

## Western Marxist Approaches to the Bible

Roland Boer

Published as: 2015 ‘西方马克思主义圣经研究方法’ (Western Marxist Approaches to the Bible). 圣经文学研究 (*Journal for the Study of Biblical Literature*) 10: 122-36. Translated into Chinese by Li Panpan.

Abstract: Western Marxist approaches to studying the Bible are becoming more and more popular. This lecture outlines some of the key ideas of that approach, based upon the revision of my book, *Marxist Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. Those ideas include: the indirect relationship of a text to its historical and social context; the role of contradiction and dialectics in the study of biblical texts; the connections between class, gender and ethnicity; and the possibility of locating alternative voices in the text. The lecture will draw on the approaches of Fredric Jameson, Antonio Negri, and Terry Eagleton, among others.

Western Marxist approaches to the Bible are becoming more and more popular in our own time. The main purpose of this study is to identify some of the key points of that Marxist analysis, and then use them to analyse a biblical text. However, before I do that, I present a brief outline of the history of Marxist approaches to the Bible, since they have a long history that begins with the

insightful work of Friedrich Engels. After outlining that history, I move onto my main focus, namely, the key ideas of Marxist methods of interpreting biblical texts. I propose to discuss four of these ideas: 1) the importance of contradiction and dialectics in any approach to the Bible; 2) the indirect and mediated relation between a text like the Bible and its historical context; 3) the expansion of critical study to include social, political and economic issues in the treatment of literature and religion; 4) the types of resistance to oppressive power that one finds in the Bible. However, so that we do not stay with pure literary theory, I also show how these points may help in interpreting a biblical text. The text is Genesis 2-3, which concerns the myth of creation, the Garden of Eden, and the account of the disobedience of the first human beings and their expulsion from the garden. (I should also say that the following discussion draws upon some of my research, especially my recently revised book, *Marxist Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, but also *Marxist Feminist Criticism of the Bible* and *The Sacred Economy*.<sup>1</sup>)

However, before proceeding, I would like to indicate two ways that we may understand the relation between Marxism and biblical criticism. These two ways depend upon how one understands the Bible. On the one hand, it is understood as Sacred Scripture for many (Christians, Jews and Muslims). It forms the basis of their

---

<sup>1</sup> Roland Boer, *Marxist Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (London: Bloomsbury, 2014); Roland Boer and Jorunn Økland (ed.), *Marxist Feminist Criticism of the Bible* (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2008); Roland Boer, *The Sacred Economy* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2014).

religious beliefs and theological reflection. In this respect, the Bible is one part of the larger area of religion. And so the Bible becomes part of the fascinating and complex question of Marxism and religion – which has been the major focus of my research for the last decade. On the other hand, the Bible is understood as an important historical and literary document. It lies at the foundation of the cultures of many countries, Western and otherwise. At this level, Marxist approaches are applied to the Bible in order to understand it better. These approaches may involve economic and social analysis, literary criticism, or the study of culture and ideology. It is worth noting that many biblical critics understand the Bible in this second sense, as an important historical and literary document. But many others also understand it as Sacred Scripture. Indeed, many biblical critics attempt to hold both understandings of the Bible together.

### **The Party of Overthrow: From Engels to Today**

Let us begin with a brief account of the history of Marxist biblical interpretation. Friedrich Engels was the first to study the Bible in light of Marxist approaches. Some may know that he was a devout Christian (Protestant) as a young man, but fewer know that he maintained his interest in the Bible throughout his life. He could read the New Testament in its original Greek and he studied the latest research on the Bible. While his early letters often contain debates over the Bible

with his friends, his later works are full of biblical references and allusions. He knew his Bible very well indeed. Yet, the importance of Engels is found in an argument he developed over many years: early Christianity was actually a revolutionary movement.<sup>2</sup> How? First, Christianity appealed to the lower classes, to the slaves and peasants and urban unemployed; second, it was organised like a revolutionary movement, with many similarities to the early communist movement in Engels's own day; and, third, it eventually took over the Roman Empire. Perhaps the best summary of Engels's position is the following:

It is now, almost to the year, sixteen centuries since a dangerous party of overthrow was likewise active in the Roman empire. It undermined religion and all the foundations of the state; it flatly denied that Caesar's will was the supreme law; it was without a fatherland, was international; it spread over the whole empire, from Gaul to Asia, and beyond the frontiers of the empire. It had long carried on seditious activities underground in secret; for a considerable time, however, it had felt strong enough to come out into the open. This party of overthrow ... was known by the name of Christians.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Friedrich Engels, 'On the History of Early Christianity', *Marx and Engels Collected Works* (vol. 27; Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1894-5 [1990]), pp. 445-69. See also Friedrich Engels, 'Bruno Bauer and Early Christianity', *Marx and Engels Collected Works* (vol. 24; Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1882 [1989]), pp. 427-35; Friedrich Engels, 'The Book of Revelation', *Marx and Engels Collected Works* (vol. 26; Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1883 [1990]), pp. 112-17.

<sup>3</sup> Engels, 'Introduction to Karl Marx's *The Class Struggles in France*', p. 523. Engels also has some criticisms of the early Christians, especially the point that they tended to focus on other-worldly salvation, but he was fully aware that Christianity makes this-worldly claims as well. Marx shows a clear awareness of Engels's argument, which should be no surprise since they discussed their ideas almost daily. For instance, Marx compares the persecution of the International Working Men's Association to the persecution of the early Christians by the Romans. These earlier assaults had not saved Rome, and so also the assaults on the workers' movement would not save the capitalist system. See MECW 22: 633-34; MECW 23: 254-56.

From Engels this proposal made its way into biblical criticism, where it has been debated ever since. Even today, biblical critics debate questions such as: Was Jesus a revolutionary? Were the early Christians seeking to undermine the oppressive power of the Roman Empire? Is early Christianity an initial form of communism?

These questions influenced biblical criticism not only through the work of Engels, but also through those who followed him in the next generation. It fell to Karl Kautsky and Rosa Luxemburg to develop Engels's proposals further.<sup>4</sup> They both described early Christianity as communist, since it based its organisation on the principles found in the Book of Acts:

And all who believed were together and had all things in common; and they sold their possessions and goods and distributed them to all, as any had need (Acts 2:44-45).

Now the company of all those who believed were of one heart and soul, and no one said that any of the things which he possessed was his own, but instead they had everything in common. And with great power the apostles gave their testimony to the resurrection of the Lord Jesus, and great grace was upon them all. There was not a needy person among them, for as many as were possessors of lands or houses sold them, and brought the

---

<sup>4</sup> Rosa Luxemburg, 'Socialism and the Churches', *Rosa Luxemburg Speaks* (ed. Mary-Alice Waters; New York: Pathfinder Press, 1970 [1905]), pp. 131-52; Karl Kautsky, *Foundations of Christianity* (trans. H. F. Mins; London: Socialist Resistance, 2007 [1908]); Karl Kautsky, *Vorläufer des neueren Sozialismus I: Kommunistische Bewegung im Mittelalter* (Berlin: J.H.W. Dietz, 1947 [1895-7]).

proceeds of what was sold and laid it at the apostles' feet; and distribution was made to each as any had need (Acts 4: 32-35).

However, this was a communism of consumption and not production. That is, the early Christians would contribute everything they owned to their common lives together, but they did not try to change the mode of production. Of course, modern Marxism provides the next step, arguing for a change in the mode of production itself.

Kautsky also produced the first book of Marxist analysis of the Bible, called *Foundations of Christianity*. Here he attempted to describe the economic and social conditions of both the Old Testament and the New Testament. He did so for the sake of understanding better the nature of those texts and way both Judaism and Christianity arose. Despite its flaws, it remains the pioneering work in Marxist biblical analysis.

It is not possible to trace here every aspect of Marxist criticism of the Bible since the time of Engels and Kautsky. So I focus on two recent contributions. The first is by Norman Gottwald,<sup>5</sup> whose work concerns ancient Israel and the Old Testament. In a detailed and careful historical argument, he proposes that early Israel arose as a revolutionary movement in the highlands of Judea at the end of the

---

<sup>5</sup> Norman K. Gottwald, *The Tribes of Yahweh: A Sociology of the Religion of Liberated Israel, 1250-1050 BCE* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999 [1979]).

first millennium BCE. New settlements were made in the hill country, using new technologies. These people, argues Gottwald, developed a new mode of production, which he calls a communitarian mode of production. It was opposed to the oppressive states of Canaan and operated in a more communal and even egalitarian manner. While there have been criticisms of Gottwald's proposal, it is really a pioneering work of modern Marxist biblical analysis.

