JESUS AND THE SCRIPTURES

JESUS AND THE SCRIPTURES

-- AN INQUIRY INTO JESUS' SELF-UNDERSTANDING --

BY

YOUNG BONG KIM, B.A., M. Div., S.T.M.

A Thesis

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

McMaster University

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (1993) McMASTER UNIVERSITY
(Religious Studies) Hamilton, Ontario

TITLE: Jesus and the Scriptures: An Inquiry into Jesus' Self-understanding

AUTHOR: Young Bong Kim, B.A. (Chung-Nam National University in Korea)

M.Div. (Methodist Theological Seminary in Seoul, Korea)

S.T.M. (Perkins School of Theology at SMU, Dallas, Texas)

SUPERVISOR: Professor Ben F. Meyer

NUMBER OF PAGES: x, 257

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to make a fresh treatment of the question of Christian origins, especially the beginnings of New Testament christology, by a holistic approach. More specifically, this study will show that, contrary to the form-critical view, the christological themes of the New Testament originated with Jesus himself, not with the post-Easter church.

The movement of exposition will be threefold. We shall begin with an investigation of the mentality of Second-Temple Judaism and, in particular, of the eschatologically-minded in this period (Part One). The main focus will be on the mode of scriptural reading of the eschatologically-minded. Next, we shall move to the Jesus tradition to show that Jesus perceived his eschatological ministry as climactic and definitive (Part Two). This analysis will show how deeply Jesus shared the eschatological mode of scriptural reading. Finally, based on the conclusions of the first two parts, we shall make an attempt to retrieve some significant aspects of Jesus' self-understanding (Part Three).

This study will contribute to the New Testament scholarship in several ways. First of all, it will confirm a recent discovery in respect to Jesus' aims. He aimed for

the restoration of Israel, and the scriptural themes of election shaped his self-understanding. Second, our study will show that the form-critical description of Christian origins is in need of revision. Third, our study has a bearing on the study of the Gospel tradition. Scholars have regarded the citations from and allusions to the Scriptures in the Jesus tradition as an indication of secondary origin. Our investigation, however, yields no support to this assumption. Finally, our study will test the advantages of the holistic approach which we shall employ in the following pages.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Profound gratitude is due primarily to my supervisor, Professor Ben F. Meyer, both for welcoming me to McMaster and for helping me in many ways throughout all the stages of my doctoral studies. Although he was going through medical treatments during the whole period of preparation of this dissertation, he was always ready to help me. I am thankful for his guidance, support, and especially his warm friendship. My debt extends also to his skillful suggestions on form and expression, which have immeasurably improved the study. I, of course, take sole responsibility for the shortcomings which remain.

Professor Stephen Westerholm has given me a consistent encouragement and helpful suggestions. His generous availability and astute advice were indispensable. I should also give thanks to my readers, Professor Eileen Schuller whose thorough knowledge of Second-Temple Judaism corrected me at many significant points and Professor Melvin Hillmer who showed a great interest in my work.

I also owe a profound debt of gratitude to Professor William R. Farmer, who trained me at Perkins School of Theology at SMU, Dallas, Texas and has been always interested in my work. Especially, I have been led by him to the conviction that the holistic approach is a real,

promising alternative. It is a great honor to have him as my mentor. Again, my deep thanks go to Professor Deuk Joong Kim who first introduced me to the world of New Testament scholarship at Methodist Theological Seminary in Seoul, Korea.

My fellow graduate students in the Department of Religious Studies at McMaster, especially Philippe Delsaut and David McMaster, have given me a warm friendship which made the academic life so pleasant. I also wish to thank the administerial staff in the department.

Finally, I wish most of all to express my gratitude to my family: To my parents, Jung Sup Kim & Kyung Soon Hong, whom I love most dearly; to my parents-in-law, Rev. Kun Il Doh & Young Jo Park, whom I respect highly; to my wife, Hyun Joo Doh, who has "endured all things" (1 Cor 13:7) throughout the whole period of my doctoral studies; to my children, Minoo William and Aerin, who have given their rightful time that their father might finish his work. This work is dedicated with love to my family.

ABBREVIATIONS

ANRW	Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt, ed. by H. Temporini and W. Haase, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter
BA	Biblical Archaeologist
BASOR	Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research
BLE	Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique
BZ	Biblische Zeitschrift
CBQ	Catholic Biblical Quarterly
ErIsr	Eretz Israel
ExpTim	Expository Times
Greg	Gregorianum
HTR	Harvard Theological Review
HUCA	Hebrew Union College Annual
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature
JJS	Journal of Jewish Studies
JSNT	Journal for the Study of the New Testament
JTS	Journal of Theological Studies
NovT	Novum Testamentum
NTS	New Testament Studies
RevQ	Revue de Qumran
RSR	Recherches de sciences religieuse
SBLSP	SBL Seminar Papers
SJT	Scottish Journal of Theology
ST	Studia theologica

TBl	Theologische Blätter
TDNT	Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, trans. by G. Bromily, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans
TynBul	Tyndale Bulletin
VT	Vetus Testamentum
ZAW	Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
ZNW	Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I

INTRODUCTION: TASK AND METHODS

In a recent book on the scribal activities of the post-Easter church, Donald Juel, drawing on the work of his mentor, N. A. Dahl,[1] has argued that early Christian christological/messianic exegesis was the product of the church's effort to bridge the gap between Jesus' non-messianic ministry and the church's conviction of his messiahship.[2] The root of New Testament christology, in other words, did not lie in Jesus' ministry, but in cognitive dissonance among the first believers. That dissonance "led them [the first believers] into the Scriptures with a specific agenda."[3] The result was the messianic exegesis which we find throughout the New Testament.

This proposal is far from new. Juel has simply rehearsed one of the main theses of the form critics. Classical form criticism as presented by Rudolf Bultmann[4] and Martin Dibelius[5] proceeded on the basis of <u>a priori</u> elements that shaped the inquiry. The form-critical hypothesis posited a certain type of primitive Christian community. Suitably multiplied, this imaginary community could be supposed to have not only shaped, but actually supplied the substance of, oral tradition on Jesus. This

notably included the motifs of redemptive christology found throughout the tradition.

The form critics readily acknowledged the quasi-circular form of their argument and a distinct a priori element in it. They did not, however, spell out the structure of the argument in its entirety. Moreover, they underplayed the closing of the circle, the effort of verification complementary to the framing of the hypothesis. They explained the presence of themes and motifs of redemptive christology in the oral tradition by reference to the aspirations and activities of the communities that produced the oral tradition. Form-critical assumptions, conspicuously open to further development, nevertheless failed to find indirect verification (i.e., verification through particular investigations taking the basic form-critical hypothesis for granted). This may be why form-critical assumptions on Christian origins have lost ground in recent years.[6]

The failure, in sum, is attributable to three factors: first, the lack of historical analogy in support of the sort of community that the form critics envisaged; second, the failure to "close the circle" by an effort to verify the form-critical hypothesis as a whole; third, the failure of follow-up studies to compensate for this by indirect verification, i.e., by the unambiguous success of particular studies that made the form-critical account of

Christian origins a working hypothesis. The hypothetical elements in the classical form-critical proposal are no less conjectural today than they were at the time of their appearance seventy years ago.

The present study is an attempt to approach Christian origins, especially the beginnings of New Testament christology, by methods different from those of form criticism. The generic topic of the present inquiry is the self-understanding of Jesus; more specifically, it is to verify the fact that his self-understanding was based on the redemptive christological motifs of the Scriptures. We intend to show that, contrary to the form-critical view, christological themes later exploited by the post-Easter church originated with Jesus himself, for Jesus conceived himself as the one who was called to fulfill the long-awaited eschatological aspirations of Israel.

Not a few scholars in the past have proposed theses akin to the present thesis, and to have done so in response to the form-critics.[7] They have tried to refute the form-critics' thesis about the beginning of christology by arguing for the authenticity of some sayings and actions of Jesus which are pregnant with christological themes. The effort yielded mixed results, some successful, others unsuccessful. In any case, they did not put an end to the form-critics' methodological skepticism. For half a century or more, we have witnessed exchanges between the two camps

without much change on either side. Thus, a repetition of these lines of argument can hope to make little contribution to the discussion. The subject calls for a new approach, which is what this study tries to offer.

We shall begin with a hypothesis, as the form-critics did; but, unlike their hypothesis, ours is presented as verifiable. That hypothesis is this: Jesus understood himself and his mission in the light of scriptural soteriological themes, which he interpreted eschatologically. To verify this hypothesis, we must prove two points: first, Jesus was the conscious bearer of a saving mission -- the climactic and definitive mission to Israel (and through Israel in favour of the nations). Second, in the light of this consciousness of himself and his mission, he read the Scriptures as prophecy, which concretely defined him and the particulars of his appointed task. Like eschatologically-minded Jews of the entire post-Exilic period and, in particular, like those since the rise of apocalyptic eschatology in the third and second centuries BCE, Jesus read the Scriptures as prophecy awaiting fulfillment in the end-time. Inasmuch as he was conscious of a climactic and definitive mission of his own, he believed that all the Scriptures were to come to completion with that mission.

Our own expectations are heuristic: Whatever Jesus found in the Scriptures as promising or foretelling or

foreshadowing God's great saving act, he must have correlated with his own person and task. Some promises, prophecies, and types were already fulfilled or coming to fulfillment; others were destined for fulfillment with the consummation of his task. We expect to find in the Gospel testimony indications of this style of thought on Jesus' part. We expect the indications to be concrete, diverse, and relatively unambiguous.

The form critics' ideal-type of "community" as the creative milieu in which the Gospel tradition arose was a matter of sheer conjecture, for which we find no independent confirmation. Our own point of departure, on the contrary, is not conjectural. It is the increasingly thorough investigation of Judaism's reading of the Scriptures in the post-Exilic period, and especially following the rise of apocalypticism. This suggests to us a new approach to certain questions, not, to be sure, on the origins and forms of oral tradition, but very definitely on the presence of christological themes in the Gospel tradition.

Besides this difference with regard to departure and aim, the present investigation will highlight the closing of the circle, i.e., the moment of verification. According to our hypothesis, it was Jesus himself who accounted for the presence in the tradition, not of titles -- an issue that has muddied the waters of research -- but of redemptive-christological motifs. Jesus, we maintain, derived them

from reading the Scriptures in the light of his self-awareness as bearer of an eschatological mission to all Israel.

We would more willingly run the risk of repeating ourselves than we would the risk of ambiguity about procedure. The movement of exposition will be threefold. We shall begin with an investigation of the mentality of Second-Temple Judaism and, in particular, of the eschatologically-minded in this period (Part One), moving from these results to Jesus' conception of his ministry (Part Two). This inquiry will lead us to a heuristic anticipation: Jesus understood himself in accord with the main soteriological themes of the Scriptures. Finally, we shall see how this anticipation is met in the data of the Gospels (Part Three).

The advantages of this mode of investigation are manifold. First, as previously mentioned, we can make a strong case against the form-critical view not by an atomistic but by a holistic approach to the data of Jewish and Christian literature. We shall try to prove Jesus' "messianic"[8] self-understanding not by exegetical work on each tradition but by showing the overall framework of the eschatologically-minded in the Second-Temple period. If the reader will join us in placing Jesus within the context and whole picture of this period, he will find an account of Christian origins far more plausible than that bequeathed to

us by the form critics.

Second, we wish to move from the known to the unknown. Scholars have long abandoned the aspiration to investigate Jesus' self-understanding, for they have come to believe it an impossible task, owing to the paucity and nature of the data. It is true that the investigation of self-understanding is difficult even given copious data. We do, however, know much about the nature of Jesus' mission from his sayings and actions. Self-understanding is an essentially knowable unknown, and we have a good foundation in the data on the eschatological nature of Jesus' view of his time and world, his mission and resources.

Third, we move from a general framework to a specific case. Mechanically used, this method would be misleading, but we can avoid the danger. We shall start with the mentality of the eschatologically-minded of the Second-Temple period. This will show us how eschatological expectations shaped modes of reading the Scriptures. We shall thereafter turn to Jesus in an effort to grasp the terms in which he understood his mission. Since scholars have debated the eschatological view of Jesus' mission, it is inevitable that we shall deal with this question at some length. If we succeed in showing the eschatological nature of Jesus' mission, we shall find ourselves on firm ground respecting Jesus' understanding of the Scriptures and their fulfillment. This will be the basis for our reconstruction

of his self-understanding. Throughout, hypothesis and verification alike will derive from accessible data, especially the data of the Gospels.

Fourth, we shall avoid the title-oriented research which has long misled the scholarly discussion of Jesus' self-understanding and of New Testament christological development. It has been customary for scholars to take up a title by which, according to the Gospels, Jesus designated himself and to inquire whether that title was used as a messianic title before the time of Jesus.[9] The foregoing works on titles, however, have diminished our readiness to take title-oriented research as promising and appropriate. It is not promising, for there is too marked a paucity of data from the Second-Temple period. It is scarcely appropriate, for messianic titles were hardly a prime "resource," and were certainly not the only resource, for Jesus. Among the "resources" for developing his self-understanding there were, first of all, the Scriptures; second, there were the many soteriological themes of the Scriptures; third, there were epithets and titles. For our purposes it thus seems wise to focus broadly on the scriptural soteriological themes.

The present study has for its main point the presentation, first, of how well grounded the once dominant view is that Jesus defined himself and his mission according to the redemptive themes of the Scriptures; and, second, the

presentation of an alternative to the form critics respecting the origin of New Testament christology. It did not originate in anonymous creative communities, but in the creative figure of Jesus himself.

END NOTES

1. Nils Alstrup Dahl, The Crucified Messiah and Other Essays (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1974).

2. See Donald Juel, Messianic Exegesis: Christological Interpretation of the Old Testament in Early Christianity (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988).

3. Ibid., p. 29.

4. See Rudolf Bultmann, The History of the Synoptic Tradition, trans. by John Marsh (New York: Harper & Row, 1963).

5. Martin Dibelius, From Tradition to Gospel, trans. and rev. by Bertram Lee Wolf (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1935).

6. This trend is notable in the works of the so-called "third questors" of the historical Jesus, to name a few: Ben F. Meyer, The Aims of Jesus (London: SCM Press, 1979); E. P. Sanders, Jesus and Judaism (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985); Marcus Borg, Jesus A New Vision (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1987); Ben Witherington, III, The Christology of Jesus (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990). For critical discussion of the form criticism, see Erhardt Güttgemanns, Candid Questions Concerning Form Criticism, trans. by W. G. Doty (Pittsburgh: Pickwick Press, 1979). For a different account of the oral tradition, see Rainer Riesner, Jesus als Lehrer, 3rd ed., (Tübingen: Mohr, 1989); Birger Gerhardsson, Memory and Manuscript (Lund: Gleerup, 1964).

7. For example, C. H. Dodd, According to the Scriptures (London: James Nisbet & Co., 1952); R. T. France, Jesus and the Old Testament (London: Tyndale Press, 1970); Reginald Fuller, The Foundations of New Testament Christology (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965). Most recently, Ben Witherington, Christology.

8. We will deal carefully with the often ambiguous terms, "Messiah" and "messianic." Whenever it appears in our discussion it will refer to the figure, whatever he may be called, after whom Israel awaited no other.

9. Such studies are far too many to list them all. It will here suffice to give some typical ones: Ferdinand Hahn, The Titles of Jesus in Christology, trans. by Harold Knight and George Ogg (Cleveland: The World Publishing Company, 1969); Fuller, Foundations; Oscar Cullmann, The Christology of the New Testament, trans. by Shirley C. Guthrie and Charles A. M. Hall (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963).

PART ONE:

ESCHATOLOGY AND THE SCRIPTURES

How did Jesus read the Scriptures? What role did the Scriptures play in Jesus' understanding of his mission? The conventional approach to such questions has been to analyze those sayings of Jesus which cited from or alluded to the Scriptures.[1] The problem, however, is the notorious difficulty of obtaining a general agreement about the authenticity of such sayings. Scholars have regarded many of them as among the most assuredly unauthentic in the Jesus tradition. This is largely due to the prevailing assumption of strenuous scribal activities on the part of the post-Easter church. This, to be sure, "scarcely justifies the assumption that Jesus did not reflect upon his own mission in light of the Scripture,"[2] but it has systematically discouraged attempts to retrieve Jesus' use of the Scriptures.

This situation calls for alternative approaches. The present study will test an alternative approach, one offering, in our judgment, a more than ordinary promise of success. Our strategy will be to study, first, the mode of scriptural reading practiced by eschatologically-oriented Jews in the Second-Temple period. If we should retrieve a common pattern shared by most of the eschatologically-minded readers in this period, we shall have firm ground under our feet as we examine Jesus' use of the Scriptures.

II

ESCHATOLOGICAL READING OF THE SCRIPTURES IN THE SECOND-TEMPLE PERIOD

Ways of reading the Scriptures are inevitably affected by the presuppositions of the readers. The study of Jewish exegesis in the Second-Temple period has shown that a given set of presuppositions or, in Daniel Patte's words, a given "culture,"[3] largely determines the way the Scriptures are read and understood. In John Barton's words,

> The kind of information that the reader would expect to obtain from the book would not be determined by any internal criteria, based on a judgment about its genre, but solely on his conception of the kind of information prophetic inspiration had existed to impart.[4]

Consequently, the differences among Jewish exegetical traditions are not "a matter of procedure or of method" but rather a matter of "a people's understanding of themselves, of their world, and of their God."[5] The scriptural reading of the apocalyptists and Qumran community was determined by their eschatological concerns, just as the rabbis' reading was by their legal concerns, Philo's by his philosophical concerns, and Josephus's by his apologetic concerns.

We should accordingly be able, like John Barton,[6] Michael Fishbane[7] and Daniel Patte,[8] to detect some common patterns of scriptural reading shared by the

eschatologically-minded. We hope that this investigation will give us some information about the relationship between one's eschatological belief and one's way of using the Scriptures. This will provide a ground for our further study of the historical Jesus.

1. Some Common Conceptions of the Scriptures in the Second-Temple Period

Although our immediate concern is with the eschatological reading, we need first to review some common conceptions of the Scriptures shared by Jews of the Second-Temple period, regardless of their theological stance. In exploring Jewish interpretations of the Scriptures in this period, we need to put aside modern conceptions of the Bible learned from the critical-biblical scholarship of our time. The Jewish understanding of the Scriptures is very different from that of the modern critics. As Barton urges, "Somehow we need to find ways of sharing this perception, closing our minds to critical questions for a while."[9] Often scholars unconsciously approach this period with a mentality alien in some respects to the people of the time.

First of all, Jews in this period believed that the Scriptures were inspired by the Holy Spirit. God's revelation is thus found everywhere in it. George F. Moore names this "the first principle of Jewish hermeneutics."[10] This conviction was, according to David Aune, "held in

common by all the diverse sectarian movements within synagogue Judaism, including the Qumran community and early Christianity."[11]

As a result, religious Jews of this period took the Scriptures as one body which was "throughout consentaneous, homogeneous."[12] This does not mean that Jews of this period read the Scriptures as a unitary whole, as the proponents of "canonical criticism" do.[13] They hardly took into account differences among the different genres and books in their reading. For them "the Scripture as a whole is considered to be inspired by the Holy Spirit"[14] and is expected somehow to convey one and the same message.

This conception of the Scriptures, in turn, shaped ways of reading them. Every part of the Scriptures was inspired and meaningful, a belief that led readers to look for the secret meaning behind each text. Especially where the meaning was not evident or the implied meaning not relevant, the need for the search of latent meaning became urgent. The ways of discerning the secrets differed in accord with the presuppositions of the readers. Some appealed to other scriptural texts, others to the tradition (e.g., the Oral Torah), others to some secret revelation, and the like. But the sole intention of all those activities was to make the whole of Scripture meaningful by revealing its concealed meaning.

This belief also led the reader to efforts toward

harmonization. There was little attention to the differences among authors and periods. "Development" within the Scriptures was not a category or concern. Even diversity of genre, as mentioned above, was of little importance for them. The Scriptures were the inspired Word of God. Therefore, there should not be any contradiction among the inspired books. Harmonization was high on the list of the interpreter's major tasks.

This conception further lent itself to atomistic interpretation "which interprets sentences, clauses, phrases, and even single words, independently of the context or the historical occasion, as divine oracles; and makes large use of analogy of expressions, often by purely verbal association."[15] The people in this period regarded the Scriptures "as a collection of innumerable fragments."[16] The hidden meaning of each section of any book was far more important than the unifying theme or message of the book.

Lastly, these presuppositions or working assumptions gave freedom to interpretative work. Interpretation in this period was more determined by the interpreter than by the text itself. The historical context of the text was not crucial. Often interpreters forgot it altogether. More frequently, the context or the theological supposition of the reader worked as a determining factor in understanding and interpretation. The interpreter's self-understanding and theological outlook are thus often discernible in a

given interpretation. Similar theological presuppositions resulted in similar ways of reading the Scriptures.

The points that we made above are far from exhaustive. It will, however, suffice to show us some important elements of the Second-Temple conception of the Scriptures which we should keep in mind in our research into this period.

It may also be helpful to see, at this point, the way in which the Scriptures functioned for Jews of the time. Daniel Patte's observations on this subject are useful.[17] He distinguishes two levels of function of the Scriptures which were true for all in Second-Temple Judaism: the "haggadic" level and the "halakic" level. The haggadic use of the Scriptures was related to the self-identity of the readers. They used the Scriptures in a way to uncover their identity and to embody the scriptural revelation. On the other hand, the halakic use of the Scriptures illustrated the way to actualize that identity and vocation. These two levels of scriptural use are detected in every group in the period. The Scriptures were the major resource for the formation and actualization of the self-identity of each individual and each community.

Again, however, the content of the Scriptures did not simply determine the self-understanding of the people in this period. People approached the Scriptures with an already formed self-understanding. It is thus truer to say

that they used the Scriptures to confirm and enrich their given identity than to say that the Scriptures directly generated that identity. They also sought divinely ordained ways of fulfilling their identity from the Scriptures.

Much, then, depended on the texts regarded as normative. For instance, choosing Numbers 25 as the normative text and Phinehas as the model should result in a totally different ethos from that which fixed on Isaiah 53 and the Suffering Servant.[18] It is thus important to discover what texts and figures were especially significant for given individuals and groups.

With this general understanding of the Scriptures in the Second-Temple period in mind, let us go to the mode of scriptural reading and interpretation of the eschatologically-minded in the period.

2. The Eschatological Reading of the Scriptures in the Second-Temple Period

We shall begin by re-stating this principle: Ways of reading the Scriptures largely depended on the theological outlook and self-understanding of the readers. Three distinctive ways discerned by Michael Fishbane[19] and four modes of reading prophecy identified by John Barton[20] reflected diverse religious foci or angles of vision. In this section we shall thus explore, by analyzing the scriptural exegesis of the eschatologically-minded in the

time before and around Jesus, the mode of reading the Scriptures which the eschatological belief was commonly to determine.

For our purpose, we shall focus on the eschatological interpretation in the Isaiah Apocalypse, in Joel, and in Daniel; we shall follow this with a review of extra-canonical writings such as some Pseudepigrapha with apocalyptic elements, the Dead Sea Scrolls, and Josephus' stories of the "Sign Prophets."[21]

We shall look first at eschatological interpretation within the Scriptures themselves. It is found in a number of "eschatological passages" (e.g., Isa 65-66; Zech 9-14; Joel 2:28-3:21; Ezek 38-39; Isa 24-27; Mal 4).[22] These passages, which are "a substantial and integral part of post-exilic prophecy,"[23] will show us early examples of eschatological interpretation. We are not able to launch a detailed study of all these passages here. Instead, we will content ourselves with a few passages clearly reflecting the older scriptural tradition.

Isaiah Apocalypse (Isaiah 24-27)

The so-called "Isaiah Apocalypse" (Isa 24-27), though it has been the subject of intensive studies, remains partly an unknown still to be known. Questions of date and authorship still remain unresolved.[24] Likewise unresolved are questions on the composite character of these chapters

and on the juxtaposition of its constitutuent elements.[25] There is one point, however, on which scholars generally agree: the chapters are basically eschatological.

The focus of these chapters is on the cosmic eschaton.[26] They depict a vision of the climactic and final drama of the future. Older traditions and prophetic oracles are taken up and re-deployed in the light of the eschatological vision:

Isaiah	source	theme
24:1	Gen 1:2	void before creation
24:2	Hos 4:9	judgment for all
24:4	Hos 4:3	universal disaster
24:5c	Gen 9:1-17	breaking of covenant
24:8	Jer 7:34; 16:9; 25:11	cessation of joy
24:17-18b	Jer 48:43-44	terror, pit, snare
24:18c-19	Gen 7:11	earthly disaster
24:20	Amos 5:2	"never again to rise"
24:23	Exod 24:9-11, 16-18	epiphany
26:1-2	Ps 24:7-10	"Oh, gates"
26:14-19	Isa 54:1-5	glorification/Israel
26:19	Hos 13:14	resurrection
27:2-5	Isa 5:1-7	song of vineyard
27:6	Hos 14:5-7	blossoming of Israel
27:13	Num 10:2-10	sounding the trumpet

The list is not exhaustive. But the glimpse it affords is telling. There is an abundance of conscious adoptions from earlier scriptural themes, motifs, and allusions (from the Torah, the prophets and the writings). They are collated in the service both of the present moment and of the impending eschaton. The eschatological judgment is depicted in the language of creation (Isa 24:1; Gen 1:2), so implying that the coming eschaton is the new creation. The imagery of the

great flood (Isa 24:5; Gen 9:1-17 and 24:18-19; Gen 7:11) is merely one among many such allusions. The covenant with Noah, once broken, unleashes a second flood to destroy the wicked of the last time. Again, exodus language is adopted to evoke the eschatological epiphany of God (Isa 24:23; Exod 24:9-11, 16-18). The author found resources for his eschatological vision in the significant events of Israel's election-history.

What, then, do we have here? First of all, we have an example of the eschatological use of typology.[27] "Typology" names a distinctive kind of thinking. It focuses on the "correspondence between beginning and end" (Urzeit und Endzeit).[28] Hence, the Garden of Eden (Isa 11:6-8; Amos 9:13) as the beginning of human history, the wilderness tradition (Hos 2:16-20; Isa 52:11f.) as the beginning of Israel's national history, and the old Davidic Jerusalem (Isa 1:21-26) as the beginning of the elected monarchy are all images foreshadowing the contours of "the end" in God's plan. Jeremiah's eschatological vision was formed in part by his use of a Moses-typology (Jer 1:4-19; 16:14-15; 23:7-8; Jer 31:31-34; etc.).[29] Here, then, we meet an eschatological-typological reading of the Scriptures, a prominent feature of the eschatological mind-set. Eschatological typology is an expression of the belief in the final renewal of the past crucial events of Israel's election-history.

Especially noteworthy is the anonymous writer's reinterpretation of the earlier prophetic oracles in his eschatological perspective. In the first part of chapter 24, we find the language and imagery of Hosea (judgment oracles against Israel: Hos 4:1ff.) brought to bear on the last, climactic affliction of the whole earth. Similarly, the judgment oracle of Jeremiah against Moab (Jer 48:43-44) now serves to detail eschatological judgment (Isa 24:17-18). In Isaiah 26:14-19 the writer highlights the victory of Yahweh in the light of the "Song of Assurance" (Isa 54:1-4). What follows may be an expression of hope for eschatological resurrection.[30] Again, the writer in Isaiah 27:6 draws on Isaiah 37:31, Hosea 14:4-7 and other texts to present Israel as a great supernatural vine made to cover the world. The Vineyard Song (Isa 27:2-5) is an adaptation of the Song of the Vineyard of Isaiah (Isa 5:1-7) to this eschatological situation.[31] A historic image thus takes on eschatological colouring. It should be noted that the Song is enclosed by the eschatological formula bayyôm hahû' (Isa 27:2, 6).[32]

Now we can see how heavily the Isaiah Apocalypse depends upon the older scriptural tradition. Typological interpretation of the Pentateuchal tradition and the reinterpretation of the earlier prophetic oracles furnish the reader with an impressive celebration of the coming eschaton. The author already reveals an eschatological consciousness that the prophecies (meaning "all biblical

tradition" for him) would find fulfillment in the eschaton. The author expected the renewal in the eschaton of the past salvific events in Israel's election-history.

The Book of Joel

Joel offers a comparable exploitation of the past. The unity and the historic context of the book remain open questions.[33] However the literary question be settled, there is a certain distinction between the first half (chs. 1 and 2: the locust-plague and a call to repentance) and the second half (chs. 3 and 4: the eschatological, prophetic oracles).[34] The latter chapters, exhibiting national and exclusivist expectations, are filled with citations from or allusions to previous prophetic oracles. The following list indicates the traditions to which the prophet alludes:

Joel	sources	themes
3:1	Num 11:29	Spirit for all
3:1-2	Isa 32:15; Ezek 39:29	the Spirit
3:3	Exod 19:18	epiphany
3:4	Amos 8:9	universal disaster
3:5	Obad 17 (poss. Isa 4:2)	"those who escape"
4:1-3,9-17	Ezek 38-39;Jer 25:30-31; Zeph 2:1-3:20	judgment on nations
4:2, 11	Zeph 2:1; 3:8	gathering for war
4:3	Obad 11	"casting lots"
4:9-12	Isa 2:2-4; Mic 4:1-3	(reversed citation)
4:13	Amos 1:3; Isa 28:27 Isa 63:1-6	"wine press"
4:16	Amos 1:2 (Exod 19:18; 20:18)	Lord's roaring
4:17	Isa 52:1-2	no more gentiles
4:18	Amos 9:13; Jer 31:12	restored mountain
	Isa 30:25	restored stream
	Ezek 47:1-12	restored fountain
4:19	Isa 19:1-15	judgment for Egypt
	Isa 34:5; Obad	judgment for Edom

| 4:20-21 | Zech 2:10-12 | Lord's dwelling |

First, we find Exodus typology here. The author describes the sign of the eschatological era by the outpouring of the Spirit upon all Israelites without distinction of age or sex (3:1). This is what Moses hoped to see (Num 11:29).[35] This immediately suggests the ideal character of the eschatological era: it is a time far better than the age of Moses. We label this use "typological."[36] The theophany at the last judgment (3:3; 4:16) is calculated to remind the reader of that on Mount Sinai (Exod 19: 18).[37] An Eden typology is also evident in this section (2:3; 4:18, 20-21).[38]

Joel's eschatological vision adopted a number of themes and languages of the prophetic oracles. Joel further developed the theme of the outpouring of the Spirit used by Isaiah and Ezekiel. He applied the imagery of cosmic disaster employed by Amos in his indictment of Israel (Amos 8:4-14) to the last judgment before the day of the Lord (3:4). The last judgment scene against the nations (4:1-17) also recasts earlier prophetic oracles. Joel 4:18 is striking for its combination of three distinct images from diverse prophetic sources. We see here that different languages and images which were once applied to different situations are artfully put together to make a unified picture.

Even more impressive is Joel's interpretation of

Obadiah 17. Obadiah had declared the judgment of Edom to be imminent and predicted the deliverance of Israel: "But in Mount Zion there shall be those that escape" (Obad 17). The escape in quotation is historical, not eschatological. But Joel points this prophecy to Israel's eschatological deliverance at the last judgment: "And it shall come to pass that all who call upon the name of the Lord shall be delivered; for in Mount Zion and in Jerusalem there shall be those who escape, as the Lord has said" (Joel 3:5). The verbal agreement between the two passages is so close that we are obliged to infer Joel's reinterpretation of Obadiah; that is, a non-eschatological oracle had been subsequently converted into an eschatological one. The original context is left completely behind.

Belief in the necessary fulfillment of the oracles of the prophets was "a basic theological-ideological concern of biblical oracles."[39] In the works of the Deuteronomic historians (e.g., Deut 18:13-22) this belief assumed prominence. Indeed, evidence for the wide currency of this belief may be gathered from almost every part of the Scriptures.[40] All prophetic predictions must come to fulfillment, for they are God's words (Num 23:19). God himself will make them happen (1 Kgs 6:12; Isa 46:11; Jer 29:10; 39:16). None will fail to see fulfillment (Josh 21:45; Ezek 12:23, 28). In this sense, we should take the traditional conception of the prophets as "forth-teller"

with caution. They were, as numerous scholars now agree, primarily "foretellers."[41]

The later prophets accordingly began to appeal to earlier prophetic oracles both in their interpretations of current history or in their eschatological oracles. "Fulfillment interpretation" made its appearance, eventually becoming widespread in the middle and late Second-Temple period. It is a feature, however, that is attested from the time of Deutero-Isaiah, for whom it was a favourite way of referring to fulfillment (Isa 40:21, 27-8; 42:9; 43:9,12; 44:26; 45:21; 46:10; 48:3-6). Again, Ezekiel refers to an unknown prediction[42] in the Gog and Magog Oracles as a prediction for his contemporaries: "Are you he of whom I spoke in former days by my servant the prophets of Israel, who in those days prophesied for years that I would bring you against them?" (Ezek 38:17). This type of interpretation developed further in the later period as we see here in Joel.

The sources of Joel 4:9-12 are Isaiah 2:2-4 and Micah 4:1-3. Both prophets saw in the gathering of the nations a prelude not to battle with Yahweh but to worship of him. They would come as "pilgrims to Yahweh."[43] The eschatological encounter of the nations with Yahweh would lead them to permanent peace: "They shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks" (Isa 2:4; Mic 4:3). Joel effected drastic changes in adapting

them to his own theological outlook. In the national and exclusivist eschatological vision of things, the pilgrimage of the nations became a gathering of the nations for battle. In earlier prophecy swords were turned into plough shares. Now plough shares are turned into swords. The old images survive but serve new meanings. The eschatologically-minded among the scrutinizers of the Scriptures are ready to redeploy ancient resources to serve new ends.

Finally, we should make a note about the role of the Spirit in the eschatological vision of Joel (3:1-2). Here we see the belief that the outpouring of the Spirit is the sign of the advent of the eschaton and that prophecy, dreams and visions are signs of the end-time outpouring of the Spirit. The Spirit is the source of the eschatological revelation, and it takes the channels of prophecy and dreams/visions. In other words, here we find attested a bond binding the outpouring of the Spirit and prophetic/visionary experiences with the eschatological expectation.

It is one of the characteristics of the post-Exilic prophets to ascribe the source of prophecy and visions to the Spirit. Joel stands on this line. Ezekiel offers a prime example: "the Spirit lifted me up" (2:2; 3:12, 14; 8:3-4; 11:1, 5, 24; 37:1). The Spirit is described as using verbal communication (Ezek 11:5) or dreams/visions to disclose the eschatological secrets. We can see this belief

about the Spirit as the source of prophecy in other prophets (e.g. Isa 61:1-2; Zech 7:12).

The outpouring of the Spirit for an individual (Isa 11:1; 42:1; 61:1), for all Israel (Isa 32:14; 44:3; Ezek 39:29) or all flesh (Joel 3:1) marks the beginning of the eschaton. The climactic disclosure of power and wisdom occurs with the outpouring of the Spirit. Especially, the outpouring of the Spirit on a specific individual in an outstanding manner sets him apart for a special task. A cardinal instance is the Davidic king, "a shoot which shall come forth from the stump of Jesse" (Isa 11:1): "And the Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and the fear of the Lord" (Isa 11:2). The outpouring of the Spirit signifies an anointing. The same is said of the Servant of Yahweh. The endowment of the Spirit means election and equipment for the work of the Servant of Yahweh (Isa 42:1-2; 61:1-2). Consequently, we may say that, in the post-Exilic period, the outpouring of the Spirit implied the dawning of the eschaton, the disclosure of the eschatological secrets, and the choosing and equipping of one for an eschatological task.

Again from Joel we find that eschatological expectation determined ways of reading the Scriptures. He expected the older prophetic oracles to be fulfilled in the eschaton, which he perceived as imminent. In this process,

he interpreted non-eschatological prophecies and other scriptural traditions in eschatological terms. He viewed the eschaton as the renewal of past salvific events of Israel's election-history (eschatological typology).

The Book of Daniel

The Book of Daniel poses a host of problems in regard to prolegomena matters of unity, date and provenance of the materials.[44] The whole book breaks down into two sections: the tales (chs. 1-6) and the visions (chs. 7-12). Our primary concern is with the latter section (visions). We shall first focus on the idea of "secret" (rāz) in relation to the concept of revelation; then on the eschatological and apocalyptic chapters[45] and their use of older scriptural texts.

In the Aramaic section (2:4-7:28) we often meet two pregnant terms: rāz(îm) and pĕšar. Rāzîm in lexical definition means "mysteries" or "secrets." In Daniel the word refers to things unknown, e.g., the meaning of a dream or a vision. And the secrets are about "what will be in the latter days" (2:28). In other words, they concern eschatological revelation. But "no wise men, enchanters, magicians or astrologers can show ... the mystery" (2:28); inspired interpretation (pĕšar) is thus needed. "Inspired," because only God reveals the secrets (2:28, 47).

These two terms do not appear in the later part of

the book apart from Daniel 7:16, but the same ideas of revelation and interpretation are attested there also. Daniel receives the secrets of the end-time through visions. Then, the angel gives him the inspired interpretations of the secrets (7:1-14 = vision; 7:17-27 = interpretation; 8:1-14 = vision; 8:15-26 = interpretation; 9:1-19 = struggle with the unfulfilled prophecy and petition for the interpretation; 9:21-27 = interpretation of the angel; 10:4-6 = vision; 10:10-21 = interpretation of the angel). Following the vision, Daniel agonizes over the secret meaning of the vision (7:15; 8:15) and asks for its interpretation (7:16). In the same way the word psr is also applied to scriptural interpretation (9:20-27). The author of Daniel presents, as the key to inspired interpretation of the Scriptures as well as to eschatological knowledge generally, divine revelation.

We may turn now to examples of inspired scriptural interpretation. Daniel 9 has been called "an exegetical MIDRASH or PESHER on Jeremiah 25:11-13; 29:10."[46] Scholars have raised questions about the unity of this chapter since they thought that the prayer of Daniel (9:3-19) had come from other source, given the apparent difference of theology and the absence of the request for illumination.[47] But Fishbane has made a convincing case for the unity of this chapter. His case is based on the chapter's stylistic continuity and correlation with Leviticus 26:14-45.[48] We

shall thus assume the unity of the chapter in our discussion.

The major scriptural source of this chapter is Jeremiah 25:11-13, where the great prophet assigns seventy years to the period of their servitude to Babylon. This prediction is one of the most frequently reinterpreted predictions in the Scriptures. It is repeated in more conciliatory terms in Jeremiah 29:10.[49] It is also reinterpreted in Leviticus 26:34-35, 2 Chronicles 36:19-21, and Zechariah 1:12; 7:5. In Zechariah, Jeremiah's prediction was interpreted to refer not to the time of exile but to the time of full restoration. It thus became a ground for Zechariah's hope for the restoration of the temple.

The writer of Daniel 9 gives a totally new interpretation to the text. He reveals the agony caused by dissonance between the prediction and the reality (9:2). On the one hand, the Babylonian exile lasted less than seventy years; on the other, restoration had not still taken place up to his own time. Inasmuch as the prediction had not literally come to pass, its meaning must be deeper than the literal sense of the words. This deeper meaning was revealed by Gabriel. The "seventy years" of the Jeremian text referred to seventy weeks or sabbatical cycles. The number of years in this deeper sense equalled ten jubilees. And the restoration in question in the prophecy was

climactic and definitive, that is, eschatological restoration. In short, what we have here is a transformation of meaning. The author has appealed to the deeper, eschatological, sense of classical prophecy.

One final feature should be noted in Daniel 9: the anthological mode of presenting scriptural witness. Moses' command (Lev 26:14-45//Dan 9:3-19; Deut 7:9//Dan 9:4; Deut 28:14-19//Dan 9:11) and the doom oracles of the earlier prophets (Jer 25:11-13//Dan 9:2; 9:6, 10 "thy servants the prophets"; Jer 39:16//Dan 9:12; Jer 44:27//Dan 9:14; Isa 37:17// Dan 9:18; Isa 10:22-23//Dan 9:26-27) are combined to explain present tragedy. The language and imagery of the prophets charge the prayer and petition of Daniel. No attention is paid to the diversity of genre. The whole of Holy Writ is conceived as prophecy for the end-time.

Daniel 11-12 are filled with references to biblical tradition. These chapters consist of a series of oracles against the nations (ch. 11) and of eschatological prophecy (ch. 12). Fishbane has noted numerous biblical allusions to Isaian oracles in Daniel 11:[50] the uses of the verb satap (Isa 10:22; 28:15, 17, 18//Dan 11:10, 22, 26, 40), of the old phraseology of destruction kālâ wĕnehrāsāh (Isa 10:23; 28:22//Dan 11:36), of za'am (Isa 10:25//Dan 11:36), of kāzāb (Isa 28:15, 17//Dan 11:27), and of šĕmû'â (Isa 28:19//Dan 11:47). These verbal correspondences imply that Isaiah

12:22-23 and 28:14-22 may well have had a powerful influence on the mind of the author of this chapter. We noted above that Daniel 9:26-27 alluded to Isaiah 10:22-23. It thus follows that Isaian oracles generally were heavy with meaning for the author of the Danielic visions, who "saw in Syria the fulfillment of old doom prophecies spoken concerning Assyria."[51] The main insight mediated by this interpretation should be found, as Fishbane remarks,[52] in the fact that the oracles had been unfulfilled. It is not merely the actualization of an old oracle. It is its eschatologization (Dan 11:40: "at the time of the end"). Old Isaian oracles have been integrated into an eschatological vision.

