

MESSIANIC ETHICS: THE KINGDOM OF GOD
AND THE APPROPRIATE RESPONSE

MESSIANIC ETHICS: JESUS' KINGDOM-OF-GOD
PROCLAMATION AND THE APPROPRIATE RESPONSE

By

BEN WIEBE, B.A., M.DIV., M.A.

A Thesis

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

McMaster University

April 1988

(c) Copyright by Ben Wiebe 1988

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (1988)
(Religious Study)

McMASTER UNIVERSITY
Hamilton, Ontario

TITLE: Messianic Ethics: Jesus' Kingdom-of-God Proclamation and the
Appropriate Response

AUTHOR: Ben Wiebe, B.A. (Abilene Christian University)
M.Div. (Knox College)
M.A. (McMaster University)

SUPERVISOR: Professor Ben F. Meyer

NUMBER OF PAGES: vii, 231

ABSTRACT

How are eschatology and ethics related in Jesus' proclamation of the kingdom of God and in the response to it that he hoped to win from Israel? How is the ethical dimension of the intended response formed or informed by the kingdom of God?

In the history of scholarship the search for the coherence between Jesus' eschatological message and the response to it that he intended to win inevitably raised the question of the relation between "kingdom" and ethics. Albrecht Ritschl's influential view affirmed the closest bond between them: the kingdom of God is to be realized in and by human ethical action.

This way of stating the relationship was shattered by the compact work of Johannes Weiss on Jesus' proclamation of the kingdom of God. If it is not possible simply to follow Weiss (or Schweitzer, who followed up on and refined the position of Weiss), it is also impossible to bypass him. Therefore in chapter one I outline the position of Ritschl and the response of Weiss' influential exposition of the kingdom of God.

This is followed by an attempt to examine the relation between eschatology and ethics in the work of representative scholars from the past one hundred years. The interpretation of the kingdom of God in Jesus' proclamation depends significantly on what is presupposed about the resources from which he drew in making his proclamation and carrying out his mission. Therefore I survey Jewish eschatological expectation in the scriptures and other later Jewish writings with the ultimate aim of determining what was clearly important for Jesus. Furthermore, these sources give evidence of a relation between (eschatological) promise and appropriate ethical response.

In the interpretation of Jesus' kingdom-of-God proclamation attention has been directed either to eschatology or to ethics: at one time the primary focus was on the human ethical response (e.g. Harnack), at another time on the activity of God (e.g. Johannes Weiss). If it is true that eschatology and ethics exist in relation in the proclamation and teaching of Jesus, it follows that they may only be properly or clearly understood in a study that examines them in their relationships. This calls for a critical correlation of Jesus' eschatological message and his ethical teaching. Jesus' eschatological proclamation and the intended ethical response become concrete only with a recovery of the purposes of Jesus bearing on the whole people, Israel, to whom he came (chapter three).

In chapter four I examine Jesus' kingdom-of-God proclamation defined more sharply and fully in the context of his mission and death as this was expressed in the esoteric teaching of his disciples. And in this teaching the connection between Jesus' own destiny and his ethics of discipleship is emphasized.

A reasonably accurate comprehension of the ethics of Jesus depends on a reasonably accurate recovery of the whole historical figure that he was. The present study accordingly pays attention to the historical bases for the understanding of Jesus' ethical teachings whether in the public forum or in the more intimate circles of his discipleship.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank the people who have supported me by participating in my interests and who have encouraged me in my work. Among them are the people from the churches in Thunder Bay, Ontario and Stoney Creek, Ontario who have included our family in their life and fellowship. Special appreciation goes to Richard Kruse, whose friendship and interest have meant much.

I am indebted to the members of my supervisory committee, Dr. Stephen Westerholm, Dr. Melvin Hillmer, and Dr. Ben Meyer. Their thoughtful and critical reading helped to improve the content as well as the form of this work. In particular I am happy to acknowledge the generous encouragement and helpful guidance of Dr. Ben Meyer over the period of my studies at McMaster University. The high standards of his criticism have been a challenge for me to think and write more clearly.

I owe much to my family. I give special thanks to Patti for her patient support, of which the typing of the several drafts is only the most apparent contribution. More than that has been her presence and her encouragement to persevere in my efforts. Also, I want to thank Paul, Carrie, and Stephen for their understanding when I could not be with them because I was "otherwise" occupied. That interest and support also was not unimportant in making possible the completion of this work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
The Non-Eschatological Reduction of Ethics	2
Imminent Eschatology and the Suspension of Ethics	3
Existential Interpretation and the Elimination of Ethics	4
A Way Forward	6
 THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF THE QUESTION	 9
I. The Importance of Ritschl and Weiss	10
1. How Ritschl Conceived "Kingdom"	12
2. The Kingdom and the Ethical Response	15
3. The Kingdom and Jesus' Destiny	20
II. From Weiss to Wilder	22
1. Harnack and Ethics Without Eschatology	23
2. Albert Schweitzer and Consistent Eschatology	25
3. C. H. Dodd and Realized Eschatology	27
4. Bultmann and Existential Eschatology	31
5. Wilder and the Ethics of Realized Eschatology	35
6. Evaluation	38
III. Elements for a New State of the Question	40
 RESOURCES FOR JESUS' PROCLAMATION AND TEACHING	 45
I. The Kingdom of God and the Messiah, Israel, and the Nations	47
1. God's Kingship and Israel According to the Scriptures	47
2. God's Kingship and the World According to the Scriptures	51
3. The Messiah and the Restoration of Israel According to the Scriptures	55
4. The Kingdom of God in Daniel and Postbiblical Judaism	65
a) The kingdom of God	66
b) The messiah	69
c) The restoration of Israel	73
II. Eschatology and Ethics in the Scriptures and in Postbiblical Judaism	75
1. Eschatology and Ethics in Scriptures	75
2. Eschatology and Ethics in Postbiblical Judaism	80
III. Conclusion	85

THE KINGDOM OF GOD AND THE APPROPRIATE RESPONSE	89
1. New State of the Question	89
2. John the Baptist and Jesus	96
3. Jesus' Proclamation, Acts and Teaching	100
4. Response to Proclamation, Action and Teaching	105
a) The beatitudes	106
b) The proclamation	109
c) The issue of repentance	111
5. Eschatological and Social Dimensions of Jesus' Ethics	120
 JESUS' MESSIANIC MISSION	 129
I. The Authenticity and Purpose of Esoteric Teaching	130
II. The Content of the Esoteric Teaching	136
1. Messiahship: Peter's Confession at Caesarea Phillipi	137
2. Messiahship and the Ethics of Discipleship	142
a) Selfgiving Service	148
b) The Primacy of Love	150
c) The Practice of Love: Forgiveness	151
d) The Willingness to Bear Suffering	152
e) Death as Victory	153
III. An Ethics for the Messianic Community	154
 CONCLUSION	 163
NOTES	175
APPENDIX	215
BIBLIOGRAPHY	218

INTRODUCTION

Following upon the work of Johannes Weiss and Albert Schweitzer, all New Testament scholars of our century have been compelled to deal with the problems attendant on the recovery of early Christian eschatology. The search for the coherence between Jesus' eschatological proclamation and the response he intended to elicit has inevitably raised the more general question of the relation between eschatology and ethics. Those who rediscovered early Christian eschatology did not make the issue of eschatology and ethics their highest priority. They nevertheless did glimpse the startling implications of eschatology for ethics.¹

In the interpretation of Jesus' kingdom-of-God proclamation attention for the most part has been directed either to eschatology or to ethics: at one time the primary focus was on the human ethical response (e.g. Ritschl and Harnack), at another time on the activity of God (e.g. Johannes Weiss). This set up a critical divergence. On the one hand, without a larger understanding of reality, ethics and the language of ethics lose their meaning or authority. A case in point is the history of "situation ethics." As "ethics" designed for everybody in general, simply to be determined in the situation, it swiftly became so abstract that talk about ethical response lost all determinate meaning. On the other hand, the connection between Jesus' teaching and the issues confronting disciples living in the world was reduced in significance to providing a "sort of atmosphere of ethical concern but little more."² Or, if Jesus' ethical teaching was seriously considered, this divergence resulted in a moralization of Jesus' teaching: ethics was reduced to rule keeping. But the kingdom as God's initiative is not revealed without the beauty of his grace. Response then

has the character of *doxology* or trust; behavior is an effect and not only self-determined action, a reflection of the gracious initiative of God as much as it is action toward future achievement. It is rather an act of praise than one of servile obedience.³ The ethical response thus emerges from and embodies a specific understanding of God and his purposes for the world.

The assumption that Jesus' mission was directed exclusively to the individual (parties to this assumption included T.W. Manson, at one end of the spectrum, Rudolf Bultmann and his school on the other) and that he was indifferent to the wider issues of justice and community must be examined. Was Norman Perrin right in asserting that "the individual had become the significant religious unit"? There may well have been an oversight, in this view, of important aspects of Jesus' proclamation and teaching. First of all, the division between religion (individual) and politics (community) was alien to the setting in which Jesus carried out his mission. It is possible, to be sure, that Jesus' teaching transcended this setting, but that specific hypothesis would need to be demonstrated, not simply asserted. Second, it is questionable to assume that sin is the act of the individual alone and that Jesus came to deal only with sin. How Jesus fulfilled his mission among and for his people, and how he stood with respect to conflict, poverty, liberation, and justice, are issues not without relevance for understanding his ethics.

The Non-Eschatological Reduction of Ethics

According to a common assumption, Jesus' message was ahistorical by definition, focused on eternal religious and moral principles and accordingly divorced from the conflicts and power struggles that conditioned

his time. It is strange that Jesus' mission should be presented as if Jesus had to choose between two options: the politics of revolutionary nationalism or a wholly supra-political stance of non-involvement. Was there no range of possibilities between violent revolution and unqualified allegiance to the existing order? Adolf Harnack argued that for Jesus "the kingdom of God comes by coming to the individual"; what mattered for Jesus was "God and the soul." Accordingly, beyond providing a general direction of regard for the neighbor, the gospel provides no help for life in community.⁴ More recently E. F. Scott offered the judgment that Jesus made it his aim to keep a safe distance from the "stormy politics of his age," and labored under the burden of carrying on "a purely religious work in a heated political atmosphere."⁵

More important for the neglect of the ethical dimension in Jesus' teaching are the factors inherent in two influential contexts for New Testament interpretation.

Imminent Eschatology and the Suspension of Ethics

The view that history and ethics were not a basic concern for Jesus has been credited to Weiss and Schweitzer. The conviction that the coming of the kingdom meant the imminent end of all things left room only for an "ascetic ideal" without history or ethics.⁶ If the kingdom is identified as otherworldly reality and with the destruction of this world in imminent cosmic cataclysm, concern about the historical character and destiny of Israel would not register on the scale for Jesus. Therefore for Schweitzer the ethical teaching of Jesus, to the extent that he attended to it at all, could only be interpreted as "world-negation."⁷ What this means in concrete terms is evident in his treatment of the question of tribute to Caesar. His question is how, if one took Jesus' perspective, "could one be concerned at

all about such things?" The institution of the state was in any case to come to an end within months; the question of whether to pay tribute or not was therefore irrelevant. "One might as well submit to it, its end was in fact near." According to Schweitzer, such issues had no significance for Jesus and were first posed by history through the delay of the parousia.⁸ The same held for questions about the place and meaning of the Torah. For Jesus, he affirmed, these questions were of no significance. Eschatology, identified simply as an end-of-the-world event, excluded all such questions.

However this understanding of Jesus' mission is evaluated, further developments precisely in the area of eschatology mean that the assessment of Jesus' teaching offered by Weiss and Schweitzer cannot serve as a blanket invocation for the suspension of ethics. To be considered here are: (1) the sayings of Jesus that point to the presence of the kingdom (that even Weiss could not altogether ignore), and (2) sayings showing that Jesus refused to set dates or times for the coming of the end. The idea that the kingdom is to be exclusively identified with the end is open to serious question. The question is whether "time" was a factor at all in Jesus' view of the coming of the kingdom. Finally, and most important, what is to be made of the body of Jesus' ethical teaching in the gospels?

Existential Interpretation and the Elimination of Ethics

The individualistic and ahistorical character of existentialist interpretation has now been widely recognized.¹⁰ It is beyond our scope to explore the issue of whether the existentialist approach is a viable hermeneutic; it is often used to convey not only the meaning of Jesus' teaching in contemporary terms but also as the framework for historical understanding of this teaching itself.¹¹ Bultmann affirmed on the one hand

that Jesus identified eschatology with the coming to pass of certain events and at the same time that the kingdom of God did not "in any sense depend on these events."¹² He wanted to insist that Jesus himself understood the kingdom of God in existential terms (apart from any relation to events in time).¹³ The proclamation of the eschatological kingdom of God places the person in the crisis of decision. This he took to be the final meaning of this proclamation.¹⁴ To the extent that there could be talk of ethics it was identified with the decision for or against God. He did include the call to love the neighbor within the scope of decision for God. He spoke of *radical obedience*, the controlling question of authenticity, which ruled out specific ethical content. The point of Jesus' teaching then was not to illuminate and inform ethical decisions. The person was to discover in his particular, concrete situation what it is to love one's neighbor.¹⁵ He did not explain how this process was to work. Neither the available choices nor the reasons why one choice would be preferable to another could be properly considered ahead of time. That would destroy the hearing of God's word in the moment.

Thus the transposition of eschatology into existential terms in effect eliminates ethics. Indeed, for Bultmann the kingdom of God provided no light for making plans or taking action within this world.¹⁶

There is no reason to question the propriety of the search for Jesus' understanding of existence; but the point and the limitations of this interpretation need to be clearly identified. What is illegitimate is the exclusion of dimensions of Jesus' teaching because they do not fit into the existentialist frame of reference. The eschatological teaching of Jesus anticipated coming events; this same teaching anticipated a renewed community (the kingdom itself has a corporate significance). If the limits

set by existential interpretation for eschatology evaporate, this itself means the ethical dimension of Jesus' teaching cannot be set aside.

A Way Forward

It is evident that the relation between eschatology and ethics continues to be a vital, if still unsettled, question. It is further evident that a successful answer to this question will turn on one's having grasped eschatology, ethics, and their reciprocal relationships. The aim of this study is to offer such an answer. What ethical response was called for by Jesus' proclamation of the kingdom of God? The study deals in turn with the character of the intended response to Jesus' public proclamation (chapter 3) and the character of the intended response to the renewed call to discipleship that he made with the announcement to them of his destiny (chapter 4). Both investigations call for a fairly full account of the eschatological perspectives of Jesus of the kingdom of God. But the primary interest is in the intended correlation between eschatology and ethics with the aim of illuminating the character of the ethics.

This work can be aptly located in the larger field of "Christian biblical ethics." In the Christian community the scriptures have served as a source of ethical insight and as a moral authority. There is an interdependence between scripture and the people of God: scripture came into being as the record of God's saving and guiding activity with his people Israel and through Jesus Christ with the church. This is warning enough against the adequacy of a naively direct appropriation of the scriptures. The messianic ethics of Jesus is not the whole of New Testament ethics. Moreover, the grasp of Jesus' messianic ethics and the grasp of the whole of New Testament ethics are acts of recovery. There can be no doubt

about the immediacy of their impact on whoever shares in and profits from these acts of recovery. But the contemporary Christian community is not fully and adequately served by limitation to this kind of direct and immediate impact. There is required a more massive and reflective mediation of all New Testament ethics to the present. Studies such as the present one accordingly seek to serve two purposes: first, to recover ancient meaning with its original form and force; second, thereby to provide theology with data indispensable for the task of mediating to the Christian community today a fully rounded, wholly contemporary Christian ethics.

Scripture does not come in the form of a timeless moral code. Covenant and commandment are given in history as part of God's relating himself to particular persons and groups (e.g. Abraham, Israel). At the same time the biblical emphasis is on the continuity of God's purpose. This purpose includes a great variety of people and concrete situations. Within this continuity there is a consistency of purpose from the past to the anticipated future (cf. Deut 30:11,14; Mic 6:6-8; Mark 10:6-9; Rom 12:2).¹⁷ The use of scripture as a resource in moral discernment calls for an awareness of the meaning or intention expressed in the text and of the kind of question that may be appropriately asked. (Just because scripture speaks with authority about nature does not mean that it will answer any or every kind of question in this area.) The basic reference in Christian biblical ethics is to scripture as integrally involved in the very process of their formulation and development.¹⁸

The purpose here is to consider the teaching and mission of Jesus and his significance for ethics. Thus the centre of attention is on the place and meaning of "messianic ethics," grounded in the eschatological mission of Jesus Christ. This messianic ethics is both old and new. It reflects the

purposes of God from the beginning and it anticipates the triumph of those purposes at the end. In this context questions about the place of creation, the Old Testament scriptures, or tradition as sources of moral insight can be properly asked and answered. Whatever light they shed on identity and behavior must cohere with and pass through the eschatological event of Jesus Christ.¹⁹ Jesus' mission was addressed to the people of God and it envisaged the eschatological restoration of the people of God. The meaning of participation in the kingdom of God was therefore mediated in and through this community. The interpretation and discernment of the appropriate response to God's initiative in Jesus could not take place as an intellectual operation by the lone individual. The promise of Jesus to actualize his will had as its context the community gathered in his name (cf. Matt 18: 18,19). The witness of the gospel was to be interpreted and appropriated anew in the future (from the perspective of Jesus' teaching the disciples). In this perspective the community was not envisioned without the scriptures (including the oral or written witness of the apostles) or the scriptures without the community. The fulfillment of the promise of guidance was to be claimed in the assembly of those gathered around this word to converse and understand together the will of God with respect to some specific moral issue (cf. Acts. 2:42; 15:6-21, 28-29).

THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF THE QUESTION

What was the meaning of Jesus' Kingdom-of-God proclamation, and what response to it did Jesus seek?

In the history of scholarship answers to this question have varied widely. This is evident in the set of contrary views that arises in that history. For some, the kingdom of God was to be realized in the human (ethical) response; for others, the kingdom was wholly the eschatological deed of God and human response could only be described as preparation for its coming in the future. In the view of some scholars, Jesus was concerned with the absolute future or the end; in the view of others, Jesus was concerned with what was to happen in the course of history. Again, according to certain scholars, the kingdom of God in Jesus' proclamation was the rule of God in the human heart; but others insist that the kingdom of God in Jesus' proclamation was to be effective in history and as the end of history.

In this chapter it is not my purpose to present my own efforts to answer the question, What was the meaning of Jesus' kingdom-of-God proclamation, and what response to it did Jesus seek? The immediate question, rather, is how critical scholarship up to the present has answered this question. Therefore, to clarify the issue I shall review the work of major scholars from Albrecht Ritschl to Amos Wilder who have contributed to the discussion. Thus I shall pick out of more recent scholarship the elements that seem to me to offer promise of a new state of the question on the ethics called for by Jesus.

We shall begin our survey with a fairly full account of Albrecht Ritschl. If Johannes Weiss inaugurated a new era in the discussion of Jesus

and the kingdom of God, Weiss defined his own position precisely vis-à-vis that of Ritschl. Further, it was Ritschl who first clearly related Jesus' proclamation and his ethical teaching. We begin, then, with Ritschl's 1889 work, Die christliche Lehre von der Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung.¹

I The Importance of Ritschl and Weiss

Briefly stated, Ritschl's view was that the kingdom of God is realized in Christian ethical action in the present. The decisive reaction to this thesis was from his student and son-in-law, Johannes Weiss. Weiss' Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes (1892) subjected Ritschl's thesis to a partly positive but also negative critique. The question of the nature of the kingdom of God and the appropriate response to it came into critical focus for the first time.

Under the influence of the Enlightenment, Ritschl had developed a synthesis on the basis of Kant, Schleiermacher and Rothe. A section in the first volume of Ritschl's major work, Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung, is a discussion of Kant's ethics and theology.² He recognized that for Kant "kingdom of God" was the goal of all ethical activity.³ Jesus was the archetype of humanity pleasing to God, an example of the moral reason within us all by which we make the kingdom the goal of this activity. Ritschl also devoted a section in the first volume of his work to discussion of Schleiermacher.⁴ Schleiermacher understood the kingdom as the corporate life of Christians in fellowship with God.⁵ He saw redemption as the influence of Jesus (sinless perfection), and from this he derived the "teleological character of Christian piety."⁶ That is, the kingdom is to be realized and becomes the goal of the person under the influence of Christ. Jesus' life of sinless perfection is the beginning of the kingdom and his

influence the power by which he leads people to live and act for that kingdom.

Richard Rothe, rarely mentioned by Ritschl, had nevertheless strongly influenced him at certain points. This is most clearly evident in his conception of the kingdom of God. For Rothe the kingdom was also the enacting of the highest good, but Rothe set this in the framework of the Hegelian speculative method and of the historical development that it hypothesizes.⁷

The preeminent emphasis on ethical activity in the work of Kant, Schleiermacher, and Rothe is a key to understanding Ritschl. All three related the kingdom of God to the highest good; they further argued that the highest good found realization through the ethical task. The concept of "the highest good" was at once the organizing perspective for ethics, the goal of action and the result of this goal-directed action.⁸ On the one hand, the kingdom of God was the establishment of the highest good by God himself. On the other hand, it was to be realized by ethical action and was already present in human ethical accomplishment.

Now, to hold that there is a close relation between ethics and the kingdom of God leads to a further question. What is the nature of this relationship? The sharp edge of the question was avoided by both Kant and Schleiermacher, for they ignored the eschatological dimension of the kingdom and concentrated instead on the kingdom as present and developing in human ethical striving and accomplishment.⁹ Kant purposely avoided reference to eschatological consummation; he emphasized the role of ethical activity in the development of "the highest good" in history. For Schleiermacher the center of attention was not the ethical duty or the good disposition of those involved but the concrete "goods" that contribute to "the highest

good."¹⁰ In his speculative explication of the kingdom, Rothe considered the relation of the kingdom to the eschaton (and failed to show how the kingdom is at once the goal and accomplishment of human ethical activity and God's action). But, however their attempt might be evaluated, these three--Kant, Schleiermacher, and Rothe--forged a bond between the kingdom of God and ethics. This construction was determinative for the thought of Ritschl.

Ritschl presented his central perspective in the form of a thesis: Christianity could only be properly described in terms of an ellipse with two focal points: the first was the redemption wrought by Jesus Christ, which brought freedom from guilt and spiritual freedom of the individual "over the world"; the second was the kingdom of God, which arose out of redemption, for it was the moral organization of people in community through love. For Ritschl this described the reciprocal relation between the religious and the ethical character of the Christian life.¹¹ In accord with reformation theology, Ritschl was interested in upholding the distinction between (religious) faith toward God and (ethical) works of love toward the neighbor. Accordingly, justification restored the relationship of the sinner to God and was at the same time an essential condition for moral activity toward people.¹² The aim of Ritschl was to clarify the relation between redemption as means to the divinely determined end of the kingdom; that is, the (ethical) kingdom of God was the "goal and content of religion and of the redemption accomplished through Jesus."¹³

1. How Ritschl Conceived "Kingdom"

For Ritschl, the intimate relation between the kingdom and ethics was epitomized in his view of the kingdom of God as the highest good. Redemption was the removal of the guilt that separated the sinner from God

and prepared the ground for participation in the kingdom of God.¹⁴ This meant that redemption was an inner spiritual experience not to be identified with freedom from social evils or economic deprivation. Redemption, as the religious dimension, itself entailed no corresponding human action. The kingdom of God, however, represented not only the highest good of God for humanity (the religious dimension), but also the human ethical task. Redemption therefore was distinct from but set the stage for response in ethical action. The realization of this highest good was the goal toward which people were to strive. Through their righteous conduct members of the Christian community "share in effecting the kingdom of God."¹⁵ The kingdom as the highest good was the goal set by God. The (religious) redemption wrought by Jesus and effective through the church served this goal. This gave to Christianity its teleological (ethical) character. Therefore the highest good was no longer simply identified with God and his gracious action but became "the positive ethical task of man as well."¹⁶

If Ritschl depended on his predecessors in his conception of the kingdom of God, he differed from them at the same time in his extensive efforts to base his views on scripture. Not only did he make the kingdom central in his systematic thought, but he did so with the claim that this was demanded by the significance that the kingdom had in Jesus' teaching.¹⁷ Weiss, as we remarked above, took up the investigation of this claim in Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes.¹⁸ He was pleased to accept from Ritschl the insight into the central importance of the kingdom; but he early reached the disturbing conclusion that Ritschl's conception of the kingdom and the kingdom in Jesus' proclamation "were two very different things."¹⁹ Weiss' concern was that in the interpretation of a theme like the kingdom of God

the original historical meaning might have been supplanted by a foreign point of view.²⁰

The work of Weiss, always with a critical eye on Ritschl's position, brought to center-stage the thoroughly eschatological character of Jesus' proclamation of the kingdom of God. The kingdom comes into being wholly at the initiative and by the action of God: "The actualization of the kingdom of God is not a matter for human initiative, but entirely a matter of God's initiative. The kingdom of God in Jesus' view, is never an ethical ideal, but is *nothing other than the highest religious Good*, a Good which God grants on certain conditions."²¹ Jesus' transcendental conception of the Kingdom of God stood in complete contrast to any notion of human "actualization" of this Kingdom.²² To Weiss this also meant that in Jesus' proclamation the kingdom was imminent but wholly future. What its coming would mean Jesus did not need to explain at length. The people understood that God's coming kingdom was the antithesis of all present conditions of sorrow, or of oppression from enemies.²³

Because of the work of Weiss the context for interpretation of the kingdom became a crucial issue. The expectation of God's coming kingdom has a variety of different forms or emphases in the Old Testament prophets and apocalyptists. Weiss took Jewish apocalyptic to be the context for Jesus' kingdom-of-God proclamation, particularly the dualistic conception of the coming of the kingdom expressed in terms of the opposition between the power of Satan and the power of God. This dualistic view in which the world was sharply divided between the realms of good and evil, divine and Satanic powers formed the background, in Weiss' opinion, of Jesus' proclamation of the imminent coming of the kingdom of God.²⁴

2. The Kingdom and the Ethical Response

Central to the debate on the relation between the kingdom of God and proper ethical action has been the question of whether the kingdom is present or future. To hold, with Ritschl, that it was in some sense both present and future called for an answer to the question of whether or how the kingdom could be both present and future. How one understood the role of Jesus was crucial at this point. For Ritschl, Jesus had a central place in the coming of the kingdom. He surpassed all his prophetic predecessors by revealing himself as the Son of God and the messianic king. Therefore he did not first prepare the way but established the kingdom of God.²⁵ This meant that Jesus exercised his messianic role "through his morally effective teaching and by his readiness to engage in the action of a servant--not by the compulsion of legal judgment."²⁶ Jesus was the exemplar and founder of the kingdom of God. It was his special vocation to establish the kingdom of God. He did this by faithful preaching of the truth and by loving action in the face of opposition from the leaders of Israel. Jesus was the first to actualize in his own life "the final purpose of the kingdom of God." At the same time, the establishment of the kingdom required Jesus' calling of the disciples; in this way the kingdom found its proper correlative in ethical action through a distinct community.²⁷

Ritschl had closely identified the kingdom and ethics. Indeed, the Kingdom was present in and realized through ethical activity. Accordingly, it was a reality only insofar as there were people who lived as obedient subjects, directing their wills toward the highest good (the kingdom of God). Ritschl emphasized love as the comprehensive ethical content of the kingdom. Hence the righteousness of the kingdom was action motivated by the universal law of love (of God and the neighbor). This action of love was

carried out in the "naturally conditioned communities" (i.e. marriage, the family, civic and social life, the state).²⁸ These "vocations in society" were to be taken up in order to "serve the common good." But the ethics of these vocations are determined by "the principles that govern each."²⁹ That is, the ethical response in a person's social setting was determined by the law inherent in that situation; the requirements of response could be both known and fulfilled independent of any relation to Christian faith. To be sure, faith conditioned the response in a general way by providing a direction to act unselfishly in the fulfillment of one's vocation. That was the meaning of Jesus' own example in the fulfillment of his vocation.³⁰ The ethical activity in one's vocation was to be motivated by and directed to the goal of realizing the kingdom of God (as the highest good).³¹ Only action directed towards that end could be properly described as Christian action.

Ethical action was determined by this teleological direction and could not therefore be determined by any form of concrete ethical teaching (e.g. teaching derived from the commands of Jesus). Love as the correlative of the kingdom was the standard for moral judgment in the concrete situation.³² At the same time, love for the neighbor transcended the limits of these natural communities. In this sense love signified regard for another as a person of infinite worth; it was love that bound the human race together.³³ Further, the kingdom present in the world through love-motivated action was at the same time supramundane (above and beyond the natural divisions of humanity).³⁴ According to Ritschl, this love corresponding to the kingdom of God was not evident to others (though it is effective in actions and relationships). Therefore the kingdom is an "invisible entity within the Christian community and as such is the object of faith."³⁵

In contrast to Ritschl, and in accord with his own emphasis on the kingdom as wholly future, Weiss insisted that Jesus' mission was only preparatory to the coming of the kingdom. On this account Jesus, in announcing the kingdom of God, did not differ in principle from John the Baptist. At the same time, he noted that in his exercise of power over evil spirits, Jesus distinguished himself from John. But Weiss made little of this distinction. The ministry of both Jesus and John was preparatory and exactly the same. The activity of Jesus' entire ministry was not messianic but had only a preparatory significance.³⁶

Still, there were points at which the meaning of Jesus' mission for the coming kingdom was clearly recognized by Weiss. Jesus understood himself to have a decisive role as "bearer of the Spirit of God against the kingdom of Satan."³⁷ Inasmuch as Jesus was moving victoriously against the strongholds of evil in human life (Matt 12:25-27), those opposing Jesus ought to have understood "that the kingly rule of God was already begun."³⁸ Thus, according to Weiss, Jesus had received the commission from God to represent the kingdom. But the words of Jesus at the last supper register his painful realization that the kingdom had still not been established. This was in accord with the basic premise of Weiss: for Jesus the kingdom could only be the end-time eschatological event, established "solely by God's supernatural intervention."³⁹ Weiss did not consider in this connection what it might mean if Jesus' words and acts represented God's action or "intervention" (e.g. Mark 2:5-12; Matt 12:28 //Luke 11:20). Accordingly, Jesus himself waited for and at the same time was aware that he would be the "messiah" in the kingdom. For Weiss, Jesus' mission was that of a teacher or prophet who expected that he would *become* the Son of man.⁴⁰

Now, Weiss granted that there were some sayings of Jesus indicating that the kingdom was already present: "though Jesus generally pictured the kingdom of God as still future, there are, on the other hand, statements in which the rule of God already appears actualized."⁴¹ Again, on the basis of his exorcisms (cf. Matt 12:25-27) Jesus expected people to draw the conclusion that the kingly rule of God was already begun. For Weiss the critical question was in what sense Jesus spoke of the presence of the kingdom and whether this was the same sense in which it is normally used today. He criticized the idea that the kingdom was to be realized in a particular community of people or in their obedience.⁴² The strongest argument against this, Weiss believed, was in the words of the prayer: "Your kingdom come."⁴³ He argued that since the disciples were called to pray that the kingdom should come, it was for them in no sense present. They were rather called "to seek the kingdom" (Luke 12:31).

Weiss rejected the idea that there could be different stages in the coming of the kingdom; "either the kingdom is here, or it is not yet here."⁴⁴ He acknowledged that Jesus could speak of the presence of the kingdom because in his exorcisms and his healing miracles the power of Satan was already being broken. But for Jesus these were "moments of sublime prophetic enthusiasm."⁴⁵ Against these sayings he referred to "the great profusion of sayings in which the establishment of the kingdom remains reserved for the future."⁴⁶ In accord with Weiss' construction, it would seem best to leave the matter open. But Weiss had his solution to the difference between the two sets of sayings: the kingdom of Satan was already broken, the rule of God was already gaining ground; but it was not yet historical event.⁴⁷ The beatitudes depict the contrast between the present condition of the hearers and the transformed condition of the future

life in the kingdom.⁴⁸ He concluded that the kingdom of God could only be a future eschatological reality.

This understanding of the kingdom informs the view Weiss held about the appropriate ethical response. As future, the kingdom was also imminent; it was the imminence of the kingdom that was "the motive for the new morality."⁴⁹ In the terms of Weiss, Jesus' expectations of his hearers were dramatic, demanding a decisive either-or response. The goods, relationships, and activities of this world had lost all value; indeed, now they could only be a hindrance. The old world was on the brink of destruction: "God himself must come and make everything new."⁵⁰ Therefore, appropriate response now meant waiting as well as certain ascetic acts of preparation. To seek the kingdom was to prepare oneself by acquiring the righteousness that God commends. People must free themselves from this world, its goods and bonds, in order to be worthy of the kingdom. These acts functioned as entrance requirements to the kingdom of God.⁵¹

Weiss perceived another strand in Jesus' ethical teaching. In the quieter periods of his ministry, when he was not thinking of the end of the world, Jesus spoke words of abiding ethical value. This was teaching of Jesus on the sanctity of marriage, on truth-telling, on love of God and neighbor.⁵² Weiss was aware that there were sayings of Jesus on the presence of the kingdom and that there were ethical actions described in Jesus' teaching that were not simply acts of preparation for the imminent end of the world. But he left the relation between them unexplored and made of the two sets of sayings exceptions that had no place in the basic understanding of Jesus' teaching and mission.

3. The Kingdom and Jesus' Destiny

There was, for Ritschl, a clear importance in the death of Jesus for the kingdom of God. Jesus exercised his dominion "in his very readiness to suffer everything even unto death for the sake of his vocation."⁵³ The kingdom of God presupposed redemption. Redemption itself had a religious or spiritual significance. It referred to forgiveness of sins or pardon from the guilt of sin that separates the person from God. Forgiveness made it possible for sinners to have fellowship with God in his final purpose (i.e., the kingdom of God). The obedience of Christ to his vocation could be interpreted as a "priestly offering."⁵⁴ The resurrection in the power of God was the consistent fulfillment "of the revelation effected through him" of the final will of God for humanity.⁵⁵ In the fulfillment of his vocation through love Christ revealed at once the will of God and the meaning of the kingdom of God.⁵⁶ What this means for ethics is not developed, a point to which we must briefly return. The kingdom began with and was founded concretely upon the life of Jesus Christ; mankind in the form of the community founded by him now had the responsibility of realizing the kingdom of God.

Now, Weiss had a very different approach to the death of Jesus. At the same time it is not clear how Weiss thought of Jesus' death in relation to the establishment of the kingdom. ^{it is not clear} According to Weiss, it was clear that what had been eagerly awaited did not happen. At a certain point Jesus became convinced that the end had been postponed. It became apparent to Jesus that the kingdom *could* not yet come because the people had not yet shown evidence of true repentance in ethical conduct.⁵⁷ The Jewish leaders aligned themselves in solid opposition to Jesus. Jesus' call for response was mostly lost in thoughtlessness and indifference on the part of the

people. Hence Jesus reached the conclusion that "the establishment of the kingdom could not yet take place."⁵⁸ First the guilt of the people had to be removed. Jesus did not expect to live to see this happen; instead he had first to fall victim to death at the hands of his opponents. From the standpoint of Jesus' own understanding this could not mean failure but must serve as a means in bringing about the final goal. Since the sin that led to his death is at the same time the chief obstacle to the coming of the kingdom, Jesus seized upon the audacious idea "that his death itself should be the ransom for the people otherwise destined to destruction (Mark 10:45)."⁵⁹ Once the kingdom was established Jesus expected to return on the clouds in glory, an event he expected within the lifetime of the generation that had rejected him.⁶⁰

It is apparent that Ritschl and Weiss had very different views of the kingdom of God; and these differences affected their understanding of the response to his proclamation that Jesus sought. This was in accord with the anticipation that both the proclamation and the response would be illuminated in reciprocal fashion. The differences between Ritschl and Weiss go to the heart of the understanding of the kingdom of God and the appropriate response to it. What interested Ritschl was the presence of the kingdom, its development en route to consummation, and the present possession of eternal life in the kingdom.⁶¹ He acknowledged that this was not to be equated with the eschatological teaching of Jesus or his apostles. They expected divine judgment and the kingdom of God coming to and for this world (including the events of resurrection of believers and the return of Christ). This form of eschatology in his view was no longer credible in the church.⁶²

The effects of this shift in perspective are evident. The kingdom of God not only formed and informed Christian ethical action; it was itself progressively realized in that ethical action. The limited form in which Ritschl recognized the eschatological future had no decisive significance for present life and action. According to his basic ethical-developmental conception the love of God manifested itself in the present and in the continuing realization of the kingdom of God in accord with his eternal teleological plan. That is, the kingdom of God was identified as the goal to be realized in the present through human ethical activity. This relationship of the kingdom of God with ethics involved a conception of the kingdom of God as both the religious and ethical highest good.

In so far as Weiss established the eschatological character of the kingdom of God, it became impossible to hold that this kingdom could be an ethical good, the result of ethical striving. In his critique Weiss made clear that the kingdom of God was for Jesus not some highest good to be realized by human ethical activity. Only God could bring about his kingdom. The kingdom of God therefore, as the eschatological future reality, was by definition not to be realized through human ethical action.

II From Weiss to Wilder

In the twentieth century biblical and other scholars came increasingly to regard eschatology as an alien encumbrance. Even for Weiss, as he discovered anew the landscape of eschatology, it represented a crisis to be overcome. Following his historical reconstruction of Jesus' eschatology, he himself returned again to the liberal understanding of Jesus.⁶³ In the alienation from eschatology and in the effort at the same time to reinterpret the gospel, various options presented themselves.

1. Harnack and Ethics Without Eschatology

A notable representative of liberal thought, Adolf von Harnack attempted to take account of the Weissian critique, but in his method as well as in his ethical conception of Christianity (i.e., his explication of the kingdom of God, his emphasis on love as the meaning of ethical action) he owed much to Ritschl.⁶⁴

(a) The conception of the kingdom. In Harnack's view the distinctive emphasis in Jesus' proclamation was the idea of "the inward coming of the kingdom of God." He knew there was no direct line from Jesus' teaching to this conclusion. According to Harnack, there were two distinct but related focal points in this teaching: 1) the kingdom was apparently a purely future event, the rule of God actualized in an external fashion; 2) it was an inward reality, already present and coming into effect.⁶⁵ The ambiguity arose because Jesus made his proclamation in continuity with the religious traditions of his people and at the same time fundamentally changed the conception of the kingdom.

Jesus discarded expectations of a worldly and political nature in his proclamation.⁶⁶ In agreement with Weiss, Harnack thought that Jesus "was profoundly conscious of the great antithesis between the kingdom of God and that kingdom of the world in which he saw the reign of evil and the evil one."⁶⁷ Jesus saw himself engaged in a dramatic struggle between the two opposing powers that would culminate in his being raised to the right hand of God. This conception of the kingdom, held in common with his contemporaries, was not the basic content of Jesus' message. The truly unique and authoritative character of Jesus' proclamation, Harnack affirmed, was the idea that the kingdom had already come and was present as the rule of God in the human heart or soul. "The kingdom of God comes by

coming to the individual, by entering into his soul and laying hold of it. True, the kingdom of God is the rule of God; but it is the rule of the holy God in the hearts of individuals; it is God himself in his power." He thus emphasized the actual presence and inward coming of the kingdom. What mattered was "God and the soul, the soul and its God." From this standpoint the future reference in Jesus' proclamation and "everything that is dramatic in the external and historical sense has vanished."⁶⁸

(b) The ethical response. Harnack forged a view of the kingdom that shaped his understanding of the appropriate ethical response. On the one hand, all the affairs and goods of the world were evaluated in terms of the primary value of the human soul. According to Harnack, this meant the world was not simply rejected; rather, life in the world was affirmed and all was to be related to God. The concept of being children of God (*Gotteskindschaft*), first emphasized by Weiss, was the key for understanding both the religious gift and the ethical task. Out of the certainty that he was a child of the Father, the human person was to do God's will.

What did this mean for concrete ethical action? The gospel called the person to love for the neighbor but beyond that offered no direct help to order life in community.⁶⁹ Still, Harnack insisted that the values and principles of Jesus' teaching "must remain the basis and guideline of our development."⁷⁰ Harnack understood that Jesus' preaching called for a definite response: "The distinction of good and evil--for or against God--he would make a life question for every man." But the response was related not to the eschatological kingdom of God but to the "glad message of mercy and the fatherhood of God."⁷¹ In the end Harnack defined an ethics without eschatology.

2. Albert Schweitzer and Consistent Eschatology

Albert Schweitzer himself recognized that in the renewed understanding of eschatology the work of Weiss represented the decisive breakthrough.⁷² In many respects the position of Weiss could stand for that of Schweitzer. But Schweitzer went beyond Weiss by offering a "consistent" or, as Schweitzer's English translator put it, "thoroughgoing" eschatological interpretation of the life of Jesus. Schweitzer criticized Weiss for failing to apply his findings consistently across the whole of Jesus' teaching and actions.⁷³ At this point, in taking account of Weiss, Harnack sought to emphasize the relevance of Jesus and his teaching for modern life, whereas Schweitzer moved in the other direction to emphasize Jesus as a stranger to modern life and thought. What highlighted the strangeness of Jesus was his eschatological outlook.

(a) The conception of the kingdom. Schweitzer's view was that Jesus' life was completely determined by his apocalyptic/eschatological vision. Jesus' life was a "dogmatic history" (history determined by theological beliefs); it was determined not by the natural course of events but by the imminent eschatological coming of the kingdom of God.⁷⁴ He believed that Jesus combined eschatology with a doctrine of predestination and that this was the frame for understanding Jesus' reaction to people and the determination by him of his own destiny.⁷⁵ It was also the ground of Jesus' assurance that the kingdom must come within a period of months. With the coming harvest would come also the kingdom of God.⁷⁶ Jesus sent out the twelve to call people to repentance, expecting that this would bring on the final tribulation and signal the end (cf. Matt 10:1-23). But the disciples returned from their mission and the end did not come. Schweitzer hypothesized that this was a major turning point for Jesus. The movement

of repentance had not been sufficient to bring the kingdom. This non-occurrence drove Jesus to change his strategy. Jesus now came to understand his own death as taking on himself the suffering that had been foreseen as the final tribulation before the end. "His death must at last compel the coming of the kingdom."⁷⁷ Jesus expected that beyond death he would be exalted as the Son of man. But according to Schweitzer, because Jesus' life ended in death, instead of fulfilling eschatological hopes he destroyed the very possibility of their fulfillment.⁷⁸ Through the conclusion of his life Jesus shattered the possibility of eschatology and, in so doing, Jesus grounded a new "spiritual" basis for living (that is his real "reign").