The other recent contribution is by Richard Horsley,<sup>6</sup> a New Testament scholar. Horsley's focus is the early movement around Jesus. Horsley draws upon detailed archaeological, historical and literary sources to argue that the people gathered around Jesus were part of a political and religious movement that was opposed to Roman imperial presence in Judea. This movement was one among many such movements. They were based in the villages of the countryside, where the effects of Roman policies (carried out by client rulers) were severe. Peasants suffered hunger, disease, and the destruction of family and social structures. To these Jesus and his movement (like many others) offered hope by resisting oppression.

The approaches I have discussed thus far are mainly historical, political, and economic. They seek to reconstruct the historical conditions of both the Old and

---

<sup>6</sup> Richard Horsley, *Jesus and the Spiral of Violence: Popular Jewish Resistance in Roman Palestine* (Philadelphia: Augsburg Fortress, 1992); Richard Horsley, *Galilee: History, Politics, People* (Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1995); Richard Horsley, *Archaeology, History and Society in Galilee* (Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1996); Richard Horsley, *Scribes, Visionaries, and the Politics of Second Temple Judea* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2007).

New Testaments. And they do in order to understand those texts in a more comprehensive way. Notably, they all find some liberating dimension among the early Israelites and early Christians. I have also contributed to this debate in a book that will be published soon – *The Sacred Economy*.<sup>7</sup> In this work I offer a new model of the ancient economies of the ancient Near East. It is based on Soviet-era Russian work and the ‘Regulation School’ of Marxist economic theory. And it proposes a broader framework in which we can understand the earlier contributions I have already discussed.

### **Touchstones of Marxist Literary Analysis of the Bible**

However, for the remainder of this paper I deal with another aspect of Marxist analysis. It concerns literary criticism and focuses on the ways one interprets the literature of the Bible. Of course, this is related to the historical matters I have just discussed. The difference is one of emphasis: you start with history and then move to literature; or you start with literature and then move to history, politics, and economics. Here, I begin with literature.

In a moment, I discuss four features of Marxist literary analysis of the Bible. But in order to focus that discussion, I use a biblical text as an example. It is none other than the story of the Fall in Genesis 2-3 – the moment when the first human

---

<sup>7</sup> Boer, *The Sacred Economy*.



beings disobey God and are thrown out of paradise. The story begins with the second creation story (after Genesis 1), in which God creates the first human being out of the ground and breathes life into him. The garden follows, and then the creation of the woman from the side of the man (after the man could not find a helper from among the animals). The man and the woman are told they may eat of every plant in the garden (no meat!), except for the tree of good and evil. However, a serpent persuades the woman to eat from the tree, and she persuades the man to eat the same fruit. When God finds out, they and the serpent are cursed – with pain in childbirth, subordination of the woman to the man, hard labour to produce food to eat, and death. The story closes with their expulsion from the garden. An angel with a flaming sword stands at the entrance to the garden to prevent them from returning.

### *Dialectics*

Now I can describe four of the main features of Marxist literary analysis: the first is a focus on contradictions and therefore on dialectics. Marx himself developed the Hegelian dialectic in a materialist direction, but in recent years, Fredric Jameson has emphasised the role of dialectics and contradiction in literary analysis.<sup>8</sup> Jameson argues that literary texts are produced in economic and political situations that

---

<sup>8</sup> Fredric Jameson, *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1981). On this matter, Jameson is heavily influenced by Georg Lukács, *The Historical Novel* (trans. Hannah Mitchell and Stanley Mitchell; Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1983 [1937]).

always face tensions and contradictions (a central feature of Marxist analysis).

Therefore, texts cannot avoid showing traces of those contradictions. Such traces may appear in the content of the story, perhaps in narrative conflicts, or between characters, or in the plot. But the traces may also be found in the form of the story, whether inconsistencies in the language, or in the conflict of genres, or in anomalies or breaks in the story. The main point is that a Marxist approach to the Bible seeks out the contradictions, wherever they may be found.