The reference to "Kittim" in Daniel 11:30 is significant in this connection. It is quite evidently an allusion to Balaam's oracles (Num 24:24), applying Balaam's prophecy on the attack of the ships from Kittim against Asshur and Eber to the attack of the ships of Rome against Antiochus IV. What caused this identification? The answer must be the eschatological interpretation of Balaam's oracle on "a scepter rising from Israel." The Kittim oracle is combined with the prediction of the scepter. It is therefore highly probable that the author understood Balaam's oracle eschatologically. In referring to the contemporary event by "Kittim," the author reveals his conviction that the eschaton had already been set in

motion.[53]

Ever since the appearance of H. L. Ginsburg's article on Daniel 12:2,[54] it has been widely accepted that the Suffering Servant Songs, especially Isaiah 53, lie behind this passage. The term maśkîl may well come from the opening verse (Isa 52:13) and the themes of vindication (Isa 52:13) and of "many" (Isa 53:11) also appear in Daniel 12:2. In this verse we can also detect the allusions to Isaiah 26:19 (resurrection) and Isaiah 66:24 ("abhorrence"). Fishbane has caught the implication of these allusions:

> Through this interweaving of prophetic sources, the apocalyptic author hoped to reinforce confidence in divine vindication at the final end, whose fulfillment was forecast of old, and now believed to be an imminent reality.[55]

The author of Daniel has a view of revelation which includes the following elements: (1) Revelation is divine, supernatural, a free gift. (2) The main function of the revealer is to "tell you what is inscribed in the book of truth" (Dan 10:21) concerning "the time of end" or "the appointed time" (Dan 11:35, 40, 45; 12:4, 9). (3) The form of revelation is that of the inspired interpretation of the Scriptures (Dan 9:24; 11; 12:2) which brings to light what had been dark, i.e., the secrets (rāzîm) to be decoded at the time of the end (Dan 2:19, 27, 28; 12:4, 9).

As only Daniel, the maśkîl par excellence, could decode the rāzîm with the help from the angel, so the secret meaning of the text of Daniel would be decoded by the later

mā̆skîlîm (Dan 12:10). Here emerges an inspired or revealed interpretation in the eschatological mode. Inspired interpretation of this type finds its fully developed form in the Qumran pĕšārîm.[56]

The significant role of the visionary experience in relation to the secret revelation is to be noted in the Book of Daniel. In the first part of the book, Daniel simply played the role of the inspired interpreter of others' dreams and visions (2:25-45; 4:19-27; 5:13-28). The interpretation of the dream and the vision came only from Yahweh. Yahweh is the "revealer of mysteries" (2:47) and the mysteries are about "what will be in the latter days" (2:28). In the later part, Daniel becomes the recipient of the secret revelation about the end-time through a series of visionary experiences. The vision functions as the channel for a higher, eschatological revelation about the eschaton. The vision as the channel of revelation is already attested in prophets like Jeremiah, Ezekiel and Zechariah. It also finds a highly elaborated form in the Apocalypses, where it becomes a common literary convention.

The source of inspiration is the Spirit ("the Spirit of the gods" or "the Spirit of God") in the first part of the book (4:8, 9, 18; 5:11, 14), while it is the angel Gabriel in the second part (8:15; 9:21; 10:5). There is no mention of the Spirit in the second part; Gabriel takes up his role. It, however, should not lead one to the

conclusion that the Spirit was not important for the pĕšārîm, since the Dead Sea Scrolls testify that "the spirit of truth," "the Prince of Light," and "the Angel of Truth" are interchangeable. It is the same with "the spirit of falsehood," "the Angel of Darkness" and "the Satan" (See 1QS 3-4). If it is true that Daniel's spiritual milieu was close to that of the Dead Sea Scrolls, it is probable that the author of the second part of Daniel had the Spirit in mind when speaking about Gabriel. Then, we can say that, for the author of Daniel, the Spirit is the source of inspired interpretation of dreams and the Scriptures. The author of Daniel was confident of his possession of the Spirit which made him the maśkîl par excellence. Here again, we see that the sense of possession of the Spirit gave the possessor the sense of election.

The Book of Daniel thus gives us a typical example for the eschatological reading of the Scriptures. The author believed that the Scriptures spoke of the eschaton. He further believed that the inspired interpreter needed the rāzîm for complete information on the eschaton. He expected the Scriptures to be fulfilled in the eschaton which would be the climax of Israel's election-history.

The Pseudepigrapha

The Pseudepigrapha containing apocalyptic elements[57] continue the tradition we have been exploring.

Scriptural interpretation in particular is important. Here we shall confine our treatment to the pseudepigrapha with apocalyptic elements produced before or around the time of Jesus: 1 Enoch (1-36), the Book of Jubilees, the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, the Testament of Moses, and the Psalms of Solomon. The dating of the Similitudes of Enoch is still debated, but we shall include this section of Enoch in our discussion.[58] Our approach to the mode of scriptural interpretation in these writings will be synthetic. Though each of these works has its distinct provenance, there remains much common ground among them:

> While we must always recognize the variety of eschatological belief, there does appear to have emerged a certain degree of uniformity in the expectation of a restored Israel as the center of a new world order of peace and righteousness following a period of disaster and cataclysm which would affect the whole of humankind. In the emergence of these ideas certain key passages seem to have played their part.[59]

Behind the variety of beliefs there subsists a common pattern of eschatology which has shaped a common attitude toward and the expectation of the Scriptures. The absence of formal quotations in these writings should not keep us from appreciating the great importance of the Scriptures for all these writings. David Aune has tended to minimize the significance of the apocalyptists as biblical interpreters.[60] It nevertheless holds true that we must understand the apocalyptists as biblical experts.[61] Only minds immersed in the Scriptures could produce the writings

they did.

Broadly speaking, the Scriptures are used as a framework for the new revelation in 1 Enoch (1-36), the Book of Jubilees, and the Testament of Moses[62]; on the other hand, they provide the language of new revelation in the Psalms of Solomon and the Similitude of Enoch.[63] Lars Hartmann's analysis of the first five chapters of 1 Enoch[64] accents the use of major characters, languages, events, and images drawn from scriptural tradition. Differences in genre are overridden, as many genres are indiscriminately brought together to make a point.

For us it is most important to observe that the whole of Scripture is made to speak of the end of time. 1 Enoch 11 is a good example. Here the author exploits a passage from Deuteronomy, a part of Moses' words of blessing for the observant: "The Lord will open to you his good treasury the heavens" (Deut 28:12). In 1 Enoch this phrase applies to the eschatological blessing. This Deuteronomic passage, combined with phrases from Isaiah 32:17 and Psalms 85:10, fits perfectly in a chapter that depicts the eschaton as a blessed state. The apocalyptic scribe treats the Scriptures like a storeroom of images and motifs apt to describe the end-time.

Jubilees is "an expansionistic paraphrase"[65] of the books of Genesis and Exodus. In the process of expanding any given story, the author expands, highlights, details,

adds, harmonizes, and actualizes.[66] We find similar phenomena in the Testament of Moses, another "expansionist paraphrase" of Deuteronomy 31-34.[67] At the end of the discourse, the author of the Testament broadens Moses' testament (which ended originally at the promise of the restoration, cf. Deut 30:3-10; 32:35-43) to include the time of the eschaton (T. Mos. 10:1-10).

What explains the great freedom of these ancient writers in dealing with the Scriptures? John C. Endres, citing J. A. Sanders, appeals to the status of the Scriptures at the time of writing:

> Jubilees reflects an era in which the 'sacred story' was still expressed in '... highly adaptable living tradition, such as those to which the early biblical writers themselves referred in whatever manner and mode they needed to do so'.[68]

This might well be a factor, but we find a more probable cause of this freedom in the very concept of "revelation" adopted in the Apocalypses. As the concept of the Oral Torah gave the scribes freedom to interpret the Scripture, so the apocalyptists believed that they had been given the final secrets of the eschaton.[69] This consciousness of eschatological revelation freed and empowered them vis-à-vis the Scriptures.

The Book of Daniel conceived of eschatological revelation as concealed until the outbreak of eschaton. But that outbreak, the apocalyptists concluded from the Scriptures, was on the brink. They glimpsed the long-hidden

secrets of the end-time through the "open heavens."[70] Thus, the Similitudes of Enoch 41-44 is a series of reports of what had been concealed but now was revealed to the seer. It reshaped the testament of Moses (Deut 31-34) in the light of the new revelation. Moses became the revealer of the secret of the end-time (T. Mos. 10:1-10). The scriptural passages were integrated by the new revelation about the end-time in the Psalms of Solomon 17-18. The Scriptures were not the whole revelation of Yahweh for the seers.

The description of the "Heavenly Tablets" especially reflects the idea of eschatological revelation. In 1 Enoch the seer was allowed to look at the "Heavenly Tablets" and ordered to read and understand them all (1 Enoch. 81:2). He was commissioned to tell what he understood from the tablets. The tablets showed him the truth "concerning the children of righteousness, concerning the elect ones of the world, and concerning the plant of truth" (93:2) and what would happen in the eschaton (106:19; 107:1; 108:7). According to 1 Enoch 108:6-7, at the outbreak of the eschaton all the Words of Yahweh spoken through the mouths of the prophets and what were written and sealed in the "Heavenly Tablets" would come to fulfillment. Yahweh had not revealed the contents of the tablets to the prophets; he reserved them for the chosen seer. This revelation was just a part of the whole secret of the end-time. In the Book of Jubilees, Yahweh revealed the "Heavenly Tablets" to Moses.

They contained the Law and the testimony (2:26), and the content of the testimony was the "eternal generations" (23:32).[71]

It is accordingly one of the common features of the seers to believe that they were given independent, eschatological revelations. They represented this as happening through visions or dreams. Christopher Rowland calls this belief the "unifying" and "distinguishing" key feature of the Apocalypses.[72] The apocalyptists believed that just a small part of the eschatological revelation was made known even to the prophets, and that the latter did not fully understand their own oracles.

The secrets of the eschaton were to be retrieved from the Scriptures by inspired interpretation. A large part of the secrets, however, was available only directly from God and his mediating agents. The Scriptures were easily subjected to the higher revelation. The seers enjoyed freedom vis-à-vis the Scriptures, and they looked for the final opening of the seal of the secrets.[73]

The channel of secret revelation was the visionary experience. As presented in the apocalyptic parts of the Pseudepigrapha we may classify these experiences in two types.[74] In Daniel the seer sees a dream or vision, but cannot understand its meaning. Only when the mediator, usually an angel, interpreted it, could the seer understand. A more common type of revelation is through the "heavenly

journey." This type was anticipated in Ezekiel 3:12; 11:1, 24. Both of these types of visionary experience derive their primitive form from the classical prophets like Isaiah, Jeremiah, and so on. What is the difference between the prophets and the seers? It lies in this, that the latter were profoundly preoccupied with these two forms of experiences, whereas the former were not.

Scholars have long debated about the authenticity of the visionary experience of the seers.[75] John Collins is among those on the skeptical side of the debate, mainly because of the phenomenon of pseudonymity ("since we do not hear elsewhere of pseudonymous shamans").[76] On the other hand, Martin Hengel,[77] D. S. Russel,[78] Daniel Patte[79] and Christopher Rowland[80] affirm the actual experience of the seers. There is no way to prove the authenticity of the experience.

Nevertheless we have reasons to think that systematic treatment of those accounts as "fiction" is not justifiable. First, we should ask how likely it is that the so-called seers put their message in a form disguised even to their eyes. Second, the development of the methods intended to induce the visionary experience (e.g., fasting, intense prayer, etc.) imply that people deliberately sought the visionary experiences. Third, similar experiences are attested outside the Jewish Apocalypses.[81] Luke's account of the visionary experiences (Acts 10) and Paul's testimony

to his heavenly journey (2 Cor 12:1-4) are among examples.

> Modern suspicion of pseudepigraphy [such as that of Collins] should not, therefore, hinder the attempt to assess whether in fact relics of authentic experiences are to be found in the apocalypses, and, if so, in what situation such experiences took place.[82]

Thus, it seems a better and more careful treatment to view the accounts of the visionary experiences with some degree of authenticity. Hence our provisional position is close to that of Herman Gunkel, namely, "that the writer actually had visionary experiences, but that, following his models, he 'interpreted,' stylized, and embellished them with various materials."[83]

Reference to the Spirit does not occur frequently in these writings. Instead, angels fill the place of the Spirit, as we saw in Daniel. But we should pay attention to one of the recurring expressions of 1 Enoch, i.e., "the Lord of the Spirits" (1 Enoch 37-63). Throughout Enoch's heavenly journey, "the Lord of the Spirits" appears as the communicator. It is thus our reasoning that, in this expression, the author implicitly thought the Spirits of the Lord to be working in the process.

The Spirit, however, appears in a few significant sections of these writings. According to 1 Enoch, the Lord of the Spirits will grant the Elect One "the spirit of wisdom, the spirit which gives thoughtfulness, the spirit of knowledge and strength, and the spirit of those who have fallen asleep in righteousness" (1 Enoch 49:3) and "the

spirit of righteousness" (1 Enoch 62:2). The Psalms of Solomon, following Isaiah 11:2, connects the anointing of the Davidic king with the outpouring of the Spirit (17:37; 18:7). The opening of heavens and the outpouring of the Spirit are also connected with the anointing of "a new priest" (Test. Lev. 18:1-7) or "a Star from Jacob" (Test. Jud. 24:2-3). "All the words of the Lord will be revealed" to him (Test. Lev. 18:1) and Beliar will be bound (Test. Lev. 18:11; Test. Jud. 25:3). It is clear from these pieces of evidence that the apocalyptists understood the special outpouring of the Spirit as the dawning of the eschaton. The Messiah would be elected and anointed by the Spirit, which was the source of his eschatological revelation and the power of his mission.

The eschatological appeal to typology should also be noted here. Above we saw the use of eschatological typology in the Isaiah Apocalypse and the Book of Joel. It was among the favourite literary resources of the apocalyptic parts of the Pseudepigrapha.[84] Following Ezekiel, the apocalyptists often drew on the Garden of Eden thematic to describe the blessed state of the eschaton (e.g., 1 Enoch 25:1-7; 29:1-32:6). Following Deutero- and Trito-Isaiah, they evoked the new creation, or the new heavens and earth to depict the purity of the eschaton. They repeatedly applied the marriage between the daughters of the earth and the sons of God in Genesis 6:1-4 to the fall of the angels and of the

people (Jub. 5:1-11; 1 Enoch 6-11). They made the Flood prefigure the Last Judgment, and presented Noah as the type of the latter-day saints (Jub. 5:20ff.; 1 Enoch 65-69). They considered the Exodus-Sinai traditions to be a type of the mediator of eschatological salvation (1 Enoch 89:28-40). Jubilees as a whole presents itself as massive evidence of the author's eschatological self-understanding. Was he the Moses of the end of time? Ancient narrative and eschatological vision are fused in these renovative biblical texts.

The eschatological consciousness and expectation of the seers made them look to the coming of an ideal end-time. Sixth-century prophecy led them to portray the future on the analogy of the former decisive salvific acts of God.

We should probably understand the phenomenon of the pseudonymity in this light, although there may be other operative factors.[85] Martin Hengel offers the following observations:

> The pseudepigraphic form necessarily became a firm rule for Jewish apocalyptic, since the apocalyptists' unheard-of claim to revelation could only be maintained by reference to those who had been endowed with the spirit in ancient times. This predilection for pseudepigraphy was furthered by the correspondence of primal time and end time. What God had revealed to the spirit-possessed pious of primal times, and these had 'sealed' from profane eyes as secret teaching or had communicated to only a few of the elect, was now made known to the pious of the last time to strengthen their faith. So we find as the predominant recipients of these 'secret doctrines' the fathers from Adam to Moses.[86]

In other words, the seers' self-understanding was --

historically, i.e., in the actuality of their religious lives -- derived from eschatological thinking and specifically from eschatological typology. Which one came first, the eschatological-typological self-understanding? Or the actual visionary experience? Probably, the visionary experience came first and produced an eschatological and typological self-understanding.[87] The seers in all probability "saw in the biblical heroes, 'types' of themselves, prefigurations of themselves either as individual seers or, in a corporate way, as the righteous community of those who had received the revelation of the secrets of the end time."[88]

Enno Janssen offers a comparable reflection on the use of the first person in these writings: "It is always described in the first person where an ancient figure appears as a speaker. There comes his self-understanding as a co-knower of God's secrets."[89] Here we find the eschatological typology going beyond the literary level and determining the self-definition of the seers as a co-knower of God's secrets. The seers could not fail to attribute to themselves genuine election, vocation, appointment to an eschatological task. Unfortunately, we do not have independent information on the seers' lives. It is plausible that they lived their lives, like the Qumran covenanters and the Sign Prophets known to us through Josephus, under the sign of their eschatological

convictions.

The above discussion furnishes us with a clearer picture of the eschatological reading of the Scriptures than the previous ones. The authors believed that they stood at the threshold of the new and final era. In their belief, the Scriptures speak of, and will find fulfillment in, the eschaton. They, however, believed that "Scripture by itself is not the complete revelation."[90] They were conscious of having the secret revelation concerning the eschaton through visionary experiences. With these conceptions they searched for the fulfillment of the Scriptures in their time. They expected the renewal of the past salvific events of Israel's election-history. Furthermore, they viewed themselves in the light of such restoration. The authors identified themselves with some outstanding figures in election-history such as Enoch, Moses and Solomon. They saw themselves as those through whom Yahweh would perform the past glorious salvific action once more, for the last time. Here we see that eschatological typology did not cease to define what the eschaton would be. It went further to define what they should be or do for the eschaton. We see such convictions lived out in the Qumran community and among the Sign Prophets.

The Qumran Pĕšārîm

Geza Vermes differentiates three types of exegesis

in the Dead Sea Scrolls: (1) implicit exegesis of an editorial type (e.g. the Temple Scroll), (2) exegesis of individual books of the Bible (the Genesis Apocryphon and Pĕšārîm) and (3) exegesis of excerpts from various writings assembled according to common themes (thematic anthologies).[91] In this section we shall mainly focus on the various pĕšārîm and on the eschatological anthologies in which the eschatological interpretation is prominent.

Of the Qumran pĕšārîm the Commentary on Habakkuk (1QpHab) is best preserved.[92] Whether or not a pešer is a type of the midrash,[93] the pĕšārîm constitute a specific type of scriptural interpretation found among the Qumran texts.

The commentaries cite a set of scriptural passages to be explained in order. The length of the citation varies from commentary to commentary. The word pešer appears in some regular formulae[94] such as "the interpretation (pĕšar) of the passage concerns ..." or "the interpretation (pĕšar) of this passage is that ...". Then follows an inspired interpretation of the cited text.

The word "pešer" (from the root pšr, "a common Semitic root attested in Akkadian, Aramaic, Hebrew and Arabic) means 'loosen,' 'dissolve.'"[95] And, as we saw in Daniel, this term is closely connected with rāz, "mystery," or "secret," of the end-time. For the Teacher of Righteousness and his community the Scriptures were full of

secrets (rāzîm), and the task of the inspired interpreter was to uncover them. The pĕšārîm accordingly aimed to uncover the secrets (rāzîm), especially of prophetic oracles.

According to the pĕšārîm, the correct interpretation was only possible when the hidden meaning (rāz) was revealed to the interpreter. Habakkuk wrote down God's oracles concerning "that which would happen to the final generation" (1QpHab 7:1), but God did not allow him to know "when time would come to an end" (7:2). William Brownlee translates 7:2 "the fullness of that time" and notes that what was not made known to the prophet "was the entire content to which the enigmatic words really relate."[96] The prophetic oracles now became the mysteries (rāzîm) sealed until the end-time (cf. Dan 12:4, 9). The interpreter could decode the mystery only when the appointed time had come, and the concealed meaning for that time had been revealed to the interpreter. The community believes that now was the appointed time. The Teacher of Righteousness was the one "to whom God made known all the mysteries of the words of His servants the Prophets" (1QpHap 7:2; CD 1:12-13). Hence the readiness of scholars to call such interpretation "inspired."

This understanding of revelation is also found in Daniel. Dreams, visions and prophecies were conceived as mysteries (rāzîm), and Daniel could reveal their meaning

only with the help of divine inspiration. Similarly, revelation to the Teacher of Righteousness was the key to his inspired interpretation of the secrets of Scriptures. He often revised the plain meaning of the text to fit the picture given by revelation. In the idea of the pĕšārîm the Scriptures require a higher revelation at the end-time.[97]

The visionary account, which played so large a role in Daniel and the Apocalypses, is a rare phenomenon in the Dead Sea Scrolls.[98] The Testament of Amram (4Q Amram) and the New Jerusalem (5Q15) are rare examples attesting visionary accounts. This should not lead us to conclude mistakenly that visionary or other types of revelatory experience were not important for the Teacher of Righteousness and the covenanters. There are some pieces of evidence that the covenanters had undergone some revelatory experiences, and that the community conceived itself as a privileged elect chosen as the heavenly community for the end of time (1QM 10:8ff., 1QH 3:20ff., 11:13f. and 1QS 11:7f).[99] They differed from other apocalyptists only in that they put the accent on eschatological revelation itself, not the account. "In this regard, the scrolls depart from the conventions of the apocalypses, although the concept of mystery is very similar."[100] Here the Teacher of Righteousness is closer to prophetic than to apocalyptic tradition.

There are not many references to the Spirit as the source of inspiration in the Scrolls. There is a section on the two spirits in the Manual of Discipline (1QS 3-4). This section, however, is not immediately relevant to our subject because the work of the two spirits is not eschatological per se. There is no clear sign in this section alluding to the eschatological work of the Spirit.

We have, however, a few references to the role of the Spirit as the eschatological agent from the Hodayot (1QH 7; 9; 14; 16; 17). We are not completely sure whether the Teacher of Righteousness wrote all these hymns, but he was likely responsible for at least some or part of them. If we acknowledge this, it implies that the Teacher of Righteousness believed himself to have been endowed with the Spirit for his mission. It probably gave him a sense of election for the eschatological work which, in his case, meant to prepare his people for the coming judgment through the inspired interpretation of the Scriptures. The Spirit was the source of his inspiration and his confidence in his eschatological mission.

The search for the secrets of the Scriptures was not confined to the Teacher of Righteousness. Everyone who entered the community learned to "seek" and "search in His Laws to know the hidden things" (1QS 5:14-15). The covenanters kept watch "for a third of every night of the year, to read the Book and to study Law and to pray

together" (1QS 6:17). And, furthermore, there were those (called the Doreš ha-Tôrâ) specially appointed to the task: "And where the ten are, there shall never lack a man among them who shall study the Law continually, day and night" (1QS 6:16). These persons took up the task of the Teacher of Righteousness as interpreter; their work would be perfected by the Interpreter of the Law, the Doreš ha-Tôrâ par excellence, who was to arise with the Davidic Messiah at the end time (4QFlor 1:11; CD 7:18). Inspired interpretation of the Scriptures was the raison d'être of the whole community.

F. F. Bruce found four exegetical skills in the pĕšārîm: atomization (e.g., 1QpHab 5:1-12), textual variants (e.g., 1QpHab 8:8-13), allegorization (e.g., 1QpHab 11:17-12:5) and reinterpretation (e.g., 1QpHab 2:12-14).[101] The application of these skills reflects their view of the Scriptures as authoritative and meaningful in every part. Pešer continu, Jean Carmignac's term,[102] was an attempt to make the whole of Scripture relevant to the belief of the community. Here we may discern an underlying belief that now was the time of the end and that the whole of Scripture was a prediction for this time. The above mentioned skills were designed to resolve cognitive dissonance between the plain meaning of the texts and the expectation of the interpreter.

Typically, the Qumran pĕšārîm read the Scriptures

eschatologically: "the Essene sect was born into a world of eschatological ferment, of intense expectation of the end foretold by the prophets."[103] As attested in the Hodayot (1QH),[104] the Manual of Discipline (1QS) and the Pĕšārîm, the covenanters believed that they were already established in the eschatological era. The Teacher of Righteousness, beneficiary of the eschatological secrets (1QpHab 7:3-5), was himself the sign of the last aeon. But whereas the eschaton had been inaugurated, its final fulfillment would bring the appearance of the messianic figures (4QpIsa frs. 8-10),[105] the eschatological battle (1QM, 4QM), and the judgment of the wicked (1QpHab 5:3-6).

Intense eschatological belief dominated the self-understanding and biblical interpretation of the community. Hervé Gabrion has well summarized the relationships at Qumran among the eschatological expectation, self-understanding, and biblical interpretation.[106] In short, eschatological expectation led the covenanters to conceive of themselves as the eschatological remnant of Israel. They, and the Teacher of Righteousness in particular, believed that they were called to and elected for eschatological redemption. They accordingly waited for the accomplishment in their time of all eschatological prophecies. This is what made them search the Scriptures for the pĕšārîm of the rāzîm. Eschatologically-interpreted Scriptures in turn shaped their self-understanding and mode

of life.

The eschatological anthologies (pešer thématique) also show us some characteristics of Qumran interpretation. Among the best examples are fragments of the Florilegium (4QFlor) and the Melchizedek (11QMel). 4QFlor identifies the community with the eschatological Temple and announces the coming of the two Messiahs. In order to do this, the document assembles various of biblical texts with commentary to make one whole picture. For the Temple theme it assembles 2 Samuel 7:10 and Exodus 15:17-18; for the eternal annihilation of Satan, 2 Samuel 7:11; for the coming of the Messiahs, 2 Samuel 7:11-14 and Amos 9:11; for the eschatological destiny of the righteous and the wicked Psalm 1:1, Isaiah 8;11 and Ezekiel 44:10; for the rebellion of the nation at the end time Psalm 2:1 and Daniel 12:10. 11QMelch tells about the eschatological liberation by the heavenly deliverer Melchizedek on the day of Atonement at the end of the tenth Jubilee cycle. This document also assembles diverse scriptural texts to make the whole picture. For the Jubilee theme it cites Levites 25:13, Deuteronomy 15:2 and Isaiah 61:1; for the judgment of Satan, different passages from the Psalms (82:1; 7:7-8; 82:2); for the prophecies about the end-time, Isaiah (52:7; 61:2-3) and Daniel (9:25).

These two pĕšārîm thématiques attest the author's high degree of familiarity with the scriptural texts. Like the Apocalypses, these works were products of the minds

immersed in the Scriptures. Diversity of genre hardly counts. The pĕšārîm treat the Torah and the Psalter as they do the Prophets. If the Tannaim took the Prophets as Torah-books, the covenanters took the non-Prophetic books as prophecy. The Scriptures as a whole envisaged the secrets of the end-time.

The eschatological belief and self-understanding of the community also determined the use of the Scriptures in other genres, such as the Hymns, the Rules and the Narratives.[107] For example, the halakic interpretation of the community found mainly in the Cairo Damascus (CD) and the Manual of Discipline (1QS) reveals a high degree of "rigorism." The covenanters were expected to observe "all" the provisions in the Torah (1QS 1:8-9, 17; 5:1, 8, 9; 8:1, 15; etc.). Thus Matthew Black explained,

> The Age was an evil one moving to its end when it would fall under the catastrophic judgment of the Wrath of God. It was all the more necessary and urgent that this Remnant should keep the whole Law with perfect obedience.[108]

Their studies of the Torah were carried out with the purpose of discovering and embodying the life proper to eschatological Israel. The Torah-forschung of the community was a way to live the eschaton in the present and, at the same time, to prepare itself for the final completion.

Eschatological typology appears also in the narrative sections in the Cairo Damascus (e.g. CD 2:14-3:20) and the Words of the Heavenly Lights (4Q504).[109] These

writings situated the community at the end of Israel's election-history and drew on election-history in the Scriptures for types of the end-time events. The Isaiah Apocalypse, Joel, Daniel and the Pseudepigrapha with apocalyptic elements had already shown these traits, offering types such as the Creation, Noah's Flood, and the Exodus/Conquest. The covenanters applied this typology to the whole of life.[110] The location of the community in the "wilderness" was the result of such eschatological typology (see the Exodus tradition in 1QS 8:12-16; cf. Isa 40:3).

The Sign Prophets

The scriptural reading of Flavius Josephus was not eschatological, but the "Sign Prophets" whom he has reported on offer several significant clues to the eschatological scriptural reading at the time of Jesus.

An anonymous Samaritan at the time of Pilate (c. 36) led a crowd to follow him by claiming that he would show them the sacred vessels which were buried in Mount Gerizim (Ant. 18:85-87). It was a popular belief among the Samaritans, based on Deuteronomy 18:15, 18, that a prophet would come and discover the hidden vessels at the beginning of the eschaton.[111] The Samaritan prophet thus promised this discovery out of his conviction of the coming of the eschaton. From Josephus' report it seems that the Samaritan was serious about his claim. Pilate, however,

stopped him before his action. Josephus tells us nothing of the Samaritan's interpretation of the Scriptures. Nevertheless, the episode offers an example of the eschatological typology at the time of Jesus.

Josephus calls Theudas (Ant. 20:97-99; CE 44-48) a goēs, a pejorative term. It should, however, not mislead us. Theudas believed that he was a prophet (20:97). David Aune speculates that "in view of the rarity of that label during the late Second- Temple period, he must have regarded himself as an eschatological prophet."[112] This speculation finds support in Theudas' claim that he would part the Jordan River, a feat calculated to remind hearers of Joshua at the Jordan (Jos 3:1-17), an eschatological reinterpretation of the Exodus/Conquest: "It is clear that in some way Theudas anticipated a new, perhaps eschatological, action of deliverance by God, analogous to the ancient acts of redemption, the exodus and conquest."[113] In other words, Theudas saw himself as "a latter-day Joshua."[114] According to Luke (Acts 5:36), Theudas succeeded in persuading a multitude of about four hundred by this claim.

We now turn to an Egyptian prophet (Ant. 20:169-172; Bell. 2:261-263; Acts 21:38). Josephus' reports singled this returned Egyptian out of many goētes (Ant. 20:167-168; Bell. 2:258-259). The goētes led crowds to the wilderness and promised signs of God's deliverance. The theme

"wilderness" is also full of biblical associations.[115] It is one of the biblical themes frequently used in typological interpretation from the time of Deutero-Isaiah (40:3). It later became a favorite theme of eschatological typology in Second-Temple Jewish writings: God would start his eschatological deliverance in the wilderness. We may thus conclude that the eschatologically-oriented goētes appealed to such eschatological associations of the wilderness.

Like Theudas, the Egyptian defined himself as a "prophet." His claims were filled with eschatological implications. He led his followers "by the circuitous route from the desert to the mount called the Mount of Olives" (Bell. 2:262). There he promised that the walls of Jerusalem would fall down. The march "by the circuitous route from the desert" was itself a typological action recalling the Exodus/Conquest. The Mount of Olives was meant to evoke Zechariah 14:1-4, 9.[116] The prediction of the fall of the walls of Jerusalem recalled Joshua's feat at Jericho (Josh 6:1-21).[117] Evidently the prophet expected the eschaton to come at any moment. He understood himself to have been elected to a task for the eschaton. God, he believed, would start the work of deliverance through him.[118] The Egyptian expected to become king after the deliverance (Bell. 2:262). That is, he took himself to be the Messiah-designate.

From these examples some common patterns of thought

emerge. First, an eschatological self-understanding is clear. It is implicit in self-definition as "prophet" and in the claim to produce eschatological "signs." Josephus' pejorative term for them (goētes) should be understood in the light of his apologetic concern. The prophets, on the other hand, were "both convinced and convincing in their claim."[119]

Second, some kind of direct revelation was a theme available to all of them, whether as a result of a visionary or other kind of experience or simply of reading the signs of the time. These prophets firmly believed that God was about to act, and that they were chosen for a role in this coming event.

Third, their self-understanding led them to look to the Scriptures, and to find in them insight into their role in coming climactic events. Some of them believed that they would be the first beneficiaries of the deliverance. Others believed that they were chosen to take an active leading role in those events. In the process they drew on eschatological typology.[120]

Finally, they had considerable success in persuading the multitude. This means that the socio-political situation in the first half of the first century made the population vulnerable to eschatological claims: "Both prophets and followers were apparently acting on the firm conviction that they were about to participate in an act of

divine liberation."[121] This situation shows us the intensity of eschatological expectations in the time of Jesus.

3. Conclusion

We have concentrated our attention on the eschatological reading of the Scriptures in the Second-Temple period, especially the way in which the eschatologically-minded (our examples came from the later prophets, Daniel, the Pseudepigrapha with apocalyptic elements, the Dead Sea Scrolls, and the Sign Prophets depicted by Josephus) read the Scriptures, namely, as prophecy of the eschaton. These writings shared eschatological presuppositions which governed their reading, and this reading, in turn, affected their total mode of life and thought.

From this investigation, it becomes abundantly clear that one's eschatological conviction determined almost everything, one's self-understanding, life-style, mode of reading the Scriptures, and so on. If one comes under this conviction, one comes at the same time under the all-comprehensive and all-pervasive influence of that conviction. Those who entertained beliefs of this kind found themselves outfitted with a specific way of interpreting and applying the Scriptures. They share in the post-Exilic tradition of treating a large part of Israel's

scriptural heritage as prophecy awaiting its fulfillment in the eschaton. This expectation led an eschatological community or its leader to such a self-understanding as the remnant community or as the one elected for the eschatological task who is appointed by God as the point of the scriptural fulfillment. Such a self-understanding made them consciously seek for the fulfillment of the Scriptures and oriented their life and mission according to such expectations. Thus, their conception of their own vocation or mission mirrored their self-understanding. The enactment of eschatological typology is a good example. Actions and claims of the Sign Prophets are reflective of their self-understanding, and their self-understanding is based upon the eschatological reading of the Scriptures.

We also found that the eschatologically-minded understood the eschaton in the light of Israel's election-history. They expected the past salvific events of Israel's election-history to be re-enacted by Yahweh for the last time in the eschaton. Some of them viewed themselves in the light of the great figures of the past history. With such eschatological typology, they consciously sought to re-enact some miraculous events in the past history of election of Israel. They also took the soteriological themes in the Scriptures in the process of describing the eschaton. The soteriological themes concern the restoration of Israel. In their expectation, the eschaton was the time of the final

action of Yahweh which would complete the entire history of election. In other words, the eschaton was the goal of the previous history of election.

If Jesus shared in the beliefs and suppositions of the eschatologically-minded, the above discussion offers us a heuristic anticipation: Jesus too expected the Scriptures soon to come to fulfillment. If Jesus perceived his own eschatological vocation or ministry as "climactic" and "definitive," it becomes all the more probable that he believed the Scriptures to be headed for fulfillment in and through his ministry. This clearly has a significant bearing on our investigation of his self-understanding, the task to which we now turn.

END NOTES

1. See, for example, France, Jesus.

2. D. Moody Smith, "The Use of the Old Testament in the New", in The Use of the Old Testament in the New and Other Essays, [W. F. Stinespring Festschrift], ed. by James M. Efird (Durham: Duke University Press, 1972), p. 24.

3. Daniel Patte, Early Jewish Hermeneutic in Palestine (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1975), p. 2.

4. John Barton, Oracles of God: Perceptions of Ancient Prophecy in Israel after the Exile (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1986), p. 147.

5. Bruce Chilton, "Commenting on the Old Testament", in It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture, [Barnabas Lindars Festschrift], ed. by D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), p. 138. This conclusion is also found, among many, in Joseph Blenkinsopp, A History of Prophecy in Israel: From the Settlement in the Land to the Hellenistic Period (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1984), p. 256; idem, Prophecy and Canon: A Contribution to the Study of Jewish Origins (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1977), p. 108; Samuel Sandmel, Judaism and Christian Beginnings (New York: Oxford, 1978), p. 14.

6. Barton, Oracles of God.

7. Michael Fishbane, Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985).

8. Patte, Jewish Hermeneutics.

9. Barton, Oracles of God, p. 147.

10. G. F. Moore, Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927), I, 248.

11. David Aune, Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983), p. 340.

12. Moore, Judaism, I, 239.

13. For the canonical approach to the Scriptures, see B. S. Childs, Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979). For the criticism of B. Childs, see Barton, Oracles of God, pp. 149ff. and Reading the Old Testament: Method in Biblical Study (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1984), pp. 77ff., pp. 140ff.

14. Patte, Jewish Hermeneutic, p. 22.

15. Moore, Judaism, I, 248.

16. Barton, Oracles of God, p. 150.

17. Patte, Jewish Hermeneutic, pp. 122ff.

18. Numbers 25 and Phenehas were crucial for the self-understanding of the Zealots. See W. R. Farmer, Maccabees, Zealots and Josephus (New York: Columbia University Press, 1956), pp. 171-186; M. Hengel, Die Zeloten, 2nd edn. (Leiden: Brill, 1976), pp. 157-234; idem, The Atonement: The Origin of the Doctrine in the New Testament, trans. by J. Bowden (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981), p. 64.

19. Fishbane, Biblical Interpretation. According to him, there were 1) legal, 2) aggadic and 3) mantological interpretations.

20. Barton, Oracles of God. According to him, there were four modes of reading the prophecy: 1) prophecy as ethical instruction; 2) prophecy as prediction of the eschaton; 3) prophecy as revelation of divine plan; 4) prophecy as theological resource.

21. We shall use P. W. Barnett's term for the false prophets and the messianic pretenders reported by Josephus. See P. W. Barnett, "The Jewish Sign Prophets -- AD 40-70: Their Intentions and Origins", NTS 27 (1981), 679-697.

22. Otto Plöger, among many, names these passages "eschatological." See his Theocracy and Eschatology, trans. by S. Rudman (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1968). S. B. Frost calls them "Old Testament apocalyptic." See his Old Testament Apocalyptic: Its Origin and Growth (London: Epworth, 1952). Paul D. Hanson uses the terms "apocalyptic eschatology" for all of them, "proto-apocalyptic" for Ezekiel and Second Isaiah, "early apocalyptic" for Isaiah 55-66; 24-27; Joel and Malachi, "middle apocalyptic" for Zechariah 12 and 14 and "late apocalyptic" for 1 Enoch 6-11, Daniel 7-12 and subsequent compositions. See his The Dawn of Apocalyptic: The Historical and Sociological Roots of Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology, rev. ed. (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979) and "Apocalyptic Literature", in The Hebrew Bible and Its Modern Interpreters, ed. by D. A. Knight and G. M. Tucker (Chico: Scholars Press, 1985), pp. 465-488.

23. Eileen Schuller, Post-Exilic Prophets (Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1988), p. 141.

24. For the detailed study of the Isaiah Apocalypse, see William R. Miller, Isaiah 24-27 and the Origin of Apocalyptic (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1976); Bernard Duhm, Das Buch

Jesaja übersetzt und erklärt (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1922); J. Lindblom, Die Jesaja-Apocalypse. Jes. 24-27 (Lund: Gleerup, 1938), among many.

25. It was first noted by Duhm, Jesaja.

26. Frost, OT Apocalyptic, pp. 144, 157.

27. For the typological interpretation within the Old Testament, see Fishbane, Biblical Interpretation, pp. 350-379. He acknowledges that the "typology" is a anachronistic term but prefers to use it for some reasons. For the reasons, see ibid., p. 351.

28. Herman Gunkel, Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1895). See also, Gerhard von Rad, "Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament", in Essays on Old Testament Hermeneutics, ed. by Claus Westermann, trans. by J. L. Mays (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1964), p. 19.

29. For the Moses-typology of Jeremiah, see Blenkinsopp, History of Prophecy, pp. 159-160; Fishbane, Biblical Interpretation, p. 412.

30. See Frost, OT Apocalyptic, pp. 159-162.

31. See Lindblom, Jesaja-Apocalypse, p. 54.

32. Habbā'îm yašĕreš (Isa 27:6) is a variation of this formula. See Plöger, Theocracy and Eschatology, p. 71.

33. H. W. Wolff, Joel and Amos (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977); Ploger, Theocracy and Eschatology, 96-105; Frost, OT Apocalyptic, pp. 103-111; A. S. Kapelrud, Joel Studies (Lund: Gleerup, 1948); G. W. Ahlstroem, Joel and Temple Cult (Leiden: Brill, 1971).

34. Here I follow the Masoretic division.

35. Scholars agree on that the author had Numbers 11:29 in his mind. See Plöger, Theocracy and Eschatology, p. 102; Frost, OT Apocalyptic, p. 107; Fishbane, Biblical Interpretation, p. 374.