(b) The ethical response. Because the kingdom of God was for Jesus a purely future entity there could be "no ethic of the kingdom of God."⁷⁹ For the kingdom of God would be the end of all natural relationships (e.g. Mark 12:25-26); temptation and sin would no longer exist. Rather, what Jesus provided, in Schweitzer's terms, was an "interim ethic" as instruction for the elect in true repentance. In agreement with Weiss, Schweitzer held that this "penitential discipline" was intended only for that brief urgent interval between Jesus' proclamation and the actual arrival of the kingdom.⁸⁰ In the end what Schweitzer called for was a spiritualization through and beyond the actual words and deeds of Jesus. Not Jesus as historically known, but the spirit proceeding from him carried his meaning and influence.⁸¹

Schweitzer did not examine the ethical teaching of Jesus in detail, but merely asserted that it was a heroic ethics for the interim between "now" and the coming of the kingdom. The kingdom as an end-of-the-world event called for a penitential discipline as entrance requirements. Has he

adequately characterized this teaching? Merely to assert a correspondence between eschatology and the ethics was not yet to show that such a correspondence really existed. Schweitzer sought a connection between Jesus' eschatologically determined words and Christian existence and action in our present. But if this meaning and influence of Jesus was, as Schweitzer apparently thought, absolutely independent of historical knowledge, what could be known about Jesus? How was it still possible to speak at all of the spirit of Jesus? There was no intelligible basis for ethical action having an eschatological quality, if the real future of the kingdom was, in the end, denied. Schweitzer, by abandoning the reality of the kingdom, could not really retrieve the ethics of Jesus. What he called "the spirit of Jesus" was perforce Schweitzer's own invention.

3. C. H. Dodd and Realized Eschatology

If the work of Schweitzer confirmed Weiss' eschatological understanding of the kingdom of God, important issues remained to be resolved. For many there was a question about the lack of coherence between sayings of Jesus that seemed to refer to the presence of the kingdom and sayings that appeared to refer to the future of the kingdom. As a whole, however, the eschatological understanding of the kingdom of God could not be denied.

(a) The conception of the kingdom. C. H. Dodd began by accepting the discovery of Weiss and Schweitzer, namely, the "eschatological" character of the kingdom. But he broke with them by proposing, on the basis of his own analysis of the sayings of Jesus, that for Jesus the kingdom was already present. In the Jewish usage prior to Jesus there already existed the notion of God as king in the present. Dodd referred to the Rabbinic

saying about taking upon oneself "the kingdom (*malkut*) of heaven." By this the Rabbis meant the careful observance of the Torah.⁸² The kingdom of God was also the great object of future hope (more often the reference in Jewish sources was to "the life of the age to come").⁸³ According to Dodd, certain cases in the teaching of Jesus on the "kingdom of God" fit within this framework of contemporary Judaism.⁸⁴ Therefore the kingdom could be "accepted" in the present with the expectation of blessings to be enjoyed in the world to come.

But there were sayings of Jesus that did not fit within this framework. Dodd pointed to the statement of Jesus, "The kingdom of God has come upon you" (Matt 12:18//Luke 11:20). The kingdom of God was present in a new and distinctive sense.

Something has happened, which has not happened before, and which means that the sovereign power of God has come into effective operation. It is not a matter of having God for your king in the sense that you obey his commandments: it is a matter of being confronted with the power of God at work in the world. In other words, the "eschatological" kingdom of God is proclaimed as a present fact, which men must recognize, whether by their actions they accept or reject it.⁸⁵

He understood the summary in Mark 1:14-15 in the same sense. "The time has reached fulfillment, and the kingdom of God has drawn near. Repent and believe the gospel." Dodd emphasized the two verbs in the above passages "is near" (*eggizein*) (Mark 1:15) and "has come" (*phthanein*) (Matt 12:28//Luke 11:20). He concluded that Jesus did not intend to proclaim the kingdom "as something to come in the near future, but as a matter of present experience."⁸⁶ Sayings which declared the kingdom to be present Dodd regarded as "the most characteristic and distinctive of the gospel

sayings on the subject. They have no parallel in Jewish teaching or prayers of the period."⁸⁷ This meant that "the *eschaton* has moved from the future to the present, from the sphere of expectation into that of realized experience."⁸⁸ Therefore "realized eschatology" became for Dodd the fundamental point of departure for the interpretation of the kingdom of God.⁸⁹

At the same time he recognized that Jesus' teaching also included reference to the future of the kingdom. He attempted to understand references to the future and the present in relationship. He observed that there was no precise equivalent form, "the kingdom will come," to balance the direct statement, "the kingdom has come."⁹⁰ In any case, the key move on Dodd's part was to interpret the future eschatological references as symbolic of the spiritual and the timeless. Thus

these future tenses were only an accommodation of language. There was no coming of the Son of man in history 'after' his coming in Galilee and Jerusalem, whether soon or late, for there is no before and after in the eternal order.⁹¹

Sayings on the future coming of the kingdom did not refer to a further "coming" of the kingdom in the world. Instead, this was the kingdom of the "new heaven and new earth" of apocalyptic thought, which for Dodd was the transcendent order beyond space and time.⁹²

Thus from the two sorts of references to the kingdom of God, Dodd understood the kingdom on two planes. There is the sense in which it was present in and through Jesus historically; the eternal meaning that gave reality to history had appeared in history so far as history could contain it. There were also those future references which, according to Dodd, are symbolic and refer to an eternal order lying beyond all history. According

to Dodd, even the events of the parousia, the revelation of the kingdom and judgment were included in Jesus' ministry. At the same time he thought it was possible to interpret eschatology to include the idea that the present earthly expression "of the kingdom of God will yield to a purely transcendent order in which it will be absolute."⁹³

In accord with his perspective, Dodd emphasized that the kingdom was a matter of individual experience.⁹⁴ The coming of the kingdom was a matter of becoming aware that in Jesus it had indeed come.⁹⁵ Even the language of glory and power related to the coming kingdom of God now had to do with human discernment and experience.⁹⁶ In his later work Dodd gave a larger scope to the kingdom. He said that "it would be wrong to suppose that [Jesus] so 'spiritualized' the idea of the kingdom of God as to make it relevant only to the inner life of the individual."⁹⁷ In an important sense Jesus identified his mission as a mission to his own people. He welcomed the repentance of the unpopular tax-collector, and referred to him as a "son of Abraham." Similarly, when he defied criticism to heal a crippled woman on the sabbath, she is called a "daughter of Abraham." Dodd observed that they were important to Jesus as individuals, but he also recognized that they were part of a people. The plight of these persons concerned this community to which they, and he, belonged. Their "salvation" also "concerned the well-being of the community as a whole."⁹⁸ He believed that for Jesus there was a correlation between the kingdom of God and this community "in and through which the kingdom is to be realized."⁹⁹ It was the aim of Jesus "to constitute a community worthy of the name of a people of God."¹⁰⁰

b. The ethical response. The position of Dodd on eschatology was in contrast to that of Weiss and Schweitzer, and this contrast was reflected

in the expected response. "Realized eschatology" for Dodd meant the exclusion of "interim ethics." Repentance, instead of being an act of preparation for the kingdom, was provoked by God's gracious initiative in the kingdom.¹⁰¹ Dodd, like Weiss, perceived two seemingly diverse types of ethical sayings: one type appeared to assume "the indefinite continuance of human life under historical conditions," while the other type appeared to expect the imminent end of these conditions.¹⁰² In accord with "realized eschatology," Dodd described the ethical teaching of Jesus as eschatological, providing moral precepts for life in the kingdom of God.¹⁰³ If the kingdom of God was defined as the eternal nature of God revealed in time (in Jesus' ministry) the ethics were a reflection of the nature of God thus revealed. The standard for the moral life was the love of God exemplified in Jesus and his ethical teaching. Therefore, with all the differences between Dodd and Schweitzer, there was also a basic similarity. Schweitzer "spiritualized" and reinterpreted the ethical teachings, and so affirmed within this world a new kind of spiritual, "eschatological" existence of significance for people of all times. Dodd emphasized that with Jesus a qualitatively new age began in human history. Every person must decide one way or another for or against the new life in the kingdom.¹⁰⁴

4. Bultmann and Existential Eschatology

The answer of Bultmann to the apocalyptic/eschatological interpretation was existential eschatology. Something of this attitude toward time and the kingdom of God had already been suggested by Schweitzer. Jesus' teaching was "spiritualized," having a reference to matters above time and history. "Dialectical" or "crisis" theology took

the same tack and developed it in its own way.¹⁰⁵ In reaction against an eschatology conceived in an ethical developmental sense (cf. Ritschl), eschatology now was understood in a timeless existential sense. The foremost representative in this century of transformed eschatology was Rudolf Bultmann.

(a) The conception of the kingdom. In the wake of Weiss and Schweitzer Bultmann emphasized that "the kingdom of God is no 'highest good' in the ethical sense. It is not a good toward which the will and action of men is directed, not an ideal which is in any sense realized through human conduct... Being eschatological it is wholly supernatural."¹⁰⁶ It was not something to be "built" or realized in human history. We can only say it draws near, that it comes, that it is constituted by the power of God alone. More specifically, what events were signified when the kingdom of God was proclaimed? For Bultmann there "can be no doubt that Jesus like his contemporaries expected a tremendous eschatological drama."¹⁰⁷ This included the events of the coming of the Son of man, the raising of the dead, the judgment. Jesus identified eschatology with these events. At the same time he refused all apocalyptic speculation; he did not engage in the calculation of times or in watching for signs (cf. Luke 17:20, 21, 23, 24).¹⁰⁸ Bultmann concluded that for Jesus the kingdom of God "does not in any sense depend on these events." For Jesus the kingdom set before a person the ultimate either-or and compelled him to decision.¹⁰⁹ The kingdom was imminent and already dawning, but not yet here. On the one hand, in agreement with Weiss and Schweitzer, he insisted that it is wholly future.¹¹⁰ On the other hand, the kingdom of God "is not something which was to come in the course of time." Jesus expected the kingdom to come as an imminent future event, but there is another "true" meaning for

these words. That is, the kingdom of God is always future, and always determines the present. The kingdom as imminent is what determines the present because now, in the present, it compels the human person to decision.¹¹¹

(b) The ethical response. The imminence of the eschatological kingdom of God made the present the last hour. This situated the human person before the impending kingdom of God and created the crisis of decision. According to Bultmann, the coming of the kingdom of God had nothing to do with the course of time; rather, it had to do with the call for decision from the hearer. In this way the kingdom of God conditioned the present and gave it its eschatological character. Just this Bultmann took to be the final significance of Jesus' eschatological proclamation.¹¹²

In Bultmann's view the ethical teaching of Jesus was closely bound up with his eschatological preaching. He emphasized that God's kingdom was not to be understood as his reign in the individual human soul or in human society. It was not an ethic designed to effect change in this world. Indeed, as an eschatological ethic it had no vision for a future to be formed within this world by human plans and actions.¹¹³ At the same time, fulfillment of the will of God was the condition for participation in the salvation of his kingdom. This condition was not an external set task but true readiness and earnest desire for the will of God. Accordingly, Jesus was not correctly represented as teaching an "interim ethics." This teaching was not a set of exceptional instructions but had an absolute validity "independent of the temporal situation." The motive for ethical action was the will of God and not eschatological expectations. The decision set before the person Bultmann equated with repentance.¹¹⁵ Most often he identified response simply by reference to "decision." In every

situation of life Jesus demanded a decision between God (and his will) and that which was not of God (and therefore evil). The decision thus was between the only two possibilities for a person, good and evil.¹¹⁶ The willing obedience of the whole person that arose out of the present situation was "radical obedience." This was not an obedience attached to the law; Jesus completely separated obedience from the law. God demanded the whole person, and "not merely specific acts" from the person.¹¹⁷

For Bultmann Jesus' radical demand for love was the explication of the will of God. The love of neighbor was the ethical expression of the decision for God. Both aspects, the eschatological proclamation and the ethical demand, placed the person before God and both directed him to the present as the hour of decision for God.¹¹⁸ What a person was to do in order to love the neighbor was not specified.

It is assumed that everyone can know that, and therefore Jesus' demand for love is no revelation of a new principle of ethics nor of a new conception of the dignity of man...love is simply the requirement of obedience and shows how the obedience can and ought to be practised in the concrete situation in which man is bound to man.¹¹⁹

In this situation of encounter with the neighbor "no standard whatsoever from the past or from the universal is available. That is the meaning of decision."¹²⁰ In the concrete situation, the person in "the crisis of decision" knows what is now good and evil.¹²¹ The apparent consideration or fear for Bultmann was that any standards for action or reflection on response would result in a formulation of "general ideas about the highest good, about virtues and values," or else some form of legalism.¹²²

Bultmann was unwilling to be as "consistent" as Schweitzer in holding that Jesus' ethical teaching was wholly provisional in view of the impending kingdom. He did not maintain with Schweitzer that Jesus' ethic had a lasting significance despite its original "interim" character and the failure of the parousia.¹²³ Rather, his view was that Jesus himself considered his ethical teaching to be absolutely and essentially valid apart from any relation to events in time or history. In other words, Jesus himself actually lived in terms of the existential futurity of God's coming kingdom which determined the present existential moment and made it the last hour (and so eschatological).¹²⁴

5. Wilder and the Ethics of Realized Eschatology

(a) The conception of the kingdom. In Wilder's view, Jesus' proclamation of the kingdom of God involved both present and future. Accordingly, it was the mission of Jesus to represent the redemption God was enacting in his generation.¹²⁵ Wilder distinguished between prophetic expectation and apocalyptic eschatology. On the one hand, Jesus saw his mission in terms of apocalyptic eschatology associated with the Son of man. Wilder held that Jesus' ministry marked the beginning of the eschatological process that was to culminate in the kingdom or the life of the age to come. This was Jesus' "dualistic" view of the future (i.e. the apocalyptic view). On the other hand, Jesus also had a "non-dualistic" or prophetic-messianic understanding of the future. Here Wilder referred to the character of Jesus' ethical teaching, the promise to the disciples of sharing rule with him over the tribes of Israel, and the saying that he would rebuild the temple after three days.¹²⁶ In this way Jesus referred to the coming new social-historical order or new Israel.¹²⁷ According to Wilder, Jesus did

not make use of apocalyptic images to develop a time-table for the future. Jesus' made use of this language to indicate the power of God.¹²⁸

The basic point for Wilder was that Jesus saw a social-historical process beginning with his ministry and moving toward a climax; he called on people to recognize it and to make the appropriate response. This mission was first concretely directed to Israel. Therefore, "Jesus' typical eschatology" with its accent on the advent of the kingdom could be "considered as symbolic of the historical crisis of his time and its outcome."¹²⁹

(b) The ethical response. It was axiomatic for Wilder that Jesus' ethical teaching was rooted in a new relation to God in the present time of salvation. Eschatology functioned, first, as a sanction of ethics. "Jesus made the coming eschatological event...the motive and sanction" for his ethical summons, a summons that was contained in the call to repentance.¹³⁰ The ethics in this case took the form of entrance requirements to that kingdom.¹³¹ Secondly, since Jesus' proclamation of the kingdom signified the "historical crisis of his time," ethics was qualified by the gift of forgiveness and reconciliation of the new age. Jesus' ethical teaching was grounded in a new human relation to God in the present time of salvation.¹³²

Thirdly, Wilder distinguished a class of heroic demands in Jesus' ethical teaching that has led people to think of Jesus' ethics as interim ethics. Wilder concluded that they had their sharp urgency not because of the expectation of the imminent end, but because the coming of the kingdom through Jesus represented a crisis, a period of challenge and conflict for the kingdom amidst the powers of evil that opposed it.¹³³ This was the ethic in the eschatological situation "construed in terms of discipleship

to Jesus."¹³⁴ Since Jesus was himself the embodiment of the kingdom, people could not reject him without rejecting it, or accept the kingdom without accepting him. Therefore righteousness issued in the summons to follow Jesus and to confess him.¹³⁵ "In particular, the most exigent requirements of Jesus have to do with the following of him in the period of struggle of the kingdom."¹³⁶

Wilder made a basic distinction, related to eschatology, in Jesus' ethical teaching; he differentiated between the "formal" and the "fundamental" grounds for this teaching.¹³⁷ Eschatology, and the imaginative language in which it was expressed, could have only a "formal" significance. The fundamental ground of Jesus' teaching was his experience and conception of the nature of God. This meant that "the ethics are conceived as responses to the nature of God."¹³⁸ If the imminent coming of the kingdom was the dominant sanction for righteousness it is, nevertheless, only a formal sanction.¹³⁹ That is, the "formal" sanction of "eschatological culmination" so partook of myth (the language of "representation") that it only formally determined ethics.¹⁴⁰ For Wilder, language about "the eschatological kingdom" referred to the God-determined future, a future that lent urgency to present moral responsibility. At the same time these sanctions were subordinate and supplementary to the fundamental sanctions.¹⁴¹ But the decisive factor was not the future of eschatology; indeed, this eschatology was significant only as it was transposed into something else. According to Wilder, the "temporal imminence" of God in Jesus' eschatological proclamation "is but a function of his spiritual imminence." It was "the latter which really determines conduct."¹⁴² In Wilder's terms, Jesus' ethical teachings set forth the appropriate response of those already participating in the kingdom of God.

In short, the fundamental occasion for response was the experience of the nature of God (revealed by Jesus), not the coming kingdom of God proclaimed by Jesus.

5. Evaluation

Before moving on to discuss elements relevant to a new state of the question on Jesus' proclamation and the proper ethical response to it, it may be well to offer a succinct evaluation of the history we have just outlined.

It is to Ritschl's credit that he recognized the kingdom as central to Jesus' teaching and central to his ethics. But Weiss rightly showed the ahistorical character of Ritschl's conception of "kingdom." The kingdom was "not a matter for human initiative, but entirely a matter of God's initiative." The kingdom of God as Jesus proclaimed it was not some "spiritual" or ethical ideal, it was the gift of God.¹⁴³

But Weiss' own definition of the kingdom as the end of all things too severely limited the relationship of the kingdom to present Christian life and ethical action. To Weiss Jesus' ethic was basically an emergency ethic, grounded in the urgency of the present moment. It functioned as entrance requirement to the kingdom of God. At the same time Weiss himself recognized that according to Jesus' teaching the kingdom and the appropriate response to it bore precisely on the present.

The issue, crucial in the work of Harnack, found a resolution in the "spiritual" character of Jesus' proclamation. Harnack identified the kingdom as an inward experience. What was "external and historical" vanished from view. By this move Harnack tried to accommodate Weiss. The

accommodation, however, was superficial. Harnack did not really retain eschatology; his "essence of Christianity" remained typically Liberal.

Schweitzer, on the contrary, confirmed the fundamental eschatological character of the kingdom in Jesus' proclamation. But was the coming kingdom in Jesus' proclamation simply to be identified with a future cataclysmic event? And how did Jesus understand his death in relation to the coming of the kingdom? Schweitzer did not provide satisfactory answers.

Dodd rightly directed attention to those sayings that seemed to refer to the presence of the kingdom and used them as the key to the interpretation of Jesus' kingdom-of-God proclamation. But Dodd retreated into a more sober variation on Liberal theology. "Eternity" took the place of "parousia." The difficulty that has always dogged Dodd's "realized eschatology" is that it effectively denied the eschatological future by appeal to Platonic categories (time and eternity) to interpret the kingdom of God. Though Dodd retained the language of the "kingdom of God" what mattered was the "nature of God." Ethics, then was a reflection of the nature of God as revealed in Jesus.

Bultmann attempted to deal with most of the same issues, offering his own alternative interpretation. On the side of history, Bultmann reduced Jesus' mission to expectation of the impending kingdom of God, denying Jesus' teaching on his death. (The redemptive significance of that death, he believed, was a later interpretation developed by the church.)¹⁴⁴ Jesus' ethic, "eschatological" in a figurative sense, hinged on transposition of eschatology into existential terms. But if the actual future is eliminated, what justification is there for an "eschatological" ethic? Bultmann's interpretation undermined the possibility of any real

eschatological future. The Jesus of history issued ethical commands; what remains of this after the transposition of the message into existentialist categories? In place of a real ethics, there remains a principle: "radical obedience," but without specific content.

Amos Wilder's view, reminiscent of Dodd's, added the notion of "community" (as did Dodd's late work The Founder of Christianity). Moreover, the kingdom was the active power of God, closely identified with Jesus' mission and destiny. Hence, the disciples must be prepared to suffer for their witness. Wilder saw the connections in Jesus' ministry, as well as the connection between this ministry and his death, more clearly than most. The new order would mean suffering and death. More specifically, as part of his sense of mission "we cannot doubt that he related his death to the fulfillment of Israel's calling."¹⁴⁵ Accordingly, his death and his vindication were of evident importance in the coming of the new order, related to the full manifestation of the kingdom.¹⁴⁶ Nevertheless, Wilder in the end fastened on the eternal nature of God, not the eschatological kingdom of God. This has informed ethical response. But it has also abandoned the historical Jesus in favor of another line of Christian tradition.

III Elements for a New State of the Question

The question of Jesus and ethics has been modified in recent years by various reconsiderations of Jesus and his proclamation. First, there were *renewals* of older critical conversations. Thus, Richard H. Hiers has attempted to rehabilitate the position of Schweitzer. In agreement with Schweitzer he took the position that Jesus' eschatological proclamation had been refuted by the non-occurrence of the parousia. This did not mean the

negation of Jesus' ethical teaching; for the teaching could get along without the eschatology.¹⁴⁷ He pointed out that Schweitzer himself attempted to express the experience of the abiding authority of Jesus by reference to his will or to his person and spirit, as well as his ethic of love and self-devotion to others. The "will" of Jesus was understood to be the authority of the person and words of Jesus.¹⁴⁸ The words were authoritative because of Jesus' insight into the nature or will of God. Out of this awareness he presented the claim of God upon people. But Schweitzer did not fill in his concept of Jesus' will with particular content.¹⁴⁹ For Hiers, though Jesus was mistaken about eschatology, it can still signify that for every person time is short and the opportunity for response is limited. It can signify the experience of judgment "in, and ultimately at the end of, our individual and collective histories."¹⁵⁰ Hiers is helpful in clarifying the meaning of love by reference to Jesus' teaching. The teaching of Jesus is significant for ethics in setting a direction, but it provides no ethics for life in community.

In response to Hiers it must be said that the authoritative ethical teaching of Jesus had as its correlative the kingdom of God. Hiers thus recognized the need for purpose and hope to support what remained of Jesus' ethics. Having abandoned the eschatology of Jesus, Hiers saw the need for the equivalent of an "eschatology." Without this the ethics may serve to condition ethical response but they are shorn of their original character. He did not resolve basic issues left by the work of Schweitzer (e.g. the relation of present to future in eschatology or the assumption that the passing of time refuted the eschatology of Jesus).

Second, there were variations on older critical conversations. As Bultmann had attempted to transpose eschatology into existentialist

categories, so Norman Perrin attempted to arrive at much the same goal by analyzing "the kingdom of God" not as a concept but as a "symbol" designed to evoke a "myth." Bultmann dispensed with the mythological form of Jesus' proclamation (through demythologizing) but sought to retain the inner meaning of that proclamation. This meaning he took to be the understanding of human existence present in the proclamation. Since for Perrin the kingdom of God was a symbol meant to evoke the myth of "the activity of God," time was not a factor in the coming-to-be of the kingdom. He therefore proposed that the mythology of Jesus' kingdom-of-God proclamation "has not been discredited by the subsequent course of history."¹⁵¹ The activity of God was the event which every person "experiences in his own time."¹⁵² The keynote of Jesus' ethical teaching was the response to this experience of God (i.e. in the case of forgiveness to forgive; in the case of love to love).¹⁵³

We will deal with this understanding of the kingdom more fully at another point. Suffice it to say now that this understanding of the kingdom hardly corresponds to the meaning it has in Jesus' proclamation. Perrin has not resolved the issues posed by the interpretation of Bultmann; he has raised more sharply the issue of what meaning the kingdom had for Jesus himself. He recognized a definite correlation between the experience of the kingdom and the proper response.¹⁵⁴ It follows that if the kingdom is circumscribed as every person's inner experience the understanding of the ethics must be limited accordingly.

Finally, there was an effort to recover the social or ecclesial correlative to "Kingdom of God" in Jesus' proclamation and teaching, a theme potentially significant for ethics as early as 1925. In 1925 Ernst Ludwig Dietrich published a technical philological study (how to derive,

analyze, and accurately construe the Hebrew expression *sûb sebût*) which drew attention to a major prophetic theme expressing the hope of Israel.¹⁵⁵ This theme was the promise (and the corresponding hope) of Israel's "eschatological restoration" (*die endzeitliche Wiederherstellung*). New Testament scholarship, however, long failed to make the connection between the primitive Christian affirmation of fulfillment and this complex of biblical motifs.

Gradually, however, there appeared sporadic signs of recognition (e.g., among British and Scandinavian scholars¹⁵⁶) that the content of the Old Testament themes (e.g., Isa 52:7-10; 61:1-3.) to which New Testament celebrations of fulfillment were explicitly related (e.g., Acts 10:36-38; Luke 2:30; 4:18-21.) was precisely the restoration of Israel. This raised the issue of whether the early Christians conceived the fulfillment in question as the claim that, in them, Israel had found eschatological restoration.

In 1953, Joseph Schmitt of Strasbourg interpreted the first five chapters of the Acts of the Apostles as providing evidence in exactly this sense.¹⁵⁷ Schmitt thus recovered a basic form, perhaps the basic form, of the earliest Christian ecclesial self-understanding.

In 1965 G.B. Caird made the restoration of Israel fundamental to his effort to conceive the contours of Jesus' mission historically.¹⁵⁸ In 1979 B.F. Meyer, exploiting the correlation between biblical themes of hope and synoptic themes of fulfillment, defined the goal of Jesus' career as precisely the eschatological restoration of Israel.¹⁵⁹ In 1985 E.P. Sanders added a full-dress treatment of the theme of "temple and restoration" and "other indications of restoration eschatology."¹⁶⁰ Also in 1985, Gerhard Lohfink specifically proposed "the correlation between the kingdom of God

and the people of God" in his effort to understand in coherence the proclamation and activity of Jesus.¹⁶¹ He considered the converging lines of evidence in Jesus' proclamation and activity pointing to this correlation between "kingdom" and "people." In the context of Jesus' mission to Israel he asked about the universal scope of the kingdom of God (does the correlation between the saving sovereignty of God and a concrete people prevent or hinder the universal goal of the kingdom? Or is the contrary argument to be made: only as the kingdom of God becomes effective and visible in at least one place in the world does its universal claim come into the light of day?).

This entire line of research has re-introduced the equivalent of "the church" into the gospel history. But the church in question is simply the sum of those who responded positively to Jesus' appeal to Israel. The gain for "ethics" represented by this act of historical retrieval is that *the subject* supposed by Jesus' ethical teaching now comes into view. This subject--contrary to Weiss, Harnack, Schweitzer, Bultmann, Perrin and countless others--is not the isolated individual person. It is restored Israel, a community of disciples.

Our purpose is to lay the foundation for recovery both of Jesus' proclamation and teaching in relation to proper response. This calls for an examination of the resources for Jesus' proclamation and teaching in the next chapter. The proclamation and teaching of Jesus will then be considered in chapters 3 and 4. The attempt will be in this context to define and characterize appropriate response to Jesus. The main clues to this task will be sought in the teaching by which Jesus followed up, elucidated, and commended anew his proclamation.

RESOURCES FOR JESUS' PROCLAMATION AND TEACHING

The kingdom-of-God theme is central to the whole gospel story. It connects Jesus' public proclamation and mission to Israel (Mark 1:14-15) with his last evening with his disciples in the narrative of his suffering (Mark 14:61, 62; 15:26,32). What is the key to the meaning of this central theme?

One key, no doubt, is the context common to the speaker of the proclamation and its hearers. This context was largely inherited from biblical tradition. Eventually, the words and acts of Jesus would give decisive definition to "the kingdom of God"; but Jesus began by assuming a basic understanding of the phrase on the part of his hearers. It seems clear that a major source of disagreements in the study of the historicity and meaning of gospel data has been founded on prior disagreements over pre-gospel data on "the Kingdom of God" and messianism, and on the connection of these themes with the restoration of Israel and the destiny of the nations. It would be beyond our present possibilities to resolve all these prior disagreements. It nevertheless lies within those possibilities to survey the relevant biblical and post-biblical data on these topics in the hope that this survey will make clear what in the present dissertation is taken to be the probable common ground for Jesus and his Jewish contemporaries. We shall accordingly survey the meaning of the *malik*-theme (king, kingship, reign, kingdom) and related themes in biblical tradition and its use in non-canonical literature and synagogue practice. It is not my purpose to trace in detail the full history and development of these great themes, but simply

to survey the data constituting an inheritance available to the proclaimer and to his hearers. This will allow us to discern the thematic legacy that Jesus seized upon and reshaped. Two questions give focus to the inquiry. First, what were the biblical resources for Jesus' proclamation of the kingdom of God? Second, how were eschatology and ethics related in Jewish tradition?

It may be well to emphasize once again that neither question calls for detailed historical investigation in the manner of contemporary critical scholarship on the Hebrew Bible. We wish merely to recover the character of the theme as providing resources for Jesus' proclamation. Since modern scholarship on the Hebrew Bible was unknown to the Jews of antiquity, its relevance to the following survey is secondary, at best. Thus, modern critical questions about the origin and dating of particular biblical texts have virtually no importance in the present context. Our main interest is in how Palestinian Jews of the age of Tiberius heard the scriptural theme of God's kingship. What texts nourished the synagogue and shaped its hopes? Our treatment of pre-Jesus data on the Kingdom of God, the Messiah, the restoration of Israel, the destiny of the nations, and on the nexus between eschatology and ethics will mainly follow a thematic rather than a chronological order, for we are attempting to reconstruct the common convictions of a people who lived long prior to the rise of modern historical consciousness, and did not take the trouble to date the origins of their views. First, we shall deal with the Kingdom of God, the Messiah, Israel and the nations. Second, we shall take up the ways in which the Jews of antiquity correlated eschatology and ethics.

I The Kingdom of God and the Messiah, Israel, and the Nations

Biblical texts frequently depict Yahweh as King of Israel and of all the earth. Whereas biblical scholarship has found here a whole tangle of historical issues on which consensus has proved to be elusive, it is sufficient to our purposes to review the biblical data. Contemporary debates on these issues will for the most part be relegated to the notes.

1. God's Kingship and Israel According to the Scriptures

Our first text is the Song of the Sea, describing God's victory and deliverance of Israel from the power of Egypt at the *Yam Sup* (= Red Sea) Exod 15:1-21).¹ The theme of the Song was the exercise of God's "military" power for the salvation of Israel (cf. 15:3). The victory was complete and completely the work of God. His action brought Israel's redemption. He continued to lead and guide them by his faithful love (15:13). Therefore, the Song of the Sea culminated in the acclamation of God's kingship ("The Lord will reign for ever and ever" v. 18). His action was creative of Israel as a people and the ground for his reign over them. Therefore Israel acknowledged him as king (v. 18 forms an *inclusio* with v. 3).²

In accord with the theme of this song, God was involved in Israel's history as the one who *alone* gained the victory. This experience consequently issued in the recognition of God *alone* as king.³

The active rule of God therefore appears from the earliest moment in the story of Israel. God's kingship was the exercise of power.⁴ In his action for Israel, Israel recognized the claim of God and acknowledged it in song. Was the Sinai covenant itself conceived within this framework? Did Israel recognize God as king in the act of making the covenant?⁵

The covenant established both a new relationship with God and new community of people. It united diverse ethnic groups under the leadership of Yahweh. This relationship bound them in certain specific ways both to God and to one another. The allegiance of Israel, in contrast to dominant patterns of ancient near-eastern kingship, was a new loyalty to Yahweh. The covenant thus signified Israel's acceptance of the lordship of Yahweh. Here, if anywhere, was the rule of God over his people.⁶ God was more than a protector of Israel; he accompanied and led his people as a king (e.g. Exod 7:4; 13:17-22; 19:6; Num 23:21; Deut 1:30-33; 33:5).⁷ If politics had to do with the formation and the direction of the community, God's saving action and his making of the covenant were in the fullest sense "theopolitical."

It is significant that Exod 19:3-8 and 20:1-17 both begin with an acknowledgement of Yahweh's deliverance of Israel from Egypt (the historical prologue). In the covenant relationship God alone was recognized as sovereign Lord and the people of Israel were his "kingdom of priests" among all the nations (Exod 19:6).⁸

In exodus and covenant alike, then, God was acclaimed as *the* king of Israel. All human alliances were therefore regarded as a form of apostasy from him (cf. Hos 7:10-13). Israel could not make overtures to Egypt and Assyria and maintain fidelity to God. The covenant carried with it an alternative to conventional politics. Israel's special identity demanded a radical separation from the ways of the nations.⁹ This also had definite implications for Israel's internal governance. If all Israelites were vassals and fellow members in the "kingdom of priests," then, strictly understood, one Israelite could not be set over another as king. That place

was reserved for God alone.¹⁰ The emphasis in the Exodus narratives is the concern of God not for the king but for his people.¹¹

At a later period, when Gideon was invited to become king, he replied in terms of the covenant tradition, "I will not rule over you, and my son will not rule over you; the LORD will rule over you" (Judg 8:23). Samuel expressed the same opposition to human kingship; the people, however, cried, "No! We will have a king over us, that we also may be like the nations, and that our king may govern us and go out before us and fight our battles" (1 Sam 8:19b-20). What was this but rejection of the kingship of Yahweh?¹²

In accord with the covenant Israel had affirmed God as king (cf. Num 23:21; Deut 33:5). The Song of the Sea celebrated Yahweh's reign over Israel. The material in the book of Exodus became the primary means of celebrating Yahweh's victory for Israel and his rule over the whole of Israel's life (e.g. present in this work are the narratives that described the passover feast in Exod 12-15 and God's making of covenant with Israel in Exod 19-24). In the face of Israel's rejection of Yahweh in favor of the human institution of kingship, three distinct references are made to Yahweh's deliverance of Israel from Egypt (1 Sam 8:8; 10:18-19; 12:8-12). Through the experience of Yahweh's victory at the sea Israel recognized his kingship and in the covenant made at Sinai acknowledged it long before she adopted human kingship.¹³

In the midst of other peoples the people of Israel had become painfully conscious of the differences that affected the character of their national life and political organization and defined what was at stake in danger from enemy peoples (cf. Judg 4:14; 1 Sam 8:10-20; 10:17-19; 1 Kings 11:26 - 12:16).¹⁴

The meaning of God's kingship was clearly defined in the effort to resolve the question of national leadership (cf. 1 Sam 8-12). The structure of the narrative dealing with leadership as a whole alternates between narratives of meeting and narratives of action (1 Sam 8:4-22; 9:1-10:16; 10:17-27; 11:1-13; 11:14-12:25).¹⁵ They describe the stages in the transition to human kingship. The absolute nature of the opposition to human kingship, on the basis of Israel's covenant traditions, is not left in doubt (1 Sam 12:16-19). The result of the intercession of Samuel is an accommodation. Even the pro-kingship texts give evidence of this; kingship is defined within the framework of theocracy: Israel is God's people and has no other LORD but him.¹⁶ In the accommodation the king is to be designated by God through the prophet as "prince" and not as "king" (1 Sam 9:16), and he is to function in holy war by instruction from the prophet (cf. 1 Sam 13:8-14; Exod 17).¹⁷

The Lordship of Yahweh and the limits of human kingship are indicated in the classic statement contained in Nathan's oracle (2 Sam 7:4-7). It guards against the king's taking the dominant role according to the pattern of the Canaanites (cf. Amos 7:12-13). The covenant with David, like that with Abraham, was an eternal covenant, but instituted within the framework of the Mosaic covenant (Deut 17:18-20; 1 Kings 9:4,5; 2 Sam 7:14). The primacy of the Sinaitic covenant over the Davidic is indicated in that concern about a shrine for the ark of the Sinaitic covenant was the occasion for the promise of the Davidic dynasty.¹⁸ If the king functions within the framework of the Torah, the challenge and judgment of David following his sin (taking Bathsheba, the wife of Uriah) indicates that the primacy of the law was more than a formality.¹⁹ In Israel the king also was to be subject

to judgment under the covenant made between God and his people. This is to affirm God's Lordship for the whole of Israel's existence.

2. God's Kingship and the World According to the Scriptures

The kingship of God was both acknowledged and celebrated in the worship of Israel. In recognizing God, Israel came to see that his kingship properly included the world. God's sovereign power, victorious over chaos at creation and demonstrated decisively in the victory at the sea, was celebrated in the feast of Passover. But the festival most closely associated with the celebration and proclamation of Yahweh's kingship was the "feast of Ingathering", or Tabernacles, in the autumn of the year (cf. Exod 23:16; 3:22; Deut 16:13-15).²⁰

Certain of the psalms, perhaps belonging to the liturgy of the feast, expressly celebrate the kingship of Yahweh.²¹ Psalm 29 dramatizes the kingship of God by reference to his activity in thunder and his mastery over the waters of the flood (v. 3-4, 10). If the psalm reflects more general views of the divine, it also reflects Israel's own traditions.²² This is suggested in the effect of the voice of God in the wilderness of Kadesh as related to God's gift of covenant and God's gift of peace to "his people" (v. 8,11). Another psalm that may reflect the autumn festival is Psalm 65. Though the kingship of God is not expressly stated, there is the anticipation of the early rains and the consequent fruitfulness of the earth (v. 9-13). The psalm opens with the appeal for restoration and forgiveness in the affirmation of God as the one who has saved and will save Israel (v. 5).²³ The appeal for renewal of God's favor and the affirmation of his salvation, followed by the enumeration of his mighty works, is fitting as part of the renewal of the covenant in the autumn festival.²⁴ The psalm

then proclaims directly God's powerful deeds, effective through the whole cosmos, in which he upholds the order of creation against the threat of chaos.²⁵ The tradition of the covenant (with its historical prelude, v. 5) is associated with God's kingship expressed in his sovereign power over creation (6-8). And he is therefore the hope of all the inhabitants of the earth (v. 5).²⁶ It is also evident in these psalms that "kingdom of God" (*malkut*) refers first to the reign or rule of God, "and only secondarily to the realm over which the reign is exercised."²⁷ This point is underscored in Psalm 145.

They shall speak of the glory of thy kingdom,
and tell of thy power,
to make known to the sons of men thy mighty deeds,
and the glorious splendor of thy kingdom
Thy kingdom is an everlasting kingdom,
and thy dominion endures throughout all generations
(Ps 145:11-13).

This dynamic understanding of the kingdom of God is closely related to God as the one who *comes* to his people to accomplish his purpose in the world.

Say among the nations, "The Lord reigns."
The world is firmly established, it cannot be moved;
he will judge the peoples with equity.
Let the heavens rejoice, let the earth be glad,
let the sea resound, and all that is in it.
let the fields be jubilant, and everything in them.

Then all the trees of the forest will sing for joy;
 they will sing before the Lord, for he comes,
 he comes to judge the earth.

He will judge the world in righteousness
 and the peoples in his truth (Ps 96:10-13).

The occasion for rejoicing is not that God sits enthroned as king in the heavens and is exalted above the earth, but that he will come to judge the peoples and so establish his reign effectively among the people "who do not now acknowledge it."²⁸ This note of creation anticipating the reign of God is sounded again in Ps 98:8-9:

Let the floods clap their hands;
 let the hills sing for joy together
 before the Lord, for he comes to judge the earth.
 He will judge the world with righteousness
 and the peoples with equity.

To anticipate salvation is to anticipate the coming of God.²⁹ God comes to act for the salvation of his people; the history of Israel, from its beginning in the exodus to the anticipation of final redemption in the kingdom of God, is set within God's coming.³⁰ In this action toward his people in the wilderness and in covenant love calling them into being as his people he showed himself to be their king (Deut 33:2, 5; Hab 3:3, 10-13).³¹ This coming is often associated with cosmic reverberations, whether God comes in response to the need of one person or the future of humanity (cf. Ps 18:3-19). If the creator steps forth the whole creation resonates to his coming. However it was understood in earlier times, for the psalmist this

imagery portrayed the mighty power of God who came to his aid.³² To anticipate the kingdom was thus to anticipate God coming and acting to effect his kingship.

Ps 67 relates the kingship of God and the harvest feast and shows its world-wide scope.

The earth has yielded its increase;

God, our God, has blessed us

God has blessed us;

let all the ends of the earth fear him! (67:6,7).

The God of Israel is the creator of heaven and earth and bestows his blessings on all the nations. Therefore the psalm has the refrain: "Let the peoples praise thee, O God; let the peoples praise thee" (67:3,5). For the peoples thus to acknowledge God would mean the universal recognition of his sovereignty: "Let the nations be glad and sing for joy, for thou dost judge the peoples with equity and guide the nations upon the earth" (67:4). At the feast of Tabernacles, therefore, Israel celebrated God's kingship not only on the basis of the revelation of this kingship in the past and experienced in the present, but also as this was destined to be revealed to and for the world on a day to come.³³

This coming day appears to be the subject of the preaching of the prophet Amos at Bethel, perhaps during the period of the autumn celebration. As in the psalms, this day will mean God coming for judgment. Amos assured them that the day they eagerly anticipated would be a day of darkness and not of light, a day in which God would judge unrighteousness wherever it is to be found, and this included first and foremost his people Israel (Amos 3:2; 5:18-20).³⁴ Once more the coming of God in judgment on those who were complacent in their violation of the covenant was associated with his sovereign power over all creation (Amos 5:6-9). At the same time the

prophet broke through the false reliance of Israel on God's election of Israel (3:1-5). Furthermore, the fact that God judged the other peoples showed that he included them in his concern (1:2-2:3). God's activity in the history of other peoples was expressly affirmed (9:7). God who called Israel is the creator of the world; his righteous purpose is as wide as the world.

3. The Messiah and the Restoration of Israel According to the Scriptures

What was the connection between "kingdom" and "Messiah" in Jewish expectation? It is clear that in seeking the connections that bind together the whole gospel history, the question of the meaning of the kingdom of God entails the question about the identity of Jesus. It is evident that Jesus' mission was neither irrelevant nor incidental to his proclamation. What role was the Messiah to have in the coming kingdom of God?

So far as pre-Jesus tradition is concerned, the fact is that in certain texts the Messiah figures prominently in the hope of the kingdom of God, whereas in other texts he finds no mention at all. If the messianic prophecies were only one line of thought among others on the future expectation of Israel we might conclude that the Messiah was of secondary importance; and it is true that the royal psalms celebrate the reign of God alone: "The Lord reigns, let the earth rejoice" (Ps 97:1; cf. 99:1). The most basic conviction was simply that salvation would come from God.

For the Lord is our judge;

the Lord is our lawgiver;

the Lord is our king,

it is he who will save us (Isa 33:22).

But one must not overlook the inner connection between the various lines of thought in the scriptures. This connection should become evident in the strands of tradition now to be considered.

(a) The messiah. We shall begin by offering a précis of the main passages, beginning with the oracle of Nathan to David. The designation "Messiah" is most commonly applied to the king of Israel. The "messianic hope" is most closely related to kingship in Israel, especially the royal line of David. The source of the messianic tradition is the oracle of Nathan to David.

II Sam 7:4-17: God has not dwelt in a house and has not commanded the building of a house. But he did take David as a shepherd and make him prince over "my people Israel." It is God who has made David victorious in war and will make his name great. It is the Lord who will build for David a house, that is, give him a future and descendants. One of these descendants will build a house "for my name." The house and kingdom of David "shall be made sure forever before me; your throne shall be established forever."

