JOSEPH KLAUSNER ON WHY ISRAEL REJECTED JESUS

JOSEPH KLAUSNER ON WHY ISRAEL REJECTED JESUS

by

Rachael L. E. Kohn

A Thesis
Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree
Master of Arts

McMaster University
September 1979

MASTER OF ARTS (1979)
(Religious Studies)

McMASTER UNIVERSITY
Hamilton, Ontario

TITLE: Joseph Klausner on Why Israel Rejected Jesus

AUTHOR: Rachael L. E. Kohn, B.A.

SUPERVISOR: Professor B. F. Meyer

NUMBER OF PAGES: 104, vi

ABSTRACT

This thesis explores Joseph Klausner on a central historical issue: why Israel rejected Jesus. Klausner's views, compiled from Jesus of Nazareth, Messianic Idea in Israel, and From Jesus to Paul, are compared to selected modern scholars, whose works in part or in whole attempt to answer a similar question. It is notable that two of the finest New Testament scholars, C. H. Dodd and W. D. Davies, have drawn on Klausner in their own formulations of the answer to this difficult question. It is evident, however, from the brief survey of modern scholars' views, that the basic information on Jesus, his aims and rejection, are as yet unsolved issues. Thus Klausner, far from being outdated, still has significant relevance for modern life-of-Jesus research.

The author shows that Klausner's obvious bias for the Jewish national imperative, aided rather than prevented him from acute insights into the nature of the messianic idea and the possible reasons for Israel's rejection of Jesus. In the final analysis a brief look at Klausner's background illuminates the ideological theme that steered his historical argument.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I Thank Dr. B. F. Meyer who exemplified the rare combination of an inspiring mind with attentive and helpful supervision.

To my parents

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this thesis is to offer an exposition and critique of Joseph Klausner on a central historical issue. The issue concerns Jesus and Israel and, specifically, why "Jesus' teaching proved unacceptable to the nation from which he sprang."[1] The resolution of this problem was the express purpose of Klausner's book, Jesus of Nazareth, His Life, Time, and Teachings.[2]

The first half of the thesis is a presentation of Klausner's views on the question, beginning with his description of the self-conscious messiahship of Jesus and ending with the confrontation between Jesus and Israel over nationalistic issues. The second half of the thesis is a reflection on Klausner's views. It will seek to highlight their significance both in terms of method and as the explanation of a particular historical problem: why Jesus' mission failed with respect to Israel.

Klausner's ideas will be drawn chiefly from Jesus of Nazareth with considerable supplementary material taken from his two other translated works, The Messianic Idea in Israel[3] and From Jesus to

---

[1]Joseph Klausner, Jesus of Nazareth, His Life, Time and Teachings (trns. H. Danby). New York: The Macmillan Co., 1925, p. 361. Hereafter this text is referred to as Jesus.

[2]Jesus, p. 361.

[3]Joseph Klausner, The Messianic Idea in Israel (trns. W. F. Stinespring). New York: The Macmillan Co., 1943. Originally published as three separate volumes: I In the Prophets (Cracow, 1909); II In the Apocalyptic and Pseudepigraphic Lit. (Jerusalem, 1921); III In the Tannaitic Period (Jerusalem, 1923). The latter (Part III, pp. 388-531) is the one historically pertinent to this paper and is therefore used exclusively. Hereafter this text is referred to as Messianic Idea.

Paul.[4] In the second half of the thesis (reflection on Klausner's views), opinions of other critics who have either broached Klausner's question or commented on relevant aspects of his work will be taken into account.

It is as an historian at once passionately Jewish and totally dedicated to an unbiased treatment of the "historical Jesus" and of Israel's reaction to him that Klausner is of interest today. Was it his involvement in Zionism that made him so keenly aware of the complexity of the problem he had set himself? In any case, he made the effort to take full account of the social, political, religious and psychological factors involved in Israel's repudiation of Jesus' teachings. As an advocate of political Zionism in Israel beginning in 1919,[5] Klausner could not fail to ponder the social, political, and national implications of religious values. Indeed, he viewed Jewish religious values as inseparable from social, political and national values.[6] It was from this perspective and with a particular sensitivity to the value-laden issues involved that he approached the question of why Israel repudiated the teachings of Jesus.

This vantage point has earned him both praise and blame. As the first book to appear in Hebrew on Jesus, Jesus of Nazareth demanded the attention of Jewish as well as Christian scholars. Their widely

---

[4]Joseph Klausner, From Jesus to Paul (trns. W. F. Stinespring). New York: The Macmillan Co., 1955.

[5]Simcha Kling, Joseph Klausner. New York: T. Yoseloff, 1970, p. 110; pp. 101-2; see also Geoffrey Wigoder (ed.), Encyclopaedic Dictionary of Judaica. Jerusalem: Keter Publishing House, 1974, p. 345.

[6]Kling, Joseph Klausner, pp. 83-85.

divergent reactions made it a landmark in historical-Jesus research. Especially, his painstaking investigation into the available sources distinguished his book as a thoroughly scholarly effort.

The four gospels are the only indispensable sources for Jesus' teaching[7] and, as thoroughly conditioned by the faith of early Christianity, they stand in need of rigorous historical critique. Edited by churchmen of the period between 60 and 125 AD, they represent pre-literary tradition shaped and stamped by the redactors' distinctive interpretation of Jesus, his teaching and his mission.

With regard to the Pharisees, the Jewish party most often mentioned in the gospels, the source problem is even more severe, for they themselves have left us no documents.[8] If we assume in common with general scholarly opinion that the Pharisees were the forerunners of the rabbis, we can accept the earliest Talmudic sayings (those preserved in the names of the rabbis known as the Tannaim) as indicative of Pharisaic beliefs.[9]

Regarding the use of sources on both Jesus and the Pharisees,

---

[7]Cf. Joachim Jeremias, Unknown Sayings of Jesus.

[8]Josephus speaks of the Pharisees at some length in six different passages in Antiquities and Jewish Wars: Ant.: xii,x,5ff; xviii,i,2ff; xvii,ii,4; xiii,xvi,2; xiii,v,9; Wars: i,v,2. From these references the Pharisees are known primarily for their preservation of the "traditions of the elders", their animosity toward the Sadducees, and their popularity with the people. However, Josephus tends to cast Pharisaic teachings in Hellenistic terms for his Roman readers. Josephus, Complete Works (trns. William Whiston). Grand Rapids, Mich.: Kregel Publications, 1960.

[9]Even less evidence for Pharisaic beliefs has been conceded by E. P. Sanders: "It seems to me quite possible that we have...virtually no Pharisaic literature apart from fragments embedded in Rabbinic material." Paul and Palestinian Judaism. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977, p. 426.

Klausner's choices are clear. In Jesus of Nazareth he relied most heavily on Mark for his material on Jesus, then (in descending order) on Matthew,[10] Luke, and John. (He inferred from the highly interpretative character of the fourth gospel that it did not have much historical value.) With regard to the Pharisaic ideas on messianism during the time of Jesus, Klausner used the sayings of the Tannaim. In addition, he says that the Pharisaic views "may be perceived in the Mishna and the earliest Talmudic Baraitas."[11]

A consequence of the uncertainty of the primary sources for both Jesus and the Judaism of his time is that the conflict between Jesus and Israel, Klausner's main object of inquiry, must be reconstructed historically. It was an intra-Jewish conflict, for Jesus was himself Jewish and his convictions were formulated and proclaimed in a Jewish environment. The conflict turned on some of Judaism's most significant hopes and beliefs: the expectation of the messiah, redemption, the kingdom of God, and the central issue of righteousness and the Law.

The precise focal point of the conflict between Jesus and Israel is further obscurred by the splintering of religious views in the Judaism at the time of Jesus. Josephus mentions that four main Jewish schools of thought existed: the Sadducees, Pharisees, Essenes, and Zealots. These groups held a variety of religious beliefs (e.g., some accepting an afterlife, others rejecting it) and political attitudes (some were pacifists, others were terrorists). Judging from an ancient Baraita[12] which lists seven types of despicable Pharisees[13] who exhibit

---

[10]Mark is used almost solely for Klausner's main narrative, but Matthew is cited more often, especially with regard to Jesus' teachings.

[11]Jesus, p. 212. [12]Sotah 22b. See also Mishna Sotah III 4.

[13]perusim--Klausner took this term as a reference to the Pharisaic party.

extremist, ascetic, and self-complacent tendencies,[14] it is likely that each of the four groups mentioned by Josephus allowed a certain range of internal variation.

In the light of this religiously discordant atmosphere, the particular impact which Jesus had on Israel must be carefully sought. Jesus' claim to messiahship alone cannot account for his impact since Josephus mentions that a number of messiah-like figures arose among the Jews around the time of Jesus.[15] If Josephus is correct it is all the more curious why the impact of Jesus was so profound both in its lasting effect on his disciples and in its arousal of bitter rejection by Israel. Hence, in accounting for Jesus' impact on Israel, Klausner asked an underlying question: 'why was Jesus alone not forgotten as a false Messiah?'[16]

He answered by reference to the "facts of Jesus' life."[17] These

---

[14]This is how Klausner interprets the ancient, obscure epithets. Jesus, p. 214.

[15]When Fadus was procurator of Judaea, about 15 years after the death of Jesus, Theudas led a great crowd of people to the Jordan and, saying that he was a prophet, promised that he would divide the river and lead them safely over (Antiquities XX,v,i). During the reign of Felix, procurator of Judaea 52-60 CE a band of robbers led a multitude into the wilderness and promised they would exhibit signs and wonders (Antiquities XX, XIII,vi). About this time a prophet from Egypt led a multitude up to the Mount of Olives saying that he would command the walls of Jerusalem to fall down, and that he would make an entrance way through the walls (ibid.). Apollonius of Tyana, a Neopythagorean sage who was born about the beginning of the Christian era, led the life of an ascetic wandering teacher. He also possessed miraculous powers. "An anti-Christian writer, Hierocles of Nicomedia, paralleled Apollonius with Christ, which provoked a reply (extant) from Eusebius" (Oxford Classical Dictionary. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949, reprint 1961).

[16]Messianic Idea, p. 255.

[17]From Jesus to Paul, pp. 257-8. The distinctive view of Klausner sees in the teachings of Jesus the embryo of the Church, and he therefore sets himself apart from those who credit the Church alone with the rise of Christianity.

included his convictions and teachings. Thus, Klausner accepted as an historical reality a debate between Jesus and Judaism (in particular, the Pharisees) over Jesus' religious teachings. Moreover, he implied that the death of Jesus was attributable to Israel's rejection of these teachings.

