating and Meals', in *The Oxford Handbook of Jewish Daily Life in Roman Palestine*, ed. by Catherine Hezser (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), pp. 403–419 and *Jewish Eating and Identity Throughout the Ages* (New York: Routledge, 2007). However, there were always means of enabling commensality, however constrained. See Jordan D. Rosenblum, *Food and Identity in Early Rabbinic Judaism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

194. For a description of this see Crossan, *The Historical Jesus,* pp. 261–264.

195. John Dominic Crossan, *Jesus: a Revolutionary Biography* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1994), p. 69.

196. See, for example, Matthew 9.10, Mark 2.15, Luke 5.29; Matthew 26.6, Mark 14.3; Thomas 61.

197. Matthew 11:19, Luke 7.34.

198. Matthew 9.11, Mark 2.16, Luke 5.30.

199. Luke 14.12–14.

200. Matthew 22.1–14, Luke 14.16–24, Thomas 64; Matthew 25.10 (cf. Matthew 9.15, Mark 2.19, Luke 9.34); Luke 12.37, 15.23.

201. The feeding of the five thousand: Matthew 14.13–21, Mark 6.30–44, Luke 9.10–17. The feeding of the four thousand: Matthew 15.32–39, Mark 8.1–10.

202. Matthew 8.11, Luke 13.29. It is, perhaps, unsurprising that a symbolic meal, associated with the kingdom, would become the central rite in early Christianity and was legitimized, probably with good reason, by appeal to an event in the life of the historical Jesus. See Matthew 26.26–29, Mark 14.22–25, Luke 22.15–20; 1 Corinthians 11.23–25. Cf. Justin, *First Apology* 66.3.

203. Something that owed itself to the universal tradition within Judaism. See Jacob Neusner, *Recovering Judaism: The Universal Dimension of Jewish Religion* (Fortress Press, 2001). Second Temple Jewish literature shows a range of ideas about the ultimate fate of the gentiles some of which involved their inclusion in salvation. See E. P. Sanders, *Judaism: Practice and Belief, 63 BCE-66 CE* (London: SCM Press, 1992), pp. 289–298. The tradition found in Matthew

8.11, Luke 13.29 may not be as self-evidently universal as it is often assumed, as Allison quite rightly notes ('Who Will Come from East and West? Observations on Matt. 8.11–12 = Luke 13.28–29', *Irish Biblical Studies*, 11 [1989], 158–170) but the implication is certainly there. See Michael F. Bird, 'Who Comes from the East and the West? Luke 13.28–29/Matt 8.11–12 and the Historical Jesus', *New Testament Studies*, 52 (2006), 441–457.

204. For cosmopolitanism see A. A. Long, 'The Concept of the Cosmopolitan in Greek & Roman Thought', *Daedalus*, 137 (2008), 50–58; Catherine Lu, 'The One and Many Faces of Cosmopolitanism', *Journal of Political Philosophy*, 8 (2000), 244–267.

205. Carl Levy, 'Anarchism and Cosmopolitanism', *Journal of Political Ideologies*, 16 (2011), 265–278.

206. See, for example, Matthew 22.16, Mark 12.14, Luke 20.21; Matthew 7.21, Luke 6.46. Jesus' initial silence when questioned by the high priest (Matthew 26.63, Mark 14.61), Herod (Luke 23.9), and Pilate (Matthew 27.11–14, Mark 15.1–4, Luke 23.2–5) could be interpreted as deliberately insolent. See also the exchange in Matthew 21.23–27, Mark 11:27–33, Luke 20.1–8.

207. Such impartiality is regarded as characteristic of God in the biblical tradition (e.g. Leviticus 19.15 cf. Acts 10.34, Rom. 2.11) and appears to be particularly associated with the rule of God in the New Testament (Matthew 5.45; cf. also Matthew 5.44, Luke 6.27, 35; Matthew 6.14, Luke 11:4).

208. For understanding the implications of departing from cultural expectations of deference and the problems of "face" it would raise, see Penelope Brown and Stephen C. Levinson, *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage* (Cambridge University Press, 1987). See also Richard Bauman, *Let Your Words Be Few: Symbolism of Speaking and Silence Among Seventeenth-century Quakers* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983).

209. Luke 8.3; Matthew 9.9–13, Mark 2.13–17, Luke 5.27–32; Luke 19.2; Matthew 8.5, Luke 7.2.

210. Bockmuehl, 'Inclusive Jesus', p. 14.

211. See, for example, Casey, *Jesus of Nazareth,* p. 200. See Matthew 4.17, Mark 1.15; Mark 6.7, 12; Luke 15.11–32; Matthew 18.10–14,

Luke 15.3–7; Matthew 12.38–42; Luke 11:29–32; Luke 13.1–9. Contra Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*, pp. 106–113 (cf. Casey, *Jesus of Nazareth,* pp. 282–84).

212. It is related to the idea in the Hebrew Bible that a sinful Israel needs to return to God (Isaiah 44.22, 55.7), a common theme, particularly in traditions concerned with the Day of the Lord (e.g. Joel 2.32)

213. See Luke 19.1–9; Matthew 19.21, Mark 10.21, Luke 18.22. For the expectation of restitution see Leviticus 6.1–5, Numbers 5.5–7.

214. See, for example, Matthew 12.28, Luke 11.20; Matthew 10.34–36, Luke 12.49–56; Matthew 11.2–6, Luke 7.18–23.

215. See, for example, Luke 5.32; Matthew 9.13; Matthew 5.21, 27, 33, 39, 44.

216. H. J. de Jonge, 'The Historical Jesus' View of Himself and of His Mission', in *From Jesus to John*, ed. by Martinus de Boer (Sheffield: JSOT, 1993), pp. 21–37; Theissen and Merz, *The Historical Jesus*, pp. 512–567; Wedderburn, *Jesus and the Historians,* pp. 275–322; Ben Witherington, *The Christology of Jesus* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1990).