Ps 89:20-37: God anointed David as his servant and God's "steadfast love" will be with him. He will cry to God, "Thou art my Father", and God will make him the "first-born, the highest of the kings of the earth." God's covenant with David and his descendants is reiterated.

Ps 132:11-18: In making the covenant with David and his descendants God has also chosen Zion for blessing and as a place to dwell.

Amos 9:11-12: The day will come when God will "raise up the booth of David" that has fallen. It will again be as in days of old. Edom and "the nations called by my name" will again look to Israel. The Lord will bring it about.

Hos 3:4-5: Israel shall be without king or temple for a long period. But they will again return and seek the Lord and David their king and experience God's goodness in the "latter days."

Isa 9:6-7: A child is to be born who will reign and who will be called "Wonderful counselor, mighty God, everlasting Father, prince of peace." Of his reign and of his peace there will be no end; he will reign from the "throne of David" and will establish justice and righteousness forevermore. The Lord will bring it about.

Isa 11:1-10: A "shoot" and a "branch" shall grow from the stump of Jesse. He will be anointed with the Spirit (this will be evidenced in wisdom,

understanding, power and knowledge). In righteousness he will judge the poor and bring equity to the meek. He will act with decisive authority against the wicked. His faithful work will mean the triumph of righteousness and the end of hostility, and the establishment of peace in the earth. All shall know the Lord. In that day the one from Jesse will stand as an ensign to the peoples.

Mic 5:2-4: From Bethlehem, representing one of the smaller clans of Judah, will come one who is "to be ruler in Israel." His origin is from the days of old. This one will be born and then shall "the rest of his brethren" return to the people of Israel. He will lead and care for "his flock" in the strength of God. "They shall dwell secure" because "he shall be great to the ends of the earth."

Jer 23:5-6: The days are coming when the Lord will raise up "for David a righteous branch" who will reign as king. He will execute righteousness and justice. Then "Judah will be saved" and Israel "will dwell securely." He will be called "The Lord is our righteousness."

Jer 33:14-18: God will keep his promise and cause a "righteous Branch" to come from David. He will execute righteousness and justice. The Lord says there will never be lacking one to sit on David's throne, nor will the Levitical priests lack one to carry out the offerings and sacrifices.

Ezek 21:27: The king (in David's line) now occupying the throne will fall but there will come one who is worthy to fill this role again (cf. Gen. 49:10).

Ezek 34:23-24: The worthy one is the "servant David" whom God will set over the people as shepherd. Then God will be their God.

Ezek 37:24ff.: God will make David king, one shepherd over all the people. Then the people will heed the instruction of the Lord. The people will dwell in their land with David over them as king forever.

Zech 9:9-10: The people of Israel ("daughter of Zion") may rejoice, for "your king comes to you; triumphant and victorious is he, humble and riding on an ass." He will bring peace and his "reign" shall be from sea to sea, and from the River to the ends of the earth."

It is apparent, first from the witness of many of the psalms and then from the echo of the promise through the prophets, though the term "Messiah" may not be used, that the Davidic dynasty and the covenant-promises associated therewith were decisive in the faith and in the eschatological expectation of Israel. The anointed one for whom Israel looked was to be one from the line of David (another David). How was this concretely understood? Whatever the opinions and ascertainments of modern biblical

scholarship,³⁵ the promise to David was associated in the Bible itself with eschatological hope.³⁶

There is no question that the promise to David was the promise of a dynasty ("Your house and your kingdom shall be made sure forever," II Sam 7:16). If the Nathan oracle envisioned a "Davidic dynasty," it also paved the way for a new and more exalted understanding of God's "anointed." His unique relation to God is indicated in the special promises made (e.g. he will be to God a son and God will be his father).³⁷ It is to be expected that this hope would be refined in the crucible of events in which the nation was destroyed and the monarchy came to an end. The kingship ideologies disappeared among the peoples around Israel under the onslaught of Assyria. But in Israel "the ideal of kingship deepened and developed into that of the Messiah."³⁸

Under the preaching of the prophets the collapse of the nation was understood as God's judgment on it. In the prophets, as they anticipated the action of God in terms of new promises and against the background of a break with the past, the messianic promise also was understood anew. There was an important step of transition from king to Messiah in a passage like Mic 5:2-4, as Hartmut Gese has observed. No specific family could claim the promise given to the Davidic dynasty; God himself would choose this bearer of eternal lordship from within the Davidic clan.³⁹ The distinctive emphasis on the coming royal figure, if anything, is even more clearly evident in the promise in Isaiah 9:6-7. The fourfold designation ("wonderful counselor, mighty God, everlasting Father, prince of peace") describing him clearly surpasses even the figure of David. This was at the same time a statement about God; inasmuch as these designations are a description of the function of the one to come "they also are an expression of *God's activity*

through him."⁴⁰ This transcends "the course of natural world events" to proclaim an order made possible through the initiative of God.⁴¹

The judgment of God meant the destruction of the people and the end of the relationship of God to this people as constituted hitherto. But this did not mean the destruction of God's faithfulness to himself. This "judgment therefore paves the way for something finally new."⁴² Moreover, in Yahweh's judgment upon Israel there was a decisive universalizing of God's action; and this was true also for the new order of peace and righteousness anticipated from the Messiah. As early as Amos the threat of judgment was universal: God judges all evil wherever it is to be found. And if God made use of the nations in judging Israel then he is clearly their Lord also. The nations were bound up with the destiny of Israel and come within the range of God's action in judgment and in blessing (cf. Isa 9:6-7; 11:1-10).⁴³ The one in whom God acts to bring both judgment and blessing is the Messiah (cf. Isa 11:3-5, 10).

In the figure of the servant, in the servant songs of Isaiah, the eschatological purpose of God is defined anew. What is the relation between these songs and messianic expectation?⁴⁴ In Isa 11:1 the coming one is described as a "shoot" growing from the stump of Jesse. It is clear that Isaiah has one royal person in mind (11:1-5,10). The authority by which he acts, judging the earth by the "breath of his lips" (v. 4), indicates his close relation to God. In the servant song the servant is introduced as a "young plant" growing up before the Lord (both texts also have the key term "root"). The work of the servant is to restore Israel and bring salvation to the nations (cf. Isa 49:5-6) and this action to restore Israel is identified as God fulfilling his promise of "steadfast love for David" (Isa 55:3). This is fully in accord with the character of God's revelation to

Israel. David, like Moses, represented the people; through him the promise of the "steadfast love" of God is anticipated. Therefore the coming of God is not to be divorced from the coming of the one who is to represent God.⁴⁵ Already it was said of the historical successor to David that he sits "upon the throne of the kingdom of the Lord over Israel" (I Chron 28:5). That must mean the king served to represent the reign of God over Israel. It is God who acts to subjugate the evil powers of the world, to bring the nations into submission to himself, to establish his saving sovereignty; and in effecting deliverance and salvation, the Messiah is to reign in order to establish the new order.⁴⁶ Nevertheless, if the Messiah is not simply identified with the servant, this is the role of the servant in the servant songs of Isaiah (42, 49, 50, and 52-53).

The servant is clearly dependent on the Lord, but his role is to be the instrument in the establishment of God's reign in the world. This is the theme of the first of the songs.

He will faithfully bring forth justice.

He will not fail, or be discouraged

till he has established justice in the earth;

and the coastlands wait for his law.

The second song identifies the task of the servant as that of bringing Israel back to God, but not only Israel:

I will make you a light to the nations,

That my salvation may reach to the farthest bounds of the earth.

The fourth servant song is difficult to interpret as a whole. But the basic significance is clear: he suffers and dies on behalf of the many

(kings and their peoples) to purge them from sin so that they may find a place in the coming salvation of God (Isa 53:4-8, 11-12).⁴⁷

In the post-exilic period the themes of Zion and the Messiah are once again affirmed together. This was expressed in the well-known messianic promise of Zech 9:9-10. Earlier the coming of the Lord God to Zion to judge and to save had been proclaimed (Isa 40:9-10). But now in Zechariah the one who comes in triumph to Mount Zion is the anointed of God. His rule of peace is for the world; the peoples of the world are joined with the people of Israel in acknowledging this king who comes to Zion. The manner of his coming, as the peaceful and at the same time victorious king, as well as the scope of his kingdom, point most clearly to the eschatological establishment of God's kingdom. This "Messiah" is one who is poor and humble, and comes to represent the kingdom of God.⁴⁸

(b) The restoration of Israel. We may begin with a simple observation: Jesus made his proclamation to Israel. How is the meaning of the proclamation to be perceived apart from its own context? With what purpose did Jesus make his proclamation to Israel? In the effort to communicate we might anticipate that Jesus would move beyond set expectations but that he would, in any case, relate to them in making his proclamation. If we begin with the fact that Jesus made his proclamation in a setting of eschatological expectation then it is important to consider what those expectations were. It is therefore appropriate to survey and set out in abbreviated form some of the key biblical passages that expressly pertain to Israel and Jewish eschatological expectation.⁴⁹

Amos 9:11-15: In that day to come God will raise up the fallen "booth of David" and rebuild it as it was. Then Israel will again have influence over the nations. God will restore Israel, cities will be rebuilt and the land will yield abundantly. God will plant the people in their land and it will be theirs forever.

Jer 30:18-22: The Lord will "restore Jacob." The city (Jerusalem) with its palace shall be rebuilt. Joy will be in their midst and they shall be great. They will have one of their own to rule over them. This is restoration of a broken people; "You shall be my people and I will be your God."

Jer 33:6-11: Now there is destruction but God gives Jerusalem wholeness and security. The Lord says, "I will restore Judah and Israel," and rebuild them. He will cleanse them from all the guilt of "their sin against me" and "forgive all the guilt of their sin and rebellion." And Jerusalem will be a cause of joy and praise among the nations. Occasions of joy and celebration will be a part of the pattern of life as in former times. Thank offerings will be brought to the "House of the Lord."

Zeph 3:16-20: God will bring victory to Israel. He will renew the people in love. He will judge oppressors and restore the lame and the outcast. Israel will be exalted among the peoples of the earth. God will gather them together and bring them home.

Isa 49:5ff: The Lord by his servant will restore Jacob and "gather" Israel to himself. He will raise the tribes of Jacob; but more, he will be a "light to the nations." His salvation will reach to the end of the earth.

Isa 56:1-8: "Keep justice, and do righteousness," for salvation will soon be revealed. Therefore keep sabbath and hold fast "my covenant." The foreigner who does so will also be accepted (the house of God is a house of prayer for all people). God gathers the outcasts of Israel and will gather the others.

Isa 60:3-10: The nations will come to the light of Israel. The sons and daughters of Israel will be gathered from afar. "The wealth of the nations" will be brought to Israel. They will come with praise and sacrifice and God will glorify his "house." Foreigners will build Jerusalem and kings will serve her. The resources of the nations will beautify "my sanctuary."

Isa 66:18-24: God will gather "all nations and tongues." Of those surviving his judgment he will send some among the nations to declare his glory. From these nations the dispersed Jews shall be brought to Jerusalem, where some will serve as priests and Levites. God will create a new heaven and a new earth. And all will worship the Lord.

Mic 4:1-7: In coming days "the mountain of the house of the Lord shall be established as the highest of the mountains." From it will go forth the teaching of the Lord. The Lord shall bring peace among the peoples of earth. He will make of the afflicted and the lame a remnant and the outcast a strong people. The Lord will reign over them from Mount Zion.

The words of the prophets have a particular context. They presuppose God's deliverance of Israel from Egypt, as well as the covenant and God's actions creative of Israel as a people. If Israel turned away from this God

it would lose the very basis for its existence.⁵⁰ The prophets' characteristic response is indicative of the distinctive relation between God and Israel. The role of the prophet reflected the fact of Yahweh's Lordship over his people; the prophet, in his social criticism, appealed to standards based on the understanding of that Lordship. The prophets appeared because Israel threatened this relationship by turning away from God. Therefore God who saved Israel now becomes the God who judges Israel; the judgment announced by the prophets, Westermann has observed, was the necessary *continuation* of the saving working of God. "In the face of his people's apostasy, the savior must become the judge. In a hidden sense, this judgment is aimed at the saving of Israel--through and after the judgment."⁵¹ Out of this failure in Israel's relationship to God, and so out of judgment, emerged the hope for a new age in which God would act to restore his people. The prophecy of Israel's restoration is therefore inherent in the character of God and his relationship with the people of Israel.⁵²

The question is, how is the the character of God's intervention related to the question of eschatology? The answer calls first for a definite hold on the meaning of "restoration." It was Ernst Ludwig Dietrich who, in his study of *sûb sebût*, drew attention to this theme expressing the hope of Israel,⁵³ namely, the promise (and corresponding hope) of Israel's "eschatological restoration" (*die eschatologische Wiederherstellung*). He determined that the basic meaning of the Hebrew expression (*sûb sebût*) was restoration (on the basis of references in Job 42:10; Ezek 16:53; Jer 29:14; 30:18; 33:7, 11, 26; 31:23; 48:47; 49:6, 39; Ps 14:7; 126:1,4 etc.).⁵⁴ Restoration means "return" but it has a more inclusive scope than that.

The meaning of restoration is fully defined only as we consider the various aspects of "restoration." It will mean that Israel will be in its

own land and there "rebuild the ruined cities" (e.g. Amos 9:14); in particular Jerusalem shall be rebuilt (e.g. Jer 30:2-3;33:10-18; cf. Mic 4:1-2); and the temple as well shall be rebuilt (e.g., Jer 33:11; cf. Ezek 40-43). The dispersed of Israel shall be restored (e.g., Isa 49:9-13; Ezek 34:11-16; 37:21-23); "David" shall be raised to rule (e.g. Jer 23:5-6; Ezek 34:23-24; 37:24-28); the Gentiles shall come to serve and to participate in the blessing of Israel (e.g. Isa 56:6,7; Mic 4:1-4). The order in which items appear in a list does not necessarily indicate the order of importance; at times that order in these passages presents the concrete or directly tangible blessings, at other times the intangible blessings are emphasized. So then restoration can mean "abundance" and "security" and it can also mean the removal of "guilt" and the "forgiveness" of sin against God (e.g. Isa 40:2; 44:23, 33:8); restoration is the antecedent of the nations coming to know the ways of God (e.g. Jer 33:9; Mic 4:2,3).

It is apparent that hope in the king from David's line and hope of restoration have a prominent place. Indeed, there exists a strong correlation between them. In the book of Amos the hope for fulfillment of the promise to David and hope for restoration are joined (Amos 9:11,14). All the major prophets include expressions of hope for both the messianic king and for the eschatological restoration of Israel (Isaiah, Micah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel). The correlation is clearly exemplified in Jer 23:5-6. In the days to come the Lord will raise up "for David a righteous branch" who will reign as king. He will execute justice and righteousness; then "Judah will be saved" and "Israel dwell securely" (cf. Mic 5:2-4). It must also be recognized, as Mowinckel acknowledged with respect to the Messiah, that even when one or the other was not mentioned it was often tacitly assumed.⁵⁵

How then were "restoration of Israel" and eschatology related? In some passages the hope is that Israel will be restored to her former place and position; in some the hope is explicitly eschatological. But we would, in any case, expect that Israel would understand her future from her past experiences of God's saving actions (another David, another Zion). Expectation was interpreted by analogy to the past in seeking to understand that which was far to exceed the past. Because people tended to conceive of coming events simply within the frame of the past, Israel was called to new understanding: that "the former things have come to pass" and "new things" are to be anticipated; even Israel herself was promised a new identity (a "new name" from "the mouth of the Lord," Isa 42:9-10; 43:18-19; 62:2). In the prophets the nations are included, first in judgment, and then "all peoples" are to be taken up into "the new coming acts of God."⁵⁶ Inasmuch as salvation has become universal, even if it is salvation *via* Israel, it has become eschatological. Along with the universal range of salvation, it was also intensified to the very limits of existence. The coming action of God overcomes the experience of judgment, of humiliation and offence, of war and idolatry, and finally death (e.g. Isa 25:1-9; cf. Ezek 37:1-14). Thus, the prophetic message, in its breadth and depth, reaches the ultimate bounds of reality and thereby becomes eschatological.⁵⁷ The restoration of Israel was accordingly contained within the scope of God's eschatological salvation.

4. The Kingdom of God in Daniel and Postbiblical Judaism

In this section we are not so much considering the resources for Jesus' eschatological proclamation as how different groups interpreted what they had received and appropriated their inheritance. But we must examine this

material in order to understand how the contemporaries of Jesus heard the scriptural theme of the kingdom of God. This is part of the context for Jesus' proclamation and mission. The pertinent question now is: are the biblical representations of God's saving action reflected in a coherent way in Jewish expectation in the period leading up to the time of Jesus? The return of the Jews from Babylonian exile encouraged great hopes. But Israel with its earlier institutions was never fully restored. Certainly the expansive visions of Isaiah, Jeremiah or Ezekiel were not realized. Israel as a whole (the twelve tribes) was not brought together again. If Jerusalem was restored, the nations did not bring their wealth to adorn it or the temple. And the expectation of a "new heavens and a new earth" (Isa 66:2) most clearly transcended actual historical experience. Consequently these prophecies remained comprehensible only with reference to a time yet to come.

(a) The kingdom of God. How did the kingdom of God figure in the Jewish hope during the second temple period? The apocalyptic writings have a place of prominence in answer to this question. Even though specific reference to the kingdom of God is sparse, a direct reference to God setting up his kingdom occurs in the book of Daniel, the literary model for the later apocalyptic writings (2:44-45). The setting up of this kingdom will mean the overthrow of evil powers (it "breaks in pieces" the existing kingdoms and "brings them to an end"). Other aspects of this event are described later in the book. The coming of the kingdom is set within the framework of God acting in judgment, and the central figure is "one like a son of man" to whom is "given dominion and glory and kingdom" (Dan 7:9-14). This is a kingdom set up in the world, the kingdom of Israel over all the peoples of this world. The concise reference at the end of the book to a resurrection

of "many who sleep in the dust of the earth" (12:2) distinguishes between some who rise to everlasting life and some to everlasting shame (this presupposes a judgment). In this work there is an emphasis on the fact that the kingdom is one "that shall never be destroyed" (7:14; cf. 7:18, 27).

A similar view of judgment appears in the Psalms of Solomon (not properly described as apocalyptic), God judges the peoples and is "our king forever" (cf. Ps 17). With the precedent already set in the prophets (e.g., Isa 65-66), there was an emphasis "on the transcendent features of the future kingdom" that would lead, at least in the time of 4 Ezra, to an expectation that God would exercise judgment in conjunction with "the Son of man" for all people and of a kingdom of God set within a transformed creation.⁵⁸ By contrast, the author of the book of Jubilees looked for no cataclysmic event, but for a gradual establishment of the kingdom. The human life span would gradually increase until it reached a thousand years (Jub 23:27). There is no reference to resurrection in the book, only that the "spirits" of the righteous will have joy forever (23:30-32). In the work known as the Assumption of Moses the kingdom is expected to appear suddenly throughout creation (10:1). God himself will punish the Gentiles and destroy their idols, and the power of Satan shall be no more (10:7). God will bless Israel and bring her enemies low (10:8-9). There is no reference to a Messiah, to a great conflict as prelude to the end, or to the resurrection, only a description of the happiness of the righteous in heaven and the torment of the Gentiles in hell (10:8-10). In 4 Ezra there is a distinction between the messianic kingdom and the final form of the kingdom. The first remains subject to the conditions of this age in which death prevails; it is only after the time of the messianic kingdom that the resurrection is to take place and God will judge the nations (7:28-34) In the

apocalypse of Baruch the messianic kingdom has a more significant but apparently similar place. It is simply said that the Messiah will reign as long as the world endures (2 Bar 4:3).⁵⁹ The teaching of Daniel 7 is repeated in this book in the vision and interpretation of the four kingdoms that are to arise, the last of which is "harsh and evil far beyond those which were before it" and is replaced by the rule of the Messiah (36-40). The coming of his kingdom is the fulfillment of prophetic "predictions" and marks "the end of corruption" (74:2-3).

At this point Qumran appears to reflect a more general understanding of the connection between future hope and the kingdom. In expectation of the messianic age, the statement to the priests is, "May you attend upon the service in the Temple of the kingdom and decree destiny in company with the Angels of the Presence" (IQ5b 4:25-26; cf. IQM 6:6). On the one hand, the "visitation" of all who walk in the ways of truth will be "healing, great peace in a long life, and fruitfulness, together with every everlasting blessing and eternal joy in life without end" (IQS 4:7-9.) On the other hand, for those walking in darkness and deceit the "visitation" will mean "everlasting damnation" and the "avenging wrath" of God. Though the doctrine of the resurrection is not mentioned, in some form the resurrection is probably presupposed (cf. Dan 12:1-2). The community understood itself to be living in the last critical time before the conflict with the forces of darkness under the direction of Belial (IQM 1:5, 13-15). Evidently the advent of the Messiah(s) of Aaron and Israel was expected before this final decisive conflict (cf. IQS 9:11). In the end the kingdom appears to be set in a renewed world (IQH 3:28-36). But the hymns of the community express thanksgiving for a salvation in which they are already participating; already they belonged to the heavenly Jerusalem and shared in eternal life

(IQH 3:19-23;6:24-27; 8:5-9). This is a distinctive understanding of eschatological salvation as it concerns the relation of present and future.⁶⁰

There appears to be unity in all the strands of tradition on the kingdom with respect to the events of judgment, the establishment of God's righteousness in the world, (and not always included) the "final event" of the kingdom set within a new creation (Dan 12:2-3). Further, a messianic figure is or messianic figures are often associated with the coming into effect of the kingdom of God (cf. Dan 7:13-14).

(b) The Messiah. The understanding of the kingdom of God and of the Messiah in the kingdom are closely related. Geza Vermes notes that if all the references to the Messiah in the Jewish literature of this period are compiled, as if all are of equal importance, the result is a variety of views, but no clear depiction of the "Messiah."⁶¹

What form did messianic expectation take in the inter-testamental period? Vermes points to the converging lines of evidence derived from the Psalms of Solomon, the Jewish prayer of the Eighteen Benedictions, and the Qumran liturgical blessing, as well as rabbinic interpretation of messianic prophecies.⁶² Ps 17 and 18 of Solomon are part of a collection of poems from the first century B.C.E. reflecting "the mainstream of Jewish religious ideology."⁶³ In these psalms several references to the one "anointed" of the Lord appear (e.g. 18:6,8). The prayer of Ps 18 reflects Isa 11; the anointed of the Lord will use his "rod" to instill "the fear of the Lord" in people and direct them to "the works of righteousness."⁶⁴ This prayer is preceded by the supplication in Ps 17 that God raise up for his people "their king, the son of David." He shall gather his people; the gentile nations will serve him and he will effect the righteousness of God; all will "be holy" under the reign of "the anointed of the Lord" (17:23-36).

The outline of this figure is clear enough. It is in accord with the figure already sketched in the prophets. The mission of this king as portrayed in Isa 11 is one of peace. The emphasis is not on a triumph wrought by the usual coercive or militant means. Therefore he judges the poor "with righteousness" and strikes the earth "with the rod of his mouth." Vermes is probably correct in his observation that for the ordinary Jew the portrait of the Messiah in the Psalms of Solomon would not have "excluded the idea of a future triumphant king."⁶⁵

In the blessing concerning David in the Eighteen Benedictions the "righteous Messiah" is clearly a royal figure.⁶⁶ And in the liturgical blessing at Qumran it is the royal, probably Davidic, conception along the lines of Isaiah 11 that predominates. The blessing is for "the prince of the congregation that he may establish the kingdom of his people forever." In the blessing there is a call for the Lord to exalt him to "everlasting heights"; that he may strike the earth with his scepter; that he may bring death to the ungodly.⁶⁷ Rabbinic expectation is concisely reflected in the view of the great rabbi Akiba. He believed that the leader in the second Jewish war against Rome, bar Kochba, was the "king Messiah" in whom the promise of Num 24:17 was fulfilled ("a star shall come forth out of Jacob").⁶⁸ Basic features of the messianic expectation are maintained in all the groups and stand out in clear relief: he is a figure from the line of David endowed by God with power and knowledge to enact his kingdom of righteousness.

But messianic expectation was not confined to this form. There was also a strong emphasis, for instance, on the priestly character of the Messiah; indeed, in the Testament of Levi the full range of messianic expectation is directed to one who shall come from the tribe of Levi. The "Lord

will raise up a new priest" to whom all the words of the Lord will be revealed; he will effect the judgment of truth over the earth for many days; he shall be extolled in the world; sin shall come to an end; he will provide access to the tree of life; and "Belial shall be bound by him" (18:2-5).⁶⁹ This appears to be in accord with the fact that a concept of two Messiahs is present in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs at a number of points. "The salvation of God" shall arise from the tribes of Levi and Judah because God will raise up from the one "as it were a high-priest" and from the other "as it were a king" (Test Sim 7:1-2; cf. Test Reub 6:5-12; Test Jud 17:5-6; 22:2-3; 24:1-6). How are we to understand this development? We know that after the reforms of Nehemiah and Ezra, the life of Israel was centered on the temple and the high priest. Even before that the emphasis in the description of Israel restored in Ezekiel 40-48 lies on the new temple and its worship. Whatever the reasons, the Levitic Messiah came to have the primary place in some circles (cf. Test Jud 21:1).

In a still more comprehensive fashion, a statement from the Qumran community refers to "the coming of a prophet and the Messiahs from Aaron and Israel" (IQS 9:10-11). This probably refers to three eschatological figures: a prophet (cf. Deut 18:18-19), a Messiah from Aaron, and a Messiah of Israel. The two Messiahs apparently have a role in bringing the deliverance that issues in the kingdom; particularly the King-Messiah seems to function as commander of the army in the final conflict (cf. IQM 5:1f.; 13:1f.). Evidently the two Messiahs are again referred to in 4QFlor 1:6-7 (the interpretation of 2 Sam. 7:11-14 includes the statement that "he is the branch of David who shall arise with the Interpreter of the Law [to rule] in Zion [at the end] of time").⁷⁰

The emphasis on the cult and the temple in the post-exilic period may have resulted in a division between the priestly and the royal functions of the Messiah. Earlier these functions were embodied in one figure (cf. Ps 110:1-4). Traces of a separation of function appear early. In Ezekiel's vision of restored Israel (40-48) the king has a subordinate place in a "priestly" community. In Jeremiah 33:14-18 there is "alongside the choice of David and the covenant with David the choice of the Levites and the Levitical covenant of priesthood."⁷¹ Still later, at the beginning of the post-exilic period the priestly and the royal figure appear side by side (Zech 4:14). Does this mean the importance of the Messiah is reduced? Not necessarily, if we recognize that both functions belong together. This is recognized even in the double conception of Messiahship; the priestly and the royal aspects of Messiahship are both preserved in the double concept of Messiahship.

The apocalyptic prophecy of the Son of man in Daniel presents a distinctly different tradition. How, if at all, is it to be related to the messianic tradition? This "one like a son of man" is associated with God and receives "dominion and glory" and a kingdom that will not be destroyed (7:9-14). In the interpretation that follows the son of man is identified with "the saints of the Most High" (cf. Ps 34:9). The interpretation of the one like a son of man as a collective figure is in accord with the concept of the Messiah who represents the people of God.⁷² The prophecy in Dan 7 is concerned "with the establishment and triumph of God's kingdom on earth through God's human representative, just as is the messianic tradition."⁷³ In the one case this representative is the Davidic king, in the other this representative is the exalted Son of man. This ensures that the kingdom is understood in its transcendent character as indeed the kingdom of God. The

special relation to true Israel is maintained but his kingdom also includes "all the peoples" who serve him (7:14, 27). What is more, this connection between the Messiah and the Son of man is affirmed in later Jewish literature. In the book of Enoch the Son of man is twice described as God's "anointed" (48:10; 52:4) and as one possessing the spirit of righteousness (cf. Isa 11:1-5). In 4 Ezra there is a fusion between the two traditions of "the man" and the Messiah; the Man is addressed by God as "my son" (a title for the Davidic king, 13:32, 37).⁷⁴ He comes to judge on Mount Zion (13:9-13, 35-36) and to restore Israel.

There is thus more than one emphasis attached to the concept of "Messiah." But these variations give depth and scope to the concept. Furthermore, they indicate that the Messiah has a significant role in the eschatological kingdom of God.

(c) The restoration of Israel. Jewish expectation included the hope of a restored Israel. Already in Daniel the coming of the one "like a son of man" was correlated with the deliverance and vindication of "the people of the saints of the Most High" (7:13-14, 25-27). As one who effected God's judgment and kingdom he represented the afflicted people of God. There is a correspondence between the kingdom coming into effect and the people of God. This hope is correlated in the Psalms of Solomon with the hope of the coming Davidic Messiah. Then God in his mercy will "gather together the dispersed of Israel" (8:28). The children of Israel will be gathered "from the east and the west" (11:2). God will raise for Israel the son of David as king (17:21) who will destroy lawless Gentile nations (17:24). He will gather a "holy people" and "judge the tribes of the people which have been sanctified by the Lord his God" (17:26). The Gentiles are included among those who will serve the king of Israel; they "will come from the ends of the earth to

see his glory, bringing as gifts her sons who had fainted" (17:31). Israel restored is Israel purified under judgment by the Lord. And central to all of this is the gathering of the dispersed of Israel.⁷⁵

The Qumran community also bears witness to the expectation of the eschatological restoration of Israel (in its own way). We would expect that the interpretation of restoration would reflect the concerns of priesthood and temple. They saw themselves as a community of the last days. At the same time this was a community that defined itself in terms of the temple, since for them temple worship was performed through the community's observance of the Law and its own liturgy (cf. IQS 5. 2-7; 8.2-6; 9-10; 11 10-11; CD 5:4-7).⁷⁶ Since the temple was largely reinterpreted in terms of the community, there is some question about their expectation as it concerned the temple. If "temple" was in important ways redefined, the actual temple appears still to have a place in expectation. As E.P. Sanders points out, the document that most clearly depicts a new temple, including reference to the sacrifices to be made there, is IQM, the War Scroll (cf. IQM 2:1-3). The Temple Scroll confirms the importance of the temple in the expectation of this community. Thus there was a strong emphasis on the restoration of Israel in the eschatological renewal that appears in some form to include the temple.

The traditional expectation of Israel's restoration is confirmed from diaspora Judaism by Philo. In De praemiis et poenis 94-97; 162-172⁷⁷ he depicts, with reference to the peace promised by the prophets for creation, a great victory over the forces of evil because there shall "come forth a man" (LXX Num 24:7) who will subdue great nations with the help of God. Further, he expected the return of Israel from all the places where they had been scattered. He expected a restoration of all the exiles, or at least of

all those who accept God's chastisement and repent of sin (163-165). Upon their return the cities shall be rebuilt and the people will live in wonderful abundance under the blessing of God (168).

This survey of passages makes clear that the emphasis can vary between the elements of eschatological expectation but at the same time that there is a remarkable coherence among the different forms of this expectation. We have had one basic question before us: whether or not definite elements of eschatological expectation (the coming of the Davidic king or Messiah, the gathering of dispersed Israel, the building of a glorious new temple, the participation of the Gentiles, etc.) continued in this period to the time of Jesus. The messianic hope remained a primary part of Israel's expectation, though the eschatological figure can be presented in different terms. At the centre of this expectation was the restoration of Israel. Present, but less prominent, was the inclusion of Gentiles, most often in subordination to Israel. Depending on the account, the elements of expectation may be explicit or only implicit. The pertinent points were summed up by T.W. Manson: 1) "The restoration of the dispersed of Israel to their own land is a principal element in the description of the coming deliverance"; 2) this "deliverance" is expected in conjunction with the coming of the Davidic Messiah.⁷⁸ There never was a stage in Israel's history when the kingdom was expected apart from the saving activity of God or one who acts for God (cf. Isa 40:9; Zech 9:9).

II Eschatology and Ethics in the Scriptures and in Postbiblical Judaism

Was there a relation between the kingdom-of-God theme and ethics? What place did ethics have in Jewish eschatological thinking?

1. Eschatology and Ethics in the Scriptures

If we understand scripture as reflecting divine initiative and human response, then human response is integral to everything said about God from Genesis to Revelation. In all his speaking and acting God seeks to elicit human response.⁷⁹ The Sinai covenant expressed the meaning of God's Lordship in relation to Israel. As king he provided instruction and gave command, he directed and went out before his people⁸⁰ (cf. Num 23:21). The content of the commands is expressive of the relationship of God to Israel ("I am the Lord your God," Exod 20:1-6). The Torah presupposes God's initiative toward his people ("I am the Lord your God who brought you out of Egypt, out of the house of bondage") and opens up a "life of peace in relation to God."⁸¹ This means that the law is not to be separated from the saving action of God (and absolutized). God, who took initiative for the salvation of Israel, at the same time gave commands to Israel. To act according to his commands and laws is response.⁸² Nothing can take the place of the response to God's will (that includes response in deed; cf. 1 Sam 15:22). God at once revealed himself to Israel ("I am Yahweh," Exod 3:13-15; 20:2) and constituted the relationship to Israel; a relationship that was determinative for Israel as Israel. In accord with the covenant, as reflected in the first commandment of the decalogue, Israel was related to God in all the spheres of existence (in all life situations Israel "was dealing with this one God").⁸³ Thus the revelation of God was not to be separated from the revelation of his will.⁸⁴ The commands reflect the character of God. To hear the commands was both to respond out of the relationship to God as his people and to be called to reflect him. The fundamental statement is presented in the formula, "You shall be holy; for I the Lord your God am holy" (Lev 19:2). It stands at the beginning of what

has come to be called the "Law of Holiness," and under it were gathered varied forms of instruction dealing with cult and conduct. Here is the instruction not to "take vengeance or bear any grudge against the sons of your own people, but you shall love your neighbor as yourself" (19:18). Central to this teaching is the character of God in relationship to his people: "When an alien lives with you in your land, do not mistreat him...Love him as yourself, for you were aliens in Egypt. I am the Lord your God" (Lev 19:33-34). The prohibition against permanently holding a fellow Israelite as slave is followed by the further instruction,

When you release him, do not send him away empty-handed.

Supply him liberally from your flock, your threshing floor and your winepress. Give to him as the Lord your God has blessed you. Remember that you were slaves in Egypt and the Lord your God redeemed you (Deut 15:13-15).

In this relationship to God Israel is directed not only to the past but to the future. The event of the exodus itself was the great act of hope in the Hebrew scripture. From it arose the certitude that God would sooner or later act to bring justice and freedom into the world. This was a certitude that arose in the midst of an oppressed people (slaves) who groaned and cried out. To recognize and to bring to speech the oppression of life is itself the first step in hope. God heard and saw their condition (Exod 2:23-25). Zimmerli emphasized that knowledge of God for Israel was founded on concrete encounter.⁸⁵ It was nevertheless not the unknown God who made himself known ("I am Yahweh") but the same God who was with the fathers (Exod 3:15-17). God who here speaks had in the time before already given evidence of his power. Through this word Israel anticipated coming events, but by reference to the earlier action of God the event which is expected

took its place in the history of God with his people to this point. This speaking of the new event by reference to God's past action makes the point "that God is the same God all the way from promise to fulfillment" (cf. Exod 3:16-17; Ezek 37:14).⁸⁶ Knowing God then must mean knowing God in his Lordship; where God is revealed his Lordship and power are revealed; that is, God is revealed where "his promises of blessing, peace and righteousness are fulfilled by him."⁸⁷ God is to be known where he shows himself to be the same, that is, in his faithfulness. God then reveals himself in his name, "which discloses the mystery of his Person to the extent that it discloses the mystery of his faithfulness."⁸⁸ And this name is at once a name of promise: God will be present with Israel on the way on which Israel is set by promise and calling (cf. Exod 3:12, 14). The promise is one side of the covenant; "God in his freedom binds himself to be faithful to the promise he has given."⁸⁹ Corresponding to promise as the other side of the covenant is the command he gives. This created a tension between the time of the promises being issued and their coming to fulfillment, thereby creating freedom for response or obedience. For Israel on the way to Canaan the promise pointed the goal and the command pointed the way.⁹⁰

Inasmuch as there was a correlation between Israel's faith and God's faithfulness, faith had a future content. The warning of judgment and the promise of salvation in the prophets are different ways of depicting the future of God in terms of particular circumstances. That future is anticipated in present action in one way or another. On the one hand there is the pattern of correspondence between sin and judgment.⁹¹ The fundamental expression of judgment comes in terms of the covenant relationship. "Because you did not serve the Lord your God with joyfulness and gladness of heart, by reason of the abundance of all things, therefore you shall serve

your enemies whom the Lord will send against you..." (Deut 28:47-48). Israel that does not serve the Lord God "will find as her punishment that she must serve her enemies" (cf. Exod 20:4-6; Jer 5:19; 6:19).⁹² This correspondence pattern is true for both evil and good; a decisive response is called for from Israel (cf. Isa 3:10; Hos 10:12).

The relation between eschatology and ethics is further indicated in the promise of the new covenant (Jer 31:31-34; cf. Ezek 36:25-28). Under this new eschatological covenant men and women will live fully in the relationship to God, and the alienation of sin will be overcome. This is made possible through the forgiveness of sin; everyone will "know" God, because the Torah will be written on the tablets of the heart. People will live in the power of a new spirit.⁹³ According to Isa 2:2-4 and Mic 4:1-4 there will be a new giving of the Torah from Zion in the "latter days." Then the peoples will flow of their own accord to Zion in order to learn God's ways "and walk in his paths." This sets a certain direction for conduct. This is not a simply spiritual or otherworldly reality. It is concretely anticipated as a historical, economic, social order in this world. The eschatological revelation from Mount Zion makes possible the participation of the peoples in the Lord's ways and in his peace. Thus already for people hearing the prophet, righteousness was characteristically anticipatory or eschatological and called for definite response: "Keep justice, and do righteousness (*sedaqa*), for soon my salvation will come, and my deliverance (*sedaqa*) be revealed" (Isa 56:1). This is to wait for, and to anticipate in the experience of living, the eschatological righteousness (in salvation) as the gift from God.⁹⁴

2. Eschatology and Ethics in Daniel and Postbiblical Judaism

One line of thought in current scholarship holds that in apocalyptic the emphasis was so much on the future that life in the present was largely neglected. There is a question about the extent to which eschatology and ethics in apocalyptic is determined by the setting. If apocalyptic is not simply determined by this setting, it is clearly affected by the restrictions of existence under the domination of foreign nations. But the prophetic literature was in large part produced under similar circumstances. Nevertheless, a contrast is evident between the outlook of the prophets and that of the apocalyptists. But is it correct to say that the prophets saw the future in relation to the present, whereas the apocalyptists saw no causal connection between present and future?⁹⁵ If apocalyptic had its rise in the radical dichotomy between the present and the coming age, in a situation of despair about any good arising in the present, then apocalyptic can be distinguished as one theological current among others. This view is stated succinctly by J.A.T. Robinson:

With the apocalyptists eschatology developed into a subject in itself, a science of the end...and one could produce treatises on the last things and treatises on ethics, the one dealing with the future, the other the present. And for late Judaism the two were distinct, the apocalyptic writers giving schematic arrangements to the divine promises, the scribal tradition providing precise codification of the divine demands.⁹⁶

Now, is this an accurate depiction of apocalyptic or has it been generalized to the point of distortion? First, it cannot be assumed that there is in apocalyptic a unified eschatological scheme which varies only in

minor details. Against the idea that apocalyptic is simply to be identified as a particular form of eschatology, Christopher Rowland showed that apocalyptic has a variety of interests and concerns (in the first section of I Enoch cosmology instead of eschatology occupies the key role).⁹⁷ Second, there was in Judaism a definite connection between eschatology and ethics. This is shown not only in apocalyptic but also in a non-apocalyptic work like the Psalms of Solomon, containing both eschatological and ethical teaching.

Further, we cannot assume the role of eschatology and ethics will be uniform in the Jewish literature. In general the contrast in apocalyptic between the present (evil) age and the future (blessed) age was sharpened. In I Enoch 6 the evil character of this age was described with reference to the work of fallen angels. Ultimately, however, God remained sovereign (2:1; 5:1,2; 9:5). He was Lord of the ages (12:3; 22:14; 25:7). He was aware of evil and permitted it without acting to restrain evil on earth (9:11). In the face of overwhelming evil God had no word for his people in their terrible plight, "except the promise of final deliverance."⁹⁸ Again, in the visionary retrospective of Enoch, the view is that God guided Israel's historical pilgrimage until the Babylonian captivity. Then God withdrew his protection and leadership, giving up his people to the wild beasts to be destroyed and devoured. God "remained unmoved, though he saw it, and rejoiced that they were devoured and swallowed and robbed, and left them to be devoured in the hand of all the beasts" (89:58). Then God handed over the people to seventy shepherds with instructions on the number of Jews who could be slain. The shepherds, however, did not heed these instructions and permitted great evils to ravage the people. Upon receiving the reports of the evil conduct of the shepherds, God set the reports aside without

taking any action (89:71, 75). On the one hand, the writer believed that God had ultimate control over history, but during this whole period he was inactive and no "deliverance could be expected before the messianic era."⁹⁹

The circumstances in which the work was set severely tested human response; the assurance of the ultimate triumph of God amidst adversity provided the antidote to unrelieved despair. From this perspective the issue was only whether people would align "themselves with God's way or the way of the world." For the present was open to opportunity for people to decide for or against the will of God (1 Enoch 30:15).¹⁰⁰ The emphasis on God who will act in the future, and who will provide ultimate salvation, resulted in a restricted view of ethical response (i.e. restricted to the preservation of personal righteousness by avoiding violations of the law) in the present because the present is largely without God.

To further specify the relation between eschatology and ethics, we may examine in order the teaching of Daniel and 4 Ezra. To understand the relation in Daniel between eschatology and ethics we must attend to both story and vision. The oppressive political power made absolute claims. Nebuchadnezzar wanted the people to concede the absolute authority of the imperial system over their lives. The story of the young men who refused to eat at the king's table points to the fact that they will not simply be accommodated by the system. And the fact that they thrived on simple food makes the point that conduct in accord with the will of God is the way of ultimate well-being (1:8-20). The three who refused to bow down in worship to the image of the king and Daniel who chose to be cast into the den of lions rather than to cease in his devotion did so out of trust and hope in God. They did not submit even if this should mean suffering or death (3:1-26; 6:6-23). They counted on a future from God not under the control of the

king. And they counted on God in the present amidst the most difficult circumstances (he has not abandoned his people). The triumph of the Son of man is also the triumph of the saints of God in the face of the kings of the earth. This hope upholds the people of God on the way. In this work there is a recognition both of Israel's sinfulness and the aim of devotion and obedience to the commands of God (9:4-10, 14). The character of God himself is the basis for assurance of God's forgiveness and action for his people (9:17-19). The concern for ethical conduct extends to the heathen. Daniel calls upon the king, "Renounce your sins by doing what is right, and your wickedness by being kind to the oppressed. It may be that then your prosperity will continue" (4:27). Turning to God has an inherent ethical character that calls for conduct in accord with God's will (cf. 9:7, 14).