Proceeding from the premise of a connection between Jesus' teaching and his death, Klausner's study culminated in a discussion of the root issues affecting the final rupture between Jesus and his people. The identification of these root issues reveal Klausner's understanding of both parties. They include his conception of Jesus' own messianic idea, of Jesus' and Judaism's notions of the kingdom of heaven, and of Jesus' and Judaism's relation to the Law and nationalism. These fundamental themes establish a context for the debate between Jesus and Israel and a focus on the crucial issues of Jesus' ethical teachings and what we shall call Judaism's 'national imperative'.

PART I

I. JESUS THE MESSIAH

There is "no doubt", according to Klausner, that "Jesus was convinced of his messiahship."[1] Klausner accepted the historical authenticity of Mark 1:9-11, according to which Jesus realized his messiahship at his baptism by the "new Elijah", John the Baptist.[2] Although it was the dazzling Judaean sun not the holy spirit that he saw,[3] Jesus reasoned that if the kingdom of God was "at hand" then the Messiah must be in the world.[4] His "dreamy, spiritual nature"[5] as well as his intimate knowledge of scripture[6] combined to make him think that he himself was the messiah.

---

[1] Jesus, p. 342.

[2] Jesus, pp. 252, 352. Albert Schweitzer commented on Mark's version of the baptism: "According to Mark he had known himself since his baptism to be the Messiah, but from the historical point of view that does not matter, since history is concerned with the first announcement of the messiahship, not with inward psychological processes" (The Quest of the Historical Jesus, trns. W. Montgomery from the first German edition, Von Reimarus zu Wrede, 1906. New York: The Macmillan Company, eighth printing, 1973). But Schweitzer did attribute to Jesus the "dogma" that John the Baptist was Elijah. Schweitzer stressed the secondary nature of this dogma which was developed only after Jesus expected his own manifestation as the Son of man: "The Baptist is made into Elias [Elijah] solely by the force of Jesus' messianic consciousness" (Quest, p. 376).

[3] Jesus, p. 252.

[4] Jesus, p. 252. Cf. p. 398 where the opposite reasoning is used: "But it followed nonetheless, that since there was a Messiah in the world, the 'kingdom of heaven was nigh' and this news Jesus, from the outset, published and proclaimed in his teaching."

[5] Jesus, pp. 252, 253.

[6] Jesus, p. 253.

Klausner viewed Jesus' missionary activity as the conscious fulfillment of his messianic self-understanding. Therefore, he interpreted Jesus' directives to the two disciples at Bethphage outside Jerusalem to procure an as yet unridden ass's colt as behaviour consciously in conformity with scriptural descriptions of the messiah.[7] His awareness of tradition matched by a lively pragmatism, he decided that the messianic revelation should take place in Jerusalem before the greatest number of witnesses.[8]

Jesus' performance of miracles[9] was also a conscious fulfillment of "the signs of the Messiah" which were to accompany the kingdom of heaven.[10] Accordingly, Klausner supposed that Jesus consciously emulated John the Baptist whose place he took;[11] and since Jesus regarded the Baptist as Elijah (Mark 9:11-13; Matthew 17:13) he performed miracles

---

[7]Zech. 9:9: "on his throne no stranger shall sit". Klausner also points out (Jesus, p. 309) that the followers using their garments in place of a saddle is in conformity with the story of Jehu whose officers did the same when they made him king (II Kings 9:13).

[8]Jesus, p. 303.

[9]Klausner categorizes the miracles into four types: 1) scriptural miracles; 2) poetical descriptions which in the minds of the disciples were transformed into miracles; 3) illusions; 4) acts only apparently miraculous (Jesus, p. 269).

[10]Jesus, p. 268. See post p. 17f.

[11]Jesus, p. 267. Klausner so fully integrated John the Baptist into the beginning of Christianity that he considered the Baptist only within a Christian framework--indeed the Baptist appears to mark the beginning of Christianity. "John the Baptist, the forerunner of Jesus, approached far more than did Jesus the Essenes in his whole manner and life...Christianity, therefore, drew from Essenism for a short time before Jesus and immediately after the death of Jesus [by way of James]" (Jesus, p. 211).

as did Elijah and his disciple Elisha.[12] Inspired by the prophetic sayings, Jesus attempted to perform miracles such as healing the blind, the deaf, the lame, and the dumb, which in the time of Jesus were thought to refer to the signs of the messianic age.[13]

He had already intimated to his disciples his messianic role (Mark 8:27ff; Matthew 16:6; Luke 9:20) in Bethphage and Caesara Philippi. Now he proceeded to Jerusalem in full mesianic regalia and aroused hosannas from the onlookers. Some of them confessed his Davidic messiahship (Matthew 21:9; Mark 11:10). Klausner took this public acclaim as the intended preparation for the confession of Jesus' messiahship in Jerusalem.[14]

In accord with this general picture Klausner accepted numerous sayings of Jesus as historically authentic intimations of his messiahship, e.g., Jesus' answer to the question of why his disciples, unlike those of John the Baptist and of the Pharisees, did not fast: "Can the wedding guests fast while the bridegroom is with them?" (Mark 2:19). This Klausner understood in the light of a late rabbinic saying from Pirke d"R. Eliezer (16 end): "the bridegroom is like unto a king". Thus, Jesus' reference to the bridegroom indicates his king-messiahship.

---

[12] Jesus, p. 267. Why Klausner thinks Jesus "must resemble Elijah... in being the forerunner of the Messiah" is puzzling, since he is clearly opposed to the view that Jesus was not on a messianic mission but a preparatory one and was therefore following in John the Baptist's footsteps with no significant change--a view held by Johannes Weiss in Jesus' Proclamation of the Kingdom, rev. 1900. See also W. G. Kümmel, The New Testament: The History of Investigation into its Problems, p. 227. Even more puzzling is why Jesus would wish to emulate Elisha....

[13] Jesus, p. 268.

[14] Jesus, p. 310.

Klausner likewise found an intimation of messiahship in Jesus' saying to the disciples concerning the coming of the kingdom. To Peter's confession of his messiahship (Mark 8:29) Jesus said: "Verily, I say unto you that there be some here of them that stand by which shall in no wise taste of death till they see the kingdom of God come with power" (Mark 9:1). Klausner argued that in linking himself with the advent of the 'end' in the disciples' own day Jesus intimated that he was himself the messiah.[15]

Klausner found another intimation of messiahship in Jesus' retort to Peter after the disciple warned him against entering Jerusalem: "Whosoever shall be ashamed of me and my words in this adultress generation, the Son of man also shall be ashamed of him when he cometh in the glory of his Father and with the holy angels" (Mark 8:38). Klausner interpreted both this saying and the one at Caesara Phillipi (Matthew 16:16-18) as messianic intimations in which "Son of man" refers both to the messiah and to Jesus.[16]

Jesus' confession before the hearing of the high priests, especially as noted in Mark 14:62 , is held by Klausner to be completely in the character of Jesus as an "oriental possessed of such a conviction"[17]

---

[15] Jesus, pp. 302-3.

[16] G. F. Moore agrees: "In eschatological contexts...the Son of Man is plainly the figure of Daniel's vision, taken individually and identified with the Messiah coming to judgement. Thus in Mark 14:61f (cf. Matt. 26:63f; Luke 22:67f), to the high priest's question, Art though the Messiah? Jesus replies, 'I am; and ye shall see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of Power ["ha Geburah"], and coming with the clouds of heaven.'" Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era, Vol. II. New York: Schocken Books, 1971 (orig. copyright, 1927), p. 335.

[17] Jesus, p. 342.

and in accord "with his spirit and manner of speech."[18]

For Klausner, the surest testimony to Jesus' claim of messiahship is the inscription on the cross which, in all four gospels, includes the appellation "King of the Jews": "The inference is clear that Jesus was crucified as 'King-Messiah', which, for non-Jews, could only mean 'King of the Jews'." Klausner believed that the inscription confirmed two facts: (1) Jesus was "delivered up to Pilate as a false Messiah"; and (2) Jesus must have declared himself as messiah.[19]

Klausner returned often to the argument that history cannot lie. Jesus' conviction of messiahship was proven by the subsequent history, for it preserved this belief. Against William Wrede's[20] thesis that Jesus never regarded himself as the messiah, Klausner argued "...had this been true it would never have occurred to the disciples (simple-minded Jews) that one who had suffered crucifixion ("a curse of God is he that is hanged") could be the Messiah; and the messianic idea meant nothing whatever to the Gentile converts. Ex nihilo nihi fit: when we see that Jesus' messianic claims became a fundamental principle of Christianity soon after his crucifixion, this is a standing proof that even in his lifetime Jesus regarded himself as the Messiah."[21]

---

[18]"The two expressions 'Son of man' (frequently on his lips) and 'at the right hand of power' (ἐκ δεξιῶν τῆς δυνάμεως), a peculiar Hebrew expression for the Deity, show that the answer is perfectly in accord with Jesus' spirit and manner of speech" (Jesus, pp. 342-43).

[19]Jesus, p. 353.

[20]Das Messiasgeheimniss in den Evangelien, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1901.

[21]Jesus, pp. 255-56. Cf. Armand Kaminka's refutation of this argument paraphrased in G. F. Moore's article "The Jewishness of Jesus", Menorah Journal, No. 33, Autumn, 1923. "It was the Christianity of the apostles, with its divine Christ and its miraculous narratives of his birth and of his resurrection, that had this success in the pagan world, to which such ideas were congenial" (p. 62). But see "A Rejoinder by Klausner", Harvard Theological Review, Vol. XVI No. 4, 1923, pp. 391-92, where he restated his position.

Klausner placed Jesus' belief in his own messiahship at the basis of Christianity. Without it Christianity would be virtually inexplicable.[22] In particular, he believed that the "extremist, individualistic ethic"[23] of Jesus' teachings derived from his messianic consciousness, not from his Pharisaic background.[24]

In summary, Klausner's portrait of Jesus as a self-conscious messiah showed that Jesus fashioned himself after scriptural, messianic traditions. He utilized his knowledge of these traditions to attract followers and convince them of his messiahship. Hence, in accordance with scripture, he both performed miracles and triumphantly entered Jerusalem. Jesus also presented himself as effecting the end of days (Mark 9:1) and as implicitly identical with the coming Son of man (Mark 8:38). Klausner took the inscription on the cross as hard evidence of Jesus' self-proclaimed and widely accepted messiahship. Finally, the testimony of history, wherein the idea of Jesus' messiahship was preserved, proved to Klausner that Jesus was a self-professed and popularly acclaimed Messiah.

