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ABSTRACT  
Jesus' statement on the tribute question (Mk 12:13–17 par) was not a direct answer to the question asked nor a practical directive but a statement of principle indicating that the question had to be answered in the light of Caesar's claim vis-à-vis God's total claim over the Jewish people. It was for the interlocutors to draw the conclusion themselves which in effect was that payment of the tribute was not lawful.

1 INTRODUCTION  
Since the emergence of liberation theology Jesus' logion on tribute to Caesar: 'Render to Caesar what is Caesar's and to God what is God's' (Mark 12:13–17 and parallel), has attracted the renewed attention of exegetes (see, e.g., Bammel & Moule 1984; Belo 1975; Kappen 1977).

But as Weiss (1974:81), Meier (1980:253), and Wansbrough have pointed out, Jesus' statement was not an explicit, direct answer to the question that was asked: 'Is it lawful to pay taxes to Caesar or not? Should we pay or should we not?' (Mark 12:14). He did not really answer the tribute question. According to Wansbrough, 'As always in his answer to such legal questions, he [Jesus] cuts through the details to the underlying principle, leaving his interlocutors to reflect upon the conclusions to be drawn.'

Along the line of Wansbrough's comment, it is our contention that the logion indeed does not constitute a definite, clear answer to the question that was asked; rather it follows a pattern found in the gospels whereby in answering questions of a similar nature Jesus poses a counter question or makes a statement to lay down the principle in the light of which the questioners are to deduce the answer to their question. What that principle is, and the conclusion the questioners probably drew from it will be the focus of our enquiry. In what follows, we shall first review some current interpretations of the text and analyse the socio-historical background of the text. This will be followed by an investigation into the patterns of Jesus' answers to questions in the gospel to identify the pattern to which the text belongs. We shall then attempt an interpretation in the light of this pattern.
2 SOME CURRENT INTERPRETATIONS

Viviano (1988:272–276) has classified the various scholarly interpretations of the text into four main categories—the political, the ironic, the anti-zealotic and the zealotic interpretations. We shall add to this the liberationist interpretation.

2.1 The political interpretation

This is the classical interpretation which is also called the ‘two kingdoms interpretation,’ and goes back to patristic times. According to it, Jesus gives us in this text, a proper Christian attitude towards political authority; he not only recommends payment of imperial tribute, but also inculcates an attitude of submission to the State. The Jewish ideas found in Dn 2:21, 37–38; Prv. 8:15–16; Wisdom 6:11 and Rm 13:1–10, as well as the fact that Jesus did not stir up revolt against political authority even though he manifested freedom from it, are cited in support of this position. It is further argued that the inauguration of God’s reign does not cancel legitimate political authority. Von Ranke (1901:6–10) saw the tribute logion of Jesus interpreted in this way as one of the most important statements Jesus made, and one that was reflected in the life of the early Christian communities. Others who follow this interpretation include Cullmann (1956:37–40), Stauffer (1955:197–199), Bonnard (1963:332–325) and Viviano (1988:275).

One comment about this interpretation is that it does not seem to take into consideration that payment of the tribute symbolised and reinforced subjugation to a colonial regime, and that this is different from payment of taxes in general. Also, the interpretation does not seem to give sufficient weight to the second part of Jesus’ statement about what is due to God. Thirdly, support for this understanding of the text cannot be rightly sought from earlier Jewish writings or from Paul because they do not belong to the same historical context. What these texts, however, have in common with the tribute text is that they see civil authority not in purely secular terms but in religious terms. Fourthly, the fact that Jesus did not stir up a revolt against the colonial regime in Palestine cannot be rightly used in support of this interpretation because not stirring up such a revolt does not mean endorsing the oppression symbolised in the tribute.

2.2 Ironic interpretation

In this interpretation the words of Jesus are understood as irony. According to it, Jesus was not interested in the payment of tax to Caesar, hence ‘what is Caesar’s’ is not to be taken seriously as it is an evasive answer to enable Jesus escape from a tight corner. It is emphasised that payment of tribute to Caesar was not a serious issue to Jesus compared to the kingdom of God. Proponents of this interpretation include Dibelius (1956:178), Schweitzer (1956:30–31), Kierkegaard (1937:297). However, as Viviano (1988:274) has pointed out, the generally serious nature of Jesus’ teachings in
the gospels makes it difficult to accept this view. Besides, form-critical analysis shows that this is a pronouncement story in which the focus of the pericope is Jesus' response (Bultmann 1963:26). More than anything else therefore, Jesus' response in this text must be seen as carrying a message on the issue rather than as an evasion of the issue.