4 Ezra, like 1 Enoch, maintains a formal doctrine of God's activity in history (e.g. 3:27, 30; 5:28). The key to this author's understanding of the present in relation to the future is the "two ages" concept (cf. 7:50). From this standpoint the historical period beginning with Adam is understood to be under the control of sin and fate (cf. 4:26-32; 7:5; 8:1-3). Since God decreed the two ages the righteous (few) can only resign themselves to the situation with the hope of a solution in the age that is to come.¹⁰¹ The future age of salvation is for the few, those few who make it through the many difficulties of this world (7:11-14) and who have perfectly kept the law (7:20-25, 45-61). If this age is completely dominated by the power of evil then the response can only be patient resignation.

Central to the book of Daniel is the future kingdom of God, but not in contrast to God's activity in history. He worked through and will act for his people in history (2:21, 5:25). It is said of God that he "is the living God...he delivers and rescues, he works signs and wonders in heaven

and on earth" (6:27). As the righteous and faithful God he will not turn away from his creation; his righteousness will be finally and fully vindicated in the establishment of his kingdom. This provided a basis for hopeful participation in life. Both Daniel and 4 Ezra are in agreement that the promise of the coming kingdom of God is a basis for hope and perseverance in the present. But in 4 Ezra the action of God and the relation of God to his people is circumscribed by the law. Expectation means the exaltation of the few righteous and the condemnation of the sinful as determined by the law. Absent from this work, for example, are the "new things" to come (e.g. Isa 42:1-9) and the expected new giving of the Torah from Mount Zion that would bring the nations to participate in the eschatological peace of God (cf. Isa 2:1-5). But it seems the emphasis, in the circumstances of oppression in and after the exile, was on the keeping of the law. Was Qumran exceptional or only the most rigorous at this point? The anticipation of God's initiative in history is apparently restricted and his activity limited to what he will do in the end for "the few righteous" who have kept the law. This community interpreted and meditated on the Law as it waited for the future age. Entrance into the community was in fact equated with making a "return to the Law of Moses with a whole heart and soul" (cf. CD 15:7-11). This meant learning and obeying the interpretation of the Law as determined by the priestly leaders of the community (IQS5:8-10). The heart of their program, as they awaited the future, was meditation on and observance of the law. They glimpsed the possibility of participation in the future age on the basis of their obedience in the present.¹⁰²

III. Conclusion

The interpretation of Jesus' proclamation and teaching to one extent or another depends on the nature of Jewish eschatological expectation. The view of this expectation that an interpreter assumes therefore may be crucial for understanding the kingdom of God in Jesus' proclamation. The recovery of eschatology by Weiss and Schweitzer continues to be important. At the same time aspects of their view, to the extent that they depended on Jewish eschatological expectation, need to be reconsidered. What is to be made of the view that the apocalyptic expectation simply means the destruction of this world, the resurrection and the judgment, followed by the creation of a new heaven and earth?¹⁰³ Schweitzer proposed that "the eschatology of Jesus" could only be "interpreted by the aid of the...Jewish apocalyptic literature."¹⁰⁴ In this category he included the works of Daniel, 1 Enoch, the Psalms of Solomon, Baruch and Fourth Ezra (2 Esdras).¹⁰⁵ Then, on the basis of "Jewish apocalyptic expectation," Schweitzer contrasted the "Messianic ideal" (including the restoration of Israel) with an end-of-the-world eschatology, affirming that by the time of Jesus the latter had displaced the earlier "political" messianic conception.¹⁰⁶ First, in response to Schweitzer, Dan 7 is concerned with the triumph of the kingdom in this world (Dan 2:44, 7:17,27). Second, even in Daniel there is a correlation between the kingdom and God's holy people (Israel) who are vindicated in the coming of the kingdom. The Psalms of Solomon affirm that God will raise from the line of David a king to "reign over Israel." In God's strength he will "destroy unrighteous rulers" and godless nations "with the word of his mouth." Here is the traditional figure of the Messiah with an emphasis on particular elements. 4 Ezra and 2

Baruch, though late; probably reflect earlier Jewish eschatological expectation; they depict a Messiah who reigns for a limited period on the earth. In 4 Ezra this period lasts for 400 years (7:28-33), followed by the judgment, resurrection and new creation. The central figure is "a man" who arises from the sea, symbolizing the emergence of one who had been concealed, like the Messiah (cf. 13:52). This is not a descent from heaven nor is this an end-of-the-world eschatology. In 2 Baruch the Messiah reigns as long as the earth endures; a reign of limited duration until "the end of corruption." Among the apocalyptic works following Daniel, the Similitudes of Enoch (37-71) present a transcendent figure who comes to judge and rule in the kingdom of God (62:2-3). It is almost certainly later than the period of Jesus and in large part stands alone in its eschatology. It can therefore, in any case, not establish "the late Jewish view" of eschatology as the context for Jesus' proclamation.¹⁰⁷

So, contrary to the view of Schweitzer, the kingdom is put into effect in this world. Indeed, in three authorities the Messiah is clearly a figure of this world as the king of a victorious people; only at the close of this reign does the new creation take place. This is in direct opposition to what Schweitzer held to be the "late Jewish" expectation. What we have is the expectation of a messianic kingdom of God in and for this world, which is then followed by the judgment and the kingdom of God in the setting of a new creation.

These works present different eschatological views but they by no means present what Schweitzer described as "the late Jewish view." Some do not mention a messianic figure at all; when he is mentioned his reign is usually closely related to the eschatological restoration of Israel. Sometimes a period of tribulation is said to occur, sometimes not; according to some

sources the tribulation precedes the coming of the Messiah (cf. 4 Ezra 5:4-12), in others it follows his coming. There was not a monolithic eschatological expectation in Judaism. This means the constraints derived in particular by Schweitzer from Jewish apocalyptic for Jesus' eschatological proclamation do not hold. The announcement of an impending end of time as the sole and sufficient definition of eschatology derived from Weiss and Schweitzer cannot be the starting point for the interpretation of Jesus' eschatological proclamation.

What holds at every stage in Jewish tradition is a connection between the kingdom and future expectation. The most immediate source for Jesus' eschatological proclamation is probably the kingdom to be set up by God in Daniel. In particular two key passages, Daniel 2 and 7, appear as a groundwork for understanding Jesus. In the first we have the vision of "a stone cut by no human hand" which itself becomes a great mountain filling the whole earth. The stone signifies the kingdom set up by God which shall never be destroyed (2:44). The vision of Daniel 7 is evidently parallel to that in chapter 2. Now it is "one like a son of man" who represents the "saints of the most high" to whom is given dominion and a kingdom never to be destroyed (7:13-14, 27). First, the alignment with Jesus' proclamation is clear in the references to God's kingdom to be effected in the future. It is significant that the two Daniel passages are in Aramaic (the language most widely spoken in first century Galilee). Thus these passages would have been directly accessible to people in a way that the rest of the Bible was not.¹⁰⁸ Second, it is clear that the kingdom in Daniel 2 and 7 is properly understood as God's kingdom; he is to set it up and the saints are apparently to be given a share in his reign (cf. 7:14,27). Thirdly, the

language of Daniel provides the framework for understanding Jesus' proclamation of the kingdom of God "in the context of the Jewish eschatological hope for a new age and for God's restoration of his people Israel."¹⁰⁹ The relation between "kingdom of God" and "people" in Jesus' proclamation remains to be investigated, but the correlation is clear in Daniel. A fourth reason for thinking that Daniel serves as the most immediate resource for Jesus' kingdom proclamation are the other important points of contact with Jesus' proclamation and teaching; in particular, the Son of man concept, the idea of the desolating sacrilege and the concept of the saints participating in the reign of God have their origins in Daniel (cf. Mark 13:14; 14:62; Luke 12:32).¹¹⁰

At the same time it is clear that Jesus drew upon a range of resources in making his proclamation and carrying out his mission. To identify and clarify the meaning of his healing and preaching he connected his work to the expectations of God's eschatological salvation in Isaiah (Isa 29:18-19; 35:5-6; 61:1-2.; Matt 11:5-6; Luke 4:16-21; 7:22f.). And particularly in Jesus' proclamation of the good news of the kingdom of God there was a clear connection to Isaiah (who mentions messenger, kingdom and the eschatological restoration of Israel, cf. Mark 1:15; Isa 52:7-10). These and other connections will be examined later. This is sufficient to point to the important resources and to indicate the context for understanding Jesus' proclamation and mission. For the kingdom of God, whether described in prophecy or apocalyptic, Israel waited upon the coming of God. The way to that future might be marked by times of great affliction, but God was expected to send his Messiah, restore his people Israel and establish his righteousness in the world.

THE KINGDOM OF GOD AND THE APPROPRIATE RESPONSE

1. New State of the Question

Jesus made his proclamation with the expectation of response. The question to which this chapter is meant to provide an answer is: what response did Jesus seek to elicit to his proclamation of the kingdom of God?

Appropriate response to Jesus exhibited more than one dimension or facet. Jesus addressed people in different ways, in accord with their different relations to him, and in accord with the unfolding of his mission in stages. Initially, he called all Israel to repent and be baptized (John 3:22-4:3). Once he had initiated his own independent career, he called some to travel with him in his entourage. He called upon all to refashion their lives to accord with the imminence of the kingdom of God. At a certain point as the climax of his career loomed before him (Mark 8:34//Matt 16:24), he called his disciples to a commitment without reserve (prepared for extreme self-denial).

Our particular interest centers on the specifically moral component -- the ethical aspect, to the extent that it can be highlighted -- of the appropriate response to Jesus' public proclamation and teaching. We should make sure from the start that the full contours of the question are clear.

First, the question presupposes that Jesus did, in fact, have a public proclamation to make and that he made it; that, like the Baptist, he addressed his proclamation to Israel at large; that the object of the proclamation was the kingdom of God and the imminence of its coming;

finally, that "the kingdom of God" signified God's climactic and definitive saving act.

Secondly, we wish to build on these presuppositions: both Jesus and his audience understood that at the heart of God's saving act stood the eschatological restoration of Israel. Inattention to this "ecclesial" dimension of Jesus' proclamation has been a grave defect in historical-Jesus research from the nineteenth century to the present. Liberal theology was blind to the specifically ecclesial significance of Jesus' word, and the Kerygma theology that supplanted it deliberately reduced all aspects of the proclamation to the demand for personal decision. The result was a curiously de-Judaized and unhistorical retrieval of Jesus' word.

Thirdly, we wish to build on the contemporary recovery of this "restoration eschatology" at the heart of Jesus' proclamation in order to reconstruct the context making the ethical component of the response sought by Jesus concrete, and concretely intelligible.

The kingdom of God (alternative expression: "the kingdom of heaven") is a central term, doubtless *the* central term, in the words of Jesus. It occurs in many of the forms of oral discourse differentiated by modern analysis, e.g., in proclamation (Matt 4:17; Mark 1:15), parable (Mark 4:26; Matt 13:31; Mark 4:30; Luke 13:18, etc.), prophetic saying (Matt 5:19), esoteric instruction (Mark 4:11; Matt 13:11), vow or prophecy (Matt 26:29; Mark 14:25) etc. Furthermore, in key instances "kingdom" appears in a saying of Jesus in the explication of something else. That is, the kingdom is not directly at issue, but it is referred to in order to identify or explain something else, such as the "mystery" of the kingdom (Mark 4:11; cf. 13:11; Luke 8:10), the "word" of the kingdom (Matt 13:19), the "sons" of the kingdom (Matt 8:12; 13:38), the "keys" of the kingdom (Matt 16:19) and the

"gospel" of the kingdom (Matt 4:23; 9:35; 24:14). The kingdom itself is not the concern in these cases; rather, it is assumed that the hearer or reader knows enough about the kingdom that reference to it will shed light on the subjects actually at issue. The situation is similar in the teaching on anxiety (Matt 6:33//Luke 12:31); people are simply told to seek the kingdom. In all of these instances, the impression is confirmed that Jesus spoke of the kingdom consistently, and that it was central in his proclamation and in his teaching.¹ The synoptic tradition makes Jesus' proclamation of the kingdom of God foundational with respect to all the other uses (Matt 4:17; Mark 1:15; Luke 16:16) and, in view of the natural and inevitable relationship between public proclamation and the many forms of public teaching, scholarship has affirmed this relationship as reflecting the history of Jesus.

Like the Baptist's proclamation of imminent judgment, Jesus' proclamation exhibited a key trait of apocalyptic eschatology: it bore on the consummation of history. Still, Jesus' proclamation stood apart from that of the Baptist; for, as several scholars (e.g., David Flusser, Joachim Jeremias) have recently urged, Jesus alone proclaimed the divine act of salvation as already inaugurated and in process of realization. Evidently, he understood his own mission to be related to the mission of John as its distinct complement and crown. As Flusser noted, Jesus was "the only Jew known to us from ancient times" who proclaimed "that the new age of salvation had already begun."² His proclamation was accordingly "without analogy."³ This, to be sure, does not yet yield a historically secure recovery of how exactly Jesus understood God's saving act--its agents, beneficiaries, scope and character. But this basic ascertainment, which we presuppose but propose to develop, sets our inquiry on track.

Does anyone today seriously deny that Jesus addressed to Israel at large a public proclamation of the kingdom of God? Direct denial is all but non-existent. Indirect denial, however, is occasionally to be encountered. In Morton Smith's Jesus the Magician, proclamation is downplayed to the point of virtual disappearance. There are, moreover, a few recent studies which, whatever their merit in other respects, are similarly eccentric in this particular; that is, they so depict Jesus' public career as to make proclamation marginal or non-existent. But a fullblown refutation of such studies necessarily falls outside the purview of the present investigation. For our purposes it will have to suffice to say, in common with the vast majority, that there is no basis, either in the sources or in a sober analysis of the distinctive tendencies of the sources, for removing Jesus' proclamation of the kingdom of God from its foundational position.

As for the imminence of the kingdom of God, the critical discussion launched by the discovery, towards the end of the last century, of the eschatology of Jesus and of the synoptic gospels continues today almost without diminution. This topic, then, cannot be relegated entirely to the present brief specification of presuppositions, but must be dealt with below in greater detail.

We have said above that we take the expression "the kingdom of God" as used by Jesus to refer to God's climactic and definitive saving act. As long ago as 1898, Gustaf Dalman correlated Jesus' use of the expression "the kingdom of God" with fundamental prayer texts in use in the time of Jesus, namely, early forms of the Eighteen Benedictions and of the Kaddish, both looking to the full earthly realization of the sovereignty of God.⁴ Though this, too, is among our "presuppositions," we intend in the course of this chapter to spell out more fully what it entails.

We recalled above that in 1925 Ernst Ludwig Dietrich offered a technical philological study which drew attention to a major prophetic theme expressing the hope of Israel.⁵ This theme was the promise and the corresponding hope of Israel's "eschatological restoration" (*die endzeitliche Wiederherstellung*). Though New Testament scholarship failed to make the connection between this complex of biblical motifs and the public proclamation of Jesus, there did appear sporadic signs of recognition that somehow the restoration of Israel was tied in with Jesus' career.

In chapter one above, we mentioned the work of Joseph Schmitt, G.B. Caird, B.F. Meyer, and E.P. Sanders. Our present purpose is to recover Jesus' proclamation and teaching with a view to defining the appropriate response to both. The main clues to this task will be sought in the teaching by which Jesus followed up, elucidated, and commended anew his proclamation.

What did Jesus mean by "the kingdom of God"? In seeking an answer we shall do well to start where Jesus' own contemporaries must have started. Jesus came into an environment in which the question about what it meant to be God's holy people was a live one. The distinctive contribution of Jesus to this question was the proclamation that the kingdom of God was at hand. In this environment there could be no understanding of "kingdom of God" apart from its relation to Israel.⁶ Jesus himself came representing the Lord God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob (cf. Matt 8:11; 22:31,32). That is to say, Jesus represented not God in general but the one true God as revealed in the history of his people Israel.

Now, this insistence is in direct contrast to liberal theology as reflected, for instance, in the work of Adolf Harnack.⁷ He assumed that the

effort to understand Jesus in the context of Judaism was fundamentally wrong. Rather the essence of Christianity has to do with "something common to us all," and he was accordingly persuaded that "Jesus Christ's teaching will at once bring us by steps which, if few, will be great, to a height where its connection with Judaism is seen to be only a loose one, and most of the threads leading from it into 'contemporary history' become of no importance at all."⁸ The same perspective is inherent in the negative application of the criterion of dissimilarity which holds that sayings attributed to Jesus that are not dissimilar to Judaism (and to the early Christian community) cannot be regarded as authentic. This application of the criterion is a prominent feature of scholarship in the tradition of Bultmann. Bultmann stated the significance of the negative application of the criterion by saying that "where opposition to the morality and piety of Judaism...are expressed, and where on the other hand there are no specifically Christian features, it is easiest to conclude there is an authentic parable of Jesus."⁹ The negative application of the criterion led Ernst Käsemann to conclude that with regard to both Torah and eschatological expectation Jesus made "a break with Judaism." This means that differences between Jesus and Judaism are methodically requisite and alone determinative for understanding Jesus.¹⁰

The relation between Jesus' kingdom-of-God proclamation and Israel is difficult to comprehend in this line of criticism. In the work of Norman Perrin we find perhaps the most thorough effort to understand Jesus' proclamation of the kingdom of God through the application of the principle of dissimilarity.¹¹ He accepted Jewish apocalyptic as the background for Jesus' understanding of "the kingdom of God." But he proposed that Jesus used it in his own way as a symbol to evoke a human experience of God as

king, "which every man experiences in his own time."¹² He therefore argued that instruction on the kingdom and the parousia in Luke 17 and Mark 13 was a transformation of Jesus' use of the symbol of the kingdom of God, and a distortion of Jesus' message.¹³ In these passages apocalyptic language about the kingdom of God was related to divine intervention that would bring judgment and redemption. But in Perrin's view the significance of Jesus' proclamation of the kingdom was a challenge to "explore the manifold ways in which the experience of God can become a reality to man." He therefore argued that it was not "legitimate to think of Jesus' use of kingdom of God in terms of 'present' and 'future' at all."¹⁴ The reason for the "illegitimacy" of this distinction is that in Jesus' usage kingdom of God was not a conception but a symbol. The kingdom was not to be identified with the historic and concrete action unfolding in Jesus' ministry or with ultimate salvation and judgment. It was something "which every man experiences in his own time."¹⁵ This was to present a clear alternative as the context for understanding Jesus' kingdom-of-God proclamation: historical Israel, with its long history of promise and eschatological hope, is dropped in favor of "every man and his experience." Despite the new idiom on myth and symbol, this was a return to Liberal theology.

Whatever degree of religious validity there may have been in the approach represented by Perrin, the historical question of how Jesus used the term "the kingdom of God" cannot be answered apart from its own original context. Since Jesus made his proclamation within and to Israel the question of context and purpose perforce involves the relation between this proclamation and this people.

2. John the Baptist and Jesus

The gospel accounts are united in their witness to the beginning and the outcome of Jesus' career. The beginning of Jesus' public work is closely associated with John the Baptist. At the end, after his death and resurrection, there was a community that recognized Jesus as the Messiah. These two facts, the connection of John to Jesus and the community that resulted, both set Jesus' mission in an eschatological framework.¹⁶

What does the connection at the beginning to John the Baptist tell us about Jesus? The answer to this question depends on the meaning of John's work. He "appeared" in the wilderness north of the Dead Sea "in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Caesar" (Luke 3:1ff). The proclamation of judgment and a summons to repentance ("Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand," Matt 3:2) identified John as a prophet of the end-time. John's preaching was rooted in a recognition that the supremely critical moment had come for Israel (that is evident in the strong images of judgment that filled his preaching: Spirit and fire, wheat and chaff, winnowing fork and threshing floor, axe and root). And it was equally evident that the standing resources of Israel (e.g. the cultic means of expiation) were not sufficient to meet the new situation. Furthermore, this call is decisive not simply for individuals within Israel but for Israel as a people.¹⁷ First, this call excluded no one but was addressed to all.

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 3:9; Luke 3:8).

God was now summoning Israel in view of the arrival of the end-time. The message of John supposes a scheme of salvation in two stages: the repentance

and baptism of John and the baptism in "the holy Spirit and fire" of the "mightier one" to come (Matt 3:11,12). The two stages were related as prologue to judgment and judgment itself.¹⁸ Second, with a view to his background it is impossible to think that John conceived judgment merely along individual lines. Rather, he conceived judgment in "ecclesial" terms (i.e. in terms of "God's people, Israel"). To miss this is to miss the context out of which came his words and acts.

In Torah and prophets alike the drama of history is the covenantal dialogue of God and people. Judgment is turned against *Israel* and *Israel* is the object of salvation. John's summons was accordingly directed to all Israel as the people of God. Diversity of response could not cancel the ecclesial character of the encounter.¹⁹

On the contrary, the diversity of response would concretely determine the destiny of Israel as such: its division (cf. the coming separation of wheat and chaff) and restoration (the wheat gathered into the granary).²⁰ The object of the judgment would be the salvation of Israel. Since judgment meant the sifting of the wheat from the chaff, saved Israel would be a remnant.²¹

In the synoptic gospels the event that marked the move of Jesus from Judea to Galilee and the beginning of his public ministry was the arrest of John (Mark 1:14//Matt 4:12//Luke 3:19). The beginning of Jesus' ministry had been closely bound up with the work of John. It was from the circle around John that Jesus had called his first disciples. With them he worked in alliance with John; though apparently not alongside him (John 3:26).²² Jesus acknowledged the mission of the Baptist in clear terms: his baptism was "from Heaven" (Mark 11:30) and he came representing "the way of righteousness" (Matt 21:32). In the desert John called Israel to a new

beginning, to be sealed by a rite of immersion. Jesus not only responded positively to the Baptist's call to Israel but actively shared in it; this underscores the eschatological character of his ministry. The close association of Jesus with the Baptist suggests participation in the Baptist's aim: the reconstitution of Israel in view of the coming kingdom of God.²³

The statement of John about the coming "mightier one" (Matt 3:11) bears on the relation between John and Jesus. To speak of it as a "Christian accretion"²⁴ overlooks important evidence for authenticity. John can hardly have referred to God coming to judge humankind in such terms. Moreover, the question later put to Jesus by those sent from John, "Are you he who is to come?" (Matt 11:3//Luke 7:19) is most likely an echo of John's speech. Furthermore, that John was a prophet of repentance is implied in the account of Josephus.²⁵ His depiction of John and his message provides support for the account of the gospels: the preaching in the desert; the dress that recalled Elijah; the message of repentance in view of coming judgment. There are thus many common elements between John and Jesus; there are also important differences.

It is important, in seeking to understand the purpose of Jesus, to discover how he saw his work vis-a-vis that of John. The gospels highlight several mutually reinforcing factors. John's role as the precursor and as Elijah (Matt 3:1-6; 11:7-15//Luke 7:24-27; Matt 17:10-13//Mark 9:11-13) meant that "until John it was the law and the prophets; since then the kingdom of God..." (Luke 16:16//Matt 11:12,13). That is, John marks the watershed between the period of the law and the time of the kingdom. The language in Matthew is similar but the emphasis is different ("From the days of John the Baptist until now the kingdom of heaven exercises force").²⁶ In

Matthew there is some rearrangement of terms so that John's ministry is included within the time of the kingdom. But Matthew and Luke agree on the main point: the period of the law and the prophets climaxed in John's ministry and that ministry served to introduce the eschatological era (Matt 11:10,14). John's ministry represented the link between the old order and the new, not so as to belong to neither, but so as to belong to both.²⁷

This saying affirms the presence of the kingdom of God in the period following the appearance of John the Baptist. Obscurities of interpretation should not divert attention from the central point: the kingdom of God was powerfully operative among people in the labors of Jesus, a stage prepared for and introduced by the ministry of John the Baptist.²⁸ The work of Jesus is closely identified with that of John; at the same time there is a significant distinction between them (a matter to which we shall return).

John's word of warning and of judgment (the sifting of wheat from chaff) divulges a singular hope: to assemble by the call to repentance and to baptism the Israel destined for restoration.²⁹ The mission of John the Baptist fastened on eschatological fulfillment. He appeared in the wilderness calling the people to repentance in view of the imminent coming of the kingdom of God. John issued this call to the people of Israel (the descendants of Abraham, Luke 3:8).³⁰ The people came to him and recognized the prophetic authority of his message ("all held that John was a real prophet," Mark 11:32). He announced the judgment to be accomplished by the "coming one" for whom he himself was preparing the way. Jesus, in coming to John, identified fully with the mission of John, as confirmed and reinforced in Jesus' teaching about John (cf. Matt. 11:7-15//Luke 7:24-28). Because of John's unique service in relation to the coming kingdom he was a prophet and

"more than a prophet" (Matt 11:9-10). Jesus not only identified with John's mission but himself participated in it. Jesus' conscious contrast with John in the character of his ministry serves to underscore their unity in basic purpose. This prepares the ground for a preliminary observation on the purpose of Jesus' mission: he understood his mission as the enactment of the age-old scriptural promise of the restoration of Israel. This he saw not as something exclusively reserved for some future but to be effected now and already begun (indeed already prepared for and begun in the work of John). Thus Jesus began to move into the eschatological task that he took to be his.

3. Jesus' Proclamation, Acts and Teaching

What is the significance of the transition from "the days of John the Baptist" (Matt 11:12) to Jesus' own independent ministry? John and Jesus alike understood the conclusion of history in terms of judgment and salvation (in biblical thinking one entails the other). But this leaves room for them to be quite different in emphasis. John, through his strong images of judgment, emphasized "the wrath to come." In Jesus' proclamation the term of decisive significance was "the kingdom of God."³¹ This language of the kingdom resonated with the promise that God would vindicate his name and his people. The emphasis was on God's initiative; it is therefore the gospel of the kingdom of God (cf. Matt 4:23; Mark 1:15). According to Jesus the coming of the kingdom did not validate, but reversed exclusion of the sinners from Israel. Jesus restored men and women to their place with God's people as he welcomed the sinners (e.g. Luke 19:1-10) and healed the sick (e.g. Mark 1:40-44; 2:5-12). This helps to define the kingdom of God in relation to the restoration of Israel. Already in Deutero-Isaiah the

announcement "Your God reigns!" was a proclamation of Israel's imminent redemption. Features of Isa 52:7-9 such as the herald of salvation, the kingship of God, and the peace and restoration of Israel are often reflected in Jesus' ministry (i.e. in the several facets of preaching, teaching, and healing, cf. Matt 4:23; 9:35; 11:5).

But Jesus' kingdom-of-God proclamation carried the meaning not only of vindication but also of judgment for Israel.³² What Jesus had to say about the kingdom challenged and disturbed current expectation. This feature stands out sharply in the profile of Jesus' mission. Jesus saw Israel passing into a crisis: this generation would see the end of the present situation of the people of God.³³ A number of the parables were designed to make this point: this is how the kingdom of God comes--like a harvest, or a distribution of wages, or a settlement of accounts.³⁴ All these are images of judgment. As harvest (judgment) brings the separation (Matt 13:24-30) of the tares from the wheat, so the kingdom of God brings the separation of the evil from the good (Matt 13:24-30); as with the fish of every kind that are sorted according to kind from the great catch, so it is with the kingdom of God (Matt 13:47-50). Indeed, the danger of condemnation is so acute that only resolute action will avoid it. The call was to recognize the judgment ahead, to take steps to avoid it and gain the entrance to the kingdom instead (Luke 16:1-8). The warning of coming judgment is no less evident in the parable of the Great Feast (Matt 22:1-10; Luke 14:15-24). Everything is at stake in the response to Jesus' proclamation of the kingdom. According to the parable, "everything is now ready," the preparations are complete, the guests have only to come in and eat. But some people are not prepared to recognize the fact that the time has come and would not accept the

summons to the feast. The situation is one of present grace and imminent judgment.

Explicit warnings in the synoptic gospels fit into this framework. Israel is confronted in this situation: this generation may participate in the climactic fulfillment that Jesus brings; to repudiate the opportunity is to face judgment and to answer for it (Luke 11:49-51; Matt 23:34-35).³⁵ The little parable of the fig tree expresses the urgency of response: the tree is to be tended with care and has one more year to bear fruit, and "if not, then you can cut it down" (Luke 13:6-8). There is the warning that those who perished in one of Pilate's brutal suppressions of Jewish concerns will set the pattern for all, unless they repent (Luke 13:1-5).³⁶ Further, without probing for the full meaning of Jesus' action in the temple, one thing clearly symbolized in this action is judgment. This is in accord with the predictions of the temple's destruction (e.g. Mk. 13:1-31).³⁷ Indeed, these warnings of the destruction of the temple draw to a climax this theme of judgment upon unrepentant Israel. The purpose of Jesus was to "gather" the children of Israel but because Israel failed to recognize the hour of divine visitation, Jesus warned of judgment on Israel and its temple (Luke 13:34-35; 19:41-44). The Jewish hope included the central conviction that God, out of faithfulness to the covenant, would act to save his people from the power of Rome. Jesus, however, turned this around. Hope was based not on a large-scale "military" deliverance from the enemy without but on repentance directed to the reality of the kingdom of God already present in their midst (cf. Luke 17:20-21).³⁸

The bond between the kingdom of God and the restoration of Israel is apparent. Why should Jesus have proclaimed the kingdom of God to Israel as such unless it bore on the destiny of Israel as such? This relation between

the proclamation of the kingdom of God and the salvation of Israel belonged to the pattern of biblical eschatology. The announcement "Your God reigns" had become a proclamation of God acting for Israel's redemption (e.g. Isa 52:8,9). At the same time in Jesus' proclamation the kingdom of God was coupled from the start with a call to conversion. The proclamation was made with a view to and attains its end in appropriate response. The nature of the kingdom included response. Israel could not be the passive beneficiary of eschatological salvation; there must be a "willed act of acceptance."³⁹

If "kingdom of God" in Jesus' proclamation entailed "restoration of Israel" we would expect to find evidence for this in his public actions. Here Jesus' choosing of the twelve becomes an important issue (cf. Mark 3:13-19//Matt 10:1-4). If the choosing of the twelve was related to the twelve tribes of Israel then this action was of crucial significance. That the choosing and sending out of the twelve was intended to embody the concept of the people of God finds strong support in the record of the gospels. We have already noted that Jewish hopes for the future included restoration of the twelve tribes of Israel (the motif of "the twelve" is maintained even by the Qumran community). In the sphere of this vital expectation, for Jesus' to appoint the twelve was to make of them a "sign" (i.e. of the anticipated restoration of Israel). This was why Jesus spoke of his followers as a "little flock" (Luke 12:32), a designation reminiscent of prophetic texts on the Israel of the messianic age (Mic 5:4; Isa 40:11; Ezek 34:12-14). The very existence of the twelve was an appeal to the whole people of Israel. The relation between the choosing of the twelve disciples and Israel is confirmed by Jesus' saying to them that they will "judge the twelve tribes of Israel" (Matt 19:28//Luke 22:28,30).⁴⁰ The twelve are described both as those who participate in the kingdom and those

who will exercise judgment (i.e. the people of God will participate in God's rule, and judgment is a function of that rule). Thus, Jesus made the twelve a sign of the future; more, he called them to participate in its coming-to-be, by sending them out in groups of two (Mark 6:7//Luke 10:1). This mission to Israel, set under the announcement of the coming of the kingdom of God, confronted Israel with a decision of faith or of unfaith.⁴¹ As the one anointed by God Jesus called "the twelve" into being; they were to be the beginnings of a renewed Israel.

To sum up, the character of Jesus' mission was epitomized in his word on the feast of the kingdom of God (Matt 8:11-12//Luke 13:28-29).⁴² This may be understood against the background in prophecy of the pilgrimage of the nations to the mountain of God (Jerusalem). The people would come bringing gifts and along with them would come the dispersed of Israel to participate in the feast of the Lord (cf. Isa 2:40,51; 45:14,23-24; 52:10; 56:7; 25:6-9). Now, this is more than Jesus stated; none of the elements of the pilgrimage of the nations is present in the passage. There is no mention of the defeat of the Gentiles or their subjection to Israel within the kingdom of God. Rather, the Gentiles are described as coming from every quarter of the world to participate in the feast of the kingdom of God with the patriarchs of Israel, whereas the Jews will be excluded from the kingdom. This is a shocking declaration of judgment on Israel. It stands in coherence with other utterances of Jesus dealing with judgment on Israel (e.g. Matt 23:34-36//Luke 11:49-51). Prophetic declarations of judgment are given with the aim of encouraging the hearers to repent, even this saying is to be understood as a warning rather than as a pronouncement of sentence. Negatively, it confirms that the eschatological salvation of Israel would not be realized apart from "a willed act of acceptance." Positively, Jesus

anticipated that multitudes of the nations would share with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom of God, while those who properly would have been expected to share in the kingdom will be cast out because of unbelief ("sons of the kingdom" = those who would inherit the kingdom, cf. IQM 17:3).⁴³

Thus the kingdom of God in Jesus' proclamation concretely entailed the people of God or restored Israel, together with saved Gentiles, as the new eschatological community. How Jesus represented both the present and future of the kingdom of God I will develop more fully in the following sections and in the following chapter. It is enough now to note that he healed, he welcomed outcasts and sinners, he called and sent out the twelve, he embodied and taught a way of life that in the power of God creates or effects a transformed people. The kingdom coming into effect in the word and work of Jesus calls for and enables the response that is appropriate to the kingdom of God.

4. Response to Proclamation, Action and Teaching

What is the relation between Jesus' kingdom-of-God proclamation and the response he expected? A relationship between them has often been presupposed but ideas about what that relationship is have varied greatly. But insofar as the pattern of the expected response can be discovered, it might well shed light on the nature of the kingdom of God. The point is to deal with proclamation and response in correlation.

The accent in Jesus' proclamation falls on God's initiative; the accent in his teaching falls on the human response. The proclamation and the teaching cannot be separated nor can they simply be equated with each other. It is apparent that proclamation was coupled from the first with the expectation of response (e.g. Mark 1:15). For Jesus to proclaim the kingdom

of God had the purpose of calling "the children of the kingdom" (Matt 8:12) into it, an event that was to anticipate the inclusion of humankind (Matt 8:11). Thus, the teaching clarifies and specifies the appropriate response. It presents concrete examples of how life is renewed in response to the kingdom of God.

Our task is to correlate proclamation with response and, within the response, to correlate general perspective with specific instances of "right response."

(a) The beatitudes. The macarism or beatitude is a declaration. It declares (a) good fortune for some particular beneficiaries (b) accruing to them in some particular and appropriate forms. The literal meaning of the opening word "blessed" (*makarios*) is: "Happy (= destined for good fortune) are you/is he!" The second part of each beatitude says why these particular beneficiaries are "happy" or "blessed." The pattern is: happy the down-and-out, for they are about to be made rich.⁴⁴

Jesus accented the imminence of the kingdom. Despite the present tense of "theirs is the kingdom of heaven/God," the original reference was to the future. The kingdom was about to be theirs (cf. Matt 19:14).⁴⁵ When the kingdom would come--and it is about to come--it is the poor who would receive it. No greater gift could be given to anyone. To those who made no claims for themselves everything was given. The kingdom of God would bring a complete "reversal of human conditions and values."⁴⁶

But in this case what significance did the beatitudes have for describing the human response to Jesus' proclamation? To see in the beautitudes simply a list of virtues or deeds of good people is hardly apt to bring their full or proper meaning into focus. The beatitudes reflected a divine initiative. As for the beneficiaries: one could not simply decide

to mourn or to hunger and thirst for righteousness. Again, the actions of showing mercy and of making peace presupposed a resource beyond that of a demand requiring these actions. The beatitudes, then, are not in the sapiential pattern, presenting the correlation between wise action and its corresponding reward. They are in the apocalyptic pattern, presenting God as sovereign and merciful and about to vindicate his righteousness for those who were poor, who mourned, who hungered (cf. Luke 7:22).

At the same time these declarations challenged those who heard them to realign their values with the coming kingdom of God. The proclamation of the kingdom of God made this possible. To trust this message and him who proclaimed it was to reshape one's life in accord with the kingdom of God. But response to the kingdom was response to Jesus (5:11). What this response meant was made concrete in the motif of persecution of the disciples. The coming of the kingdom of God called for a reversal of values. In contrast to life as a struggle for success and power, the beatitudes proclaimed God's initiative in favor of those who were poor, who mourned, who were meek, who sought righteousness above all, who were merciful, pure in heart, and made peace. The kingdom of God would come to them. It was they who were formed by and who would be at home in the kingdom of God. In the beatitudes, accordingly, Jesus proclaimed the kingdom as God's initiative and as his gift. Response in this field of force became a live option. It involved a single-hearted (Matt 5:4,8) desire for God's vindication (Matt 5:3,6). The proper response to God's goodness was wonder and praise. It was the opening of one's heart to God's way. It was the inclination to celebrate God's revelation of salvation. It was to align oneself with the poor, the mourners, the hungry, the peacemakers, the seekers after righteousness.

The disciples participated by anticipation in the future announced by Jesus; they participated immediately in what was becoming effective in Jesus. This makes intelligible why the beatitudes were declarations rather than exhortations. As declarations they had a new and striking character in announcing the coming of the kingdom as effective in the present.⁴⁷ The beatitudes themselves proclaimed and presupposed the kingdom of God (cf. Matt 4:23-25); that is, the gracious initiative of God was already becoming effective in Jesus.

Joachim Jeremias emphasized that for the whole of Jesus' teaching the proclamation of the kingdom was presupposed. In support of his point he cited several examples. One was Jesus' statement, "You are the light of the world" (Matt 5:14). This, in his view, made no sense taken by itself; in their weaknesses and failures the disciples were not all that illuminating. The statement presupposed their relation to Jesus himself as "the light of the world" (cf. John 8:12). Another was Jesus' word, "If you do not forgive men their trespasses, neither will your heavenly Father forgive your trespasses" (Matt 6:15).⁴⁸ This is only properly understood when God's "great debt cancellation" is presupposed as expressed in the parable (Matt 18:35) and indicated in the Lord's prayer. Again, Jesus' call to love one's enemies presupposed the message of God's grace and unbounded goodness. The beatitudes then were not an anxious expression of demands in the face of catastrophe (e.g. Weiss). Rather, for Jesus what was decisive was something quite different: knowledge of the time of salvation.⁴⁹

How then were present and future related in Jesus' announcement of blessing? Did the significance of the announcement depend on the one who made it? As the beatitude on the meek echoed Psalm 37:11, so the beatitude on the "mourning" echoed the prophecy of Isaiah 61:1-3; the mission of the

one sent by God (*mebasser*) was to "comfort all who mourn." Further, the prophet pointed to the coming salvation when the people would "neither hunger nor thirst," instead, there would be joy because the Lord would show compassion for the afflicted (Isa 49:8,10,13). Inasmuch as Jesus, in his mission, brought consolation to the poor, to the hungry, and the grieving, the salvation he promised became effective (cf. Luke 4:21; 7:22) in the present. If the beatitudes had their significance as announcement of eschatological salvation, the disciples were "blessed" precisely because they had accepted this salvation. They had not taken offense, but had received Jesus as the one sent from God (cf. Matt 11:6, 25-27). They could therefore be said to have eyes that see and ears that hear what the prophets and the righteous in past ages had desired but were not privileged to see and hear (Matt 13:16-17).

(b) The proclamation. In Mark's summary (1:14,15) Jesus' gospel proclamation is presented in two parallelisms:

1. "the time is fulfilled/
the kingdom of God is at hand;
2. repent/ and
believe the gospel."

In Jesus' proclamation it is clear that the coming of the kingdom of God did not depend on prior human repentance.⁵⁰ The coming was simply proclaimed. The proclamation linked announcement and command; two parallel announcements are followed by two parallel commands.⁵¹ The relation of announcement to command is not defined, but the sequence suggests dependence. The imperatives "repent" and "believe" make sense in relation to Jesus' announcement. The whole sequence indicated dependence on God's

initiative and action. The grasp of any one part depended on the grasp of the coherent whole.⁵²

On the supposition that the proclamation was simply the announcement of an event to be fulfilled in the immediate future, some have limited response to acceptance of this announcement and expectation of its fulfillment (e.g. Weiss). A variation on this view is that since God fulfills his purpose and acts on behalf of his people there can be no expectation of active human response. This view, however, represents an oversight, for it leaves the relation of the proclamation to the messenger undefined. Only if Jesus' proclamation was grounded in true knowledge of the coming of the kingdom of God, would the commands have validity. The response presupposes that claim to prophetic knowledge.⁵³ The sequence is decisive: the call to repentance corresponds to the dawning of the new time. Second, this quietist view of appropriate response fails to observe that repentance and faith were coordinates. Repentance was defined by faith in the good news. Would repentance have been possible without the trust implied in "believe"? Conversely, would trust in Jesus' good news have been possible without repentance? Was not repentance here the turning of one's life toward a new compass-point? The hearer, it seems, was being invited to reorder his perceptions and commitments. The change of direction (*metanoēite*) took place in conjunction with the emergence of trust in Jesus and his message.⁵⁴ The dependence of this call to repentance on the prior announcement of the kingdom of God follows from the intrinsic connection between repentance and faith in the good news (*metanoēite kai pisteuete en tō euaggeliō*). Response to the good news of the imminence/presence of the kingdom of God was to stake one's life on this good news.

(c) The issue of repentance. The realignment of perception and trust was indeed a response, not an initiative. Appropriate response corresponded to the initiative of God. This was expressed in Jesus' proclamation of the coming of God's kingdom. The ethical dimension of the response was situated in this context.

What was the meaning of repentance in Jesus' teaching? The answer turns in part on how to resolve the conflict between two current views. The first view is that repentance is fundamental in Jesus' teaching; the second, opposite view is that the motif of repentance is conspicuous by its absence from Jesus' preaching. This issue ties in with another: Jesus' association with sinners, and the offence that this created. The initiative toward sinners and the teaching on repentance have been variously construed: (1) Controversy arose because Jesus offered people forgiveness (admission to the kingdom) before requiring repentance, whereas in Judaism forgiveness had been offered to the righteous (i.e. only after proper repentance).⁵⁵ (2) Controversy arose because the call to repentance was directed not only to the wicked but to all. That is, Jesus' call put all on the same level, all needed repentance.⁵⁶ (3) Controversy arose because Jesus did not call for repentance according to the standing requirements of Jewish law and ritual; therefore Jesus was accused of being the friend of tax collectors and sinners.⁵⁷

What place did Jesus in fact give to repentance in his proclamation and teaching? To answer, we must begin with the sense of repentance in Judaism. Because sin was understood as a turning away from God, repentance was the action of turning back from sin to God. Thus, repentance derived its meaning from the relation between God and his people.⁵⁸ It belonged to the sphere of covenant and Torah. Turning to the law came to be identified with

turning to God. The covenantal theme of repentance was the axis on which the book of Jeremiah turned. There was, on the one hand, the lament that Israel had forsaken God for idols (Jer 1:16; 2:13,17,19; 5:7,19 etc.); on the other hand, there was the call to repent or turn to the Lord (Jer 3:12-14,19-22; 36:3,7 etc.).