In Klausner's analysis the fact of Jesus' messianic consciousness was followed by an inquiry into the distinctive themes and traits of this consciousness. Thus, Jesus' belief that he was the messiah was bound up with his recognition of John the Baptist as Elijah. In conformity with a prevalent Jewish belief that Elijah was the forerunner

---

[22] Jesus, p. 342.

[23] Jesus, p. 405.

[24] Jesus, p. 405.

of the Messiah, Jesus asserted that Elijah had come in the figure of John the Baptist (Mark 9:13, Matthew 11-13:14). The beliefs both in the return of Elijah and in his pre-messianic, preparatory function originated in the prophetic book of Malachai (4:5-6). Both Ben Sira (48:10-11) and the Gospels (Mark 9:11-13; Luke 1:17; Matthew 17:10-12) reflect them.[25] Likewise in rabbinic literature the activity of Elijah as one who effects the purification (for example in the mishnaic tractate Eduyyoth 8:7 end) which shall prevail in the Age to Come (i.e. messianic age)[26] can be related to John the Baptist's activity as purifier by baptism.[27]

In addition, Klausner cited as "trustworthy" the non-Talmudic source Dialogue with Trypho for the Jewish belief in the anointing of the Messiah by Elijah.[28] In Dialogue "Trypho represents the anointing of the Messiah by Elijah as a well established view".[29] The Tannaitic literature,[30] however, only states that Elijah must come one day before the Son of David.[31]

---

[25]In John 1:19-23 the belief in Elijah as forerunner to the Messiah is implied by the priests' and Levites' questions to John the Baptist. In this gospel, John denies that he is Elijah. However, it is also true that the prophet was likewise an expected messianic forerunner (Deuteronomy 18:15; Isaiah 40:3).

[26]For example, in Kiddushin 72b with slight differences in Tosephta Kiddushin 5:4.

[27]Although the tradition of Elijah's precedence was well established, G. F. Moore, Judaism, Vol. II, notes that "None of the earlier Tannaitic sources makes it Elijah's especial mission to bring Israel to repentance." (But compare the later source, Pirke d'R. Eliezer, Ch. 43, end.) "Nor does Elijah in any ancient source announce the Messiah is shortly coming or is come", p. 359 (underline, my own).

[28]Messianic Idea, p. 456.

[29]Messianic Idea, p. 456, n. 22.

[30]Messianic Idea, p. 456.

[31]Erubin 43 ab.

Klausner argued that Jesus neither regarded himself as God nor as son of God in the later Trinitarian sense.[32] The latter idea was inconceivable during the period of the Second Temple, since it was "wholly contradictory to the belief in [God's] absolute unity."[33] Klausner cited Mark 10:18 and Matthew 19:17 (see Luke 18:19) as evidence that Jesus did not place himself on the same level as God.[34] Therefore, God was the one who decided the specifics about the kingdom. Consistent with this belief was the saying Jesus addressed to the disciples as they argued among themselves over their place in the kingdom: "To sit at my right hand and at my left is not mine to give but it is for them for whom it hath been prepared of my Father" (Matthew 20:20). Thus, Jesus was "a man of the sons of men" (Dialogue with Trypho, par. 49) in conformity with the Tannaitic descriptions of the Messiah ascribing to him no "powers beyond the bounds of human nature."[35]

At Caesara Phillipi, after Peter confessed that Jesus was the Christ, Jesus told the disciples that the Son of man must suffer. Klausner took "Son of man" as a name for the messiah[36] and interpreted this saying as a reference to Jesus' own suffering messiahship.[37]

---

[32] Jesus, p. 377.

[33] Jesus, p. 377.

[34] Jesus, pp. 364-5.

[35] Messianic Idea, p. 465.

[36] Cf. G. Vermes, Jesus the Jew. London: Wm. Collings Sons & Co., Ltd., 1973 (rep. 1976) in which the titular interpretations of the son of man sayings in the gospels is expressly denied, pp. 185-6. See post p. 53.

[37] Jesus, p. 300. E. F. Scott, "A Jewish Interpretation of Jesus", Journal of Religion, Vol. VI, No. 1, 1926, incorrectly represented Klausner on this point saying that Jesus confidently went to Jerusalem and could not have had an idea about his suffering. Klausner stated quite clearly that Jesus feared death on his route to Jerusalem and that he most definitely told the disciples about his suffering--otherwise the whole rise of Christianity is incomprehensible (Jesus, p. 300).

Immediately following this saying is a reference to his death and resurrection after three days, but Klausner did not accept this reference as authentic. He explained that a dying messiah was an "impossible belief"[38] at the time of Jesus, and that the reference to Jesus' resurrection was a necessary interpolation by his disciples who thereby accounted for their messiah's death.

This explanation of the Christian resurrection account as a later insertion is similar to Klausner's discussion[39] of the Talmudic "slain Messiah", Messiah ben Joseph. The Talmudic legend of the warrior messiah who is to die in battle originated, according to Klausner, in the time of the Jewish uprising (132-135 AD) against Hadrian. It was specifically fashioned after the revolutionary chieftain, Bar Kochba, who was thought to be the messiah by some (notably, Rabbi Akiba) but who later died in battle. In order to rescue the idea of the messiah from extinction it was later asserted that Messiah ben Joseph, the messiah that dies in battle, was only a precursor of the Davidic messiah. Similarly, Klausner interpreted the "resurrected Messiah" as a (Christian) idea that arose out of the bitter disillusionment around Jesus' death. In both cases his argument rested on a firm belief that specific messianic ideas arise from necessity and are dictated by historical

---

[38]Klausner argued that the Talmudic sayings about 'the messiah who dies' (Messiah ben Joseph) originated in the post-Hadrianic period, which makes them late Tannaitic or early Amoraic (Messianic Idea, p. 492). According to Klausner, this unique Talmudic notion derived both from the two-fold character of the messiah (heroic and spiritual) and, more directly, from the death of the warrior hero Bar Kochbah, who was believed to be the messiah by some (Messianic Idea, pp. 483-501).

[39]Messianic Idea, pp. 483-501.

circumstance.[40]

Although Klausner viewed the resurrected messiah as a post factum justification of a problematic turn of fate, he did not view this to be the case with the doctrine of the suffering messiah. Jesus himself incorporated an idea of the suffering messiah into his mission. He also envisioned suffering for his disciples, telling them that they too must suffer because of him, but in losing their lives they would save them (Mark 8:35-36). Klausner confirmed the authenticity of Jesus' warning to his disciples about his suffering by pointing to the unanimity of this saying in the synoptic gospels. Ex nihilo nihil fit. If "the disciples believed in a suffering messiah, then Jesus must, while still alive, have spoken of such sufferings."[41]

In addition to this inference, Klausner asserted that the facts of Jesus' life before entering Jerusalem point toward a premonition of suffering: "(a) he had seen the fate of John the Baptist; (b) he was, at the time, persecuted and suffering in a foreign land; and (c) the coming of the Messiah was impossible without 'the pangs of the Messiah.'"[42] Furthermore, Jesus foresaw that his sufferings were to come in Jerusalem, for in Caesara Phillip he tells his disciples that "the elders, the chief priests and scribes" would reject him.[43]

---

[40]Klausner repeatedly stated that "in Judaism, obscure Biblical verses have never brought into being completely new doctrines [against the Drummond-Wünsche hypothesis about the origin of Messiah ben Joseph]; it is only that doctrines already in existence are supported and confirmed by such verses." Messianic Idea, p. 487.

[41]Jesus, p. 300.

[42]Jesus, p. 300.

[43]Jesus, p. 301.

Thus, according to Klausner, Jesus' messianic idea is both dependent on scriptural traditions and shaped by the facts of his life.

II. THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN ACCORDING TO JESUS AND JUDAISM

During the time of Jesus, the belief in 'signs' which indicated the dawn of the kingdom of heaven (messianic age)[44] was derived from Biblical and Pseudepigraphic literature. The belief that Elijah would return before the Day of the Lord (and the messianic age) was based on the prophetic book of Malachai (4:5). The well established idea that repentance was a requirement for the messianic redemption is found in prophetic literature (e.g., Isaiah 59:20; Malachai 4:2, Amos and Hosea). The idea of the final catastrophe of the world that would precede the coming redemption in the eschatological realm is extravagentally represented in apocalyptic books such as Daniel, (the pseudepigraphic) IV Ezra (3-14), and Sibylline Oracles. The catastrophic day[45] for Israel ("or at least for the majority")[46] has its pristine represenation in the descriptions of the Day of Yahweh[47] in the prophetic

---

[44] Jesus, p. 245, see rabbinic passages in footnote 34.

[45] John Gray states that the notion of catastrophe preceding the redemption is possibly influenced by Persian Zoroastrianism with its eschatological prospect of the destruction of the earth by fire and a cataclysm of molten metal, which would destroy living sinners but would be survived by the just (The Day of Yahweh in Cultic Experience and Eschatological Prospect, pamphlet. Lecture delivered at the Exegetical Day in Uppsala on September 26, 1973, p. 1).

[46] The Day of Yahweh, p. 1.

[47] The first emergence of the Day of Yahweh is in Amos in the middle of the 8th Century BCE (The Day of Yahweh, p. 1).

books (e.g., Amos 5:18-20; Isaiah 13:6; Malachai 3:19; Zepheniah 1:14-15, also all of chapter 1). Not until the Second Century CE[48] did the Tannaim attempt to represent these ideas in a messianic 'scheme'.[49]

By the time of Jesus the belief in signs indicating the dawn of the kingdom of heaven had not yet attained an orthodox conception. The gospels are ambiguous with regard to how and when the kingdom would come. Klausner was not sensitive to their ambiguity, and therefore his presentation of the signs of the kingdom according to Jesus was confused.

In a short discussion Klausner recognized two signs for the commencement of the kingdom of heaven: Jesus' messiahship and Elijah's (John's) appearance. He noted that from the moment of Jesus' baptism he looked upon himself as the messiah; and since the messiah was in the world "the kingdom of heaven, the kingdom of the Messiah, was likewise in existence in the world."[50] But in the next paragraph he also asserted[51] that for Jesus "the kingdom of heaven began with John the Baptist:" "the Law and the Prophets were until John, and from that time the kingdom of God is preached" (Matthew 11:12-15; Luke 7:28,

---

[48] Judaism, Vol. II, p. 323.

[49] In Tannaitic literature the "Day of Judgement" corresponds to the prophetic term "Day of the Lord" (Day of Yahweh). The Day of Judgement in Tannaitic literature is more often called "the birth pangs of the Messiah" i.e., of the messianic age, which involved the judgement of individual Jews and did not apply to the nation as a whole nor to all humanity". (Messianic Idea, p. 278).