217. For example, Matthew 10.1–5; Mark 3.16–19, 4.10, 6.7, 9.35; Luke 6.13–16; John 6.67; Acts 1.13, 6.2; 1 Corinthians 15.5.

218. For example, Luke 10:9–16, Matthew 10:7–16; Luke 12:8–9 and Matthew 12:32–33.

219. Bakunin, *God and the State,* p. 33. See Simon Western, 'Autonomist Leadership in Leaderless Movements: Anarchists Leading the Way', *Ephemera: Theory & Politics in Organization*, 14 (2014), 673–698.

220. See Richard P. Saller, *Personal Patronage Under the Early Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

221. Mark 10.42–44; see also Matthew 20.20–28, Luke 22.24–27; Matthew 18.1–5, Mark 9.33–37, Luke 9.46–48; see John 13.1–11.

222. Myers in Van Steenwyk, *Holy Anarchist,* p. 8.

223. 1 Samuel 8.7. 1 Samuel 8.10–18 includes a stinging critique of the exploitation that results from monarchy.

224. The idea that the messiah would be identified by the healings he carried out, assumed in the tradition of Jesus' answer to John the Baptist (Matthew 11.2–6, Luke 7.18–23) is almost entirely absent from our sources for Jewish messianic expectations at the time. It can only be found in Dead Sea Scroll 4Q521. See Lidija Novakovic, '4Q521: The Works of the Messiah or the Signs of the Messianic Time?', in *Qumran Studies*, ed. by Michael Thomas Davis and Brent A. Strawn (Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2007), pp. 208–231.

225. E.g. Matthew 10.8, Luke 10.9.

226. Matthew 19.28, Luke 22.28–30. Cf. Psalms of Solomon 17.26. Gerd Theissen, 'Gruppenmessianismus: Überlegungen zum Ursprung der Kirche im Jüngerkreis Jesu', *Jahrbuch für Biblische Theologie*, 7 (1992), 101–123.

227. This is most obvious in the arrest narratives. See Matthew 26:47–56, Mark 14:43–52, Luke 22:47–53, John 18:1–11.

228. Benjamin Franks, *Rebel Alliances: The Means and Ends of Contemporary British Anarchisms* (Edinburgh: AK Press, 2006), p. 93.

229. Franks, *Rebel Alliances,* p. 98.

230. Matthew 13.31, Mark 4.31; Luke 13.18–19, Thomas 20.

231. Graeber, *Direct Action,* p. 203.

232. Matthew 21.13, Mark 11.15–19, Luke 19.45–48, John 2.13–17.

233. Matthew 22.15–22, Mark 12.13–17, Luke 20.20–26, Thomas 100, Egerton Papyrus 2.

234. Matthew 26.57–27.26, Mark 14.53–15.15, Luke 22.54–25, John 18.12–19.16.

235. Graeber, *Direct Action*, p. 114.

236. See, for example, Matthew 17.19–27; Matthew 18.3, Mark 9.15, Luke 18.17.

237. Marshall, *Demanding,* p. 75.

238. Justin J. Meggitt, 'Review of Mary Ann Beavis, *Jesus & Utopia: Looking for the Kingdom of God in the Roman World*', *Utopian Studies*, 18 (2007), 281–284.

239. See, for example, the use of a fictional anarchist utopia in Ursula Le Guin, *The Dispossessed: An Ambiguous Utopia* (New York: HarperPrism, 1974).

240. See the classic anarchist critique Marie Louise Berneri, *Journey Through Utopia* (London: Freedom Press, 1982).

241. Franks, *Rebel Alliances,* p. 99.

242. Matthew 15.21–28, Mark 7.24–30.

243. Mark 13.53–58, Mark 6.1–6a; cf. Luke 4.16–30.

244. Matthew 16.13–23, Mark 8.27–33, Luke 9.18–22.

245. See, for example, Bockmuehl, *This Jesus,* p. 86.

246. Henry Joel Cadbury, *The Peril of Modernizing Jesus* (New York: Macmillan, 1937), p. 141.

247. Judith Suissa, *Anarchism and Education: A Philosophical Perspective*, 2nd edn (Oakland: PM Press, 2010), p. 149.

248. Justin Mueller, 'Anarchism, the State, and the Role of Education', in *Anarchist Pedagogies: Collective Actions, Theories, and Critical Reflections on Education*, ed. by Robert H. Haworth (Oakland: PM Press, 2012), pp. 14–31 (p. 14).

249. Mueller, 'Anarchism', pp. 18–19.

250. Matthew 5.44; Luke 6.27, 35 (Romans 12.12–21).

251. Matthew 19.3–12, Mark 10.2–12; Matthew 5.31–32; Luke 16.18 (1 Corinthians 7.10).

252. For example, Matthew 22.1–14, Luke 14.15–24, Thomas 64; Matthew 25.31–46; Luke 10.25–37; 15.11–32; 16.19–31.

253. Christoyannopoulos, *Christian Anarchism,* p. 118.

254. Myers, *Binding the Strong Man,* p. 383.

255. For the use of the term see Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God,* pp. 86, 98.

256. A. E. Harvey, *Jesus and the Constraints of History* (London: Duckworth, 1982), p. 16.

257. Matthew 27.37, Mark 15.26, Luke 23.38, John 19:19, 21.

258. For further discussion of this, see Meggitt, 'Madness'.

259. Corley, *Women and the Historical Jesus*. Jesus' message clearly appealed to some women, who were significant in the early movement, but probably because it embodied the more liberative tendencies visible in some forms of Judaism of the time, and elsewhere in the empire, or because of what it offered the poor and oppressed more generally.