Let us consider the text of Genesis. The obvious contradiction is between the two creation stories. Genesis 1 has an orderly account of creation: God says a word and each item of creation appears, one day after another. God divides heaven and earth, water from land, night from day; then God commands plants, animals and then human beings to appear. Finally, God rests on the seventh day. By contrast, Genesis 2 is a more earthy account: the earth is dry and dusty; from the earth he creates a human being, then he waters the ground so that plants grow. Animals appear only when the first human being needs a helper. None of the animals are suitable, so a woman is created from the first human being. So they become male and female. Only in this creation story is the created place called the Garden of Eden, with food good to eat.

Biblical critics have noted this tension between the two creation stories for a long time. But Marxist analysis brings political and economic matters into the

interpretation (I will return to these later). However, other contradictions include the following: a) a perfect garden that has a flaw in it (the tree of good and evil), which means that the garden is not so perfect; b) the fact that the serpent actually speaks the truth and God does not (the human beings do not die as a result of eating the tree); the tension between the two states of the human beings. On the last point, I mean that in the garden, Adam and Eve behave like king and queen. They are the highest point and focus of creation. They walk about the garden and can eat from it without any labour (the labour is hidden). In the evenings they meet and talk with God. Yet, when they are expelled from the garden, Adam and Eve are no longer king and queen. They become peasants, with lives full of hard labour, pain and death. This tension is arguably the main one in the story: the two very different forms of human existence. On the one hand, they are like rulers; on other hand, they are like peasants.

Other contradictions may also be found (for instance, only the man, and not the woman, is banished from the garden), but I have noted these since they become important in the rest of my discussion.

### *Mediation*

The second point of Marxist analysis is that the relation between texts and their contexts is always mediated or indirect. Let me explain by comparing a text to

a window. Is the text a clear window, through which you can see directly to what is on the other side? Or is the text a frosted window (as with a bathroom), through which you can see light and perhaps some shapes, but you cannot see anything clearly? Or is the text a stained-glass window, through which the light changes colour and images are distorted? A Marxist approach says that the text is not a clear window to its context; rather, it is more like a frosted or stained-glass window, through which the context can be seen dimly or in a distorted fashion.

How do we then understand the relation of a text to its context? I begin with the distinction between reflection and response. A text does not reflect its context; it responds to it. We may think of the text as the answer to a question posed by its social and economic context. The problem is that the answer given is usually unexpected and indirect. The text may try to solve a problem by offering an imagined solution to it. Thus, the world presented by the text has little direct relation to reality.

But let me offer a more theoretical formulation of this relation between text and context. A useful theoretical formula comes from the work of Louis Althusser, which he develops in relation to ideology: a text is the representation of an imaginary relationship to real conditions of existence.<sup>9</sup> We need to be careful and this point and consider closely what Althusser is saying. As an item of ideology, a

---

<sup>9</sup> Louis Althusser, *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays* (trans. Ben Brewster; New York: Monthly Review Press, 2001 [1971]), p. 162.

text is not directly related to real conditions. That would require a simple relationship between two items – the text and its context. Instead, Althusser suggests three items: 1) the context or the real conditions, which are the social and economic forces; 2) the imaginary relationship to that context, which is how people conceive of their relationship to the realities of everyday life; 3) the representation of that conception or belief, which is where the text appears. That is, the text is an effort to represent the way people imagine how they fit in the world (this imagined way may be incorrect or correct, although it is usually a mixture of the two). Now Althusser's position becomes even more complex: the way the representation works may be in terms of content – in the words of a story, myth or poem. It may also appear in indirect ways, in the language, in the structure of a story, or in unexpected traces that we often ignore.

I have spent some time with this complex argument, since it is vitally important for Marxist approaches to interpreting texts. Let us see how this works with the text of Genesis 2-3. I suggest that the story represents the way different groups or classes understood their relationship to agriculture. The Garden of Eden is clearly an agricultural garden, with domesticated plants that are good for food. It also includes animals that the man names, which is an indication of domestication. Above all, it is a garden, a space that God himself has cultivated for human use. However, this is an agricultural space far from reality. No place has ever been found

like this, nor will it be found. It does not exist. It is an ideal garden or agricultural estate. The first human beings do not need to work, for all the fruits and grains are freely available. They merely need to walk about, reach out their hands and take the food they need.