[50] Jesus, p. 403. Also "...since there was a Messiah in the world the kingdom of heaven was nigh" (Jesus, p. 398).

[51] Jesus, p. 403.

16:16).[52] Klausner possibly saw in the latter a contradiction to the idea that the kingdom of heaven began with the appearance of the messiah, and interpreted it as "the kingdom of God was at least already drawing near."[53] So far Klausner has implied three different times of the dawning of the kingdom. Nevertheless, he accepted all three of them. The kingdom was: (1) present from the time of Jesus' messiahship; (2) present from the appearance of John; and (3) drawing near from the time of John's preaching.

In the gospels the dawning of the kingdom is also associated with the repentance of sinners. Klausner took account of Jesus' preaching of repentance[54] and explained it in the light of Rabbi Eliezer's statement concerning the kingdom (Sanhedrin 97b). According to him, the kingdom of heaven was contingent upon the repentance of all Israel,[55] i.e., it would be brought in by the penitents. Then Klausner turned his attention to the saying of Jesus in Mark (13:32), and pointed out that the kingdom would come suddenly: "But about that day or that hour no one knows...only the Father" (see also Matthew 24:35, 42, 44; Acts 1:7). Following that statement, however, Klausner asserted that "in real fact

---

[52]Despite the lack of evidence, Klausner maintained that John was conscious of being the messianic forerunner: "John thought of himself as Elijah, even though he did not openly proclaim this...John as the Messiah's forerunner, must prepare the way for him by teaching the need for repentance and good works. So he proclaimed his great message: 'Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand!'" (Jesus, p. 245).

[53]Jesus, p. 403.

[54]Jesus, p. 403.

[55]A slightly different version is found in Jer. Ta'anit, 63d.

the kingdom of heaven had already begun:[56] 'Behold, the kingdom of God is within you'"[57] (Luke 17:21).

In addition to the various signs associated with the dawning of the kingdom of heaven, Klausner discussed "the pangs of the Messiah" as a major sign of the kingdom. He did this by citing Mark 13:3-8 in which Jesus answered his disciples' question concerning when the kingdom will come by speaking of the "beginning of woes" (αρχαι ὠδινων) [Mark 13:5-27; Matthew 24:4-36; Luke 21:8-36]. Klausner accepted as authentic Jesus' description of the beginning of woes (Mark 13:3-8) since they are similar to the "pangs of the Messiah"[58] cited in various Talmudic Baraitas:[59] "wars and rumours of wars, nation rising against nation, and kingdom against kingdom, earthquakes, famines and tumults" (Sanhedrin 97a).

Klausner acknowledged the possibility that the following description (Mark 13:8-27), i.e., the woes befalling the entire generation of "the days of the Messiah" is a later, post-70 CE apocalyptic document. Indicative of this late derivation are references to the persecutions

---

[56] Jesus, p. 403.

[57] Klausner interpreted this as "among you" in common with the RSV's "in the midst of you."

[58] Moore notes that the rabbinical equivalent is "the travail of the Messiah" חבלי של משיח. "While in the Bible the plural is generally used as in Matt. 24:8 (pangs, throes), in the rabbinical texts the word is invariably singular." Judaism, Vol II, p. 361, n. 6.

[59] Jesus, p. 322. The appearance of "travail of the Messiah" in a Tannaitic list of the three great punishments from which one can be saved (Mekhilta, Wayyassa Chapter 5, 3nd [ed. Friedmann, 50b]; and Chapter 6 [ed. Friedmann 51a]; Shabbat 118a indicates that it was a familiar messianic idea that needed no explanation.

suffered by the disciples, the need to preach to the nations, and, especially, "the flight of the men of Judaea to the mountains", which calls to mind the Jewish-Christians who fled to Pella at the destruction of Jerusalem.[60]

The later apocalyptic insertion in Mark (13:8-27) can be understood in the light of Klausner's discussion[61] on Tannaitic statements concerning "the birthpangs of the Messiah." Klausner attributed the whole messianic idea to the "history of afflictions which beset Israel from the beginning of its national existence until the time after the persecutions of Hadrian."[62] If the messianic idea is rooted in political oppression, the specific "pangs of the Messiah" are descriptions of actual persecutions. Hence, just as the "gloomiest delineations of 'the birth pangs of the Messiah' came out of Bar Kochba's unsuccessful attempt at rebellion, and are patterned after the cruel persecutions that followed the fall of Bethar,"[63] so is the gospel insertion portending dark days reflective of the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 CE.[64]

From the discussion of the gospel's insertion, Klausner concluded

---

[60]This apocalyptic character is plainly shown by the words, "Let him that readeth understand" (Mark 13:14), Jesus, p. 323.

[61]Messianic Idea, pp. 440-2.

[62]Messianic Idea, p. 441; pp. 399-400.

[63]Messianic Idea, p. 441, see also Ch. 1.

[64]Cf. John A. T. Robinson who attributes such sayings to the Church during the earlier persecutions of Christians which took place in Rome between the burning of Rome (July 64) and the suicide of the Emperor Nero (June 68). The gospels, according to Robinson, were all written before 70 CE (Time Magazine, March 21, 1977, p. 95).

that "Jesus only foresaw 'the pangs of the Messiah' [Mark 13:3-8] without which there could be no 'Days of the Messiah', and he saw the kingdom of heaven 'nigh even at the doors', and that this generation should not pass away till all these things come to pass.'"[65] Just as the Talmud declares, it will come without the knowledge of men, for only the Father knows (Sanhedrin 97a).

The Messianic Age and Eschatology of Jesus

Klausner described a five-stage development in Jesus' 'messianic scheme'. First, succeeding the appearance of Elijah (John the Baptist), Jesus would come to Jerusalem to proclaim his messiahship. Second, his proclamation would cause the repentance of Israel. Third, the "pangs of the Messiah" would befall both the people and the messiah causing his death and resurrection. Fourth, the signs and wonders would follow, and God would cause Rome to be overthrown "without hands." Fifth, then Jesus would return as "the Son of man coming on the clouds of heaven" (Daniel 7:13)[66] "who was to sit at the right hand of God [Psalm 110:1] and with his twelve disciples judge the twelve tribes of Israel."[67]

---

[65] Jesus, p. 323.

[66] "That the Messianic interpretation of the human figure who in Dan. 7:13 comes with the clouds of heaven is much older [than its appearance in rabbinic literature in the first half of the Third Century in the words of R. Joshua ben Levi] is the great probability to be inferred from the Sibylline Oracles. In 5:414 we read 'There came from the wide heavenly spaces a blessed man, holding in his hands a sceptre which God put in his grasp, and he brought all into subjection, etc.'" "Cf. Sibylline 3:652 'And then from the sun God will send a king'; see also 3:46-50." Moore, Judaism, Vol. II, p. 335, also nn. 5 and 6; also p. 337.

[67] Jesus, p. 313.

Except for the role of the Messiah as himself the hero-conqueror of Israel's foes,[68] the scheme included the basic Biblical and Tannaitic ideas concerning both the messianic age and eschatology.[69] Jesus therefore was placed squarely in the Jewish beliefs of his time.

Tannaitic Ideas of the Messianic Age and Eschatology

Klausner's discussion on the messianic and eschatological ideas[70] of the Tannaim will be presented here for two reasons. First, in Klausner's view these ideas established the historical context of Jesus' expectations of the kingdom. Secondly, they allow us to interpret Jesus' expectations in the light of their contemporary or almost contemporary parallels.

Tannaitic sayings on "the World to Come" correspond to the gospel expressions "the world to come" (KJV) or "the age to come" (RSV).[71] According to Klausner "both the Hebrew and Greek phrases express merely a contrast to 'this world.'"[72] Under this rubric come all beliefs concerning life after death. Such beliefs include the judgement of the

---

[68]"Throughout the earlier periods of the Messianic idea Israel's best minds thought of the Messiah as a king and warrior." Messianic Idea, p. 493.

[69]See Moore, Judaism, Vol. II, p. 323, on this distinction.

[70]Klausner discusses the terms "Messianic Age" and "World to Come" and concludes that the latter denotes the realm of eschatology, and is antithetic not only to this world but also the messianic age. Messianic Idea, p. 418, 417.

[71]Matthew 12:32; Mark 10:30; Luke 18:30; Heb. 11:5. Messianic Idea, pp. 408-9.

[72]However, it should be noted that in both Mark and Luke the "age to come" contrasts with the bounty the disciples will receive in this world (in the messianic age).

righteous and the wicked after death; reward and punishment (Paradise and Gehenna); the resurrection of the dead;[73] and the renewal of the world (the New World after resurrection).[74]

If life after death took on a distinctly spiritual character, one would expect descriptions of the World to Come to be devoid of the 'worldly' splendour envisioned in the messianic age. Confusions arose in rabbinic literature, however, when the term the World to Come was indiscriminately applied to descriptions of the messianic age.[75] Klausner pointed out that the interchagability of the terms stemmed from both the relatedness of their ideas[76] and the possible derivation of Jewish eschatology from the messianic idea.[77] Despite the rabbis' occasional confusion of the terms "the eschatological World to Come" and "the Messianic age," Klausner maintained that their intended meaning could be determined by the descriptions employed.[78] The criteria for deciding

---

[73]Cf. Urbach who interprets the saying (in the name of R. Akiba but probably earlier than him): "And these are they that have no share in the world to come: he who says that there is no resurrection..." (Mishna Sanhedrin 10.1) as referring to two different ideas. He says "...there is a difference between the world to come and resurrection," possibly fashioned after Dan. 12:2, where the resurrection takes place before reward and punsihment and the World to Come (The Sages. Jerusalem: Magnus, 1975, p. 652).

[74]Messianic Idea, p. 408. [75]Messianic Idea, p. 410.

[76]Klausner agreed with E. Schurer that the hope of the resurrection and the messianic age were closely bound up in an earlier time (according to Daniel 12:2). Messianic Idea, p. 413.

[77]Messianic Idea, p. 418.