36. Cf. Fishbane, Biblical Interpretation, p. 374.

37. Ibid., pp. 55, 365.

38. Ibid., p. 371.

39. Ibid., p. 468.

40. See ibid., p. 468.

41. For the nature of the prophetic figures, see H. H. Rowley, "The Nature of Old Testament Prophecy in the Light of Recent Study", in The Servant of the Lord and Other Essays (London: Lutterworth, 1952), pp. 95-134; W. H. Schmidt, Zukunftsgewissheit und Gegenwartskritik: Grundzüge Prophetischer Verkündigung (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1973); G. M. Tucker, "Prophecy and Prophetic Literature", in The Hebrew Bible and Its Modern Interpreters, pp. 325-396; Claus Westermann, Prophetische Heilsworte im Alten Testament (Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987).

42. Fishbane and Russell are probably right when they guess that the prophecy may refer to Jeremiah's prediction about the attack from the north (4:6, 13). See ibid., p. 477 and D. S. Russell, The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1964), p. 191.

43. G. von Rad, The Message of Prophets, trans. by D. M. G. Stalker (New York: Harper & Row, 1965), p. 260.

44. For these introductory questions, see J. J. Collins, The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977); idem, Daniel with an Introduction to the Apocalyptic Literature (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984); L. F. Hartmann and A. A. Di Lella, The Book of Daniel (Garden City: Doubleday, 1978); Otto Plöger, Das Buch Daniel (Gütersloh: G. Mohn, 1965).

45. The first part is neither eschatological nor apocalyptic.

46. Collins, Daniel with an Introduction, p. 91.

47. See Collins, Daniel with an Introduction, pp. 90-91; idem., Apocalyptic Vision, pp. 185-187.

48. Fishbane, Biblical Interpretation, pp. 487-489.

49. Fishbane regards Jer 29:10 as a post-Exilic revision. See ibid., p. 480.

50. See ibid., pp. 489-491.

51. Ibid., p. 491.

52. Ibid., p. 491.

53. It might be also true for the Teacher of Righteousness. See The War Rule and Commentaries on Isaiah and Habakkuk.

54. H. L. Ginsburg, "The Oldest Interpretation of the Suffering Servant", VT 3 (1953), 181-89. His interpretation has been widely accepted. See Russel, Method of Apocalyptic, p. 188; Fishbane, Biblical Interpretation, p. 493; Collins, Daniel with an Introduction, p. 100.

55. Fishbane, Biblical Interpretation, p. 493.

56. For the similarity between the Danielic and The Qumran interpretations, see Collins, Apocalyptic Vision, pp. 78ff.; Maurya P. Horgan, Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books (Washington, DC: CBA, 1979), pp. 255-56.

57. For the discussion of these writings, see Klaus Koch, The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic (London: SCM, 1972); J. J. Collins, The Apocalyptic Imagination (New York: Crossroad, 1984); idem., (ed) Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre. Semeia 14 (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979); Russel, Method of Apocalyptic; Christopher Rowland, The Open Heaven (New York: Crossroad, 1984); J. M. Schmidt, Die jüdische Apokalyptik, 2nd ed. (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969).

58. As for the dating, we follow Collins: "The Similitudes, then, should be dated to the early or mid first century CE.... The Similitudes fully belong in the discussion of ancient Jewish apocalypticism" (Apocalyptic Imagination, p. 143).

59. Rowland, "Apocalyptic Literature", in It is Written, p. 171.

60. Aune, Prophecy in Christianity, p. 113.

61. Enno Janssen, Das Gottesvolk und seine Geschichte: Geschichtsbild und Selbstverständnis im palästinensischen Schrifttum von Jesus Sirach bis Jehuda ha-Nashi (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1971), p. 97.

62. Patte calls this use the "structural use." See his, Jewish Hermeneutic, p. 169.

63. Patte calls this use the "anthological use." See ibid., pp. 181ff.

64. Lars Hartmann, Asking for a Meaning: A Study of 1 Enoch 1-5 (Lund: Gleerup, 1979).

65. Collins, Apocalyptic Imagination, p. 64.

66. For the interpretive skills, see John C. Endres, Biblical Interpretation in the Book of Jubilees, (Washington, DC: CBA, 1987), pp. 198-225.

67. George W. E. Nickelsburg, Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981), p. 80.

68. Endres, Biblical Interpretation, p. 250. Here he cites J. A. Sanders, "Text and Canon: Concepts and Method", JBL 98 (1979), 23.

69. For the Oral Torah and the Secret Revelation, see Patte, Jewish Interpretation, pp. 151-153.

70. This is the title of the book whose author regards the appeal to the secret revelation as the main feature of the Apocalypses. See Rowland: "What we are faced with in apocalyptic, therefore, is a type of religion whose distinguishing feature is a belief in direct revelation of the things of God which was mediated through dream, vision or divine intermediary" (Open Heaven, p. 21).

71. See also Test. of Ash. 2:10; Test. of Levi. 5:4. For the history-of-religions discussion of the theme, see Martin Hengel, Judaism and Hellenism, trans. by John Bowden (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974), pp. 200-201.

72. Rowland, Open Heaven, pp. 11, 13, 14, 21.

73. Hengel's discussion about the three stages in the apocalyptic understanding of wisdom may be helpful in this connection. See his Judaism and Hellenism, pp. 207-8.

74. For the two types of the visionary experiences, see Janssen, Gottesvolk, pp. 88-96. For a more detailed analysis, see Collins, "Morphology of Genre."

75. For the history of scholarship of this subject, see Schmidt, Die jüdische Apocalyptik, pp. 47, 93-95, 172-173, 218-219, 279-281.

76. Collins, Apocalyptic Imagination, p. 30.

77. Hengel, Judaism and Hellenism, p. 207.

78. Russel, Method of Apocalyptic, pp. 158-77.

79. Patte, Jewish Hermeneutic, pp. 179-182.

80. Rowland, Open Heaven, pp. 61-70.

81. M. Stone, "Apocalyptic -- Vision or Hallucination", Milla wa-Milla 14 (1974), 47-56; Rowland, Open Heaven, pp. 214-47.

82. Rowland, Open Heaven, p. 66.

83. H. Gunkel, "Das vierte Buch Esra," in Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments, ed. by E. Kautzsch (Tübingen: Mohr, 1900), II, 342. Translation is mine.

84. For the "Entsprechung von Urzeit und Endzeit" in the Apocalypses, see Schmidt, Die jüdische Apocalyptik, pp. 221-25.

85. For the probable explanations of the pseudonymity, see Russel, Method of Apocalyptic, pp. 127-39; B. M. Metzger, "Literary Forgeries and Canonical Pseudepigrapha", JBL 91 (1972), 3-24; Collins, Apocalyptic Vision, pp. 64-74; Rowland, Open Heaven, pp. 61-70, 240-45.

86. Hengel, Judaism and Hellenism, p. 205. The emphasis is original. Cf. Patte, Jewish Hermeneutic, pp. 177-180.

87. Janssen, Das Gottesvolk, p. 96.

88. Patte, Jewish Hermeneutic, p. 180.

89. Janssen, Das Gottesvolk, p. 96. Translation is mine.

90. Ibid., p. 205.

91. G. Vermes, "Bible Interpretation at Qumran", ErIsr 20 (1989), 184-191.

92. The discussion of the pĕšārîm is found in the following works: Otto Betz, Offenbarung und Schriftforschung in der Qumransekte (Tübingen: Mohr, 1960); William H. Brownlee, The Midrash Pesher of Habakkuk (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979); Karl Ellinger, Studien zum Habakkuk-Kommentar vom Toten Meer (Tübingen: Mohr, 1953); Horgan, Pesharim; F. F. Bruce, Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1959).

93. For the view that the pĕšārîm are a new type of midrash, see William H. Brownlee, "Biblical Interpretation among the Sectaries of the Dead Sea Scrolls", BA 14 (1951), 54-76. This view has not won the consensus.

94. For the formulae, Horgan, "The Bible Explained (Prophecies)", in Early Judaism and Its Modern Interpreter, p. 249.

95. Horgan, Pesharim, p. 231.

96. Brownlee, Midrash Pesher, p. 110.

97. Collins, Apocalyptic Imagination, p. 121.

98. For this phenomenon, see P. Schulz, Der Autoritätsanspruch des Lehrers der Gerechtigkeit in Qumran (Meisenheim am Glan: Hain, 1974); Patte, Jewish Hermeneutic, pp. 217-18.

99. Rowland, Open Heaven, pp. 113-120.

100. Collins, Apocalyptic Imagination, p. 121.

101. Bruce, Biblical Exegesis, pp. 11-18. For further detailed description of the skills, see Horgan, Pesharim, pp. 244-55.

102. Jean Carmignac, "Le document de Qumrān sur Melkisedeq", RevQ 7 (1967-71), 343-78.

103. G. Vermes, The Dead Sea Scrolls in English, 3rd ed. (Hammondsworth: Pengine Books, 1975), p. 52.

104. For the eschatology of the Hodayot, see H. W. Kuhn, Enderwartung und gegenwartiges Heil: Untersuchungen zu den Gemeideliedern von Qumran (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966).

105. It has been well noted that the community expected two, or possibly three, Messiahs. See G. Vermes, The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspective (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977), pp. 182-88.

106. Hervé Gabrion, "L'interprétation de l'Ecriture dans la littérature de Qumrān" ANRW, II, 19.1 (1979), 804.

107. For this, see Patte, Jewish Hermeneutic, pp. 209-314.

108. Matthew Black, The Scrolls and Christian Origins: Studies in the Jewish Background of the New Testament (Chico: Scholars Press, 1983), p. 122.

109. For this, Patte, Jewish Hermeneutic, pp. 237-241, 291-293.

110. Ibid., p. 293.

111. For this, see Louis H. Feldman's note on Ant. 18:86.

112. Aune, Prophecy in Christianity, pp. 127-28. Emphasis is original.

113. R. A. Horsley and J. S. Hanson, Bandits, Prophets, and Messiahs (Minneapolis: Winston Press, 1985), p. 167.

114. Ibid., p. 128.

115. See chapter four.

116. Horsley and Hanson, Bandits, p. 170.

117. The fact that the prophet predicted the fall of the walls not of Jericho but of Jerusalem is not surprising if we consider 4Q Test. See Barnett, "Sign Prophets", p. 683.

118. It looks far-fetched to say as Barnett that the Sign Prophets intended to force God to start the eschatological action by their promise. See his "Sign Prophets", p. 688. It is more plausible that, on the contrary, they somehow came to the conviction that God was about to start his eschatological action through their signs.

119. Ibid., p. 688.

120. Horsley and Hanson, Bandits, p. 172.

121. Ibid., p. 171.

PART TWO:

ESCHATOLOGY AND JESUS

The task of this part of our study is to investigate how Jesus understood his mission. Did he understand his mission eschatologically? If so, how intense was his belief? How did he perceive the eschaton and his role in it?

In past history of the study of Christian origins, scholars have not paid due attention to the significance of Jesus' eschatological conviction. In Part One, we have seen that living with eschatological belief had an all-encompassing influence. Thus, if Jesus harboured eschatological convictions, we should take that as among the most crucial factors in shaping his self-understanding and mission.

According to the form critics, messianic exegesis derived from the post-Easter church and won universal recognition among the first believers. But the form critics did not succeed in finding a feasible explanation for the origin and success of this "messianic" development. As Albert Schweitzer and, later, Nils A. Dahl (among many others) have pointed out, there is no necessary bond between "resurrection" and "messiahship." We are confronted here by a kind of "missing link." We shall be able to supply that missing link if we can show that Jesus understood his

mission in eschatological and messianic terms.

This part consists of two chapters. First, we shall review arguments of some adversaries of the Weiss-Schweitzer thesis respecting the eschatological character of Jesus' view of the situation of the world and of Israel. Then, we shall take up a series of authentic traditions on Jesus in order to grasp how he understood his own ministry.

III

AN ORTHODOXY UNDER ATTACK: THE ESCHATOLOGICAL JESUS

In 1892 Johaness Weiss published a slim monograph on Jesus' proclamation of the Kingdom of God.[1] It was to have a crucial and lasting impact on New Testament scholarship. Weiss, it seemed, had rediscovered the transcendental nature of the Kingdom of God in Jesus' teaching. In opposition to earlier, Liberal lives of Jesus through the previous two centuries, Weiss insisted that we should view Jesus' sayings against their historical background. In his view, this was Jewish apocalyptic. His new approach issued in the conclusion that the Kingdom of God in Jesus' teaching was not a this-worldly utopian ideal of morality, but involved the intervention of God in the world. The Kingdom was not something we might "build" ourselves. It was rather something that we had to await and prepare for. This conclusion established a new foundation for subsequent historical-Jesus research: Jesus' "thoroughgoing eschatology."[2] Albert Schweitzer's eloquent assertion of this view in 1906[3] helped to create a general scholarly consensus and, eventually, an "orthodoxy"[4] in New Testament scholarship. It became a scholarly truism, though with many

qualifications,[5] that Jesus thought of his ministry as eschatological through and through.

This orthodoxy, however, has recently come under attack. The attack is not altogether new. There have always been scholars who raised serious questions about this topic since the days of Weiss and Schweitzer. It was long possible for the majority, however, to dismiss those questions and to launch their arguments, building on the assumption of the eschatological Jesus.[6] The situation has now changed. The attack has recently reached the point at which it no longer seems possible simply to assume the eschatological character of Jesus' proclamation and mission. Any thesis having to do with the eschatological consciousness of Jesus should take the question up, either to reveal the flaws of the opponents' negative arguments or to verify the eschatological character of Jesus through the study of data, or both. We shall pursue the former task here and leave the second for the next chapter.

Among representatives of the opposing trend, we shall deal with Norman Perrin, George B. Caird and Marcus Borg. In the present author's judgment they are among the most influential. If we can reveal that all three have serious flaws in their arguments, this will serve our limited, immediate purpose.

1. Norman Perrin:

God's Kingdom as Tensive Symbol

Norman Perrin's understanding of a non-eschatological Jesus stands mainly on two arguments: Jesus' use of the Kingdom of God as a tensive symbol and the secondary nature of the apocalyptic Son of man sayings. Perrin has had a considerable influence on those who have subsequently seen Jesus' proclamation as non-eschatological.

As for the former argument, Perrin surveys the history of the image of the Kingdom of God. According to his survey, its roots lie in the ancient Near Eastern myth of the kingship of God, celebrating the activity of God in the act of creation. The myth was subsequently combined with the amphictyonic Heilsgeschichte, celebrating the activity of God at crucial moments in Israelite history. The combination of the two originally separate entities resulted in the emergence of the symbol Kingdom of God.

> What happened was that the two myths came together to form one, the myth of God who created the world and is active on behalf of his people in the history of that world, and the symbol evolved to evoke that myth.[7]

Perrin defines "myth" with the help of Allan Watts: "a complex of stories -- some no doubt fact, and some fantasy -- which, for various reasons, human beings regard as demonstrations of the inner meaning of the universe and of human life."[8] He defines "symbol" with the help of Philip Wheelwright and Paul Ricoeur: "a relatively stable

and repeatable element of perceptual experience, standing for some larger meaning or set of meanings which cannot be given, or not fully given, in perceptual experience itself."[9] It is a function of symbol to evoke myth. The symbol "Kingdom of God" was calculated to evoke "the myth of a God who created the world and was continually active in that world on behalf of his people, with the emphasis upon the continuing activity of God."[10]

In this explanation the symbol "Kingdom of God" does not correspond to one single referent. Borrowing from Wheelwright, Perrin calls it a "tensive symbol," that is, the symbol having a set of meanings that can neither be exhausted nor adequately expressed by any one referent. The symbol "Kingdom of God," according to Perrin, had been used as a tensive symbol almost exclusively until the emergence of the apocalyptic movement in the fourth century BCE. Even during the subsequent period, its use as a "steno symbol" (i.e., symbol corresponding to one single referent) was not the only choice. Although steno-use was predominant, tensive use was also there. The Qaddiš prayer is a good example of the tensive use of the symbol at the time of Jesus.[11]

Jesus, according to Perrin's analysis, followed the Qaddiš tradition: He used the Kingdom of God as a tensive symbol and, in so doing, evoked the myth of the activity of God. The Kingdom of God did not correspond to any specific

single future event in Jesus' sayings. Perrin concludes that Jesus had no clear picture of the imminent end of the world. This was the product of the post-Easter church. The latter misunderstood the tensive symbol of God's Kingdom in Jesus' sayings as a steno symbol referring to the coming of the Son of man.[12]

However fascinating it may appear, Perrin's argument is not totally convincing. We should ask: Does Jesus' tensive use of the Kingdom of God exclude the possibility of his having a fairly defined picture of the future? In order to answer this question, we need to remember what a tensive symbol is. In Wheelwright's definition,[13] a tensive symbol has "a set of meanings that can neither be exhausted nor adequately expressed by any one referent." If we confine ourselves to Perrin's highly selective list of authentic Kingdom sayings, the Lord's Prayer, some proverbial sayings and parables,[14] and if we follow his analysis, it appears that the Kingdom of God in Jesus' sayings has multiple referents. Perrin concludes here, "An extended summary of Jesus' use of the Kingdom of God would be out of place."[15] Based upon this conclusion he prefers the term "symbol" to more conventional terms such as "idea" or "conception" for the Kingdom of God, because "to speak of Jesus' conception of the Kingdom is to imply that for Jesus the Kingdom of God evoked a consistent well-defined understanding of the nature and form of the activity of God represented by that symbolic

language."[16]

Does that, however, mean that Jesus could not have any clear idea of God's Kingdom? Does the fact that the referent of the symbol Kingdom of God is multiple mean that no actual vision of the Kingdom was in Jesus' mind? Obviously "Kingdom of God" is not a simple term in Jewish and Christian literature, but this does not automatically exclude the expectation of a coherently conceived Kingdom of God. It is well known that Jewish eschatological expectations were diverse and complex. All sorts of symbols and beliefs have been associated with their eschatological expectations. The "Kingdom of God" was one of a few terms which could encompass these diverse and complex expectations. We may accordingly call it a "tensive symbol." This, however, has little to do with the question of whether Jesus harboured coherent expectations of an actual future. John Collins[17] has shown that one with actual imminent, concrete expectations of the eschaton might well use the term "Kingdom of God" both as steno and tensive symbol. The argument that Jesus used the language as a tensive symbol cannot, then, serve as a counter-argument against the so-called orthodoxy of "the eschatological Jesus."

Now for Perrin's second argument. It is impossible to demolish the eschatological view of Jesus without attributing all the future Son of man sayings to the post-

Easter church. That is what Norman Perrin tried to do, especially in his book Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus.[18]

He begins by raising a question with respect to H. E. Tödt's monograph on the Son of man.[19] Todt assumed that there was a unified and consistent conception of the Son of man in Second-Temple Judaism. Perrin analyzes the relevant Jewish texts (Dan 7; 1 Enoch 70-71; 4 Ezra 13) in an effort to prove that Todt was wrong. Perrin concluded that there was no single, consistent conception of the coming of the Son of man before Jesus' time. What we have is merely "the imagery of Dan 7:13 being used freely and creatively by subsequent seers and scribes."[20]

He analyzed three groups of apocalyptic Son of man sayings in detail against this background:[21] 1) those clearly reflecting Daniel 7:13 (e.g., Matt 24:30//Mark 13:26//Luke 21:27; Matt 26:64//Mark 14:62//Luke 22:69); 2) the judgment sayings (e.g., Matt 10:32-33//Luke 12:8-9; Matt 16:27//Mark 8:38//Luke 9:26); 3) the comparison sayings (e.g., Matt 24:27//Luke 17:24; Matt 24:37-39//Luke 17:26-27; Matt 40//Luke 11:30). We may summarize the results of Perrin's analysis as following: 1) all the apocalyptic Son of man sayings are unauthentic; 2) the resurrection of Jesus regarded as ascension stimulated the early Christians to interpret it in terms of Daniel 7:13 and subsequently to identify Jesus with the Son of man; 3) the early Christians

then developed this belief to produce the apocalyptic Son of man sayings. Consequently, "Jesus could not have spoken of the coming of the Son of man, either in reference to himself or in reference to an eschatological figure other than himself."[22]

We shall address this question again in chapter five, and thus a few comments must suffice here. First, Perrin puts too much emphasis on the fact that there was no consistent conception of the Son of man before the time of Jesus. He repeatedly says: If that conception existed in late Judaism, Jesus could have alluded to it, but if not Jesus could not.[23] Here we see an example of the title-oriented approach which has proved itself to be unpromising. Scholars have now reached an almost unanimous consensus that there was no single, consistent conception of the Son of man in Second-Temple Judaism. That, however, is no reason to deny the possibility that Jesus could have employed the imagery of Daniel 7 in reference to the coming consummation. What really matters is not the use of the Son of man title before the time of Jesus but the creative use of the imagery of Daniel 7:13. As Perrin himself acknowledged, there were some independent cases where the imagery was employed in relation to the messianic figure. Furthermore, he admits that Jesus could have used "the imagery of Dan. 7:13 to express the concept of a future vindication of his ministry and of men's proper response to it."[24] If that was the

case, why should we not expect Jesus to use the imagery of the Son of man in relation to himself and his mission? When we take into account Jesus' high view of himself, the possibility of Jesus' use of the imagery becomes even clearer and more plausible.

Perrin gives us a strange statement about Jesus' conception of his future: "In all this we have the concept of a future vindication; but we have nothing of the form it will take, nor of the time element involved, except the fact that it is future."[25] If a large part of Jewish apocalyptic texts and, in particular, elements such as Daniel 7 and the Son of man imagery were known to Jesus, then we should ask how Jesus could have had such a firm conviction about his future and, at the same time, managed not to give it any form? The Jewish Apocalypses and even the Old Testament prophetic oracles are filled with diverse descriptions of the future. Is it reasonable to assume that one could derive a firm conviction about God's future from these texts, and yet totally bypass all other elements of its shape? Perrin answers affirmatively because such an answer meets the criterion of dissimilarity.[26] But if we draw on all indicators, it will appear more plausible that Jesus had both the conviction of God's future vindication and some idea of the shape it might take.

Perrin's systematic rejection of all the apocalyptic Son of man sayings as unauthentic is also liable to

reversal, if so much as one or two apocalyptic sayings out of the great number that exist prove to be authentic. In fact, the inadequacy and illegitimacy of the Bultmannian classification of the Son of man sayings (concerning his earthly ministry; concerning his suffering, death and resurrection; concerning his future works) and the systematic rejection of any group as a whole based upon this classification have long been noted and well accepted.[27] Perrin's own arguments fail to satisfy a critical reader.

2. George B. Caird: Eschatology as Metaphor

George B. Caird has likewise had a strong influence in promoting a non-eschatological view of Jesus. Indeed, he has provided a key stepping-stone for the recent trend, basing his argument on the metaphorical character of biblical eschatological language. This, Caird thought, held true for all Jewish and Christian writings.

Caird begins with the biblical expressions "the latter end of the days" and "the day of the Lord." According to his analysis, these phrases were intended to refer not to the literal end of the world but to contemporary crises such as the overthrow of Babylon, the annihilation of Edom or the wasting of Judah by a plague of locusts. None of the biblical writers believed that such a crisis constituted an actual or literal end of the world.

In other words, "they were using the term as metaphor."[28]

Why did they prefer metaphorical language to factual? According to Caird, this accorded with the prophets' unique historical perspective:

> The prophets looked to the future with bifocal vision. With their near sight they foresaw imminent historical events which would be brought about by familiar human causes; for example, disaster was near for Babylon because Yahweh was stirring up the Medes against them (Isa 13:17). With their long sight they saw the day of the Lord; and it was in the nature of the prophetic experience that they were able to adjust their focus so as to impose the one image on the other and produce a synthetic picture.[29]

Eschatological language understood as metaphor was most serviceable to this prophetic perspective. The prophetic "bifocal vision" and "synthetic technique" were shared, Caird said, by all the prophets and the apocalyptists like the authors of Daniel and 4 Ezra. Jesus, Paul and other New Testament writers (including the author of the Revelation) also knew and used that technique. Together with prophetic vision and technique, Jesus borrowed the language of eschatology as metaphor. Literal interpretation of biblical eschatological language is an error due to "some blurring of the edges between vehicle and tenor on the part of the speaker" (Caird's Proposition 3).[30]

In this view, Jesus was not a (or the) eschatological figure in any literal sense. Even when Jesus predicted the imminent coming of the Son of man he actually had in his mind a coming decisive disaster to Jerusalem.[31]

Jesus' eschatology was not different from that of prophets like Jeremiah. They all believed that the entire world would come to an end some day (Caird's proposition 1)[32] but they did not expect that day to be imminent. For Jesus as for the prophets, what was imminent was a crisis for Israel. Jesus employed eschatological language to refer to such an event (Caird's proposition 2).[33] The Jesus-movement, or Christianity in its beginnings, was not an eschatological movement, as many groundlessly assume. The assumption is attributable to the post-Easter church's misunderstanding of the symbolic nature of the biblical eschatological language.

What has Caird done here? He has identified the metaphorical character of eschatological language at some places in the Bible and pressed the insight to cover all biblical uses of eschatological language. By way of response, we should make the point that expectation of the eschaton as universal and final does exist in the later Old Testament writings. It follows that the use of eschatological language in pre-Apocalyptic texts must not be predicated, without further ado, of all texts without exception. A universal and final eschaton is specifically supposed by the apocalyptic parts of Daniel. New Testament texts, which exhibit the traits of expectation of an imminent consummation (Naherwartung) are to be read against this background. Dale C. Allison, Jr. forcefully makes the point:

> Few scholars would agree that the decisive revelation of God's eschatological Kingdom is no near prospect in the Synoptics or Paul, and this entails a reading different from that of Caird. When a document depicts the present or immediate past in apparently eschatological terms, talk of metaphor is appropriately only if the redemption remains distant; for ... if it is thought to be proximate, the present becomes the time immediately before the redemption and hence naturally draws to itself the language of eschatology. It has nothing to do with metaphor.[34]

We shall show below that Jesus understood the eschaton as the "last act" to be already operative in the present.[35] Jesus and possibly John had inaugurated it (Matt 11:12-13//Luke 16:16). Its consummation would be soon -- "in" or "after three days." Jesus conceived the referents or objects of eschatological language in a proper rather than a metaphorical sense.

We should recall that in Second-Temple Judaism catastrophic events such as the destruction of the temple or the political downfall of a superpower were readily taken to be the beginning of the end. Prior to the era of apocalyptic eschatology, eschatological language might be used to describe some crucial historical event metaphorically. But when apocalyptic eschatology imposed itself, a visionary with end-time expectations was liable to take any significant event as an initial fulfillment of that expectation. This was true of Second-Temple Judaism for over a century before the time of Jesus.[36] We have noted in the previous chapter, for instance, that the Sign Prophets easily won public attention whenever a crucial

historical event happened to Israel or the superpowers.[37] We should also note that the apocalyptic literature posits the eschatological drama as consisting of a series of events including the destruction of the superpower and the restoration of Israel.[38] Therefore, in Second-Temple Judaism, even when a visionary refers to a historical event in eschatological language, it is often true that he employs the language not as a metaphor. He uses that language because the event was perceived as initial stage in the eschatological drama.

Second, Caird's error was mainly due to his application of the earliest use of eschatological language to later texts. He observes that the "day of the Lord" in the Old Testament does not have an eschatological connotation in any literal sense.[39] He takes for granted that the phrase was used in the same way throughout the whole period. He does not see any changes in its use between the Assyrian period and the Greco-Roman period, despite the great length of time between those periods. It is more reasonable to assume some changes in its usage.

The expectation of development and change is confirmed by a reading of the relevant passages. Such a reading has been well done, for example, by Yair Hoffmann.[40] Hoffmann sees two methodological errors in earlier studies of the phrase. First, a distinction between the phrase the "day of the Lord" (yôm yahweh) and several

related expressions (e.g., "the day of his fierce anger," "that day is the Lord's," etc.) has not been clearly made. Second, a relatively early usage has often been applied to the later texts. Hoffmann says,

> The possibility that the concept of DOL [the Day of the Lord] did change and develop in the course of time must not be disregarded. It is quite plausible that the meaning of yôm yahweh in Amos's time was not the same as in Zephaniah's or Ezekiel's day.[41]

Based upon this observation, Hoffmann starts his study with the expression yôm yahweh in Amos 5:18-20 which is, according to him, a non-eschatological concept (not a term) referring to "theophany." Theophany here means "a special and exceptional intervention in the current stream of events."[42] Whether or not there was eschatology in Amos's time, it is at least clear that this concept was not a part of it.

When we come to Zephaniah 1:1-18 (some 150 years after Amos) we find that the expression has become an eschatological term referring to the final judgment (or salvation) by Yahweh. In contrast to Amos 5:18-20, the scope is universal (v. 2 "I will utterly sweep away everything from the face of the earth"; v. 3 "I will cut off mankind from the face of the earth"; v. 18 "for a full, yea, sudden end he will make of all the inhabitants of the earth") and the crisis is definitive (repeated use of the verbs "consume" and "annihilate"; "a full, yea, sudden end"). What was expected by Zephaniah was not just a

crucial event happening to Israel but rather the definitive and climactic action of Yahweh for the whole creation. The term yôm yahweh is clearly eschatological. Robert R. Wilson thus said, "Zephaniah's ideas about the Day of Yahweh develop those found in Amos, Isaiah, and Micah."[43]

We find such a developed idea of the "day of the Lord" in Joel which we saw in the previous chapter (e.g., Joel 2:1; 3:4; 4:14). As previously noted, the scope of the picture is definitive and universal. It is clear from these chapters that the term (the "day of the Lord") took an eschatological meaning in the later period. It is, however, still not clear exactly when and how firmly this term had established itself as an eschatological term in the post-Exilic period. We can thus confirm this much with certainty: the term was given eschatological connotations by some prophets in the post-Exilic period. Caird's blanket interpretation cannot stand for this reason. Presumably we may infer that the process of eschatologization of the term was completed within the era of "Daniel," i.e., of the Maccabees.[44] Its usage in the New Testament (2 Thess 2:1-12; 2 Pet 3:1-18) shows us that the term had already become eschatological.

3. Marcus J. Borg:
A Mystical Eschatology

One of Caird's students, Marcus J. Borg, has become

an articulate opponent of the eschatological view of Jesus.[45] Drawing on the works of Perrin and Caird, Borg has mounted a serious attack on "one of the prevailing orthodoxies of New Testament scholarship in this century,"[46] that is, the eschatological Jesus.[47] It seems that more and more scholars have felt the force of his campaign. Having conducted a poll among selected groups of New Testament scholars,[48] Borg declared, "the consensus regarding Jesus' expectation of the end of the world has disappeared."[49] Whoever wishes to maintain the eschatological view of Jesus is thus obliged to deal with Borg's formidable attack.

Borg rejects the "end-of-the-world-Jesus" on three grounds: 1) The results of the recent study of the socio-political setting of Jesus suggest that Jesus was a son of his age; his intention was historically oriented and conditioned, 2) there is virtually no exegetical basis in Jesus tradition for the eschatological Jesus, 3) the Gestalt of the non-eschatological Jesus is far more comprehensive and convincing.[50]

As far as the first objection is concerned, it seems that Borg considers eschatological concern and political consciousness as mutually exclusive.[51] Borg's assertion that Jesus was concerned with the fate of Israel is a point well taken. The larger issue, however, is the recovery of the horizons in which Jesus conceived Israel, its fortunes

and fate. Was his attention drawn to this issue of Israel's fate by broad and comprehensive concerns like those of the literary prophets, or by a narrower, more immediately focused religio-political view? Borg proposes that eschatological preoccupations have neglected socio-political aspects of Jesus, and that out of a more socio-political orientation, a fuller, more realistic, picture of Jesus will emerge.

There is no doubt that a totally different view of Jesus can be worked out by drawing on a limited number of texts and giving them a distinctive contour. On this basis, coherent (i.e., internally coherent) views of Jesus can be produced ad infinitum. The real test is whether the sum total of the data of the Gospels yield or can be made to yield an image of Jesus that corresponds to Borg's non-eschatological, socio-political hypothesis. If judged by the criteria of the logic of positive investigation (i.e., investigation that intends more than a limited, negative conclusion), Borg's work appears to be defective.

There is a sense in which Jesus surely was a son of his age; an investigation that could not set him in the plausible context of what we know of his age would surely be suspect. Unfortunately, Borg's first point is a heuristic expectation that many hypotheses -- including the eschatological view of Jesus -- adequately meet. As for whether the eschatological view is well-grounded

exegetically, that remains to be seen at some length and in some detail. Respecting the fuller Gestalt (concrete form of Jesus taken as a whole) to emerge from a more comprehensive investigation of the Synoptic texts,[52] that is a hopeful expectation that Borg's work meets to a limited extent. Whose view -- that of Borg, or that of the works he criticizes -- provides the fuller and more satisfactory Gestalt remains to be seen.

There are, in any case, some problems with Borg's reconstruction. One relates to the application of modern categories (suggested by the phenomenology or sociology of religion) which were not at home among the ancients.[53] Borg's three-fold or four-fold categories may help moderns to understand ancient phenomena, but whether this understanding can be verified in the data remains an open question. Hypotheses are useful, indeed necessary; but they must be verified. The labor of projecting a hypothesis will be merely love's labor lost if verification is not forthcoming. It may be possible for us to understand Jesus according to the categories that Borg proposes; but this, of itself, proves nothing.

There is a second problem, which relates to Borg's use of the term "eschatological prophet." Borg sees only one function for the category of eschatological prophet: "proclaiming the imminent end."[54] It is unclear from where he has taken this category. It is a misleading

simplification of the eschatological view of Jesus to use this ambiguous term in such a narrow sense.

Furthermore, if we take into account the category of the "Messiah," new functions are to be expected. Exactly what they would be is difficult to set out in advance. On the other hand, there is no need to set them out in advance. We should simply be aware of the main characteristics of the category of the "Messiah," and should allow for the diversity of the Jewish messianic expectations in that period. It is perfectly possible to locate major features of data on Jesus in relation to Jewish messianic expectations. Indeed, we should observe that some of the features belonging to the three or four categories espoused by Borg can be related to the messianic expectations of that time. Examples include: a special relationship with God, authority and power (a holy man), transcendent wisdom (a sage) and intense concern for the fate of Israel (a prophet).[55]

Let us return for a moment to Borg's second objection against the eschatological Jesus. It is based upon his study of the Synoptic threat tradition and the Son of man tradition. His detailed analysis of the Synoptic threat tradition[56] is competent and potentially helpful. Borg concludes that the imminent expectation of the end of the world is not found in this tradition. In the threats pointing to the imminent crisis, the end of the whole world

is not envisaged. Envisaged is Israel's crisis. Jesus predicted the imminent but contingent destruction of Israel because of her wrong orientation for the quest of holiness. This came from Jesus' prophetic insight into the fate of Israel. On the other hand, when Jesus mentions the Last Judgment, there is no sense of imminence. Jesus thus did not combine these two: 1) the imminent crisis and 2) the end of the whole world.

The premises of this conclusion, however, must not be allowed to explain away the copious Son of man tradition. Here the imminent expectation of the eschaton is evident. Borg does away with this hurdle far too easily, by simple appeal to Perrin's thesis that the apocalyptic Son of man sayings were the product of the post-Easter church.[57] By comparison with his meticulous analysis of the Synoptic threat tradition, his analysis of the Son of man sayings is disappointing. He merely dismisses the tradition as a whole. Serious detailed analysis is conspicuously lacking. Since a classic, widely accepted analysis concluding to the non-historicity of the Son of man sayings as a whole is not available, this lacuna in Borg's argument is a severe defect.

At places, Borg reveals his uneasy awareness of this situation. He is not able to deny this element altogether, banishing it totally from the authentic Jesus tradition.[58] Despite his efforts to get rid of the futurist element,

there remains a group of sayings whose authenticity he is forced to acknowledge. Again, however, Borg dismisses their significance, pointing to their narrow base. He offers the following explanation of why and how the narrow base has become the foundation of Jesus studies:

> Though a very narrow base, it [the imminent eschatological expectation] becomes very broad by a series of extensions: first, to other passages which speak of the coming Son of man; second, the imminence is extended to those passages which do speak of a last judgment, so that it becomes imminent; and finally, the combined elements of imminence and universal world collapse and renovation are extended to that large category of threats of unidentifiable content. The crisis of which Jesus spoke is thus affirmed to be the final crisis of history.[59]

How "narrow" the base is remains to be discussed. But even if Borg were correct about this "narrow base," the significance of each tradition must be determined on its own merit. The quantity of the tradition is not necessarily decisive. Let us suppose that we have only two authentic statements of the expectation of an imminent end. This narrowly based ascertainment would be enough to wreck the hypothesis. In other words, if Jesus revealed his expectation of the future in any form, however rare the occasions might be, all his future sayings would need to be integrated into the matrix of that expectation.

Borg's effort to separate the fate of Israel from that of the whole world is also unconvincing. Jesus, he says, primarily warned of the imminent destruction of Israel. This derived from his prophetic insight. But here

Borg overlooks the fact that pious Jews in Second-Temple period saw the fate of Israel as decisive for the whole world. The initiating event in the eschatological drama was precisely the cleansing and restoration of Israel.[60] If, then, Jesus foresaw a crucial event for Israel in the near future, it is probable that it would signal further events destined to impinge on the whole world.

Throughout his work Borg gives the impression that imminent expectation of the end of the world is the sole criterion of "eschatological expectation." In his analysis of the Synoptic threat tradition and the Son of man sayings, the sole aim is to seek out any trace of the <u>imminent expectation of the end of the world</u>. His conclusion is: There is none. He then aligns himself with Caird and Perrin in defining Jesus' eschatology as "an eschatological mysticism (a mysticism which used language associated with the end of the world) or a mystical eschatology (an eschatology in which the new age was the other realm of mystical communion)."[61]

But the imminent expectation of the end of the world is neither the sole criterion nor the core element of Jewish eschatology. The synopsis drawn up by John Collins[62] shows this. The expectation of the destruction of the world is rarely present even in apocalyptic eschatology.[63] The only element common to all fifteen apocalypses is the judgment/ destruction of the wicked. It implies an over-systematizing

on Borg's part. It need not follow that the absence of the imminent end of the world signifies a merely mystical eschatology. Thus, even if Borg were correct in insisting on the absence of imminence, he should still prove the absence of other, equally essential eschatological features in order to argue for a "non-eschatological Jesus."

Eschatology is rich. It is irreducible to belief in the imminent end. The eschatological prophet is not one who merely announces that end. Borg's whole effort runs the risk of reductionism. Jesus consciously stood at the threshold of a great drama. Reductionist accounts of eschatology risk reducing the sense and significance of that drama.

4. Conclusions

What becomes increasingly clear is that there are still many high hurdles which must be removed if we are to see Jesus' proclamation and ministry as non-eschatological. To mention just a few of them, the phrase "Kingdom of God," the existence of authentic future Son of man sayings, many sayings and deeds of Jesus only explicable in eschatological context (e.g., the Institution of the Twelve, sayings on discipleship, the Entry into Jerusalem, and the Temple Cleansing, etc.). Some of them may be interpreted in non-eschatological or figuratively eschatological sense, but not all, not even most of them. Perrin, Caird and Borg all

failed. The Weiss-Schweitzer thesis of the eschatological Jesus, though in need of complementary contributions, still stands.

It is not, however, sufficient for our purposes to show that the opponents of the eschatological view of Jesus are unsuccessful. We need a positive treatment of the evidence of the Gospels to retrieve the eschatological dimensions of Jesus' mission.

END NOTES

1. Johaness Weiss, Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1892). English translation of the first edition (2nd edition appeared in 1900) was published in 1971: Jesus' Proclamation of the Kingdom of God ed. and trans. by R. H. Hiers and D. L. Holland (London: SCM, 1971).

2. This term implies the "thoroughgoingly transcendental and apocalyptic character" of Jesus eschatology. See Weiss, Jesus' Proclamation, p. 129.

3. Albert Schweitzer, Von Reimarus zu Wrede (Tübingen: Mohr, 1906). English translation: The Quest of the Historical Jesus, trans. by W. Montgomery (New York: MacMillan, 1961).

4. I borrow this expression from Marcus Borg. See his "An Orthodoxy Reconsidered: The 'End-of-the-World Jesus'", in The Glory of Christ in the New Testament: Studies in Christology, [G. B. Caird Festschrift], ed. by L. D. Hurst and N. T. Wright (Oxford: Clarendon, 1987), pp. 207-17.

5. Some major works on the nature of Jesus' eschatology since the time of Weiss and Schweitzer: C. H. Dodd, The Parables of the Kingdom (London: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1935); J. A. T. Robinson, Jesus and His Coming (London: SCM, 1957); W. G. Kümmel, Promise and Fulfillment, trans. by D. M. Barton (London: SCM, 1957); E. Jügel, Paulus und Jesus (Tübingen: Mohr, 1962); Joachim Jeremias, New Testament Theology I, trans. by John Bowden (London, 1971); E. Grässer, Die Naherwartung Jesu (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1973); Norman Perrin, Jesus and the Language of the Kingdom (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976).