In Postexilic Judaism repentance had its content and meaning with reference to the law. Indeed, repentance was specified with reference to particular sins understood on the basis of individual commandments (cf. Test R 1:9; Jud 15:4; Jos 6:6). The Psalms of Solomon referred to God's chastening for the purpose of leading the righteous to repentance: "If I sin, Thou chastenest me that I may return (unto Thee)" (16:11). The repentant righteous were those who walked in God's commandments (14:1). They were careful to avoid even the sin of ignorance (3:8). If they did sin they repented and made atonement (3:9; 9:11-15). Ben Sira identified the law with the eternal wisdom of God "which Moses enacted" (24:22-23). Though the exhortations to repentance were given in general terms (e.g. "turn away from iniquity and hate abominations..."), what it meant to "turn to the Lord and forsake your sins" was clearly determined by the law (cf. 5:5-7; 17:24-26). In Jubilees repentance was identified as turning away from "uncleaness" and to "observe the ordinance of the most High God" (21:23). The author of the work looked forward to a time when "the children shall begin to study the laws, and to seek the commandments, and to return to the path of righteousness" (23:26). Repentance as return to the law found emphatic expression in the Qumran Community. To become members of this community was to enter a "covenant of repentance" (CD 19:16). Accordingly, "every man who repents of his corrupted way...return(s) to the Law of Moses" (CD 15: 5-7; 16 1-3). The Eighteen Benedictions also presented repentance

as return to the law. "Cause us to return, O our Father, unto thy Law; draw us near, O our King, unto thy service and bring us back in perfect repentance unto thy presence. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who delightest in repentance."⁵⁹

Repentance, then, has its meaning with reference to the law. The Lord was expected to show "mercy to those who repent and live by his law" (4 Ezra 7:63). In the Isaiah Targum repentance was precisely defined as "return to the law." Bruce Chilton has examined the view of repentance in this Targum.⁶⁰ It regularly and explicitly defined repentance as adherence to the law. The call of God in Isaiah to "wash yourselves" was interpreted as a call to "return to the law" (Isa 1:16,18). As a parallel to the prophet's statement, "My people do not understand," the Targum had "my people have not considered repenting to my law" (1:3; cf. 17:11; 42:14; 57:19).⁶¹ Corresponding to this emphasis on repentance was the emphatic declaration that God's action was responsive (cf. 8:18). This raised the question of how God might be expected to show his initiative in restoring his people.

Now, Jesus did not make his proclamation a refinement of the law (cf. Mark 1:21-22; Matt 7:28). He spoke and acted with an authority uniquely his own. In taking the initiative of table fellowship with sinners he broke through the social form that defined identity within Judaism. Both his proclamation and his action would thus lead us to anticipate that Jesus in some way went beyond the standard call to repentance within Jewish law and ritual. But if there is a difference in the meaning of repentance, the difference is not simply a matter of contrast. What in Judaism and what in Jesus accounts for their collision? If the victory of God's righteousness meant no more or less than the exaltation of the righteous and the putting to shame of the unrighteous in accord with the Torah, this would leave only

one relevant word to sinners: repent. One thing is quite clear: Jesus did something other than reiterate the standard call for repentance.

In Matthew Jesus' proclamation was epitomized in one concise statement, "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand" (4:17). As in Mark, there was a sequence in which announcement and response are interdependent. In the immediate context Jesus' proclamation was precisely identified as "the gospel of the kingdom" (4:23; cf. 24:14; 26:13). Matthew used the same words to summarize the proclamation of Jesus and that of John the Baptist: "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand" (3:2). By itself this leaves the way open to the interpretation that they were the same in their proclamation: the proclamation of an imminent eschatological event.⁶² It is true that both proclaimed the same coming event. Still the differences between John and Jesus were important. John was an ascetic (Mark 1:6; Matt 11:18//Luke 7:33), and his mission was to serve as the precursor for the coming Lord (Matt 3:3); John and his disciples fasted, while Jesus and his disciples celebrated (Mark 2:18-20); Jesus was known as a "wine-bibber and a glutton" (Matt 11:19), and his mission included the extension of forgiveness to sinners (Mark 2:5-12; cf. Luke 4:16-21). John's call was essentially associated with ascetic, penitential practises; the call of Jesus was associated with fellowship (eating and drinking together) in joy of God's gracious initiative. This difference is expressed in terms of a difference in relation to the event proclaimed by both of them (Mark 2:18-20); Jesus is already engaged in the ultimate event of which John was the precursor.⁶³

And this consciousness of participating already in the coming event found explicit expression in Jesus' saying, "the law and the prophets were until John; since then the good news of the kingdom of God is preached"

(Luke 16:16//Matt 11:12,13). Again, the advance beyond John in the eschatological drama present in and through Jesus was highlighted by the note of fulfillment, particularly the emphasis that the "time is fulfilled" (Mark 1:15). The time of waiting for the kingdom had been completed, the time of the kingdom had begun.⁶⁴ This coordination of Jesus' time with the time of fulfillment highlighted the beginning of Jesus' proclamation in all three synoptic accounts (Matt 4:14-17a; Mark 1:14-15; Luke 4:19,21).⁶⁵

This emphasis on fulfillment in Jesus' proclamation distinguished him from John. John announced the imminence of the eschaton; this was surpassed by the note of fulfillment that marked the proclamation of Jesus. Therefore that proclamation was aptly described as "the good news of the kingdom" (Matt 4:23; cf. Mark 1:14b,15b). This correlated the herald of salvation-- "Your God reigns"--with the restoration of Israel (Isa 52:7). The appropriate response was a new orientation in the face of fulfillment. Repentance or conversion took its character from this new situation.⁶⁶

(d) "The Righteous vs. the Sinners" yields to "Accepters vs. Rejecters". Of the two sons called by the father to work in the vineyard one refused but then changed his mind and went, while the other son said he would go but did not (Matt. 21:28-32). The parable turns on the change of thought and action. But repentance with reference to what? Interpreters have been inclined to think that the issue is hypocrisy; that is, the discrepancy between profession and practise, between word and deed. Two possible understandings emerge: (1) their response was a verbal "Yes" to Jesus and a repudiation of that "Yes" in their conduct. But there is no indication that the opponents of Jesus agreed in word with Jesus. (2) Their response was a "Yes" to God's commands as they understood them, but non-observance in actual practise. This second understanding is excluded on two counts.

First, there is clear evidence that the Pharisees took practise (in accord with their own understanding) seriously. And this, in part at least, is confirmed even by the criticism directed to them (cf. Matt 23:23-24). Second, the parable makes clear that their non-observance did not consist of failure in living up to the understanding of their obligation. Their non-performance is set in contrast to the acceptance given by sinners to what Jesus initiated. They gave their "Yes" by word to God but in confronting the eschatological fulfillment of God's will as initiated in Jesus their response became a "No" in fact. Their "Yes" really "amounted to a non-performance of the will of God--not because they failed to perform that to which they had committed themselves, but because that to which they had committed themselves was not the will of God."⁶⁷ Specifically, for Jesus the failure to discern and to follow up the eschatological call of John the Baptist is equated with the refusal of repentance by his critics (Matt 21:31-32).

This provides a well-focused confirmation of the ascertainment reached above: Jesus' call for repentance had its meaning with reference to the kingdom of God. It also raises a new question. Did Jesus accept that basic premise of Judaic moral judgment which distinguished the righteous from the sinners? We may begin by asserting, first of all, that Jesus' mission is directed to all Israel. Jesus' preaching focused on the kingdom of God (Mark 1:14,15), offered to all Israel. Henceforward repentance would have its meaning from proclamation of the kingdom (e.g. Mark 1:15; Matt 21:21-32), which preceded and invited a new response. Second, Jesus' table fellowship with sinners converted God's gracious initiative into action. Often Jesus defended this initiative with parabolic teaching (Luke 15:1-32).

This policy of "defence of mercy" was an effort to win the righteous

over to God's way; at the same time, Jesus warned the righteous that their refusals were blocking their entry into the Kingdom of God (e.g., Matt 21:31). This was an extraordinary turnabout. The crucial division was no longer drawn with reference to law ("the righteous" vs. "the sinners"); it was drawn with reference to Jesus (accepters vs. rejecters). Everything hinged on the response to Jesus. Some of the facets or aspects of this new situation--the call of repentance was directed not only to the "sinners" (i.e. the lawless or wicked); it was directed to all without distinction. Jesus to be sure did distinguish between the righteous and the sinners. This is apparent in his response to criticism of his association with sinners. "Those who are well have no need of a physician, but those who are sick... I came not to call the righteous, but sinners" (Matt 9:12,13//Luke 5:31). The distinction is the basis of the parable of the Two Sons (Matt 21:28-32). From the righteous, as those informed by law and promise, a positive answer might have been expected. In reality it was to be otherwise. The parabolic statements, therefore, also indicate the crisis of this righteousness. The concern of the righteous with the law was now disclosed as a closed system in which the sense of God's mercy was stifled (e.g. Matt 9:12; Mark 7:8-13). Jesus' word and action could not be appropriated within the limits of the system.

How explain this break with standard Judaism? It would seem that Jesus' transcending of the system had its immediate source in his relation to God as Father (e.g. Matt. 11:25-27//Luke 10:21-22). He based his table fellowship with sinners on the need of sinners ("It is not the well but the sick who need a physician," Mark 2:17//Matt 9:12//Luke 5:31), yet more fundamentally and emphatically on the goodness of God (Luke 15:11-32) and his "joy" over the converted sinner.⁶⁸

A third facet of the new situation created by Jesus' prophetic career consisted in a new view of the nearness of the kingdom. As the Baptist made clear, the ordinary economy of Mosaic religion no longer sufficed (cf. Matt 3:7-10//Luke 3:7-9). All Israel was called to repent--righteous as well as sinners (Matt 21:32). John required repentance as readiness for the judgment; Jesus in his proclamation and action summoned people to repent as a response to the kingdom of God. Jesus' proclamation of the kingdom took its point of departure, not from the past but from the future. Thus, a new pattern of living came into view: disconcerting, upsetting, unpredictable. Its foundation was the "repentance" that consisted in the birth of trust in the good news brought by Jesus.⁶⁹ The proclaimer made possible proleptic participation in the kingdom.

A fourth aspect immediately presents itself: one and the same act is both "repentance" and "faith." Repentance was associated with Jesus' proclamation (e.g. Matt 4:17//Mark 1:15; Matt 11:21-24//Luke 10:13-15; Matt 12:38-42//Luke 11:29-32); likewise it was associated with the proclamation of the disciples sharing in the mission of Jesus (Mark 6:12).⁷⁰ The fact that repentance was present in varied forms of teaching (e.g. parables, warnings, historical analogies, editorial summaries) lends support to the authenticity of this teaching. Jesus specifically related the gift of forgiveness to the one coming in faith (Mark 2:5). The authority to forgive sins was confirmed by the word that conveyed healing (Mark 2:11). The "mighty acts" of Jesus constituted part of his mission to Israel. In this way it was evident that he was the one who concretely brought God's help and salvation. Where this design was not recognized the mission of Jesus was misinterpreted,⁷¹ witness the account of the response of the Nazarenes to Jesus (Mark 6:2-6). The people could and did accept the fact of Jesus'

power to do mighty works. But they wanted him to do the kind of "irresistible" works that would spare them the challenge of a decision (cf. Mark 8:11-13). The decisive issue was faith in Jesus as one empowered by God to heal and to save (e.g. Mark 5:36; 9:18-24; 10:46-52). In the case of the Gentile who came to Jesus seeking his help for her daughter the meaning of faith in relation to Jesus stands out. In her persistence she expressed faith in God whose salvation is first for Israel but then also for the Gentiles. As the one sent to Israel Jesus acknowledged this faith (Mark 7:25-30//Matt 15:22-28).⁷² The woman responded with the faith that should have come from Israel (cf. Matt 15:28). Thus Jesus looked to Israel for the response of faith in him as the one sent of God to restore the people of Israel. Forgiveness and healing are part of Jesus' eschatological mission to Israel. This means therefore, at the same time, that Jesus' mission to Israel was a summons to faith and the lack of faith represented a condition that kept Jesus from doing his healing works (Matt 13:58//Mark 6:5,6).⁷³

(e) Appropriate response to Jesus' initiative toward sinners. We have already suggested that the public action of Jesus which most called for an appropriate religious response was Jesus' table fellowship with sinners. He was accused of being "a friend of tax collectors and sinners" (Matt 11:19//Luke 7:34). Numerous gospel texts register the impact this made on contemporary Israel and the intense reactions it set in motion (Mark 2:16-17//Matt 9:11-13//Luke 5:30-32; Matt 11:19; 20:1-16, 21:28-32; Luke 7:41-43; 15:1-32; 19:8).⁷⁴ Dining together expressed a special bond; its violation represented rank betrayal (Ps 41:9). Exclusion from table fellowship signified the repudiation of social ties generally.⁷⁵ By means of table fellowship the distinctions between clean and unclean and between good and evil found concrete social expression.⁷⁶ These distinctions defined one's

identity within Judaism. To contravene them challenged the social order. This is just what Jesus did. The act of initiating table fellowship with sinners was not an incidental development but the vivid translation of Jesus' proclamation into action. Jesus' table fellowship with sinners highlighted God's free initiative. Thus it dramatized the gracious character of the restoration of Israel as Jesus envisaged it.

The parables of the lost sheep and the lost coin (i.e. the one taken from the realm familiar to men, the other from that familiar to women) dramatize the real contours of the event of the conversion of sinners. Their recovery means joy (Luke 15:5; 9-10). Jesus' critics were thus invited to see the meaning of the event. It was a cause for rejoicing. They were themselves invited to share in that rejoicing--a theme particularly evident in the parable of the Prodigal Son. As Jeremias put it: "His hearers were in the position of the elder son who had to decide whether he would accept his father's invitation..." In response to the words of the father to the elder son: "But we had to celebrate and be glad, because your brother was dead and has come back to life; he was lost and is found" (Luke 15:32), the hearer, the righteous man shocked by Jesus' policy had to make his own decision. There is no doubt about what Jesus thought was the appropriate response. It was a change of heart, a change of view, and a change of mood. The sour critic was being invited into joy.

5. Eschatological and Social Dimensions of Jesus' Ethics.

If the twentieth-century effort to retrieve the eschatological ethics of the historical Jesus has often failed for want of concreteness, can we specify exactly what has been missing and move to supply those missing elements?

Lack of adequate concreteness in dealing with historical-Jesus questions and notably with those questions that most directly and immediately bear on his purposes and on the very concrete terms in which he conceived them has bedevilled the work of even the most outstanding scholars. Bultmann, Manson, Jeremias, Kümmel, Schnackenburg, Schürmann, and others have concurred--whatever their disagreements in other areas--in overlooking or underestimating the interaction of aims and responses. Their common tendency has been to exclude the prospect that Jesus might have taken fully into account negative responses to his proclamation on the part of individuals, groups, whole villages, and so forth. To be sure, all of them took notice of the prominent and varied synoptic data on negative response to Jesus. Jeremias gathered together materials on Jesus' warnings against the lack of appropriate response.⁷⁷ Schürmann proposed that, as the situation of indifference in the face of approaching judgment grew more desperate, Jesus dispatched seventy disciples to launch a last appeal to every sector of the country.⁷⁸ Still, these scholars as well as the others listed above took Jesus' intention to be the winning of the allegiance of all Israel, without asking how Jesus might have adjusted and achieved his purpose despite the failure of all Israel to respond positively to him.

This prospect, however, was fully conscious on the part of Jesus, witness the parable of the Sower. Though much of the seed does not take root and grow, the harvest comes in its fullness! Jesus was acutely aware of the diversity of response to him. He attended to those who rejected his summons by urging, again and again, that they stood in dreadful danger. He attended to those who accepted his summons by spelling out the new mode of life into which they were entering. Though he occasionally confronted his critics with specifics of his ethical teaching (e.g., Mark 10:1-12//Matt

19:1-12), he generally reserved this teaching for his followers. In the end it could only have been intelligible to them and could only have been meant for them.

This discerning choice met the diversity of response to Jesus' call in the most realistic fashion. It did not signify the retraction or contraction of the summons to all Israel. But inattention to the realism of Jesus has confused the issue of "audience" for his ethical teaching. Contrary to Manson, Bultmann, and Perrin,⁷⁹ neither his proclamation nor his teaching was addressed to the isolated individual in Israel. Contrary to the suppositions of Oepke, Schnackenburg, and others,⁸⁰ it was not addressed to all Israel, regardless of their response to Jesus' proclamation. His ethics was indeed an ethics for society, but the society in question was the Israel that was coming into being in and through positive responses to the eschatological call of God. Jesus' ethics was a code of discipleship for restored Israel.

A second concrete factor is the correlation of messianic ethics with Jesus' eschatological perspective. Extremist views on the eschatology of Jesus (e.g., the wholly unrealized, exclusively futurist eschatology hypothesized by Schweitzer, and the wholly realized, non-futurist eschatology proposed by Dodd in his writings of the 1930s) are irrelevant here. Most efforts to retrieve Jesus' eschatological perspective occupy the middle ground between these extremes, affirming two factors in tension: the "already" or realized factor and the "not yet" or future factor. Some (e.g. W.G. Kümmel) tended to overaccentuate the "not yet"⁸¹ and others (e.g. T.W. Manson, John W. Bowman)⁸² to overaccentuate the "already." The truly centrist position of Schnackenburg, Jeremias, Beasley-Murray and many others has defined itself by acknowledging a) that the kingdom of God in the full

sense of the term has yet to come; (b) that the reign of God has nevertheless already become operative and effective in the career of Jesus; and (c) that the second is intrinsically ordered to the first and that the first has the second as the condition of its possibility.

If the kingdom of God becomes effective in history through Jesus this makes possible in the midst of history the anticipation of the kingdom of God. But this anticipation is not yet identical with the complete reign of God. If Jesus in his mission and destiny represents the coming kingdom of God the abstract alternatives of present and future are transcended. In his solidarity with sinners Jesus brought forgiveness and thus reconciliation in new community. In the same way the ethics corresponding to the kingdom transcend the conventional pattern of life but have their place within the conditions of history. The coming of the kingdom signified the resurrection of the dead and the judgment, and "when they rise from the dead, they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are like the angels in heaven" (Mark 12:25//Matt 22:30//Luke 20:35). With the coming of the consummation of history (the kingdom of God in the formal, full, and final sense of the term) there would no longer be any place for ethics as such.⁸³

The place of the ethics of Jesus was neither the situation prior to John and Jesus nor the situation of final consummation. It was the interim between the inauguration of Jesus' independent mission and the coming in fullness of the kingdom he proclaimed. With respect to the past of historical Israel this interim, which supposed the election, covenant, and law of Israel, was new and climactic. With respect to the future, it was a beginning founded on the proclamation of Jesus and ordered to, anticipating, tending toward the longed-for consummation of time.

Jesus, then, prescribed an ethics for the life of a community living in expectation of the eschatological future. Indeed, the ethics was the anticipation in the life of the community of that eschatological future in the present. The ethics have their meaning only if this future is initiated and anticipated in the present. All Israel was summoned to constitute this community, but only the accepters of Jesus actually did so. His ethics corresponded to the structure of his eschatology; and it took fully into account the opposition of rejecters. Let the parable of the Wheat and the Weeds make this twofold point.

The parable accents the presence of the kingdom beginning with Jesus in the face of a reality regularly understood as a negation of the presence of the kingdom (i.e. the presence of evil) (Matt 13:24-30). In this parable, as in other parables of growth, the sowing corresponds to the initiation of the saving reign of God in the word and deed of Jesus.⁸⁴ Sowing and harvest call attention to the present and the future of the kingdom of God.⁸⁵ Response does not take the form of waiting simply for the coming of a future event but of participation in the kingdom of God beginning in the ministry of Jesus to be revealed at the end in glory.

To understand the kingdom only as an end-of-the-world event is to miss completely the point of Jesus' teaching on the kingdom in this parable. For present along with the kingdom of God are also other powers ("an enemy has done this" 13:28). The kingdom becoming effective in the face of evil makes appropriate response a critical choice and challenge. Jesus in his mission reckoned with the power of evil. Appropriate response will also reckon with the reality of evil. The statement on the opposition of evil is in accord with the saying that the kingdom of God is the object of violent attack (Matt 11:12). Jesus understood his work in terms of conflict with evil

powers (cf. Matt 12:28; 3:27). The parable spotlights this problem of evil ("weeds among the wheat" 13:25).⁸⁶ The question of the presence of evil becomes critical precisely on the understanding that the kingdom of God has become effective in the present. It is the ground of John the Baptist's question to Jesus; if Jesus is indeed the Coming One then why is Herod allowed to carry on his evil work? The purpose of the parable is to point to the fact that, along with the incursion of God's kingdom in Jesus' activity, an enemy opposing the work of God is also at work.

To this problem the command "let both grow together until the harvest" presents a distinctive solution. It is different from that offered by any of Jesus' contemporaries because it is based on a different understanding of the kingdom and of the time in which they stood. It presupposes that the gracious initiative of God was indeed operative in Jesus and that his mission was not to mediate the judgment of God but the redemptive powers of the kingdom. Hence his appeal for the reverse of separation from sinners: he extended to them the divine compassion and the opportunity to participate in the kingdom.⁸⁷ Nevertheless, this is not the final stage. To participate in the kingdom is to anticipate the end of evil and the vindication of God's righteousness.

This response must reckon with the power of evil in the present. But there is a strong sense of assurance that supports response. As the kingdom of God has begun, despite the powers of evil, just so the end will bring the triumph of the kingdom. Response therefore corresponds to a reality begun, and to participate in it is at the same time to anticipate the future fulfillment that is to come. For the kingdom is enacted in the grace and patience of God; conduct that corresponds to it participates in this spirit of grace and patience to others. This patience gives opportunity for the

hitherto unresponsive to respond to the initiative of God. The parable calls for faith and patience in confronting evil: God has initiated his kingdom and will bring the problem of evil to full resolution in judgment at the end.

The basic structure of the response is clear. It gains its distinctive character from the reality of the kingdom. It is shaped by the fact that the kingdom has come into effect in the ministry of Jesus in anticipation of the fullness of God's righteousness to be revealed at the end. The parables are designed to create the anticipation of the new; they aim to take people beyond the understandings and expectations of the past. The heart of parable is metaphor and the purpose of metaphor is to challenge the hearer to a new apprehension of reality.⁸⁸ It is the nature of the parable to provoke active thought so that the listener may become a participant in the parable's sphere of meaning.⁸⁹ That is, the parable has one purpose: to lead people to actively participate in the "secret of the kingdom of God." Thus the parables open up new possibilities for and set out the contours of appropriate response.

We conclude with a swift outline of the kind of community that Jesus envisaged and sought to shape by his teaching. This community would be most fundamentally defined by its living in acknowledgement of the goodness and power of God revealed in Jesus and by living in expectation of God's kingdom first in judgment, then in the fullness of glory.

Jesus accordingly envisaged a community formed and informed by response to the kingdom of God. This, and not simply some directive, grounds the love of the neighbor (including the enemy), because that is the way God is revealed in Jesus. This, and no dreamer's confidence in the natural goodness of people or refinement of society, enables the perseverance and

confidence of the disciple. On the one hand this provides an orientation that would put aside as trivial or irrelevant the quarrels and grudges that had hitherto dogged everyday life (Luke 12:57-59//Matt 5:24-26; Matt 5:39-42//Luke 6:29-30); a society that in faith and repentance would find the resources to deal with offense through forgiveness that might otherwise generate hatred and erupt in vengeance and murder (Matt 5:22, 39-42//Luke 6:29-30); a society that would abolish the artificially created and shabbily treated depressed classes of the "little" (*mikroi, elachistoi*) including in principle women (Mark 10:1-12//Matt 19:1-12) and children (Matt 10:42; Mark 9:42//Matt 18:6; Matt 19:10, 14).

The enabling condition of a community so dealing with its conflicts was allegiance to Jesus himself (Matt 10:37-39//Luke 14:26-27) and to the God who has--now above all, in the face of approaching judgment--shown himself to be "Father." Yet the piety of this community would be secret, not ostentatious (Matt 6:3-6, 17-18). This would be a community that had learned the great secret of reconciliation: forgiveness. (As we shall see in the next chapter, the prayer that Jesus taught his disciples would underscore such themes.) A community that made mutual forgiveness its watchword and, moreover, cherished the ideal of forgiving even enemies would indeed be a beacon to the world (Matt 5:14). A community shaped by these commands and prescriptions expressive of the kingdom of God would, like a city on a hill (Matt 5:14), orient the traveler; more, it would be messianic Zion drawing the whole world to itself.⁹⁰

The empirical society that was the Israel of Jesus' time presented a viable but more or less crass everyday world of injustice and widespread resentment, of dispute and litigation, of economic disorder routinely sanctioned by those in positions of wealth and power. This society was

divided by the phenomenon of Jesus himself. Before the resolution of the looming *nisyônā'* (=the eschatological "test" or "ordeal"), the division over Jesus and his followers would disrupt families, setting a man against his father and daughter against mother (Matt 10:35//Luke 12:53).

As his career carried him forward to a confrontation with religious authority in Jerusalem, Jesus clearly saw that the community formed and informed by him was headed for a future like his own. In accord with the prospect of his own destiny, he foresaw hatred and persecution for them. These appeared most emphatically in the esoteric instruction, but they were also directed to the larger circle of Jesus' following (e.g., Mark 8:34-9:1//Matt 16:24-28//Luke 9:23-27). Nevertheless, this "little flock" (Luke 12:32) should not fear, for God was preparing a future of splendour for them: in this remnant of Israel he would bring to fulfillment the restoration promised in the prophets.

JESUS' MESSIANIC MISSION

If the purpose of Jesus was the eschatological restoration of Israel (and with that the salvation of people from the nations, cf. Matt 8:11), how was his mission to achieve that purpose and how was his destiny related to that purpose? The proclamation and the activity of Jesus created definite expectations (e.g. Matt 20:20-24//Mark 10:35-41; John 6:15). But this proclamation and this activity of Jesus did not yet reveal the inner connection between this purpose and his destiny. The course of his destiny as he envisaged it remained in important respects a puzzle even to his disciples. It is at this point that the esoteric teaching takes up its pivotal place. By means of this teaching Jesus invited his disciples to grasp his words and acts as a whole and, in particular, the deep and far-ranging significance that he attached to his personal destiny. Each of the synoptic gospels has its own distinctive structure, but all three present Jesus' word on his destiny as the beginning of a distinct and final phase in his teaching and in his career. The event that opened this final stage was Caesarea Philippi: Simon Peter's confession of Jesus as "the Messiah." And in each account, the word on Jesus' destiny stands in close correlation with the call to discipleship (Matt 16:13-28//Mark 8:27-38//Luke 9:18-27).

This complex of messiahship, destiny, and discipleship suggests a definite strategy of inquiry. It calls first for an examination of the distinction between Jesus' public proclamation and teaching and the more intimate teaching within the circle of his disciples. Both the purpose and the authenticity of the esoteric teaching are at issue in the modern study

of the gospels. Secondly, if Jesus himself made the disciples' acknowledgement of his messiahship a condition of the esoteric teaching that followed, what was the rationale of this strategy? Thirdly, there is the critical issue of the relation between the good news of the kingdom of God and--at the heart of the esoteric teaching--the suffering and expiatory death of Jesus. The public teaching concentrates on the kingdom of God, the esoteric teaching on the destiny of Jesus. The public teaching presents the gracious forgiveness of sin to all who turn to God, the esoteric teaching presents Jesus' death of atonement for sin. How account for this difference? Is the meaning of the kingdom-of-God proclamation opposed to the meaning of the teaching on the destiny of Jesus? Or is there an intelligible coherence between them? And finally, if "kingdom of God" is now taken up and defined anew in Jesus' destiny, what does this mean for discipleship (and the ethical dimension of response)?

I The Authenticity and Purpose of Jesus' Esoteric Teaching

We have noted that Jesus offered his disciples private explication of public teaching from the beginning of his ministry (e.g., Mark 4:10-20, 34; 7:17-23). Nevertheless, according to all four gospels there is a particular context for the core of Jesus' esoteric teaching. This is the explication of messiahship as issuing in repudiation, suffering, death and resurrection (Mark 8:27-33; Matt 16:13-23; Luke 9:18-22; John 6:61-65; 12:23,24; 14:1-7). The aim in this section is to deal with the setting for the esoteric traditions (gospel texts depicting Jesus alone or Jesus alone with the disciples) and Jesus' esoteric teaching (teaching reserved for his disciples).

What accounts for the oversight or the rejection of the idea that Jesus made a distinction between public teaching and esoteric teaching? First, concentration on Jesus as teacher, apart from the context of his life and death, will itself inevitably result in generalizing the teaching. Apart from the context of his mission and destiny the teaching will be presented within the framework of some formula or concept; to be consistent Jesus must have the same message in much the same terms for everyone.¹ Second, if the difference between Jesus' public teaching and the esoteric teaching is converted into a lack of coherence between the two forms of teaching, this leads inevitably to a discounting of one or the other. Third, Jesus' more intimate teaching to the disciples as we have it in the gospels is regularly ascribed to the post-Easter community. The guiding assumption for this move is that Jesus' self-understanding was non-Messianic; but that this view of Jesus was derived from the post-Easter faith of the church, and the gospels were cast to reflect this faith (this will be examined in the next section).² If the key elements of the esoteric teaching are transposed into the context of the Christian community, this eliminates it as a category in Jesus' teaching. Nevertheless, the form-critical effort to locate the various elements of gospel tradition in terms of occasion and function in the life of the church does not necessarily entail the denial that Jesus was the ultimate source for these traditions. Therefore, the elements of esoteric tradition are appropriately judged in the light of their coherence with what we know of the life and destiny of Jesus.

But what in Jesus' life and destiny supplies the rationale for the esoteric teaching? The public activity of Jesus in proclamation, teaching, healing, reconciling of notorious sinners inevitably prompted the question, "who then is this?" (e.g. Mark 2:7-12; 41//Luke 8:25). What place does

this man have, or claim to have, in the scripturally attested eschatological purpose of God (Mark 8:27-29)? The synoptic gospels represent Jesus as offering these disciples private explanation of public teaching at key moments in his ministry. On the one hand, the gospels furnish abundant evidence that Jesus had a clear awareness of the kinds and degrees of responsiveness to him on the part of his hearers (e.g. Mark 8:18; Matt 13:15-16/Luke 10:23-24). A striking example of this occurs in the saying which the Synoptic redactions connected with Jesus' use of parables (Mark 4:11-12//Matt 13:11-13//Luke 9:10). Here the tradition differentiates between "you" (the twelve disciples and those about him with the twelve) and those outside (*hoi exō*, v. 11). Essentially, the distinction is between two groups: those around Jesus who receive "the secret of the kingdom of God" and "those outside" to whom everything is enigma, or who, at any rate, do not get any further than the parables (4:11).³ To the first group of hearers Jesus both speaks and explains his parables. This accords with their understanding "the secret of the reign of God."⁴ If the intention of Jesus was to reveal fully the secret of the kingdom of God, the esoteric teaching achieves this intention. But there is more to this matter. The proper response to this full revelation is a total and totally positive response. The *raison d'être* of the esoteric teaching is precisely this response.

Furthermore, Jesus' choosing of the twelve disciples itself is a condition that provides strong warrant for the expectation of an esoteric teaching. To choose these men to be "with him" put them in a special position to learn from Jesus (cf. Mark 3:13-19). The fact that they were sent out to participate in Jesus' own mission to preach, heal, and teach presupposes that Jesus would seek to lead them into the fullest measure of

understanding possible of that mission (i.e. conditioned by their readiness and the stage of his ministry).⁵ The twelve disciples had a special place in Jesus' purpose; and this purpose at the same time related them in mission to the crowd (*ochlos*). In the gospels this "crowd" refers, for the most part, to people who were much more than an amorphous group of bystanders. The disciples received the special training and preparation in order to extend this mission (i.e. to the crowd, Matt 9:35-10:16). This "crowd" (*ochlos*) itself has a very significant role in the events of the gospel. Of course the word could also be used to refer to a hostile company (e.g. Mark 15:11,15), and on occasion to a group of casual onlookers (Mark 5:24,27,30,31; 12:41). But in the majority of cases these "crowds" demonstrated strong interest and even a measure of commitment to Jesus.⁶ They are often described as following him (Matt 4:25; 8:1; 12:15; 14:13; Mark 2:13; 3:8-9; 4::1; 5:21; 6:34,45; 7:14;17;33; 8:1,2; 10:1-2,46). They recognized Jesus' authority and heard his teaching (Matt 7:28; 8:18-22;9:8,33; 15:31; Mark 2:12; 3:32-34; 4:1; 7:,14; 10:1; 11:18,32; 12:12,37). They glorified God for the redemption of Israel (Matt 9:8; Matt 15:31//Mark 7:37). They accepted Jesus as a prophet (Matt 21:11,26,46). They hailed him as Son of David (Matt 12:23; Matt 21//Mark 11:9). It was this crowd that the rulers feared (Mark 11:18,32; 12:12) because of their numbers, certainly, but also because of the measure of acceptance they were giving to Jesus' teaching (Mark 11:18,32; 12:35-37).

The significance of this "crowd" should not be overlooked. Their attachment to him and the readiness to hear him as the authorized spokesman of God's Kingdom is clearly part of the correlation for understanding the hostility to Jesus among the Jewish leaders (i.e. it is an important factor in making the response of these leaders intelligible). For our purposes, to

define the character of this crowd makes intelligible in large part Jesus' call, teaching, and sending out of the disciples.⁷ The disciples and the crowd often stand in close relation as hearers of Jesus' teaching (e.g., Mark 4:1,2,10; 8:34).

Interpretation has always taken some account of "audience" in Jesus' teaching, but the one who first clearly related diversity in Jesus' teaching and vocabulary to diverse audiences was T.W. Manson. In "matter and method the teaching of Jesus is conditioned by the nature of the audience."⁸ He identified three different groups of hearers to be distinguished in Jesus' teaching: the opponents (e.g. scribes and Pharisees), the disciples, and the general public. The most important result was the differentiation that pointed up the existence of an esoteric tradition in the synoptic gospels that had as its main themes the identity and destiny of Jesus and the events of the eschatological crisis and its resolution.⁹ Others, such as Paul Minear, have built on the work of Manson and further refined the process of audience criticism. Once the assumption is made in form criticism that much of the material is created in "typical situations" as a function of some need in the church the context for sayings of Jesus is generally assumed to be secondary (or simply editorial).¹⁰ Even if it were the case that the context is generally secondary, this would not provide license for the determination of the original meaning of a saying in isolation from the context. For the editorial pattern not only reveals the intention of the gospel writer but may also point to the meaning of the saying in the earlier tradition from which it was derived. The immediate context therefore remains a matter of considerable importance.¹¹

At this point form criticism is simply inadequate. At issue is the formation and character of the gospel records. As a whole the question is

not yet settled, but certain points have been clarified and established. The aim of the gospels is to present concrete narratives about Jesus. But if we turn to the other writings of the New Testament we can say with equal certainty that the contrary holds: their aim is clearly not to present concrete traditions about Jesus. Outside the gospels we do not find substantial narrative traditions about Jesus; inside the gospels we have complete texts, not just essential points.¹² As Sanders has observed, in combination these two points serve to undermine the basic form-critical position that much of the gospel material had its origin in "typical situations" in response to diverse needs in the church. What we have is ethical instruction without narrative about Jesus, as in James, and much narrative about Jesus which would serve the purpose of ethical instruction (especially in Matthew), but no evidence that the need for ethical instruction led to the creation of narrative about Jesus.¹³ For activities such as exhortation and apologetic the church needed primarily points and not necessarily the reading of complete narratives.¹⁴ This breaks through in certain important respects the view developed in form criticism on the origin of the gospel material; particularly it means that audience identification in a narrative is present for serious consideration as part of the narrative. The work of Minear reveals that there is a large measure of agreement and continuity in the gospels with respect to audience identification in relation to Jesus' teaching.¹⁵ Indeed, Baird proposed that the tradition of audience identification is one of the most stable elements in the synoptics.¹⁶

This tradition of audience identification does not stand by itself. Often the content gives a clear indication about the audience to whom a particular saying or teaching was addressed. It is evident, for example, from the content that controversies were carried on with opponents and that

the instructions for messengers were given to the disciples.¹⁷ Indeed, the distinction between public teaching and private explanation is intrinsic to certain teachings. Jesus' teaching about clean and unclean in Mark 7 reflects this in corresponding to an early rabbinic pattern of teaching. This is a pattern that involves 1) a question put by an outsider, 2) a reply sufficient for him but not revealing the deeper truth, 3) the request of the disciples, and 4) the full explanation to the circle of disciples.¹⁸ Similarly, Jesus' question designed to focus the meaning of his own mission is first appropriately asked in the circle of the disciples (Mark 8:27-30). More important, to link messianic mission with repudiation, suffering, and death involved so complete a revolution in thought that it could meaningfully and properly only be disclosed to those with a large measure of loyalty and understanding (i.e. the disciples, cf. Mark 9:31). Thus the esoteric teaching is decisively conditioned by Jesus' anticipation and disclosure of messianic destiny in suffering rejection and death, and the anticipation of vindication from God (e.g. Mark 8:30,31; 10:38-39//Luke 12:49,50). But this is already to speak of the matter at the heart of the esoteric teaching: the messiahship and mission of Jesus.

II The Content of the Esoteric Teaching

We cannot expect to understand the esoteric teaching without examining what is explicitly presupposed in this teaching, namely the recognition and acknowledgement of Jesus as the Messiah.

Since the appearance of William Wrede's work on the messianic secret in 1901, the hypothesis that messiahship was first attributed to Jesus only after his death has had a wide following.¹⁹ Certain data respecting the death of Jesus have, however, seemed to call for the articulation of

messiahship at the time of Jesus' trial. These data include, first, the messianic connotations of the riddle on the destruction of the sanctuary and the building of a new one in three days (Mark 14:58//Matt 26:61; John 2:19; cf. Mark 15:29//Matt 27:40; cf. Acts 6:14), for the building of the sanctuary was a kingly prerogative and, as a Qumran text (4QFlor 1-13) suggests, a probably messianic prerogative.²⁰ Other crucial data: the symbolic entry into Jerusalem and cleansing of the temple;²¹ the symbolic mockeries in the the passion story such as the purple cloak and crown of thorns; and, above all, the *titulus* on the cross. Thus, N.A. Dahl urged that Jesus had to have been accused of pretention to messiahship to explain the details of his suffering and death.²²

More recently, Marinus de Jonge (for his own set of reasons relating to Mark 1-8)²³ and R.A. Horsley and J.S. Hanson (largely established on the distinct basis of data related to the messianic issue in Josephus)²⁴ have opened up a new position favorable to the attribution of messiahship to Jesus during his public career.

This view had already been urged by many scholars and, though many aspects of the esoteric teaching of Jesus would be intelligible without resolving the issue of Jesus' messiahship or messianic consciousness, the convergence of probabilities underscored by Dahl, Hengel, de Jonge, et al. seem to me to favour a positive resolution of the issue. That is, I shall proceed on the basis of the view that Jesus, in fact, understood himself to be the messianic Son of God (2 Sam 7:14 in the light of 4QFlor 1-13; Ps 2:7; 89:27; 110:3; cf. Mark 14:61-62a//Matt 26:63-64a; Luke 22:70-71).

1. Messiahship: Peter's Confession at Caesarea Philippi

To elucidate the relations between Jesus' messiahship and his mission, we will examine several texts in the esoteric teaching, notably Peter's messianic confession (Matt 16:16-20//Mark 8:27-30//Luke 9:18-21) and the following tie between messiahship and a destiny of repudiation and violent death (Matt 16:21-23//Mark 8:31-33//Luke 9:22).

Crucial to the whole pericope is the initiative of Jesus in putting the opening question: "Who do men say that I am?" The significance of this question was to relate Jesus in a specific way to Israel's history of promise and fulfillment. Jesus' question was asked in pursuit of one crucial point: an answer to the question of the sense and significance of Jesus' work. "Identification by reference to Israel's eschatology was meant to illuminate the final meaning of words and actions already interpreted as signs of the eschaton."²⁵ Thus in putting his question to the disciples Jesus was at the same time putting a question about his eschatological mission: "Who do you say that I am?" The answer would supply the key to his purpose: the messianic task of building the house of God (2 Sam 7:13-14; 1 Chron 17:12-13; Hag 1:1-2; 2:20-23; Zech 6:12-13; cf. Mark 14:58//Matt 26:61).

To build the house of God was, in effect, to bring about the restoration of Israel. Messiahship, in other words, merely expressed what we have already taken to be the purpose of Jesus. At this point Jesus emphatically went beyond the popular messianism of the time.

A study of the rise of popular messianic movements before and after the time of Jesus has confirmed the plausibility of a statement like that in John 6:15 in which the Galilean crowd determined "to make him king."²⁶ Indeed, groups of Jewish peasants informed by popular memory of distant

ancestors like David and other anointed figures would form around figures whom they acclaimed king with the aim of gaining independence and the re-establishment of a just social order in society.²⁷ Still more significant is the reflection of M. de Jonge on the use of "anointed" in contemporary Jewish sources and its relation to the acts leading up to Caesarea Philippi and the confession of Peter.²⁸

The first and foundational element to be ranged under the heading "the content of the esoteric teaching" is the role of Jesus as long-awaited Messiah. We call this not only first but foundational because--to use the language of Bonhoeffer--Jesus the Messiah is the "form" on the basis of which the "formation" of the disciples will proceed.

Whenever [the Scriptures] speak of forming they are concerned only with the one form which has overcome the world, the form of Jesus Christ. Formation can only come from this form.²⁹

Bonhoeffer's view exactly reflects the esoteric teaching of Jesus. It was the revelation of Jesus' messianic destiny--

the Son of man must suffer many things and be rejected by the elders and the chief priests and the scribes and be killed...(Mark 8:31; cf. Matt 16:21//Luke 9:22)--

that would give shape to the final and most distinctive teaching of Jesus.

Many scholars have attempted to relate the kingdom of God and the destiny of Jesus. Jesus, according to Schweitzer, believed, on the basis of Jewish apocalyptic, that the ordeal of the end-time must precede the coming of the kingdom of God; he accordingly determined to bear the weight of the ordeal himself, and thus usher in the kingdom of God. "He must suffer for others...that the kingdom might come."³⁰ Dodd, who found the view of Schweitzer unacceptable, offered an alternative: the proclamation of Jesus

was an announcement of the presence of the kingdom and the works of Christ represented this presence itself. It followed that the death and resurrection of Jesus fell within the kingdom, representing God's ultimate triumph over all opposing powers.