2.3 Anti-zealotic interpretation

This is the more popular interpretation among exegetes today. According to this view, Jesus is openly against the zealots' stand of refusal to pay tribute to Caesar, yet this does not mean offering a teaching about relations with the State. Rather, Jesus means to tell his interlocutors that since they have already acknowledged Caesar's authority by using the coin that bears his image, they should pay the tax. Some who hold this view add that the second part of Jesus' answer, 'render to God what is God's' is meant to tell the interlocutors that they have put too much importance on the issue of tax which is secondary and have neglected the important issue of repentance and obedience to God (Meier 1980:252; Harrington 1989:621; Bornkamm 1975:123).

Others take this part of Jesus' answer to be a reminder to the interlocutors of the homage and service that they, as human beings, owe to God since they bear God's image and are inscribed with his name (Fitzmyer 1985:1298).

Taking Jesus' answer to mean that the tax should be paid, as this interpretation does, makes it difficult to explain why the interlocutors would be 'amazed' (exthaumazon) because, as is clear from the context, that is one of the replies they had expected, and amazement is generally connected with what one does not understand or expect (Gibblin 1971:514).

2.4 Zealotic interpretation

According to this view, though not a zealot, Jesus, like his followers, was in fundamental sympathy with zealot principles including the use of violence. Zealots were opposed to the payment of the tribute. In Jesus' answer to the tribute question, the words 'render to God what belongs to God' effectively nullify the superficial meaning of the preceding words, 'render to Caesar.' This is because the things that belong to God comprised the land of Israel and God's sovereignty over it was compromised by payment of the tribute to a gentile ruler. Thus in effect, Jesus' reply meant that tribute should not be paid to Caesar. This is the view of Brandon (1967:66-68).

Since the tribute was a sign of oppression of the Jewish people, and Jesus' mission was directed towards liberating the oppressed (Lk 4:18–19; Isaiah 61:1–2), the Zealotic interpretation which expresses this liberating aspect of Jesus' mission is, to that extent, quite germane. However, the view that Jesus supported the use of violence by the zealots cannot be sustained in view of the strong evidence of Jesus' persistent preaching against the use of force that we find in the gospels.
2.5 Liberationist interpretation

According to this interpretation, Jesus' logion means that the Jews should have nothing to do with the coin or the economic and political power that it represents, and that the coin should be returned to Caesar whose image it bears. However, since the Jews bear God's image, they belong to God and should be subject to God alone, and to no one else, not even to Caesar. This is the position of Belo (1975:250–255) and Kappen (1977:115–116). One problem with this interpretation is that it takes the word 'apotote' literally to mean returning the tribute coin to Caesar. Clearly, this does not seem to be what was meant. Besides, the basis for Jews belonging to God alone is not that they bear the image of God because everyone including Caesar bears the image of God; rather the basis is that the Jews were God's own special people.

3 SOCIO-HISTORICAL ANALYSIS

The tax in question here is the kensos (phoros, according to Luke) that is, the tributum capitis which, as colonised people, adult male Jews had to pay to Rome. It symbolised their subjection to Caesar. At the time of Jesus, the Jews in Judaea had to pay three main types of tax. These were the theocratic dues which comprised the temple tax and the annual half-shekel poll-tax; direct imperial taxes on landed property (tributum agri/tributum solt) and on personal property (tributum capitis); and indirect imperial taxes such as customs dues. This was indeed highly burdensome for the people. But as Bruce (1984:253–255) remarks, 'it was not because of the sheer weight of taxation that the question of tribute to Caesar was such a burning one in Jesus' day'. The root of the matter was religious. According to Fitzmyer (1985:1293) 'part of the problem in first-century Palestine, which is the background for understanding the tribute question posed to Jesus, was how God's people (Jewish and later Christian) were to react to the pagan government of the occupying Roman forces and the imperial fiscus'.