6. Borg went too far when he said, "Very few scholars have been willing to follow them [Weiss and Schweitzer] in the immediacy which they attach to the expectation of the end." See his Conflict, Holiness, and Politics in the Teachings of Jesus (Toronto: Edwin Mellen Press, 1984), p. 9.

7. Perrin, Jesus and Language, pp. 20-21.

8. Ibid., p. 22.

9. Ibid., p. 29.

10. Ibid., p. 22.

11. Ibid., pp. 28ff.

12. Ibid., pp. 32ff.

13. Philip Wheelwright, Metaphor and Reality (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1962), p. 92.

14. Perrin, Language of Kingdom, pp. 41ff.

15. Ibid., p. 56.

16. Ibid., p. 34.

17. John J. Collins, "The Symbolism of Transcendence in Jewish Apocalyptic", Papers of the Chicago Society of Biblical Research 19 (1974), 12-22. Here he demonstrates that one symbol may work both symbolically (tensive) and literally (steno) in Jewish apocalyptic texts.

18. Norman Perrin, Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus (New York: Harper & Row, 1976).

19. H. E. Tödt, The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition, trans. by D. M. Barton (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1965).

20. Perrin, Rediscovering, p. 172.

21. Ibid., pp. 173-199.

22. Ibid., p. 198.

23. Ibid., pp. 175, 198. By the term "late Judaism," Perrin means "Early Judaism" or "Second-Temple Judaism." Perrin's term should be avoided for its implied pejorative tone.

24. Ibid., p. 198.

25. Ibid., p. 198. See also p. 203.

26. See ibid., p. 198: "This is so different from Jewish apocalyptic, and from the early Church, that it demands careful attention." For the criterion of dissimilarity, see E. Käsemann, Essays on New Testament Themes, trans. by W. G. Montague (London: SCM, 1964), pp. 15-47.

27. For Bultmann's classification, see his Theologie des Neuen Testaments (Tübingen: Mohr, 1977), pp. 31-32. For criticism on this methodology, see Morna Hooker, The Son of Man in Mark (London: SPCK, 1967), p. 80; A. Yarbro Collins, "The Origin of the Designation of Jesus as 'Son of Man'", HTR 80 (1987), 395-96.

28. G. B. Caird, The Language and Imagery of the Bible (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1980), p. 258.

29. Ibid., p. 258.

30. Ibid., p. 256.

31. Ibid., p. 266.

32. Ibid., p. 256: "The biblical writers believed literally that the world had a beginning in the past and would have an end in the future."

33. Ibid., p. 256: "They regularly used end-of-the-world language metaphorically to refer to that which they well knew was not the end of the world."

34. See Dale C. Allison, Jr. The End of the Ages Has Come: An Early Interpretation of the Passion and Resurrection of Jesus (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985), p. 88.

35. See the next chapter.

36. For eschatological fever at the time of Jesus, see Horsley and Hanson, Bandits: "It [Messianic expectation] certainly reemerged in vigorous form just before and after the life of Jesus of Nazareth. In response to foreign domination, severe repression, and illegitimate Herodian kingship peasant attempts to set things right took the form of Messianic movements." (p. 131)

37. For the social and ideological conditions leading to the Messianic movement, see Horsley & Hanson, Bandits, pp. 102-110. For the Sing Prophets, see chapter two.

38. The Psalms of Solomon 17 may be a typical example: the destruction of the unrighteous (vv.21-25), the restoration of Israel (v.26), the reward for Israel (vv.26-28), the judgment of the Gentiles (v.29-30), the purification of Jerusalem (v.30b), the pilgrimage of the Gentiles (v.31), and so on. All those events are seen as occurring one after another.

39. Gerhard von Rad precedes Caird in this observation. See von Rad, Message of Prophets, pp. 95-99. "The concepts connected with the Day of Yahweh are, therefore, in no way eschatological per se ..." (99).

40. Yair Hoffmann, "The Day of the Lord as a Concept and a Term in the Prophetic Literature", ZAW 93 (1981), 37-50; cf. G. R. Beasley-Murray, Jesus and the Kingdom of God (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986), pp. 11-16; 43-45; For a more detailed discussion, see D. A. Gray, "The Day of the Lord and Its Culmination in the Book of Revelation" (Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation: University of Manchester, 1974).

41. Hoffmann, "Day of the Lord", p. 39.

42. Ibid., p. 44.

43. Robert R. Wilson, Prophecy and Society in Ancient Israel (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980), p. 280; See also, Hoffmann, "Day of the Lord", p. 46.

44. For the use of this term in the apocalyptic literature, see Beasley-Murray, Jesus, pp. 43-45.

45. Borg, Conflict; idem., "A Temperate Case for a Non-Eschatological Jesus", Foundation & Facets Forum 2,3 (1986), 81-102; "An Orthodoxy Reconsidered"; Jesus A New Vision: Spirit, Culture, and the Life of Discipleship (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1987).

46. Borg, "Orthodoxy Reconsidered", p. 208.

47. The exact term which Borg uses is "the end-of-the-world Jesus." Here he leaves the impression that he identifies eschatological belief with belief in the imminent end of the world. As we will see later, eschatological belief should not be taken in this narrow way.

48. For the result of the two polls which he conducted in 1986, see Borg, "Temperate Case", pp. 99-100; see also his Jesus, p. 20, n. 25.

49. Borg, Jesus, p. 14.

50. Borg's arguments are concisely presented in his article, "Orthodoxy Reconsidered."

51. Borg, Conflict, pp. 8-13.

52. Borg, "Orthodoxy Reconsidered", pp. 214-17.

53. For the problems of this kind of attempt, see Martin Hengel, The Charismatic Leader and His Followers, trans. by James Greig (New York: Crossroad, 1981), p. 69.

54. Borg, "Orthodoxy Reconsidered", p. 217.

55. For the fact that those features are not mutually exclusive and that all of them are covered by the category of the "messianic prophet," see Hengel, Charismatic Leader, pp. 44-50.

56. See his Conflict, pp. 201-21.

57. Ibid., pp. 221-27.

58. Ibid., pp. 213, 226.

59. Ibid., pp. 213-14.

60. We saw that his teacher G. B. Caird reveals the same problem.

61. Borg, Conflict, p. 261.

62. This synopsis appears in John Collins, "The Jewish Apocalypses", Semeia 14 (1979), 28 and idem., Apocalyptic Imagination, p. 6.

63. According to the synopsis, 2 Enoch, 1 Enoch 1-36, the Apocalypse of Weeks and possibly the Apocalypse of Zephaniah contain the destruction of the whole world in their eschatological drama. For this, see Rowland, Open Heaven: "Eschatology has connotations of the end of history, and, while it is certainly true that many Jews looked forward to the end of the present world-order, it would not be correct to suppose that the end of the world was the essential element of the Jewish hope for the future" (p. 2). See also von Rad, Message of Prophets, pp. 90-91.

IV

ESCHATOLOGICAL CHARACTER OF JESUS' MINISTRY

In the previous chapter we saw that recent efforts to refute the eschatological character of Jesus' mission have not succeeded. Once we have gathered and weighed all the evidence, this eschatological thesis remains among the firmest results of New Testament scholarship since Johannes Weiss. Jesus thought, lived, acted and died in a context of eschatological expectation.

In order to measure up to this thesis, however, we shall take up here the task of analyzing traditions on Jesus which are arguably authentic and relevant to Jesus' eschatology. In so doing, we hope to avoid the pitfalls of the two types of approaches which have long been employed in the historical study of Jesus. One is the sayings-based approach represented by Rudolf Bultmann and Günther Bornkamm.[1] This approach takes the sayings (on the reliability of which both were in some measure skeptical) as the appropriate evidence of Jesus' horizons and perspectives. E. P. Sanders[2] represents another approach. He takes the evidence of Jesus' actions to be more reliable than the sayings. Avoiding both of these strategies, we shall take a third approach. It is to assess the data of

words and actions together. An example of critical openness to "word," together with a keen appreciation of the special significance of symbolic action, is the work of Heinz Schurmann.[3]

We shall focus on three solid data on Jesus. First, Jesus' sayings and actions in relation to John the Baptist; second, his sayings and actions in relation to his followers, including the twelve; and, third, his sayings and actions in relation to the Spirit. The solidity of these data is guaranteed by a series of considerations, which we shall review below.

1. Traditions on Jesus and John the Baptist

That Jesus in the initial period of his ministry had significant contact with John the Baptist is not open to serious doubt.[4] We may especially point to two reasons in support of this consensus. First, the Gospel texts show Jesus' affirmation of John, without striking the note of the superiority of Jesus' own mission. The tendency of the later tradition, especially in the Lukan and Johannine writings, is to subordinate John the Baptist to Jesus. There is accordingly a certain discontinuity between the character of the texts on John and Jesus and the tendency of the later (especially, but not exclusively, Lukan and Johannine) tradition. Second, the data on John and Jesus are copious; we meet them through all the main currents of

tradition and in many forms. This rooting of data on John in the Jesus tradition is far too deep, too detailed, too free of Tendenz to be adventitious. We cannot separate the two figures without doing violence to our available data. Thus, Ragner Leivestad among many says: "the question of who Jesus thought he was cannot be asked without taking into consideration that there were two individuals who appeared on the scene at about the same time, and that there are several factors which link them to each other."[5]

John the Baptist

How should we understand the significance of this relationship? We are probably well advised to begin with an effort to grasp who the Baptist was and what he intended to do. Among the clues to an answer: data on John the Baptist such as his choice of the wilderness, his life-style, his message of the coming wrath and of the "coming one," and, most significantly, a unique baptismal rite.

As for the Baptist's choice of "wilderness" as the scene of his ministry, Murphy O'Connor, drawing on geographical data, asks,

> Why would the Baptist have chosen a place that was difficult for individuals, impossible for mass baptism, and virtually inaccessible during the one season in the year when he could expect people to come to him, namely, the relative cool winter months?[6]

The implication is surely that the Baptist deliberately chose the wilderness as the proper place for his ministry.

What then was that deliberate intention?

An obvious point of departure for the answer to this question is the historical and religious significance of the "wilderness" in Jewish tradition, illustrated in the Old Testament,[7] the Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha,[8] the Dead Sea Scrolls[9] and the works of Josephus.[10] Throughout all those works, the "wilderness" is understood in the light of eschatological typology. That is, Yahweh in the past history of election performed a great salvific action for Israel in the wilderness. In the eschaton, when the entire history of election reaches its climax, Yahweh will re-enact climactically and definitively that salvific action in the same place. Such an eschatological-typological understanding had the eschatologically-minded view of the wilderness as the place of Yahweh's eschatological salvific action. This religious significance sheds light on the Baptist's choice of the wilderness. Despite obvious disadvantages, in other words, he chose that place because he and his people considered it as the proper place of preparation for the eschaton.

A less important, but nonetheless telling, indication of the Baptist's thinking is his diet and clothing (Matt 3:4//Mark 1:6). We should not take the description as the post-Easter church's creation, designed to make the Baptist look like Elijah. Generally speaking, data on life-styles are hardly created or altered in the

face of massive eye-witness testimony to the contrary. We should give full credit to the tradition on life-styles or notable actions, perhaps even more than to traditions of the sayings.

Whether the Baptist's scanty diet came from the Essene practice of Kashruth[11] hardly matters in the present context. His diet and clothing together fit well with the traditions on the eschatological prophecy in the wilderness.[12] It is quite plausible that the Baptist deliberately adopted that life-style out of his fully conscious prophetic self-understanding.[13] His style of life was both calculated and sufficient to give the impression that he was a prophet.

Most important is John's baptism. The question of the aims of John is reducible to the meaning of his baptizing in the wilderness.[14] In order to retrieve this meaning, scholars have concentrated on the history-of-religions origin of John's baptism. Major suggestions are Jewish proselyte baptism,[15] the Qumran ritual of ablution[16] or the Old Testament tradition (the Levitical ablutions and the eschatological purification).[17] This history-of-religions study of John's baptism, however, has not yet resulted in any considerable consensus, owing to the distinctive features of John's baptism. We can easily list the main distinctive features: 1) its once-and-for-all nature, 2) its orientation to all the Israelites, 3) the

fact that it was not self-administrated,[18] 4) and its eschatological character. The first and third features make it difficult for us to relate John's baptism to the ritual of ablution. These are the features of proselyte baptism. The second and fourth features, on the other hand, make it difficult to relate it to the proselyte baptism which was administrated to the Gentiles who intended to enter the covenant community. Herein lies the difficulty of the history-of-religions study of the origin of John's baptism.

There is, however, one piece of evidence which is able to break this deadlock:

> You brood of vipers!
> Who warned you to flee from the wrath to come?
> Bear fruit that befits repentance,
> and do not presume to say to yourselves,
> 'We have Abraham as our father';
> for I tell you, God is able from these stones
> to raise up children to Abraham
> (Matt 3:7b-9//Luke 3:7b-8).

The sayings assigned to John generally have high claims to authenticity.[19] Dale Allison correctly pointed out that we may well understand this saying in the light of Isaiah 51:1-2[20] where Isaiah, in the vision of the eschatological restoration, recalls Yahweh's miraculous election of Israel through Abraham and Sarah. Put in this light, this saying implicitly refers to the new election of Yahweh's people. Allison aptly catches the point of the saying:

> From Abraham, a lifeless rock (cf. Gen 17:17; 18:10-14; Rom 4:17), God had miraculously caused to be born Isaac and descendants as numerous as the stars of heaven. This, the Baptist declares, God can do again, thereby cutting the ground out from under

> those who would stand upon their physical sonship from Abraham.[21]

Here John rejects the popular belief that to be born a Jew was to be a member of the covenant community, and to be a member of the covenant community was to be a member of God's Kingdom.[22] He reveals his perception that the old election of Israel was invalid, owing to her unfaithfulness. His message of judgment also supports this conclusion: the Israelites' favored status before God would be no longer effective; judgment was unavoidable for them unless they do something to themselves. What John intended to achieve was to have them know the present status and prepare for the future judgment.

The discussion of the above-mentioned saying sheds light on our discussion of the origin of John's baptism. It differed from the proselyte baptism on two points: that John demanded it from all Israelites and that it was administrated in view of the eschaton. We can understand these differences in the light of the above-mentioned saying. That is, John found no difference between Israel and the Gentiles; all of them were the same in facing with the imminent judgment. Nothing but genuine repentance could save them. Although there are recently some controversies on whether the proselyte baptism existed before the time of Jesus,[23] still the best candidate for John's baptism is proselyte baptism. Thus, T. W. Manson noted,

> It seems to me that the point -- and it is a very

> sharp and stinging point -- of John's procedure is that he deliberately invited the children of Abraham to submit to a rite which had been devised for the benefit of pagans. He says in effect: You call yourselves Jews, you claim to be the descendants of Abraham, you demand the privileges that belong to Israel. You have no right to the name, no right to the status; you have forfeited all by your wickedness. You have only one chance. You must begin where the unclean Gentiles begins -- at the bottom.[24]

The content and tone of other sayings of John confirm the preparatory, eschatological nature of his ministry. One of some reasonably reliable facts about John is that he preached about the coming judgment (Matt 3:7b-10//Luke 3:7b-9) and the "one to come" (Matt 3:11-12//Mark 1:7-8//Luke 3:16-17//John 1:15, 26-27; Act 13:25). There have been some contentions about which of the two was the core of John's message.[25] This, however, seems somewhat pointless, for the two are inseparable. As long as one believes in the coming of a messianic figure, as many Jews did in John's time, mention of his coming implies coming judgment.

Scholars have often questioned the authenticity of John's prediction about the "one to come" since the "prediction" is attributable to the church's desire to have John identify Jesus with the "one to come." Such skepticism is unwarranted, however, because that clear identification appears only in the Fourth Gospel (John 1:29-31), and the Baptist did not make such identification in the Synoptic Gospels. It is likely enough that the post-Easter church

took the prediction and interpreted it of Jesus. It is in any case probable that the "one to come" was a main theme, if not the main theme, of John's message. The tone indicates the urgency of the message. The judgment and the "one to come" are already on the brink. The axe is already at the root of the tree (Matt 3:10//Luke 3:9).

When we take all the data as a whole, what do we come to know about John the Baptist and his aims? Is it not that John acted out of his prophetic self-understanding and eschatological expectation? Is it not that he intended to make Israel, once failed, ready for the coming judgment through his baptism and radical message? All the data show that John located himself at the end of the past history of election and at the threshold of the eschatological drama which he envisioned.

John and Jesus

What does it mean, then, for Jesus' self-understanding that he came to John to be baptized and, probably, shared in his baptizing activity? What does it mean that Jesus, after some period of intimate relationship with John and his movement, launched his own ministry, quite distinct from John's? Since John was a prominent figure, alliance with or opposition to or separation from him can be an important clue to the mentality of the person involved. Jesus' alliance with and subsequent separation from John are

thus highly significant data, which call for reflection and for analysis.

That Jesus underwent John's baptism is almost unquestionable. The historicity of this incident is secured primarily by its discontinuity with the tendencies of the transmitting church, which regularly softened indications of any subordination of Jesus to John. It is clearly incredible that the post-Easter church should have invented an incident easily interpretable as cutting across the grain of (a) its own christology, and (b) of its competition with the Baptist movement. We can accordingly take a positive judgment of historicity as probable.

Besides, we need to look at the Johannine account of the origin of Jesus' public career (John 3:33-4:3). Not many years ago it was rare to find proponents of the historicity of this account (namely, as a baptist alongside John the Baptist, but in quasi-independence of John). The situation gradually changed in the decade or so that followed Joachim Jeremias's treatment of the question in 1971 (See Jürgen Becker in 1972, Eta Linnemann in 1973, Simon Legasse in 1977, B. F. Meyer in 1979, Paul Hollenbach in 1982, Hans-Josef Klauck in 1984).[26]

What does the fact of Jesus' baptism and his subsequent ministry mean for Jesus' inner world? It means that Jesus' bond with John was solid, deep and lasting, not slight or fleeting. It further means that he accepted the

validity of John's eschatological mission. His alliance with John signifies that Jesus shared John's eschatological belief and his view of the election-history. He agreed on the necessity of the preparation of all the Israelites for the coming judgment. On the part of Jesus such solid relationship implies, not precisely discipleship to John, but a self-involving conviction that God willed the eschatological baptizing of Israel; and that John's personal mission and message defined this particular moment in the scenario of fulfillment.

Still more important is the fact that early in his ministry Jesus ceased to function as baptizer. The signal for this change was the arrest of John.[27] The Gospels clearly indicate the tie between the arrest of John and the beginning of Jesus' Galilean career as proclaimer of the Kingdom of God (Matt 4:12a//Mark 1:14//Luke 4:14). Jesus started his own, independent ministry when John's was stopped; and when he started he left the wilderness and ceased baptizing.

The arrest of John likely provided a ground for Jesus' conception of the present (Mark 1:15a): "The time has been fulfilled" (peplērōtai ho kairos). Whether or not this saying is authentic, it seems to show exactly what was in Jesus' mind. The idea that the appointed measure has been reached with him is also attested elsewhere (Matt 5:17; Matt 23:32; Luke 4:21; cf. 1 Cor 10:11).[28] In other words, the

time of the Law and the prophets has passed; now is the time of the eschaton. Jesus believed that the eschaton had been set in motion and that the Kingdom of God had in some sense now arrived[29] (Matt 9:15//Mark 2:19//Luke 5:35; Matt 12:28//Luke 11:20; Matt 11:2-6//Luke 7:18-23; etc). He saw himself not only as its proclaimer but also as one appointed to bring the Kingdom of God to the world.

Jesus' conviction about the present time is also illuminated by his leaving the place of John's campaign of preparation (the "wilderness") and its rite (baptism). The Johannite movement had now passed. Now was the time of grace and blessing. There was no need for fasting or asceticism, for the great feast was being offered (Matt 9:14-17//Mark 2:18-22//Luke 5:33-38). It was time to celebrate and rejoice. Accordingly, Jesus, in contrast to John (who emphasized the wrath of God and judgment), stressed the grace and blessing of the Kingdom of God.[30] Jesus as the bringer of the Kingdom started at the point where John as the last voice before the Kingdom disappeared. Jesus saw a new phase of salvation history beginning with himself.

Some of Jesus' sayings about John the Baptist further support this conclusion. Although there have been contentions about the authenticity and the meaning of each saying, all of them (Matt 11:2-19//Luke 7:18-35; Matt 21:23-27//Mark 11:27-33// Luke 20:1-8) point to the same

conclusion as we have reached above. Here in these sayings Jesus reveals his views that John was the eschatological prophet with divine authorization, that both John and himself were crucial for the unfolding eschatological drama and that, however, there was a great distinction between John and himself, the former for the first phase of preparation and fulfillment, the latter for a new and climactic phase of both preparation and fulfillment. "Now" was the time of salvation.

When we take all the data on Jesus' relationship with John into account, we come to the following conclusion: (1) Jesus shared John's eschatological perspective (the world coming to its end; Israel's election being lost; Yahweh's eschatological action of restoration being imminent); (2) Jesus defined John's ministry as preparatory work for the imminent coming of the Kingdom; (3) in relation to John's work, Jesus defined his own ministry as enacting eschatological salvation and himself as the bringer of the Kingdom. Jesus not only expected and proclaimed the eschaton, but mediated its presence. The Kingdom was now breaking in through his ministry. Jesus thus stood at its epicenter. John, Jesus and many of their contemporaries were alike in eagerly awaiting the eschaton, but Jesus differed from the others in affirming its presence in the activities of his ministry.

2. Traditions on Jesus and His Followers

As Hans Conzelmann noted, Jesus' relationship with his disciples is significant for understanding Jesus: "What is specific in Jesus' self-consciousness is documented in his relationship with his disciples."[31] By the "disciples" Conzelmann specifically meant the twelve disciples, excluding the general followers. Jesus' relationship with the wider group, however, should by no means be so easily dismissed.

It is all but indisputable that Jesus presided over a "two-tiered system," the twelve at the center and the wider circle of followers around them.[32] Although the distinctions between the two groups and between the esoteric tradition and the public tradition has been blurred in the process of transmission, we can still trace the distinction, historically, made by Jesus himself. In our discussion we shall use the term "followers" for the wider circle, and "twelve" for the inner circle.

We shall mainly focus on the following two data: (a) the tradition that Jesus selected the twelve disciples and his sayings reserved especially to them; (b) the phenomenon of the "table fellowship" and sayings closely related to it. We expect that this study will show us again Jesus' understanding of his eschatological ministry.

Jesus and the Twelve

Scholars have generally accepted the historicity of the twelve tradition ever since Bornkamm reversed Bultmann's position about this question. His teacher Bultmann argued that the tradition of the twelve was the creation of the post-Easter church.[33] In opposing to this view, Bornkamm offered two indices to the authenticity of the twelve tradition.[34] First, he pointed out the inclusion of Judas Iscariot in the lists of their names. That is, if the post-Easter church created the tradition of the twelve, it should have not included the name of Judas. Second, he mentioned the pre-Pauline tradition in 1 Corinthians 15:3-5. This pre-Pauline formula shows that the tradition of the twelve was firmly fixed from very early period.

The argument for its authenticity has been elaborated by the "third questers"[35] with some more indices such as the multiple and multiform attestations and the disagreement of the lists of names.[36] The minor disagreements among the lists, which had been over-emphasized and used as evidence against the authenticity, have been properly evaluated by some scholars as evidence for its authenticity.[37] Thus, Richard Horsley said,

> These slight discrepancies are explicable if the number twelve was already fixed but the memory of a few particulars somewhat dim or variant, but it is hardly credible that the church would have created the Twelve as a group of regents and then make lists that disagree.[38]

If individuals created the list, the major agreement is incredible. If it was a collaborate work, the minor

disagreement is striking.

Consequently, we can claim a high degree of probability for the authenticity of the tradition of the twelve.[39] As the Gospels testify, Jesus selected twelve men out of large number of followers and made them a distinct entity during his earthly ministry (Matt 10:1-4//Mark 3:13-19//Luke 6:12-16; Matt 10:5-11//Mark 6:6b-13//Luke 9:1-6).

The next question is, What was Jesus' intention in taking this action? In answering this question we shall focus first on the facts that Jesus selected no more and no less than "twelve" men and that the number "twelve" was a meaningful number in Jewish tradition. In the light of the religious associations of the number "twelve" in Jewish tradition, Jesus' choice of the twelve disciples should be accounted as something showing, in Horbury's words, "a distinctive mentality."[40] Thus we shall first review the significance of the number twelve in Second-Temple Judaism and look at Jesus' choice of the twelve in that light. Then, we shall go to some arguably authentic sayings of Jesus which reflect his intentions respecting the twelve.

The number "twelve" was, first of all, associated with the "twelve tribes of Israel." The origin of the twelve tribes has been a center of controversy in Old Testament Studies. Whether a twelve-tribe scheme originated in pre-monarchic times[41] or in the monarchic period,[42] and

whether it was amphictyonic or not,[43] are questions that we shall not attempt to resolve. Once the tradition of the twelve tribes established itself in biblical tradition, Israelites came to consider the perfect union and harmony of the twelve tribes as an ideal or divinely ordained state of Israel.[44] This ideal was subsequently incorporated to the eschatological hope of the Old Testament. Thus says the Lord through Isaiah,

> And now the Lord says,
> who formed me from the womb to be his servant,
> to bring Jacob back to him,
> and that Israel might be gathered to him, ...
> he says:
> "It is too light a thing that you should be my
> servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob
> and to restore the preserved of Israel;"
> (Isa 49:5-6)

The restoration of Israel is here equated with the rise of the (twelve) tribes of Jacob, and all this is a prime task of the Servant of Yahweh. This text shows that the restoration of the twelve tribes was what Israel should expect for God's future. The eschatological nature of this hope was much more enhanced in Ezekiel 37; 39; 40-48. Again and again Yahweh affirms that eschatological event by saying, "Now I will restore the fortunes of Jacob, and have mercy upon the whole house of Israel"(Ezek 39:25).

This eschatological hope became intense and widespread during the Second-Temple period. The degree to which the ideal of the twelve tribes permeated Jewish minds and the intensity of the eschatological expectation of the

restoration of the twelve tribes are well attested in this period.[45] From these sources we learn that "the twelve tribes had become one of the principal images of the future restoration of the people."[46] The eschatological hope for the restoration of the twelve tribes was so vivid and widely shared that mentioning the number "twelve" was very liable to incite that hope.[47]

Several sayings confirmed that Jesus appealed to this eschatological hope in instituting his closest disciples, twelve in number.

> Truly, I say to you, in the new world,
> when the Son of man shall sit on his glorious throne,
> you who have followed me will also sit on twelve thrones,
> judging the twelve tribes of Israel.
> (Matt 19:28//Luke 22:30)

The priority of the Matthean to the Lukan version has been generally accepted.[48] What is still debated is the authenticity of this saying. Because of the importance of this saying for our argument, we shall deal with this problem in some detail.

We can list four major reasons against its authenticity that scholars have suggested. Bornkamm, following Bultmann, suggested two reasons: first, there is no Aramaic equivalent of palingenesia; second, the Lukan phrase "my Kingdom" is unlikely on the lips of Jesus.[49] Third, those like Perrin, who systematically reject the authenticity of all future Son of man sayings, also dismiss

this saying as unauthentic.[50] Last, W. D. Davies points the apparent contradiction between the idea of "judging" (krinein) in Matthew 19:28 and that of "serving" (diakonein) in Matt 20:28//Mark 10:45.[51]

Can these objections survive critical scrutiny? As for the unlikeliness of the Lukan phrase "my Kingdom," we should remember that there are not a few, arguably authentic sayings where investiture as regent of the coming Kingdom has been given to Jesus.[52] We have also seen in the previous chapter that it is illegitimate to exclude systematically all the future "Son of man" sayings as secondary. As for the Aramaic equivalent of palingenesia, some feasible explanations have been made.[53] In any case, the force of this suggestion by itself is not strong enough to rule out the authenticity of the whole saying. As for the apparent contradiction between Matthew 19:28 and 20:28, Horsley recently offered a helpful analysis of the term krinein.[54] According to his analysis, the Hebrew word šāpaṭ lies behind the Greek term krinein, and the biblical meaning of šāpaṭ is "liberating, redeeming, establishing justice for." Thus, the Greek term krinein in Matthew 19:28 is not in its biblical sense an antonym of diakonein. In this sense, it is not contradictory to say that the twelve's function will be both "judging" and "serving."[55]

On the other hand, some serious difficulties arise if we take Matthew 19:28 as a creation of the post-Easter

church. First, how could the post-Easter church create a saying which promises a throne to Judas Iscariot? As T. W. Manson noted, "the saying surely belongs to a much earlier period, before the treachery of Judas was suspected, much less known."[56] If it were secondary, some further comment on the exclusion of Judas might have been expected. Second, is it likely that "the Church of itself formulated such an embarrassing saying, because the role assigned to the disciples or apostles here is not that found to be theirs in the rest of the New Testament"?[57] If we consider the fact that the status of the twelve apostles quickly yielded to James the Brother of Jesus and Saul of Tarsus, the creation of this saying becomes more unintelligible. Matthew 19:28 in its core should be taken as authentic.

Then, it becomes clear from this saying that we should understand Jesus' choice of the twelve in the light of the eschatological hope for the restoration of the twelve tribes of Israel, i.e., the restoration of the ideal, divinely ordained people. The image of sitting at Jesus' right hand (Matt 20:20-28//Mark 10:35-45) also supports this conclusion. In Jesus' perspective, the coming Kingdom was the restoration of the lost twelve tribes of Israel. In this restored eschatological Kingdom the twelve disciples will be given the role of the patriarchs of the restored Israel with Jesus as their King. Jesus selected and constituted the twelve disciples out of this conception of

the Kingdom. As Gerhard Lohfink says,

> Jesus' constitution of twelve disciples could only be grasped as a symbolic prophetic action: The twelve exemplified the awakening of Israel and its gathering in the eschatological salvific community, something beginning then through Jesus.[58]

At this juncture we need to look at other sayings of Jesus directed to the twelve disciples. First, sayings of Jesus spoken at the sending of the twelve disciples will reveal other aspects of Jesus' intention. The sending of the twelve on a mission is also certainly authentic, as has been well demonstrated by Rainer Riesner.[59] From this tradition we learn that Jesus gave the group of the twelve not only a symbolic significance but also a practical function.[60] Their function in the present was the function of emissaries (šĕlîḥîm) of Jesus for the urgent proclamation of the Kingdom of God and the call for repentance (Matt 10:7; Mark 6:12; Luke 9:2). The sayings belonging to this context exhibit characteristic notes of Jesus' eschatology. Jesus confined his and their missionary activities primarily to "the lost sheep of Israel" (ta probata ta apolōlota oikou Israēl, Matt 10:6; 15:24). "The lost sheep of Israel" does not mean that Jesus intended to win over only a part of Israel. As Geyser and Lohfink suggest, we should take the term in the prophetic sense.[61] In this sense, all Israel had been lost through their rebellion and hardened hearts. By using this term, Jesus intended not to point out one class of the people but to characterize the entire people as

"lost". To win back the lost Israel thus means the restoration of Israel. What Jesus expected to happen in the eschaton was the "restoration of Israel." For Jesus also, Israel's old election was no longer effective.

We might extend our discussion to further details on Jesus and the twelve, but the above discussion should suffice to show the main, most crucial, aspects of Jesus' conception of his own ministry, at least insofar as they can be inferred from the acts of instituting and sending out the twelve. Jesus' life was wholly in the service of the Kingdom of God. This service consisted in the effort to realize the restoration of Israel. This was the antecedent condition of the eschatological pilgrimage of the peoples to Zion (Matt 8:11//Luke 13:28-29).[62] In the Kingdom Jesus would take the role of King. The twelve would constitute the nucleus of renewed Israel.

Jesus and Table-Fellowship

A second focal point is Jesus' table-fellowship. The twelve were part of that fellowship, but it was not confined to them. This bond was apparently open to all who wished to join Jesus in breaking bread. It reflects the relationships between him and his followers, and we can derive some information from this phenomenon for our account of Jesus' conception of his mission.

Despite sporadic arguments against the authenticity

of this phenomenon,[63] Jesus' table-fellowship is among the most solid and unquestionable data in the Jesus tradition. Table-fellowship belonged to and revealed the Judaic "social code." This holds for all, including sectarian groups in the Second-Temple period and, at a greater distance, the ancient Greco-Roman world.[64] So far as Jesus' practice is concerned, it is attested in the main sources and in multiple fashion.[65] Can we apply here the criterion of dissimilarity? Perhaps not. It is not unlikely that the early Christian meal-fellowship reported in Acts 2:46 was a continuation of Jesus' table-fellowship.[66] The prophetic, symbolic nature of the practice accords with Jesus' mode of action. Similarly, Simon Peter's lodging with "one Simon, a tanner" in Joppa (Acts 9:43) follows in the line of Jesus' openness even to those who practiced "despised trades."

Our concern, in any case, is also to grasp, in the practice of Jesus, significant aspects of his eschatology and self-understanding. We should first ask, What significance did this "social code" have in the Jewish milieu? In most Jewish sects, the table-fellowship was an act expressing mutual acceptance and solidarity among the members, and one's acceptance into the fellowship was thought to secure one's acceptance by God. Although it was not always the case that a group regarded access to God as available only though the group, some communities, such as that attested at Qumran, did take it that acceptance or

rejection by the fellowship was the equivalent of acceptance or rejection by God. Thus, among the intentions of Jesus, in the light of his prophetic career, was the offer of sharing in God's favour and acceptance through participation in table-fellowship with Jesus.

Other traits of Jesus' table-fellowship notably included the outstanding note of "joy". Joy was not a unique feature of Jesus' table fellowship; nevertheless it characterized, to an astonishing degree, the table-fellowship of Jesus, and was far too striking to go unnoticed (Matt 9:14//Mark 2:18//Luke 5:33). Jesus himself employed "joy" as a key motif in his teaching (Matt 9:15-17//Mark 2:19-20//Luke 5:34-38), especially in his parables (Matt 22:1-10//Luke 14:16-24; Luke 15:3-32).

Another feature of his fellowship was "openness." It was so conspicuous that Jesus' critics accused him of being a "friend of tax-collectors and sinners" (Matt 11:19//Luke 7:34). It was unimaginable to his contemporaries that the unmistakably irreligious were accepted into the table-fellowship of a religious group. Either the irreligious should be kept outcast or the group must be illegitimate. That is why religious critics were so offended (Matt 9:11//Mark 2:16//Luke 5:30; Luke 15:2). Jesus offered free access to himself in the hope, which was evidently often fulfilled, that the "sinners" would be moved to conversion. Such was the powerful experience of divine

grace. Ben Meyer made this point by saying that in the table-fellowship of Jesus "forgiveness and conversion" were at stake, and that Jesus was intent on "a mission of reconciliation."[67] Under all the surface irritations that Jesus provoked among his critics there was a deeper fear; that this sovereign mode of action meant the replacement of Torah and temple; hence deeply serious suspicion, offence and fear. Here was a threat to the system.

This uniqueness and offensiveness called for interpretation. First, we shall consider a saying about the wedding guests: "Can the wedding guests mourn as long as the bridegroom is with them?"(Matt 9:15//Mark 2:19//Luke 5:34). This is a reply to the question about why his disciples did not fast.[68] Whether the question was raised by "the disciples of John" (Matt 9:14), indefinite "people" (Mark 2:18) or "the Pharisees and their scribes" (Luke 5:33),[69] the answer is clear as crystal: "Jesus considers his presence to be a time of salvation in which the disciples' joy makes the custom of mourning impossible."[70] The source of joy is the presence of Jesus the "messianic bridegroom."[71] The "feast" is an anticipation of the messianic banquet. The theme of the messianic banquet, abundantly attested in Jewish eschatological expectation,[72] solidly rooted in the Jesus tradition (Matt 8:11// Luke 13:29; Luke 14:24; Matt 26:29//Mark 14:25//Luke 22:16). Jesus' table-fellowship was more than an element of his

"social code." It was a foretaste of the coming messianic banquet.

The ēlthon sayings have been viewed with strong suspicion because they look like a summary statement of Jesus' ministry based upon a retrospective look after his death.[73] This logic, however, should not be followed mechanically. Davies and Allison offer the best summary of the illegitimacy of this explanation. They appeal to 1) Luke 12:49 where Jesus is clearly speaking of his ministry as still in process and of the tension that obtains until it is completed; 2) Jesus' Sendungsbewusstsein; 3) the high probability of the authenticity of Matthew 10:34//Luke 12:51; 4) Josephus' use of this formula (Bell. 3:400); and 5) the consistency of this saying with Jesus' self-conception.[74] We can add more to this list: that the Aramaic equivalent of ēlthon means "it is my intent, will, task,"[75] and that the Sitz im Leben of some of the sayings show us the historical situation in which that kind of "programmatic saying"[76] was needed.

Jesus' reply to opponents of his table fellowship (Matt 9:12-13//Mark 2:17//Luke 5:31-32) is an example. The core of the saying is, "I came not to call the righteous, but sinners."[77] The Semitism is notable in the dialectical negation, which is another index to the primitiveness of the saying. The plausible historical context also supports the authenticity of the saying. The openness of the fellowship

certainly caused offence, and this situation must have forced Jesus to say something about it. And if he did, it was expected to mention the reason for accepting "sinners" into his table-fellowship. This saying is something we can justly expect Jesus to have spoken in such a situation.

Not a few scholars have made a mistake by taking this saying as a general maxim for Jesus' mission and its orientation. Taken this way, this saying means the exclusion of the righteous from Jesus' concern. Some, such as E. P. Sanders, argue that Jesus oriented himself toward a part of Israel while he intended the restoration of the whole of Israel.[78] But we should remember that the saying belongs to a context of controversy. In other words, it was spoken not as a general maxim but to defend a particular aspect of his behavior and to silence his opponents.[79] If we see it in this light, it becomes evident that Jesus used the term "the righteous" in a paradoxical way: "Do not count on your righteousness!"

The "sinners" were welcomed by Jesus and responded whole-heartedly to his proclamation. By contrast, the Pharisees and others prominent among "the righteous" rejected Jesus and his message. As long as they defined themselves as the "righteous" they would be excluded by their own choice. The so-called righteous still belonged to Jesus' concern.[80] He even acknowledged the excellence of the righteousness of the elite groups (Matt 5:20), but it

would be of no use, in his view, unless they accepted his message of the Kingdom. Both in theory and practice, contrary to Sanders's suggestion, Jesus worked for all Israel. His ultimate intention, indeed, went even further, for it comprehended the eschatological pilgrimage of the Gentiles (Matt 8:11//Luke 13:29).

When we bring all these data together, we can grasp what is implied in Jesus' table-fellowship. What it tells us of the inner world of Jesus is this: Jesus understood his mission as bringing the eschaton, that is, the messianic age (the marriage feast); now was the time for joy, feast, and celebration at the presence of the eschaton. His table-fellowship was a foretaste of the future messianic banquet. Once again the main features of Jesus' eschatology appear: the messianic age had begun; Jesus was its key figure, the host at the feast; it was for all Israel; it prefigured an imminent realization of salvation (Matt 26:29//Mark 14:25//Luke 22:16).

3. Traditions on Jesus and the Spirit

Another datum which has a crucial bearing on Jesus' eschatological stance was his relation to the Spirit. New Testament scholarship has tended to underplay the role of the Spirit in relation to the historical Jesus. Among the reasons are the relative rarity of references to the Spirit in the Jesus tradition and the uneasiness of the modern,

scientific mind in dealing with such seemingly elusive, unscientific matters. Despite this trend, however, it has been occasionally noted that the Spirit played a role of importance in the experience of Jesus.[81] Here we shall attempt to show how deeply Jesus' conscious possession of the Spirit is rooted in the tradition, and how Jesus himself understood the role of the Spirit in his ministry.

Jesus and the Spirit:

Evidence

We may begin with the Beelzebul controversy (Matt 12:24-29//Mark 3:22-27//Luke 11:15-22). Except for the introductory remarks (Matt 12:24; Mark 3:22; Luke 11:15) and the saying about the Spirit/finger of God (Matt 12:27-28//Luke 11:19-20) which the Markan parallel does not have, the three Gospels tell us basically the same story: an accusation that Jesus collaborated with Beelzebul, Jesus' saying about a divided kingdom, and his parable about a duel. We cannot be sure whether the parable was originally spoken together with the saying about the divided kingdom, but this has some probability.

The authenticity of the section is secured in the light of the almost certain authenticity of the accusation against Jesus. The Gospels widely attest the accusation that Jesus was working under the power of Satan. Even in the Fourth Gospel we repeatedly meet this charge (John 7:20;

8:48, 52; 10:20). The tradition was apparently old and widely known. At the same time, it is inconceivable that the post-Easter church invented so offensive a tradition. We should also note that the tradition of Jesus' victory over Satan in his earthly ministry is in conflict with the post-Easter church's tradition, which believed that Satan was defeated at his crucifixion and resurrection (1 Cor 15:24; Col 2:15; Eph 1:20-21).[82] The antithetical parallelism of question and statement is also typical of Jesus' style.[83] All these factors converge in suggesting that the saying and the parable are authentic.