Bultmann was simply negative on the relation between kingdom of God and Jesus' destiny and has been influential on this point. He found no evidence in the gospel texts of Jesus' death as the fulfillment of his work. One of his last contributions states his view concisely:

This execution can hardly be understood as the necessary consequence of his work; it happened rather through a misunderstanding of his work as a political action. Historically speaking, therefore, it was a fate without significance. Whether or how Jesus found a meaning in it we cannot know.³¹

More recently, the question of the relation between Jesus' eschatological proclamation and his destiny has found clear focus in the debate between Anton Vögtle and Rudolf Pesch. For some years Pesch has been dealing with Jesus' understanding of his death. Vögtle, emphasizing Jesus' public proclamation of the kingdom of God, has always questioned the coherence between the good news of the kingdom of God and the teaching on Jesus' destiny.³² In general, Vögtle's argument is that Jesus proclaimed the good news of forgiveness or salvation in the kingdom of God for all who would repent. If the atoning death of the Messiah was the basis on which God would bestow these gracious gifts, this would have had to be a key feature of the proclamation. Further, if Jesus had come to hold the concept at some point in his ministry, he would have modified his message to incorporate this important change. But there is no indication of any such modification of his teaching.³³

The argument has been taken up and refined by Vögtle's student Peter Fiedler, who finds it impossible to accept the idea that Jesus, after

preaching the triumphant love of God and his sovereign will to forgive, would in the face of his death come to the conviction that he must renounce this message and believe instead that God willed his death as expiatory sacrifice. According to Fiedler, the clear implication would be that God was not so generous or so sovereign in his grace as Jesus had earlier taught; that now God required an atonement. Thus Jesus' proclamation of the kingdom of God and his atoning death are held to be irreconcilable.

The response of Pesch to the view that Jesus' death of atonement is historically incompatible with God's unconditional mercy expressed in the proclamation of the kingdom of God is illuminating. He begins with John the Baptist and with Jesus' new post-Johannite proclamation of the good news of salvation even for notorious sinners. Jesus' offer was free, but this free gift called for response; it was not merely optional for Israel. On the contrary, the gracious proclamation was simultaneously a radical demand. On it hinged the status of Israel. A question that cannot have been remote for Jesus himself was: what would be the result, should Israel reject him as the representative of God's eschatological salvation? The good news risked turning into condemnation. Was the mediator of eschatological salvation to become, in effect, the mediator of eschatological ruin for Israel?³⁴

Pesch sees Jesus' understanding of this conflict epitomized in the parable of the wicked tenants (Mark 12:1-9). What was to be the fate of those who would reject the last messenger of God? What could be done for the refuser in this situation of refusal? Pesch locates the resolution of this issue in the perseverance of Jesus in his mission as a saving mission into death itself, intending his death as expiatory for Israel.³⁵

So far from competing with the good news of the kingdom of God, this intention maintained it against the grave consequences otherwise entailed by

Israel's refusal. Conceived biblically, expiation was not a "demand" incompatible with "grace"; it was pure grace. Jesus' kingdom-of-God proclamation and the meaning of his death were not only compatible but interdependent. Moreover, the intention of Jesus respecting his death generated a new consequence of its own: the institution of the new covenant.³⁶

On the major issue (whether Jesus' death of atonement is incompatible with his kingdom-of-God proclamation), Pesch quite clearly has the better of the argument with Vögtle. Vögtle's reconstruction of the conditions that would have had to obtain if Jesus' esoteric instruction on his death was historical has an almost fanciful character, whereas Pesch's argument has a concreteness of observation that cannot fail to impress the reader. The point of this swift review of the much debated question of how the esoteric teaching of Jesus on his destined death relates to his public proclamation of the kingdom is to make intelligible the stand taken here on (a) the historicity of the esoteric teaching, (b) its radical coherence with Jesus' proclamation, and (c) its importance in the whole universe of Jesus' ethical teaching.

2. Messiahship and the Ethics of Discipleship

If the kingdom of God was initiated and defined through the repudiation, suffering and death of Jesus, this in turn shaped the appropriate response of the disciple. The meaning of discipleship was thus correlated with the way in which Jesus would fulfill his destiny. This relationship between Jesus' destiny and the meaning of discipleship found repeated expression in esoteric instruction of the disciples (e.g. Mark

8:34-38=Matt 16:24-27//Luke 9:23-26; Mark 9:30-32; Matt 17:22-23//Luke 9:43-45; Mark 10:32-34//Matt 20:17-19//Luke 18:31-34; Mark 10:35-45//Matt 20:20-28; cf. Luke 22:24-27; John 12:23-26). Consequently, what followed the explication of Messiahship amounted almost to a new call to discipleship: "If any man would follow me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and so follow me" (Mark 8:34-38//Matt 16:24//Luke 9:23).³⁷ To "follow" Jesus was to be willing to suffer with him; how difficult it was to understand this is evident from the uncomprehending response of Peter, who spoke for the disciples (Mark 8:32//Matt 16:22). Therefore, at this juncture especially, the disciples were challenged to reorder their whole scheme of values--their perception and trust and hope. Discipleship was to be understood only in relation to Jesus and his destiny.

What then did it concretely mean to "follow" (*akolouthein*) Jesus? Was it to "imitate him"? To join with him and do as he did (i.e. participate in his ministry, cf. Mark 3:14-15)? Surely there was some connection between following, imitation, and discipleship; but the scope of "following" is not immediately obvious. Martin Hengel³⁸ and Hans-Dieter Betz³⁹ have attempted to clarify the matter in ways that are flatly incompatible. Betz's reference to the mystery religions at this point turns on an assumption of non-historicity with reference to this word of Jesus (Mark 8:34//Matt 16:24//Luke 9:23). My own effort to understand the call to "follow" Jesus is more closely aligned with that of Hengel.

The two notions of "following" and "imitation" are reciprocally defining. We may begin with a simple recognition. "Following" is in the Gospels most often correlated with discipleship (e.g. Matt 8:19//Luke 9:57; Matt 8:21-22//Luke 9:59-60; Matt 10:38//Luke 9:61; Mark 1:18; 2:14; 6:1; 10:28,32).⁴⁰ Since Jesus represented a "new eschatological teaching,"

discipleship to him became possible only in association with him and taking up his way. Jesus gave discipleship his own stamp.

There already existed in Judaism a close relationship between teachers and pupils. But beyond that, there were at least three characteristics of discipleship to Jesus that marked it off from Jewish forms: (1) the disciple did not decide to follow on the basis of personal initiative; he was called or chosen by the sovereign word of Jesus; (2) the Old Testament was no longer the central focus of Jesus' message and so for the learning of the disciple; when he did make use of scripture and the forms of his age (e.g. parable, wisdom sayings) they were used to express a new eschatological content; (3) the association with the master was not provisional (i.e., until such a time as the student himself becomes a master) but permanent.⁴¹ This gave a particular character to "following" Jesus.

Concretely, the following of Jesus entailed the disregarding or "denial" of self. The core of self-denial was the disowning of any claim urged by the self. Self-denial was not merely the denial of things to the self (i.e. in asceticism or self-discipline). As a preliminary definition, self-denial was the maintenance of loyalty to God even if as a result life would be threatened by the persecutor. This was the ultimate expression of self-denial.⁴²

The link of "following" and self-denial is caught in the image of the cross. The reference to the cross would be clear and vivid since crucifixion was then a common Roman form of punishment. The command to take up the cross is, however, ambiguous. Was the point of the command to cultivate a readiness for martyrdom? Perhaps. At the same time, in the light of early Christian experience, at least a partly metaphorical meaning

is indicated. This metaphorical dimension of the command is suggested by its parallel with self-denial and confirmed by the concluding imperative to "follow me." This recapitulates the action in which denial of self and cross-bearing express themselves.⁴³

Thus, to follow Jesus (as his disciple) meant to deny self and take up the cross. Jeremias has persuasively focused on the most frightful aspect of the cross imagery. It was the moment when the condemned man, given his cross-bar to carry to the place of execution, turned to face the howling mob, isolated, no longer a part of society.⁴⁴

What stood behind the stunning tie between messiahship (Mark 8:29//Matt 16:16//Luke 9:20) and "cross" (Mark 8:34//Matt 16:24//Luke 9:23)? The connection becomes intelligible only if we take account of Jesus' path to the cross in historical and political context. For Jesus to be Messiah was not to seize power as king. That kind of campaign would have received wide acclaim (Mark 10:35-40; John 6:15). Jesus resolutely turned from this way; he would not be this kind of Messiah. Against any such beckoning acclamation, the cross appeared as a stark alternative. As his career unfolded, estrangement more and more began to mark not only Jesus' relation to the Jewish leaders, but also to many in the crowds (cf. John 6:60,66). Yet what Jesus chose was not withdrawal. He moved forward in his ministry and set out for Jerusalem.

It was Jesus' conscious purpose (=ēlthon: it is my intention, task)⁴⁵ to "kindle a fire" on earth (Luke 12:49). His message had become a source of division even within the family (Mark 10:35-36//Luke 12:51-53). Thus, the perspective and prospect of strife and suffering were not limited to Jesus himself; the terse warning "not peace but a sword" was expanded into

extended word on discipleship. Just when "great crowds" were accompanying him Jesus spoke his severe word of warning:

If anyone comes to me and does not hate his father and mother and wife and children and brothers and sisters, yes, even his own life, he cannot be my disciple (Luke 14:25-27).

Here there are two pertinent points: 1) Jesus called all Israel, 2) but it was clear that not all would accept the call. Furthermore, he affirmed that both the offer and the appropriate response inherent in the "kingdom of God" were divinely authoritative; the gift was free but acceptance was obligatory. This was to press upon Israel a decision, so engendering a crisis that set up a division. The secret of Jesus' pressing the decision had to lie in its positive aspect: the reconstitution by anticipation of Israel.⁴⁶ This was shown not only by the calling of disciples into fellowship around himself, but by the symbolism of the "twelve." In a society characterized by very stable, religiously sanctioned family ties Jesus was calling into being a community on the basis of voluntary response. This was a community willing for the sake of its calling to take upon itself the hostility of the surrounding society. The two parables of the builder and the king underscored the need for counting the cost of following Jesus (Luke 14:28-33). This was specified as a call to take up the cross and so to follow Jesus (Luke 14:27//Matt 10:38).

It is disputed whether "taking up the cross" carried an explicit reference to the death of Jesus. If it did, then, since cross-bearing referred to a precise event in the life of Jesus, the element of "imitation" came into play. But this would be no individualist effort to copy the pattern of Jesus in an external manner. Disciples were called into relation with him and so into his community. "Taking up the cross" had to be the

hallmark of a community of disciples in its relation to the larger society. But the focus remained on the quality of life to which the disciple was called. To be a disciple was to participate in that way of life which for Jesus culminated in the cross.⁴⁷ This conclusion would hold even if "taking up the cross" did not originally include an explicit reference to the coming death of Jesus.

The significance of imitation is further clarified if we begin, not with Jesus, but with Israel. In accord with the Hebrew scriptures, a series of events in Israel's history was decisive for God's relation to humankind. It was essential for Israel as the people of God to maintain an intimate relation to this vital formative period of her history (e.g. through "remembering" and "meditation") because in it the shape of life had been clearly indicated by God himself. In this history God showed that he was always prevenient: he freed his people and went before them as guide; and that he was always provident: he accompanied them and gave commands that pointed the way to the promised inheritance and that pointed to the destiny of this people.⁴⁸ What made Israel Israel was to walk in the way of the Lord. To walk in this way Israel had to be obedient to the Lord's commands (Deut 8:6); to fear the Lord (Deut 10:12); to love the Lord (Deut 11:22). But all this presupposed and expressed a unique relation to God; Israel was nothing less than God's "first-born son" (Exod 4:22). Since God had revealed himself as a just and compassionate God, Israel was called to act justly and with compassion (Deut 10:15-19; Jer 22:16). Israel as a people was therefore called to reflect the character uniquely expressed in God's deliverance of his people.⁴⁹

The structural similarity to this pattern in Jesus' call was unmistakable. He was bringing into being restored Israel. Jesus as Son of

man represented the kingdom of God not by being served but by serving (Mark 10:45//Matt 20:28; cf. Luke 22:27). This gave new definition to both "kingdom of God" and to participation in it. Son of man referred not only to Jesus but to those who participated with him in God's design with confidence in ultimate vindication from God.⁵⁰ Jesus' statement, "whoever loses his life for my sake will find it" (Matt 16:25//Mark 8:35//Luke 9:24), underlined this. At the same time, this further explained the word on self-denial and cross-bearing.⁵¹ The person who denied himself was also the one who lost himself for the sake of Christ; he thus saved himself. The person who refused to deny himself wished to preserve his life and so lost it.⁵²

What is the ethical significance of this correspondence between discipleship and Christology? The answer requires that we examine several strands of tradition reflecting the correspondence between Christology and discipleship.

a) Selfgiving Service

You know that those who are regarded as rulers of the Gentiles lord it over them, and their high officials exercise authority over them. Not so with you. Instead, whoever wants to become great among you must be your servant...For even the Son of Man did not come to be served, but to serve and to give his life a ransom for many (Mark 10:42-45//Matt 20:25-28).

This word, according to the accounts of Matthew and Mark, was provoked by the request of two of Jesus' disciples for a place of privilege in the coming kingdom. Again the issue was to be resolved on the basis of imitation (i.e. as one who came to serve, Jesus was the criterion for the

the reordering of the disciples' values). At the same time it is clear that Jesus was more than an exemplar; the possibility of imitation by the disciple of Jesus was grounded in Jesus' will--at once an act of obedience to God and a creative novelty--to go to his death in function of his saving mission. Was this Jesus' "service"? Did "service" consist in "self-sacrifice"? One way to understand the paradoxical connection is to note the continuity between the service that was Jesus' life (10:45a) and the service that was to be his death (10:45). The second was "service" of another and higher order. On the other hand, if Jesus conceived the coming of the kingdom of God to be mediated by the whole single event of his life and death, then his death becomes the ultimate measure of service. Like the figure in the Songs of Deutero-Isaiah (Isa 42:1-4; 49:1-6; 50:4-9; 52:13-53:12) Jesus, going innocently to his death for the life of world (John 6:51c; cf. Isa 53:11-12; Mark 14:24//Matt 26:28), is "servant" *par excellence*. The whole ministry has its climax as he gives himself up in death in the service of his mission.

The natural instinct of the disciples, on the contrary, was to anticipate honour and position in the kingdom of God. They asked a favour which assumed that Jesus was a king, soon to enter upon his royal dignity. (There was no quarrel on Jesus' part with their basic assumption that he was a king.) The expected or hoped-for answer to their request, however, supposed the way that worldly rulers behave toward their subjects. Jesus represented an entirely different conception of reign and kingdom. It was to be defined by his self-giving service. This revolution--no lesser word will do--has revolutionary significance for ethics. In their response to Jesus, the disciples were called to a new understanding of the good. It lay in the role of "servant." And this servant's service was to be entirely

for others. Indeed, it included laying down one's life for others. The gospel of John offers a symbolic illustration: Jesus takes the towel and the basin and washes his disciples' feet (John 13:1-13).

In its own way the statement in Mark 10:42-45 expressed what it meant to "take up the cross": it was creative of a new kind of community. It called for a clear decision in which the costs of commitment had been consciously accepted, and it signified a way of life distinct from that of the crowd.⁵³ This way of life was different, not because of arbitrary rules separating the disciple's behavior from that of others, but because of the quality of humanness that Jesus revealed and in which the disciples were to participate. The distinctiveness was not a matter of cultic or ritual separation, but a nonconformed way of life in the world. It was to generate a new way of being in community and thereby to constitute, inevitably, a challenge to the powers that be.⁵⁴

b) The Primacy of Love

A new command I give you: Love one another. As I have loved you, so you must love one another. (John 13:34)

This statement represents an instruction that Jesus gave his disciples as part of his "farewell discourse." It epitomizes in typically Johannean fashion a fundamental trait of the life as well as of the teaching (Mark 12:28-34//Matt 22:34-40; cf. Luke 10:25-28; 22:27) of Jesus. Indeed, the washing of the disciples' feet in John 13:1-17 dramatizes the saying in Luke 22:27. This is summed up in John in the "new command" of mutual love (13:34-35).⁵⁵ In all the gospel traditions love is associated with the concrete self-giving in service to or for another. The imperative in both cases is based on the stance of Jesus ("I am among you as one who serves,"

and again, "Love...as I have loved you"). Both served to define the new social order in contrast to existing society ("it shall not be so among you," Luke 22:25; "By this all men will know that you are my disciples, if you have love one for another", John 13:35). Facing the hostility of the "world" exemplified in the cross, how were the disciples as a community to continue to represent Jesus in the world? Jesus showed how by giving both the example and the command of love. The command was grounded in his own self-giving acceptance of death.

c) The Practice of Love: Forgiveness

If your brother sins, rebuke him, and if he repents forgive him. If he sins against you seven times in a day, and seven times comes back to you and says, "I repent," forgive him. (Luke 17:3-4)⁵⁶

The field of moral action supposes conflict; Jesus' primary response, both by the story of his life and throughout his teaching, was forgiveness. Just as God's forgiveness was boundless, in the same way the forgiveness of the disciples was to be boundless. It was to include even one's enemies: to pray for them presupposed that one was prepared to forgive (Matt 5:44//Luke 6:28).⁵⁷ If the text is genuine, Jesus himself united prayer and the spirit of forgiveness on the cross (Luke 23:34). Furthermore, the covenant Jesus initiated by his death was a covenant defined by forgiveness (explicitly in Matt 26:28, implicitly in Mark 14:23; Luke 22:19,20). In this matter we are told very precisely that forgiving is part of being forgiven (forgiveness is a unity). Above all, this was dramatized by its inclusion in the prayer Jesus taught his disciples: "Cancel our debts as we (hereby) cancel those of our debtors" (Matt 6:12//Luke 5:4). It is significant that Jesus thereby

included a performative act of forgiving in the text of the prayer--a meaning that emerges mainly from the Aramaic substratum.⁵⁸ The imperative character of living in accord with the gift of forgiveness is expressed by Jesus' parable of the Unmerciful Servant (Matt 18:23-35). So the purpose of the approach to the brother or sister is to forgive. The issue is not who has been offended or whether the sin was great or small. For Jesus the focus was pardon; if the person listens and repents, forgive (Luke 17:3; cf. Matt 18:15-18). Instead of dealing with offense, it is possible to try to ignore or to make light of offense; this is to cheapen relationships and withhold good news. The gift of forgiveness is creative of community; the community lives from and extends this gift.

d) The Willingness to Bear Suffering

Anyone who does not carry his cross and follow me cannot be my disciple. (Luke 14:27)⁵⁹

"A servant is not greater than his master." If they persecuted me, they will persecute you. (John 15:20-21)

The statement in Luke is preceded by the call to forsake family and is followed by the call to prior deliberation about the costs of following Jesus. Each statement in its own way emphasizes the social suffering of rejection. This was not teaching reserved for a spiritual elite. It was for all his followers. To follow him was to share in both his mission and his destiny.⁶⁰

The reasons for the persecution that Jesus envisaged were not defined in detail. It is clear, however that the persecution was not related to "religious" reasons independent of the ethical stance that Jesus and his disciples were to share. The "cross," whether of Jesus or of his followers,

represented the world's response to that stance. It was a political punishment.⁶¹ The dichotomy between the political and religious orders is foreign to the gospel texts. The consequence of discipleship as part of this new communitarian way of being would be to unmask the ruler's claim to be "benefactor" (cf. Luke 22:25).⁶²

e) Death as Victory

For whoever would save his life will lose it; and whoever loses his life for my sake will find it. For what does it profit a man, if he gains the whole world and forfeits his life? (Matt 16:25-26)

Truly, truly, I say to you, unless a grain of wheat falls into the earth and dies, it remains alone; but if it dies, it bears much fruit. He who loves his life loses it, and he who hates his life in this world will keep it for eternal life. (John 12:24-25)⁶³

These statements presuppose a particular horizon. The paradox of losing life by saving it and vice versa took both of the opposed perspectives seriously. The hearers were reminded of their deep instinctive concern to preserve their lives and of the fear that any threat to their lives instantly awakened. Such fear was founded on firm convictions about saving and losing one's life. This entirely understandable understanding of the human situation was, however, just what Jesus challenged and repudiated by a sharply antithetical saying. The impact of this new perspective was to compel attention to a new possibility. The hearer was told that he should fear what he had always wanted and should face what he had always feared.⁶⁴ The saying hardly fits within the conventional or established vision of life; it called for a new beginning, challenging the rules by which conventional life was governed. The called-for response had to be radical.

The phrase "for my sake" (Matt 16:25) made the saving of one's life through losing it a matter of discipleship. John's Gospel expressed this by an analogy (John 12:24). The ancients held that, in order to bear fruit, a seed must "die." If it did not die, it would remain alone. This dying of the seed corresponds to "hating"⁶⁵ one's life in this world. The harvest corresponds to the gift of eternal life. The analogy first has reference to Jesus (12:23-24). But then it moves to include the followers of Jesus (12:25-26).⁶⁶ These words have their decisive meaning inasmuch as they are spoken by one who follows the path that leads to death. Thus the basic saying about losing and saving depends on and takes up the meaning of Jesus' self-giving, even to the point of death.⁶⁷

The above treatment of Jesus' esoteric teaching on human values, decision, and comportment has not been comprehensive in the sense of attending to every text in the esoteric tradition. It has nevertheless surveyed the core of the tradition. What remains is to integrate this core of esoteric teachings in a synthesis of the ethical responses called for by Jesus as proclaimer of the kingdom of God and as the Messiah going to a destiny of repudiation and death. This synthesis must furthermore highlight the distinctive contribution to New Testament ethics that it is the aim of this dissertation to make.

III An Ethics for the Messianic Community

If the reader has been struck by the seemingly "individualist" character of the values commended by Jesus' esoteric instruction--a way of life marked by a bold and generous "following" of Jesus, by a taking up of one's "cross," by un-self-regarding love and service and the will both to forgive and to suffer--it is our task now to accent the already thematic

placement of all these traditions in their proper social and ecclesial context. Jesus did not offer an individualist perspective but a communitarian perspective. In the modern era this all-pervasive trait of Jesus' purposes, actions, and words has been not only underplayed but consciously or unconsciously rejected. Many moderns have been blind to this indispensable context.

Essentially, our case has already been made by our having recovered the controlling theme of the eschatological restoration of Israel. But now we shall take up the beginning and the end of the esoteric teaching in an effort to concretize the matter. Jesus' "teaching" related to the community of faith made up of all who welcomed his proclamation and committed themselves to the (messianic) proclaimer himself. The communitarian or ecclesial dimension was concentrated in Jesus' statement of intention and was epitomized in the name ($K\hat{e}p\bar{a}'=Petros="Rock"$) that Jesus, according to Matthew (16:18), Mark (3:16), Luke (6:14) and John (1:42), conferred on the disciple Simon at some point during his public career.

Only in the gospel of Matthew is this giving of the name described and its meaning spelled out. Once Simon Peter had said, near Caesarea Phillipi, "You are the Christ, the Son of the living God," Jesus responded:

Blessed are you, Simon Bar-Jona!

For flesh and blood has not revealed this to you,

but my Father who is in heaven.

And I tell you, you are Peter ($K\hat{e}p\bar{a}'$)

and on this rock ($k\hat{e}p\bar{a}'$) I will build my church

and the powers of death shall not prevail against it.

I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven,

and whatever you bind on earth will be bound in heaven,

and whatever you loose on earth will be loosed in heaven

(Matt 16:17-19)

What is the significance of this text for the understanding of Jesus' eschatological mission? In Jesus' statement of intention (v. 18) the image of the foundation rock has a central place. There was a larger background for this image in the ancient Near East. We are concerned with it as it relates to Israel in particular. The image referred to the temple founded on rock and thus signified Israel's secure place in covenant relation to God.⁶⁸ Thus it was natural for Isaiah (28:16) to speak prospectively of God's laying in Zion a prized foundation stone. Significantly, this word was amplified in a prayer from Qumran (IQH VI. 23-28). The waves threaten, the sea roars, but the worshiper finds security by being brought within a fortified city founded by God upon rock. Moreover, the Qumran text has a marked eschatological quality and context.⁶⁹

If the image of the foundation rock was central to Jesus' word, the oracle of Nathan (God's promise to David in 2 Sam 7:12-14a) underlay the various elements of the Matthean text as a whole. This oracle served as a source for biblical tradition identifying the Davidic king as God's son (cf. Ps 2:7; 89:27; 110:3), defining the building of the temple as his task (cf. Zech 6:12-13), and promising the perpetuity of the Davidic dynasty (cf. 2 Sam 23:5; Isa 9:5-11; Ps 89:3-5, 20-29).⁷⁰ Transposed to an eschatological key, the oracle was made to refer to the community created by God's action in the end-time (cf. 4Q Flor 1-13). The eschatological interpretation of the oracle issued in a significant conclusion: the building of God's house was a messianic task.⁷¹ The themes linked and established for biblical tradition by this oracle provided the unarticulated relation between confession and commission in Matt 16:16-19. As "the Messiah, Son of the

living God," Jesus' task was to build the eschatological temple (= "my church", or the messianic community).⁷²

I said above that I wished to make the ecclesial aspect of Jesus' career and teaching explicit by reference to the beginning and the end of his esoteric teaching. The "beginning" (of its most important phase) was the confession near Caesarea Philippi. The "end" is the last supper and the trial before the Sanhedrin.

The conjunction of Jesus' messiahship and eschatological mission in Matt 16:16-19 was strikingly paralleled and confirmed by key moments in the trial before the Sanhedrin (Mark 14:55-64//Matt 26:59-66).⁷³ Once more the sequence in the Markan trial scene is illuminated by reference to the Nathan oracle. The relevant features occur as follows: (Destruction and) construction of the temple (Mark 14:58; 2 Sam 7:13); the Messiah, the Son of the Blessed one (Mark 4:61; 2 Sam 7:14); ultimate enthronement (Mark 14:62, 2 Sam 7:13,16). Further, these features provided the intelligible ground for the charge of blasphemy and the sentence of death that followed. In all probability the blasphemy (Mark 14:64) was linked to the dishonouring of "the Blessed One" by the claim to be his Son (a claim ostensibly false inasmuch as Jesus stood before his judges powerless).⁷⁴ For our purposes the most significant word is the one that marks the turning point of the entire scene: "We heard him say, 'I will destroy this temple made with hands, and in three days I will build another, not made with hands'" (Mark 14:58//Matt 26:61).

The temple saying, though distorted by the trial witnesses, certainly originated with Jesus. The evidence converges in a remarkable way on this fact: (1) a variety of witnesses support it (e.g. Mark 15:29//Matt 27:40; John 2:19; cf. Acts 6:14; Mark 13:2). This variation within the sources

indicates that the meaning of the saying was obscure, a fact that in this case speaks not against but in favor of authenticity; (2) in accord with it is the fact that the Jerusalem temple authorities (the Sanhedrin) lead the opposition to Jesus.⁷⁵ And in light of Jesus' temple action the significance of his word (cf. Amos 7:10-17; Jer 7:1-15) could easily include a challenge to their own claim of leadership.⁷⁶ In confirmation of that possibility, following his action in the temple as reported in John's Gospel, Jesus was confronted by the officials on the issue of authority for his action (2:13-17). What is more, in the response Jesus made reference to the destruction of the sanctuary and the building of a new sanctuary in three days.

All this imagery says "community." Indeed, even before considering this imagery we found ourselves compelled by the concrete correlates of "the kingdom of God" to posit the ecclesial dimension of the "yes" that many gave to Jesus' proclamation. What the further texts on "temple" or "sanctuary" add is the messianic character and the communitarian character of Jesus' mission. Israel comes to eschatological restoration, not as a disparate scattering of yea-sayers to Jesus, but as an as yet ungathered, unorganized community of faith. Jesus' disciples constituted its nucleus.

On the basis of this context we may consider a final esoteric tradition, the last and climactic command of Jesus. This command was to take the bread that he offered and to eat it, to take the cup of wine that he offered and to drink it. The context was the last supper, and the command bore on a climactic symbolic act of Jesus reserved for his disciples.

Our argument has been to the effect that the commands of Jesus were not meant as wise sayings directed to all comers but as the charter of messianic

Israel. It would be possible to disassociate some of Jesus' moral teaching from the intended ecclesial context, but that context nevertheless stands out as the historic point of reference for all of Jesus' teaching. The last supper is among the traditions that are most clearly inseparable from the context of messianic Israel.

Here, according to the synoptic texts, Jesus made explicit the covenantal dimension of his mission (Mark 14:24//Matt 26:28; cf. Luke 22:20). Because there is a clear connection between the last supper and the church's worship in the eucharist, it is widely assumed that the last supper accounts have been fashioned for this purpose (other than Luke 22:15-18). Further, Bultmann supposed that Mark's account was "the cult legend of the Hellenistic circles about Paul."⁷⁷ Jeremias, through the demonstration of the semitisms within Mark's account, ruled out that possibility. He showed that the tradition behind the accounts of the last supper was formulated in Aramaic (or Hebrew), and that this shines through the Markan account with particular clarity.⁷⁸ Rudolf Pesch presented a most clearly articulated alternative to the views of Bultmann. Taking his stand in the tradition of exegetical and historical study of the eucharistic words inaugurated by Dalman and Jeremias, Pesch clarified the character of two sets of texts (Mark-Matt and I Cor-Luke) by defining clearly their literary genre. The genre of the Markan tradition, as well as of the Matthean tradition dependent on Mark, was historical narrative, originally conceived as part of the passion story. The genre of the tradition in I Cor 11:23-25 was cultic aetiology fashioned for use in the church's worship. Pesch took Luke's account (the long text) to be a mixed genre, dependent on Mark 14 and I Cor 11.⁷⁹

In support of the difference in genre between the Markan and the Pauline accounts, Pesch set out a range of pertinent considerations. The Markan text (14:22-25) is embedded in the context of the Passover meal of Jesus with his disciples (Mark 14:17, 21, 26). The words on the bread and on the wine are addressed to the twelve. Narrative traits (introductory *kai*; narrative *kai edōken*; the invitation *labete*; narrative *kai epion ex autou pantes*, etc.) abound, whereas liturgical traits such as the "remembrance" command (I Cor 11:24, 25) are absent.

The Pauline text, on the other hand, has a different character and represents an independent literary unit. Reference to the original group of the disciples has been dropped, yielding to the "you" of the celebrating community. Narrative traits are lacking, whereas the aetiological anamnesis (remembrance) is accented. The text is introduced asyndetically with a solemn liturgical notice (I Cor 11:23). The so-called eschatological perspective, which in Mark 14:25 connects the meal situation with the imminent death of Jesus, is missing in Paul (I Cor 11:26 does make reference to the past event of Jesus' death and its complementary counterpart, the *parousia*).⁸⁰

Mark's is a concrete setting (the last Passover meal of Jesus with his disciples). Paul rehearses a tradition that in part, at least, has left the concrete setting and its original figures behind, so functioning all the better as a model for liturgical celebration. As a part of the depiction of the original situation, the elements of the Markan account as a whole (vv. 22-24) are clearly narrative (26 narrative words). The Pauline text by contrast (23 narrative words, 34 spoken words) is a community oriented liturgical formulation. There is one imperative in Mark (*labete*) belonging to the historic situation in which Jesus specifically invites the disciples

to "take" (and eat, cf. Matt 26:26). Two imperatives in Paul (*poieite... poieite...*) envisage the celebrating community. Correspondingly, the phrase "for as often as" (*hosakis gar ean* I Cor 11:26) evokes the Lord's supper as repeatable event. Once it is pointed out, this set of contrasts is obviously relevant to and, in fact, reflects and clinches the diversity of genre.

The historicity of the eucharistic words has accordingly been placed in a new and far more positive light. Our interest, however, goes beyond historicity to meaning. What was the meaning of Jesus' act of giving the bread and, later, giving the cup to his disciples?

The answer turns on the content and the allusions of the words of institution. Jesus' designation of the *massâ* as "my body" and of the third Passover cup as "my blood, covenant-blood, (to be) poured out for many" (Mark 14:24//Matt 26:28; cf. Luke 22:19-20; 1 Cor 11:24-25) evoked his coming death under two headings: expiation (the *hyper* formula probably relates, like the expression "many," to Isa 53) and the sacrifice that seals the covenant (Exod 24:8; Jer 31:31). Jeremias draws the inevitable conclusion:

If, immediately following his words on the bread and immediately following his words on the wine, Jesus gives the same bread and the same wine to his disciples, this act signifies his giving them a share, by their eating and drinking, in the atoning power of his death.⁸¹

The point is that the response, including the ethical dimension of the response, sought by Jesus whether in his public preaching or in his private transactions with his followers, belongs to this ecclesial context. The ethics of Jesus was aimed toward an eschatological people of God. Messianic

ethics, in a word, is the ethos of the messianic community. If the messianic ethics of Jesus were torn--as in fact this ethics has been torn again and again--from its context in the life of messianic Israel (=the church), it becomes an ethics that no longer makes real sense. This ethics is a religious and ecclesial teaching. It hinges not on human nature or on natural law nor on philosophic foundations, but exclusively on the mission and destiny of the Jesus of history.

This was perhaps the most telling of all the traits that stamped the ethics of Jesus as uniquely his. If the concrete history and destiny of Jesus were bracketed or severed from the values, ideals, injunctions, and prohibitions that made up his ethics, that ethics would lose its rationale, cohesion, and force. This was an ethics for a specific community, and there could be neither a messianic ethics nor a messianic community without the Messiah.

CONCLUSION

The aim in this thesis has been to examine the central significance of the kingdom of God represented in Jesus' eschatological proclamation and mission in relation to ethics. The theology of Ritschl supposed a definite bond between the kingdom of God and ethical action. But the discovery by Weiss of the thoroughly eschatological character of the kingdom of God demolished the structure of theology constructed by Ritschl, decisively refuting Ritschl's ethical-developmental conception of the kingdom.

This posed all the more clearly the question of the relation between eschatology and ethics. But with the evident failure of Ritschl there was little inclination to take up the question anew; scholars might consider the one with an acknowledgement of the other but they failed to undertake a direct and comprehensive consideration of eschatology and ethics in their interrelationship.

Important questions are at stake in determining the sources upon which Jesus drew in making his eschatological proclamation and fulfilling his mission. It has therefore been important to understand the variety of eschatological expectations in the scriptures and in Judaism. The connection between these sources and Jesus have, I hope, illuminated and established more exactly the nature of Jesus' proclamation and mission as stamped by eschatology. In these sources it is already evident that there is a strong link between eschatological promise and appropriate ethical response. The central importance for Jesus of the kingdom of God (and its correlative, the restoration of Israel) is confirmed by beginning his mission in relation to John and by the outcome of his proclamation and

mission in the formation of the eschatological community around him after the resurrection.

The relation between Jesus' public proclamation and destiny and, correspondingly, the relation between Jesus' destiny and the ethics of discipleship come to light in the esoteric teaching. As it is impossible to understand his death without his life, so it is impossible to understand his life without the one for whom he lived, his God and Father, and that for which he lived the kingdom of God. The death of Jesus is therefore at once related to the eschatological purpose of God and embedded in the social setting of his life and mission. That is, crucifixion is not understood apart from the interaction of Jesus and the Jews and Romans.

Crucifixion was the result of who Jesus was and how he acted, in the face of the religious and political configurations of power. In this way Jesus' death had ethical import from the beginning: it was the outcome of his life in response to God in social and political context; as he died, instead of words of vengeance he spoke forgiveness in the fulfillment of love that becomes love of enemies. The formation of disciples within the eschatological community is made possible by and corresponds to this Jesus. Therefore this community lives by the power of forgiveness, reconciliation out of conflict, creative love in the midst of enmity and evil.

One conspicuous feature of the present investigation has been its constant concern, from beginning to end, with disputed questions about the historical Jesus. The reader may have wondered more than once why a study of the messianic ethics of Jesus has had to be burdened by preliminary, non-ethical issues: the laborious efforts of scholars to recover the proclamation of Jesus, its eschatological implications, its connection with Jesus' symbolic acts, and its relation to his teachings or the meaning of

his career, the authority of his warnings, the force of his commands and prohibitions.

The fact is that the ethics of Jesus--and the convergent data make us think that this was entirely conscious on Jesus' part--is utterly inseparable from his personal plenipotentiary authority. A reasonably accurate comprehension of the ethics of Jesus depends on a reasonably accurate recovery of the whole historical figure that he was. The Schweitzerian and the Harnackian versions of Jesus' ethics are based respectively in a Schweitzerian and a Harnackian reconstruction of the Jesus of history.

A constant struggle has accordingly been imposed on us to secure solid historical bases for the understanding of Jesus' ethical teachings whether in the public forum or in the more intimate circles of his discipleship. This has been a more compelling task even than comprehensiveness in the treatment of Jesus' ethics. If the constant attention to historical problems has sometimes been a distraction from ethical issues, it has been a price worth paying for the increased assurance that we have been genuinely in touch with the unique historical figure, Jesus of Nazareth.

The present study, whatever its defects, has sought to exploit a breakthrough in historical research on Jesus: the recovery of his purposes as bearing on the whole people, Israel. The Jesus that emerges here is not the individualist discovered by Bultmann and his followers or by T. W. Manson or Norman Perrin. Rather, he is a man with a mission of eschatological restoration centering on Israel and then encompassing the nations. The fact that not all responded to this mission does not destroy the "ecclesial" character of his encounter with the Israel of his time. Nothing less than the nascent restoration of Israel came into being in those

who did respond to him or, to put the matter more cautiously, and exactly, these were the terms in which both he and his followers understood his words, acts, and destiny. The messianic ethics of Jesus survived in history precisely because this understanding of him survived in the Easter community that emerged out of his life and death.

In the opening pages of this investigation I said that the recovery of the messianic ethics of Jesus is not the whole of New Testament ethics. Furthermore, there is required a reflective mediation of New Testament ethics as a whole to the present. Mediation seeks to unite these ethics as represented in the New Testament with the present experience of men and women as they face the future. The process of discernment and mediation within the Christian community of a contemporary Christian ethics therefore stands as a continuing requirement and challenge.

Now, the process of discernment and mediation may be restricted or broken off completely for one reason or another. Not only the possibility of mediation, but the validity of the ethics is sweepingly denied by a work like that of Jack T. Sanders on Ethics in the New Testament.¹ He is forthright in his conviction that Jesus' ethical teaching is intelligible only in relation to the eschatology. But the consequence for ethics is that Jesus "does not provide a valid ethics for today."² This negative thesis depends on three interrelated points. (1) The most important of these is the perceived failure of the eschatology of Jesus. Imminent eschatology is constitutive for Jesus. But this eschatology was crushed by his death on the cross as history continued.³ (2) The ethics of Jesus is impossible. The ethics have their possibility only in the light of the imminent arrival of the kingdom of God; that is, to accept the ethical teaching of Jesus is to cut all ties with the present world in order to accept the imminent

kingdom of God.⁴ In the real world of family, work, and limited resources the way of Jesus is impossible.⁵ With the passing of time and without the fulfillment of eschatological expectation the ethics are shown to be invalid. (3) Jesus does not provide an ethics usable in modern pluralistic society.⁶

To consider these points in order should help to focus some pertinent issues as well as highlight the larger discussion to which this effort is a contribution. The points Sanders makes are also made by others and deserve to be considered, here in reverse order. Undifferentiated as it stands, the last statement invites a series of questions. What is it about modern society that would make the ethics "unusable"? The original Christian mission moving from Judaism to the larger Gentile world encountered a variegated pluralism and provided ethical coherence and meaning in the lives of many people. And it continues to do so today. But the deeper issue for Sanders may be the particular character of the ethics of Jesus. Without accepting Jesus as the beginning for ethics, Sanders still thinks it possible to determine what is "humane" and "right." What understanding of existence provides content and concrete meaning to these words? An ethic of itself carries no authority in making response to the concrete issues of life. How are these values determined and on what ground are they affirmed? They might (in the West) be Enlightenment values, largely derived from the Christian world vision (and so also particular or "provincial," perhaps including more people and places than some others).

What must not be bypassed here is the recognition of evil, even the hopelessness of the world as it stands. To recognize this is at the same time to recognize the limitations of any dominant ethical perspective based on "natural insight" within that world. There is the alternative of simply

accepting the status quo and adapting oneself to the times, but Sanders seems to call for something more than that. The question is what provides a basis for transcending the present situation as it is?

If the concern is comprehensibility, to begin with Jesus is not to be called to discount either comprehensibility or public appeal in ethical reflection and response. His story, as it begins with Abraham, has been around longer and farther than most (having run through a myriad of contacts in culture and world views). His impact has created a nearly world-wide communion. His teaching has a wholeness that relates to politics as well as to prayer. Now, this is not to provide final verification, that can only be anticipated eschatologically, but enduring relevance over time supports its credibility. The particularity of Jesus in this case is not bad news but good news worth sharing. This, at the same time, corresponds to the distinction between the ethics of discipleship dependent on the resources of faith and an ethics of justice within the limits of relative fairness and self-preservation. This may serve as a starting point from which to converse with the larger society. This is to avoid the mistake of thinking that the good of the ethical life can be attained apart from changing the minds and hearts of people.

In stating the impossibility of Jesus' ethics Sanders singles out the actively generous love of Jesus' ethical teaching as exemplified in the parable of the good Samaritan. Sanders is right in the qualification of this kind of response: "The Samaritan's comportment cannot be possible to every man who, at any time...by his own choosing, decides to step into the Samaritan's world."⁷ But he is wrong in thinking of this kind of response as meant for some realm other than the present world. It is in the present world that love is opposed and must show itself to be love tested in

confrontation with various evils (cf. Matt 13:24-30). It is true that Jesus' teaching is radical and relativized all human ties and relationships. And this is done in the light of the coming, indeed already effective, kingdom of God. Those who, for the sake of the kingdom, leave behind everything they have participate in a new family (community). With this family there are again brothers, sisters, mothers and children, with "persecutions" (Mark 10:29-30). This was not in some other world but now in this time (*nun en tō Kairō toutō*). Now the reign of God is effective in the creation of renewed community, in the present still marked by suffering. Specifically, the self-forgetful love of the Samaritan has the eschatological community as its horizon.

The call is not to a rigorous asceticism, rather, the correlative of this generous love is the sharing community (cf. Mark 10:29-30). Similarly, Jesus' teaching on divorce supposes healing for "your hardness of heart" in response to God's eschatological initiative (cf. Matt 7:17-20//Luke 6:43-45). The response Jesus called for represented the anticipation of the kingdom of God. That is, the now renewed command of God ("The two shall become one") referred not to the ultimate situation on the far side of judgment (when, indeed, people would "neither marry nor be given in marriage," Matt 22:30//Mark 12:25//Luke 20:35), but to the time (*kairos*) of fulfillment marked by Jesus' proclamation and mission. The nature of sin, here sin as divorce, is contrary to the good that God has made possible for men and women in eschatological renewal. But people may refuse or exclude that possibility. The very existence of the prohibition showed that divorce is conceivable. The kingdom becoming effective means new response is possible, but hearts may still be hardened and because the kingdom in its fullness is still future divorce is conceivable. This ethics is an ethics

of the anticipation of the kingdom of God (who makes possible what is "impossible with men," Mark 10:27).