Though previously the Jews had paid taxes to foreign gentile powers, at the time of Quirinus' census in 6 AD there was opposition to the payment of the Roman tribute spearheaded by Judas the Galilean (Jones 1965:183). Judas laid claim to messiahship and taught that payment of tribute to the Romans was incompatible with Israel's theocratic ideals. Some modern authors, though acknowledging the theocratic nature of the Israelite nation, however, see Judas' position as completely strange (see for example Bruce 1984:157, 254–256). Judas' position ought to be seen not as a strange and queer philosophy but as an expression of the theocratic sentiments of the people of Israel at the time. Hence it is that even though Judas' revolt was quickly quelled and Judas himself executed, his teaching lived on, and Josephus (Antiquities 18.6–8) traced the later Jewish revolt that led to disaster in 70 AD to it.

By the time of Jesus' public ministry, the tribute had come to be seen by the people as 'an odious token of subjugation to Rome' (Lane 1974:423).

The Jews who had a very theocratic view of life saw the tax not in secular terms, as we would today, but in religious terms. They were God's people and their property...
was God's possession—this was the basis of the sabbatical and Jubilee regulations (Lv 25; Dt 15). This made them see the subjugation of themselves and their property to a gentile power, which payment of the tribute signified, as illegitimate. However, since refusal to pay was tantamount to rebellion that would be squashed by the imperial authority, the mass of the people took the way of resignation (Walch 1986:37; Lapide 1986:99–100). While they had nothing to gain by their resignation to the situation, however, the Jewish religio-political authorities who were involved in putting the tribute question to Jesus were the ones that benefited from the status quo since they exercised power and authority within it. They knew that in Jewish religious terms payment of the tribute was illegitimate but they happily lived with it because of the material benefits that accrued to them from the political status quo. Yet they went to entrap Jesus with their question. Jesus' response ought to be seen as a critique of their double position.

4 LITERARY ANALYSIS

The pericope occurs in all three synoptic gospels. We shall, however, keep to Mark's version but with our eyes on the other gospels to see how they interpret Mark. In particular, we note that Luke's concluding verse (20:26) is different from Mark's. B Weiss (1907:212–214) has attributed this to Luke's use of a variant source, but a close look shows that it is Luke's composition, as it reveals his compositional style (Schramm 1971:168–170; Fitzmyer 1985:1290). Thus Mark's version is to be seen as the source for the other evangelists.

From the form-critical point of view, exegetes agree that the pericope is a pronouncement story, its focal point is the saying of Jesus (Bultmann 1963:26; Harrington 1980:186; Taylor 1949:64–65). This means that both the interlocutors' question, and their answer to Jesus' counter-question all lead to the logion. Most exegetes also agree with Bultmann (1963:26) that the pericope is not a product of the early Christian community but belongs to the historical context of Jesus' ministry.

The question was a trap, the result of a plot against Jesus. Those involved in the plot were the chief priests, the scribes, the elders, the Pharisees and Herodians (Mk 11:27, 12:11; Mt 22:15; Lk 20:1, 20), all of whom, except the Herodians, belonged to the Sanhedrin that would later try Jesus. The interlocutors' understanding of Jesus' response is manifested at Jesus' trial where the issue resurfaced (Lk 23:1–12).

The intention of the question was to get Jesus to make a public statement on a sensitive political issue. Malicious in intent, the interlocutors sought to flatter Jesus by saying that they recognised him as one that taught the true way of God, that is, one that proclaimed the divine will (Michaelis 1984:87): 'for you do not regard the position

---

1 Harrington (1980:186) calls it the finest example of a pronouncement story in the Gospel of Mark.
of men, but truly teach the way of God' (v14). Thus the word ἐστιν ('is it lawful', v14) in the question: ἐστιν δουλαι χενσων Καίσαρι ε ὄν ('is it lawful to pay taxes to Caesar or not?') implies that the issue was whether payment of the tribute was consistent with Jewish religious principles (Jones 1965:183). In its structure, this part of the question requires a statement of principle as an answer. The second part of the question, 'should we pay or should we not?', omitted by Matthew and Luke, is, by its structure, a request for a practical directive. In Mark's version therefore, what is sought is not just a statement of principle but a practical directive. If Jesus recommended payment of the tax, he would lose the esteem of the common people for whom the tax had become odious, and would no longer be seen as 'teaching the true way of God'. If, however, he forbade payment of the tax, he would be liable to the charge of fomenting a revolt. The point of the question was to discredit Jesus whichever way he answered it. By omitting from their source (Mark) the second part of the question that calls for a practical directive, Matthew and Luke seem to show that they understand Jesus' answer to be a statement of principle and not a practical directive.