260. A point forcefully made by James Crossley, *Jesus and the Chaos of History: Redirecting the Life of the Historical Jesus* (Oxford:Oxford University Press, 2015), pp. 64–95.

261. Barclay, *People Without Government,* p. 18.

262. Paul Chambers, 'Review of *Christian Anarchism: A Political Commentary* by Alexandre Christoyannopoulos', *Anarchist Studies*, 20 (2012), 109–111 (p. 110).

263. For those who reject such a capacious understanding of the term 'anarchist', at the very least there is sufficient evidence here to say that the historical Jesus displayed "an anarchist sensibility", and can legitimately be ranked alongside other figures like Aurobindo, Berdyaev, Blake, Gandhi and Tolstoy who are descibed in such a way by Brian Morris. See Brian Morris, 'Review of Paul Cudenec, *The Anarchist Revelation: Being What We Are Meant to Be*', *Anarchist Studies*, 23 (2015), 111–15 (p. 112).

References

Allison, Dale C., 'Who Will Come from East and West? Observations on Matt. 8.11–12 = Luke 13.28–29', *Irish Biblical Studies*, 11 (1989), 158–170.

Allison, Dale C., *Jesus of Nazareth: Millenarian Prophet* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1998).

Allison, Dale C., 'Behind the Temptations of Jesus : Q 4:1–13 and Mark 1:12–13', in *Authenticating the Activities of Jesus*, ed. by Bruce Chilton and Craig A. Evans (Leiden: Brill, 1999), pp. 195–213.

Allison, Dale C., *Constructing Jesus: Memory, Imagination, and History* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2010).

Allison, Dale C., 'It Don't Come Easy: a History of Disillusionment', in *Jesus, Criteria, and the Demise of Authenticity*, ed. by Chris Keith and Anthony Le Donne (London: T&T Clark, 2012), pp. 186–199.

Alston, Charlotte, *Tolstoy and His Disciples: The History of a Radical International Movement* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2014).

Anderson, Paul N, Felix Just and Tom Thatcher, eds, *John, Jesus, and History, Volume 1: Critical Appraisals of Critical Views* (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007).

Anderson, Paul N, Felix Just and Tom Thatcher, eds, *John, Jesus, and History, Volume 2: Aspects of Historicity in the Fourth Gospel* (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009).

Arnal, William E., *The Symbolic Jesus: Historical Scholarship, Judaism and the Construction of Contemporary Identity*, Religion in Culture: Studies in Social Contest and Construction (London: Equinox, 2005).

Arnal, William E., 'The Cipher "Judaism" in Contemporary Historical Jesus Scholarship', in *Apocalypticism, Anti-Semitism and the Historical Jesus: Subtexts in Criticism*, ed. by John S. Kloppenborg and John Marshall (London: Continuum, 2005), pp. 24–54.

Arshinov, Peter, *History of the Makhnovist Movement, 1918–21,* 2nd edn (London: Freedom Press, 2005).

Bailey, James L., and Lyle D. Vander Broek, *Literary Forms in the New Testament: A Handbook* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1992).

Bakunin, Mikhail, *God and the State* (London: Freedom Press, 1910 [1882]).

Bammel, Ernst and C. F. D. Moule, eds, *Jesus and the Politics of His Day* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984).

Barclay, Harold B., *People Without Government: An Anthropology of Anarchy* (London: Kahn & Averill, 1990).

Bauckham, Richard, *The Bible in Politics: How to Read the Bible Politically*, 2nd edn (London: SPCK, 2011).

Bauman, Richard, *Let Your Words Be Few: Symbolism of Speaking and Silence Among Seventeenth-century Quakers* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983).

Berdyaev, Nicolai, *Slavery and Freedom* (New York, NY: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1944).

Berkman, Alexander, *Now and After: The ABC of Communist Anarchism* (New York, NY: Vanguard Press, 1929).

Bermejo-Rubio, Fernando, 'Jesus and the Anti-Roman Resistance', *Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus*, 12 (2014), 1–105.

Bermejo-Rubio, Fernando, 'Jesus as a Seditionist: The Intertwining of Politics and Religion in his Teaching and Deeds', in *Teaching the Historical Jesus: Issues and Exegesis,* ed. by Zev Garber (London: Routledge, 2015), pp. 232–243.

Berneri, Marie Louise, *Journey Through Utopia* (London: Freedom Press, 1982).

Bessière, Georges, *Jésus selon Proudhon: la « messianose » et la naissance du christianisme* (Paris: Cerf, 2007).

Betz, Hans Dieter and Adela Yarbro Collins, *The Sermon on the Mount: A Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount, Including the Sermon on the Plain (Matthew: 5:3–7:27 and Luke 6:20–49)* (Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress, 1995).

Bird, Michael F., 'Who Comes from the East and the West? Luke 13.28–29/Matt 8.11–12 and the Historical Jesus', *New Testament Studies*, 52 (2006), 441–457.

Blanton, Ward, James G. Crossley, and Halvor Moxnes, eds, *Jesus Beyond Nationalism: Constructing the Historical Jesus in a Period of Cultural Complexity* (London: Equinox, 2010).

Bockmuehl, Markus, *This Jesus: Martyr, Lord, Messiah* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994).

Bockmuehl, Markus, 'The Trouble with the Inclusive Jesus', *Horizons in Biblical Theology*, 33 (2011), 9–23.