In both the saying and the parable, Jesus clarifies the significance of his ministry of healing and exorcisms: they were visible demonstrations of the collapse of Satan's kingdom. Jesus had broken Satan's dominion. In this story we discern probable allusions to Isaiah 49:24-5 and/or Isaiah 53:12[84] and a reminiscence of the Jewish eschatological expectation of the final annihilation of Beliar or Satan.[85] The imagery is eschatological. Another arguably authentic saying about the fall of Satan (Luke 10:18) points in the same direction.

Jewish eschatological belief, attested in Second-Temple writings,[86] expected the binding of Satan to happen in the eschaton through the Spirit-filled eschatological prophet. The claim of definitive victory over Satan and his evil spirits thus amounts to a claim to the eschatological

Spirit. Behind "victory over Satan" lies "anointment as eschatological warrior" by the Spirit.

This leads us to a saying that has been widely accepted as authentic (Matt 12:28//Luke 11:20). James Dunn puts the authenticity of the saying in the strongest terms possible:

> Indeed, if we cannot be sure that the Q saying preserved in Matt 12:28//Luke 11:20 is a genuine saying of Jesus, we might as well give up all hope of rediscovering the historical Jesus, the man or his message.[87]

Perrin argues for this saying's high claims to authenticity by pointing out three marks of dissimilarity: 1) the use of Kingdom of God in reference to the eschatological activity of God, 2) the use of the verb "to come" in connection with it and 3) the relating of the presence of the Kingdom to the present experience of a man.[88]

A still disputed question is whether "the Spirit of God" of the Matthean version or "the finger of God" of the Lukan version is original. Commonly, the verdict has favoured the Lukan version.[89] A major reason for this judgment is the difficulty of supposing that Luke dropped mention of the Spirit. Dunn, however, finds this judgment superficial. Reversing an argument once made by T. W. Manson, he proposes, in the light of Luke's distinctive Exodus typology, that we thus explain the change from "the Spirit" to "the finger" of God (see Exod 8:15; LXX Exod 8:19).[90] Essentially, the terms are synonymous.[91] The

implication of the saying in either case is that Jesus believed the power of the Spirit to be working through him in his eschatological works.

We shall add one more saying of Jesus mentioning the Spirit: the saying about the sin against the Spirit (Matt 12:31-32//Mark 3:28-29//Luke 12:10). Its historicity is probable. Matthew and Mark posit a probable setting: the controversy caused by Jesus' exorcism.[92] If we acknowledge that at least the basic form of this saying is authentic, it will be a clear example that Jesus was conscious of his possession of the Spirit. For, in this saying, Jesus regarded criticisms against his exorcisms as insulting the Spirit who was working through himself.

This saying also reveals Jesus' consciousness of the eschatological character of the Spirit working through himself. This consciousness is implied in his declaration that the sin against the Spirit is not forgivable. Why not? Since it is the work of the eschatological Spirit; "since it is God's final, eschatological, deed of salvation, those who utterly reject it can, in the nature of the case, find no salvation."[93] An Exodus typology is implied in this saying. Long ago in the wilderness, the hand of God gave Israel salvation, but they grieved him through disobedience and rebellion. Isaiah already interpreted this sin as against the Spirit: "But they rebelled and grieved his Holy Spirit." (Isa 63:10) God, however, forgave them at that

time. This, however, is not possible for the generation living at the time of the new exodus when the Spirit of God is working finally and definitively.

All these sayings together leave us an inescapable impression that Jesus was conscious of his possession of the Spirit. He believed that he won a decisive initial victory over Satan by the power of the Spirit. In his view, his healing and exorcisms were a visible demonstration of that victory. In other words, through him the eschatological war and the eschatological Exodus were taking place.

We have two more, circumstantial pieces of evidence for Jesus' consciousness of possession of the Spirit. One is his utilization of the Servant Songs of Isaiah, and the other is the tradition of Jesus as the prophet.

First, there are some indices that Jesus understood himself in the light of the Servant Songs of Isaiah (Isa 42:1-4; 49:1-6; 50:4-11; 52:13-53:12; 61:1-4).[94] Jesus, to be sure, probably did not read these texts atomistically. More likely, he appreciated the unique quality of these texts and cherished them with other favorite texts. One of the distinctive themes of the these texts is the role of the Spirit: God has put his Spirit upon his servant (42:1) and anointed him by the Spirit (61:1) for the eschatological task. We may well infer that Jesus believed himself to be the Spirit-filled Servant, for he alluded to one or more of these texts in relation to himself and implicitly identified

himself with the Servant.

We need to look at first that there are a few passages which give the impression that Isaiah 61:1-4 was significant for Jesus: Jesus' reply to the question about the "one to come" (Matt 11:2-6//Luke 7:18-23), the Beatitudes (Matt 5:3-6//Luke 6:20-21) and Luke's introduction to Jesus' public ministry (Luke 4:18-19). All three are the same in citing from or alluding to Isaiah 61:1-4. Although the degree of authenticity of these texts varies, the fact that the influence of Isaiah 61:1-4 is multiply attested means that the tradition is very old. It is even possible to trace its root back to Jesus himself because of the high degree of authenticity of the former two sayings. All this makes it probable that Jesus applied this prophetic text to himself and his ministry.[95]

On the other hand, there have been many scholars who believe that the fourth servant song also had a great influence on Jesus.[96] We can find the marks of its influence in the ransom saying (Matt 20:28//Mark 10:45), the eucharistic words (Matt 26:28//Mark 14:24//Luke 22:20), and "the plundering of the strong man" in the parable of the duel (Matt 12:29//Mark 3:27//Luke 11:22). Even though the probability of the authenticity of these sayings varies, which we shall see again in the following chapter, they are among the sayings which have gained some solid claim to authenticity. Furthermore, the cumulative evidential force

of these texts is impressive.

Besides, we can add the baptism narrative as supporting evidence. All together, it makes an impressive case for Jesus' use of the Servant Songs. One can argue that some of these texts are secondary, but scarcely all of them. If Jesus understood his ministry in terms of the Servant texts, this implies the probability that he was conscious of the working of the Spirit in his life.

Second, we find a firm, old tradition about Jesus as the prophet. First of all, that Jesus was identified with a prophet by others is a probable conclusion from all four Gospels.[97] We find evidence for this in the Caesarea Philippi incident (Matt 16:13-20//Mark 8:27-30//Luke 9:18-21): The popular views of Jesus were all in terms of prophetic figures (John the Baptist, Elijah, Jeremiah, or one of the prophets). Evidently, the multitudes recognized similarities between Jesus and the prophets.[98]

More important, however, Jesus identified himself as a prophet (e.g., Matt 13:57//Mark 6:4//Luke 4:24; Luke 13:33; Matt 12:41//Luke 11:32), although he favored other terms such as the "Son of man." Furthermore, Jesus often compared his disciples with the prophets (Matt 5:12//Luke 6:23; Matt 10:42) and called John the Baptist a "prophet," or "more than prophet" (Matt 11:9//Luke 7:26). This confirms that Jesus saw himself too as belonging to the line of prophets.

This self-identification becomes more certain in the light of the christological tendency of the post-Easter church.[99] That is, the christology of Jesus as a prophet did not fit in well with the high christology of the post-Easter church. The conclusion is difficult to avoid: Jesus understood his mission in prophetic terms. But if so, we have a confirmation of his conviction that the Spirit had equipped him for his mission. To be sure, he could not be fully satisfied with this identification. His mission was far greater than anything that the term "prophet" suggests. That is why modern historians use the term "the eschatological prophet" (Deut 15:15-18).

In summary, despite the paucity of express mentions of the Spirit in the Jesus tradition, it is still an all but indisputable fact that the Spirit was significant for Jesus.[100] He believed that the Spirit had empowered him for his wonderworking, a visible manifestation of the Kingdom of God. The works of the Spirit were eschatological, climactic and definitive; so was his mission.

Jesus and the Spirit:
Significance

As we have seen in Part One, the eschatologically-minded in the Second-Temple period expected that the eschaton would be inaugurated with the outpouring of the

Spirit. The roles of the Spirit were to make an election of a group or person for the eschatological task and to offer what is needed for that task, i.e., revelation, power, authority, etc. In other words, the eschatologically-minded expected the Spirit to elect and to equip.

It follows from the above discussion that Jesus thought of the Spirit along these selfsame lines. For him too the Spirit generated eschatological meaning. We are not sure whether Jesus shared with some of his contemporaries the belief that the Spirit had ceased to work ever since the last prophet of Israel disappeared.[101] Jesus in any case perceived that the work of the Spirit within himself was definitive and climactic. To deny Jesus' message of forgiveness was unforgivable. Such was the sin against the Spirit.

It is possible, if not probable, that Jesus underwent in the wilderness such an experience as would lead him to the conviction of victory over Satan. By mentioning the "binding" in the Beelzebul controversy (Matt 12:29//Mark 3:27; Luke 11:21-22) Jesus probably meant an action, a discrete, individual event. The saying is not, then, self-contained. It is an allusion to some experience of Jesus. Jesus points back to an anterior experience. It is probably the most viable option to see this as the experience of "temptation" or testing in the wilderness.[102]

The last statement does not, however, mean that we

regard the Matthean/Lukan form of the wilderness pericope (Matt 4:1-11//Luke 4:1-13) as authentic. What we believe to be true is that the narrative represents the outline and the nature of the event: that Jesus went to the wilderness and that the nature of this retreat was eschatological.[103] In this relation, it is helpful to note that "going to the wilderness for preparation of ministry" was a common feature in Jewish as well as other religious tradition (Exod 24:18; 1 Kgs 19:8,15; Gal 1:17), and that Jewish religious tradition has long regarded the wilderness as a place of testing and temptation and as a habitation of evil spirits (Lev 16:10; Tob 8:3; 1 Enoch 10:4-5; 4 Macc 18:8; 2 Bar 10:8). In this light the temptation narrative appears to report some historical truth about Jesus' retreat in the initial period of his ministry.

If we acknowledge the historical nucleus of the temptation narrative, there is no other, more plausible incident than Jesus' retreat to the wilderness as the referent of the event implied in the Beelzebul controversy. Jesus had somehow been led to the conviction that he had already defeated Satan. This experience and conviction became a basis of his interpretation of his healing and exorcisms as the defeat of Satan and the realization of the Kingdom. If we consider Jesus' eschatological belief attested from his alliance with and subsequent separation from John the Baptist, we may well expect that he perceived

the defeat of Satan as an eschatological event. Engaged in eschatological war[104] with Satan, he won the initial victory. From this it becomes clear that Jesus understood his ministry as the mediation of God's supreme saving act.

This leads us to Jesus' baptism experience. The baptism and the temptation are inseparably related, as Borg noted:

> The sequence of initiation into the world of Spirit (the baptism) followed by a testing or ordeal in the wilderness is strikingly similar to what is reported of charismatic figures cross-culturally.[105]

Again, the historical aspect of the text betrays itself in the unschematic character of the sequence from the prophecy of the Baptist to the temptation account. If the sequence of pericopes were schematic, what ought to follow the Baptist's "even now the axe is laid to the root of the trees!"? Certainly not the appearance of the coming one to be baptized by John! Certainly not the coming one's receiving his "call" in the context of the Baptist's preaching and rite of repentance! If, contrary to the schematic, this is in fact what is given, it is surely because the tradents of the tradition are led, not by literary schemes (e.g., Old Testament history-writing) but by a historic sequence of events. All this means that the two pericopes were inseparable in nature and that they are historical in their basic forms.

We have already noted some indices of authenticity of the baptism pericope.[106] We may add to them two more

pieces of evidence for its authenticity. First, the question about his authority (Matt 21:23-27//Mark 11:27-33//Luke 20:1-8) implies that Jesus did cherish the experience at his baptism as a legitimating incident for his authority. The question ("By what authority are you doing these things?") raised by the opponents is most probably authentic.[107] Then, what did Jesus mean by the answer? In Sigfred Pedersen's words,

> In reply to this original question Jesus raises another question: how should John the Baptist be interpreted. In other words, the interpretation of the origin and nature of Jesus' authority is fundamentally tied with the interpretation of John the Baptist as God's action.[108]

Why did Jesus base his authority so heavily on the authority of John the Baptist? We find the most probable answer in Jesus' experience at the baptism.[109] He probably believed that he was given authority through John's baptism. This conviction linked them together, at least in the eyes of Jesus.

Second, the history of Christian baptism is telling for the historicity of the baptism narrative. In the present Gospel texts, we can detect no traces of an attempt to make the narrative a prototype of Christian baptism.[110] Without this reason, we can see no reason why the post-Easter church would have created it. The origin of Christian baptism has long been disputed and the Gospels do not give any probable connection between Jesus and Christian baptism, except a saying in Matthew (28:16-20) whose

historicity has been reasonably doubted. If Jesus cherished his experience at baptism, however, we may well say, with Dunn,

> The fact that the earliest Christian communities seem to have practiced baptism from the first is probably best explained by the suggestion that Jesus gave his disciples some indication of how important the occasion of his own baptism was for him.[111]

It seems thus very likely that Jesus went through some sort of spiritual experience at his baptism which made him believe himself to have been elected for a special mission by the Holy Spirit. In this light, Fritzleo Lentzen-Deiss was right when he defined the genre of the baptism pericope as a "call."[112] Indeed, it is a "Deute-Vision" for Jesus. There may be credible objections to some of the particularities of the "Deute-Vision" hypothesis, though it seems still to present itself as the best account currently available. The text defines the "call" of Jesus to his mission, on the model of the numerous examples of the calling accounts of prominent figures in the Old Testament: Abraham, Moses, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and so on. The main thrust of the pericope is to identify Jesus for the audience.

Again, the question is not, Could Jesus have narrated his experience of "call" to the circle of disciples? The lead question bears on Jesus' authorization/election/vocation/ commission. Was it for himself? Hardly. This is why the tradition predictably

represents Jesus sharing with the circle of disciples: (1) his "authority" over the unclean spirits (Matt 10:1//Mark 6:7//Luke 9:1); (2) the mission to preach and heal (Matt 10:7//Luke 9:2); (3) to cleanse lepers and raise the dead (Matt 10:8); (4) the appointing of the twelve "to be with him" (where he would be) and share in the powers belonging to his mission (Mark 3:14-15); (5) as well as in his destiny (Luke 10:17-20). They also shared in his trials and ordeals (Luke 22:28). The genuinely appropriate question respecting his call, then, is not: Could it be that Jesus might have recounted it to his disciples? But rather: On what possible basis might we suppose his keeping it unknown to them?[113]

The Markan text is very probably closer than the others to what actually happened, especially on the voice from heaven. It was probably addressed, not to bystanders, but to Jesus himself. This more or less directly suggests an aspect of the experience of Jesus at the baptism: it reveals to him his vocation; he is chosen for a divinely defined, eschatological task. This pericope explains both the nature of Jesus' ministry and his self-understanding.

In conclusion, we should again stress that the baptism narrative, the temptation narrative and the Beelzebul controversy are closely inter-related with each other; the theme of the Spirit links them together; all of them reflect the catalytic experience of Jesus; all of them reveals his conception of his ministry and himself. We

should deal with these narratives in their mutual relationship. Looking backwards: Jesus interpreted his exorcisms as the destruction of the realm of Satan's kingdom; he came to such conviction in the wilderness; he was convinced at his baptism that he was elected for such eschatological ministry. Looking forward: he went through such an experience at his baptism as to have him believe that God elected and equipped him through outpouring of the Spirit; then he went through another experience in the wilderness through which he came to believe that he did bind the "strong man"; he believed that his exorcisms and healing are visual sign of the destruction of that kingdom. In short, these three narratives tell us that Jesus understood his ministry as the climactic and definitive saving visitation of God and himself as the elect for such ministry.

3. Conclusions

We have now completed the task of verifying that Jesus understood his ministry as the climactic and definitive action of God on Israel. The three all but incontestable facts of Jesus' life converge to make clear this character of Jesus' mission.

This analysis yields virtually the same conclusion as does the analysis of Jesus' Kingdom sayings.[114] The Kingdom sayings generally offer a clearer view of Jesus'

mentality than other material does, but it is difficult to find counter-controls to determine their authenticity. Hence, we have focused on acts and sayings which indirectly reveal Jesus' conception of the eschaton.

Jesus shared common Jewish eschatological expectations with John the Baptist and other contemporaries: God was about to bring human history to an end and to establish his everlasting Kingdom. Like some of his contemporaries (such as the Qumran covenanters, John the Baptist and other eschatologically-minded Jews) Jesus expected the final completion in the near future. What was evidently unique for Jesus, however, was that the long-awaited eschaton had now started with his ministry. He believed that the realities of the eschatological Kingdom could now be tasted, as it were, in and through his miracles and table-fellowship. The presence of Jesus represented the presence of God and his Kingdom. The eschaton had been inaugurated. In a sense the Kingdom was there now. But there would be more to come.

Jesus worked for the accomplishment of what he believed was to happen in the eschaton. The eschaton in his view would involve the destruction of Satan's kingdom, the restoration of Israel and the establishment of the Kingdom of God. He believed that he won the initial victory over against Satan by the God-given, eschatological Spirit. As John the Baptist did, so did Jesus view Israel's election as

no longer effective. Like John, Jesus addressed all Israel. His mission was the restoration of God's people, which would entail the eschatological pilgrimage of the Gentiles. Jesus envisioned the new election of the new Israel by instituting the twelve disciples. He expected the final establishment of the Kingdom of God with the coming of the Son of man in the near future.

In every feast which symbolized the messianic banquet, Jesus was the center. Sometimes he was the guest (Matt 9:9-13//Mark 2:14-17//Luke 5:27-32; Luke 7:36-50), and sometimes he was the host (Matt 14:13-21//Mark 6:32-44//Luke 9:11-17//John 6:5-13; Matt 15:32-39//Mark 8:1-10; Matt 26:17-19//Mark 14:12-16//Luke 22:7-13).[115] In a parable it is said that the wedding feast was offered by a king for his son (Matt 22:1-10//Luke 14:16-24) and Jesus once implied that he was the bridegroom of the wedding feast (Matt 9:15//Mark 2:19//Luke 5:34).

All these data converge on a single self-understanding. His time was the last time. He himself was to be the center of the new era. This self-understanding is implied by a saying spoken to the twelve (Matt 19:28//Luke 22:30). They would be the head of the restored Israel, with Jesus as the King. Here Jesus implicitly revealed his self-understanding as King in the Kingdom of God. It is true that history according to the Gospels would climax in the reign of God (Matt 26:29//Mark 14:25//Luke 22:18). This did

not prevent Jesus from attributing kingship/reign to himself (Luke 22:28-30; Matt 20:21//Mark 10:37) or to the Son of man (Matt 19:28; Matt 24:30//Mark 13:26//Luke 21:27) nor did it rule out the share of the twelve in the royal act of judgment (Matt 19:28//Luke 22:30; Luke 12:32).[116] The multiple attestation of the saying about the relationships among God, Jesus and the twelve (Matt 10:40//Luke 10:16; Mark 9:37//Luke 9:48; John 13:20)[117] shows how all three could be bound together in Jesus' view. The Kingdom belongs to all of them at the same time, God as the sovereign, Jesus as God's Son and the Son of man, and the twelve as šĕlîhîm of Jesus and God.

If Jesus had this kind of self-understanding, and if this kind of figure was called "Messiah" in Jewish tradition, we should ask: Why should Jesus himself not have thought along these lines? True, Jesus avoided the title. It was, however, the only category in Jewish tradition that fits the kind of self-understanding which Jesus entertained.

END NOTES

1. Rudolf Bultmann, Jesus and the Word, trans. by L. P. Smith & E. H. Lantero (London: SCM, 1958); Günther Bornkamm, Jesus of Nazareth, trans. by Irene and Fraser McLuskey (New York: Harper & Row, 1960).

2. Sanders, Jesus, pp. 3-18.

3. See Heinz Schürmann, Das Geheimnis Jesu (Leipzig: St. Benno Verlag, 1972).

4. Morton S. Enslin is the sole exception, as far as the present author knows. He argues that there was no contact at all between the two. See his, "John and Jesus", ZNW 66 (1975), 1-18.

5. Ragner Leivestad, Jesus in His Own Perspective: An Examination of His Sayings, Actions, and Eschatological Titles, trans. by D. E. Aune (Minneapolis: Augusburg, 1987), p. 88. Underline is original.

6. Jerome Murphy O'Conner, "John the Baptist and Jesus: History and Hypotheses", NTS 36 (1990), 359.

7. Especially Israel's deliverance by God in the wilderness gave the "wilderness" a special significance. This event was recited as a historical event (e.g., Deut 32:10; Ps 78:52) and subsequently integrated into the eschatological hope (e.g., Hos 2:14-23; 12:9).

8. 1 Macc 2:29; 2 Macc 5:27; 6:11; 10:6; Ps. of Sol. 17:19.

9. 1QS 8:12-16

10. Bell. 2:259 (deceivers and impostors); 2:261 (an Egyptian); 6:351 (flee to the desert); 7:438 (Jonathan); Ant. 20:97-98 (Fadus); Vita. 11 (Bannus). All these references show the popularity of the idea of the "wilderness" as the place of divine deliverance.

11. Stevan Davies, "John the Baptist and Essene Kashruth", NTS 29 (1983), 569-71; J. Allegro, The Dead Sea Scrolls (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1956), p. 116; John Scobie, John the Baptist, (London: SCM, 1964), p. 139.

12. John's clothing reminds us of Elijah the prophet: 1 Kgs 19:19; 2 Kgs 1:8; 2:13, 14. Later Elijah's style became the typical prophetic style. See Zech 13:14; Heb 11:37.

13. Hengel, Charismatic Leader, p. 36; Bornkamm, Jesus, p. 45; Scobie, John the Baptist, p. 128.

14. Meyer, Aims, p. 117, 119.

15. For this view, see Israel Abrahams, Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospel (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967), pp. 30-46; Joachim Jeremias, Infant Baptism in the First Four Centuries (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1960); T. W. Manson, The Servant-Messiah (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953), pp. 43-45; H. H. Rowley, "Jewish Proselyte Baptism and the Baptism of John", HUCA 15 (1940), 313-34. For the arguments against this view, see Scobie, John the Baptist, pp. 95-102; J. Thomas, Le mouvement baptiste en Palestine et Syrie, 150 av. J.-C. - 300 ap. J.-C. (Gembloux: Duculot, 1935), pp. 61-88, 356-74; A. Y. Collins, "The Origin of Christian Baptism", St Liturg 19.1 (1989), 32-35; S. Zeitlin, "A Note on Baptism for Proselytes", JBL 52 (1933), 78-79.

16. For this view, see Otto Betz, "Die Proselytentaufe der Qumransekte und die Taufe im Neuen Testament", RevQ 1 (1958), 213-34; W. H. Brownlee, "John the Baptist in the New Light of Ancient Scrolls", in The Scrolls and the New Testament, ed. by Krister Stendahl (London: SCM, 1957); S. Gnilka, "Die essenischen Tauchbäder und die Johannestaufe", RevQ 3 (1961-62), 185-207; Bo Reicke, "The Historical Setting of John's Baptism", in Jesus, the Gospels, and the Church, [William Farmer Festschrift], ed. by E. P. Sanders (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1988), pp. 209-24; Scobie, John the Baptist, pp. 107-10. Contra to this view, see A. Y. Collins, "Origin of Baptism", p. 31; Roland Schütz, Johannes der Täufer (Zurich: Zwingli, 1967), p. 57.

17. For this view, see A. Y. Collins, "Origin of Baptism", pp. 35-36; Leonhardt Goppelt, Theology of the New Testament, trans. by John E. Alsup (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981), I, 37-38.

18. Jeremias argues that John's baptism was also self-immersion. See his Theology, p. 51. It is more likely, however, that John administered the baptism, for John the Baptist compares himself with the one who will pour out the Holy Spirit (Matt 3:11//Mark 1:8//Luke 3:16). Furthermore, without assuming that, we cannot explain the history of Christian baptism which was not self-immersion from the beginning.

19. W. D. Davies and Dale C. Allison, The Gospel according to Saint Matthew (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1988), I, 301.

20. Dale C. Allison, "Jesus and the Covenant: A Response to E. P. Sanders", JSNT 29 (1987), 59. See also, Davies and Allison, Matthew, I, 308-9.

21. Davies and Allison, Matthew, I, 308.

22. See T. Levi. 15:4; m. Sanh. 10:1; Justin, Dial. 140.

23. L. H. Schiffman, "At the Crossroads: Tannaitic Perspectives on the Jewish-Christian Schism", in Jewish and Christian Self-Definition, ed. by E. P. Sanders (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981), II, 127-31; K. Pusey, "Jewish Proselyte Baptism", ExpTim 95 (1984), 141-45; D. Smith, "Jewish Proselyte Baptism and the Baptism of John", RevQ 25 (1982), 13-32.

24. Manson, Servant-Messiah, pp. 44-45.

25. For example, Enslin, "John and Jesus", pp. 4-6.

26. Jeremias, Theology, pp. 42-46; J. Becker, Johannes der Täufer und Jesus von Nazareth (Neukirchener-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1972), pp. 13-14; Eta Linnemann, "Jesus und der Täufer", in [Ernst Fuchs Festschrift], ed. by Gerhard Ebeling et al., (Tübingen: Mohr, 1973), pp. 219-36; Simon Legasse, "Le Baptême administré par Jésus (Jn 3,22-26; 4,1-3) et l'origine de bapteme chretien", BLE 78 (1977), 3-30; Paul Hollenbach, "The Conversion of Jesus: From Jesus the Baptizer to Jesus the Healer", ANRW 2.25, I (1982), 196-219; Hans-Josef Klauck, "Die Sakramenta und der historische Jesus", in Wissenschaft und Weisheit 47 (1984), 1-11.

27. For other explanations about Jesus' separation from John, see Enslin "John and Jesus", pp. 17-18 (Herod Antipas's murder of John); Hollenbach, "Conversion", pp. 207-8; C. H. Kraeling, John the Baptist (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951), pp. 148-50 (the outbreak of the healing power); O'Conner, "John the Baptist", pp. 373-74 (his concern for the unjust social situation); David Flusser, Jewish Sources in Early Christianity (New York: Adama Books, 1987), p. 48 (his theological orientation to the "Sagic tradition").

28. Meyer, Aims, pp. 166-67.

29. For the synonymity of peplērōtai and ēggiken, see Paul Joüon, "Notes philologique sur les Évangiles", RSR 17 (1927), 82-85.

30. For Jesus' emphasis on the "salvation as pure gift," see Meyer, Aims, pp. 129ff.; Leivestad, Jesus, p. 35.

31. Hans Conzelmann, Jesus, trans. by J. Raymond Lord (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1973), p. 35.

32. The fact that the twelve was a part of the larger group of followers is well attested in Matt 10:1//Mark 3:14; Mark 4:10; Matt 7:28; Matt.20:17//Mark 10:32; Luke 10:1.

33. Bultmann, Theologie, I, 39; See also Phillip Vielhauer, "Gottesreich und Menschensohn in der Verkündigung Jesu", in [Günther Dehn Festschrift], ed. by W. Schneemelcher (Neukirchen: Moers, 1957), pp. 62-64.

34. Bornkamm, Jesus of Nazareth, p. 150.

35. This term was coined by N. T. Wright. See his "Towards a Third 'Quest': Jesus Then and Now", ARC 10 (1982), 20-27.

36. See Meyer, Aims, p. 293, n. 82; Sanders, Jesus, pp. 98-101; Witherington, Christology, pp. 126-27; Riesner, Jesus als Lehrer, pp. 483-84; Richard Horsley, Jesus and the Spiral of Violence (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1987), p. 200.

37. Horsley, Jesus, p. 200; Sanders, Jesus, pp. 483-84.

38. Horsley, Jesus, p. 200.

39. If Act 1:15-26 is proved to be historical, this narrative will be good evidence for the historicity of the twelve. Ernst Henchen's theory that this narrative was created by Luke in order to stress the importance of the apostolate is questionable. See his, The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary, trans. by B. Noble & G. Shinn (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971), pp. 155ff. For criticism of Henchen's view, see K. H. Rengstorf, "The Election of Matthias. Act. 1:15ff.", in Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation, [O. A. Piper Festschrift], ed. by W. Klassen & G. F. Snyder (New York: Harper & Row, 1962), pp. 178-92.

40. W. Horbury, "The Twelve and the Phylarchs", NTS 32 (1986), 526.

41. For example, Martin Noth, Das System der Zwölf Stämme Israels (Stuttgart: Kahlhammer, 1930).

42. For example, Norman Gottwald, The Tribes of Yahweh: A Sociology of the Religion of Liberated Israel 1250-1050 BCE (New York: Orbis Books, 1979).

43. For the amphictyonic theory, see Noth, Das System. For counter argument, see most recently Roland de Vaux, The Early History of Israel, trans. by D. Smith (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1978), pp. 695-749.

44. Vaux, History of Israel, p. 749: "The twelve -tribe system, uniting the tribes in the same genealogical or tribal list, was, during the reign of David, the ideal structure of a 'great Israel' which never in fact existed as a political organization."

45. A selective list of references from the Second-Temple literature is found in Sanders, Jesus, pp. 96-97: Baruch 4:37; 5:5; Ben Sira 36:11; 48:10; 2 Macc. 1:27f.; 2:18; Ps. Sol. 17:28-31, 50; T. Mos. 3:4; 4:9; 10:7; 1QM 2:7f.; 3:13; 5:1; 2QTemple 18:14-16.

46. Horsley, Jesus, p. 200.

47. This is one of the main points of Horbury's study of the twelve tradition. See his "Twelve and Phylarchs", p. 525.

48. Julius Schniewind, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1956); Käsemann, Questions, pp. 93-94; Kümmel, Promise, p. 47; Sanders, Jesus, p. 100; Horbury, "Twelve and Phylarchs", p. 524.

49. Bornkamm, Jesus, p. 209, n.13.

50. Perrin, Rediscovering, pp. 17-19.

51. W. D. Davies, The Gospel and the Land (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974), p. 365.

52. Matt 20:21//Mark 10:37; Matt 24:30//Mark 13:26//Luke 21:27; Matt 16:27//Mark 10:33//Luke 12:9. Cf. Jeremias, Theology, p. 98, n. 2.

53. See Horsley, Jesus, pp. 202-6; Adolf Schlatter, Der Evangelist Matthäus (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1959), p. 582; Schlatter suggests that palingenesia is the Greek equivalent of ḥiddûš hā ʿôlām (meaning "the renewal of the world").

54. Horsley, Jesus, pp. 203-6.

55. For a different explanation of the term diakonein, see Peter Stuhlmacher, Reconciliation, Law, and Righteousness: Essays In Biblical Theology, (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986), p. 21.

56. T. W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957), p. 217.

57. Davies, Gospel and Land, p. 364.

58. Gerhard Lohfink, Jesus and Community: The Social Dimension of Christian Faith, trans. by J. P. Galvin (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), p. 10. Underline is original.

59. Riesner, Jesus als Lehrer, pp. 453-54. Here Riesner lists seven reasons for the historicity of the sending tradition.

60. In this light, Witherington (Christology, pp. 128-37) and Horbury ("Twelve and Phylarchs", p. 525) perhaps made a mistake in stressing the functional significance alone. We should take into account both the ontological (implied in the number "twelve") and the functional (implied in the sending tradition) significance.

61. Albert Geyser, "The Twelve Tribes in Revelation: Judean and Judeo Christian Apocalypticism", NTS 28 (1982), 398, n. 8; Lohfink, Jesus and Community, p. 11.

62. We will not treat Jesus' attitude toward the Gentiles in detail. It would distract us from the main point of our discussion. See Jeremias's work on this subject: Jesus' Promise to the Nations, trans. by S. H. Hooke (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1958).

63. For example, Dennis E. Smith argues that "Jesus at the table" is "the idealized characterization of Jesus." See his, "The Historical Jesus at Table", in SBLSP 27 (1989), 486.

64. See, for instance, Qumran evidence and Pharisaic fellowship of haveroth. For the Greco-Roman background, see D. E. Smith, "Meals and Morality in Paul and His World", in SBLSP 19 (1981), 319-39.

65. The multiform attention is striking: in narrative (Matt 9:9-13//Mark 2:14-17//Luke 5:27-32; Matt 9:14-17//Mark 2:18-22//Luke 5:33-38; Luke 7:36; 15:1-2; 14:15; 19;1-10), in accusation (Matt 11:19//Luke 7:34), in parables (Luke 15:3-32; Matt 22:1-15//Luke 14:16-24). If we take the Miraculous Feeding and the Last Supper as another form of the table-fellowship, we will appreciate how deeply this tradition is rooted in the Jesus tradition.

66. Horsley, Jesus, p. 179.

67. Meyer, Aims, p. 161.

68. For the fact that this interrogation pertained to the joyous table-fellowship, see Perrin, Rediscovering, p. 80.

69. Kümmel, Promise, pp. 75-77; Perrin, Rediscovering, p. 79; Joachim Jeremias, The Parables of Jesus, trans. by S. H. Hooke (Rev. ed.; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1963), p. 52.

70. Kümmel, Promise, p. 77.

71. The fact that Second-Temple Judaism did not know the title of the messianic bridegroom does not necessarily mean that we should not take this passage messianically. Here is implicit the messianic claim that he is the hero of the messianic feast. See ibid., p. 57, n. 123.

72. See the long list of Jewish sources in H. L. Strack and Paul Billerbeck, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrash, (Münich: Beck, 1922-61), IV, 1154-65. The list is evidence that the expectation for the messianic banquet was widespread and deep-rooted.

73. Bultmann, History, pp. 127-28; Eduard Lohse, The Formation of the New Testament, trans. by M. Eugene Boring (Nashville: Abingdon, 1981), p. 112. For a comprehensive treatment of this tradition, see E. Arens, The ELTHON-Sayings in the Synoptic Tradition (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976).

74. Davies and Allison, Matthew, I, 483; See also Fuller, Christology, p. 128; Franz Mussner, "Wege zum Selbstbewusstsein Jesu", BZ 12 (1968), 165-67; E. Schillebeekx, Jesus: An Experiment in Christology (New York: Vintage Press, 1981), p. 688, n. 138.

75. J. Jeremias, "Die älteste Schicht der Menschensohn-Logion", ZNW 58 (1969), 167.

76. Stuhlmacher, Reconciliation, p. 22.

77. "To repentance" (Luke 5:32) is a Lukan addition.

78. Sanders, Jesus, pp. 222ff.

79. For the polemic character of this saying, see Meyer, Aims, p. 166: "The Pointed antithesis, 'not the righteous but sinners', is polemic."

80. For the fact that Jesus' appeal to the righteous was a persistent effort, see ibid., p. 162.

81. For example, C. K. Barrett, The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition (London: SPCK, 1958); J. D. G. Dunn, Jesus and the Spirit: A Study of the Religious and Charismatic Experience of Jesus and the First Century Christians as Reflected in the New Testament (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1975); Borg, Jesus.

82. See Jeremias, Theology, p. 73.

83. Meyer, Aims, p. 155.

84. Barrett finds an allusion to Isa 49:24-5 (Holy Spirit, p. 62) and Jeremias to Isa 53:12 (Theology, p. 94).

85. For the final annihilation of Satan, see Test. Lev. 18:11-12; Test. Reub. 6:10-12; Test. Jud. 25:3; Test. Zeb. 9:8; Test. Dan. 5:10-11. For the eschatological war against Satan, see the Dead Sea Scrolls, especially 1QM and 4QM.

86. See above chapter two.

87. Dunn, Spirit, p. 44. See also Bultmann, History, p. 162; Käsemann, Essays, p. 39.

88. Perrin, Rediscovering, p. 64.

89. See Jeremias, Theology, p. 79; Perrin, Rediscovering, p. 63; Kümmel, Promise, p. 106; Davies ana Allison, Matthew, II, 340.

90. Dunn, Spirit, pp. 44-46.

91. Davies and Allison, Matthew, II, 340. Cf. Pss 8:3; 33:6; Ezek 3:14; 8:1-3; 37:1.

92. See Davies and Allison, Matthew, II, 344.

93. Barrett, Spirit, p. 105.

94. Duhm first made this identification in 1892. See his Das Buch Jesaia.

95. See Dunn, Spirit, pp. 53-62; Barrett, Spirit, pp. 69-93; Harvey, Jesus, p. 140.

96. For examples, Jeremias, Hengel, Manson, Dodd, Stuhlmacher, Meyer, Fuller, and so on.

97. For the discussion of the relevant passages, see David Hill, New Testament Prophecy (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1979), pp. 50-57.

98. For the similarity between the two, see C. H. Dodd, "Jesus as Teacher and Prophet", in Mysterium Christi: Christological Studies by British and German Theologians, ed. by Bell and Deissmann (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1930), pp. 53-66.

99. Jeremias, Theology, pp. 79-80.

100. Barrett explains this contradictory phenomenon in comparison to his attitude towards the "Kingdom of God" and the messiahship. See his Spirit, pp. 140-62.

101. For this, see Jeremias, Theology, pp. 80-82.

102. Among many, see Jeremias, Theology, p. 73.

103. For discussion of the historical core elements of the narrative, see Fritz Neugebauer, Jesu Versuchung: Wegentscheidung am Anfang (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1985); Jeremias, Theology, pp. 68-75; Borg, Jesus, pp. 42-45.

104. For Jesus' conception of the eschatological/messianic war, see Otto Betz, "Jesu Heiliger Krieg", NovT 2 (1957), 116-37.

105. Borg, Jesus, p. 43. Emphasis is original.

106. See the first section of this chapter.

107. John 2:18, which was probably independent from the Synoptic versions, means that the setting was historical.

108. Sigfred Pedersen, "Die Gotteserfahrung bei Jesus", ST 41 (1987), 130. Translation is mine.

109. See also, Jeremias, Theology, p. 56.

110. Albert Schweitzer, The Mysticism of St Paul (New York: H. Holt and Co., 1931), p. 234; Witherington, Christology, p. 150.

111. Dunn, Spirit, p. 65.

112. Fritzleo Lentzen-Deiss, Die Taufe Jesu nach den Synoptikern: Literarkritische und Gattungsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen (Frankfurt: Knecht, 1970).

113. Neugebauer, Jesu Versuchung, p. 15.

114. A prime example will be Kümmel, Promise.

115. For the view that the Miraculous Feeding Story should be taken as a form of Jesus' table-fellowship, see Schillebeekx, Jesus, pp. 213-18. For the view that the Last Supper can also be treated in relation with the table-fellowship, see ibid., pp. 307-10.

116. Sanders mistakenly regards this phenomenon as contradictory. See Sanders, Jesus, p. 308.

117. For the authenticity and significance of this saying, see Riesner, Jesus als Lehrer, pp. 461-62.

PART THREE:

JESUS, ESCHATOLOGY AND THE SCRIPTURES

In Part One we saw that the eschatological orientation among traditional Jews in the period before Jesus led to a special mode of reading and using the Scriptures. Jews in the Second-Temple period drew on the Scriptures in order to define their identity and to seek for the appropriate ways of realizing that identity. The eschatologically-minded, believing that they lived on the threshold of the eschaton and that the Scriptures were speaking of and for their time, shaped their self-understanding and oriented their life accordingly.

In Part Two we turned to the Jesus-tradition. The aim of the second part was to reveal the explicitly eschatological nature of Jesus' mission. In order to grasp Jesus' self-understanding and understanding of his mission, we mounted the attempt to grasp both in historical context. The result was to have confirmed an improved form of the Weiss-Schweitzer theory: Jesus understood his ministry as eschatological. But whereas Weiss and Schweitzer made no room for <u>eschatological fulfillment in the present</u>, we do. Both John and Jesus were preparationists, preparing Israel for the ordeal and the coming of the Kingdom of God; but they were also figures of fulfillment, as the present part will confirm.

Our discussion will focus on Jesus' reading of the Scriptures. Like his forebears and contemporaries, he read the Scriptures as prophecy to be fulfilled. Here we wish to combine the conclusions of Part One and Part Two. 1) The eschatologically-minded expected the Scriptures to come to fulfillment in the eschaton; 2) Jesus understood his mission as that of the last prophet and the central figure of the eschatological drama. 3) Therefore, Jesus expected the Scriptures to find their fulfillment in and through his mission.

We should, if this almost syllogistic argument holds, find some traces of fulfillment in Jesus' readings of the Scriptures. That is, in considering Jesus' inaugurated eschatology and his self-understanding as the one charged with a climactic and definitive mission to God's people, we may expect "to find in him a phenomenon otherwise unexplained in ancient Israel: the conviction that God's promises for the end-time <u>were already being fulfilled</u>."[1]

Let us be more specific. If our conclusions that Jesus conceived his mission as climactic and definitive and himself as chosen for this mission by the Spirit are true, how could he have failed to expect the Scriptures to be fulfilled in and through himself and his mission? He believed himself to have been appointed and equipped for tasks reserved for the eschaton. Hence, we expect him to have found Scriptures which spoke of him, his tasks and his

destiny. Since he believed that the eschatological drama had started with John the Baptist, we should expect to find evidence in the Gospels that part of the Scriptures had already, in Jesus' view, found fulfillment in the recent past. Since he believed that the Kingdom was now establishing itself through his (and his disciples') ministry, we should expect to find evidence in the Gospels that part of the Scriptures, in Jesus' view, were now being fulfilled. Since he believed that the coming Son of man would complete the eschatological works in the near future, we should expect to find evidence in the Gospels that the part of the Scriptures, in Jesus' view, should come to fulfillment in the near future.