Jesus' answer appears on the surface to be clear and simple, but the fact that he was responding to a dilemma should make us suspect that it is more complicated than it appears. That the interlocutors were amazed at Jesus' response, which means that they were surprised at his wisdom in escaping their trap, also indicates that in his answer Jesus did not explicitly approve or disapprove of the tribute. What then did Jesus' response amount to? To answer this question, we shall look in the synoptic gospels at the patterns of Jesus' answers to questions put to him by the category of people that posed this question—Pharisees, Sadducees, scribes, chief priests, elders and Herodians. These people feature in the gospels generally as opponents of Jesus. We shall therefore not consider questions that emanate from friendly people—his disciples, John the Baptist, John's disciples, the friendly Pharisee, Simon (Lk 7:39). The purpose is to identify the pattern to which the tribute question belongs and the principle underlying Jesus' answer. Because the question we are investigating is found only in the synoptic gospels, we shall stay within the synoptic tradition. Four patterns of such questions and answers are discernible.

4.1 Non-trap questions of a religious nature

These are theological questions without any indication that the purpose is to test or trap Jesus. Examples are questions concerning eating with sinners (Mk 2:3–17; Mt 9:9–13; Lk 5:27–32), fasting (Mk 2:18–22; Mt 21:4–17; Lk 5:33–39), plucking of corn on the Sabbath (Mk 2:23–28; Mt 12:1–8; Lk 6:1–5), what to do to gain eternal life (Mk 10:17–23; Mt 19:13–15; Lk 18:15–17), the resurrection (Mk 12:18–27; Mt 22:23–33; Lk 20:27–40) et cetera. To such questions Jesus gives direct and explicit explanations that go beyond conventional explanations to the root of the matter, and lead to the education of the questioners. He is thus revealed and acclaimed as an authoritative teacher of the law (e.g Lk 20:40).
4.2 Trap questions of a religious nature

These are questions that have implied or expressed intention to get Jesus to say or do something that could be used to accuse or fault him on a religious or theological issue. Such questions may be explicit, like the question regarding the legality of divorce (Mk 10:1-2; Mt 19:3-12; Lk 16:18), and the question concerning the greatest commandment (Mk 12:28-34; Mt 22:34-40; Lk 10:25-28), or only thematically present in the biblical text as in the case of the man with a withered hand where the people watched to see if Jesus would heal him on a Sabbath (Mk 3:1-6, Mt 12:9-14; Lk 6:6-11). To such questions Jesus either gives or elicits from the questioners explicit answers and as in the previous case, he is shown to be a great and authoritative exponent of the law.

4.3 Non-trap questions that have messianic implications

These are questions that have to do with the identity of the messiah and that have no implicit or explicit intention to test or trap Jesus. Jesus does not give explicit, direct answers to such questions. He rather asks a counter-question or makes a statement or comment to enunciate a principle from which the appropriate answer to the question is to be deduced. Such is the question regarding authority to act the way he did in the temple (Mk 11:15-17; 27-33; Mt 21:12-13, 23-27; Lk 19:45-46, 20:1-8). The question had messianic implications because at the time of Jesus there were no more prophets. People were, however, expecting the messianic prophet (cf Mt 11:3). Thus claiming a prophetic authority from God at that time (which Jesus implicitly did by his action and by his saying about the temple) meant claiming to be the expected messianic prophet. Jesus did not give an explicit answer. Instead he posed a counter-question on the origin of John's baptism. His interlocutors knew that John's baptism was from God but refused to say so. The implication of the question was that Jesus' authority was from God and hence he was the messianic prophet. To this group also belongs the question regarding the messianic title 'Son of David' that was raised by Jesus himself (Mk 12:35-37; Mt 22:41-45; Lk 20:41-44) and the Beelzebub question (Mk 3:22; Mt 9:32-34; 12:11-24; Lk 11:14-15) which Jesus answered with a parable.