Boehrer, Frederick, 'Christian Anarchism and the Catholic Worker Movement: Roman Catholic Authority and Identity in the United States' (unpublished PhD, New York: Syracuse University, 2001).

Bond, Helen K., *The Historical Jesus: A Guide for the Perplexed* (London: T&T Clark, 2012).

Bookchin, Murray, *To Remember Spain: The Anarchist and Syndicalist Revolution of 1936* (Oakland, CA: AK Press, 1995).

Bookchin, Murray, *Social Anarchism Or Lifestyle Anarchism: An Unbridgeable Chasm* (Oakland, CA: AK Press, 1996).

Borg, Marcus, *Jesus in Contemporary Scholarship* (London: Continuum, 1994).

Brandon, S. G. F., *Jesus and the Zealots: a Study of the Political Factor in Primitive Christianity* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1967).

Brown, Penelope and Stephen C. Levinson, *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987).

Burridge, Richard A., *What Are the Gospels?: a Comparison with Graeco-Roman Biography*, 2nd edn (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2004).

Burridge, Richard A. *Imitating Jesus: An Inclusive Approach to New Testament Ethics* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2007).

Cadbury, Henry Joel, *The Peril of Modernizing Jesus* (New York, NY: Macmillan, 1937).

Carrier, Richard, *On the Historicity of Jesus: Why We Might Have Reason for Doubt* (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2014).

Casey, Maurice, *Is John's Gospel True?* (London: Routledge, 1996).

Casey, Maurice, *Jesus of Nazareth: An Independent Historian's Account of His Life and Teaching* (London: Continuum, 2010).

Casey, Maurice, *Jesus: Evidence and Argument or Mythicist Myths?* (London: T&T Clark, 2014).

Chambers, Paul, 'Review of *Christian Anarchism: A Political Commentary* by Alexandre Christoyannopoulos', *Anarchist Studies*, 20 (2012), 109–111.

Charlesworth, James H. and Craig A Evans, 'Jesus in the Agrapha and Apocryphal Gospels', in *Studying the Historical Jesus: Evaluations of the State of Current Research*, ed. by Bruce Chilton and Craig A. Evans (Leiden: Brill, 1994), pp. 479–534.

Chilton, Bruce, 'The Kingdom of God in Recent Discussion', in *Studying the Historical Jesus: Evaluations of the State of Current Research*, ed. by Craig A. Evans and Bruce Chilton (Leiden: Brill, 1998), pp. 255–280.

Christie, Stuart, *We the Anarchists: A Study of the Iberian Anarchist Federation (FAI) 1927–1937* (Oakland, CA: AK Press, 2008).

Christian, David, 'State Formation in the Inner Eurasian Steppes', in *Worlds of the Silk Roads: Ancient and Modern*, ed. by David Christian and Craig Benjamin (Turnhout: Brepols, 1998), pp. 51–76.

Christoyannopoulos, Alexandre, ed., *Religious Anarchism: New Perspectives* (Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2009).

Christoyannopoulos, Alexandre, *Christian Anarchism: A Political Commentary on the Gospel* (Exeter: Imprint Academic, 2011).

Cohn, Norman, *The Pursuit Of The Millennium: Revolutionary Millenarians and Mystical Anarchists of the Middle Ages* (London: Pimlico, 2004).

Conrad, Joseph, *The Secret Agent* (London: J. M. Dent, 1907).

Conway, Colleen M., *Behold the Man: Jesus and Greco-Roman Masculinity* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008)

Cook, John Granger, *The Interpretation of the New Testament in Greco-Roman Paganism* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2002).

Corley, Kathleen E., *Women and the Historical Jesus: Feminist Myths of Christian Origins* (Santa Rosa, CA: Polebridge Press, 2002)

Craib, Raymond and Barry Maxwell, eds, *No Gods, No Masters, No Peripheries: Global Anarchisms* (Oakland, CA: PM Press, 2015).

Crone, Patricia, 'Ninth-Century Muslim Anarchists', *Past & Present*, 167 (2000), 3–28.

Crone, Patricia, *Medieval Islamic Political Thought*, 2nd edn (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2005).

Crossan, John Dominic, *The Historical Jesus: The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992).

Crossan, John Dominic, *Jesus: A Revolutionary Biography* (San Francisco, CA: HarperSanFrancisco, 1994).

Crossley, James G., *Jesus in an Age of Terror: Scholarly Projects for a New American Century* (London: Equinox, 2008).

Crossley, James G., *Reading the New Testament: Contemporary Approaches* (London: Routledge, 2010).

Crossley, James G., *Jesus in an Age of Neoliberalism: Quests, Scholarship and Ideology* (London: Equinox, 2012).

Crossley, James G., *Jesus and the Chaos of History: Redirecting the Life of the Historical Jesus* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015).

Curran, Giorel, *21st Century Dissent: Anarchism, Anti-Globalization and Environmentalism* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006).

Damico, Linda H., *The Anarchist Dimension of Liberation Theology* (Pieterlen: Peter Lang, 1987).

Davies, W. D., and D. C. Allison, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew. Volume I. Introduction and Commentary on Matthew I-VII* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988).

Davies, W. D., and Dale C. Allison, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew. Volume III. Commentary on Matthew XIX-XXVIII* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997).

Dirlik, Arif, *Anarchism in the Chinese Revolution* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1991).

Dodd, C. H., *History and the Gospel* (London: Nisbet, 1938).

Dorion, Louis-André, 'The Rise and Fall of the Socratic Problem', in *The Cambridge Companion to Socrates*, ed. by Donald R. Morrison (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), pp. 1–23.