Thus the most important issue in Sander's denial of the ethics of Jesus is finally eschatology. If one holds that the eschatology of Jesus was an illusion then, of course, the ethics corresponding to it are invalid. Sanders has taken up the inadequate view of eschatology in Weiss and Schweitzer. I have already shown that to simply sound the note of imminence fails at crucial points to correspond to the eschatological perspective of Jesus. Within a more differentiated perspective, it is clear, Jesus held to a near-expectation of the end ("So also, when you see these things taking place, know that he is near, at the very gates," Mark 13:29). It is reasonable to hold, at the same time, that "all these things" to come upon "this generation" in Mark 13:30 is distinguished from "that day" and "that hour" marking the culmination of the kingdom (Mark 13:32). That is, the judgment of the Lord upon an impenitent people and the end stand in relation in the eschatological perspective, but the two events are distinguished in the tradition. For the prophetic predecessors as well as for Jesus, receiving the word of God did not mean precise or determinate knowledge of the future (cf. Mark 13:32). What is affirmed is the power of God alone to determine the future and the time of the end (cf. Acts 1:7). Jesus' eschatological perspective is best understood in the light of the whole history of prophecy and promise to Israel. The prophetic word of promise was not repudiated because the expectation for the near future was not immediately fulfilled. Hoping and praying for early fulfillment, Israel learned to entrust that fulfillment to the time of God's own choosing (Hab 2:2-3). As it turns out, Jesus not only proclaimed the kingdom of God but initiated and represented it in his own mission. This decisively defines

"kingdom of God" and response to it as it forms and informs the ethical stance of the messianic community.

Chapter 1--The Historical Background of the Question

1. Albrecht Ritschl, Die christliche Lehre von der Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung (Bonn: Adolph Marcus, 1889).
2. Norman P. J. Metzler, The Ethics of the Kingdom (Ann Arbor, Mich: University Microfilms, 1974) 396f.; Ritschl, Rechtfertigung I, 429-483.
3. Kant's conception was of "an ethical commonwealth under divine moral legislation." See Immanuel Kant, Religion Within the Limits of Reason Alone (New York: Harper & Row, 1960) 92.
4. Rechtfertigung, ch. 9.
5. Friedrich Schleiermacher, Christian Faith (¹1821; ²1880). ET of second edition. Eds. H.R. Machintosh and J.S. Stewart (1928) (New York: Harper and Row, 1963) Sec. 87: para. 3.
6. Christian Faith II, 361, 363, 425.
7. Richard Rothe, Still Hours (London: Hodder and Staughton, 1886) 239-241, 331-335; Metzler, Ethics, 75-76.
8. Schleiermacher, Christian Faith II, 506-508; cf. Metzler, Ethics, 68, 72.
9. Metzler, Ethics, 73
10. Metzler, Ethics, 72-73.
11. Albrecht Ritschl, Three Essays (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1972) 240 and 245.
12. Metzler, Ethics, 115.
13. Metzler, Ethics, 116.
14. Ritschl, Three Essays, 236.
15. Ritschl, Three Essays, 236.
16. Metzler, Ethics, 117.

17. Metzler, Ethics, 206.
18. Johannes Weiss, Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1892). English translation Jesus' Proclamation of the Kingdom of God (London: SCM, 1971).
19. As quoted from the second edition of Weiss in Metzler, Ethics, 206
20. Weiss, Proclamation, 59.
21. Weiss, Proclamation, 59.
22. Weiss, Proclamation, 76-77.; Metzler, Ethics, 210.
23. Weiss, Proclamation, 101-103.
24. Weiss, Proclamation, 76-77.
25. Ritschl, Three Essays, 229.
26. Ritschl, Three Essays, 229.
27. Ritschl, Three Essays, 265, n. 7.
28. Ritschl, Rechtfertigung, III, 12, Three Essays, 245.
29. Ritschl, Three Essays, 245.
30. This means for Ritschl that there is a distinction between the "rules" that govern the person when acting within the scope of his vocation and when acting as an individual Christian in intercourse with other people. The primary element in the "ethics of vocation" is patient obedience. See his Three Essays, 238, 245, 247, 283 notes 161-163.
31. Ritschl, Three Essays, 241.
32. Ritschl, Three Essays, 241.
33. Ritschl, Rechtfertigung, III, 267.
34. Ritschl, Rechtfertigung, III, 576.
35. Metzler, Ethics, 181. Metzler notes that "Kant had already called the kingdom of God an invisible reality within the hearts of men" (515 n. 345).

36. Weiss, Proclamation, 82.
37. Weiss, Proclamation, 76.
38. Weiss, Proclamation, 77.
39. Weiss, Proclamation, 84.
40. Weiss, Proclamation, 82, 115.
41. Weiss, Proclamation, 67.
42. Weiss, Proclamation, 68.
43. Weiss, Proclamation, 73.
44. Weiss, Proclamation, 73.
45. Weiss, Proclamation, 78.
46. Weiss, Proclamation, 79.
47. Weiss, Proclamation, 79.
48. Weiss, Proclamation, 94-95.
49. Weiss, Proclamation, 106.
50. Weiss, Proclamation, 108-112.
51. Weiss, Proclamation, 105, 111.
52. Weiss, Proclamation, 52.
53. Ritschl, Three Essays, 230.
54. Ritschl, Three Essays, 258.
55. Ritschl, Three Essays, 258.
56. Ritschl, Rechtfertigung, III, 267.
57. Weiss, Proclamation, 86.
58. Weiss, Proclamation, 86-87.
59. Weiss, Proclamation, 86-87.
60. Weiss, Proclamation, 130.
61. Ritschl, Three Essays, 254.
62. Ritschl, Three Essays, 254.

63. Weiss, Proclamation, 135. What it means to be liberal here is understood in accord with Enlightenment presuppositions of what is possible and what is not; that is, Christianity is purely a historical phenomenon and Jesus is to be understood in terms of the critic's own conception of religion as interior experience and ethical ideal. On this basis the eschatological dimension was eliminated from Jesus' teaching.
64. Richard H. Hiers, Jesus and Ethics: Four Interpretations (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1968) 32, 38.
65. Adolf Harnack, What is Christianity (Gloucester, Mass: Peter Smith, 1978) 6, 38.
66. Harnack, Christianity, 52-53.
67. Harnack, Christianity, 53.
68. All three citations are from Harnack, Christianity, 56.
69. Harnack, Christianity, 116.
70. Harnack, Christianity, 6.
71. Both citations are from Harnack, Christianity, 38.
72. Albert Schweitzer, ET The Quest of the Historical Jesus (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1968); Von Reimarus zu Wrede (Tübingen: Mohr, 1906) 238.
73. Schweitzer, Quest, 350.
74. Schweitzer, Quest, 351.
75. Schweitzer, Quest, 354-355.
76. Schweitzer, Quest, 357-358.
77. Schweitzer, Quest, 388-390.
78. Schweitzer, Quest, 370-371
79. Schweitzer, Quest, 365.

80. Schweitzer, Quest, 365-366.
81. Schweitzer, Quest, 401.
82. C.H. Dodd, The Parables of the Kingdom (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1961), 27.
83. Dodd, Parables, 28.
84. Dodd, Parables, 28.
85. Dodd, Parables, 29.
86. Dodd, Parables, 31.
87. Dodd, Parables, 34.
88. Dodd, Parables, 34.
89. Dodd, Parables, 35.
90. Dodd, Parables, 37.
91. Dodd, Parables, 34.
92. Dodd, Parables, 34.
93. Dodd, Parables, 83,39.
94. Dodd, Parables, 37.
95. Dodd, Parables, 37-38.
96. Dodd, Parables, 31.
97. C.H. Dodd, The Founder of Christianity (New York: Macmillan, 1970) 84.
98. Dodd, Founder, 84-85.
99. Dodd, Founder, 85.
100. Dodd, Founder, 90.
101. Dodd, Parables, 32.
102. Dodd, Parables, 79.
103. Dodd, Parables, 83-84.
104. Metzler, Ethics, 259-260.
105. Metzler, Ethics, 261.

106. Rudolf Bultmann, Jesus and the Word (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958) 35-36.
107. Bultmann, Jesus, 38.
108. Bultmann, Jesus, 39-40.
109. Bultmann, Jesus, 40-41.
110. Rudolf Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951, 1955) I, 4,7.
111. Bultmann, Jesus, 51, 158-159.
112. Bultmann, Jesus, 131.
113. Bultmann, Theology I, 19.
114. Bultmann, Jesus, 20.
115. Bultmann, Jesus, 32.
116. Bultmann, Jesus, 78,83.
117. Bultmann, Jesus, 77,92.
118. Bultmann, Theology I, 20.
119. Bultmann, Jesus, 113.
120. Bultmann, Jesus, 88.
121. Bultmann, Jesus, 88.
122. Bultmann, Jesus, 88.
123. Bultmann, Jesus, 127.
124. Bultmann, Jesus, 129.
125. Amos N. Wilder, Eschatology and Ethics in the Teaching of Jesus (New York: Harper, 1939) 39.
126. Wilder, Eschatology, 40.
127. Wilder, Eschatology, 50-51.
128. Wilder, Eschatology, 41.
129. Wilder, Eschatology, 53.

130. Wilder, Eschatology, 58.
131. Wilder, Eschatology, 197.
132. Wilder, Eschatology, 195.
133. Wilder, Eschatology, 199.
134. Wilder, Eschatology, 200.
135. Wilder, Eschatology, 206-07.
136. Wilder, Eschatology, 201.
137. Wilder, Eschatology, 153-154.
138. Wilder, Eschatology, 199.
139. Wilder, Eschatology, 153.
140. Wilder, Eschatology, 197.
141. Wilder, Eschatology, 166.
142. Wilder, Eschatology, 197.
143. Weiss, Proclamation, 132.
144. Bultmann, Theology, I, 31.
145. Wilder, Eschatology, 50.
146. Wilder, Eschatology, 50.
147. Richard H. Hiers, Jesus and the Future (Atlanta: John Knox, 1981) 107-110.
148. Hiers, Jesus and Ethics (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1968) 48-58
149. Hiers, Jesus and Ethics, 155.
150. Hiers, Jesus and Ethics, 198-199.
151. Norman Perrin, Jesus and the Language of the Kingdom (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976) 78.
152. Perrin, Jesus and Language, 199.
153. Norman Perrin, Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus (London: SCM, 1967) 152-153.

154. Perrin Rediscovering, 152.
155. Ernst Ludwig Dietrich, Sûb Sebut Die eschatologische Wiederherstellung bei den Propheten (Giessen: Töpelmann, 1925).
156. Cf. T.W. Manson, The Teaching of Jesus (London: Cambridge, 1931); Anton Fridrichson, et al., The Root of the Vine (London: A.C. Black, 1953) 37-62.
- 157 Joseph Schmitt, "L'Eglise de Jerusalem, ou la 'Restauration' d'Israël d'après les cinq premier chapters des Actes," Rev Sc Rel 27 (1953) 209-218.
158. G.B. Caird, Jesus and the Jewish Nation (London: Athlone, 1965).
159. Ben F. Meyer, The Aims of Jesus (London: SCM, 1979) 127-128, 170-173, 220-222.
160. E.P. Sanders, Jesus and Judaism (London: SCM, 1985) 77-119.
161. Gerhard Lohfink, "Die Korrelation von Reich Gottes und Volk Gottes bei Jesus," Theologische Quartalschrift 165 (1985) 173-183. See also Gerhard Lohfink, Jesus and Community (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984) 7-26.

Chapter 2--Resources for Jesus' Proclamation and Teaching

1. Gerhard von Rad, Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, Ed. Gerhard Kittel. "Basileus" I (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964); Martin Buber, Kingship of God (New York: Harper & Row, 1967) 36-39, 121-128. Martin Buber, in discussion with Gerhard von Rad, brings the issue to focus with primary reference to the song of the sea (Exod 15:1-21) and to the character of the Sinai covenant; see the discussion of the character and date of the song by Frank M. Cross, Canaanite Myth and

- Hebrew Epic (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University, 1973) 124-126; David N. Freedman places the origin of the basic formulation of this material before 1200 B.C.E. Pottery, Poetry, and Prophecy: Studies in Early Hebrew Poetry (Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1980) 79-81, 216.
2. Millard C. Lind, Yahweh Is a Warrior (Scottsdale, Pennsylvania: Herald, 1980) 50.
 3. Lind, Yahweh, 51.
 4. Rudolf Schnackenburg, God's Rule and Kingdom (Montreal: Palm Publishers, 1963) 13.
 5. Scholarly opinion is divided on the understanding and origin of the covenant. Still, there are strong arguments to support the view that Exod 19:3-8 is a reflection of covenant traditions from an early phase of Israel's history. Some scholars have attempted to illuminate the meaning of "covenant" by treaties derived from the Hittite empire (ca. 1500-1200 B.C.E.). These are *suzerainty* treaties between the great king, the *suzerain*, and the lesser monarchs who are his vassals. Of course, even these treaty documents from the Hittites show a variety in form but with a number of common elements in particular sequence (i.e. preamble, historical prologue, stipulations, deposition, list of witnesses, curses and blessings). Exod 19:3-8 bears marks of the covenant formulary that first appear in the Hittite suzerainty treaty. The historical prologue is reflected in v. 4, the stipulations in v. 5b, and the blessings in v. 5b-6a. At the same time it is clear that Exod 19:3-8 is not in detail the text of a covenant. In Josh 24:1-28, where the covenant is commended and confirmed anew, all the elements of the covenant formulary appear to be represented, some very

- fully (historical prologue, stipulations, deposition of the text and witnesses) and others indicated (the curses and blessings, the preamble); Jon D. Levenson, Sinai and Zion, (New York: Winston, 1985), 25. To Israel God was described in "covenant" terms (Exod 19:3-8). The people of the time of Jesus recognized the "theopolitical" nature of this relationship, as the *Qaddis* and the *Tepillâ* indicate.
6. John Bright refers to the covenant as Israel's acceptance of the Lordship of Yahweh. He sees here the origin of the concept of the rule of God over his people (= kingdom of God). A History of Israel (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1959) 135.
 7. Cf. Buber, Kingship, 150-151.
 8. Buber, Kingship, 31; Walter Zimmerli cautions against making a "too close comparison between these treaty formularies" and the covenant of Yahweh with Israel. The caution is appropriate at least to the extent that some of the factors are different in the two settings. Old Testament Theology in Outline (Atlanta: John Knox, 1978) 49-50. W. L. Moran, "A Kingdom of Priests" The Bible in Current Catholic Thought, Ed. J.L. McKenzie (New York: Herder and Herder, 1962) 7-20, esp. 11-17.
 9. Levenson, Sinai and Zion, 72.
 10. Levenson, Sinai and Zion, 72-73.
 11. Levenson, Sinai and Zion, 72-73.
 12. Lind, Yahweh, 52.
 13. Lind, Yahweh, 52, 102; cf. Cross, Canaanite Myth, 221.
 14. Levenson, Sinai and Zion, 97-98.
 15. Lind, Yahweh, 100.
 16. Lind, Yahweh, 103.
 17. Lind, Yahweh, 103.

18. Lind, Yahweh, 120.
19. Lind, Yahweh, 120.
20. Sigmund Mowinckel, He That Cometh (New York: Abingden, 1954) 24-25.
Noteworthy in this context was his study of the theme of kingship in the Psalms.
21. John Gray, The Biblical Doctrine of the Reign of God (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1979) 28-30. Because of the similarities between the ritual of Israel and the Canaanites Mowinckel concluded that the Israelite festival had developed under the influence of the Canaanite pattern. The more recent careful study of John Gray, in the main, supports Mowinckel in his view that the feast of Tabernacles was the festival of an agricultural community celebrating both the kingship of God (adapted from the Canaanites) and the renewal of the covenant from Israel's own tradition. Insofar as the kingship of God and covenant are shown to be associated early with Israel's own traditions this will need to be qualified; certain elements may have been derived from foreign sources but they were then transformed in the service of a new purpose. Mowinckel makes extensive comparisons and shows this; it is one thing to note elements Israel took over from alien sources "but quite another what she did with them", 75,81,85.
22. H. Gese, Essays on Biblical Theology, (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1981) 144. At certain points we would expect parallels of different peoples in the writings dealing with the same general subject matter. With respect to the relation between the divine and creation, Psalm 29 is a case in point. A Canaanite hymn dramatizing the kingship of the god Baal is associated with his activity in rain, snow, the voice from the

clouds in thunder. Gray, Biblical Doctrine, 39 note 2, translates a fragment of this Canaanite hymn:

And moreover, may Baal send abundance
 Abundance of moisture with his snow
 May he send his voice from the clouds,
 His flashing to the earth in lightening, 39 n.2.

23. Gray, Biblical Doctrine, 42.
24. Gray, Biblical Doctrine, 42.
25. Gray, Biblical Doctrine, 43.
26. Gray, Biblical Doctrine, 43-44.
27. George Eldon Ladd, The Presence of the Future (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1974) 46-47.
28. Ladd, Presence, 48.
29. Claus Westermann, Elements of Old Testament Theology (Atlanta: John Knox, 1982) 60.
30. Westermann, Old Testament Theology, 60.
31. Ladd, Presence, 48-49.
32. G. R. Beasley-Murray, Jesus and the Kingdom of God (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986) 6.
33. F. F. Bruce, This is That: The New Testament Development of Some Old Testament Themes (Exeter: Peternaster, 1968) 24.
34. Bruce, This is That, 24
35. Mowinckel, He That Cometh, 7, 159.
36. Mowinckel, He That Cometh, 159, 173. Part of the difficulty is that Mowinckel maintains his position in conjunction with a denial that the prophets developed an eschatology. In order to make his point he provides a definition of eschatology: the end of the present world

order superseded by "another of an essentially different kind" (the cataclysmic end of this world followed by the new creation) 125, 159. This definition of eschatology as the end of the present world order superseded by another is, by itself, vague. Mowinckel would himself grant that Deutero-Isaiah hoped for a new order. And if eschatology is to be defined as a perspective defined by an ultimate horizon then Amos, at least in this respect, has an eschatology. He saw the end of old Israel in the decisive judgment of God. See further below.

37. Mayne Saebø, "Messianisms in Chronicles?," Horizons in Biblical Theology 2 (1980), 85-109.
38. Gese, Essays, 146.
39. Gese, Essays, 146-147.
40. Saebø, Messianism, 85-109.
41. Gese, Essays, 147.
42. Jürgen Moltmann, The Theology of Hope (London: SCM, 1967) 129.
43. Moltmann, Theology, 128; Westermann, Elements, 136.
44. Mowinckel, He That Cometh, 256. It certainly appears that Israel pinned its hopes on certain kings in the line of David that were disappointed (e.g. Zech 4:6-9). Every new king must have reminded Israel of the promises made to David. In the events of history Israel learned that she must wait on God to send the one worthy to fulfill his purpose. If the emphasis is on the Messiah as one who would realize the ideals of kingship within the natural course of events in this world, the great expectations embodied in the servant songs properly have no relation to Messianic expectations. According to Mowinckel, the Messiah was not connected to the establishment of the kingdom of God; what was not possible for the Messiah, the servant was to

accomplish. This is to say that with the collapse of the monarchy, messianic hope is enlarged and defined anew. In the Isaiah Targum (52:13-15) the servant is in fact identified as "the Messiah."

45. Mowinckel, He That Cometh, 159.
46. Beasley-Murray, Kingdom, 22-23.
47. Beasley-Murray, Kingdom, 23.
48. Gese, Essays, 149-50.
49. E.P. Sanders has assembled some of these passages. See his chapter on "New Temple and Restoration in Jewish Literature" in Jesus and Judaism, 77-90.
50. Westermann, Elements, 126. In the ancient near-eastern pattern of political authority the king represented the gods and was above the criticism or judgment of any particular group in society. In Israel the king was not above judgment.
51. Westermann, Elements, 126.
52. Mowinckel, He That Cometh, 156-58. According to Mowinckel, there was a correlation between the restoration of Israel and messianic expectation; messianic faith was also faith in the restoration of Israel. Because Mowinckel accepted this correlation he found it necessary to deny that the prophets developed an eschatology. But why should the restoration of Israel signify the absence of an eschatology? Mowinckel answered: because the restoration of Israel meant "the restoration of the state, the nation, and the monarchy." That is, the restoration of Israel and the work of the Messiah all had their place within the frame of a "natural" course of events. The restoration of Israel and the messianic hope had nothing to do "with a change in the course of the world or an eschatological new creation."

53. Ernst Ludwig Dietrich, Sûb Sebut. Die endzeitliche Wiederherstellung bei den Propheten.
54. Dietrich, Sûb Sebut, 13-28.
55. Mowinckel, He That Cometh, 170.
56. Moltmann, Theology of Hope, 131.
57. Moltmann, Theology of Hope, 131.
58. Beasley-Murray, Kingdom, 47.
59. Christopher Rowland saw 2 Baruch and 4 Ezra as arising out of the same situation and with very similar concerns. He argues convincingly that this was the situation just after the devastation of C.E. 70 and the issue of what constituted the people of God (those who were finally to be saved). The Open Heaven (London: SPCK, 1982) 131, 167-169.
60. Gray, Biblical Doctrine, 259; Beasley-Murray, Kingdom, 50-51.
61. Geza Vermes, Jesus the Jew: A Historian's Reading of the Gospels (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1973) 130.
62. Vermes, Jesus, 130.
63. Vermes, Jesus, 130.
64. Vermes, Jesus, 131.
65. Vermes, Jesus, 131.
66. Vermes, Jesus, 132.
67. Vermes, Jesus, 132.
68. Vermes, Jesus, 133-134.
69. The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, II, ed. James H. Charlesworth (Garden City: Doubleday, 1985).
70. This is the rendering of Geza Vermes, The Dead Sea Scrolls in English (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1962).
71. Gese, Essays, 148.

72. C.F.D. Moule, The Origin of Christology (London: Cambridge University, 1977) 13-14.
73. Gese, Essays, 154.
74. Gese, Essays, 157-160; Gray, Biblical Doctrine, 304-06.
75. Sanders, Jesus and Judaism, 17-90.
76. Bertil Gärtner, The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament (London: Cambridge University, 1965) 18-19.
77. In his allegorical interpretation Philo still bears indirect witness to speculation in the diaspora on the kingdom of God (cf. Spec. Leg. I. 207; IV. 164; Sam. II. 285; Abr. 261; Vit. Mos. I. 190).
78. T.W. Manson, The Servant Messiah (Cambridge: University Press, 1961) 24,25.
79. Westermann, Elements, 26.
80. Buber, Kingship, 126, 133.
81. Gese, Essays, 62. See his Elements of Old Testament Theology, 175-179.
82. Gese, Essays, 176. Westermann sees a distinction between commandments and laws. As to form the command is addressed directly to the people ("Thou shalt not..."). A law has two parts, an assumed situation and a statement of consequences: whosoever does thus and so-this or that will happen to him. The commandments as the direct address of God have their place in worship. The laws were formed in relation to and dependent upon the community forms and their changes. The laws therefore were much more subject to change than the commandments (laws about slavery became inoperative when slavery was done away with; the law of sacrifices, when the temple was destroyed), whereas the commands

like those of the decalogue have an enduring character. In time "Law" became the primary concept which also included the commandments.

83. Gese, Essays, 185.
84. Buber, Kingship, 67-68; Walter Zimmerli, The Old Testament and the World (London: SPCK, 1976) 8-9.
85. Zimmerli, Old Testament, 7.
86. Moltmann, Theology of Hope, 115-116.
87. Moltmann, Theology of Hope, 115-116.
88. Moltmann, Theology of Hope, 116.
89. Moltmann, Theology of Hope, 120-121.
90. Moltmann, Theology of Hope, 120.
91. Patrick D. Miller has extensively studied this correspondence pattern between sin and judgment. A dramatic early example of this is David's sin of murder and adultery. David's misuse of royal power will mean that his office will be under continual threat and danger; because David had Uriah killed with the sword so now the "sword shall never depart from your house" (2 Sam 12:10), and as he took Uriah's wife David will himself experience this (2 Sam 12:11). Evil (*ra*) leads to evil (*ra*). The evil of David's sin leads to the evil (punishment) of God's judgment. Sin and Judgment in the Prophets (Chico, California: Scholars, 1982) 82-83.
92. Miller, Sin and Judgment, 102, 127.
93. Gese, Essays, 80-81.
94. Gese, Essays, 83-84.
95. H.H. Rowley, The Relevance of Apocalyptic (London: Lutterworth, 1963) 38-39.
96. J.A.T. Robinson, Jesus and His coming (London: SCM, 1957) 94.

97. Christopher Rowland, The Open Heaven, 26-29.
98. Ladd, Presence, 96.
99. Ladd, Presence, 96.
100. Rowland, The Open Heaven, 145. Also see note 59 above. The relation between eschatology, as we have noted, and ethical response is basically the same in 1 Enoch and 4 Ezra. Sanders sees 4 Ezra as exceptional in the literature representing Jewish thought on salvation and the keeping of the law (arguing that in this work the covenant has collapsed and that salvation is not by mercy but by merit). 4 Ezra, in making the point that people will be judged according to their deeds (8:31-33), evidently presents this emphasis. The point seems to be that a very few righteous people have the "good works stored up" to earn final salvation. But Ezra, in the same passage, included himself among those who have sinned and who must depend on the mercy of God (cf. 8:31-33). It is clear that the righteous are few but they include the repentant righteous. Thus, there may be a difference in emphasis, but on the key points with which we are concerned this work stands in clear continuity with other Jewish literature. Cf. Sanders, Paul and Palestinian Judaism, 409,420-422.
101. Ladd, Presence, 97. See preceding note (100). For a discussion of questions on the unity and teaching in fourth Ezra see Sanders, Paul and Palestinian Judaism, 409-418.
102. What can the "restoration of Israel" mean in this restricted view? Lou H. Silverman sees that ethical response has been severely limited or reduced in this work but ascribes this to the circumstances in which it was written. See his "The Human Deed in a Time of Despair: The Ethics

- of Apocalyptic," 191-202. In Essays in Old Testament Ethics, (New York: Ktav Publishing House Inc., 1974).
103. Weiss states that when the kingdom comes "God will destroy this old world which is ruled and spoiled by the devil, and create a new world." Jesus' Proclamation of the Kingdom, 130.
104. Albert Schweitzer, The Quest of the Historical Jesus (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1968) 367.
105. Schweitzer, Quest, 321, 368.
106. Schweitzer, Quest, 254.
107. See the pertinent discussion of T. Francis Glasson, "Schweitzer's Influence - Blessing or Bane?" in the work edited by Bruce Chilton, The Kingdom of God (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984) 107-120. The "rock" on which the pre-Christian dating for the Similitudes rested was largely the identification of "kings and the mighty" as Maccabean princes and the Sadducees who supported them. But the reference is almost certainly to Gentile oppressors (cf. 46:7; 63:47). As for the meagre historical references in the work, they, along with other evidence, point to a post-Christian date. See discussions of the issue in Beasley-Murray, Kingdom, 63-68; Sanders, Paul and Palentinian Judaism, 347-48.
108. David Wenham, "The Kingdom of God in Daniel", The Expository Times, Feb 1987, 98 #5, 132-134., Cf. Jeremias, New Testament Theology, 98-99, 205.
109. Wenham, "Kingdom," 132-34.
110. Wenham, "Kingdom," 132-34.

Chapter 3--The Kingdom of God and the Appropriate Response

1. Bruce Chilton, "Introduction", The Kingdom of God in the Teaching of Jesus, ed. by Bruce Chilton (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984) 2-3.
2. David Flusser, Jesus, (New York: Herder and Herder, 1969).
3. Joachim Jeremias, New Testament Theology (London: SCM, 1971).
4. Gustaf Dalman, The Words of Jesus (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1902) 98-101.
5. Ernst Ludwig Dietrich, Sûb Sebut. Die endzeitliche Wiederherstellung bei den Propheten (Giessen: Töpelmann, 1925).
6. See George B. Caird's Essay, "Jesus and Israel: The Starting Point for New Testament Christology," in the book edited by Robert F. Berry and Sarah A. Edwards, Christological Perspectives (New York: Pilgrim, 1982) 58-68.
7. Adolf Harnack, What is Christianity? (Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1978) 16-17.
8. Harnack, Christianity, 16-17.
9. R. Bultmann, The History of the Synoptic Tradition (Oxford: Blackwell, 1963) 205.
10. Ernst Käsemann, New Testament Questions of Today (London: SCM, 1969) 56, 101.
11. Norman Perrin, Rediscovering the teaching of Jesus (London: SCM, 1967) 39.
12. Norman Perrin, Jesus and the Language of the Kingdom (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976) 198-99.

13. Perrin, Language, 58-60. The first difficulty with Perrin's exposition of "kingdom of God" is that if Jesus' teaching relative to the kingdom departs from an apocalyptic understanding of time, does not involve the end of time, and yields no guidance as to the manner and time of consummation, what then is left of the original assertion that the kingdom of God is an apocalyptic concept in the teaching of Jesus? A second more serious problem is the distinction he makes between steno-symbols and tensive symbols, identifying apocalyptic reference to "kingdom of God" as an instance of the first and Jesus' use as an instance of the second. Consider the imaginative use of symbol to represent redemption by the Lamb in Revelation 5, or the expression of redemption through the image of combat, the portrayal of the parousia in Revelation 19, and the symbols used to describe the city of God in Revelation 21:9-22:5. To describe these representations of God's redemptive interventions as "steno-symbols" is hardly accurate.
14. Perrin, Language, 40.
15. Perrin, Language, 198-199.
16. Sanders, Jesus and Judaism, 91-95.
17. G.B. Caird, Jesus and the Jewish Nation (London: Athlone, 1965) 7.
18. B.F. Meyer, The Aims of Jesus (London: SCM, 1979) 117.
19. Meyer, The Aims of Jesus, 118.
20. Meyer, The Aims of Jesus, 118.
21. Caird, Jesus and the Jewish Nation, 7; Meyer, The Aims of Jesus, 118.
- There are points of comparison between the summons of the Baptist and the self-understanding and purposes of other groups, e.g., the exiles returning from the land of Babylon saw "the remnant of Israel in themselves as those who had survived the judgment. The Baptist

assembled the remnant of Israel to the extent that he sponsored a public rite to signify the decision of repentance. Though the remnant, like contemporary remnant groups such as the Essenes, was thereby assembled in advance of the judgment, unlike them it did not exist as a separate organized community. It was distinctive in remaining genuinely open to all Israel." Cf. Meyer, Aims, 120.

22. Meyer, Aims, 122., Cf. John A.T. Robinson, The Priority of John (London: SCM, 1985) 137.
23. Meyer, Aims, 123.
24. Bultmann, Synoptic Tradition, 246.
25. Josephus BJ XVIII. 116-119. Josephus, for his own purposes, appears to downplay certain features of John's proclamation. But he does say that Herod had him killed because he feared the influence of John with the people.
26. The text of Luke 16:16 is secondary at least in form. See W.G. Kümmel, "Das Gesetz und die Propheten gehen bis Johannes"--Lukas 16,16 in Zusammenhang der heils geschichtlichen Theologie der Lukasschriften," in Verborum Veritas (Wuppertal: Brockhaus, 1970), 279-301; see esp 288-300. In substance, the historicity of the saying gains probability from multiple attestation (of Jesus' affirmation of the eschatological new age opened with John). See Jeremias, New Testament Theology, 46-47. The key to this text is whether the word *heōs/mechri* is to be taken inclusively or exclusively. The emphasis is different in Matthew and Luke but fundamentally the two are compatible. Cf. Beasley-Murray, Jesus and the Kingdom of God (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986) 94.
27. Beasley-Murray, Kingdom, 94.
28. Beasley-Murray, Kingdom, 95.

29. Meyer, Aims, 128.
30. Gerhard Lohfink, Jesus and Community (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984) 7-9.
31. To be sure according to Matthew (3:2) John also announces that the kingdom is near. In John's message, however, the dominant reference is to judgment (Matt 3:7-10//Luke 3:7-9). Jesus alludes to a difference of emphasis reflected in conduct (Matt 11:12-19//Luke 7:31-35).
32. N.T. Wright, "Jesus, Israel and the Cross," Society of Biblical Literature: 1985 Seminar Papers, (Atlanta: Scholars) 75-95.
33. Beasley-Murray, Kingdom, 121.
34. Jeremias, The Parables of Jesus (London: SCM, 1963) 101.
35. Caird, Jesus and the Jewish Nation, 10.
36. Bultmann thinks that Luke 13:1-5 is probably a formulation of the church. He has difficulty because it is hard to identify it with a specific interest of the church and rule against authenticity on the basis of the principle of dissimilarity. He therefore allows that it could easily contain "historical reminiscence." Synoptic Tradition, 55. While Luke 13:1-5 cannot be identified with a specific incident on the basis of other sources, examination of the background provides reason for accepting the episode as historical. I. Howard Marshall, The Gospel of Luke (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978) 52-53.
37. Wright, "Jesus, Israel", 81. The coherence of these predictions with Jesus' eschatological proclamation has come to be more clearly recognized. cf. Caird, Jesus and the Jewish Nation, 11; Sanders, Jesus and Judaism, 71-73.
38. Caird, Jesus and the Jewish Nation, 11; Wright, "Jesus and Israel", 81-82.

39. Meyer, Aims, 138-39.
40. The historicity of the twelve in Jesus' public career is secured by a convergence of criteria: (a) discontinuity: the ascription of Judas Iscariot to "the twelve"; (b) multiple attestation (triple tradition, e.g., Mark 6:7-13//Matt 10:1,9-14=Luke 9:1-6; matter common to Matthew and Luke, e.g., Matt 19:28//Luke 22:30; special traditions, e.g., Luke 8:1-3; John 6:67-71); (c) multiform tradition (story; logion; faith-formula in 1 Cor 15:5). On these criteria see appendix, pp. 215-216. cf. Beasley-Murray, Kingdom, 276.
41. Meyer, Aims, 154.
42. On the historicity of this text, opinions are divided; I side with the majority view, well expressed by J. Jeremias, Jesus' Promise to the Nations. In particular, there is no clear reason to deny a reference to the inclusion of a Gentile. Sanders, Jesus and Judaism, 220, argues that, since Matt 8:12 is a Matthean addition, Matt 8:11 is to be seen as a reference to the dispersion. But the antithetic parallelism of the clauses tells in favor of the authenticity of this logion as a whole (See G.R. Beasley-Murray, Kingdom, 169-170.) It is important to note the fact that this favorable word from Jesus on Gentile participation in eschatological salvation by no means stands alone. Much is indicated by Jesus' condemnation of Chorazin, Bethsaida, and Capernaum for failing to make response to his proclamation that would have been accepted by Tyre, Sidon, or Sodom had they been offered a like opportunity (cf. Matt 11:21-24//Luke 10:13-15). Similarly, he referred to the condemnation that the Ninevites and the Queen of Sheba will utter at the judgment, since they gave heed to the word delivered by Jonah and Solomon (cf. Matt 12:41-42//Luke 11:31-32). In this

pericope (Matt 8:5-13) the reference to Gentiles participating in the feast of the kingdom is a fitting climax to the account of a Gentile who has come and the meaning of his faith. For a discussion of the unity of the passage see Eduard Schweizer, The Good News According to Matthew (Atlanta: John Knox, 1975) 213-14. The text insofar as it supposes the eschatological pilgrimage of the nations, stands in conspicuous discontinuity with the church of the world mission.

43. Beasley-Murray, Kingdom, 173.
44. Further, with reference to all of the beatitudes, scholars differ on which edition, Matthew's or Luke's, is more original; there is general agreement that the basic form and content of the beatitudes goes back to Jesus. In Matthew 5:3-10 the first eight beatitudes form a composite description. These beatitudes constitute a single poetic structure, each sentence formed to parallel the others, each contributing to the meaning of the whole. Each beatitude clarifies and reinforces the others. For example, those who enter the kingdom (vs. 3,10) are certainly the same as the "sons of God" (v.9). Paul S. Minear, Matthew: The Teacher's Gospel (New York: Pilgrim, 1982) 46-47. Matt 5:3.4,6//Luke 6:20-21 are acknowledged by form-critics to be the earliest of the beatitudes. And their authenticity is strongly affirmed. see Werner Grimm, Weil ich dich Liebe: Die Verkündigung und Deuterojesaja (Frankfurt: Herbert Lang Bern, 1976), 68-69.
45. Beasley-Murray makes the point that the beatitudes set forth the prospect of future glory. This is not to negate the kingdom coming into effect in the present. The emphasis then is that when the kingdom which has become effective with its representative comes in its fullness it is the "poor" who shall receive it. Kingdom, 162-63.

46. My purpose is not to affirm the historicity of each beatitude in the Matthean tradition, but to make the point that the beatitudes evoke an eschatological pattern to which the appropriate response is thankful and single-hearted acceptance. See below. See also Beasley Murray, Kingdom, 162.
47. Schweizer, Matthew, 81. The beatitude is a specific genre in both Greek and Jewish contexts (e.g. Ps 1:1; Prov 8:34; Dan 12:12; Ps of Sol 4:23; 17:44; 18:16). Early Christians made extensive use of it (e.g. Rom 14:22; Matt 5:3-12; John 20:29; Rev 14:13; 16:15; 22:7).
48. J. Jeremias, Sermon on the Mount (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1963) 27.
49. Jeremias, Sermon on the Mount, 26-27.
50. The text of Mark 1:14,15 is secondary in form (it is Mark's own summary, as we have observed), but historical in substance, i.e., Jesus did proclaim the imminence of the kingdom of God. Both John and Jesus make a proclamation and issue a call to repentance. But the distinctive note in Jesus' speech and action begins to emerge; the accent for Jesus falls on the fulfillment of time, the kingdom of God, and acceptance (in trust) of this good news. (cf. Vernon K. Robbins, Jesus the Teacher (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 28-30. "Repentance" derived its meaning from the proper response to the proclamation; see below, 118-120. The precise form "Believe the gospel" is probably Markan or pre-Markan. (On later Hebrew and Aramaic, see Pesch, Markus-Evangelium, 103). Respecting repentance in the Jewish perspective Rabbi Levi from the third century) said: "If the Israelites would but repent for one day they would be redeemed, and the son of David would come immediately." See Jack P. Lewis, The Gospel According to Matthew Part I, (Austin: Sweet, 1976) 74.

51. Paul S. Minear, Commands of Christ (New York: Abingdon, 1972) 23-24.
52. Minear, Commands, 25.
53. Minear, Commands, 21-28.
54. Minear, Commands, 24-26.
55. Jeremias, Theology, 119. Sanders, Jesus and Judaism, 203,204. Sanders reviews or criticizes Jeremias. He notes that there is very little material in which Jesus calls Israel to repent. Material that so portrays Jesus he regards as Lucan (Luke 15:7, 10; 19:1-9)
56. Stephen Westerholm, Jesus and Scribal Authority (Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1978) 132.
57. Sanders, Jesus and Judaism, 206.
58. George F. Moore, Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1950) I, p. 507. J. Behm, "metanoēō, metanoia," "Basileus" Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, Ed. Gerhard Kittel. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964) 4:989-999.
59. C.G. Montefiore, Rabbinic Literature and Gospel Teachings (London: Macmillan, 1930) 391. The Lord's Prayer and Jewish Liturgy, ed. by Jakob J. Petuchowski and Michael Brocke. (New York: Seabury, 1978). Petuchowski, in discussing the Eighteen Benedictions, says the prayer may well go back to the pre-rabbinic period and was already used by the priests in the Jerusalem Temple, 50-51.
60. Bruce D. Chilton, The Glory of Israel: The Theology and Provenience of the Isaiah Targum, (Sheffield: JSOT, 1983) 37-46. In this Targum he sees reflected important elements of theology "from just prior to the destruction of the Temple until the beginning of the Bar Kokhba revolt," with further developments in the Amoraic period, 12.

61. Chilton, The Glory of Israel, 40-44.
62. George Eldon Ladd, The Presence of the Future (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1974) 110.
63. E. P. Sanders, Jesus and Judaism, 92-93.
64. Rudolf Pesch, Das Markusevangelium I. Teil (Freiburg-Basel-Wien: Herder, 1977) 102. Aloysius M. Ambrozic calls attention to the important point in this connection that the perfect tense of the verb *peplērōtai* in Mark 1:15a precedes its subject and so emphasized completed action. The Hidden Kingdom: A Redactional Critical Study of the References of the Kingdom of God in Mark's Gospel, (Washington D.C.: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1972) 21.
65. "The time is fulfilled" (*peplērōtai ho kairos*, Mark 1:15); "In order that what was spoken might be fulfilled" (*hina plērōthe to rēthen...* Matt 4:14, 17); "Today this scripture has been fulfilled in your hearing" (*Sēmeron peplērōtai hē graphē autē en tois āsin humōn* Luke 4:21).
66. Meyer, Aims, 132.
67. Marcus J. Borg, Conflict, Holiness and Politics, 110-111.
68. Meyer, Aims, 162. To say as Moore does that Jesus called for repentance in the same way and to the same purpose as the Jewish teachers of the law is therefore completely inadequate. Judaism, I, 518-519.
69. Keck, A Future for the Historical Jesus (Nashville: Abingdon, 1971) 222.
70. Cf. Bultmann, History of the Synoptic Tradition, 54, 118.
71. Edward Schillebeeckx, Jesus: An Experiment in Christology (New York: Seabury, 1979) 196. The historicity of Jesus' reception by those who

knew him and his parents is established on the basis of discontinuity with earliest Christianity.

72. Schillebeeckx, Jesus, 196-97.
73. That is to say no more or less than that Jesus, in accord with his purpose, expected faith but allowed for the refusal of faith. Jesus expected faith, and on certain occasions was amazed at the lack of faith (Mark 4:40; 6:6). Specifically, forgiveness was bound both to faith and to repentance (e.g. Mark 2:5; Luke 15:7,10). The faith Jesus called for is actualized and completed in the repentance that carries a person into a new relationship (cf. Mark 10:52; Luke 17:11-19). If faith and repentance are interdependent, this means that the call for one tacitly includes the other. Which is called for in a particular case will depend on the standpoint of those addressed: those outside and uninvolved were directed to repent (e.g. Mark 6:12; Luke 13:3; those already involved were called to faith (e.g. Mark 5:36; Luke 7:50). Thus the focus of each term may be distinct but the substantial correspondence between the two terms also becomes evident.
74. Meyer, Aims, 159. Pesch underscores the point that Jesus' eating with sinners (e.g. Mark 2:15-17) is part of the fabric of what we know about Jesus' activity. Further, it is also confirmed out of the charges of the opponents. Markusevangelium I., 167.
75. Meyer, Aims, 159; Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, 232.
76. Meyer, Aims, 159-60. At the same time it is clear that "clean" and "unclean" cannot be equated with righteous and unrighteous, see Sanders, Jesus, 177-188.
77. Jeremias, NT Theology, 134-151.

78. Heinz Shürmann, Traditionesgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den synoptischen Evangelien (Düssildorf: Patmos-Verlog, 1968) 146.
79. T.W. Manson, The Teaching of Jesus, 163
R. Bultmann, History and Eschatology, 31.
N. Perrin, Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus, 67: "The victory of God is resulting not in the restoration to a state of purity of the land Israel and its people, but in the restoration to wholeness of a single disordered individual. The experience of the individual, rather than that of the people as a whole, has become the focal point of the eschatological activity of God."
80. A. Oepke, Das neue Gottesvolk in Schriftturn, bildender Kunst und Weltgestaltung (Gütersloh: Mohr, 1950) 165-167.
81. See Schnackenburg God's Rule and Kingdom, (Montreal: Palm Publishers, 1963) 222-23.
82. Manson's emphasis on the present overlooks the fact that the present participation in the kingdom is characterized by anticipation of the kingdom in consummation. The Teaching of Jesus, 163,173. John W. Bowman, Prophetic Realism and the Gospel, (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1955) 200-202.
83. The moral struggle is over, though the values that it had expressed within the limitations of history endure, sublated by eternal life.
84. Dodd, Parables, 148-149, makes the point that it has its own emphasis but he has great difficulty in giving a coherent interpretation of this parable. He, of course, equates the coming kingdom with the harvest that is already realized in the work of Jesus. He may not be completely off track in relating the question in the parable about the tares to the presence of many sinners in Israel. This being the case,

how can it be that the kingdom of God has come (in fullness)? In the parable this question can only come before the harvest. But in Dodd's framework the question could only be appropriate as a question because harvest has come. The attempt to identify the coming reign of God with one element in the parable here most visibly fails.