Why tell a story like this? Is it a dream of a world without hard labour, without the need to plough the ground, sow seed, deal with pests and disease, harvest a crop, and then turn it into food? Above all, there is no risk of famine or disease, no risk of not having enough food. It is clearly an ideal, perhaps something we might dream about. But we need to ask a crucial question: for whom is this imaginary garden an ideal? Is it an ideal for all human beings, or just some of them? The hint that it may be the ideal of specific group or class is the end of the story, when the first human beings are expelled from the garden and must work hard for their daily food. But to explore that issue, we need to consider the next point of Marxist analysis of biblical texts.

### *Expansion*

The third feature of Marxist analysis is what I call expansion, that is, the expansion of analysis beyond the text. A text never exists by itself. It is always part of a larger reality that includes economics, politics, culture, and ideology. In this way, Marxist analysis challenges the overwhelming tendency of modern interpretation to

break human existence into little pieces. Modern interpretation compartmentalises everything into boxes that seem to have little relationship to one another. For example, at a university we have specialists in many different types of engineering, or in the medical sciences, or in many different types of literature. Even in biblical studies, you find specialists focusing on different books of the Bible, or in social sciences, or in archaeology, or in historical reconstruction. Each one has their own little corner in which they specialise. A Marxist approach challenges us to think and work in light of a larger whole and to see how the parts belong to that whole. In other words, it dares to think in terms of the big picture and to examine the frameworks we use.

What does that mean for our biblical text, Genesis 2-3? Obviously, we need to factor in economic and social factors into our interpretation. This enables us to answer the question I asked earlier: for whom is this agricultural garden an imagined ideal? Does it perhaps represent the hopes of the majority of peasants in the ancient world? They comprised 90 per cent of the small populations. Living mostly in village communities of between 75 to 150 people, their lives tended to be short (life expectancy was about 30) and the work of herding animals and growing crops was tough. Yet they had system of living that had stood the test of time. They needed little and developed an economic and social system of life that was strong enough to withstand the difficulties they faced. Would they dream of a life in a

grand agricultural estate in which they did not have to work and in which food was provided without labour? Possibly.

Or is the text a representation of the ideal life of the small ruling class? This class was made of the despot, priests, scribes, and landlords (who were also tax collectors and lenders). They supplied their own needs through royal and palace estates. These estates were separate from the peasant villages and were managed by landlords or agents appointed by the despot. They grew crops, herded animals, made beer and wine, produced bricks and building materials. And the workers on them were usually dragged from the villages and forced to work. These workers might have to pay off a debt, or they might be slaves from a war, or might be called on to work for some time of the year (when they had to leave their villages). In other words, the ruling class did not actually do any work; they relied on the labourers in the estates to do the work for them. So they came to believe that the agricultural estates simply produced goods for them, without their own labour. Grain would arrive, or meat from animals, or textiles for clothes – all without work on their part. I suggest that Genesis 2-3 actually represents the perspective of the ruling class. The image the text presents is one of vast and lush estate. It even manages to remove labour entirely by making God the one who creates and maintains the estate. It seems to produce food entirely by itself. Indeed, the man and woman behave as king



and queen in their estate. They have been created at the peak of creation, talk with God, and have everything provided for them.

### *Resistance*

But now a contradiction arises in the story of Genesis 2-3. This contradiction brings me to a fourth feature of Marxist approaches. The man and woman do not remain king and queen forever. As is well known, the reason is disobedience. They were told not to eat the fruit from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. Yet, the woman and then the man do eat from the tree, enticed by the serpent. The result is punishment: the woman will have pain in childbirth and be subservient to the man; the man will need to work hard for their daily food. He will struggle with a hard ground, full of thorns and thistles. And they will die: from dust they came and to dust they will return. Then they are banished from the garden, never to return.

At an economic and political level, this crucial episode in the story still represents a ruling class perspective. The life of a peasant, they feel, is hard and unrewarding. It is best to be avoided at all costs. Yet, the rulers know that they too can easily be reduced to the status of peasants. All it would take is an invasion by a powerful army, or a severe famine, or another disaster. Their hold on power is precarious at the best of times.