[78]Commenting on a Tannaitic Midrash, Siphre Deuteronomy 317, end (ed. Friedmann, 136a, beginning), Klausner said "There can be no doubt about it: all these [see p. 410] exaggerated pictures of the fruitfulness of Palestine are irrelevant to the life after death or after resurrection, but they are thoroughly Messianic...It can be concluded with certainty, therefore, that the expression 'the World to Come' is used here in the sense of the Messianic Age." (Messianic Idea, p. 410.)

what term was actually meant were two: the messianic age included political and materialistic expectations whereas the World to Come did not; secondly, the messianic age must exclude all sayings dealing with resurrection, Paradise, Gehenna, and the New World.[79]

The distinction between the two was also a matter of temporal sequence. The messianic age preceded the eschatological realm.[80] In support of this view Klausner cited[81] the Mekhilta, Wayyassa Chapter 4 (ed. Friedmann, 50b) and the commentary on this passage by Bacher (Agada der Tannaiten I, 202, n. 3 and I. H. Weiss I^3, 217).

Although Klausner stressed the distinction between the World to Come and the messianic age,[82] he acknowledged the impossibility of keeping them absolutely distinct. When compared to the present age the distinction

---

[79]Messianic Idea, p. 414. Here Klausner followed David Castelli, The Messiah According to the Jews (translated from Italian, originally published in Florence, 1874), p. 205. R. H. Charles made essentially the same distinction but used different terms: prophetic eschatology and apocalyptic eschatology (Eschatology. New York: Schocken Books, 1963, originally published 1899, 2nd ed. 1913). The eschatological visions of the prophets included the destiny of nations, was materialistic, and did not offer "light or comfort for the individual beyond the grave" (pp. 178-9). Apocalyptic eschatology incorporated the belief in a future life which was "a fundamental postualte of belief in God" (p. 178).

[80]In the writings which Moore (Judaism, Vol. II, p. 338) labeled "revived apocalyptic" he notes that "the Messianic Age is not final; it endures only till the last judgement " (IV Ezra 7:26-44; 12:34; Syriach Baruch 40:4; see also the Christian apocalypse--"closely contemporary" with the former two books--The Revelation of John 19:11-21:8). About the Revelation, Moore concludes (p. 342): excepting the idea of the first resurrection of the martyrs, the exhortation (2:8), and the reference to the names of the conquering hero as "Word of God" (the latter possibly not authentic), "the whole conception is Jewish" (see pp. 342-345).

[81]Messianic Idea, p. 414, n. 29.

[82]Messianic Idea, p. 413.

between them might easily be lost.[83] The World to Come and its accompanying set of eschatological beliefs provided spiritual solace for individual souls whereas the messianic age was a collective fulfillment of political hopes which remained more or less mundane.[84] Klausner concluded his remarks on the messianic age and the World to Come by stating that intensified persecutions led the Jews to develop an eschatological "kingdom of heaven", a "kingdom not of this world",[85] which was distinguished from the worldly messianic age. Because the former consisted of "pure spirituality" which approached divinity,[86] it was above the disappointment inevitably perpetuated by hopes of worldly fulfillment in the messianic age.

III. MESSIANIC HOPES DURING THE TIME OF JESUS

During the time of Jesus, hopes of the fulfillment of the messianic age still flourished.[87] Klausner took note of Tannaitic testimonies to these hopes. For example, the Tannaim had a tradition based upon Deuteronomy 32:14 ("And of the blood of the grape though drankest foaming wine"): "the World to Come is not like this world. In this world there is trouble of harvesting and treading (of grapes);

---

[83] Messianic Idea, pp. 414, 418, see also 414, n. 27.

[84] Messianic Idea, p. 418.

[85] Messianic Idea, p. 418.

[86] Messianic Idea, p. 418.

[87] See footnote 13.

but in the World to Come a man will bring one grape on a wagon or in a ship, put it in a corner of his house, and use its contents as if it had been a large wine cask...There will be no grape that will not containe thirty kegs of wine" (Kethubboth 11b and in abbreviated form Midrash Siphre Deuteronomy 317 end [ed. Friedmann, 136a beginning]). A Baraitha envisioned "a juster distribution of land[88] in the messianic age at which time each person will possess land in mountain, lowland, and valley enabling him to grow all types of crops (Baba Bathra 122a). A similar idea is portrayed in the Tannaitic Midrash, Siphre Deuteronomy 317 end (ed. Friedmann, 136a beginning).

Josephus tells us that self-proclaimed saviours arose around the time of Jesus and attracted a host of followers.[89] Klausner portrayed Judas Iscariot as one of these typical, disillusioned followers. Although Klausner somewhat fictionized Judas,[90] his point is that Judas's expectations of Jesus (after the confession of messiahship at Caesara Phillipi) were like any other Jew's hopes of the messiah--namely, "miracles," "mighty deeds," and "effecting of redemption."[91] All these, Klausner said, Judas expected to become manifest in Jerusalem. But his hopes were frustrated, so he delivered Jesus up as a deceiver.[92]

---

[88] Messianic Idea, p. 511.

[89] Klausner, referred to the Samaritan Messia, Theudas and the prophet from Egypt as "false messiahs" (Jesus, p. 244). Josephus did not refer to the last two as "messiahs."

[90] Jesus, pp. 324-5.

[91] Jesus, p. 325.

[92] Jesus, p. 325.

Since Klausner regarded Judas as a typical Palestinian Jew, he implicitly paralleled Judas's rejection of Jesus' self-professed messiahship to Israel's rejection of Jesus. Thus, Judas had assessed Jesus as one who failed to measure up to an idea of messiahship that Klausner implied had reached normative definition among the Jewish population in Israel.

It is difficult to comprehend what Klausner believed was the 'normative' messianic idea during this time. His discussion of the messianic notions of the Tannaim and Jesus indicate that he was unclear on the point himself. Concerning the Tannaim, Klausner separated their messianic ideas, such as the political restoration of Israel, from their eschatological ideas, such as resurrection. But with regard to Jesus, Klausner stated that the messianic belief of Jesus, like that of the Pharisees, "was bound up with the resurrection of the dead"[93] which set him apart from the Sadducees. Klausner cited as evidence of Jesus' messianic belief the dispute in the temple court between Jesus and the Sadducees concerning the resurrection of the dead in which Jesus argued that the resurrected do not continue with the mundane activities of life, such as marriage, but live as "angels of God" (Mark 12:25). Here, Klausner took the eschatological notion of resurrection as a reference to the messianic idea equally of the Pharisees and of Jesus. It should be noted, however, that the passage which he cited (Mark 12:25) as evidence of Jesus' messianic idea does not once mention the kingdom of heaven.

Klausner's description of "the ideal of the kingdom of heaven

---

[93] Jesus, p. 319.

or 'the Days of the Messiah' at the time when Jesus lived"[94] combined all the prevalent notions of messianism and eschatology. Messianic ideas of the restored kingdom of Israel, the pangs of the messiah, and the messiah's reign, as well as the eschatological ideas of the judgement of the twelve tribes of Israel, Gehenna, the day of judgement, resurrection and the world to come are all considered together as "the ideals of the kingdom of heaven, or 'Days of the Messiah' [messianic age], which Jesus saw in his mind when he made his great proclamation 'the kingdom of heaven is at hand.'"[95]

Another aspect of the messianic idea involved determining who would enter the kingdom of heaven. Many Tannaim had "a deep rooted conviction that the dispersion of Israel would in the Messianic age return."[96] Klausner remarked that the reunion of the already great number of Jews who were in the Diaspora[97] would be no less than a miraculous, messianic event.[98] Combined with the return of 'exiled' Israel in the messianic ingathering is the redemption of Israel. The

---

[94] Jesus, p. 400.

[95] Jesus, p. 400. It is noteworthy that here and elsewhere Klausner took the "kingdom of heaven" to be a synonymn for the "Days of the Messiah." See also p. 403: "...the Messiah was, therefore already in the world, and so the kingdom of heaven, the kingdom of the Messiah was likewise in existence in the world." But see p. 15 supra.

[96] Messianic Idea, p. 470.

[97] From Jesus to Paul, pp. 30-31.

[98] Messianic Idea, p. 470. Reports vary on who will lead the mass pilgrimage in the messianic age, according to many Tannaitic references it is God himself (Megillah 29a "Then the LORD thy God will return with thy captivity"; Shemoneh Esreh, Benediction 10 in The Standard Prayer Book by Singer, enlarged American ed., p. 142.

Mekhilta, Beshallah, Chapter 1 (ed. Friedmann 25a, beginning) reads: "And the ransomed of the Lord shall return and come singing to Zion"; and in another tractate, Mekhilta, Pisha, Chapter 7 (ed. Friedmann 7b) the hosts of the redeemed march forward.

In the light of this popular rabbinic motif, doubtlessly inspired by the belief in the return of the 12 Tribes of Israel (Isaiah 49:6; 63:17; Ezekiel 45:8), Klausner rejected the authenticity of Jesus' saying on the messianic ingathering (Matthew 8:11-12). He interpreted "many shall come from the east and west" as the welcoming in of the Gentiles, and "the sons of the kingdom will be thrown into the outer darkness; there men will weep and gnash their teeth" as the condemning of Israel.[99] Klausner found the saying irreconcilable with the Pauline reference to the 17-year delay in evangelizing to the Gentiles (Galatians 1:13; 2:10). The thrust of Klausner's argument, however, was not the apparent contradiction of the pro-Gentile saying of Jesus and the exclusively Jewish proselytization efforts of the early church, but his basic apprehension of the saying as non-Jewish, even anti-Jewish. Klausner's view is evident in the concluding remarks of his argument: "Jesus was a Jew and a Jew he remained till his last breath. His one idea was to implant within his nation the idea of the coming of the Messiah and, by repentance and good works, hasten the 'end'".[100] In other words, Jesus' intentions were thoroughly Jewish and could not have incorporated such an anti-Jewish idea.[101]

---

[99] Jesus, pp. 367-8.

[100] Jesus, p. 366.

[101] Cf. J. Jeremias, Jesus' Promise to the Nations. London: SCM Press, (first English edition), 1958, p. 48. Jeremias argues for the "definiteness with which Jesus assigns Gentiles a place in the kingdom of God."

Jesus' Expectations of the Kingdom of Heaven

Jesus' notion of the kingdom, according to Klausner, "differed but little from that of his fellow Jews in the early Tannaitic period.[102] Jesus incorporated ideas such as "the sovereignty of the good--worldly, material good as well as higher spiritual good"[103]--in his messianic expectations. Klausner argued against the view that Jesus conceived his messiahship in solely spiritual terms. Instead, he showed that Jesus held materialistic hopes in agreement with Jewish messianism. Klausner cited as evidence the verse in Matthew (19:28-29) in which Jesus promised his disciples that in the new world (παλιγγεμεσια) they would not only eat and drink at his table in the kingdom of heaven but also receive a hundred-fold more of what they give up (i.e. houses, bretheren) to follow him.[104]

Another example of Jesus' materialistic orientation is given by Klausner in the context of Jesus' mission to the poor and the downtrodden. Klausner conjectured that the saying: "Verily, I say unto you that I shall not drink again of the fruit of the vine till the day when I drink it new in the kingdom of heaven" (Mark 14:25) was a materialistic promise (reference to the "fruit of the vine") that Jesus held out to the poor and downtrodden to whom promises of spiritual wealth would not be attractive.[105] Klausner's suggested context for the saying

---

[102] Jesus, p. 398.