All these are simply heuristic expectations and probabilities. Now we should show whether these expectations are met and these probabilities verified by the data of the Gospels.

V

JESUS AND THE SCRIPTURES

The form critics and their followers have urged that we should look for the root of New Testament christology, which was fundamentally shaped by the Scriptures, in the scribal activities of the post-Easter church. It is beyond question that the first believers practiced active messianic exegesis of the Scriptures after Easter. This acknowledgement of the post-Easter church's scribal activities, however, should not prevent us from focusing on Jesus' own interpretative activity in the course of his ministry. The form critics were somewhat onesided in their treatment of this issue. They settled primarily on the role of the post-Easter church and tended to underplay the significance of Jesus' own eschatological orientation to scriptural texts.

In previous chapters we investigated the spiritual milieu of the eschatologically-minded and of Jesus. We ascertained that the spiritual milieu under which the eschatologically-minded and Jesus lived was sufficient to ground our expectation that Jesus would look to Scriptures for the shaping of his understanding of his mission and of

himself.

In the following chapter, we adopt a more detailed approach to the question. We shall see whether the data of the Gospels meet and fulfill our heuristic expectations. First of all, we shall examine evidence of Jesus' consciousness of his own time as the time of definitive fulfillment.

1. Jesus' Consciousness of Fulfillment

The form critics regarded many (though by no means all) sayings and actions of Jesus which reflected a clear and specific consciousness of his time as the time of fulfillment, as secondary. This held especially for "messianic" texts. They chose to read these texts as retrojected from the post-Easter church back to Jesus.

The eschatological beatitude ("Blessed are your eyes ...," Matt 13:16-17//Luke 10:23-24) shows how firmly Jesus was convinced that his time was the time of fulfillment. This was a fragmentary saying transmitted without its having been embedded in its original historical context. (The context in Matthew differs from that of Luke.) Matthew relates it to the previous verses by the catchwords "to see" (blepō) and "to hear" (akouō). The historical authenticity of this saying commends itself for several reasons.[2] First, the claim of the saying that the Kingdom is already present among the hearers accords with the uniquely profiled

eschatology of Jesus insofar as we can retrieve it from other Jesus material (i.e., criterion of coherence). Second, in referring to Jesus' eschatology as "uniquely profiled," we are pointing to its originality vis-à-vis Judaism. Third, in genre (eschatological macarism) and rhythm (qînâ) it reflects the personal style of Jesus.[3] Whether we may also appeal to discontinuity with the transmitting community is perhaps open to doubt, but it would be difficult to parallel this saying to material known on other grounds to be non-historical.

In comparison with the Lukan version, Matthew's shows perfect parallelism ("to see"/"to hear" in v. 23 and v. 24). There is no telling sign to decide which version is original, but many commentators have been inclined to the primacy of the Matthean version.[4] As Kümmel pointed out, this juxtaposition of "seeing" and "hearing" is not something taken over from the Jewish tradition but something unique to Jesus.[5]

This saying resembles Jesus' reply to John's question (Matt 11:5//Luke 7:22). We have seen the authenticity of the latter saying in the previous chapter. These two sayings mutually support and illuminate one another. Both define the present moment as the time of eschatological fulfillment. In the former saying Jesus defined his time as the time of fulfillment; in the latter, that is, the present macarism, he characterized the present

moment as fulfilling the hopes of the prophets and the righteous. Both sayings are indices to Jesus' conception of his time.

We find the same motif in a group of sayings on divinely appointed measures.[6] The first sentence of the Markan form of Jesus' public proclamation (peplērōtai ho kairos) is most probably redactional,[7] but we have reasons for regarding this summary as valid. Time has now reached the point chosen by God for his climactic saving act. The foreordained measure of time has been fulfilled. As Meyer has noted, "the probable image here is a great vase that with the years has been slowly filled until at last it is full to the brim."[8]

The theme of "eschatological measure" is attested elsewhere in the Jesus tradition (Matt 23:32; Matt 24:22//Mark 13:20; Mark 4:29). Israelites have piled up their sins to the foreordained point at which God at last would act. The full measure -- from Cain's act of killing Abel to the stoning of Zechariah in 2 Chronicles 24:20-25 -- has been reached.

The discussion of eschatological measure should take account of Jesus' word on the fulfillment of the Law (Matt 5:17). Scholars have considered this saying as secondary for several reasons.[9] First of all, the ēlthon form, which the form critics regarded as a sure sign of secondary origin, may give an impression of viewing Jesus' ministry in

retrospect. Second, according to the redaction-critical study,[10] the reshaping of the Jesus tradition in more conservative fashion was the overall tendency of Matthew; Jesus had been far more radical on the Law than this saying would suggest.

These objections, however, are not decisive. The ēlthon form itself, as we noted above,[11] does not betray a retrospective view. Consequently, it is not an a-priori sign of non-historicity. Again, that Matthew reshaped the Jesus tradition in conservative fashion is true but not necessarily relevant to this text. It should not prevent us from seeing Jesus as a Jew faithful to his own tradition. This fidelity is confirmed by his habitually frequenting temple and synagogue, citing the Shema, and urging the observance of the Law. Thus, we should say that Jesus was faithful to his tradition, so far as it went, but going beyond it in accord with his view of eschatological measure applied to divine revelation (Matt 5:17).[12] The objections to historicity are inadequate. On the contrary, at a closer look, we shall find that it fits well "in with his [Jesus'] declaration that in his preaching an eschatological event comes to pass."[13] We can thus safely assume the authenticity of the saying.

The probable original context of this saying was a charge against Jesus: He was taking away from the Law. The saying itself was an act of self-defence. He was not taking

away from the Law; he was bringing the Law to completion. The key to the saying lies in the meaning of "to fulfill" (plērōsai).[14] If our judgment on the historical setting of this saying is correct, then "and the prophets" was probably a later addition.[15] The most probable meaning of the term plērōsai is then "to make perfect" or "to finish perfectly."[16] Jesus understood finalizing and perfecting the Law as his mission. What Jesus intended in this saying is not to absolutize the Law but to declare his mission in relation to the Law. He came to perfect the Law by bringing it to its appointed eschatological measure.

In this connection we should recall Jesus' saying about divorce, especially Matthew 19:3-9//Mark 10:2-9. Scholars generally accept the historicity of this saying.[17] Here Jesus defined the Law on divorce (Deut 24:1) as imperfect and provisional. The Law is divine in origin but provisional in nature. He urged upon his listeners the return to the norm of paradise (Genesis 2:24). This is paradise typology: as in the beginning, so in the end.[18] The followers of Jesus should no longer live according to the laws promulgated "in view of your hardness of heart" (Matt 19:8//Mark 10:5).

From these two sayings it becomes clear that Jesus perceived his time as the time of restoration, perfection, and fulfillment. All in the past shall be restored, perfected and fulfilled, especially and prominently the Law

and the prophets: the former to be brought to the eschatological measure of perfection and the latter to be fulfilled to the last word.

2. Jesus' Use of the Scriptures

Now, let us analyze some sayings and actions of Jesus to see if the data of the Gospels actually meet our expectation of Jesus' affirmations of scriptural fulfillment. In the interest of clarity, we shall divide the data into three groups: Jesus' expectation of the fulfillment of the Scriptures in his recent past, in his ministry, and in his immediate future. We cannot deal with the relevant data exhaustively. It will suffice, we believe, to deal with some typical examples

Fulfillment in the Recent Past

The term "inaugurated eschatology" aptly catches the essence of Jesus' conception of time: the appointed moment of salvation has already begun with his ministry. The work of John the Baptist belonged to the beginning of eschatological fulfillment (Matt 11:12//Luke 16:16b).[19] No matter which form is original, both the Matthean form ("from the days of John the Baptist") and the Lukan form ("from then") tell the same truth: John belongs in the Kingdom.[20] God's climactic and definitive action has started with John the Baptist who prepared the way in the wilderness. This

conception is also implied in Jesus' active alliance with John the Baptist through baptism. If this is the case, then we may expect to find some texts where Jesus reveals his view of John the Baptist, i.e., that the massive fulfillment of the Scriptures started with him.

There are some slight differences between the parallels in Matthew 11:13//Luke 16:16a. Nevertheless, the two make the same point: there is a great gap between the age of the Law/the prophets and that beginning with John the Baptist. It has been a general tendency to understand that Jesus, by this saying, intended to declare the invalidity of the Law and the prophets for the new age of eschaton. This interpretation, however, contradicts the actual tendency of Jesus about the Law and the prophets otherwise ascertained. The data of the Gospels do not support this interpretation. What Jesus probably meant is that the Law and the prophets are until John because the massive, eschatological fulfillment of the two would begin with him.

Jesus saw the fulfillment of the Elijah prophecy (Mal 3:23-24) in John the Baptist. The scriptural source of this belief was Malachi 3:1, 23-24 which predicts the coming of Elijah before the day of the Lord. This prophecy developed into two forms in the subsequent period: one is the belief that the coming Elijah would be the Messiah himself (e.g., Sir. 48:10),[21] and the other the belief that he would be the Messiah's forerunner (e.g., Sib. Or. 2:187-

89; 4 Ezra 6:26).[22] We are not certain about the existence of the latter conception before the time of Jesus because the extant evidence is post-Jesus. Given that Jesus perceived John the Baptist as the one to prepare for the eschatological work, it seems probable that Jesus inaugurated this reading for the first time. At the present, it is impossible to answer to this question due to the paucity of evidence. We can only say that Jesus found the fulfillment of the oracle of Malachi in John the Baptist and that this reading is attested in later Jewish writings.

This expectation enhances the probability of the authenticity of sayings where the Elijah typology is clear (Matt 11:14; Matt 17:10-13//Mark 9:11-13; Matt 11:9-10//Luke 7:26-27). New Testament scholarship has generally regarded all these sayings as secondary based on the hypothetical theory of the post-Easter church's scribal activities. But Jesus' eschatological belief, his typological thinking, and his definition of John in relation to himself -- all these indicate that he first applied Elijah typology to John the Baptist. Jesus, in his eschatological belief, saw that the Scriptures were beginning to be fulfilled in John the Baptist.

Fulfillment in His Own Time

After the arrest of John the Baptist, Jesus launched his own mission. As previously seen, Jesus differentiated

his ministry from John's in several ways. Jesus' belief that the period of preparation had gone and that of fulfillment had come must have led him to expect a massive fulfillment of the Scriptures in and through himself.

One example is Jesus' reply to John's question (Matt 11:5//Luke 7:22), which we discussed above.[23] In this reply Jesus interpreted his miracles as the fulfillment of what Isaiah predicted of the eschaton (Isa 35:5-6; 29:18-19; 61:1-2). As A. E. Harvey noted, all the infirmities are "an intractable barrier between the present age and the age to come."[24] In other words, all the cures point to the restoration of the original state of blessing. It is interesting to see that the miracles of Jesus, apart from exorcisms and nature miracles, belong to one of these categories.[25] This does not mean that Jesus intentionally worked miracles to order, in accord with his eschatological reading of Isaiah. Rather, it means that Jesus found the fulfillment of Isaian oracles in the miracles which he himself worked. This was not just fulfillment but fulfillment with intensification (including "the raising the dead").[26] For Jesus his miraculous works were the sign of the fulfillment of the scriptural vision of eschatological restoration.

We have also seen that the Servant Songs of Isaiah had a significant influence on Jesus' understanding of his ministry and himself. Especially Isaiah 61:1-2 together

with Isaiah 52:7[27] became a crucial factor in Jesus' orienting his ministry. These texts help us in understanding two distinctive features of Jesus' ministry.

First, it explains his orientation toward the good news of salvation. In contrast to John the Baptist who focused on the coming wrath of God, Jesus focused on the present realization of salvation.[28] Although Jesus also warned of the upcoming judgment, he consistently defined the latter as his future work as the Son of man. His present task was to bring Israel to eschatological restoration. Whether the omission of the latter half of Isaiah 61:2 ("and the day of vengeance of our God") in Luke 4:19 is authentic or not, it correctly shows what was in Jesus' mind. He identified himself with the mĕbaśśēr of the good news of salvation whom the Qumran covenanters identified with the messianic figure (11QMelch).

Second, influence from Isaiah 61:1-2 explains Jesus' orientation to the simple, the afflicted and the outcast. In Isaiah 61 they are the beneficiaries of the good news of salvation. We should also note that those beneficiaries of Isaiah 61 are the eschatological remnant (61:4-9). The anointed one will work for the restoration of the remnant on Zion; that is the good news. Jesus saw the fulfillment of Isaiah 61:1-2 when he was faced with enthusiastic acceptance by the simple, the afflicted and the outcast. This prompted him to proclaim the Beatitudes and to open his table-

fellowship to all. The result was that he was called the friend of "sinners and tax-collectors."

It follows that Jesus found the fulfillment of Isaiah 61:1-2 in his own ministry of good tidings to the simple, the afflicted and the outcast. Without this scriptural background, it is hardly possible to explain these orientations of Jesus' ministry. His ministry was shaped by his expectation for the fulfillment of the scriptural prophecies through his ministry.

In two distinctive cases, Jesus consciously acted according to scriptural prophecies: Jerusalem Entry and Temple Cleansing. In both cases, it seems that Jesus carefully arranged his action in order to fulfill some crucial, at least to himself, prophecies.

Although some have raised serious doubts about the authenticity of the narrative of Jerusalem entry (Matt 21:1-9//Mark 11:1-10//Luke 19:28-40//John 12:12-19),[29] there is hardly any compelling ground for that position. We find some differences among the parallel texts,[30] but this is no reason to doubt the authenticity of its basic form.[31] All the versions of the Gospels point to a specific, historical event in the life of Jesus. We can retrieve, with a reasonable degree of certainty, what actually happened from the available data: It happened when Jesus entered Jerusalem for the last time to complete his mission; when he entered, he was mounted on an ass; and he attracted the attention of

pilgrims and, no doubt, of people from the Mount of Olives.

What did Jesus intend by this action? His choice of an ass and his mounting on it are the clues to his intention. Whatever the animal was, Jesus' mounting on a non-military animal is reminiscent of the oracle of Zechariah 9. This oracle depicts Yahweh as the Divine Warrior who would fight for the restoration of Israel, and the king of the restored Israel would enter Jerusalem as a prince of peace riding "on an ass, on a colt the foal of an ass" (v. 9). He would establish peace in the whole world (9:10) as well as in Jerusalem and Israel. We should thus see Jesus' deliberate choice of a non-military animal at his entry into Jerusalem as a symbolic action based on this oracle. Albert Schweitzer was probably correct when he conjectured that the messianic connotation of this action was not readily evident for the general public[32] since the Fourth Gospel reports that even the disciples did not appreciate its meaning (John 12:16). It was, however, clear at least to Jesus himself: he "consciously intended to fulfill the prophecy of Zechariah 9:9, and in so doing indirectly make known that he was prepared to let himself be proclaimed Messiah."[33]

Catchpole has drawn attention to the inconsistency between the oracle of Zechariah and Jesus' actual history: the king in Zechariah 9:9 enters Jerusalem after the victory, but Jesus has not yet won a victory. For

Catchpole, this discrepancy is an index to inauthenticity.[34] We have seen in the previous chapter, however, that Jesus reached early in his ministry a firm conviction about his victory over Satan and his powers. There is no discrepancy between the oracle and Jesus' action.

Temple cleansing (Matt 21:12-13//Mark 11:15-17//Luke 19:45-46//John 2:13-17) is another case in which Jesus consciously arranged his action according to the scriptural prophecy. As for the authenticity of this narrative, Sanders, for example, declared that this incident is the most reliable source for our historical understanding of Jesus.[35] The focus of scholarly discussion has been on the meaning of the incident, not its authenticity. It is clear that the incident is a prophetic, symbolic action, but it is still unclear what Jesus intended through that action.[36] Most recently, three scholars have done a fresh analysis of this incident with different interpretations. Sanders suggested that Jesus foreshadowed the temple's destruction through this symbolic action.[37] On the other hand, Jacob Neusner concluded that Jesus symbolized the imminent replacement of the tables in the temple by the table of the Eucharist.[38] In response to Sanders's thesis, Craig A. Evans reaffirmed a traditional thesis that Jesus intended to cleanse the temple according to the popular beliefs with regard to the temple and the messianic age as informed by

the Scriptures.[39]

The foregoing discussion about Jesus' theology leads us to agree with Evans: Jesus' action in the temple was motivated by his eschatological/messianic self-understanding and by the scriptural prophecies about the messiah/temple. We should seek for Jesus' intention in this action in the light of this motivation. It is very probable that Jesus believed his climactic and definitive mission to include the temple-visitation predicted by the Scriptures. The most prominent prophecy of the eschatological visitation to the temple is Malachi 3:1 ("and the Lord whom you seek will suddenly come to his temple"). One may raise questions about this thesis, based on the fact that it was not the Messiah but Yahweh himself who would come to the temple. This question, however, comes from ignorance of the conception of the eschatologically-minded in the Second-Temple period. One of the outstanding features of Jewish eschatology is that, for them, the role of Yahweh is often taken up by the messianic figure. There was no clear-cut distinction between the role of Yahweh and that of the messianic figure in the eschaton.

If Malachi motivated Jesus' action in the temple, then what was his intention? According to Malachi, the purpose of that "sudden coming to the temple" is to purify the corrupted system of the temple so that acceptable sacrifices could be offered. This is not, however, just an

action of a social or religious reformer. The concern is not simply with the corruption and its reformation. The real concern is with eschatological restoration. Jesus was acting as the eschatological prophet, not as an ordinary reformer. The intention of Jesus in this action is thus the eschatological restoration of what the temple was originally supposed to bring.

In Part One we saw that the Sign Prophets acted according to their understanding of what scriptural prophecies would be fulfilled through themselves. These examples shed light on our understanding of Jesus' two actions in Jerusalem (entry and temple cleansing). Given that Jesus understood his mission as climactic and definitive, it is very natural to see from Jesus such intentional actions for the fulfillment of the Scriptures.

We also find that Jesus anticipated and interpreted his tragic end in the light of the Scriptures. His sayings about his suffering and death abundantly attest such conception (Matt 26:24//Mark 14:21//Luke 22;22; Matt 26:54; Matt 26:56//Mark 14:49; Mark 9:12; Luke 18:31; 22:37). The multiple and multiform attestation is striking. Jesus repeatedly taught the disciples that he would undergo a scripturally appointed destiny of suffering and death (Matt 5:11-12; Matt 20:22//Mark 10:38; Matt 10;16-23//Mark 13:9-13//Luke 21:12-17; Matt 10:34-39//Luke 12:51-53).

Scholars have viewed these sayings with suspicion

for many reasons: Prophecy in the proper sense does not and presumably cannot be realized; supposed prophecy but actually post-factum retrojection had been a well-attested phenomenon for centuries, e.g., in apocalyptic literature; in the present instance, the disciples never acted or reacted in a way that showed they had known of these events by prophecy in advance. To this we may add the thesis of the post-Easter church's messianic exegesis.

It is beyond the scope of this study to deal with the issue of the possibility of prophecy. (We assume this possibility on philosophical and theological grounds.) It must be acknowledged that pseudo-prophecy is well attested. It is also true that the behavior of the disciples does not support the historicity of Jesus' prophecy. Nevertheless, the matter must be judged without prejudice. There are reasons for believing that Jesus anticipated at least his rejection and violent death. First, Jesus' ministry was met from the outset by opposition from the religious authorities, and, according to the data of the Gospels, it had been aggravated as time passed on. Second, he also urged his disciples to prepare the coming persecution. Third, Jesus most probably knew the Jewish prophetic tradition that most prophets went through hardships and sometimes violent death. Fourth, most important, the violent death of John the Baptist with whom Jesus allied himself was likely enough to teach Jesus the probable

future of his mission. Fifth, Jewish eschatological belief expected that the messianic tribulation would come before the final establishment of the Kingdom. Sixth, we have some pieces of evidence that Jesus also expected the eschatological tribulation (e.g., Matt 10:34-39//Luke 12:49-59). If we put these together, it is probable that Jesus anticipated his suffering and violent death. In this light it is not strange to meet the Gospel story that Jesus predicted his future suffering and death.

If, indeed, Jesus anticipated his repudiation and death, and if he understood his mission as climactic and definitive, how did he put these all together? Surely, he must have searched for the meaning of his destiny in the Scriptures, which still awaited fulfillment. And from this search, he must have come to the conviction that suffering and death were scripturally destined. The only likely scriptural resources -- texts on death and salvation -- appear to be the Servant Songs of Isaiah and the shepherd passages of Zechariah.

First, we have some pieces of evidence that Jesus understood <u>his suffering and death in the light of the fourth servant song</u> (Isa 52:13-53:12). Scholars have long disputed this matter without any considerable consensus. The debate centers mainly around two questions: first, whether Isaiah 53 was messianically interpreted in the pre-Christian period; second, whether Jesus actually alluded to

this chapter. The available data are so ambiguous as to permit scholars to answer both questions either way. It is, however, a result of an atomistic approach to evidence. When we take a more holistic approach to the matter, the result will be different.

As for the pre-Christian use of this chapter, we shall point to Sydney Page's investigation of the pre-Christian Jewish texts.[40] The Wisdom of Jesus ben Sirach 48:10 combines Malachi 4:5-6 and Isaiah 49:6; the Wisdom of Solomon 2:10-5:23 has numerous allusions to the Servant Songs; the descriptions of the "Righteous One" or the "Elect One" in 1 Enoch are similar to those of the Servant; 1 Enoch 47:1-4 possibly alludes to Isaiah 53:12; 4 Ezra 7:28-29 talks about the dying messiah. All these allusions are eschatological and messianic.

Furthermore, we should make a note about the importance of the Servant Songs for the Teacher of Righteousness and the covenanters.[41] Allusions are especially prominent in the Hodayoth (e.g., 1QH 8:36/Isa 50:4; 1QH 4:8/Isa 53:3; 1QH 2:8/Isa 53:5; 1QH 7:1/Isa 53:7; 1QH 18:14/Isa 61:1). In all these passages we can detect many allusions to the Servant Songs, especially Isaiah 53. We also should note that 1QS 8:5-7 is full of allusions to the Servant Songs, and 11QMelch combines Isaiah 52:7, Daniel 9:25 and Isaiah 61:2-3 in the description of the heavenly deliverer Melchizedek. We see here that the Servant Songs

had a significant influence on the self-understanding and mission of the Teacher of Righteousness and the covenanters.

The Tg. Neb. Isaiah (42:1; 43:10; 52:13; 53:10) offers us a clear example of the identification of the Servant of Yahweh with the messianic figure. Scholars have mistreated this evidence in discussing Jesus' use of Isaiah 53. They have assumed that it would have evidential value only if the Targum predated Jesus. We can, however, use this evidence for the spiritual milieu of the first two centuries: The Servant Songs were liable to messianic interpretation during this time.

In relation to Targumic evidence, Ragner Leivestad suggested an interesting but plausible explanation.[42] He asked why the rabbis, in their polemical efforts against the Christian interpretation, felt it necessary to transform the fourth song in such a radical fashion while keeping the identification of the Servant with the Messiah. It would have been much easier to refute the Christian interpretation by identifying the servant with some other figure. According to Leivestad, this radical transformation seems unwanted unless the identification of the Servant with the Messiah was a firm tradition. In other words, this identification was such an old tradition that the Jewish apologists could not change it. If this was the case, we can safely posit the pre-Christian messianic interpretation of Isaiah 53.

All the above-mentioned points together make it "completely credible that someone possessed with a messianic consciousness could have interpreted his career, and especially his death, in light of the songs."[43] The ransom saying (Matt 20:28//Mark 10:45) and the cup saying (Matt 26:28//Mark 14:24//Luke 22:20) show that this was indeed the case. A substantial number of scholars take the cup saying as authentic.[44] The ransom saying is more often contested, but there seems to be a growing tendency to view this saying, too, as authentic.[45] In these sayings Jesus interprets his suffering and death by alluding to the fourth servant song. Jesus understood his mission as that of the Servant of Yahweh who, according to the Songs, would be elected for the eschatological tasks by the Spirit and, at the same time, to accomplish his tasks by going through vicarious suffering and death.

Second, at one occasion Jesus cites Zechariah 13:7 in relation to his impending death (Matt 26:31//Luke 14:27). Since scholars have regarded formal citation in the Jesus tradition as an indication for secondary origin, they have set this saying aside. Jeremias, however, offers some reasons for taking it to be authentic.[46] Furthermore, when we take into account the shepherd theme which is multiformly and multiply attested throughout the Gospels, the case for authenticity becomes stronger. The shepherd/sheep theme is so deeply and widely attested[47] that we may well say that

Jesus understood himself as the eschatological shepherd. There was an expectation for the eschatological shepherd in Jewish eschatological belief (Ezek 34:11-24; 1 Enoch 89:22,24,28; Ps. Sol. 17:40-41). Zechariah 13:7 thus explains the meaning of the violent death of the eschatological shepherd.

It is then also very probable that Jesus' citation from the Zecharian passage reveals his understanding of the death of the eschatological shepherd. According to the context of Zechariah 13, the striking of the shepherd signals the beginning of the great tribulation which will refine and test the remnant (13:9). Great tribulation should come before the renewal of covenant and the restoration. Thus, it follows that Jesus, by referring to this Scripture, interpreted his upcoming death as the beginning of the great tribulation which would test and refine the followers (the eschatological remnant). In other words, Jesus found the fulfillment of the Scriptures in the end of his life.

Fulfillment in the Immediate Future

Furthermore, Jesus predicted subsequent fulfillment of the Scriptures in the near future. According to our configuration of the nature of Jesus' eschatology ("inaugurated eschatology"), Jesus must have had a picture of the future in which his climactic and definitive

eschatological mission would be completed. As Ben F. Meyer, drawing on the insights of Jeremias, correctly noted, "the leading motifs in Jesus' vision of the future were, then, the coming ordeal and its resolution by the triumph (enthronement) of the Son of man."[48] We have seen that Jesus interpreted the coming ordeal (his suffering and death, the persecution of disciples, the tragic end of Israel and Jerusalem) as the eschatological tribulation foretold in scriptural prophecies (e.g., Jer 30:4-7; Dan 12:1). Jesus, however, did not stop at predicting merely the coming ordeal. In accord with the entirety of biblical tradition, he went further to predict the final resolution by the coming of the Son of man. The data of the Gospels reveal that Jesus' conception of the future was largely shaped by scriptural prophecies.

Most of all, Jesus expected the fulfillment of the Danielic vision of the Son of man in the immediate future. We may need some length of discussion about this question.

One of the points of the Son of man question has been its relation to Daniel 7:13. With few exceptions, the current trend among scholars is to deny the influence of Daniel 7 upon Jesus' use of the "Son of man." The major reason for this view is that there is no attestation of the messianic use of the Son of man title from the pre-Jesus Jewish writings. We see here another example of the title-oriented research and of its weakness. In the present

situation, it seems impossible that we should attain consensus on this question in the near future for hermeneutical reasons and in light of the limitations and ambiguity of the available data. When we stop focusing on titles, however, we shall more easily find reasons to think it reasonable to accept Jesus' reference to Daniel 7 in the Son of man sayings.

First, this is probable in view of the religious milieu at Jesus' time. The observation that bar ʾĕnāš[ā'] had not been used as messianic title before the time of Jesus has tended to mislead scholars who have never weighed the situation of one convinced that, in himself and his mission, the whole of prophecy must come to fulfillment. The absence of the titular usage before the time of Jesus does not necessarily mean that Jesus did not use it that way.[49] More important than prior attestation is the general religious milieu which favoured such an interpretation. Although "the one like a son of man," as far as we know from the extant evidence, had never been interpreted messianically before the time of Jesus, it always had had that kind of potentiality. The Similitudes of Enoch and 4 Ezra 13 illustrate how this potentiality came to expression.

It therefore does not follow that the Similitudes have evidential value only if written before the time of Jesus. The date of this book has been contested, and the growing trend is to place it between the

reign of Herod the Great and the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 CE.[50] Even if it were to be firmly dated before the early first century CE, however, this would not make any decisive change in our discussion unless it is proved that Jesus knew that writing. We should rather interpret the existence of the Similitudes as evidence for the spiritual milieu of the eschatologically-minded at the time of Jesus. Regardless of its date, the Similitudes, 4 Ezra 13 and the Gospels tell us that Jesus lived in an intellectual and spiritual milieu in which Daniel 7 and "the one like a son of man" were liable to messianic interpretation.[51] We should also mention William Horbury's study of Daniel 7 in Second-Temple writings.[52] According to his study, although the Son of man as the messianic title is not attested in this period, the messianic interpretation of Daniel 7 is not rare. All this tells us that the messianic interpretation of the "one like a son of man" was liable to appear at the time of Jesus.

Second, with this, we should consider Jesus' own eschatological belief. It has been our main thesis that Jesus spoke and acted in terms dictated by his eschatological expectations. In chapter three we have seen that attempts to reconstruct a non-eschatological Jesus cannot be successful. In the previous chapter we have seen the climactic and definitive character of Jesus' eschatology. Thus, if the spiritual milieu at that time was

favourable to the messianic interpretation of Daniel 7, if Jesus was one of the typical eschatologically- minded, and if the messianic interpretation of Daniel 7 and the "one like a son of man" is deeply rooted in the Jesus tradition, then is it not most reasonable to conclude that Jesus himself was the source of that messianic interpretation?

Third, there are some arguably authentic sayings which allude to Daniel 7 but do not have the Son of man title (Luke 12:32; Matt 19:28//Luke 22:28-30; Matt 20:20-28//Mark 10:35-45). We have already treated the Lukan "little flock" saying (12:32)[53]. The phrase dounai tēn basileian is certainly an allusion to Daniel 7:27: "And the Kingdom and the dominion ... shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High."[54] Matthew 19:28//Luke 22:28-30 contains the similar idea of "the giving of the kingdom/dominion." We find this idea again in the pericope of the sons of Zebedee. Bultmann regards this pericope as "a manifest vaticinium ex eventu,"[55] but there are some reasons favouring its authenticity. First, Sanders points out that the history of the post-Easter church as known to us does not support the assumption that the pericope was made after the fact.[56] Second, Jesus specifies a limit on his authority in Matthew 20:23//Mark 10:40, which is hardly probable to be a post-Easter invention.[57] If we take this pericope as authentic, it again confirms Danielic influence on Jesus. The idea of "giving the kingdom" and the theme of

divine sovereignty strongly suggest the influence of Daniel 4 on this pericope. It is, thus, reasonable that the Book of Daniel was significant for Jesus, as it was for his contemporaries.[58]

Fourth, as previously seen, Jesus' self-understanding as the future Judge-King is deeply rooted in the Jesus tradition. Some have questioned whether a normal person like Jesus could have owned such a high self-understanding.[59] But that Jesus owned such a self-understanding is one thing and that it is difficult for us to understand is quite another. However we take it, it is an indisputable fact in the Jesus tradition. Jesus' use of the Son of man in the Danielic sense is fully in accord with Jesus' self-understanding as we have ascertained it so far.

The above considerations are quite sufficient for us to conclude that Jesus could use bar ʾĕnāšā in the Danielic sense under the influence of that book. In other words, Jesus identified himself with the "one like a son of man" of Daniel 7:13. It means that Jesus read that Scripture eschatologically and expected its fulfillment through himself. In this understanding, Jesus' self-understanding as the Son of man was thus primarily related to "his future royal status and his future judicial authority."[60] When he uses this designation in the context of earthly activities, he does it in terms of the future expectation.

3. Conclusions

The above data of fulfillment are not exhaustive but representative. They cannot be exhaustive because the available data do not report everything about Jesus and because debates on the authenticity of many sayings and actions are still going on without general consensus. There is no way but to be selective. The above examples, selective but representative, seem to be sufficient to confirm that the data of the Gospels do meet our heuristic expectations of fulfillment as a ubiquitous motif. Jesus actually expected that the scriptural prophecies had been fulfilled in his immediate past, were being fulfilled in the present and would be fulfilled in the future. The Scriptures which Jesus regarded as waiting for fulfillment and significant for his mission furnished him with crucial insights for the orientation of his mission and for his interpretation of unfolding events. The Scriptures were a major source for Jesus' self-understanding.

END NOTES

1. Ben F. Meyer, "Appointed Deed, Appointed Doer: Jesus and the Scriptures", in Christus Faber (Allison Park: Pickwick, 1992), pp. 59-80.

2. Even Bultmann accepts its authenticity. See his History, p. 126.

3. C. F. Burney, The Poetry of Our Lord (Oxford: Clarendon, 1925), p. 145.

4. For example, see I. Howard Marshall, The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary (Exeter: Paternoster, 1978), p. 438. He thinks that Luke abbreviated the original saying, thereby losing the parallelism. He also lists names of scholars who support the primacy of the Matthean version. Cf. Davies and Allison, Matthew, II, 395. They think that Matthew added "to hear" to make the parallelism perfect.

5. Kümmel, Promise, p. 122.

6. For a detailed discussion of this theme, see R. Stuhlmann, Das eschatologische Mass im Neuen Testament (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983).

7. See for example D. E. Nineham, Saint Mark (Hammondsworth: Penguin Books, 1963), p. 68.

8. Meyer, "Appointed Deed", p. 61; also pp. 76-7, n. 6.

9. For example, Bultmann, History, p. 138.

10. For examples, Günther Bornkamm, Gerhard Barth and Hans-Joachim Held, Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew, trans. by Percy Scott (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1963); M. D. Goulder, Midrash and Lection in Matthew (London: SPCK, 1974); J. P. Meier, Law and History in Matthew (Rome: Biblical Institute, 1976).

11. See above chapter four.

12. For the discussion of Paul's attitude towards the Law, see Hans Hübner, Law in Paul's Thought (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1984); E. P. Sanders, Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983); Stephen Westerholm, Israel's Law and the Church's Faith (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988); James Dunn, Jesus, Paul and the Law (London: SCM, 1990).

13. Kümmel, The Theology of the New Testament according to Its Major Witnesses, trans. by John E. Steely (Nashville: Abingdon, 1973), p. 53.

14. For discussions of the possible meanings of this term, see Gustaf Dalman, Jesus-Jeshua, trans. by P. P. Levertoff (New York: MacMillan, 1929), pp. 56-66; Matthew Black, An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts, 3rd ed. (London: Oxford University Press, 1967), pp. 229-236; Jeremias, Theology, pp. 83-84; Davies and Allison, Matthew, I, 485-87.

15. For the same conclusion with somewhat different reasons, see Dalman, Jesus, p. 64; Davies and Allison, Matthew, I, 484.

16. Black, Aramaic Approach, p. 232.

17. For example, Meyer, Aims, p. 289, n. 38; Stephen Westerholm, Jesus and Scribal Authority (Lund: Gleerup, 1978), p. 120; Sanders, Jesus, p. 257.

18. Jeremias, TDNT, V, 767; Meyer, Aims, p. 139; We find the paradise typology in other places: Matt 11:5//Luke 7:22; Matt 26:64//Mark 14:62; Luke 22:69.

19. For the authenticity of this saying, see Jeremias, Theology, pp. 46-47.

20. Davies and Allison, Matthew, II, 253.

21. For rabbinic evidence, see Strack-Billerbeck, Kommentar, IV, 782-4.

22. See ibid., IV, 784-9.

23. See above chapter four.

24. A. E. Harvey, Jesus and the Constraints of History (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1982), p. 117.

25. Ibid., p. 115.

26. Meyer, Aims, p. 157.

27. For the connection between Isa 52:7 and Isa 61:1-2 based on the theme of "good tidings" in the pre-Christian period, see Harvey, Jesus, p. 152. The Qumran evidence (1QH 18; 11QMelch) implies that reference to one of the two texts was likely to remind of the other.

28. Meyer, Aims, pp. 129-30.

29. For example, D. Catchpole, "The 'Triumphal' Entry", in Jesus and the Politics of His Day (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), pp. 319-24.

30. For example, Matthew has "the ass and the colt," Mark and Luke "the colt" and John "the ass."

31. See Vincent Taylor, The Gospel according to St. Mark (London: MacMillan, 1966), p. 456; Marshall, Luke, p. 715; Sanders, Jesus, p. 308.

32. Schweitzer, Quest, p. 394.

33. Leivestad, Jesus, p. 140.

34. Catchpole, "Triumphal Entry", p. 319.

35. Sanders, Jesus, pp. 61-76.

36. For various attempts at interpretation, see Davies, Gospel and Land, p. 350, nn. 45-6.

37. Sanders, Jesus, pp. 61-76.

38. Jacob Neusner, "Money-Changers in the Temple: the Mishnah's Explanation", NTS 35 (1989), 287-90.

39. Craig A. Evans, "Jesus' Action in the Temple: Cleansing or Portent of Destruction?", CBQ 51 (1989), 237-270.

40. Sydney H. T. Page, "The Suffering Servant between the Testaments", NTS 31 (1985), 481-84.

41. Bruce, Exegesis; W. H. Brownlee, "Messianic Motifs of Qumran and the New Testament," in NTS 3 (1956-7), 12-30, 195-210; idem., "The Servant of the Lord in the Qumran Scrolls," in BASOR 132 (1953), 8-15 and 135 (1954), 33-38.

42. Leivestad, Jesus, p. 70.

43. Page, "Suffering Servant", p. 453.

44. For example, see Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, trans. by Norman Perrin (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1966); Meyer, "The Expiation Motif in the Eucharistic Words: A Key to the Historical Jesus", Greg 69 (1988), 461-87.

45. For arguments for authenticity, see France, "The Servant of the Lord in the Teaching of Jesus", TynBul 19 (1968), 32-33; Seyoon Kim, "The 'Son of Man'" as the Son of God (Tübingen: Mohr, 1983); Peter Stuhlmacher, Reconciliation, pp. 16-29; Witherington, Christology, pp. 251-56.

46. Jeremias, TDNT, VI, 492-3.

47. Matt 9:36//Mark 6:34; Matt 10:6; Matt 15:24; Matt 18:12-14//Luke 4-7; Matt 25:31-44; Matt 26:31//Mark 14:27; Luke 12:32; Matt 14:13-21//Mark 6:32-44//Luke 9:10-17//John 10:1-13.

48. Meyer, Aims, p. 206; See also, Jeremias, "Eine neue Schau der Zukunftsaussagen Jesu", TBL 20 (1941), cols. 216-222.

49. See A. Yarbro Collins, "The Origin of the Designation of Jesus as 'Son of Man'", HTR 80 (1987), 404: "This argument is basically sound but should not be pressed too far." Also, John Collins, Apocalyptic, p. 154: "Scholarly debate has focused too narrowly on the question whether 'Son of Man' was a title in Judaism."

50. Collins, "Origin of Designation", p. 404, n. 50.

51. Cf. John Collins, Apocalyptic Imagination, p. 154; Hooker, Son of Man, p. 48.

52. William Horbury, "The Messianic Association of 'The Son of Man'", JTS 36 (1985), 40-48.

53. See above chapter four.

54. Jeremias, Theology, p. 265; idem., TDNT, V, 501, n. 20; Dalman, Words, p. 134; Meyer, Aims, p. 309, n. 118.

55. Bultmann, History, p. 24.

56. Sanders, Jesus, p. 147.

57. Ibid., p. 147; Taylor, Mark, p. 439.

58. See Josephus, Ant., 10:267-8.

59. John Knox, The Death of Christ (Nashville: Abingdon, 1959), pp. 52-77; F. C. Grant, The Gospel of the Kingdom (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1940), pp. 115-63.

60. Jeremias, Theology, p. 276.

VI

SELF-UNDERSTANDING OF JESUS

We have finally come to the goal which we have set in the beginning: an inquiry into Jesus' self-understanding. Conscious of the failure of the atomistic and the title-oriented approaches to the question, we have chosen to take a "circuitous road," that is, a holistic approach. There is a sense in which Jesus' self-understanding is the last thing we can know about him; to that extent everything we have ascertained up to this point can be pressed into the service of coming to know something of Jesus self-understanding. The kind of holistic approach adopted in this study has not been widely used in historical-Jesus studies.

In chapter four we retrieved the basic framework of Jesus' self-understanding: he understood himself as the final envoy, the King of the restored Kingdom, the eschatological warrior, the spirit-filled Servant of Yahweh, the Son of man, and so on. Jesus, in short, understood himself according to various categories which the Jews of his time applied to the key eschatological figure. In his conceiving his own ministry as climactic and definitive, he interpreted himself as the elect one who was to bring almost all eschatological tasks to completion. Our knowledge of

the eschatologically-minded in the Second-Temple period informed us that such eschatological belief and self-understanding entail a specific attitude towards the Scriptures, that is, one that regards the Scriptures as prophecies of the eschaton and expects their fulfillment in the eschaton.