Downing, F. Gerald, 'Jesus and Cynicism', in *Handbook for the Study of the Historical Jesus. Volume 2. The Study of Jesus*, ed. by Tom Holmén and Stanley E. Porter, 4 vols. (Leiden: Brill, 2010), pp. 1105–1136.

Dschulnigg, Peter, 'Positionen des Gleichnisverständnisses im 20. Jahrhundert. Kurze Darstellung von fünf Wichtigen Positionen

der Gleichnistheorie (Jülicher, Jeremias, Weder, Arens, Harnisch)', *Theologische Zeitschrift*, 45 (1989), 335–351.

Dunn, James D. G., 'Jesus Tradition in Paul', in *Studying the Historical Jesus: Evaluations of the State of Current Research*, ed. by Bruce Chilton and Craig A Evans (Leiden: Brill, 1994), pp. 155–178.

Dzielska, Maria, *Apollonius of Tyana in Legend and History* (Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider, 1986).

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

Ehrman, Bart D., *Did Jesus Exist?: The Historical Argument for Jesus of Nazareth* (San Francisco, CA: HarperOne, 2012).

Esenwein, George R., *Anarchist Ideology and the Working-Class Movement in Spain, 1868–1898* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1989).

Evans, Craig A., 'Jesus in Non-Christian Sources', in *Studying the Historical Jesus: Evaluations of the State of Current Research*, ed. by Bruce Chilton and Craig A. Evans (Leiden: Brill, 1998), pp. 443–478.

Evans-Pritchard, E. E., *The Nuer: a Description of the Modes of Livelihood and Political Institutions of a Nilotic People* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940).

Eve, Eric, *The Healer from Nazareth: Jesus' Miracles in Historical Context* (London: SPCK, 2009).

Faure, Sébastien, *Les douze preuves de l'inexistence de Dieu,* (Paris: Librairie sociale, 1908).

Fiorenza, Elizabeth Schüssler, *In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins,* 2nd edn (London: SCM, 2009).

Flusser, David and R. Steven Notley, *The Sage from Galilee: Rediscovering Jesus' Genius*, 4th edn (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007 [1968]).

Fonrobert, Charlotte, and Martin S. Jaffee, 'Introduction: The Talmud, Rabbinic Literature, and Jewish Culture', in *The Cambridge Companion to the Talmud and Rabbinic Literature,*

ed. by Charlotte Fonrobert and Martin S. Jaffee, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), pp. 1–14.

Franks, Benjamin, *Rebel Alliances: The Means and Ends of Contemporary British Anarchisms* (Edinburgh: AK Press, 2006).

Fredriksen, Paula, *From Jesus to Christ: the Origins of the New Testament Images of Christ*, 2nd edn (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2000).

Frickenschmidt, Dirk, *Evangelium als Biographie: Die vier Evangelien im Rahmen antiker Erzählkunst* (Tübingen: Francke, 1997).

Frier, Bruce W., 'More Is Worse: Some Observations on the Population of the Roman Empire', in *Debating Roman Demography,* ed. by Walter Scheidel (Leiden: Brill, 2001), pp. 139–160.

Funk, Robert W., *Honest to Jesus: Jesus for a New Millennium* (New York, NY: Polebridge, 1996).

Gathercole, Simon, *The Gospel of Thomas* (Leiden: Brill, 2014).

Gelderloos, Peter, *How Nonviolence Protects the State* (Cambridge, MA: South End Press, 2007).

Giesen, Heinz, *Herrschaft Gottes, heute oder morgen?: Zur Heilsbotschaft Jesu und der Synoptischen Evangelien* (Regensburg: Pustet, 1995).

Goodway, David, *Anarchist Seeds Beneath the Snow: Left-libertarian Thought and British Writers from William Morris to Colin Ward,* 2nd edn (Oakland, CA: PM Press, 2011).

Gordon, Uri, *Anarchy Alive!: Anti-Authoritarian Politics From Practice to Theory* (London: Pluto Press, 2008).

Gowler, David B., *What Are They Saying About the Parables?* (New York: Paulist Press, 2000).

Gowler, David B., *What Are They Saying About the Historical Jesus?* (New York, NY: Paulist Press, 2007).

Graeber, David, *Fragments of an Anarchist Anthropology* (Chicago, IL: Prickly Paradigm Press, 2004).

Graeber, David, *Direct Action: An Ethnography* (Oakland, CA: AK Press, 2009).

Graham, Robert, *Anarchism: From Anarchy to Anarchism (300CE to 1939) V. 1: A Documentary History of Libertarian Ideas* (Montreal: Black Rose Books, 2005).

Greenwood, E. B., 'Tolstoy and Religion', in *New Essays on Tolstoy*, ed. Malcolm Jones (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978), pp. 149–174.

Hägg, Thomas, *The Art of Biography in Antiquity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012).

Harvey, A. E., *Jesus and the Constraints of History* (London: Duckworth, 1982).

Hays, Richard B., *The Moral Vision of the New Testament: Community, Cross, New Creation* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996).

Hebden, Keith, *Dalit Theology and Christian Anarchism* (London: Ashgate, 2011).

Hezser, Catherine, ed., *The Oxford Handbook of Jewish Daily Life in Roman Palestine* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010).

Holmén, Tom and Stanley E. Porter, eds, *Handbook for the Study of the Historical Jesus. Volume 1: How to Study the Historical Jesus* (Leiden: Brill, 2010).

Hooker, M. D., 'Christology and Methodology', *New Testament Studies*, 17 (1971), 480–487.

Hopkins, Keith, 'Taxes and Trade in the Roman Empire (200 B.C.-A.D. 400)', *The Journal of Roman Studies*, 70 (1980), 101–125.