4.4 Trap questions that have messianic implications

These are questions that touch on Jesus' messiahship and that are meant as a trap to fault or implicate Jesus in what he might say or do. In such cases Jesus either does not answer the question at all, or else he asks a counter-question or makes a statement in which is embedded the principle from which the questioners are to deduce the answer to their question. He does not give an explicit answer. Such is the question concerning a sign from heaven (Mk 8:11-12; Mt 12:38-42; 16:1-4; Lk 11:16, 29-32). The Pharisees, scribes and Sadducees wanted Jesus to legitimize his implicit messianic claims (implied in the healing and
exorcisms he performed, see Mt 11:2–5) with a special sign, probably an eschatological portent. They said this hoping he would try and fail, and thus would be discredited. In the Markan version, Jesus directly refuses to grant a sign. In the other synoptics, the questioners are referred to the sign of Jonah. According to Matthew this refers to the fact that as Jonah was in the belly of the fish for three days and three nights, in like manner, the ‘Son of man’ would remain in ‘the heart of the earth’ for three days and three nights. The implicit answer here is that the sign referred to is the resurrection. To this theme is added Jonah’s preaching in Nineveh (Mt 12:38–42). Luke does not have the resurrection theme but only the theme of Jonah’s preaching in Nineveh which refers to Jesus’ preaching of repentance. Jesus’ words in these statements do not constitute the direct answer to the original question. The only exception to this in this category is found in the passion narratives where, at the trial before the high priest (Mk 14:61–62; Mt 26:63–64; Lk 22:67–70) and before Pilate (Mk 15:2; Mt 27:11; Lk 23:3), Jesus admitted his messiahship explicitly.2

The explanation for Jesus giving implicit answers to messianic questions is to be found in Mark’s theology of the messianic secret whereby Jesus did not openly affirm his messiahship, and even forbade people to do so. (All the messianic questions are Markan material.) However, at his trial he openly affirmed his messiahship because he was already at the verge of being revealed as the suffering messiah (at the resurrection).

The tribute question, though political in nature, had strong messianic implications. The tribute was an opprobrium that the messiah was expected to do away with. Thus Judas the Galilean, a claimant to messiahship, led a revolt against it but failed and was executed in 7 AD.

Luke’s trial scene (Lk 23:2–7) also explicitly links Jesus’ messiahship to the tribute question. All this makes the tribute question fit the pattern of trap questions with messianic implications.

5 INTERPRETATION

Before making his pronouncement, Jesus asked for a denarius (Mk 12:15), the coin with which the tribute was paid. This was a silver coin minted in Rome with the image and inscription of the reigning emperor on it. This meant that the issuing authority was the Emperor (Hart 1984:242). The coin thus carried with it the Emperor’s claim of authority over its users as well as his claim to their service as his subjects. To use it was to acknowledge this claim; and it was imposed on the Jewish people for this purpose as they were not permitted to mint their own currency except for copper coins of lower value (Fitzmyer 1985:1291; Meier 1980:251–252; Lane 1974:494; Jones 1965:

2 The questions put to Jesus at his trial were trap questions since they were meant to give the basis for condemning him.
By making them produce the coin, Jesus exposed the hypocrisy of his questioners. Jesus' question: 'Whose image (eikon) and inscription (epigraphe) is this?' (v16) calls attention to the emperor's claim of authority over the people as his subjects, a claim further symbolised in the emperor's demand of the tribute from the people.3

This led to Jesus' pronouncement: ta Kaisaros apodole Kaisari kai ta tou theou to theo: 'render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's and to God the things that are God's' (v 17). Matthew and Luke have: 'therefore, render to Caesar...' (Mt, de, Lk, oun). This simply means that the pronouncement is occasioned by this claim of Caesar's, it does not imply that Caesar is entitled to demand the tribute.

The term ta Kaisaros in Jesus' pronouncement (v 17) has been interpreted by many exegetes as referring to the tribute money and the tribute. Thus Bornkamm (1975: 123): 'The coin, which bears the image of Caesar, we owe to Caesar', (also Cairns 1973:38; Volkl 1961:113–116; Schnackenburg 1965:117–118; Bruce 1985:259, 261–262; Meier 1980:252). Hence the coin is to be returned to Caesar by paying the tribute. This understanding of the term does not seem to take sufficient account of the fact that ta ('the things') is neuter plural and therefore refers to many things rather than just the tribute coin or the tribute.