We also saw in the previous chapter that this held for Jesus. Jesus believed that the eschaton had already dawned; that he had been chosen for eschatological tasks; that the Scriptures would find fulfillment in him. It follows that what he took to be crucial to his eschatological mission had a powerful impact on his self-understanding. In other words, we can grasp some aspects of Jesus self-understanding by looking at the texts which Jesus considered to be significant.

1. Some Aspects of Jesus' Self-understanding

What Scriptures did Jesus take to be soteriologically significant, which called for fulfillment through his mission? The data of the Gospels are the only source for the answer of this question. We have seen some of the Scriptures which Jesus believed to be fulfilled in the previous chapter. We shall see some retrievable aspects of Jesus' self-understanding by reviewing those Scriptures which Jesus took to be important.

Prophecy of the Mĕbaśśēr

The main theme of Jesus' message was the Kingdom of God (or the reign of God). The history-of-religions background of this term has been disputed,[1] but we should understand this term in relation to the Qaddiš prayer. Jews in Jesus time recited this prayer weekly in the Synagogue one phrase of which reads, "May he let his kingdom rule in your lifetime and in your days and in the lifetime of the whole house of Israel, speedily and soon."[2] The audience of Jesus who were accustomed to this phrase surely recalled this prayer when they heard Jesus' message of the Kingdom of God. Facing this message, they could have appreciated that Jesus claimed the fulfillment of the national eschatological expectation in his ministry.

Further, Jesus' message of the Kingdom of God has its roots in the scriptural prophecies of God's eschatological Kingdom (Isa 24:23; 33:22; 52:7-10; 61:1-4; Zeph 3:14-20; Dan 7:14). Especially, Isaiah 52:7-10 has significant bearings on Jesus' message of God's Kingdom. This text reveals three themes which are prominent in the Jesus tradition: the herald of salvation (mĕbaśśēr), the reign of God (mālak ʾĕlōhāik) and the restoration of Israel (v. 9).[3] These common themes of Isaiah 52 and Jesus suggest some kind of connection between the two.

In this relation, we should recall our discussion of Jesus' use of the Servant Songs of Isaiah. As the Baptism

Narrative shows, Jesus believed that he was elected and anointed by the eschatological Spirit, with the help from Isaiah 42:1-4. We also found that Isaiah 61:1-4 worked for Jesus' interpretation of his miracles and orientation of his ministry (to the "good news" and to the "little"). We have some pieces of evidence that Isaiah 52:7 was eschatologically interpreted in combination with Isaiah 61:1-4 or Isaiah 42:1-4.[4] It means that it was easy for these passages to be interpreted in connection with each other at the time of Jesus. The Qumran evidence gives us an example that these passages interpreted each other for Second-Temple eschatological Jews (11QMelch 2:15-18).

Thus, we can say that Jesus found fulfillment of the above-mentioned oracles of Isaiah in himself.[5] His self-understanding was then formulated by those scriptural prophecies. He understood himself as the eschatological herald (Isa 52), who was anointed by the eschatological Spirit (Isa 42), whose task was to proclaim the good news of God's Kingdom(Isa 52) to the poor and the outcast (Isa 61). The herald was at the same time the Servant of Yahweh.

Prophecy of the Suffering Servant

We saw above that Jesus found the fulfillment of one of the Servant Songs (Isa 52:13-53:12) in relation with his suffering and death. That is, Jesus defined his death as the destination of his earthly ministry and interpreted it

as "ransom for many" (Matt 20:18//Mark 10:45) which made a new covenant for the restoration of Israel (Matt 26:28//Mark 14:24//Luke 22:20). Using the scriptural prophecies, Jesus set his goal "making a new covenant" (Jer 31:31) or "an everlasting covenant" (Isa 55:3) for the restoration of Israel. In order to accomplish that goal, Jesus believed that he should live out the destiny of the Servant of Yahweh predicted in Isaiah 52:13-53:12. Thus we may well say that the fourth servant song was one of the significant sources for Jesus' self-understanding.

Daniel's Vision of the Future

We saw above that the Book of Daniel, especially chapter 7, was significant for Jesus' self-understanding. Jesus expected the fulfillment of the prophecy about "the one like a son of man" and his kingdom in the immediate future. Based on such self-understanding, Jesus chose to use bar ʾĕnāšā' , which was an idiom at the same time,[6] as an oblique self-designation. Jesus' self-understanding as the Son of man is in accord with the tradition defining Jesus as the King of the restored Kingdom or as Judge in the coming Kingdom. Jesus identified himself as the Son of man in light of his future role.

Luke reports that on one occasion Jesus uttered a saying in which the Servant motif corrects the picture of the exalted Son of man:

> Blessed are those servants
> whom the master find awake when he comes;
> truly, I say to you, he will gird himself
> and have him sit at table,
> and he will come and serve them." (Luke 12:37)

The allegorizing feature of this parable led Jeremias to conclude, with some reservation, that it may be secondary,[7] but there are some overriding considerations: amēn, the semitism parelthōn, and the use of diakonein, a motif crucial to Jesus' self-understanding. Most important, the idea of this saying (that Jesus will still serve as a servant in his coming Kingdom) is not something that the post-Easter church would likely have created.[8] This parable meets the criterion of discontinuity with the post-Easter church. A reasonable degree of authenticity then may well be assumed.

In this saying there is no mention of the Son of man, but its context (concerning his future work) implies that the "master" (ho kyrios) is the Son of man. Then, this saying is an indication that the picture of the Son of man in the future was revised by the Servant theme: He would come as the Son of man but his work still should be service for his people. Again we should recall that the meaning of the Hebrew "to judge" (šāpaṭ) includes "to serve" (diakonein).[9] Jesus defined his role not as an authoritative ruler over the people but as the Servant Judge. Such a future role of the Son of man, according to the ransom saying, would be a continuation of his role in

his earthly ministry. He may well have spoken this kind of saying more than once, but all else except this saying was suppressed by the post-Easter church, owing to its high view of the returning Lord. This single saying, with the ransom saying and the eucharistic saying, is enough to show that the ruling theme in Jesus' self-understanding was the Servant theme of Isaiah.

Prophecy of a Prophet Like Moses

We have already discussed above Matthew 5:17, its authenticity and meaning.[10] It implies that Jesus' task is "to mediate the final, climactic revelation of God's will, thus bringing the teaching of the Law and the prophets to its full, divinely predetermined, eschatological measure of completeness."[11] In other words, Jesus claimed that he stood over Moses; he was the fulfillment of the Mosaic Law. In other words, he was a second Moses.

This understanding reminds us of the Deuteronomic promise to raise up a prophet "like you" (Moses) (Deut 18:15-19).[12] In this oracle, interpreted eschatologically, God promised not only the coming of a second Moses (vv. 15, 18a) but also a new revelation (v. 18b). Jesus found the fulfillment of this prophecy in himself and implicitly expressed this self-understanding in this saying. This self-understanding is also clearly reflected in the six antitheses (Matt 5:21-48) and other teachings. He was sure

about his possession of the eschatological revelation (Matt 11:27//Luke 10:22) and his authority as God's mouth (amēn).

The Moses typology of Jesus extended to other aspects of Moses: his deliverance (Luke 11:20), miracles (Matt 14:13-21//Mark 6;32-44//Luke 9:10-17//John 6:1-15), and covenant (Matt 26:28//Mark 14:24//Luke 22:20//1 Cor 11:25). In all these traditions there is correspondence between the Urzeit and the Endzeit. In the past Moses delivered his people Israel from the hands of the Egyptians, and now Jesus is delivering his people from the hands of Satan; in the past Moses miraculously fed Israelites in the wilderness, and now Jesus is doing the same thing in the wilderness; in the past Moses cut the covenant between God and his people, and now Jesus does the same thing in the end. Moses' deliverance, miracles and covenant, however, were neither final nor perfect. On the contrary, Jesus' deliverance, miracles and covenant were final and perfect. In this sense, too, Jesus was a second Moses.

Prophecies of the Davidic Messiah

The coming of a new David or son of David is one of the most widely shared eschatological expectations in the Second- Temple period. The main scriptural source of this expectation is Nathan's oracle (2 Sam 7:5-17). This oracle contains the themes of God's raising a Davidic king, establishing an eternal kingdom and building the temple. We

also find this theme in the prophets (e.g., Isa 9:2-7; 11:1-9; Jer 23:5-6; 33:15, 22; Ezek 34:23-24; 37:24-25; Hos 3:5-6; Amos 9:11; Mic 5:1-5). Most of these prophets interpreted this oracle as a prediction of the Davidic Messiah. We find further development of this theme in the Pseudepigrapha (Ps. Sol. 17:23) and in the Dead Sea Scrolls (4QFlor 1:11-13).[13] The expectation of the Davidic Messiah was so widely accepted that it was inevitable for one with the kind of eschatological self-understanding to use the Davidic typology. Jesus' use of the terms "king" and "kingdom" in the context of restoration of Israel then implies that Jesus found the fulfillment of the eschatological expectations of the Davidic Messiah in himself.

The data of the Gospels confirm our expectation. Most of all, the temple riddle (Matt 26:61//Mark 14:58//John 2:19; Matt 27:40//Mark 15:29) is strong evidence for Jesus' self-understanding as a new David (the builder of the eschatological temple). The authenticity of this tradition is secured by its multiple and multiform attestations and its offensive character.[14] There must have been an authentic Jesus' saying about the temple behind all these different forms.

We do not know exactly the original form of the saying, but we can make some probable suggestions. First, it is improbable for Jesus to say "I will destroy the

temple." As Matthew and Mark insist, this was "false witness." The negative mentality of destroyer of the temple does not fit into the Gestalt of Jesus retrieved otherwise. Further, we should also note that "in none of the messianic texts is the Messiah expected to destroy the temple, even as a prelude to the building of a new temple."[15] If Jesus indeed mentioned the destruction of the temple, "his meaning would be luminously clear: he predicted the imminent appearance of the judgment and the new age."[16] In other words, Jesus anticipated the destruction of the temple as a part of the eschatological tribulation.

As far as the second limb of the saying is concerned, all layers of tradition agree with each other: Jesus said that he would raise the temple again. Given Jesus' eschatological belief, it is clear that Jesus did not intend to rebuild the ordinary temple as Herod the Great did. If Jesus perceived the destruction of the temple as part of the ordeal, then he must have expected its resolution, too, that is, the building of the eschatological temple.[17]

He surely identified himself as the eschatological builder of the temple. It follows with solid probability that he identified the new temple with the eschatological remnant community. Qumran evidence of such interpretation of the eschatological community as the temple supports this suggestion.[18]

At any rate, Jesus' self-understanding as the builder of the eschatological temple points to Nathan's oracle (2 Samuel 7:13) as its probable source. He found its fulfillment in himself; he was a new David who would carry out the restoration of Israel and build the eschatological temple.

This self-understanding is attested in other sayings and actions. We saw above that Jesus revealed self-understanding as the King of the restored Israel when he entered Jerusalem for the last time. We have also some sayings of Jesus employing the David typology: Jesus' answer in the controversy over the disciples' plucking grains at the sabbath (Matt 12:1-8//Mark 2:23-28//Luke 6:1-5) and his question in the Davidssohnfrage (Matt 22:41-46//Mark 12:35-37//Luke 20:41-44). Although their degree of authenticity varies, both of them together enhance the probability that Jesus understood himself according to the category of a new David.

Prophecy of God's Sonship

Our discussion of Jesus' self-understanding according to Nathan's oracle (2 Samuel 7) leads us to another corollary of such influence: his self-understanding as God's special son. The oracle predicts that there will be a special father-son relationship between God and David's son: "I will be his father, and he shall be my son." (2 Sam

7:14) In its eschatological interpretation, this verse foretold the special relationship which the son of David would entertain with God. If it was true that Nathan's oracle affected Jesus' self-understanding as a new David, the builder of the eschatological temple, then we can safely assume that Jesus understood himself as God's special son based on this oracle.

Jesus' self-understanding as God's special son is abundantly attested in the data of the Gospels (Matt 11:17//Luke 10:22; Matt 21:33-45//Mark 12:1-12//Luke 20:9-19; Matt 24:36//Mark 13:32).[19] Jesus explicitly affirmed that he was the Son of God only in answer to the high priest at the trial before the Sanhedrin. But in the three sayings evoked above, as Harvey noted,[20] that claim is implicit. Further, Jeremias has firmly established that Jesus regularly used the Aramaic word ʾabbāʾ in addressing God.[21] If Jesus regularly called God ʾabbāʾ and the early church followed his example (Rom 8:15; Gal 4:6), and if there is scarcely any example of this usage in the pre-Christian Jewish writings,[22] we are in the presence of a pregnant datum calling for explanation. This usage reflects Jesus' consciousness of standing in an intimate relationship with God.

James Dunn was correct when he noted that Jesus reached such an intimate sense of relationship with God through his experience of God,[23] but it was not all. Both

his experience of intimacy with God and his conviction of the fulfillment of Nathan's oracle through himself probably worked together to produce such self-understanding and style. Jesus, based on Nathan's oracle, came to define himself as God's special son.

Prophecy of the Eschatological Shepherd

In the previous chapter we have seen that Jesus interpreted his suffering and death by citing Zechariah 13:7 (Matt 26:31//Luke 14:27). It means that Jesus understood himself as the eschatological shepherd. The shepherd/sheep theme is one of the most widely attested themes in the Jesus tradition. This theme is also a favourite imagery of the Old Testament applied to God (e.g., Ps 23:1-6; 95:7; Jer 50:19), to the leaders (e.g., Jer 23:1-2; Ezek 34:6) and the eschatological prophet ("a new shepherd unlike former ones"; e.g., Ezek 34:23-24; 37:24). 1 Enoch and the Psalms of Solomon also attest this image of God as the Shepherd (1 Enoch 89:22, 24, 28) or the Messiah as the shepherd (Ps. Sol. 17:40-41). Thus we may say that Jesus, using the eschatological expectation about the eschatological shepherd based on the Scriptures, defined himself as the eschatological shepherd.

Some Less Prominent Themes

The above-mentioned soteriological themes are among

the major themes which have had a profound influence upon Jesus' self-understanding. In addition to this, we may note some less prominent, but still important themes.

It is probable that Jesus understood himself as the cornerstone of the temple (Matt 21:42//Mark 12:10//Luke 20:17//Thomas 66). Scholars have disputed the authenticity of the citation of Psalm 118:22-23 in the end of the Parable of the Wicked Tenants,[24] we may postpone the final judgment insofar as there is decisive evidence neither for nor against its historicity. At the same time, we notice that the meaning of the text stands in perfect coherence with what we have ascertained independently of Jesus' self-understanding.

If it is authentic, it shows that Jesus drew also on the imagery of the cornerstone of the temple (Psalm 118). The theme of rejected stone and that of Servant stand in close correlation with one another. We should bear in mind that this psalm was interpreted messianically in the Targum and eschatologically in rabbinic writings.[25] In the eschatological reading of the psalm, the "cornerstone" stands for the messianic figure upon whom the new temple (the new Israel) would be built. The Messiah would be the cornerstone of the new temple, i.e., the new messianic community. According to this imagery, the Messiah should go through rejection by the people. If Jesus cited this Psalm, then he might well have read it eschatologically. If so,

this puts a special premium on the imagery of the temple. Given Jesus' use of the imagery of 2 Samuel 7 to signify his followers under the image of the eschatological temple, it is hardly strange to find the "cornerstone" among images of his self-understanding.

Jesus further understood himself as the Divine Warrior, one of the recurring themes of the eschatological oracles of the Old Testament (e.g., Isa 13:1-22; Jer 50-51; Joel 4:9-17). In an important article,[26] Otto Betz has shown that the theme of the Holy War was important to Jesus. He first examines the Holy War theme in the Dead Sea Scrolls and then analyzes three significant sayings of Jesus (Matt 10:34; 11:12; 12:40) with some secondary ones in the light of the Qumran evidence. We are somewhat skeptical about his analysis of Matthew 12:40 because this passage has long been regarded as Matthean interpretation and because we are not sure whether Jesus knew the rabbinic idea about Jonah as "der endzeitliche Streiter und Besieger der Chaosmacht." Betz's analysis of the other texts (Matt 10:34; 11:12), however, has found wider acceptance among scholars.[27]

Besides, we saw in chapter four that Jesus believed that he had already won the victory over Satan.[28] Given his eschatological horizon, his war against Satan was eschatological in nature. He believed that he was elected and empowered as the eschatological Divine Warrior for that final war. He would fight for the eschatological remnant.

The data of the Gospels also show that Jesus understood himself as the eschatological bridegroom. The multiple attestation of the theme of the bridegroom/wedding (Matt 9:15//Mark 2:19-20//Luke 5:34-35; Matt 25:1-13; Matt 22:1-10//Luke 14:16-24//Thomas 64; cf. John 3:29) is impressive. Besides, each parable contains some indices to authenticity.[29] All these parables are evidence that Jesus was fond of the bridegroom/wedding image. He compared his table-fellowship to the "wedding feast" and himself to the bridegroom of that wedding.

Jeremias was perhaps overly impressed by the absence of the pre-Jesus usage of the bridegroom as a messianic title.[30] According to him, the choice of this imagery is simply due to the common comparison of the age of salvation with a wedding.[31] We should, however, take into account the Old Testament uses of the theme in the eschatological sense (e.g., Hos 2:16-23; Isa 54:4-8; 62:4-5). "In those days" there would be a joyous wedding feast again, and Yahweh would be Israel's permanent husband. This theme developed into the eschatological/messianic theme in the subsequent period.[32] In this light, it is by no means incredible that Jesus should have charged this scriptural theme with eschatological/messianic meaning.[33] He probably understood himself as the eschatological bridegroom. Here is one of the keys to the secret of his joyous table-fellowship: it was an eschatological feast.

Summary

Jesus, under the conviction of his election to a climactic and definitive eschatological mission to Israel, believed that the scriptural prophecies should find their fulfillment in himself. In Part One we noted with Daniel Patte that Jews in the Second-Temple period sought out the Scriptures in an effort to uncover 1) their identity and 2) ways of realizing that identity. We find that Jesus too shared in this searching of the Scriptures. There he sought, and found, what he should be and do. Thus, crucial soteriological themes and images helped to specify Jesus' self-understanding and mission.

According to the data of the Gospels, the major soteriological themes and images were those of the "herald of good tidings" (Isa 52:7; 61:1-4), of the "Servant of Yahweh" (Isa 52:13-53:12), of the "one like son of man" (Dan 7:13), of the "prophet like Moses" (Deut 15:15,18), of the "son of David" and "God's special son" (2 Sam 7) and of the "eschatological shepherd" (Ezek 34; Zech 13). Less prominent themes and images include the "cornerstone of the temple" (Psalm 118:22-23), the "Divine Warrior" and the "eschatological bridegroom." This list is not exhaustive. For we cannot definitively secure the authenticity of many traditions using the scriptural soteriological themes. Our source itself is very selective, but this list is sufficient

enough to show significant aspects of Jesus' self-understanding.

All these themes blended together to produce a unified and consistent picture in Jesus' mind; he was clearly able to harmonize these diverse images and themes. The harmony was the product not so much of activities, as of his belief that the sum total of scriptural prophecy was bound to come to convergent fulfillment in a single subject, that is, in himself.

2. Jesus and the Election of Israel

What we should especially note from our investigation of Jesus' self-understanding is that all the soteriological themes and images which Jesus exploited for his self-understanding and mission center on the theme of "election" in the Scriptures. The scriptural themes and images listed above are among those which the Scriptures are using in describing God's election of Israel.

The theme of election is essential to Israel's faith, theology, self-understanding and practices.[34] According to current consensus, the authors of Deuteronomy first introduced this theme into biblical tradition in the process of interpreting Israel's history, especially the exodus experience (Deut 7:6-8).[35] They did not create a new theme, but thematized Israel's unique relationship to Yahweh. This theme appears in the prophets, especially

Amos, Hosea and Deutero-Isaiah. "Election" was a main category for interpretation of Israel's history in the Old Testament.[36]

We should also note that the election theme is correlated with other significant themes such as covenant, judgment, remnant and restoration. Yahweh elected Israel out of many nations by his sovereign and abounding grace and entered into covenant relationship with her (e.g., Deut 7:6-8; 2 Kgs 19:34; 20:6; Isa 41:8-9; 44:1; Amos 3:2; Ezek 20:9, 41). That election entailed responsibility on both parts, that is, Yahweh was to protect and guide Israel, and Israel to obey Yahweh's command (e.g., Exod 19:4-6; Deut 14:1-2). In other words, the covenant was conditional ("If you will obey..."; Exod 10:5). Yahweh was faithful to his covenantal responsibility but Israel was not; she violated the terms of the covenant and paid high price for such violation (e.g., Isa 50:1; Jer 3:8; 16:13; Hos 9:15; Amos 3:2). Israel's unfaithfulness and subsequent judgment endangered her election.

Israel's eschatological belief took up this theme. Israel believed that gracious Yahweh would not forsake her forever; he would restore her by sparing and purifying the remnant[37] (e.g., 2 Kgs 19:29-31; Isa 1:9; 7:3; 66:18-21; Ezek 36:24-32), by the election of the Servant of Yahweh (Isa 42:1-4; 49:1-6; 50:4-9; 52:13-53:12; 61:1-4) or by his own coming (cf., Hos 3:1). The point of Israel's

eschatological expectation was her future restoration to the full privileges as the elected people. In this sense we should consider these themes (election, covenant, judgment, remnant, restoration) in their reciprocal relations. They were the means of interpreting the past, present and future of Israel.

In depicting this relationship, the Scriptures employed various themes and images.[38] Jesus adopted these themes in the shaping of his own self-understanding. For instance, the shepherd theme is a favourite image of the Old Testament often applied to Yahweh's election of Israel.[39] Yahweh is the Shepherd of Israel: he goes before his flock, guides it, leads it to the pastures, and protects it (e.g., Ps 68:7; 95:7; Jer 50:19). This covenantal relationship, however, might be lost because of Israel's rebellion (Isa 53:6), and the flock was scattered among the nations (Jer 9:15-16).

Yahweh, however, would not desert his flock forever. He promised restoration: he would redeem his scattered flock and bring it back; he himself would shepherd his flock directly (Ezek 34:11-22) and appoint a new shepherd unlike former ones (Ezek 34:23-24; Mic 5:3-4). The restored flock is called the "remnant":

> Then I will gather the remnant of my flock
> out of all the countries where I have driven them,
> and I will bring them back to their fold,
> and they shall be fruitful and multiply. (Jer 23:3)

Here we find the system of election-covenant-judgment-

remnant-restoration. Election, covenant and judgment belonged to both past and present; restoration also kept a future reference. The coming of the eschatological shepherd meant the beginning of the restoration of Israel.

The bridegroom/wedding theme was also used to depict this relationship: Yahweh married Israel, but she was unfaithful (e.g., Hos 2:1-13; Jer 3:6-10; Ezek 16:15-63); despite her unfaithfulness, Yahweh would not forsake her forever; he would bring her back, annul the writ of divorce, and restore the covenantal relationship in the future (e.g., Hos 2:16-23; Isa 54:4-8; 62:4-5).[40] It was the same with the Divine Warrior and God's son. Yahweh took the role of the Warrior for Israel in order to fulfill his part of the covenantal relationship. When, however, Israel violated the condition of the treaty, Yahweh became angry about her and turned against her (Jer 21:5; Ezek 5:8; 21:8); he waged war against Israel (Isa 63:10). Again, Israel had been in the father/son relationship with Yahweh (Deut 32:6; Ps 103:13; Isa 63:16; Ezek 7:27) but has lost it by violating the covenantal obligation (Jer 3:19-20: Mal 1:6). Israel would find the restoration of that relationship in the eschaton.

Other themes are likewise related to the theme of election. The "herald of good tidings" in Isaiah 52 proclaims the restoration of the kingship of Yahweh ("The Kingdom of God/Reign of God has come!"), an image applied to the covenantal relationship between God and Israel (e.g., Ps

48:1; 95:3; Isa 44:6; Jer 10:10). A son of David (2 Sam 7) or the prophet like Moses (Deut 18) in the eschatological view also entailed recovery of the covenant. The Servant of Yahweh would pay the price for Israel's transgression by his own life; his death effected the restoration of the loving relationship between Yahweh and Israel. The Son of man would preside over the final perfection of the covenantal relationship between the two.

In conclusion, the theme of election goes through all the images and themes which Jesus adopted in relation to himself. It means that Jesus viewed himself and his mission in the context of the election-history of Israel. He believed that he was elected for the eschatological mission, that is, the restoration of Israel. He perceived his followers as the "eschatological remnant" with whom he would accomplish the eschatological work.

This conclusion further implies that Jesus shared with the eschatologically-minded the view that Israel's election stood in need of restoration. Israel's election and covenant in the past has long been invalidated by her unfaithfulness. Yahweh's judgment on Israel in the sixth century BCE was a sign of that fact. Until the final eschatological reversal of the present fate happens, Israel's election and covenant was practically invalid during the interim.

There was a competing belief, that Abrahamic descent

was not only a necessary but a sufficient condition for salvation (e.g., T. Levi. 15:4; m. Sanh. 10:1; Justin. Dial. 140). Already in the time of Amos, there was belief that the "day of Yahweh" would guarantee the salvation of all the Israelites regardless of their behavior (Amos 5:18-29). Amos fought this illusion.[41] John the Baptist's rebuke of the Jewish leaders (Matt 3:9//Luke 3:8)[42] and a saying ascribed to Jesus (John 8:37) also show that the opponents of John and Jesus entertained this old illusion. Many felt safe in their belief in election as guarantee.

The data of the Gospels show that Jesus held an opposed conception of election. We should ponder the fact that Jesus went to John the Baptist. As we noted above, this shows that Jesus accepted John's theological outlook, which was based on his conception of election and covenant, and of restoration. Hence John's demand that even Jews undergo the rite of baptism. Election is no longer effective! What mattered in the coming judgment was not Abrahamic descent but repentance.

Jesus appears to have shared this conception with John. First, he hinted at Israel's failure and rejection in at least three parables: the Parable of the Two Sons (Matt 21:28-32),[43] that of the Wicked Tenants (Matt 21:33-41//Mark 12:1-9//Luke 20:9-16//Thomas 65-66)[44] and that of the Great Feast (Matt 22:1-10//Luke 14:16-24//Thomas 64).[45] The recurring theme of these parables is that the most

likely candidates for salvation (represented by the elder son, the old tenants and the first called) would be rejected. Who were the likely? In the historical context of Jesus, they were those Jews who, safe in their piety, rejected Jesus' proclamation. The unlikely (the younger son, the new tenants and the last called), on the contrary, responded to Jesus' call. According to the data of the Gospels, these unlikely included the Gentiles (e.g., Matt 15:21-28//Mark 7:24-30). In all these parables, then, Jesus implied that the old election was no longer effective and that salvation depended on one's response to his proclamation alone.

The Parable of the Tenants (Matt 21:43//Mark 12:9//Luke 20:16) is capped by a saying on the vineyard. This may have been a later addition, but, as Nineham noted, it is "a natural enough conclusion to the story."[46] The vineyard, an image applied to Israel's election in the Old Testament, stands for Israel as God's elected people or Israel's election itself (Isa 3:14-15; 5:1-7; Jer 12:10). In the Old Testament too there was the charge of abuse of the vineyard (Isa 3:14-16; Jer 2:21; 8:13) and a promise of its future restoration (Isa 27:2-6; 65:21; Amos 9:13-15; Zech 8:12). In our parable the vineyard stands rather for election and covenantal relationship with God than for Israel itself.[47] Hosea 2:14-15, where Israel receives back her vineyard, would be a good parallel to this parable.

Thus, what Jesus meant was that election would be restored; but it would not be the same as the former one. It would be given to whoever accepted it. There will be a new election of a new Israel through Jesus, a new Moses and a new David.

Second, we find seemingly unintelligible sayings of Jesus: "Many are called, but few are chosen" (Matt 22:14) and "the first will be last, and the last, first" (Matt 19:30//Mark 10:31; Matt 20:16; Luke 13:30). The Gospels do not give any information about the historical context for these sayings. The evangelists (or transmitters) subsequently adopted these aphoristic sayings as generalizing conclusions to the parables.

The situation of the rejection of Jesus' call by the likely or of the acceptance by the unlikely is the positively probable context of these two sayings. It is probable that Jesus, faced with such a paradoxical phenomenon, intended to explain the state of the dawning Kingdom. In the Kingdom, the seemingly most pious would be rejected and the unlikely would be accepted; in the Kingdom not all the called would be saved.[48] These two sayings thus concerns the fate of the elect, and Jesus said that it is <u>not</u> guaranteed by their state of election or of being the first. Does this not indicate that Jesus referred to the ineffectiveness of the old election?

Third, Jesus "consistently affirmed that the maintenance of election in the sight of God hinged on

response to the final call of God."[49] There is no other criterion for salvation than Jesus himself (Mark 8:38//Luke 9:26; Matt 10:32-33//Luke 12:8-9). Jesus' mission was the last call to the restoration of election. There is no hope in the old election. In order to enter the restored election, one should respond to Jesus' proclamation. The likely failed at this point; they should have accepted Jesus' message. On the contrary, the unlikely entered that Kingdom by accepting it. In this context, Jesus said, "Publicans and prostitutes will enter the basileia of God, and not you (the likely)."[50]

All this reveals Jesus' conception of Israel's election-history. Like the prophets and John the Baptist, he believed that the old election of Israel was no longer valid and that it was to be restored in the eschaton. He understood his mission as the eschatological restoration of that election which would also entail the restoration of covenant. To enter this new era of election-history, one should accept Jesus' proclamation. If one persisted in clinging to the old election, one would meet judgment. In short, Jesus viewed his ministry and himself in the line of election-history of Israel. His aim was to restore the lost election by cutting a "new" (Jer 31:31) or "everlasting" (Isa 55:3) covenant.

3. Conclusions

Ever since Meyer (The Aims of Jesus) and Sanders (Jesus and Judaism) interpreted Jesus' ministry in light of the theme of the restoration of Israel, there has been a growing attention to this theme. Our investigation decisively affirms this conclusion. Jesus believed that he was elected to accomplish the restoration of Israel; he summoned the eschatological remnant around himself. He understood himself as the herald of good tidings of restoration, as the Servant of Yahweh who would redeem Israel by his own life, as the son of David who would build a new temple, as God's special son who would restore Israel's filial relationship with God, as a new Moses who would perfect the Law (a sign of the covenant), as the eschatological shepherd who would restore the shepherd/sheep relationship, as the cornerstone of the eschatological temple, as the eschatological Divine Warrior who would fight for his people, and as the eschatological bridegroom who would renew the marriage. The eschaton for Jesus would see the perfect realization of all these crucial events and the restoration of privileged relationship with God in the past history of election. The lost election and the invalidated covenant would be restored through his work. A true Israel was born in Jesus. This was the aim of Jesus and the basis of his self-understanding.

END NOTES

1. See, for example, Michael Lattke, "On the Jewish Background of the Synoptic Concept 'the Kingdom of God'", in The Kingdom of God, ed. by Bruce Chilton (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), pp. 72-91.

2. For this prayer, see I. Elbogen, Der jüdische Gottesdienst in seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung, 3rd ed. (Frankfurt: Kaufmann, 1931), pp. 92-98.

3. Meyer, Aims, p. 133.

4. See above chapters four and five; cf., Davies and Allison, Matthew, II, 598, nn. 15, 16.

5. Cf. Harvey, Jesus, p. 141.

6. For discussion of idiomatic use of bar ʾĕnāšāʾ, see Geza Vermes, "The Use of bar nas/bar nasa in Jewish Aramaic", in An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts, by Matthew Black (Oxford: Clarendon, 1967), pp. 310-28; Barnabas Lindars, Jesus Son of Man (Michigan: Grand Rapids, 1983); P. Maurice Casey, Son of Man (London: SPCK, 1979); Richard Bauckham, "The Son of Man: 'A Man in My Position' or 'Someone'", JSNT 23 (1985), 23-33.

7. Jeremias, Parables, p. 54, n. 18.

8. See also Marshall, Luke, p. 537.

9. See above chapter four.

10. See above chapter five.

11. Meyer, Aims, p. 147.

12. Jeremias, Theology, p. 84; Davies and Allison, Matthew, I, 487.

13. For rabbinic evidence, see Strack-Billerbeck, Kommentar, I, 11-14.

14. For the offensiveness of this tradition, see Meyer, Aims, pp. 181. See also Sanders, Jesus, pp. 71-72.

15. Juel, Messiah, p. 200.

16. Sanders, Jesus, p. 73.

17. Meyer, Aims, p. 182.

18. For this subject, see Juel, Messiah, pp. 159-209; Bertil Gärtner, The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965).

19. For the review of scholarly discussion, see B. M. F. van Iersel, 'Der Sohn' in den synoptischen Jesusworten, 2nd ed. (Leiden: Brill, 1964), pp. 3-28.

20. Harvey, Jesus, p. 169.

21. Jeremias, The Prayers of Jesus, trans. by John Bowden and John Reumann (London: SCM, 1967), pp. 9-67; see also, idem., Theology, pp. 61-67.

22. For the objection to Jeremias's point, see Fuller, Foundations, pp. 31-33; Otto Betz, "Die Frage nach dem messianischen Bewusstsein Jesu", NovT 6 (1963), 20-48. The Qumran evidence which both of them suggested is, however, not enough to refute the distinctiveness of Jesus' use of this term.

23. Dunn, Spirit, p. 48.

24. For example, Nineham, Mark, p. 313.

25. See Strack-Billerbeck, Kommentar, 849-50, 875-76.

26. Otto Betz, "Jesus Heiliger Krieg", NovT 2 (1957), 116-137. It was reproduced in his collection of articles, Jesus der Messias Israel (Tübingen: Mohr, 1987), pp. 77-98. Our references will be made to the latter.

27. For example, Matthew Black, "'Not peace but a sword': Matt 10:34ff; Luke 12:51ff", in Jesus and the Politics of His Day, pp. 287-94; Allison, End, pp. 118-28.

28. See above chapter four.

29. For the authenticity of the parable of the wedding guests, see Perrin, Rediscovering, pp. 79-80. For that of the parable of ten virgins, see Dodd, Parables, p. 137; Kümmel, Promise, p. 58.

30. Jeremias, Parables, p. 52; idem., TDNT, VI, 1102. See also Davies and Allison, Matthew, II, 110.

31. He repeated the same mistake in his interpretation of Matthew 11:27//Luke 10:22. See Jeremias, Theology, pp. 56-61.

32. See Tg. Neb. Isa 62:15; Strack-Billerbeck, Kommentar, I, 517.

33. See Kümmel, Promise, p. 57, n. 123.

34. For the significance of election theme, see Peter Altmann, Erwählungstheologie und Universalismus im Alten Testament (Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1964); Th. C. Vriezen, Die Erwählung Israels nach dem Alten Testament (Zurich: Zwingli, 1953); Klaus Koch, "Zur Geschichte der Erwählungsvorstellung in Israel", ZAW 67 (1955), 205-26; R. G. Rogers, "The Doctrine of Election in the Chronicler's Work and the Dead Sea Scrolls" (Ph. D. Dissertation, Boston University, 1969); Seock-Tae Sohn, The Divine Election of Israel (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991); Norman H. Snaith, The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament (London: Epworth, 1944), pp. 131-142; G. Schrenk, TDNT, IV, 144-92.

35. See E. W. Nicholson, Deuteronomy and Tradition (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1967), pp. 56-57.

36. Since the time of Walter Eichrodt, the theme of election and covenant has been recognized as the "center of the Old Testament faith." See Walter Eichrodt, Theology of the Old Testament, vol. 1, trans. by J. A. Baker (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1961).

37. For the theme of the "remnant," see Gerhard F. Hasel, The Remnant (Berrien Springs: Andrews University Press, 1980); V. Herntrich, TDNT, IV, 194-209.

38. One of the best and most recent treatments of the themes and images of election in the Old Testament is Sohn, Divine Election. We refer to this work for further detailed discussion about this theme in the Old Testament.

39. For the shepherd theme, see Jeremias, TDNT, VI, 485-502; Gustaf Dalman, "Arbeit und Sitte in Palastina, VI", BFCT 2.41 (1939), 249-50, 253-55.

40. For this theme in Hosea, see Walter Brueggemann, Tradition for Crisis (Atlanta: John Knox, 1968).

41. See Klaus Koch, The Prophets, trans. by Margaret Kohl (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982), I, 50-56.

42. Davies and Allison, in relation to this saying, remind us of the prophetic habit of quoting only to refute (Isa 24:14-19; Jer 8:9-13; Hag 1:2-11). That is, John here quotes the thoughts of the Jews only to refute. See their Matthew, II, 307.

43. For its authenticity, see Perrin, Rediscovering, p. 119.

44. For its authenticity, see Dodd, Parables, pp. 93-98; Jeremias, Parables, pp. 175-76; Leivestad, Jesus, pp. 112-13; Klyne Snodgrass, The Parable of the Wicked Tenants (Tubingen: Mohr, 1983); Marshall, Luke, pp. 726-27; Witherington, Christology, p. 213.

45. Jeremias, Parables, pp. 63-66, 176.

46. Nineham, Mark, p. 313.

47. As Snodgrass points out, if we take the vineyard as Israel it creates problems: "How can Israel be taken away and given to others?" See his Parable, p. 74.

48. Cf. Ben F. Meyer, "Many (=All) Are Called, But Few (=Not All) Are Chosen", NTS 36 (1990), 89-97. He succinctly shows, based on Edmond Boismard's insights, that the meaning of the saying is "not all are chosen."

49. Ibid., p. 97.

50. See Jeremias, Theology, p. 117.

VII

CONCLUSIONS

1. Results of This Study

In the Introduction we defined the general topic of our inquiry as Jesus' self-understanding, in the understanding that this would have a significant bearing on the history of Christian origins. In order to accomplish our goal, we investigated the way the eschatologically-minded in the Second-Temple period read the Scriptures (Part One). From this investigation we confirmed that the eschatologically-minded interpreted the Scriptures as awaiting fulfillment in the eschaton. This shaped their self-understanding and oriented their life.

We then turned to Jesus to see if the Weiss-Schweitzer theory, which has recently came under attack, remains viable (Part Two). We analyzed the arguments of prominent opponents of the "eschatological Jesus" (Caird, Perrin, and Borg); we dealt with this in the light of traditions on Jesus, concluding: It is unassailable that Jesus lived in the light of an intense eschatological belief and, further, that he understood his ministry as the climactic and definitive salvific act of God.

Putting together the conclusions of Part One and

Two, we formulated an inescapable conclusion. Jesus, like other eschatologically-minded Jews, anticipated the fulfillment of the Scriptures in the eschaton. Moreover, since he believed that the eschaton had already begun with his ministry and this ministry mediated God's definitive saving act, we formulated a heuristic expectation: the Gospel data should yield evidence of Jesus' consciousness of fulfillment. Has this expectation been met?

Our study of sayings and actions of Jesus (Part Three) confirmed that he actually found the fulfillment of the Scriptures in the recent past and in the present, and that he expected final fulfillment as part of his own destiny. The point of fulfillment was Jesus himself.

There can hardly be any doubt that this kind of reflection shaped Jesus' self-understanding and ministry. We identified some crucial soteriological themes of the Scriptures, and asked whether they played a significant role in the thinking of Jesus. We discovered that the Scriptures were indeed a major resource for the forming of his self-understanding.

Jesus as the principal source of the christology of the post-Easter church: As we have noted more than once, the form critics derived the motifs of christology from the post-Easter Christian community, acknowledging only grudgingly and reluctantly that there may have been some

anticipation.[1] The "Easter experience" of the first believers was, in their view, the source of the christological development. We shall cite Juel again:

> The point of argument is that the presupposition for the development is the confession of Jesus as the Messiah. It is a confession that, given the biblical data, cannot be derived from Jesus' teachings or from an explicit self-consciousness but can be derived only from the events of Good Friday and Easter as they are reported in the Gospels.[2]

This citation represents the majority position on Christian origins. One of the most serious problems that beset this reconstruction is that it overlooks Jesus' eschatological reading of the Scriptures.

The present argument avoids the well-worn path of argument based on titles. We focused rather on a less ambiguous term: "eschatology/eschatological." We investigated the significance of "living under the ascendancy of eschatological belief" from the Second-Temple Jewish writings. Our investigation of the Gospel tradition in the light of our understanding of Jewish eschatology led us to a conclusion sharply different from that of the form critics on Jesus' self-understanding and the origins of the church's christology. Jesus understood himself as the one chosen for the climactic and definitive salvific act for Israel, which aimed at the restoration of Israel's election and covenantal relationship with God. The self-understanding of Jesus led him to the soteriological motifs of the Scriptures. These, he believed, were meant to come

to fulfillment in himself. He understood himself according to the Scriptures.