Hopkins, Keith, *Death and Renewal. Volume 2: Sociological Studies in Roman History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985).

Hultgren, Arland J., *Jesus and His Adversaries: The Form and Function of the Conflict Stories in the Synoptic Tradition* (Minneapolis, MI: Augsburg, 1979).

Jennings, Jeremy, 'Anarchism', in *Contemporary Political Ideologies*, ed. by Roger Eatwell and Anthony Wright, 2nd edn (London: Continuum, 1999), pp. 131–151.

Jensen, Richard Bach, *The Battle against Anarchist Terrorism: An International History, 1878–1934* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013).

Jeremias, Joachim, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus: an Investigation into Economic and Social Conditions During the New Testament Period* (London: SCM Press, 1969).

Jeremias, Joachim, *New Testament Theology: The Proclamation of Jesus*, trans. by John Bowden (London: SCM Press, 1971).

Johnson, Luke Timothy, *The Real Jesus: The Misguided Quest for the Historical Jesus and the Truth of the Traditional Gospels* (San Francisco, CA: HarperSanFrancisco, 1996).

Kähler, Martin, *Der sogenannte historische Jesus und der geschichtliche, biblische Christus* (Leipzig: A. Deichert, 1892).

Keener, Craig S., *The Historical Jesus of the Gospels* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2009).

Kinna, Ruth, *Anarchism: A Beginner's Guide* (Oxford: Oneworld Publications, 2009).

Klassen, William, 'The Authenticity of the Command : "Love Your Enemies"', in *Authenticating the Words of Jesus*, ed. by Bruce Chilton and Craig A. Evans (Leiden: Brill, 1999), pp. 385–407.

Konishi, Sho, *Anarchist Modernity: Cooperatism and Japanese-Russian Intellectual Relations in Modern Japan* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2013).

Kraemer, David, 'Food, Eating and Meals', in *The Oxford Handbook of Jewish Daily Life in Roman Palestine*, ed. by Catherine Hezser (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), pp. 403–419.

Kraemer, David, *Jewish Eating and Identity Throughout the Ages* (London: Routledge, 2007).

Kropotkin, Peter, *Ethics: Origin and Development* (Bristol: Thoemmes Press, 1993 [1924]).

Lategan, Bernard C., 'Questing or Sense-Making? Some Thoughts on the Nature of Historiography', *Biblical Interpretation: A Journal of Contemporary Approaches*, 11 (2003), 588–601.

Le Donne, Anthony, *The Historiographical Jesus: Memory, Typology, and the Son of David* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2009).

Le Donne, Anthony, *Historical Jesus: What Can We Know and How Can We Know It?* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2011).

Le Guin, Ursula, *The Dispossessed: An Ambiguous Utopia* (New York, NY: HarperPrism, 1974).

Levine, Amy-Jill, Dale C. Allison and John Dominic Crossan, eds, *The Historical Jesus in Context* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006).

Levy, Carl, 'Anarchism and Cosmopolitanism', *Journal of Political Ideologies*, 16 (2011), 265–278.

Long, A. A., 'The Concept of the Cosmopolitan in Greek & Roman Thought', *Daedalus*, 137 (2008), 50–58.

Love, John R., *Antiquity and Capitalism: Max Weber and the Sociological Foundations of Roman Civilization* (London: Routledge, 1991).

Lu, Catherine, 'The One and Many Faces of Cosmopolitanism', *Journal of Political Philosophy*, 8 (2000), 244–267.

Lubac, Henri de, *Proudhon et le christianisme* (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1945).

Lüdemann, Gerd, *Jesus After Two Thousand Years: What He Really Said and Did* (London: SCM Press, 2000).

Luz, Ulrich, *Matthew 1–7: a Commentary*, 2nd edn (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2007).

Macklin, Graham D., 'Co-opting the Counter Culture: Troy Southgate and the National Revolutionary Faction', *Patterns of Prejudice*, 39 (2005), 301–326.

MacMullen, Ramsay, 'How Big Was the Roman Imperial Army?', *Klio,* 62 (1980), 451–460.

Malina, Bruce J., 'Christ and Time: Swiss or Mediterranean?', *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 51 (1989), 1–31.

Marshall, Peter, *Demanding the Impossible: A History of Anarchism,* 4th edn (Oakland, CA: PM Press, 2010).

May, Todd, *The Political Philosophy of Poststructuralist Anarchism* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1994).

Mbah, Sam and I. E. Igariwey, *African Anarchism: A History and Analysis* (Tucson, AZ: See Sharp Press, 1997).

Meggitt, Justin J. 'The Madness of King Jesus', *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, 29 (2007), 379–413.

Meggitt, Justin J., 'Review of Mary Ann Beavis, *Jesus & Utopia: Looking for the Kingdom of God in the Roman World*', *Utopian Studies*, 18 (2007), 281–284.

Meggitt, Justin J., 'Psychology and the Historical Jesus', in *Jesus and Psychology*, ed. by Fraser Watts (London: Darton,Longman & Todd, 2007), pp. 16–26.

Meggitt, Justin J., 'Popular Mythology in the Early Empire and the Multiplicity of Jesus Traditions', in *Sources of the Jesus Tradition: Separating History from Myth*, ed. by R. Joseph Hoffmann (Amherst, NY: Prometheus, 2010), pp. 53–80.

Meier, John P., *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus* (New York, NY: Doubleday, 1991).

Meier, John P. 'The Present State of the "Third Quest" for the Historical Jesus: Loss and Gain', *Biblica*, 80 (1999), 459–487.

Merriman, John M., *The Dynamite Club: How a Bombing in Fin-de-Siècle Paris Ignited the Age of Modern Terror* (London: JR Books, 2009).