[103] Jesus, p. 398.

[104] Jesus, pp. 305, 401.

[105] Jesus, pp. 400-1.

was dubious--the imagery of the promised wine is not directed to the people[106]--nevertheless he viewed the saying together with two others: the prediction of the bounty which Jesus' disciples would receive (Matthew 19:28-29); and the promise of increased fruitfulness on earth, which is preserved as a Jesus-saying by Papias[107] who spoke in the name of John of Asia.[108] As a whole, these sayings indicated to Klausner that Jesus' conception of the kingdom was not entirely spiritual but included typical materialistic hopes of Jewish messianism.

In further support of the portrait of Jesus as a Jewish messiah who had materialistic expectations, Klausner rejected the saying found in the Gospel of John in which Jesus replied to Pilate "My kingdom is not of this world" (John 18:30). The other-worldly kingdom is a notion which, as Klausner had elsewhere stated,[109] arose in Judaism after the fall of Bethar when spiritualistic messianic ideas replaced the frustrated political hopes. Therefore, Klausner

---

[106]We have seen that in rabbinic literature wine is envisioned as part of the splendour of the messianic age. In Targum Eccl. 9:7 wine is envisioned in paradise: "Come, eat thy bread with joy and drink with a merry heart the wine which is reserved for thee in paradise." This straightforward description of paradise cannot be compared, however, to the figurative use of wine found in Revelations 14:9-10; 17:2; 18:3; 19:5, nor can it be compared to the metaphorical saying of Jesus found in Mark 2:22 (Matthew 9:17; Luke 5:31f.).

[107]Papias was Bishop of Hierapolis and one of the earliest Church fathers. Cf. Jeremias who, commenting on the saying preserved by Papias, concluded that it had "nothing to do with Jesus" but was a product of fanciful legend which was uncritically accepted by Papias, who was not known for his intelligence (Eusebius, Church History III 39:13) Unknown Sayings of Jesus (trns. R. H. Fuller), London: SPCK, 1958, pp. 8-9.

[108]Jesus, p. 401.

[109]Messianic Idea, p. 418. See page 23 supra.

flatly remarked that the saying in John was "quite impossible for Jesus the Jew."[110]

Even more characteristic of the Jewish messiah are the political-national hopes which Klausner believed Jesus also shared. He cited as evidence one of the first verses of Acts of the Apostles in which the disciples gather together and ask the risen Christ "Lord, dost though at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?" (1:6).[111] This saying left no doubt in Klausner's mind that Jesus was expected to restore the kingdom.[112] Ex nihilo nihil fit: Klausner reasoned that Jesus himself implanted in them this hope.[113]

Basic to Jesus' expectation of the restoration was his mission to Israel. Klausner cited the Matthaean passage with added emphasis: "Go not the way of the Gentiles, neither enter into any city of the Samaritans; but go to the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Matthew 10:5-6).[114] With one exception, Jesus did not waver from this stand. Klausner observed that Jesus' healing of the Syrophoenician woman was the only healing he performed for a non-Jew (Mark 7:24-30).[115] In the

---

[110]Jesus, p. 346. Messianic Idea, p. 392.

[111]Klausner has overlooked a similar saying in Luke 24.21. Since both Acts and Luke were written by the same author, this appears to be a Lucan tradition.

[112]Jesus, p. 402.

[113]Jesus, p. 402.

[114]This exclusive aspect of the mission is completely lost by the time the Gospel of John was written. It includes the conversion of a Samaritan woman which results in the conversion of a host of Samaritans (4:9ff.).

[115]Klausner rejected the historical authenticity of the healing of the centurion's servant at Capernaum because it did not occur in Mark (Jesus, p. 364).

Matthaean version (15:21-28) Jesus says to the woman; "I was not sent except to the lost sheep of the house of Israel." Klausner also noted[116] that Jesus used the terms "Gentile" and "publican" to express contempt for one's brother who is at fault with one: "And if he will not listen...tell the congregation, and if he will not listen to the congregation, then regard him as a Gentile and tax collector" (Matthew 18:17). In a similar derogatory tone, Jesus criticized the Gentile way of praying as "vain repetitions" (Matthew 6:7). Klausner concluded that Jesus was indeed a "chauvinistic" Jew.[117]

Consistent with his 'chauvinism', Jesus' mission was directed only to the people of Galilee, Judaea, and those beyond the Jordan; with the purpose of bringing them to the highest level of moral conduct so that the kingdom would be restored to Israel.[118] Because Jesus held repentance as the central factor in redemption, his role was as a preacher to the unrighteous to facilitate their repentance. It alone was required before God would effect the restoration of Israel. Similarly, Talmudic literature stressed the necessity of repentance for the restoration of Israel.[119]

Although Jesus' expectations of the kingdom of heaven incorporated

---

[116] Jesus, p. 364.

[117] Jesus, p. 364.

[118] Jesus, p. 403.

[119] Numerous Talmudic dictums reflect the belief that repentance would bring about the messianic age: Baba Bathra 10a; Yoma 86b; Yalkut on Isaiah 59 (section 358). "The same emphasis on repentance as a prerequisite of redemption is also found in the sayings of the greatest of pre-Hadrianic Tannaim" (Messianic Idea, p. 428).

a political aspect--the restoration of Israel--it excluded the notion of a political messiah. Contrary to the Tannaitic belief in the messiah as a military hero who is divinely chosen to overcome Israel's foes and establish the messianic kingdom,[120] Jesus believed that the establishment of the kingdom would take place "without hands" and through the will of God. This non-military belief, according to Klausner, was the only point of difference between Jesus' conception of the messiah and that of Israel.[121]

Klausner saw "the politico-national salvation and religio-spiritual redemption" as "inseparably woven together" in the Jewish messianic idea.[122] The twofold character of the messianic idea was well represented in prophetic literature,[123] and was also current among Pharisaic circles "even before the destruction of the Second Temple."[124] In the Talmud, however, messianic sayings from before the destruction are completely lacking,[125] so Klausner's contention that the popular

---

[120] Messianic Idea, p. 493.

[121] Jesus, p. 402.

[122] Messianic Idea, p. 392.

[123] "The idea of a great and final messianic battle [is seen in] Amos and Ezekiel as well as in the Targums" (Messianic Idea, p. 493). The spiritual conception of the messiah finds support in Isaiah 11, Zechariah 12 as well as in the Psalms of Solomon and IV Ezra (Messianic Idea, p. 494).

[124] Messianic Idea, p. 392. "This is very evident from the Psalms of Solomon, written about 45 BCE, after the Tannaitic period had already begun." However, after the destruction until the revolt of Bar Kochba (132 CE) the political conception of the messiah prevailed over the spiritual one among the Tannaim (Messianic Idea, pp. 395, 498, 500).

[125] Messianic Idea, p. 396; see the explanation that follows.

conception of the messiah had political overtones is supported by only one Pharisaic document extant from that time, the Psalms of Solomon.[126]

Despite the exclusion of political activity from Jesus' messianic scheme, there was, according to Klausner, the presence of nationalistic loyalty in Jesus' consciousness and activity. He has already shown that Jesus harboured the hope of the restoration of Israel. Klausner viewed Jesus' 'political' hope against his place of origin. Jesus was from Galilee, the home of the die-hards of Jewish nationalism --the Zealots. Although Jesus was not one himself,[127] he did include "Simon the Zealot" in his following (Luke 5:16; Acts 1:13)[128] and, like the Zealots, held a lively hope for the end of the existing conditions in Israel. Klausner contended that Jesus was thoroughly Palestinian and was unaffected by the many Gentiles in Galilee.[129] Indeed, Klausner asserted that Jesus' sense of nationalism was at least

---

[126]Klausner's concluding remarks on the Psalms of Solomon, especially 17:21-44 (Messianic Idea, p. 324), should be considered: "Note that here there is indeed a political and national side to the Messianic kingdom; but the spiritual side is emphasized more. Of the material prosperity of which the messianic visions in most of the Apocryphal books and in Talmud and Midrash are so full there is here hardly a trace (except for the apportionment of the land to the tribes and 'the words' and the 'sweet-smelling trees' for the returning exiles)."

[127]Jesus, p. 206.

[128]Klausner argued that "Simon the Canaanite" (Matthew 10:4; Mark 3:18) is a corruption of "Simon the Zealot". The change occurred when it became apparent to the Church that the kingdom which Jesus preached was "not of this world" and therefore was incompatible with the aims of a Zealot (Jesus, p. 206). Note that Oscar Cullman (Jesus and the Revolutionaries, trns. Gareth Putnam. New York: Harper and Row, 1970, p. 9) argued that Peter could have been a Zealot and that Judas Iscariot was probably one also.

[129]Jesus, p. 363.

as strong as modern Jewish nationalistic sentiments.[130] Klausner supported this assertion by citing an instance where Jesus exhibited loyalty to the Temple cult in commanding the cleansed leper to show himself to the priest and present an offering to the Temple (Mark 1:44; Matthew 8:4; Luke 5:4). Evidently, Klausner equated adherence to the Law, specifically the Temple cult,[131] with nationalism. In accordance with this view, he stressed that Jesus' outlook conformed with that of the most legally observant Jew, and therefore Jesus directed his disciples to preach to Israel and avoid the Gentiles (Matthew 10:5-6).[132] Klausner referred to Jesus as a "true Pharisaic Jew"[133] and an "orthodox Galilean."[134] He supposed that Jesus' orthodox conduct once in Jerusalem, namely, his

---

[130]At the time of Klausner, this is an especially unclear statement (p. 363) since there were a number of radically different expressions of Jewish nationalism. Orthodox loyalty was eschatologically conceived and did not necessarily require actual pilgrimage; Political Zionists were aggressive and more inclined toward territorialism; and Cultural Zionists stressed spiritual and cultural Judaism. These are only three of many Zionist types.

[131]Cf. the Qumranians who did not sacrifice to the Temple and made no offering to it and who despised Israel. Israel was included in the redemption only as 'converts' to the true Israel which was the community of Qumran (Damascus Rule IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, Messianic Rule I, beginning G. Vermes, The Dead Sea Scrolls. London: Penguin Books, 1968).