Thus, the root of the christologies of the post-Easter church did not lie in the Easter experience of the first believers but in Jesus himself, in his reading of the Scriptures in the eschatological manner and in the light of his consciousness of eschatological mission. The messianic exegesis of the Scriptures attested in the Gospels was not the product of early Christian scribes. It started with Jesus himself. This does not mean, however, that the christologies of the Gospels all came from Jesus. We acknowledge that there were ongoing scribal activities on the part of the post-Easter church and that post-Easter developments have entered the Jesus tradition in the process of transmitting. This process complicated the work of the historical critics. This acknowledgement, however, should not blind our eyes to Jesus' use of the soteriological themes of the Scriptures.

There is no doubt that the Easter experience played a significant role in the christological developments, not to generate a new perception of a non-messianic Jesus as the "Messiah." Rather, the experience made the first believers comprehend at last the intentions and opaque self-revelation of Jesus,[3] who was the principal source of the later developments of christology.[4]

Aims of Jesus and the Theme of Election: One result of this study is to have discovered the significance of the election theme for Jesus' self-understanding and ministry. The themes which Jesus exploited are related with the theme of election in the Scriptures. Jesus expressed his understanding of himself and ministry by using all those themes. In other words, Jesus viewed himself in light of the election history of Israel.

He understood himself as standing at the climax of the long history of the election of Israel. Like the prophets such as Amos and Deutero-Isaiah, Jesus thought that Yahweh's election and his covenantal relationship with Israel had been lost because of Israel's unfaithfulness. He actually uttered such sayings implying the voiding of the old election. He further agreed with the prophets in counting on God's unfailing love to restore the election and covenant in the eschaton. This was what Jesus regarded as his aim. He intended to complete the long history of election by making a new covenant for Israel and the nations. Through this covenant, the privileged relationship with God would be restored in the perfect form and in the eternal basis. This restored Israel is thus a "new"[5] Israel which will not depend on the racial origin but on the attitude (Matt 3:9).

2. Contributions of This Study to the New Testament Scholarship

To the extent that our investigation is acceptable, it will be seen to have contributed to the New Testament scholarship. We shall attempt, in conclusion, to say how.

First of all, our study has shown the advantage of its strategy: to adopt a holistic approach and avoid title-oriented research. The holistic approach to the historical Jesus question is more promising than an atomistic approach, which betrays the lack of a consensus on basic problems of New Testament study. Despite this situation, scholars have persevered with efforts of atomistic approach.[6] The result is gridlock. We have chosen to take a holistic approach (with supplementary use of detailed treatment of particulars) to the question of Jesus' self-understanding. This has often been regarded as "impossible." But sober effort to go from a set of verifiable observations about antiquity to a specific example (Jesus), and from Jesus' conception of his overall ministry to his self-understanding has proved to be feasible. As a result, we could grasp, with some confidence, crucial aspects of the character and content of Jesus' understanding.

We have examples of works on the same topic as ours, which, however, focusing on the titles of Jesus, failed to produce results.[7] This orientation made them continuously ask whether Jesus actually used each term in titular sense

and whether such a titular usage is attested from the pre-Jesus Jewish writings. If they find that any term does not meet both of these conditions, they conclude that Jesus had nothing to do with the christological idea implied in that term. The Son of man or the Servant of Yahweh is an example. Since it is not clear whether Jesus used them in a titular sense and their use as messianic title is not attested before Jesus, scholars have concluded that Jesus did not entertain such themes. This method is illegitimate because the messianic use of any theme does not necessarily find expression in titular use. We chose, on the contrary, to focus on soteriological themes which supplied the resources for eschatological beliefs. This proved to be a real alternative to title-oriented research. Soteriological themes, not christological titles, are a pathway to Jesus.

Second, our investigation reveals that the form critics' explanations of Christian origins are largely wrong. Their assumption of the non-messianic character of Jesus' ministry is highly doubtful. Critical analysis of the Gospel data shows that Jesus understood his ministry as climactic and definitive salvation. Further, he perceived himself according to the categories which were used to describe the messianic figure in the Second-Temple period. We do no more than justice to the data when we view Jesus' self-understanding in terms of that final figure who would complete the eschatological tasks. This is well named a

"messianic self-understanding."

The form critics' assumptions respecting the explosion of the messianic exegesis in the post-Easter church also demand modification in the light of our investigation. The first believers engaged in messianic exegesis for many reasons such as apologetics and mission: some of the results of such exegesis were incorporated into the Jesus tradition in the process of transmission. We should not, however, so stress this process as to overlook what Jesus did. We should fully acknowledge Jesus' eschatological belief and its significance. The messianic exegesis of the post-Easter church was not invented to make the non-messianic Jesus messianic. It was rather a thematization of what Jesus adumbrated, an expansion and extension of what Jesus originally had in mind.

Our investigation also impinges on the understanding of Christian origins. Jesus, not the Easter experience of the first believers, was the origin of the New Testament christology. The post-Easter church's confession of Jesus as Christ was neither a misunderstanding nor a forgery.[8] It was a joyous acknowledgment of what Jesus believed him to be.

Third, our study has a bearing on the study of the Gospel tradition. It was a scholarly truism to regard the citations and allusions of the Scriptures in the Jesus tradition as an indication of secondary origin. Our

investigation, however, yields no support to this assumption. The presence of citations or allusions itself cannot make the case for or against authenticity. Realization of this may shed new light on the discussion of authenticity of more than one significant pericope.

END NOTES

1. For example, Bultmann and his school, with minor variations among them, adopted the "indirect (or implied) Christology" in the late 1950s and 1960s. See Bultmann, "The Primitive Christian Kerygma and the Historical Jesus", in The Historical Jesus and the Kerygmatic Christ, ed. & trans. by C. E. Braaten and R. A. Harrisville (Nashville: Abingdon, 1964), pp. 22-24, 28.

2. Juel, Exegesis, p. 173.

3. Meyer, "Appointed Deed", p. 74.

4. For the similar position, see, for example, Jeremias, Theology; Witherington, Christology; Leivestad, Jesus; Käsemann, Essays, pp. 15-47; Schillebeeckx, Jesus.

5. "Newness" of the eschaton does not mean a second creation but "miraculous transformation" of the first creation. See Claus Westermann, Isaiah 40-66: A Commentary, trans. by David M. G. Stalker (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1969), p. 408.

6. A recent example is Witherington, Christology.

7. An outstanding example is Hahn, Titles.

8. The discontinuity between the historical Jesus and the proclamation of the post-Easter church began to be claimed already in the 18th century. See H. S. Reimarus, Von dem Zwecke Jesu und seiner Jünger (Braunschweig: Lessing, 1778).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. TEXTS AND REFERENCE WORKS

Aland, K. and others, ed. The Greek New Testament. 3rd ed. New York and London: United Bible Societies, 1975.

--------, ed. Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1976.

Bauer, W. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. Trans. and rev. by F. Wilbur Gingrich and Frederick W. Danker. 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979.

Brown, F., Driver, S. and Briggs, C. A. Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament. Oxford: Clarendon, 1907.

Charles, R. H, ed. The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1913.

--------, trans. The Book of Enoch. Oxford: Clarendon, 1892.

Charlesworth, J. H., ed. The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha. 2 vols. Garden City: Doubleday, 1983.

Colson, F. H. and Whitaker, G. H. Philo. 10 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1929-43.

Dupont-Sommer, A. The Essene Writings from Qumran. Trans. by Geza Vermes. New York: Meridian Books, 1967.

Danby, H., trans. The Mishnah. Oxford: Clarendon, 1933.

Elliger, K. and Rudolph, W., ed. Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1967.

Kittel, G. and Friedrich, G. Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Trans. by G. Bromily. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968.

Sperber, A. The Bible in Aramaic. Leiden: Brill, 1959-68.

Thackery, H. and Marcus, R, trans. and ed. Josephus. 10 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927-67.

Vermes, G. The Dead Sea Scrolls in English. 3rd ed. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1987.

2. GENERAL WORKS AND COMMENTARIES

Abrahams, I. Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospel. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967.

Ahlstroem, G. W. Joel and Temple Cult. Leiden: Brill, 1971.

Allegro, J. The Dead Sea Scrolls. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1956.

Allison, Jr., D. C. The End of the Ages Has Come: An Early Interpretation of the Passion and Resurrection of Jesus. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.

--------. "Jesus and the Covenant: A Response to E. P. Sanders", JSNT 29 (1987), 57-78.

Altmann, P. Erwählungstheologie und Universalismus im Alten Testament. Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1964.

Arens, E. The Elthon-Sayings in the Synoptic Tradition. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976.

Aune, D. Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983.

--------. "Matthew 11:25-30", JTS 39. 2 (1988), pp. 477-485.

Aytoun, R. A. "The Servant of the Lord in the Targum", JTS 23 (1921-2), 172-80.

Barnett, P. W. "The Jewish Sign Prophets -- A.D. 40-70 -- Their Intention and Origin", NTS 27 (1981), 679-97.

Barrett, C. K. The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition. London: SPCK, 1958.

--------. "The Background of Mark 10:45", in New Testament Essays. T. W. Manson Festschrift. Ed. by A. J. B.

Higgins, Manchester: University of Manchester Press, 1959. pp. 1-18.

Barton, J. Oracles of God: Perceptions of Ancient Prophecy in Israel after the Exile. London: Darton, Longman and Tod, 1986.

--------. Reading the Old Testament: Method in Biblical Study. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.

Batdorf, I. W. "Interpreting Jesus since Bultmann: Selected Paradigms and Their Hermeneutic Matrix", SBLSP (1984), 187-215.

Bauckham, R. "The Son of Man: 'A Man in My Position' or 'Someone'?", JSNT 23 (1985), 23-33.

--------. "The Sonship of the Historical Jesus in Christology", SJT 31 (1978), 245-260.

Beasley-Murray, G. R. Jesus and the Kingdom of God. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986.

Becker, J. Johannes der Täufer und Jesus von Nazareth. Neukirchener-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1972.

Betz, O. Offenbarung und Schriftforschung in der Qumransekte. Tügingen: Mohr, 1960.

--------. "Die Proselytentaufe der Qumransekte und die Taufe im Neuen Testament", RevQ 1 (1958), 213-34.

--------. "Jesu Heiliger Krieg", NovT 2 (1957), 116-37.

--------. "Die Frage nach dem messianischen Bewusstsein Jesu", NovT 6 (1963), 20-48.

--------. Jesus der Messias Israel. Tübingen: Mohr, 1987.

Black, M. "Aramaic Barnasha and the 'Son of Man'", ExpTim 95 (1984), 200-206.

--------. The Scrolls and Christian Origins: Studies in the Jewish Background of the New Testament. Chico: Scholars Press, 1983.

--------. An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts. 3rd ed. London: Oxford University Press, 1967.

--------. "'Not peace but a sword': Matt 10:34ff; Luke 12:51ff", in Jesus and the Politics of His Day. Ed. by E. Bammel and C. F. D. Moule. Cambridge: Cambridge

University Press, 1984. pp. 287-94.

Blenkinsopp, J. A History of Prophecy in Israel: From the Settlement in the Land to the Hellenistic Period. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1984.

--------. Prophecy and Canon: A Contribution to the Study of Jewish Origins. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1977.

Borg, M. "An Orthodoxy Reconsidered: The 'End-of-the-World Jesus", in The Glory of Christ in the New Testament: Studies in Christology. G. B. Caird Festschrift. Ed. by L. D. Hurst and N. T. Wright. Oxford: Clarendon, 1987. pp. 207-17.

--------. Conflict, Holiness and Politics in the Teachings of Jesus. Toronto: Edwin Mellen, 1984.

--------. Jesus: A New Vision. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1987.

--------. "A Temperate Case for a Non-Eschatological Jesus", Foundation & Facets Forum 2-3 (1986), 81-102.

Bornkamm, G. Jesus of Nazareth. Trans. by Irene and Fraser McLuskey with James M. Robinson, New York: Harper & Row, 1960.

--------, G. Barth & H. J. Held. Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew. Trans. by Percy Scott. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1963.

Bowman, J. "Samaritan Studies", BJRL 40 (1957-8), 298-327.

Brandon, W. G. F. Jesus and the Zealots. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1967.

--------. The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church: A Study of the Effects of the Jewish Overthrow of A.D. 70 on Christianity. London: SPCK, 1957.

Braun, H. Jesus of Nazareth: The Man and His Time. Trans. by E. R. Kalin. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979.

Breech, James. The Silence of Jesus: The Authentic Voice of the Historical Man. Toronto: Doubleday, 1983.

Briggs, C. A. The Book of Psalms. 2 vols. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1907.

Brownlee, W. H. The Midrash Pesher of Habakkuk. Missoula:

Scholars Press, 1979.

--------. "Biblical Interpretation among the Sectaries of the Dean Sea Scrolls", BA 14 (1951), 54-76.

--------. "John the Baptist in the New Light of Ancient Scrolls", in The Scrolls and the New Testament. Ed. by Krister Stendahl. London: SCM, 1957. pp. 33-53.

--------. "Messianic Motifs of Qumran and the New Testament", NTS 3 (1956-7), 12-30, 195-210.

--------. "The Servant of the Lord in the Qumran Scrolls", BASOR 132 (1953), 8-15 and 135 (1954), 33-38.

Bruce, F. F. Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1959.

Brueggemann, W. Tradition for Crisis. Atlanta: John Knox, 1968.

Buchanan, G. W. "Symbolic Money-Changers in the Temple?", NTS 37 (1991), 280-90.

Bultmann, R. The History of the Synoptic Tradition. Trans. by John Marsh. New York: Harper & Row, 1963.

--------. Jesus and the Word. Trans. by L. P. Smith and E. H. Lantero. London: SCM, 1958.

--------. Theologie des Neuen Testament. Tübingen: Mohr, 1977.

--------. "The Primitive Christian Kerygma and the Historical Jesus", in The Historical Jesus and the Kerygmatic Christ. Ed. and trans. by C. E. Braaten and R. A. Harrisville. Nashville: Abingdon, 1964. pp. 15-42.

Burney, C. F. The Poetry of Our Lord. Oxford: Clarendon, 1925.

Caird, G. B. Jesus and the Jewish Nation. London: Athlone Press, 1965.

--------. The Language and Imagery of the Bible. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1980.

Carmignac, J. "Le document de Qumrān sur Melkisedeq", RevQ 7 (1967-71), 343-78.

Casey, P. M. Son of Man. London: SPCK, 1979.

--------. "General, Generic and Indefinite: The Use of the Term 'Son of Man' in Aramaic Sources and in the Teaching of Jesus", JSNT 29 (1987), 21-56.

--------. "The Jackals and the Son of Man (Matt. 8:20// Luke 9:58)", JSNT 23 (1985), 3-22.

Catchpole, D. R. The Trial of Jesus, Leiden: Brill, 1971.

--------. "The 'Triumphal' Entry", in Jesus and the Politics of His Day. pp. 319-24.

Charlesworth, J. H. Jesus within Judaism: New Light from Exciting Archaeological Discoveries. New York: Doubleday, 1988.

Childs, B. S. Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979.

Chilton, B. D. God in Strength: Jesus' Announcement of the Kingdom. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987.

--------. "Jesus and the Repentance of E. P. Sanders", TynBul 39 (1988), 1-18.

--------. "Jesus ben David: Reflections on the Davidssohnfrage", JSNT 14 (1982), 88-112.

--------. "Commenting on the Old Testament", in It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture. Barnabas Lindars Festschrift. Ed. by D. A. Carson & H. G. M. Williamson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988. pp. 122-140.

Cohen, A. The Psalms. Hindhead: Soncino Press, 1945.

Collins, A. Y. "The Origin of The Designation of Jesus as 'Son of Man'", HTR 80.4 (1987), 391-407.

--------. "The Origin of Christian Baptism", St Liturg 19.1 (1989), 28-46.

Collins, J. J. The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977.

--------. Daniel with an Introduction to the Apocalyptic Literature. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984.

--------. The Apocalyptic Imagination. New York: Crossroad, 1984.

--------, ed. Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre. Semeia 14. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979.

--------. "The Symbolism of Transcendence in Jewish Apocalyptic", Papers of the Chicago Society of Biblical Research 19 (1974), 12-22.

Conzelmann, H. Jesus. Trans. by J. Raymond Lord. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1973.

Cranfield, C. E. B. "Thoughts on New Testament Eschatology", SJT 35 (1982), 497-512.

Cullmann, O. The Christology of the New Testament. Rev. ed. Trans. by S. C. Guthrie and C. A. M. Hall. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963.

Dahl, N. A. The Crucified Messiah and Other Essays. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1974.

Dahood, M. Psalms. 3 vols. Garden City: Doubleday, 1970.

Dalman, G. Jesus-Jeshua: Studies in the Gospels. Trans. by Paul P. Levertoff. New York: MacMillan, 1929.

--------. The Words of Jesus. Trans. by D. M. Kay. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1902.

Davies, S. "John the Baptist and Essene Kashruth", NTS 29 (1983), 569-71.

Davies, W. D. The Gospel and the Land. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974.

--------. and Dale Allison. The Gospel according to Saint Matthew. 2 vols. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1988-90.

Dibelius, M. From Tradition to Gospel. Trans. and rev. by Bertram Lee Wolf. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1935.

Dodd, C. H. The Founder of Christianity. New York: MacMillan, 1970.

--------. According to the Scriptures. London: James Nisbet & Co., 1952.

--------. The Parable of the Kingdom. London: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1935.

--------. "Jesus as Teacher and Prophet", in Mysterium Christi: Christological Studies by British and German Theologians. Ed. by Bell and Deissmann. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1930. pp. 53-66.

Donahue, J. R. "Recent Studies on the Origin of 'Son of Man' in the Gospels", CBQ 48.3 (1986), 484-98.

Duhm, B. Das Buch Jesaja übersetzt und erklärt. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1922.

Dunn, J. D. G. Jesus and the Spirit: A Study of the Religious and Charismatic Experience of Jesus and the First Christians as Reflected in the New Testament. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1975.

--------. Unity and Diversity in the New Testament: An Inquiry into the Character of Earliest Christianity. 2nd ed. London: SCM, 1990.

--------. Jesus, Paul and the Law. London: SCM, 1990.

Eichrodt, W. Theology of the Old Testament. 2 vols. Trans. by J. A. Baker. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1961.

Elbogen, I. Der jüdische Gottesdienst in seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung. 3rd ed. Frankfurt: Kaufmann, 1931.

Ellinger, K. Studien zum Habakkuk-Kommentar vom Toten Meer. Tübingen: Mohr, 1953.

Endres, J. C. Biblical Interpretation in the Book of Jubilees. Washington, DC: CBA, 1987.

Enslin, M. S. "John and Jesus", ZNW 66 (1975), 1-18.

Epp, E. J. and MacRae, G. W, ed. The New Testament and Its Modern Interpreters. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.

Evans, C. A. "Jesus' Action in the Temple: Cleansing or Portent of Destruction?", CBQ 51 (1989), 237-70.

Farmer, W. R. Jesus and the Gospel. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982.

--------. Maccabees, Zealots and Josephus. New York: Columbia University Press, 1956.

Fishbane, M. Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel. Oxford: Clarendon, 1985.

Fitzmyer, J. A. "Further Light on Melchizedek from Qumran Cave II", JBL 86 (1967), 25-41.

--------. A Wandering Aramean: Collected Aramaic Essays. Chico: Scholars Press, 1979.

Flusser, D. Jewish Sources in Early Christianity. New York: Adama Books, 1987.

France, R. T. Jesus and the Old Testament. London: Tyndale, 1970.

--------. "The Servant of the Lord in the Teaching of Jesus", TybBul 19 (1968), 26-52.

Frost, S. B. Old Testament Apocalyptic: Its Origin and Growth. London: Epworth, 1952.

Fuller, Reginald. The Foundations of New Testament Christology. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965.

Gabrion, Hervé. "L'interprétation de l'Ecriture dans la littérature de Qumrân", ANRW, II, 19.1 (1979), 779-848.

Gärtner, B. The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965.

Gerhardsson, B. Memory and Manuscript: Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity. Lund: Gleerup, 1964.

--------. The Origins of the Gospel Traditions. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979.

--------. Tradition and Transmission in Early Christianity. Lund: Gleerup, 1964.

Geyser, A. "The Twelve Tribes in Revelation: Jedean and Judeo Christian Apocalypticism", NTS 28 (1982), 388-99.

Ginsburg, H. L. "The Oldest Interpretation of the Suffering Servant", VT 3 (1953), 181-89.

Gnilka, S. "Die essenischen Tauchbäder und die Johannestaufe", RevQ 3 (1961-2), 185-207.

Goulder, M. D. Midrash and Lection in Matthew. London: SPCK, 1974.

Goppelt, L. Theology of the New Testament. 2 vols. Trans. by John E. Alsup. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981.

Gottwald, N. The Tribes of Yahweh. New York: Orbis Books, 1979.

Grant, F. C. The Gospel of the Kingdom. New York: Chalres Scribner's Sons, 1940.

Grässer, E. Die Naherwartung Jesu. Stuttgart: Kohlhämmer, 1973.

Gray, D. A. "The Day of the Lord and Its Culmination in the Book of Revelation". Ph. D. Dissertation: University of Manchester, 1974.

Grimm, W. Jesus und Danielbuch, Band I: Jesu Einspruch Gegen das Offenbarungssystem Daniels (Mt. 11:25-27; Lk. 17: 20-21). Frankfurt am Main: Verlag Peter Lang, 1984.

--------. Weil ich dich liebe. Die Verkündigung Jesu und Deuterojesaja. Frankfurt am Main: Verlag Peter Lang, 1976.

Gunkel, H. Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1895.

--------. "Das vierte Buch Esra", in Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments. Ed. by E. Kautzsch. Tübingen: Mohr, 1900. Vol. 2, 331-401.

Güttgemanns, E. Candid Questions Concerning Gospel Form Criticism: A Methodological Sketch of the Fundamental Problematics of Form and Redaction Criticism. Trans. by William G. Doty. Pittsburgh: Pickwick Press, 1979.

Hahn, F. The Titles of Jesus in Christology. Trans. by Harold Knight and George Ogg. Cleveland: The World Publishing Company, 1969.

Hanson, P. D. The Dawn of Apocalyptic: The Historical and Sociological Roots of Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology. Rev. ed. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979.

Hartmann, L. F. Asking for a Meaning: A Study of I Enoch 1-5. Lund: Gleerup, 1979.

-------- and A. A. Di Lella. The Book of Daniel. Garden City: Doubleday, 1978.

Harvey, A. E. Jesus and the Constraints of History. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1982.

Hasel, G. F. The Remnant. Berrien Springs: Andrew University Press, 1980.

Henchen, E. The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary. Trans. by B. Noble & G. Shinn. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971.

Hengel, M. Between Jesus and Paul: Studies in the Earliest History of Christianity. Trans. by John Bowden. London:

SCM, 1983.

--------. Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period. 2 vols. Trans. by John Bowden. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974.

--------. The Atonement: The Origins of the Doctrine in the New Testament. Trans. by J. Bowden. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981.

--------. The Charismatic Leader and His Followers. Trans. by J. Greig. New York: Crossroad, 1981.

--------. The Son of God: The Origin of Christology and the History of Jewish - Hellenistic Religion. Trans. by John Bowden. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976.

--------. Die Zeloten. 2nd ed. Leiden: Brill, 1976.

Higgins, A. J. B. The Son of Man in the Teaching of Jesus. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.

Hill, D. New Testament Prophecy. Atlanta: John Knox, 1979.

Hoffmann, Y. "The Day of the Lord as a Concept and a Term in the Prophetic Literature", ZAW 93 (1981), 37-50.

Hollenbach, P. W. "The Conversion of Jesus: From Jesus the Baptizer to Jesus the Healer", ANRW II, 25.1 (1982), 196-219.

Hooker, M. D. "On Using the Wrong Tool", Theology 75 (1972), 570-81.

--------. The Son of Man in Mark. London: SPCK, 1967.

--------. Jesus and the Servant. London: SPCK, 1959.

Horbury, W. "The Messianic Associations of 'the Son of Man'", JTS 36.1 (1985), 34-55.

--------. "The Twelve and the Phylarchs", NTS 32 (1986), 503-27.

Horgan, M. P. Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books. Washington, DC: CBA, 1979.

--------. "The Bible Explained (Prophecies)", in Early Judaism and Its Modern Interpreters. Ed. by R. A. Kraft & W. E. Nickelsburg. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986., pp. 247-53.

Horsely, R. A. Jesus and the Spiral of Violence. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1987.

-------- and J. S. Hanson. Bandits, Prophets,and Messiahs: Popular Movements in the Time of Jesus. Minneaplois: Winston Press, 1985.

Hübner, H. Law in Paul's Thought. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1984.

Iersel, B. M. F. van. 'Der Sohn' in den synoptischen Jesusworten. 2nd ed. Leiden: Brill, 1964.

Janssen, Enno. Das Gottesvolk und seine Geschichte: Geschichtsbild und Selbstverständnis im palastinensischen Schrifttum von Jesus Sirach bis Jehuda ha-Nashi. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1971.

Jeremias, J. "Die älteste Schicht der Menschensohn-Logion", ZNW 58 (1967), 159-72.

--------. Jesus' Promise to the Nations. Trans. by S. H. Hooke. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982.

--------. New Testament Theology: The Proclamation of Jesus. Trans. by John Bowden. London: SCM, 1971.

--------. The Eucharistic Words of Jesus. Trans. by Norman Perrin. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1966.

--------. The Parables of Jesus. Rev. ed. Trans. by S. H. Hooke. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1972.

--------. The Prayers of Jesus. Trans. by John Bowden and others. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1967.

--------. Infant Baptism in the First Four Centuries. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1960.

--------. "Eine neue Schau der Zukunftsaussagen Jesu", TBl 20 (1941), cols. 216-22.

Joüon, P. "Notes philologique sur les Évangiles", RSR 17 (1927), 82-85.

Jügel, E. Paulus und Jesus. Tübingen: Mohr, 1962.

Juel, Donald. Messiah and Temple: The Trial of Jesus in the Gospel of Mark. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977.

--------. Messianic Exegesis: Christological Interpretation of the Old Testament in Early Christianity.

Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988.

Kähler, M. The So-Called Historical Jesus and the Historic, Biblical Christ. Trans. by Carl E. Braaten. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1964.

Kapelrud, A. S. Joel Studies. Lund: Gleerup, 1948.

Käsemann, E. Essays on New Testament Themes. Trans. by W. G. Montague. London: SCM, 1964.

Kim, Seyoon. "The 'Son of Man' " as the Son of God. Tübingen: Mohr, 1983.

Klauck, H. -J. "Die Sakramenta und der historische Jesus", Wissenschaft und Weisheit 47 (1984), 1-11.

Knight, D. A. and G. M. Tucker, ed. The Hebrew Bible and Its Modern Interpreters. Chico: Scholars Press, 1985.

Knox, J. The Death of Christ. Nashville: Abingdon, 1959.

Koch, K. The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic. London: SCM, 1972.

--------. "Zur Geschichte der Erwählungsvorstellung in Israel", ZAW 67 (1955), 205-26.

--------. The Prophets. 2 vols. Trans. by Margaret Kohl. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982.

Kraeling, C. H. John the Baptist. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951.

Kraus, H. -J. Psalms 60-150. Trans. by Hilton C. Oswald. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1989.

Kuhn, H. W. Enderwartung und gegenwartiges Heil: Untersuchungen zu den Gemeindeliedern von Qumran. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966.

Kümmel, W. G. Jesus Der Menschensohn? Stuttgart: Kahlhämmer, 1984.

--------. The Theology of the New Testament according to Its Major Witnesses. Trans. by J. E. Steely. Nashville: Abingdon, 1973.

--------. Promise and Fulfillment: The Eschatological Message of Jesus. Trans. by Dorothea M. Barton. London: SCM, 1957.

Lattke, M. "On the Jewish Background of the Synoptic Concept 'the Kingdom of God'", in The Kingdom of God. Ed. by Bruce Chilton. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984. pp. 72-91

Legasse, S. "Le Baptême administré par Jésus (Jn 3,22-26; 4,1-3) et l'origine de bapteme chretien", BLE 78 (1977), 3-30.

Leivestad, R. Jesus in His Own Perspective: An Examination of His Sayings, Actions, and Eschatological Titles. Trans. by David E. Aune. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1987.

--------. "Jesus - Messias - Menschensohn: Die Jüdischen Heilandserwartungen zur Zeit der ersten römischen Kaiser und die Frage nach dem messianischen Selbstbewusstsein Jesu", ANRW, II, 25.1 (1982), 220-64.

Lentzen-Deiss, F. Die Taufe Jesu nach den Synoptikern: Literarkritische und Gattungsgeschichtliche Untersuchung. Frankfurt: Knecht, 1970.

Lindblom, J. Die Jesaja-Apocalypse. Jes. 24-27. Lund: Gleerup, 1938.

Lindars, B. Jesus Son of Man: A Fresh Examination of the Son of Man Sayings in the Gospels. Grand Rapids; Eerdmans, 1983.

--------. New Testament Apologetic. London: SCM, 1983.

Linnemann, E. "Jesus und der Taufer", in Ernst Fuchs Festschrift. Ed. by Gerhard Ebeling and others. Tübingen: Mohr, 1973. pp. 219-36.

Lohfink, G. Jesus and Community: The Social Dimension of Christian Faith. Trans. by J. P. Galvin. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.

Lohse, E. The Formation of the New Testament. Trans. by Eugene Boring. Nashville: Abingdon, 1981.

Lonergan, B. Method in Theology. London: Darton, Longman and Tod, 1972.

Manson, T. W. The Servant-Messiah: A Study of the Public Ministry of Jesus. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953.

--------. The Sayings of Jesus. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957.

Marshall, I. H. Jesus the Savior: Studies in New Testament Theology. Downers Grove: IVP, 1990.

--------. The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary. Exeter: Paternoster, 1978.

Marxsen, W. The Beginnings of Christology. Trans. by P. J. Achtemeier and Lorenz Nieting. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979.

Meier, J. P. Law and History in Matthew. Rome: Biblical Institute, 1976.

Metzger, B. M. "Literary Forgeries and Canonical Pseudepigrapha", JBL 91 (1972), 3-24.

Meyer, B. F. The Aims of Jesus. London: SCM, 1979.

--------. "The Expiation Motif in the Eucharistic Words: A Key to the History of Jesus?", Greg 69.3 (1988), 461-87.

--------. Critical Realism and the New Testament. Allison Park: Pickwick, 1989.

--------. "Appointed Deed, Appointed Doer: Jesus and the Scpritures", in Christus Faber. Allison Park: Pickwick, 1991. pp. 59-80.

--------. "Many (=All) Are Called, But Few (=Not All) Are Chosen", NTS 36 (1990), 89-97.

Miller, W. R. Isaiah 24-27 and the Origin of Apocalyptic. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1976.

Moore, G. F. Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: The Age of the Tannaim. 3 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927-30.

Moule, C. F. D. The Origin of Christology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.

Murphy-O'Connor, J. "John the Baptist and Jesus: History and Hypotheses", NTS 36 (1990), 359-74.

Mussner, F. "Wege zum Selbstbewusstsein Jesu", BZ 12 (1968), 165-67.

Neile, S., and Tom Wright. The Interpretation of the New Testament 1861 - 1986. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987.

Neugebauer, F. Jesu Versuchung: Wegentscheidung am Anfang.

Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1985.

Neusner, J. "Money-Changers in the Temple: The Mishnah's Explanation", NTS 35 (1989), 287-90.

Nicholson, E. W. Deuteronomy and Tradition. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1967.

Nickelsburg, G. W. E., ed. Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981.

--------. "Apocalyptic and Myth in 1 Enoch 6-11", CBQ 96 (1977), 383-405.

Nineham, D. E. Saint Mark. Hammondsworth: Penguin Books, 1963.

Noth, M. Das System der Zwölf Stämme Israels. Stuttgart: Kahlhämmer, 1930.

O'Conner, J. M. "John the Baptist and Jesus: History and Hypotheses", NTS 36 (1990), 359-74.

O'Neill, J. C. "Did Jesus Teach That His Death Would Be Vicarious As Well As Typical?", in Suffering and Martyrdom in the New Testament. G. M. Styler Festschrift. Ed. by W. Horbury and B. Mcneil. London: Cambridge University Press, 1981. pp. 9-27.

--------. Messiah: Six Lectures on the Ministry of Jesus. Cambridge: Cochrane Press, 1980.

Page, S. H. T. "The Suffering Servant between the Testaments", NTS 31 (1985), 481-97.

Patte, D. Early Jewish Hermeneutic in Palestine. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1975.

Pedersen, S. "Die Gotteserfahrung bei Jesus", ST 41 (1987), 127-56.

Perrin, N. Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus. New York: Harper & Row, 1976.

--------. Jesus and the Language of the Kingdom. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976.

Plöger, Otto. Theocracy and Eschatology. Trans. by S. Rudman. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1968.

--------. Das Buch Daniel. Guetersloh: G. Mohn, 1965.

Pusey, K. "Jewish Proselyte Baptism", ExpTim 95 (1984), 141-45.

Rad, G. von. Essays on Old Testament Hermeneutics. Ed. by J. L. Mays. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1964.

--------. The Message of the Prophets. Trans. by D. M. G. Stalker. New York: Harper & Row, 1965.

Reicke, B. "The Historical Setting of John's Baptism", in Jesus, the Gospels and the Church. William Farmer Festschrift. Ed. by E. P. Sanders. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1988. pp. 209-24

Reimarus, H. S. Von dem Zwecke Jesu und seiner Junger. Braunschweig: Lessing, 1778.

Rengstorf, K. H. "The Election of Matthias. Act. 1:15ff.", in Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation. O. A. Piper Festschrift. Ed. by W. Klassen & G. F. Snyder. New York: Harper & Row, 1962. pp. 178-92.

Riches, J. Jesus and the Transformation of Judaism. London: Seabury Press, 1980.

Richter, H. -P. "Notes Sur le Manuscrit de XIQ Melkîsédeq", RevQ 12.48 (1987), 483-518.

Riesner, R. Jesus als Lehrer: Eine Untersuchung zum Ursprung der Evangelien-Überlieferung. 3rd. ed. Tübingen: Mohr, 1989.

Robinson, J. A. T. Twelve More New Testament Studies. London: SCM, 1984.

--------. Jesus and His Coming. London: SCM, 1957.

Robinson, J. M. A New Quest of the Historical Jesus and Other Essays. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983.

Rogers, R. G. "The Doctrine of Election in the Chronicler's Work and the Dead Sea Scrolls". Ph. D. Dissertation, Boston University, 1969.

Rowland, C. The Open Heaven. New York: Crossroad, 1984.

--------. "Apocalyptic Literature", in It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture. pp. 170-89.

Rowley, H. H. The Servant of the Lord and Other Essays. London: Lutterworth, 1952.

--------. "Jewish Proselyte Baptism and the Baptism of John", HUCA 15 (1940), 313-34.

Russell, D. S. From Early Judaism to Early Church. London: SCM, 1986.

--------. The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1964.

Sanders, E. P. Jesus and Judaism. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.

--------. "Jesus, Paul and Judaism", ANRW II, 25.1 (1984), 390-450.

--------. Paul, the Law and the Jewish People. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983.

Sandmel, S. Judaism and Christian Beginnings. New York: Oxford, 1978.

Schiffmann, L. H. "At the Crossroads: Tannaitic Perspectives on the Jewish-Christian Schism", in Jewish and Christian Self-Definition. Ed. by E. P. Sanders. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981. Vol. 2, 127-31.

Schillebeekx, E. Jesus: An Experiment in Christology. New York: Vintage Press, 1981.

Schlatter, A. Der Evangelist Matthäus. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1959.

Schmidt, J. M. Die jüdische Apokalyptik. 2nd ed. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchen Verlag, 1969.

Schmidt, W. H. Zukunftsgewissheit und Gegenwärtscritik: Grundzüge Prophetischer Verkündigung. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1973.

Schniewind, J. Das Evangelium nach Matthäus. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956.

Schuller, E. Post-Exilic Prophets. Wilmington: Michael Grazier, 1988.

Schulz, P. Der Autoritätsanspruch des Lehrers der Gerechtigkeit in Qumran. Meisenheim am Glan: Hain, 1974

Schürer, E. The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ. 4 vols. Rev. and ed. by Geza Vermes, Fergus Millar and Matthew Black. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1973-1987.

Schürmann, H. Das Geheimnis Jesu: Versuche zur Jesusfrage. Leipzig: St. Benno Verlag, 1972.

--------. "Wie hat Jesus seinen Tod bestanden und verstanden?", in Orientierung an Jesus: Zur Theologie der Synoptiker. Josef Schmid Festschrift. Ed. by P. Hoffmann and others, Freiburg: Herder, 1973. pp. 325-63.

Schütz, R. Johannes der Täufer. Zurich: Zwingli, 1967.

Schweitzer, A. The Quest of the Historical Jesus: A Critical Study of Its Progress from Reimarus to Wrede. Trans. by W. Montgomery. New York: MacMillan, 1968.

Schweizer, E. Lordship and Discipleship. London: SCM, 1960.

Scobie, John. John the Baptist. London: SCM, 1964.

Smith, D. E. "Jewish Proselyte Baptism and the Baptism of John", RevQ 25 (1982), 13-32.

--------. "Meals and Morality in Paul and His World", SBLSP (1981), 319-39.

--------. "The Historical Jesus at Table", SBLSP (1989), 466-86.

Smith, D. M. "The Use of the Old Testament in the New", in The Use of the Old Testament in the New and Other Essays. W. F. Stinesspring Festschrift. Ed. by James M. Efird. Durham: Duke University Press, 1974. pp. 3-65.

Smith, M. Jesus the Magician. New York: Harper & Row, 1978.

Snaith, N. H. The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament. London: Epworth, 1944.

Snodgrass, K. The Parable of the Wicked Tenants. Tubingen: Mohr, 1983.

Sohn, Soeck-Tae. The Divine Election of Israel. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991.

Stone, M. "Apocalyptic -- Vision or Hallucination", Milla wa-Milla 14 (1974), 47-56.

Strack, H. L. & Paul Billerbeck. Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrash. 6 vols. Münich: Beck, 1922-61.

Stuhlmacher, P. Reconciliation, Law and Righteousness: Essays in Biblical Theology. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986.

Stuhlmann, R. Das eschatologische Mass im Neuen Testament. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983.

Syren, Roger. "Targum Isaiah 52:13-53:12 and Christian Interpretation", JJS 40 (1989), 201-212.

Taylor, V. The Gospel according to St. Mark. London: MacMillan, 1966.

Theissen, G. Sociology of Early Palestinian Christianity. Trans. by John Bowden. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978.

--------. The Shadow of the Gallilean: The Quest of the Historical Jesus in Narrative Form. Trans. by John Bowden. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.

Thomas, J. Le mouvement baptiste en Palestine et Syrie, 150 av. J.-C. - 300 ap. J.-C. Gembloux: Duculot, 1935.

Tödt, H. E. The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition. Trans. by D. M. Barton. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1965.

Vaux, R. de. The Early History of Israel. Trans. by D. Smith. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1978.

Vermes, G. Jesus and the World of Judaism. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983.

--------. Jesus the Jew: A Historian's Reading of the Gospels. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1973.

--------. "Bible Interpretation at Qumran", ErIsr 20 (1989), 184-191.

--------. The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspective. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977.

--------. "The Use of bar nash/bar nasha in Jewish Aramaic", in An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts, by Matthew Black. Oxford: Clarendon, 1967, pp. 310-28.

Vielhauer, P. "Gottesreich und Menschensohn in der Verkundigung Jesu". Günther Dehn Festschrift. Ed. by W. Schneemelcher. Neukirchen: Moers, 1957. pp. 51-79.

Vriezen, Th. C. Erwählung Israels nach dem Alten Testament. Zurich: Zwingli, 1953.

Weiss, J. Jesus' Proclamation of the Kingdom of God. Ed. and trans. by R. H. Hiers and D. L. Holland. London: SCM, 1971.

Westerholm, S. Jesus and Scribal Authority. Lund: Gleerup, 1978.

--------. Israel's Law and the Church's Faith. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988.

Westermann, C. Prophetische Heilsworte im Alten Testament. Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987.

--------. Isaiah 40-66: A Commentary. Trans. by D. M. G. Stalker. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1969.

Wheelwright, P. Metaphor and Reality. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1962.

Wilcox, M. "Jesus in the Light of His Jewish Environment", ANRW, II, 25.1 (1982), 131-195.

Wilson, R. R. Prophecy and Society in Ancient Israel. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980.

Wink, W. John the Baptist in the Gospel Tradition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968.

Witherington, B. The Christology of Jesus. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990.

Wolff, H. W. Joel and Amos. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977.

Wright, N. T. "Jesus, Israel and the Cross", SBLSP (1985), 75-95.

--------. "Towards a Third 'Quest': Jesus Then and Now", ARC 10 (1982), 20-27.

Zeitlin, I. M. Jesus and the Judaism of His Time. New York: Polity Press, 1988.