85. Beasley-Murray, Kingdom, 133.
86. Beasley-Murray, Kingdom, 134.
87. Perrin, Language, 89.
88. Perrin, Language, , 134.
89. Thus Allen Verhey, who highlights the accent in Matthew on fulfillment of the law, sets Matthew and Mark in contrast at this point; Mark presents freedom from the law whereas Matthew teaches that the law holds. One must agree that the accent falls differently even within a single gospel depending on the point that is being made, and this is not only to be expected but true of the two different gospel accounts. To say the least, careful attention to both differences and appropriate coherence seems important for the sake of proper interpretation. See his The Great Reversal: Ethics and the New Testament, 83-87.
90. See K.M. Campbell, "The New Jerusalem in Matthew 5.14," Scottish Journal of Theology, 31 (1978) 335-363.

Chapter 4--Jesus' Messianic Mission

1. T.W. Manson, The Teaching of Jesus: Studies of its Form and Content (London: Cambridge University, 1935) 4-6, 13-17.
2. Respecting the historicity of the pre-Easter designation of Jesus as Messiah, the following data are relevant: (1) According to John 6:15, a Galilean crowd intended to make Jesus a "king." This tradition gains

in plausibility from contemporary research on messianic movements in the late second-temple period. See R.A. Horsley and J.S. Hanson, Bandits, Prophets, and Messiahs (Minneapolis: Winston, 1985). (2) The riddle on the new sanctuary (Mark 14:58//Matt 26:61), the historicity of which is generally acknowledged, implies a royal (=messianic) function. (3) Jesus' proclamation of the kingdom of God was clearly God's last word to Israel; the envoy of God is accordingly equipped with plenipotentiary authority, as Jesus' use of "Amen" and emphatic "ego-I" (personal rather than scriptural authority) indicates. Matt 4:23; 9:35; cf. 11:5 take "proclamation" to be a messianic function (cf. 11QMelch 18). (4) Further data, suggesting a claim to messiahship, derive from the passion story: the answer to the high priest (Mark 14:62//Matt 26:64); the purple cloak, the crown of thorns, the *titulus* on the cross. (5) The confession of Caesarea Philippi is followed by the exchange between Jesus and Peter. This exchange, indeed, implies at least high status for Jesus. Moreover, in the synoptic tradition the exchange is firmly located as the follow-up on the confession. In Luke the two are combined in a single pericope. Cf. Bultmann, The History of the Synoptic Tradition (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1963), 258. See also Jeremias, Theology of the New Testament (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951) 32.

3. Cf. C.F.D. Moule, "Mark 4:1-20 Yet Once More" Neotestamentica et Semitica (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1969) 99-101.
4. Moule, Neotestamentica et Semitica, 106. See also the discussion on the parables above.

5. Hengel, "That Jesus did send forth the disciples can hardly be doubted in principle," The Charismatic Leader and His Followers (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1981) 73-74.
6. Paul S. Minear reviewed these distinctions between hearers relative to Jesus' teaching in the synoptics carefully. See his "Audience Criticism and Markan Ecclesiology", in Neues Testament und Geschichte, ed. Heinrich Baltensweiler and Bo Reicke (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1972), 77-89. "The Disciples and the Crowds in Matthew," Anglican Theological Review (Suppl. series), 1974, 28-44; "Jesus' Audiences According to Luke," Nov. T. 16, 1974, 81-109.
7. One need not accept Minear's precise delineation of these groups of hearers and still find the basic presentation convincing. It seems that the boundaries of the two groups, disciples and crowds, are not as firm as he makes them. The very fact that "disciple" is used to refer to people beyond the twelve and that "crowd" can refer to others than people sympathetic to Jesus makes the point. The crowd is indeed most often a reference to people sympathetic to Jesus but to speak of them as "committed believers" is going too far and makes it difficult to preserve the distinction between "crowd" and "disciples." The relation of the crowd to Jesus is not settled; among them are those who cease to follow and those who come forward to become disciples (cf. Matt. 8:18-22).
8. Manson, Teaching, 19; cf. J. Arthur Baird, Audience Criticism and the Historical Jesus (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1969), 11-16.
9. Manson, Teaching, 320-327. Even if it is clear that not all the words appearing as indices for each category are equally significant, still the number of definite words specific to each of the three categories is impressive.

10. Baird, Audience Criticism, 18-19.
11. The greater part of the material which the synoptic tradition represents as esoteric calls of itself for such a context; thus, it is difficult, if not impossible, to imagine esoteric traditions such as the prophecy of the destruction of the temple or the eucharistic words as ever having had a place in "public" tradition. The issue, then, is not primarily one of "setting." It is directly an issue of historicity itself. If Jesus taught that the temple would be destroyed, he certainly reserved this teaching to his disciples, regardless of whether the details of the setting of Mark 13 parr. were secondary. Our conclusion, then, is that the historicity of esoteric traditions should be established. There is, however, no need to reconstruct specific settings for such traditions (The synoptists have already done this for us.) Cf. E.E. Ellis, "Present and Future Eschatology in Luke," NTS 12, 1964-65, 27-41.
12. Sanders, Jesus and Judaism, (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985) 14, makes this point in dependence on Berger Gerhardsson, "Der Weg der Evangelienstradition," Das Evangelium und die Evangelien (Tübingen: Mohr, 1983) 79-102. As part of the evidence in making this point, Gerhardsson cites the fact that in Acts we become aware that the author knows the life and work of Jesus, but this is not cited in his text so that we recognize that he actually had a full and detailed knowledge of Jesus' teaching and work. Again, the author of 1 John at the least was well aware of the Johannine form of the Jesus tradition (if he was not himself the evangelist). Yet he does not once explicitly cite a word from Jesus (but it was clearly fundamental for him, 2:7,24; 3:11) 81.
13. Sanders, Jesus, 14.

14. Sanders, Jesus, 14.
15. His primary interest is of course to examine the place of audience identification in terms of the redactional work of each of the synoptics. In the process he shows that the audience tradition is part of the whole fabric of the gospel material. There are differences on this point between the gospels; Luke is less definite at times in his audience identifications than Matthew and Mark. But this does not destroy their coherence in this respect.
16. Baird, Audience Criticism, 16-17.
17. Joachim Jeremias, New Testament Theology (London: SCM 1971) 255-57. Jeremias goes on to make the point that esoteric teaching was both prevalent and important in the Judaism of Jesus time. It was a crucial element of the Qumran community and it was present as the reason for gathering of groups of disciples in other branches of Judaism. It seems also to be an aspect of the character of the apocalyptic writings.
18. David Daube, The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism (London: The Athlone Press, 1956), 142ff. Morton Smith makes much the same point. He cites Paul's reference to "the wisdom of God in a mystery" that he speaks to the mature (I Cor 2:1-6). He also refers to the parallel distinction recognized by the Tannaim between material suitable for public teaching and that reserved for secret teaching. (Hagigah T 2:1 [233]. Tannaitic Parallels and the Gospels (Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature, 1968), 155-156.
19. William Wrede, The Messianic Secret (London: Cambridge, 1971).

20. See J.A. Fitzmeyer, "Further Light on Melchizedek from Qumran Cave 11", JBL 86 (1967) 25-41; repr. in Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1974) 246-67 at p. 248.
21. On the royal entry, see the parallel addressed by R. Horsley and Hanson. Bandits, Prophets, and Messiahs (Minneapolis: Winston, 1985) cf. 110-117, 256-257. For the cleansing, it is clear that in Israel the establishing, maintenance, and reform of Cult was historically a royal prerogative in Israel as in Mesopotamia.
22. See N.A. Dahl, "The Crucified Messiah" in The Crucified Messiah and Other Essays, (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1974) 10-36.
23. Marinus de Jonge, "The Earliest Christian Use of *Christos*: Some Suggestions" New Testament Studies, Vol 32, 1986, 321-343.
24. Horsley, Bandits.
25. B. F. Meyer, Aims of Jesus, (London: SCM, 1979) 188.
26. Horsly, Bandits, 256-257.
27. Horsly, Bandits, 98-102, 108-110.
28. M. de Jonge, "The Earliest Christian Use of *Christos*."
29. Dietrich Bonhoeffer, Ethics (New York: Macmillan, 1955) 80.
30. Schweitzer, Quest, 388-390.
31. Bultmann, Das Verhältnis der urchristlichen Christusbotschaft zum historischen Jesus, Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil-his. Klasse, 1960, Z. Abhandlung, 3. Aufl. (Heidelberg, 1962), 12.
32. The debate is well represented in the two essays, one by Vögtle, "Todesankündigungen und Todesverständnis Jesu," in Der Deutungen im Neuen Testament, ed. K. Kertelge, Quaestiones Disputatae 74. Freiburg, 1976:51-113; and one by Pesch, in the volume edited by Karl Kertelge, Der Tod Jesu: Deutungen im Neuen Testament (Freiburg: Herder, 1976).

33. Kertelge, Der Tod Jesu, 67-76.
34. Kertelge, Der Tod Jesu, 113; cf. Fiedler, "Sunde und Vergeltung im Christentum," Concilium 10 (1974), 568-71.
35. Pesch, "Das Abendmahl und Jesus Todesverständnis", Der Gott Jesu, 181-182.
36. Pesch, "Das Abendmahl und Jesus Todesverständnis", 183-184.
37. That the text is a post-Easter product cannot be assumed from the imagery of the cross. That imagery was commonplace in Palestinian Judaism. The text of Mark 8:34//Matt 16:24//Luke 9:23 envisages the moment when the condemned man takes the *patibulum* on his shoulder and turns to face the howling mob from which he is now cast out. The rabbis (b. Sanh. 85a) considered the condemned man to be already dead. Anyone who strikes him is free of punishment. In the gospel text this outcast is proposed as the paradigm of discipleship. Hence the relevance to historicity of the index of originality. Cf. Hengel, Studies in the Gospel of Mark (London: SCM, 1985) 42.
38. Hengel, The Charismatic Leader.
39. Hans-Dieter Betz, Nachfolge und Nachahmung Jesu Christi im Neuen Testament (Tübingen: Mohr, 1967).
40. Ernest Best, Following Jesus: Discipleship in the Gospel of Mark (Sheffield: JSOT, 1981.) 37-40.
41. Martin Hengel has given thorough consideration to the relation between disciple and master in the Jewish and Hellenistic world and the points here presented sum up part of his exposition. The Charismatic Leader, 42-57.
42. Best, Following Jesus, 37; William L. Lane, The Gospel According to Mark (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974) 307.

43. Robert A. Meye, Jesus and the Twelve: Discipleship and Revelation in Mark's Gospel (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1968) 123. Some have made much of the aorist tense (*aratō ton stauron*) to indicate a single action and thus a single act of martyrdom. But attention should also be directed to the present imperative to "follow" (*akoloutheitō*), implying a period of discipleship after taking up the cross. Cf. Best, Following Jesus, 38-39.
44. Jeremias, Parables, 218-19.
45. Jeremias, "Die älteste Schicht der Menschensohn-Logien," ZNW 58 (1967) 159-72 at p. 167.
46. Meyer, Aims, 211-213.
47. John H. Yoder, The Politics of Jesus. (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1972) 45.
48. E. J. Tinsley, The Imitation of God in Christ (London: SCM, 1960), 31.
49. Stanley Hauerwas, The Peaceable Kingdom (Notre Dame: University Press, 1983) 78.
50. C.F.D. Moule, The Origin of Christology (London: Cambridge, 1977) 10-22. The use of *gar* in Mark 8:35 shows that v. 35 is closely bound to v. 34 and explains it. *emou kai* in v. 35 is lacking in some important manuscripts but present in others; both Matt 16:25 and Luke 9:24 have it but lack *kai tou euaggeliou*. The last phrase is probably an interpretative addition by Mark. Cf. Best, Following Jesus, 40; Martin, Mark: Evangelist and Theologian (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1970) 24-28. A new argument for the historicity of Mark 10:45//Matt 20:28 has been offered by Peter Stuhlmacher, "Vicariously Giving His Life for Many, Mark 10:45 (Matt. 20:28)", pp. 16-29 in Reconciliation, Law, and Righteousness (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986). Stuhlmacher's treatment

shows that the saying (1) does not derive from eucharistic tradition, though it does parallel the eucharistic words in part; (2) draws on Isa 43:3-4 and on Isa 53:11-12, but, above all, has its distinctiveness from the reversal of the situation in Dan 7:14 where "the peoples, nations, and languages" serve "the one like a (son of) man." Here the Son of man serves them by making himself their ransom.

51. A contrast between "physical life" and "spiritual life" is not intended. Consistency in the meaning of *psyche* throughout v. 35 seems required by the use of the pronouns for it in the second half of each contrast. And it can have this consistency only if it is given the fullest possible meaning (i.e. true or essential life.). Best, Following Jesus, 41.
52. J.L. Houlden reviews this material on Christology and discipleship in Mark and concludes that there is a "paucity of ethical material." The small amount of ethical content Mark does present derives from nonethical interests (i.e. Christology and the kingdom of God). But does the evidence that is cited for this judgment not simply show that the ethics is theological and not autonomous? Ethics and the New Testament (London: Penguin, 1973), 41-42.
53. Yoder, Politics, 47.
54. The formation of a group of disciples comprised of both former zealots and former publicans, the representative number twelve, and the mission of the twelve (the source of Herod's first concern and perplexity about Jesus (cf. Luke 9:7-9), are all supporting evidence of the social relevance of this "minority" community.
55. C.H. Dodd, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel (London: Cambridge, 1968) 393. The view that John restricts love to members of the

community is finally an argument from silence. Even in the call to be a community of love others beyond the community are not left out of concern (John 13:35b). Love is thus not confined to disciples, but it is defined in the community of disciples. Cf. John A.T. Robinson, The Priority of John (London: SCM, 1985), 334-336.

56. Bultmann refers to this on the one hand as a reformulation and expansion of a dominical saying and on the other as a "Christian construction". Tradition, 141, 147. The teaching is in coherence with what we know from Jesus; as it is Bultmann's claim is unsupported.
57. Jeremias, Theology, 192-194.
58. Jeremias, "The Lord's Prayer in the Light of Recent Research" in The Prayer's of Jesus, Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 6 (London: 1967) 92, 103.
59. This statement is strongly aligned in content with other teaching on discipleship. It may be a reformulation but in substance comes from Jesus. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, The Gospel According to Luke (X-XXIV) (New York: Doubleday, 1985), 1061.
60. Fitzmyer sums up the statement from Luke: "Only the person who is capable of a radical and painful decision, to set all natural, human relations behind the connection with Jesus (cf. 9:59-62; 8:19-21; 11:27-28) and to give up life itself in martyrdom, can really become a disciple of Jesus." Luke, 1062.
61. Paul Minear discusses with real insight the rationale for persecution on the basis of John 16:1-3. John: The Martyr's Gospel, (New York: Pilgrim, 1984), 24-30.
62. Yoder, Politics, 128, 46-47.

63. This is an example of teaching common to John and the Synoptics represented by different vocabulary (so that literary dependence is inherently improbable) but they are clearly the same teaching. The variety of forms supports both the authenticity and importance of this teaching (cf. Matt. 10:39; 16:25; Mk. 8:35; Lk. 9:29; 17:33). Cf. C.H. Dodd, Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel (London: Cambridge, 1963), 335-65.
64. Robert C. Tannehill, The Sword of His Mouth, (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975), 99-101.
65. Minear, John, 129-130.
66. Tannehill, The Sword, 101.
67. Dan Otto Via, The Ethics of Mark's Gospel--In the Middle of Time (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985) 81.
68. Meyer, Aims, 185, 186, 188.
69. G. R. Beasley-Murray, Jesus and the Kingdom of God (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986) 181-184. In this Qumran text there is reference to the gates of death, the city built on rock, and the securely bolted doors.
70. Meyer, Aims, 180; Betz, Jesus, 90.
71. Betz, Jesus, 90.
72. Though the historicity of Matt. 16:17-19 has been repeatedly questioned, there is evidence, as Ben Meyer has shown, that strongly supports both its historicity and its placement in the Caesarea Philippi scene. All the gospels, not only Matthew, are in agreement that Simon received the name Peter from Jesus (Mk. 3:16; Lk. 6:14; Jn. 1:42). In Mark and Luke the significance of this datum is left altogether unexploited. "It received neither special accent nor thematic development. The only way in which this lack of emphasis,

whether on the name itself or on its bestowal can affect the judgment of the critic is to support a verdict of historicity." Similarly in the Fourth Gospel where the original aramaic (*Kephas*) is given, its force is supposed but not highlighted or developed. This provides strong warrant for the conclusion that Jesus in fact gave Simon the completely new name. Furthermore, if the basis for the giving of the new name offered by Matt 16:17-19 is not accepted, what alternative explanation has ever made this act even minimally plausible? What is more, the character and importance of the role of "Cephas" in pre-Pauline (I Cor. 15:5), Pauline (Gal. 1:18; 2:9,11,14; I Cor. 1:12; 3:22; 9:5; 15:5) and post-Pauline (all four gospels) estimation accords exceedingly well with the voice of the Matthean text, 186.

73. The historicity of Jesus being handed over to Pilate on the basis of certain determinations made by the Jewish leaders is hardly to be questioned. Cf. A. E. Harvey, Jesus and the Constraints of History (London: Duckworth, 1982), 25-26. Whatever the relevance of Jewish tradition about procedure at such trials (M. Sanh, IV-VII. If the gospels report preliminary proceedings and not fundamentally a trial it is irrelevant), certain basic information in such a case would certainly soon be in the public realm. Betz, Jesus, 87-88.
74. Betz, Jesus, 89; Meyer, Aims, 180; There is question about precisely what could form the basis for a charge of blasphemy. Rabbinic evidence indicates that it was necessary to have pronounced the divine name (M. Sanh VII. 5); Philo and probably Josephus, who furnish evidence for the first century, show that the basis for the charge was more inclusive. See A.E. Harvey, Jesus on Trial. A Study of the Fourth Gospel (London: SPCK, 1976) 77-81.

75. See K. Schubert, "Biblical Criticism criticised: with reference to the Markan report of Jesus's examination before the Sanhedrin," 385-402 in Jesus and the Politics of His Day, edited by Ernst Bammel and C.F.D. Moule (London: Cambridge, 1984), 396.
76. Meyer, Aims, 180; Betz, Jesus, 89-90; Bertil Gärtner, The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament (London: Cambridge, 1964), 115-122.
77. Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, I, 148-149.
78. Joachim Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus (London: SCM, 1966)
79. Rudolf Pesch, Das Abendmahl und Jesu Todesverständnis (Freiburg: Herder, 1978) 21-34.
80. Pesch, Abendmahl, 31-34.
81. J. Jeremias, Die Abendmahlsworte Jesu (Göttingen: Vanderboeck & Ruprecht, ³1964) 224-25. Perrin's translation in The Eucharistic Words of Jesus (London: SCM, 1966) 133, differs slightly.

Conclusion

1. Jack T. Sanders, Ethics in the New Testament (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975).
2. Sanders, Ethics, 29.
3. Sanders, Ethics, 29.
4. Sanders, Ethics, 9.
5. Sanders, Ethics, 8-9.
6. Sanders, Ethics, 20, 45.
7. Sanders, Ethics, 8.

APPENDIX

THE USE OF CRITERIA IN HISTORICAL CRITICISM OF THE GOSPELS

In the study of the gospels and forming historical judgments there are three possible verdicts: historical, non-historical and undecided or suspended judgment. If these verdicts are not to rest on mere assumption but on actual evidence, one cannot do without definite indices of historicity and non-historicity.

The issue of criteria in the historical criticism of the gospels has recently received increased attention. The view, which has largely prevailed for at least a hundred and fifty years, has been that the proper formulation and use of criteria would yield objective results.* But there is a general recognition that the present situation is one of confusion and disagreement. The confusion has centered around the question of presupposition in criticism and interpretation of the gospel accounts (how take account of subjectivity as a component and as a condition of objectivity). The disagreement has been in part a question over which criteria are cogent or pertinent and in part a question of whether in fact they are adequate to the task.

The criteria (or, more accurately, indices) to historicity are: discontinuity with early Christianity; originality vis-à-vis Palestinian Judaism; coherence with material shown by other means to be authentic (e.g.

* The work of David F. Strauss completed in 1836 on the life of Jesus' was notable in the formulation of definite criteria for gospel criticism. See his work in English The Life of Jesus Critically Examined (London: SCM, 1973). For the more recent discussion see D.G.A. Calvert, "An Examination of the Criteria for Distinguishing the Authentic words of Jesus," NTS 18 (1971-72); 209-218. Robert H. Stein, "The 'Criteria' for Authenticity," in Gospel Perspectives. Studies of History and Tradition in the Four Gospels, (eds.) R.T. France and David Wenham (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1980) 225-263.

if a saying in a new setting bears the stamp of the same inner logic of material already acknowledged to be authentic, then we may fairly conclude that Jesus is the source of this saying also); multiple attestation (in relatively independent strands of tradition); multiform attestation (e.g. in narrative material, or sayings material). Of these indices, discontinuity with the transmitting church is regularly the most convincing. For example, if (as seems clear) the tendency of the transmitting church was to present Jesus as independent of John the Baptist, the historicity of the tradition of Jesus seeking the baptism of John is established with high probability. Again, the index of originality vis-à-vis Palestinian Judaism is often decisive of itself; the evidence for the originality of Jesus is both more extensive and compelling than the evidence for the originality of the post-Easter Christian community. The other indices, though they do not carry the force of independent cogency, have their own significant weight as part of the cumulative evidence for establishing the case for historicity.

Since the task of criticism depends on human judgment in the discernment of what is or is not so, matters will hardly ever be settled by a single decisive question. Rather, what is normally involved is a range of considerations depending on relevant indices and cumulative evidence. The pertinence and the application of particular indices must be established from case to case (otherwise criticism becomes merely arbitrary and superfluous). For instance, the presence of the indices of discontinuity or originality is positive evidence for historicity, but their absence is not positive evidence against historicity (i.e. the early Christian community saw itself as responsible to Jesus evidenced most clearly by traditions preserved counter to the tendencies of the church; but if this is so it certainly would preserve traditions in accord with existing patterns and tendencies).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ambrozic, A. M. The Hidden Kingdom: A Redactional Critical Study of the References of the Kingdom of God in Mark's Gospel. CBQ--Monograph Series, 2. Washington. 1972.
- Baird, J. Arthur. Audience Criticism and the Historical Jesus Philadelphia: Westminster, 1969.
- Barrett, C.K. "The Background of Mark 10:45." New Testament Essays. Studies in Memory of Thomas Walter Manson. Ed. A.J.B. Higgins. Manchester, 1. 1-18.
- _____. Jesus and the Gospel Tradition. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1968.
- Beare, Francis W. The Earliest Records of Jesus. New York: Abingdon, 1962.
- Beasley-Murray, G. R. Jesus and the Kingdom of God. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986.
- _____. The Coming of God. London: Paternoster Press, 1983.
- Behm J. "metanoēō, metanoia," "Basileus" Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Ed. Gerhard Kittel. 10 Vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964.
- Borg, Marcus J. Conflict, Holiness & Politics in the Teachings of Jesus. New York: Mellen, 1984.
- Best, Ernest. Following Jesus: Discipleship in the Gospel of Mark. Sheffield: JSOT, 1981.
- Betz, Hans-Dieter. Nachfolge und Nachahmung Jesu Christi im Neuen Testament. Tübingen: Mohr, 1967.
- Bonhoeffer, Dietrich. Ethics. New York: Macmillan, 1955.
- Bornkamm, Gunther. Jesus of Nazareth. Trans. Irene and Fraser McLusky with James M. Robinson. New York: Harper & Row, 1959.

- Borsch, F. H. The Christian and Gnostic Son of Man. Studies in Biblical Theology, 2nd series, No 14, London: 1970.
- Bowman, John W. Prophetic Realism and the Gospel. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1955.
- Bright, John. A History of Israel. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1959.
- Bruce, F.F. This is That: The N.T. Development of Some O.T. Themes. Exeter: Paternoster, 1976.
- Buber, Martin. Kingship of God. Trans. Richard Scheimann. New York: Harper & Row, 1967.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. Das Verhältnes der urchristlichen Christusbotschaft zum historischen Jesus, Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akdamic der Wissenschaften, Phil-his. Klasse, 1960, Z. Abhandlung, 3. Aufl. Heidelberg, 1962.
- _____. Exegetica. Aufsätze zur Erforschung des Neuen Testaments. Ed. E. Dinkler. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1967.
- _____. History and Eschatology. The Gifford Lectures 1955 Edinburgh: University Press, 1957.
- _____. Jesus and the Word. Trans. L.P. Smith and E H. Lantero. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958.
- _____, The History of the Synoptic Tradition. Trans. John Marsh. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1963.
- _____. Theology of the New Testament. 2 Vols. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951.
- Caird, George B. "Jesus and Israel: The Starting Point for New Testament Christology." in Christological Perspectives. Ed. Robert F. Berry and Sarah A. Edwards. New York: Pilgrim, 1982.
- _____. Jesus and the Jewish Nation. London: Athlone, 1965.

- Calvert, D.G.A. "An Examination of the Criteria for Distinguishing the Authentic words of Jesus," NTS 18 (1971-72); 209-218.
- Campbell, K.M. "The New Jerusalem in Matthew 5.14." in Scottish Journal of Theology. 31. 1978.
- Cassidy, Richard J. Jesus, Politics, and Society: A Study of Luke's Gospel. New York: Orbis Books, 1978.
- Charlesworth, James H. Ed. The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha. 2 Vols. Garden City: Doubleday, 1985.
- Childs, Brevard S. Biblical Theology in Crisis. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1970.
- Chilton, Bruce D. God in Strength: Jesus' Announcement of the Kingdom. Freistadt: Verlag F. Plochl, 1979.
- _____. "Introduction." in The Kingdom of God in the Teaching of Jesus. Ed. Bruce Chilton. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.
- _____. The Glory of Israel: The Theology and Provenience of the Isaiah Targum. Sheffield: JSOT, 1983.
- Cranfield, C.E.B. "Thoughts on New Testament Eschatology." S.J.T. 35, 1982. 497-512.
- Crenshaw, James L. and John T. Willis. Essays in Old Testament Ethics. New York: Ktav, 1974.
- Cross, Frank M. Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic. Cambridge: Harvard University, 1973.
- Dahl, N.A. "The Crucified Messiah." in The Crucified Messiah and Other Essays. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1974.
- Dalman, Gustaf. The Words of Jesus. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1902.
- R. J. Daly. Christian Biblical Ethics. Ed. R.J. Daly. New York: Paulist, 1984.

- _____. "The Eucharist and Redemption: The Last Supper and Jesus' Understanding of His Death," Biblical Theological Bulletin (1981), 21-27.
- Daube, R. David. The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism. London: The Athlone, 1956.
- Davies, W.D. The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount. London: Cambridge University Press, 1966.
- Dietrich, Ernst Ludwig. SWB-SBWT. Die endzeitliche Wiederherstellung bei den Propheten. Giessen: Töpelmann, 1925.
- Dodd, C. H. Gospel and Law. New York: Columbia University Press, 1951.
- _____. Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel. London: Cambridge University Press, 1963.
- _____. The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel. Cambridge: The University Press, 1968.
- _____. The Parables of the Kingdom. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1961.
- Dunn, James D. G. Christology in the Making. London: SCM, 1980.
- Ellis, E.E., "Present and Future Eschatology in Luke," NTS 12, 1964-65.
- Fiedler, P. "Sünde und Vergebung im Christentum," Concilium 10. 1974: 568-71.
- Fitzmyer, J. A. "Further Light on Melchizedek from Qumran Cave 11." JBL 86 (1967) 25-41; in Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament. Missoula: Scholars, 1974: 246-76.
- _____. The Gospel According the Luke (X-XXIV). New York: Doubleday, 1985.
- Flusser, David. Jesus. New York: Herder, 1969.

- Freedman David N. Pottery, Poetry, and Prophecy: Studies in Early Hebrew Poetry. Winona Lake, Indiana: Essenbrauns, 1980.
- Fridrichson, Anton et al., The Root of the Vine. London: A.C. Black, 1953.
- Gärtner, Bertil. The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament. London: Cambridge University Press, 1964.
- Gerhardsson, Berger. "Der Weg der Evangelienstradition." in Das Evangelium un die Evangelien. Tübingen: Mohr, 1983.
- Gese, Harmut. Essays on Biblical Theology. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1981.
- Glasson, T. Francis. "Schweitzer's Influence - Blessing or Bane?" in The Kingdom of God. Ed. Bruce Chilton. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.
- Gray, John. The Biblical Doctrine of the Reign of God. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1979
- Grimm, Werner. Weil Ich dich Liebe: Die Verkündigung Jesu Und Deuterojasaja. Frankfurt: Herbert Lang Bern, 1976.
- Harnack, Adolf. What is Christianity? Trans. Thomas B. Saunders. Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1978.
- Harvey, A.E. Jesus and the Constraints of History. London: Duckworth, 1982.
- _____. Jesus on Trial. A Study in the Fourth Gospel. London: SPCK, 1976.
- Hauerwas, Stanley. The Peaceable Kingdom. Notre Dame: University Press, 1983.
- Hengel, Martin. The Atonement. Trans. John Bowden. London: SCM Press, 1981.
- _____. The Charismatic Leader and His Followers. Trans. James C. G. Grieg. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1981.
- _____. Property and Riches in the Early Church. Trans. John Bowden. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974.

- _____. Studies in the Gospel of Mark. Trans. John Bowden. London: SCM, 1985.
- Henry, Carl F.H. "Jesus as the Ideal of Christian Ethics." Christian Personal Ethics. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957.
- Hiers, Richard H. Jesus and Ethics: Four Interpretations. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1968.
- _____. Jesus and the Future. Atlanta: John Knox, 1981.
- Hooker, Morna D. The Son of Man in Mark. Montreal: McGill University, 1967.
- Horsley, Richard A. and J. S. Hanson. Bandits, Prophets, and Messiahs. Minneapolis: Winston, 1985.
- Houlden, J.L. Ethics and the New Testament. London: Penguin, 1973.
- Hunter, Archibald M. "The Sermon and its Interpreters." in A Pattern For Life. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1965.
- Jeremias, Joachim. "Die älteste Schicht der Menschensohn-Logien," ZNW 58 (1967) 159-72.
- _____. Jesus' Promise to the Nation. Translation by H. St. J. Thackeray, R. Marcus, A. Wikgren and L.H. Feldman. 9 Vols. Loeb Classical Library. London: New York, Cambridge: William Heinemann and Harvard University Press. 1926-1965.
- _____. New Testament Theology. London: SCM, 1971.
- _____. The Eucharistic Words of Jesus. London: SCM, 1966.
- _____. "The Lord's Prayer in the Light of Recent Research." in The Prayers of Jesus. Studies in Biblical Theology. No. 6. London: 1967.
- _____. The Parables of Jesus. London: SCM, 1962.
- _____. The Sermon on the Mount. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1963.

- de Jonge, Marinus. "The Earliest Christian Use of *Christos*: Some Suggestions." New Testament Studies. Vol 32. 1986:321-343.
- Kant, Immanuel. Religion Within the Limits of Reason Alone. New York: Harper & Row, 1960.
- Käsemann, Ernst. New Testament Questions of Today. London: SCM, 1969.
- Keck, A. A Future of the Historical Jesus. Nashville: Abingdon, 1971.
- Kertelge, Karl (ed.) Der Tod Jesu: Deutungen im Neuen Testament. Freiburg: Herder, 1976.
- Kim, Seyoon. The Son of Man as the Son of God. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983.
- Kümmel, W. G. "Das Gesetz und die Propheten gehen bis Johannes' -- Lukas 16,16 in Zusammenhang der Lukasschrifter." In Verborum Veritas (G. Stählin Festschrift). Edited by O. Böcker and H. Haacker. Wuppertal: Brockhaus, 1970.
- _____. The Theology of the New Testament. New York: Abingden, 1973.
- Ladd, George Eldon. The Presence of the Future. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974.
- Lane, William L. The Gospel According to Mark. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974.
- Levenson, Jon D. Sinai and Zion. New York: Winston, 1985.
- Lewis, Jack P. The Gospel According to Matthew, Part I. Austin: Sweet, 1976.
- Lind, Millard C. Yahweh Is a Warrior. Scottdale: Herald, 1980.
- Lindars, Barnabas. Jesus Son of Man. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983.
- _____. The Gospel of John. London: Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 1972.

- Lohfink, Gerhard. "Die Korrelation vom Reich Gottes und Volk Gottes bei Jesus," Theologische Quartalschrift. 165 (1985) 173-183.
- _____. Jesus and Community. Trans. John P. Galvin. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.
- Maddox, Robert. The Purpose of Luke-Acts. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1982.
- Manson, T. W. The Servant Messiah. London: Cambridge University Press, 1961.
- _____. The Teaching of Jesus. London: Cambridge University Press, 1931.
- _____. The Teaching of Jesus: Studies of its Form and Content. London: Cambridge University Press, 1955.
- Marshall, I. Howard. The Gospel of Luke. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978.
- _____. New Testament Interpretation: Essays on Principles and Methods. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977.
- Martin, Ralph. Mark: Evangelist and Theologian. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1972.
- Metzler, Norman P. J. The Ethics of the Kingdom. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1974.
- Meye, Robert P. Jesus and the Twelve: Discipleship and Revelation in Mark's Gospel. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968.
- Meyer, Ben F. The Aims of Jesus. London: SCM, 1979.
- Miller, Patrick D. Sin and Judgment in the Prophets. Chico, California: Scholars, 1982.
- Minear, Paul S. Commands of Christ. New York: Abingdon, 1972.

- _____. "Audience Criticism and Markan Ecclesiology", in Neues Testament und Geschichte, ed. Heinrich Baltensweiler and Bo Reicke
Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1972.
- _____. "Jesus Audiences According to Luke," Nov. T. 16, 1974, 81-109.
- _____. John: The Martyr's Gospel. New York: Pilgrim, 1984.
- _____. Matthew: The Teacher's Gospel. New York: Pilgrim, 1982.
- _____. "Some Archetypal Origins of Apocalyptic Prediction." in Horizons in Biblical Theology I. 1979.
- _____. "The Disciples and the Crowds in Matthew". Anglican Theological Review. (Suppl. series). 1974: 28-44.
- _____. To Die and to Live, New York: Seabury, 1977.
- Moltman, Jürgen. The Crucified God. London: SCM, 1974.
- _____. The Experiment Hope. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975.
- _____. The Future of Creation. Trans. Margaret Kohl. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979.
- _____. Theology of Hope. Trans. James W. Leitch. London: SCM, 1967.
- Montefiore, C.G. Rabbinic Literature and Gospel Teachings. London: Macmillan, 1930.
- Moore, George F. Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1950. Vol 1.
- Moran, W. L. "A Kingdom of Priests." in The Bible in Current Catholic Thought. Ed. J.L. McKenzie. New York: Herder, 1962.
- Moule, C.F.D. Birth of the New Testament. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1981.
- _____. "Mark 4:1-20 Yet Once More." Neotestamentica Et Semitica. ed. by E. Earle Ellis and Max Wilcox. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1969.

- _____. The Origin of Christology. London: Cambridge University Press, 1977.
- Mowinckel, Sigmund. He That Cometh. Trans. G. W. Anderson. New York: Abingdon, 1954.
- Oepke, A. Das neue Gottesvolk in Schriftturn, bildender Kunst und Weltgestaltung (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1950).
- Pannenberg, Wolfhart. Basic Questions in Theology. Vols. I & II Philadelphia: Fortress, 1970.
- _____. "Can Christianity do without an Eschatology?" in the collection The Christian Hope. London: SPCK, 1970.
- Perrin, Norman. Jesus and the Language of the Kingdom. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976.
- _____. The Kingdom of God in the Teaching of Jesus. London, SCM, 1963.
- _____. Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus. New York: Harper & Row, 1967.
- Pesch, Rudolf. Das Markusevangelium. Freiburg-Basel-Wien: Herder, 1977.
- _____. Das Abendmahl und Jesu Todesverständnis. Freiburg: Herder, 1978.
- Petuchowski Jakob J. and Michael Brocke, Eds. The Lord's Prayer and Jewish Liturgy. New York: Seabury, 1978.
- Philo. With an English translation by F.H. Colson, Ralph Marcus and G. Whitaker. 12 Vols. The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann, 1949-1962.
- Ritschl, Albrecht. Three Essays. Trans. Philip Hefner. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1972.
- Robbins, Vernon K. Jesus the Teacher. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.

- Robinson, John A.T. The Priority of John. London: SCM, 1985.
- Rothe, Richard. Still Hours. Trans. Jane T. Stoddart. London: Hodder and Staughton, 1886.
- Rowland, Christopher. The Open Heaven. London: SPCK, 1982.
- Rowley, H.H. The Relevance of Apocalyptic. London: Lutterworth, 1963.
- Saebø, Mayne. "Messianisms in Chronicles?" Horizons in Biblical Theology. 2 1980: 85-109.
- Sanders, E. P. Jesus and Judaism. London: SCM, 1985.
- _____. Paul and Palestinian Judaism. London: SCM, 1977.
- _____. The Tendencies of the Synoptic Tradition. London: Cambridge, 1969.
- Sanders, Jack. Ethics in the New Testament: Change and Development. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975.
- Schnackenburg, Rudolf. God's Rule and Kingdom. Trans. John Murray. Freiburg: Herder, 1963.
- _____. The Moral Teaching of the New Testament. Trans. J. Holland-Smith and W.J. O'Hara. Montreal: Palm, 1965.
- Schillebeeckx, Edward. Jesus: An Experiment in Christology. New York: Seabury, 1979.
- Schleiermacher, Friedrich, Christian Faith (¹1821; ²1880). ET of second edition. Eds. H.R. Machintosh and J.S. Stewart (1928). New York: Harper and Row, 1963.
- Schmitt, Joseph. "L'Eglise de Jerusalem, ou la Restauration d'Israel' d'apres les cinq premier chapters des Actes," Rev Sc Rel, 1953.
- Schrage, Wolfgang. Ethik des Neuen Testaments. Gottingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1982.

- Schubert, K., "Biblical Criticism criticised: with reference to the report of Jesus's examination before the Sanhedrin." 385-402 in Jesus and the Politics of His Day. Ed. Ernst Bammel and C.F.D. Moule. London: Cambridge University Press, 1984.
- Schweitzer, Albert. The Mystery of the Kingdom of God. London: 1914.
_____. Von Reimarus zu Wrede. Tübingen: Mohr, 1906. ET. The Quest of the Historical Jesus. Trans. W. Montgomery. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1968.
- Schweizer, Eduard. The Good News According to Matthew. Trans. David E. Green. Atlanta: John Knox, 1975.
- Scott, E. F. The Ethical Teaching of Jesus. New York: MacMillan, 1936.
_____. The Crisis in the Life of Jesus. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1952.
- Shürmann, Heinz. Traditionesgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den synoptischen Evangelien. Düsseldorf: Patmas-Verlag, 1968.
- Sigal, Phillip. The Halakah of Jesus of Nazareth According to the Gospel of Matthew. New York: University Press of America, 1986.
- Silberman Lou H. Essays in O.T. Ethics. Ed. James L. Crenshaw and John T. Willis. New York: Ktav, 1974.
- Smith, Morton. Tannaitic Parallels to the Gospels. Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature, 1968.
- Sparks, H.F.D. Editor. The Apocryphal Old Testament. Oxford: Clarendon, 1984.
- Stein, Robert H. "The 'Criteria' for Authenticity," in Gospel Perspectives. Studies of History and Tradition in the Four Gospels. Eds. R.T. France and David Wenham Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1980.

- Stendahl, Krister. Paul Among Jews and Gentiles. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976.
- Strauss, David F. Life of Jesus Critically Examined. London: SCM, 1973.
- Stuhlmacher, Peter. Reconciliation, Law, and Righteousness. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986.
- Taibert, Charles H. Reading Luke: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Third Gospel. New York: Crossroad, 1982.
- Tannehill, Robert C. The Sword of His Mouth. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975.
- Tinsley, E. J. The Imitation of God in Christ. London: SCM, 1960.
- Vermes, Geza. Jesus the Jew: A Historian's Reading of the Gospels. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1973.
- _____. The Dead Sea Scrolls in English. Middlesex, England: Penguin, 1962.
- _____. "The Use of Bar Nash/ Bar Nasha in Jewish Aramaic" in Post-Biblical Jewish Studies. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1975.
- Via, Dan Otto. The Ethics of Mark's Gospel--In the Middle of Time. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985
- _____. The Parables: Their Literary and Existential Dimension. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1967.
- Vielhauer, P. "Gottesreich und Menschensohn in der Verkündigung Jesu" in Aufsätze Zum Neuen Testament. München: Kaiser Verlag, 1965.
- Vögtle, "Todesankündigungen und Todesverständnis Jesu." In Der Deutungen im Neuen Testament. Ed. K. Kertelge. Quaestiones Disputatae 74. Fireburg, 1976:51-113.
- von Rad, Gerhard. Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Ed. Gerhard Kittel. 10 Vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964. "Basileus" I.

- Weiss, Johannes. Jesus' Proclamation of the Kingdom of God. Trans. R.H. Hiers and D.L. Holland. London: SCM, 1971.
- Wenham, David. "The Kingdom of God in Daniel." The Expository Times, Feb 1987, Vol 98 #5.
- Westerholm, Stephen. Jesus and Scribal Authority. Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1978.
- Westermann, Claus. Elements of Old Testament Theology. Trans. Douglas W. Stott. Atlanta: John Knox, 1982.
- Wilder, Amos. Eschatology and Ethics in the Teaching of Jesus. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1939.
- Wrede, William. The Messianic Secret. London: Cambridge University Press., 1971.
- Wright, N.T. "Jesus, Israel and the Cross," Seminar Papers (SBL), Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1984.
- Yoder, John H. He Came Preaching Peace. Scottdale: Herald, 1986.
- _____. "The Biblical Mandate" in The Chicago Declaration. Ed. Ronald J. Sider. Carol Stream, Illinois: Creation House, 1974.
- _____. "The Political Axioms of the Sermon on the Mount," in The Original Revolution. Scottdale: Herald, 1971.
- _____. The Politics of Jesus. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972.
- _____, The Priestly Kingdom: Social Ethics as Gospel. Notre Dame: University Press, 1984.
- Zimmerli, Walter. The Old Testament and the World. London: SPCK, 1976.
- _____. Old Testament Theology in Outline. Trans. David E. Green Atlanta: John Knox, 1978.