Miller, Robert J., *The Apocalyptic Jesus: A Debate* (Santa Rosa, CA: Polebridge Press, 2001).

Milstein, Cindy, *Anarchism and its Aspirations* (Oakland, CA: AK Press, 2010).

Mitchell, Timothy, 'The Limits of the State: Beyond Statist Approaches and Their Critics', *The American Political Science Review*, 85 (1991), 77–96.

Morris, Brian, *Ecology and Anarchism: Essays and Reviews on Contemporary Thought* (Malvern: Images Publishing, 1996).

Morris, Brian, *Kropotkin: The Politics of Community* (Amherst, NY: Humanity Books, 2003)

Morris, Brian, *Anthropology and Anarchism: Their Elective Affinity* (London: Goldsmiths College, 2005).

Morris, Brian, 'Review of Paul Cudenec, *The Anarchist Revelation: Being What We Are Meant to Be*', *Anarchist Studies*, 23 (2015), 111–15.

Mueller, Justin, 'Anarchism, the State, and the Role of Education', in *Anarchist Pedagogies: Collective Actions, Theories, and Critical Reflections on Education*, ed. by Robert H. Haworth (Oakland, CA: PM Press, 2012), pp. 14–31.

Myers, Ched, *Binding the Strong Man: A Political Reading of Mark's Story of Jesus* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1988).

Myers, Ched 'Forward', in Mark Van Steenwyk, *That Holy Anarchist: Reflections on Christianity & Anarchism* (Minneapolis, MN: Missio Dei, 2012), pp. 1–11.

Neusner, Jacob, *Recovering Judaism: The Universal Dimension of Jewish Religion* (*Philadelphia, PA:* Fortress Press, 2001).

Newman, Saul, *From Bakunin to Lacan: Anti-Authoritarianism and the Dislocation of Power* (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2001).

Nietzsche, Friedrich Wilhelm, 'Der Antichrist', in *Nietzsches Werke: Der Fall Wagner; Götzen-Dämmerung; Nietzsche contra Wagner; Der Antichrist; Gedichte* (Leipzig: C. G. Naumann, 1895), VIII, pp. 211–313.

Novakovic, Lidija, '4Q521: The Works of the Messiah or the Signs of the Messianic Time?', in *Qumran Studies*, ed. by Michael Thomas Davis and Brent A. Strawn (Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2007), pp. 208–231.

Overing, Joanna, 'Images of Cannibalism, Death and Domination in a "Nonviolent" Society', *Journal de la Société des Américanistes,* 72 (1986), 133–156.

Patterson, Stephen J., *The God of Jesus: The Historical Jesus and the Search for Meaning* (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1998).

Patterson, Stephen J., 'The Gospel of Thomas and Historical Jesus Research', in *Coptica – Gnostica – Manichaica*, ed. by Louis Painchaud and Paul-Hubert Poirier (Quebec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval, 2006), pp. 663–684.

Peabody, Francis, 'New Testament Eschatology and New Testament Ethics', *Harvard Theological Review*, 2 (1909), 50–57.

Peirats, José, *The CNT in the Spanish Revolution*, ed. by Chris Ealham, 3 vols. (Oakland, CA: PM Press, 2011).

Porter, Stanley E., *The Criteria for Authenticity in Historical-Jesus Research: Previous Discussion and New Proposals* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000).

Preston, Paul, *The Spanish Holocaust: Inquisition and Extermination in Twentieth-century Spain* (London: HarperPress, 2012).

Proudhon, Pierre-Joseph, *Qu'est-ce que la propriété? Ou recherches sur le principe du droit et du gouvernment* (Paris: Librairie de Prévot, 1840).

Proudhon, Pierre-Joseph, *Jésus et les origines du christianisme* (Paris: G. Havard fils, 1896).

Proudhon, Pierre-Joseph, *Ecrits sur la religion*, ed. by M. Ruyssen (Paris: M. Rivière, 1959).

Reimarus, Herman S., *Fragments,* ed. by C. H. Talbert (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1970 [1774–7]).

Rohrbaugh, Richard L., 'Ethnocentrism and Historical Questions About Jesus', in *The Social Setting of Jesus and the Gospels*, ed. by Wolfgang Stegemann (Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress, 2003), pp. 27–43.

Rosenblum, Jordan D., *Food and Identity in Early Rabbinic Judaism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

Ruel, Malcolm, *Belief, Ritual and the Securing of Life: Reflective Essays on a Bantu Religion* (Leiden: Brill, 1997).

Runesson, Anna, *Exegesis in the Making: Postcolonialism and New Testament Studies* (Leiden: Brill, 2010).

Saller, Richard P., *Personal Patronage Under the Early Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

Sanders, E. P., *Jesus and Judaism* (London: SCM Press, 1985).

Sanders, E. P., *Judaism: Practice and Belief, 63 BCE-66 CE* (London: SCM Press, 1992).

Sandford, Michael J., *Poverty, Wealth, and Empire: Jesus and Postcolonial Criticism* (Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2014).

Sandt, Huub van de, and Jürgen K. Zangenberg, *Matthew, James, and Didache: Three Related Documents in Their Jewish and Christian Settings* (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008).

Scheidel, Walter, 'From the "Great Convergence" to the "First Great Divergence": Roman and Qin-Han State Formation and Its Aftermath', in *Rome and China: Comparative Perspectives on Ancient World Empires*, ed. by Walter Scheidel (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), pp. 11–23.

Schinkel, Willem, *AspE. P. Sanders, Judaism: Practice and Belief, 63 BCE-66 CE (London: SCM Press, 1992)ects of Violence: A Critical Theory* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2010).