In a study of the use of ta ton... (the things of...) in the New Testament, Giblin (1971:520–521) has rightly come to the conclusion that it refers basically to the notion of 'concerns' and in this text would refer to 'duties to be rendered.' Thus ta Kaisaros refers to the services and the subjection to Rome claimed by the imperial authority over the Jewish people. This claim was already pointed to in the 'image' and 'inscription' discussion in the previous verse. Payment of the tribute was one of such services claimed by Rome. With the expression ta Kaisaros, Jesus carries the discussion beyond the concrete tribute question to that of service and subjection to the Roman authority. Also, the fact that in Jesus' pronouncement there is no mention of the coin or the tribute indicates that the pronouncement transcends the concrete issue of the tribute.

That Jesus uses apodidomi rather than didomi as used by the interlocutors is significant. Apodidomi has the nuance of rendering a service that is due (Giblin 1971:523; Sand 1990:128; Busse 1990:321). And the idea of rendering service corroborates the understanding of ta Kaisaros as referring to services claimed by Caesar. Thus ta Kaisaros apodole Kaisari is not to be understood in terms of the tribute but rather as a general statement of principle: 'render to Caesar the services due to Caesar'. A corollary to it is the question: what services are due to Caesar? The second part of Jesus' statement points the way to the answer.

---

3 Payment of the tribute signified acknowledgment of and subjection to the ruling power while refusal to pay meant a revolt against the ruling power. The revolt of Judas the Galilean consisted in refusal to pay the tribute, and for this he was executed in 7 AD. See Jones (1965:183).
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Just as in the case of Caesar, *ta tou theou* in the second part of the statement refers to God's claim over the Jewish people and the services due to God from them, and should read: 'and (render) ...to God the services due to God'. With this statement Jesus points to the fact that the tribute question should be considered in the light of God's claim over Israel. He puts the issue in its proper theological perspective as that of Caesar's claim over the Jewish people vis-à-vis God's claim over the same people, and offers this as the underlying principle for answering the tribute question. And since every Jew knew that God's claim over them was total, it was clear that Caesar's claim over them was not 'lawful'. However, to say so does not amount to forbidding people to pay the tax (the zealotic position). As we have seen above, the ordinary people were in principle opposed to the tax yet they had to pay it to avoid reprisals. Jesus' statement merely affirmed that position; he did not give a practical directive forbidding payment of the tax.

Jesus' reply was *ad hominem*, directed against the Jewish politico-religious leaders who were involved in putting the question to entrap him. It was an indictment on their double position—they knew that God's claim over the people was total yet they had collaborated with the gentile regime that also claimed authority over Israel, and at the same time had come to him for a public pronouncement on a matter that they knew to be politically volatile. They were challenged to search their consciences to provide the answer. They were amazed because they had not expected such a soul-searching challenge when they went to entrap Jesus—Jesus had turned the scales.

What conclusion did the interlocutors themselves draw from Jesus' pronouncement? Luke's gospel gives us a hint. The fact that in Luke's passion narrative (Lk 23:1-12) one of the charges openly made against Jesus was that he forbade tribute to Caesar, and the fact that those involved in bringing up the charge were the same Jerusalem authorities who were involved in the tribute question (cf Lk 20:19; 2:66, 23:1), indicate that Jesus' pronouncement was interpreted by his interlocutors to mean forbidding payment of tribute to Caesar. (This charge is also implied by the other evangelists.) Interestingly, unlike Mark and Matthew (Mk 14:56; Mt 26:59-60), Luke does not add in so many words that the charge was false which he would have been right to do since Jesus did not actually forbid payment of the tribute. Rather, he leaves that to the more impressive and independent judgement of Pilate (Lk 23:4, 13-6).

6 CONCLUSION

In the above, we have tried to show that Jesus' statement on the tribute question was not a direct answer to the question asked nor a practical directive but a statement of principle indicating that the question had to be answered in the light of Caesar's claim vis-à-vis God's total claim over the Jewish people. It was for the interlocutors to draw the conclusion themselves which in effect was that payment of the tribute was not lawful.
This interpretation takes seriously the fact that the question posed a dilemma that required a subtle answer. It seeks to understand the pericope against its social, historical, political and religious contexts. It takes into account the Jewish world-view which was essentially religious and did not separate the religious from the political as we do today. It understands Jesus' words against the background of the Jews as a colonised people who had to remind themselves of the yoke of colonialism by paying such taxes. It is an attempt to see the issue from the perspective of the ordinary Jew at the time.
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