But how does the episode of disobedience and punishment relate to the question of resistance? A Marxist literary approach locates resistance by looking 'between the lines' of a story. In other words, it attempts to read against the dominant ideological position of a story. In the case of Genesis 2-3, the dominant position is that the man and woman disobeyed God and were punished for their 'sin'. But when we reconsider this account, it becomes a moment of resistance. They say 'no' to the figure that represents power – God. They do exactly what he tells them not to do. Such resistance is always punished by the powerful. But my point is that the story preserves a moment of rebellion. And it does so in the attempt to show that such rebellion is futile. Indeed, it is worth pointing out that myths like this often tell a story of resistance that is crushed. Myths tend to explore conflict and resistance, with the aim of showing that they are not viable. That may be the purpose of myths, but the result is that the rebellion itself is preserved.

The point I have outlined concerning the resistance of Genesis 2-3 and myths in general is indebted to the work of Ernst Bloch and Antonio Negri.<sup>10</sup> It requires a dialectical approach that challenges the dominant ideological position of a story in order to find moments of resistance. These moments then provide hope for those

---

<sup>10</sup> Ernst Bloch, *Atheism in Christianity: The Religion of the Exodus and the Kingdom* (trans. J. T. Swann; London: Verso, 2009 [1968]); Ernst Bloch, *The Principle of Hope* (trans. Neville Plaice, Stephen Plaice, and Paul Knight; Cambridge: MIT Press, 1995 [1959]); Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, *Empire* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000); Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire* (New York: Penguin, 2004); Antonio Negri and Michael Hardt, 'Marx's Mole is Dead! Globalisation and Communication', *Eurozine*, no. February 13 (2002), <http://www.eurozine.com/articles/2002-02-13-hardtnegri-en.html>.

who later read these stories. Even more, we should not think that this resistance is on the fringes, challenging a stable and central power. We need to change our perspective on this relationship as well. Instead, resistance itself is central, and power constantly seeks to adapt to that resistance. Ruling class power develops ever new ways in order to undermine that resistance. It should be no surprise, then, that myths constantly focus on the need to crush resistance. These myths are yet another way in which despotic powers attempt to undermine the creativity of resistance.

## **Conclusion**

To conclude: the tradition of Marxist biblical criticism is now a long one. I have outlined some of that history, and also provided some of the key points in its approach. These are the emphasis on contradiction and dialectics; the important of mediation in understanding the relations between texts and their socio-economic context; the expansion of literary analysis to include matters of history, politics, and economics; and the importance of identifying forms of resistance, especially by 'reading between the lines' of a text. I hope to have shown how these features work well with a text like Genesis 2-3.

For more than a century, Marxist biblical criticism has always been present, at times becoming more popular and at other times less popular. At the moment we are in a period of increasing popularity of Marxist approaches by biblical critics,

especially in the West. In particular, younger scholars and PhD students are making use of a range of Marxist literary theories.<sup>11</sup> The result is that these approaches are becoming more sophisticated and insightful. And the reason is that we have moved beyond basic understandings of class, ideology, mode of production, culture and literature. Many of these basics are assumed knowledge, even among those who do not explicitly use Marxist approaches. But with this basis, it is possible to develop more complex and sophisticated approaches.

## Bibliography

- Althusser, Louis, *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays* (trans. Ben Brewster; New York: Monthly Review Press, 2001 [1971]).
- Bartlett, Joseph M. 'Bourgeois Right and the Limits of First Phase Communism in the Rhetoric of 2 Thessalonians 3:6-1'. *The Bible and Critical Theory* 8, 2 (2012), pp. 36-56.
- Bernier, Jonathan. 'From Historical Criticism to Historical Materialism in the Study of Earliest Christology'. *Bible and Critical Theory* 8, 2 (2012), pp. 67-76.
- Bloch, Ernst, *Atheism in Christianity: The Religion of the Exodus and the Kingdom* (trans. J. T. Swann; London: Verso, 2009 [1968]).
- , *The Principle of Hope* (trans. Neville Plaice, Stephen Plaice and Paul Knight; Cambridge: MIT Press, 1995 [1959]).
- Boer, Roland, *Marxist Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (London: Bloomsbury, 2014).
- , *The Sacred Economy* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2014).
- Boer, Roland, and Jorunn Økland (ed.), *Marxist Feminist Criticism of the Bible* (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2008).