[132]Jesus, p. 364.

[133]Jesus, p. 319. See Jesus, p. 320 where Jesus is likened to an "expert Pharisee"; p. 319 where Jesus exhibits typical Pharisaic exposition; and p. 264 where "Jesus at the outset of his career was received as a Pharisee in every respect." How Klausner interprets from Luke 13:32 that the Pharisees considered Jesus a "Rab" (p. 305) is unexplainable from the text. The most that could be concluded from the text is that the Pharisees merely warned him of what they knew would come. But it is also possible that the reference to the Pharisees is only an editorial introduction to the prophecy which follows concerning Jesus' lamentation of Israel's fate.

[134]Jesus, p. 311. The meaning of the term is unclear.

fulfillment of the first duty of every Jew on the Feast of Passover--going to the Temple--represented only one of his visits.[135] And in contrast to the disciples, who "did not strictly observe the Sabbath and despised washing hands" (Matthew 15:2),[136] Jesus appeared to have observed both together with other ceremonial laws such as, the wearing of fringes (Matthew 14:36).[137] Thus, in Klausner's view, not only was Jesus "wholly explainable by the scriptural and Pharisaic Judaism of his time,"[138] he "never dreamed of being a Prophet or a Messiah to the non-Jews."[139]

Jesus' Ethical Teachings and His Attitude Toward the Law

Klausner understood Jesus to have possessed "a positive attitude toward the Law generally."[140] which entailed a critical view of the ethics of many who practised it. Jesus' posture with regard to the Law is best exhibited in the Sermon on the Mount. On the one hand, Jesus stated that every detail of the Law must stay intact until the eschaton--"till heaven and earth pass away" (Luke 26:17); and he therefore admonished his hearers to do and to teach all the commandments (Matthew 5:17-19). On the other hand, he condemned the scribes and

---

[135] Jesus, p. 311.

[136] Jesus, p. 365.

[137] Jesus, p. 365.

[138] Jesus, p. 363.

[139] Jesus, p. 363.

[140] Jesus, p. 367.

Pharisees who regarded the ceremonial laws more highly than the moral laws (Matthew 5:20-28), and who conducted them with unnecessary pride and display (Matthew 6:5-7, 16-18). Yet Jesus' criticisms and new dispensations were not meant to replace the law, argued Klausner, but to add to it.[141] To be sure, "Jesus at the outset of his career was received as a Pharisee in every respect."[142] He practised the same parabolic style of teaching which was characteristic of the Tannaim and Amoraim;[143] its simplicity and poetic style combined to attain a high level of ethical symbolism.

It was not only the parabolic style that Klausner saw to be common to Jesus and the Tannaim[144] but, citing Geiger[145] and Graetz,[146]

---

[141] Jesus, pp. 366-7.

[142] Jesus, p. 264. Klausner noted that when Jesus attempted to reach Jerusalem, by way of Samaria, the Pharisees, regarding him as a Pharisaic "Rab", warned him against Herod Antipas (Luke 13:32), Jesus, p. 305.

[143] Jesus, p. 265.

[144] This feature is drawn out in detail by Asher Finkel in The Pharisees and the Teacher of Nazareth. Leiden/Köln: E. J. Brill, 1964. Finkel showed that Jesus used a homilectical style (of "proem homilies") that was practised during the synagogue service on Sabbath morning in pre-Destruction days. Finkel gave three examples of the homilectical style, also called "pearl stringing", from Rabbinic literature (e.g. Genesis Rabbah 41; I Aboth d'R. Nathan 4; II Aboth d'R. Nathan 13), Qumran (Pesharim), and Paul (Acts 13:14-41). The method involved 1) linking the pericope text with a proem text; 2) followed by a "pesher: or a message derived from the text; and 3) conclusion of the sermon with the introductory scripture or with words of comfort. This method was employed to reveal the true meaning ("secret knowledge"--Qumran) of scripture (pp. 150-155).

[145] A. Geiger, Das Judentum und Seine Geschichte (I Abteilung: bis zur Zerstörung des zweiten Tempels. 2 Aufl., 1865, pp. 108-48), p. 119.

[146] H. Graetz, Sinai and Golgotha, pp. 392-407.

he also noted that "throughout the Gospels there is not one item of ethical teaching which cannot be paralleled either in the Old Testament, and Apocrypha, or in the Talmudic and Midrashic literature of the period near to the time of Jesus."[147] Even the maxims of the Lord's Prayer are found throughout ancient rabbinic sayings.[148] The difference between Jesus and contemporary Judaism was largely one of degree.[149] Although the Mishna included a book entirely devoted to ethical teachings, Pirke Aboth ("Sayings of the Fathers"), it was a compilation over several generations of many Tannaitic and some early Amoraic sayings. In the Talmud generally, ethical maxims are found interspersed among many more laws and precepts pertaining to civil and ceremonial matters. In contrast, the Gospels contain comparatively more sayings on ethical matters than does the Talmud.

Why is there a concentration of ethical precepts in the teaching

---

[147] Jesus, p. 384. Talmudic sayings that were written later than the time of Jesus were probably current in oral form during his time "because there are no grounds whatever for assuming that the Gospels influenced the authorities of the Talmud and Midrash," p. 385.

[148] Jesus, pp. 386-7.

[149] But Klausner also argued that although Jesus could be compared to great Jewish figures who were famous for their ethical precepts such as Hillel the sage and Jeremiah the prophet, he is clearly unlike them in significant respects (Jesus, p. 390). Klausner noted that Jesus was a lover of peace, as was Hillel; yet Jesus spoke badly about his enemies while Hillel was willing to compromise to make peace (p. 389). Comparing Jesus to Jeremiah, Klausner pointed out that although both Jesus and Jeremiah spoke harshly toward Palestine, Jesus did not directly address the political life of his nation, and when pressed to give his opinion of the foreign rules, he compromised, saying "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and unto God the things that are His" (Matt. 22:21; p. 390). According to Klausner, Jesus was too radical for Hillel and not radical enough for Jeremiah. Thus, his political ethics were inappropriate since they did not reflect traditional views.

of Jesus? Klausner explained this emphasis as the natural outcome of an apocalyptic consciousness: Jesus' belief that the kingdom was imminent demanded both the highest possible standard of righteousness from the scribes and Pharisees, who expected to enter the kingdom, and the immediate attention of the sinners, who were in danger of being prevented from entering it. Consequently, Jesus taught an "extremist ascetic ethic"[150] which reflected an "end of the world"[151] morality. He diminished the importance of mundane preoccupations, such as family, property and some external aspects of religious life.[152] His special authority to legislate on these matters stemmed from the fact that he consciously played a major role as messiah in the dawn of the kingdom. Although he seemed, for the most part, to have followed the Law himself, he was capable of both waiving it--as in the cases of performing healings and allowing corn to be plucked on the Sabbath (Mark 2:23-3:36)--and of increasing its severity--as in the prohibition of divorce (Mark 10:9) and swearing oaths (Matthew 5:34).

Generally speaking, the apocalyptic perspective introduces a new dimension into the world: the imminent realization of eschatology. As the "end of the world" breaks into history, all existing historical conditions, including traditions, are corrupted. It is this opposition of the new order to the old that Klausner believed to be at work in Jesus' consciousness. The new ethical teachings of Jesus were unlike the 'new'

---

[150] Jesus, p. 405.

[151] Jesus, p. 405.

[152] Jesus, pp. 404-405.

teachings of the Pharisees. The latter attempted to keep their teachings within Biblical authority by reading them into scripture.[153] On the contrary, Jesus saw "such cautious changes, such combining of the old and the new [to be] nothing more than sewing patch upon patch, patching up an old, out-worn garment which can no longer adhere to the new patches and will, in the end tear away completely: New matter must take on a completely new form."[154]

Klausner made this observation partly by comparing a parable of Jesus to one of a Tanna, in which the same symbolical expressions were employed to convey similar ideas. The Tannaitic saying in Pirke Aboth teaches that it matters not from whom a teaching is learned (a child or an old man) but rather what the teaching is: "Look not on the jar but on what is in it; there may be a new jar that is full of old wine and an old one in which is not even new wine" (Aboth 4:20). In the context of the comparison, Klausner understood this saying to mean both that new teachings could be contained in scripture and that old, established teachings could arise in new legislation. In contrast, Jesus' saying that new wine must be stored in new wine skin (Matthew 13:44-52) betrayed his intention to separate the new teaching from the old (Pharisaic) teaching. Interpreting this to be a radical critique of the Jewish exegetical tradition, Klausner guessed that Jesus would not have dared to explain the parable to his disciples. Klausner summarized the teaching thus: "the new he would gather into his vessels and the

---

[153] Jesus, p. 369.

[154] Jesus, p. 369.

rest he would cast aside."[155]

Jesus' negative attitude toward traditional Judaism is concretely evident in his instruction to the one who asked him how to attain eternal life: "'Do not kill, Do not commit adultry, Do not steal, Do not bear false witness, Honour your father and mother, and Love your neighbour as yourself'" (Matthew 19:18-20). Jesus omitted the first four commandments, which comprise the ceremonial religious duties, from the requirements of the kingdom of heaven.[156] In addition, noted Klausner, Jesus attached "little importance to the 'washing of hands' and...permitted the eating of forbidden foods."[157] And unlike the Pharisees and John the Baptist, Jesus did not fast often.[158] Jesus' de-emphasis of ceremonial laws was coupled with the fact that he did not give any new ones.[159]

Despite Klausner's statement that Jesus nearly nullified the ceremonial laws,[160] he insisted that "Jesus remained steadfast to the old Torah: till his dying day he continued to observe the ceremonial laws like a true Pharisaic Jew."[161] Klausner described him as a "Rabbi" who did not insist on the observance of all the laws:[162] "Jesus remained a Jew in his positive attitude to the Law generally."[163]

---

[155] Jesus, p. 370.

[156] Jesus, p. 370.

[157] Jesus, p. 369.

[158] Jesus, pp. 369, 291.

[159] According to Klausner, the rite of the Last Supper is a product of the Church (Jesus, p. 328).

[160] Jesus, p. 371.

[161] Jesus, p. 275.

[162] Jesus, p. 276.

[163] Jesus, pp. 366-7.