Schmidt, Michael, *Cartography of Revolutionary Anarchism* (Oakland, CA: AK Press, 2013).

Schweitzer, Albert, *Von Reimarus zu Wrede: eine Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck,1906).

Schweizer, Bernard, *Hating God: The Untold Story of Misotheism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010).

Scott, Bernard Brandon, *Hear Then the Parable: A Commentary on the Parables of Jesus* (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1989).

Scott, James C., *The Art of Not Being Governed: an Anarchist History of Upland Southeast Asia* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2009).

Segers, Mary C., 'Equality and Christian Anarchism: The Political and Social Ideas of the Catholic Worker Movement', *The Review of Politics,* 40 (1978), 196–230.

Seidman, Michael, *The Imaginary Revolution: Parisian Students and Workers in 1968* (New York, NY: Berghahn Books, 2004).

Shpayer-Makov, Haia, 'Anarchism in British Public Opinion 1880–1914', *Victorian Studies*, 31 (1988), 487–516.

Sim, David C., and Boris Repschinski, eds, *Matthew and his Christian Contemporaries* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2008).

Snodgrass, Klyne, 'From Allegorizing to Allegorizing: a History of the Interpretation of the Parables of Jesus', in *The Challenge of Jesus' Parables*, ed. by Richard Longenecker (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000), pp. 3–29.

Steenwyk, Mark Van, *That Holy Anarchist: Reflections on Christianity & Anarchism* (Minneapolis, MN: Missio Dei, 2012).

Stirner, Max, *The Ego and His Own* (New York, NY: Benj. R. Tucker, 1907).

Suissa, Judith, *Anarchism and Education: A Philosophical Perspective*, 2nd edn (Oakland, CA: PM Press, 2010).

Temin, Peter, *The Roman Market Economy* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2012).

Theissen, Gerd, 'Gruppenmessianismus: Überlegungen zum Ursprung der Kirche im Jüngerkreis Jesu', *Jahrbuch für Biblische Theologie*, 7 (1992), 101–123.

Theissen, Gerd and Annette Merz, *The Historical Jesus: a Comprehensive Guide* (London: SCM Press, 1998).

Theissen, Gerd, and Dagmar Winter, *The Quest for the Plausible Jesus: the Question of Criteria* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002).

Thompson, E. P., *The Making of the English Working Class* (London: Victor Gollancz, 1963).

Thompson, Thomas L., and Thomas S. Verenna, *Is This Not the Carpenter?: The Question of the Historicity of the Figure of Jesus* (Sheffield: Equinox, 2012).

Tolstoy, Leo, *Church and State and Other Essays: Including Money; Man and Woman: Their Respective Functions; The Mother; A Second Supplement to the Kreutzer Sonata* (Boston, MA: B. R. Tucker, 1891).

Tolstoy, Leo, '*The Kingdom of God Is within You': Christianity Not as a Mystic Religion but as a New Theory of Life*, trans. by Constance Garnett, 2 vols. (London: William Heinemann, 1894).

Vaage, Leif E, 'Beyond nationalism: Jesus the "holy anarchist"? : the cynic Jesus as eternal recurrence of the repressed', in *Jesus Beyond Nationalism: Constructing the Historical Jesus in a Period of Cultural Complexity*, ed. by Halvor Moxnes, Ward Blanton and James G. Crossley (London: Equinox, 2009), pp. 79–95.

Verhey, Allen, *The Great Reversal: Ethics and the New Testament* (Exeter: Paternoster, 1984).

Vermes, Geza, *The Religion of Jesus the Jew* (London: SCM Press, 1993).

Viviano, Benedict, 'Eschatology and the Quest for the Historical Jesus', in *Oxford Handbook of Eschatology,* ed. by Jerry L. Walls (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2008), pp. 73–90.

Walter, Nicholas, *About Anarchism*, 2nd edn (London: Freedom Press, 2002).

Weber, Max, *The Theory of Economic and Social Organizations*, trans. by A. M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons (New York, NY: Free Press, 1964).

Weber, Max, *Weber: Political Writings*, ed. by Peter Lassman and Ronald Spiers (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).

Wedderburn, Alexander J. M., *Jesus and the Historians* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010).

Western, Simon, 'Autonomist Leadership in Leaderless Movements: Anarchists Leading the Way', *Ephemera: Theory & Politics in Organization*, 14 (2014), 673–698.

Wilde, Oscar, *The Soul of Man Under Socialism* (London: Privately Printed, 1891).

Williams, Kristian, 'The Soul of Man Under . . .Anarchism?', *New Politics*, 8 (2011). <http://newpol.org/content/soul-man-under-anarchism> [accessed 31 July 2015]

Willitts, Joel, 'Presuppositions and Procedures in the Study of the Historical Jesus: Or, Why I Decided Not to Be a Historical Jesus Scholar', *Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus*, 3 (2005), 61–108.

Wink, Walter, 'Neither Passivity nor Violence: Jesus' Third Way (Matt 5:38//Luke 6:29–30)', in *The Love of Enemy and Non-Retaliation in the New Testament*, ed. by Willard M. Swartley (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1992), pp. 102–125.

Woodcock, George, *Anarchism*, 2nd edn (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1986).

Wright, N. T., *Jesus and the Victory of God* (London: SPCK, 1996).

Zerbe, Gordon, *Non-retaliation in Early Jewish and New Testament Texts: Ethical Themes in Social Contexts* (Sheffield: JSOT, 1993).

Zimmermann, Ruben, 'How to Understand the Parables of Jesus: A Paradigm Shift in Parable Exegesis', *Acta Theologica*, 29.1 (2009), 157–182.