---

<sup>11</sup> As a sample among many, see Mark Sneed, 'Qohelet and his 'Vulgar' Critics: A Jamesonian Reading', *Bible and Critical Theory* 1, 1 (2004), pp. 1-11; Jonathan Bernier, 'From Historical Criticism to Historical Materialism in the Study of Earliest Christology', *Bible and Critical Theory* 8, 2 (2012), pp. 67-76; Joseph M. Bartlett, 'Bourgeois Right and the Limits of First Phase Communism in the Rhetoric of 2 Thessalonians 3:6-1', *The Bible and Critical Theory* 8, 2 (2012), pp. 36-56; Larry L. Welborn, 'Towards Structural Marxism as a Hermeneutic of Early Christian Literature, Illustrated with Reference to Paul's Spectacle Metaphor in 1 Corinthians 15:30-32', *The Bible and Critical Theory* 8, 2 (2012), pp. 27-35; Randall W. Reed, *A Clash of Ideologies: Marxism, Liberation Theology, and Apocalypticism in New Testament Studies* (Eugene: Pickwick, 2010).

- Engels, Friedrich, 'The Book of Revelation', *Marx and Engels Collected Works* (vol. 26; Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1883 [1990]), pp. 112-17.
- , 'Bruno Bauer and Early Christianity', *Marx and Engels Collected Works* (vol. 24; Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1882 [1989]), pp. 427-35.
- , 'Introduction to Karl Marx's *The Class Struggles in France*', *Marx and Engels Collected Works* (vol. 27; Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1894-5 [1990]), pp. 506-24.
- , 'On the History of Early Christianity', *Marx and Engels Collected Works* (vol. 27; Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1894-5 [1990]), pp. 445-69.
- Gottwald, Norman K., *The Tribes of Yahweh: A Sociology of the Religion of Liberated Israel, 1250-1050 BCE* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999 [1979]).
- Hardt, Michael, and Antonio Negri, *Empire* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000).
- , *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire* (New York: Penguin, 2004).
- Horsley, Richard, *Archaeology, History and Society in Galilee* (Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1996).
- , *Galilee: History, Politics, People* (Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1995).
- , *Jesus and the Spiral of Violence: Popular Jewish Resistance in Roman Palestine* (Philadelphia: Augsburg Fortress, 1992).
- , *Scribes, Visionaries, and the Politics of Second Temple Judea* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2007).
- Jameson, Fredric, *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1981).
- Kautsky, Karl, *Foundations of Christianity* (trans. H. F. Mins; London: Socialist Resistance, 2007 [1908]).
- , *Vorläufer des neueren Sozialismus I: Kommunistische Bewegung im Mittelalter* (Berlin: J.H.W. Dietz, 1947 [1895-7]).
- Lukács, Georg, *The Historical Novel* (trans. Hannah Mitchell and Stanley Mitchell; Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1983 [1937]).
- Luxemburg, Rosa, 'Socialism and the Churches', *Rosa Luxemburg Speaks* (ed. Mary-Alice Waters; trans. Juan Punto; New York: Pathfinder Press, 1970 [1905]), pp. 131-52.
- Negri, Antonio, and Michael Hardt. 'Marx's Mole is Dead! Globalisation and Communication'. *Eurozine* no. February 13 (2002).  
<http://www.eurozine.com/articles/2002-02-13-hardtnegri-en.html>.
- Reed, Randall W., *A Clash of Ideologies: Marxism, Liberation Theology, and Apocalypticism in New Testament Studies* (Eugene: Pickwick, 2010).
- Sneed, Mark. 'Qohelet and his 'Vulgar' Critics: A Jamesonian Reading'. *Bible and Critical Theory* 1, 1 (2004), pp. 1-11.

Welborn, Larry L. 'Towards Structural Marxism as a Hermeneutic of Early Christian Literature, Illustrated with Reference to Paul's Spectacle Metaphor in 1 Corinthians 15:30-32'. *The Bible and Critical Theory* 8, 2 (2012), pp. 27-35.