Klausner seems to have held two opposing views of Jesus' relation to Judaism. On the one hand, Jesus was thoroughly Jewish and was loyal to the Torah. How else could Klausner explain the fact that Simon Peter and James defended the Jewish law against Paul's desire to abolish circumcision?[164] On the other hand, Jesus' teachings contained a "kernel of opposition" to Judaism which Paul nurtured into a full-grown, non-Jewish, even anti-Jewish, religion.[165] How else could Klausner explain the growth of the Christian church?[166] The "kernel of opposition" contained in Jesus teaching could exist with his loyalty to the Torah only because he "never carried his teaching to its final conclusion."[167] It was Paul, in his mission to the Gentiles, who accomplished the latter and sought to abolish the ceremonial laws entirely.

If Jesus harboured only a "kernel of opposition" to traditional Judaism, his crucifixion as well as Paul's mission to the Gentiles appear to be insufficiently accounted for. But Klausner did offer an explanation both for the fate of Jesus and for the eventual schism within Judaism. He did so by closely examining the "kernel of opposition" in Jesus' teaching and its fullest implications for Israel.

The Ethics of Jesus and the Jewish National Imperative

Klausner contended that Jesus' teachings unconsciously contained

---

[164] Jesus, pp. 367-8.

[165] Jesus, p. 369.

[166] Jesus, p. 369.

[167] Jesus, p. 371.

the embryonic Gentile Church.[168] By deprecating the ceremonial laws, Jesus diminished the value of the nationhood of Israel, to whom alone these laws had been given by God. Klausner interpreted Jesus' anti-traditional words as anti-national by definition.[169] There were also concrete instances in which Jesus overstepped the national boundaries in his missionary activity and preaching. First, there was the healing of the Syrophoenician woman. Second, there was the saying about Caesar which Klausner felt was too passive for the generally anti-Roman sentiments of Palestine.[170]

Still more important than his actual policy toward the Gentiles was Jesus' attitude to the people of the nation of Israel. Clearly, in an environment where ceremonial laws were generally followed, the breach of these laws caused some turmoil. Jesus' association with sinners and especially his table followship with them, his violations of the Sabbath and his neglect of fasts all triggered disputes between him and the Pharisees.

The intra-national difficulties were caused not only by Jesus' disregard for ceremonial laws, but also by his ethical teachings.

---

[168] Jesus, p. 371. "Hence, all unwittingly, he brought it to pass that part of the 'House of Jacob' was swallowed up by those other nations who, at first, had joined themselves to that part..."

[169] Jesus, p. 279.

[170] Jesus, p. 318. T. W. Manson (Jesus and the Non-Jews. London: Athlone Press, 1955, p. 9) holds a similar view: "that Jesus declines to back Jewish nationalism against Roman imperialism." Cf. C. J. Cadoux who assessed Jesus' passive attitude toward the Romans as "sound political judgement" and, in the circumstances, practical. He also compared Jesus to Hillel who, like Jesus, was "'no fighter or politician'" ("Dr. Klausner's Estimate of Jesus", London Quarterly and Holborn Review, July 1935, pp. 306-321; p. 315. Cadoux is referring to Klausner's assessment of Hillel's political attitude, Jesus, p. 396).

Klausner observed that the ethical maxims of Jesus, especially as represented in the Sermon on the Mount,[171] were far too idealistic to be put into practice: "Hence the nation as a whole could only see in such public ideas as those of Jesus, an abnormal and even dangerous phantasy."[172] The danger lay, for example, in what Klausner labelled Jesus' disregard for justice generally.[173] Jesus' saying, "Judge not that ye be not judged" (Matthew 7:1)--which in Luke 7:37 became a "lofty ethical rule"[174]--as well as Jesus' disavowel of the authority to judge when requested to by one of the people (Luke 12:13-14), indicated to Klausner a disinterest in civil affairs.[175] Similarly, Jesus' commands to resist not evil and to offer the right cheek after being struck on the left (Matthew 5:39) was evidence for Klausner that Jesus disregarded civil justice generally.[176]

In addition to the threat that they posed to the judicial system and civil relations, Jesus' teachings implied the breakdown of family life. Klausner viewed both Jesus' encouragement of celibacy for the sake of entering the kingdom of heaven (Matthew 19:12) and

---

[171]Klausner did recognize the artificiality of the 'document', seeing that it was a compilation of scattered sayings of Jesus (Jesus, pp. 45-46).

[172]Jesus, p. 376.

[173]Jesus, p. 375.

[174]Jesus, p. 374.

[175]Jesus, p. 375.

[176]Jesus, pp. 373-4.

his strict ruling on divorce (Matthew 5:32) as tantamount to the destruction of family life.[177] Economic livelihood was also jeopardized by Jesus' attitude to the material aspects of social life, for he recommended the relinquishment of property (Matthew 19:21-22, 24; 5:40, 42) and the adoption of an ascetic lifestyle (Matthew 10:8-10).[178] But Jesus' asceticism, according to Klausner, was an outgrowth of the latter part of his ministry when the Herodians and Pharisees began to pursue him.[179] Klausner observed that Jesus then became a "pessimist",[180] who was resigned from the worldly strivings of national and civil existence.[181]

Worldly pessimism was exactly what Israel could least afford to nurture. The particularly dark picture Klausner painted of political life in Israel during the time of Jesus[182] was coupled with his equally

---

[177] Jesus, p. 374.

[178] Jesus, p. 374.

[179] Jesus, p. 391.

[180] Jesus, p. 391.

[181] Klausner cited Mark 14:29 (Matthew 26:6-13) to show that Jesus, having allowed a woman to annoint him with spikenard, did enjoy pleasures at one time (Jesus, p. 391). Jesus' laxity with regard to the laws of purity and fasts also indicated that he was not "a complete ascetic" (p. 391).

[182] "...the dreadful period of world-wide servitude, when all the nations were writhing in the claws of the cruel and voracious Roman eagle" (Jesus, p. 406). Cf. E. F. Scott ("A Jewish Interpretation of Jesus") who remarked on this view: "Dr. Klausner paints the economic distress in the darkest colors he can, but we can make out from his picture that life and property were secure, trade and agriculture were carried on peacefully. A protest is necessary against the view maintained in this book, and by many Christian writers of the present day, that the people responded to Jesus' message of the Kingdom because they were ground down by economic need. It might be more fairly contended that the mission of Jesus was made possible by the comparative quiet and prosperity of the times. The mass of men were living under stable conditions and could now attend to a purely spiritual message" (pp. 92-93).

intense portrait of Israel's national consciousness. In fact, as a general principle, Klausner several times noted that severe political afflictions often underlaid extravagent nationalistic messianic hopes.[183] Thus did Klausner characterize Judaism at the time of Jesus: "The Judaism of that time, however, had no other aim than to save the tiny nation, the guardian of great ideals, from sinking into the broad sea of heathen culture and enable it, slowly and gradually, to realize the moral teaching of the Prophets in civil life and in the present world of the Jewish state and nation."[184] The key words have been underlined here for they embody the entire critique that Klausner believed Israel launched against the teachings of Jesus. We will examine each point in turn.

First, the prominent place of Israel's nationhood in Judaism was supported by a popular hope for Israel's independence. With this hope in mind, Klausner disparaged Jesus' advice concerning the payment of Roman tribute because he found it to be unacceptably passive.[185] He also viewed the general failure of Jesus to bring about any sort of

---

[183]This is apparent from the messianic sayings after the Destruction compared with none from before. "The unhappy people, robbed of freedom, persecuted and afflicted to the point of death by the Romans, longed for vengeance on their enemies and for political independence. Thus, it came about that Rabbi Akiba could join himself to a purely political Messiah who was distinguished for no spiritual qualities whatever..." (Messianic Idea, p. 494). See also p. 394 where Klausner cites Emil Schürer "Out of grief over the overthrow of the Sanctuary the Messianic hope drew new nourishment, new strength" (History I:4, p. 660). Klausner commented: "It was quite natural that people should have started looking for a Messiah who would take vengeance on the Romans ...and restore Israel's glory." See also p. 393.

[184]Jesus, p. 376; my underline.

[185]Jesus, p. 318.

release from Roman dominion as non-fulfillment of messianic hopes.[186] Apparently, Jesus was not aiming to "save the tiny nation" in a political sense.

Second, Israel's struggle against "heathen culture" was achievable, according to Klausner, not only through the establishment of a nation state but also through the cultivation of a homogeneous culture. To Klausner, the mortality of a culture was suffered at the sudden imposition of radical changes which threaten existing values. Thus, Jesus' diminution of Judaism's ceremonial laws caused the erosion of the "practical religiousness"[187] which bound expressions of Judaism and were absolutely indispensable, to the stability and continuity of the nation of Israel.

For Klausner, Judaism and Israel were inextricably bound since Judaism provided the nation's culture or "way of life".[188] The Pharisees (and later the Tannaim) led the effort to embrace the whole of life within a religious purview, including law, matters of contract, medicine, botany, agriculture, and so on.[189] Klausner placed their efforts within a larger cultural context, noting that in the Eastern world generally, religion was not an isolated part of personal existence but was completely integrated with all other aspects of national life. Therefore, radical changes in religious tradition were a threat

---

[186] Jesus, p. 406.

[187] Jesus, p. 371

[188] Jesus, p. 371. "...nation and belief are inseparable" (p. 393).

[189] Jesus, p. 372.

to national unity. Klausner suggested that the destruction of national cultural unity was a continuing fear of Israel, which tried to prevent the infiltration of Gentile culture while being politically dominated by foreigners.[190]

Yet, asserted Klausner, Israel was capable of "digesting the best and newest things of others' creations"[191] without jeopardizing its religion. Indeed, these other creations could contribute to its own liveliness.[192] Concerning Jesus, Klausner then mused that if Jesus had come offering objects of culture that were non-religious per se, such as "science and art", "learning and poetry", or a "practical theoretical secular culture, national and humanistic"[193] he would have benefited the nation which would have absorbed them into its own religious tradition. "But he did not come and enlarge the nation's knowledge, and art, and culture, but to abolish such culture as it possessed, bound up with religion" as it was.[194] Both Jesus' near nullification of the ceremonial laws[195] and his ethical teachings--the latter intimating that "there was one moral law for all nations"[196]--

---

[190]"In its deeper consciousness the nation felt that then, more than at any other time, they must not be swallowed up in the great cauldron of nations in the Roman Empire, which were decaying for lack of God and social morality" (Jesus, p. 392).

[191]Jesus, p. 373.

[192]Jesus, p. 373.

[193]Jesus, p. 373.

[194]Jesus, p. 373.

[195]Jesus, pp. 370-1.

[196]Jesus, p. 371.

succeeded in "rais[ing] the nation out of its national confines."[197] Thus, Jesus drove a wedge between elements that Klausner saw to be inseparable: the ethico-religious values of Judaism and the national cultural values of Israel.

The third and fourth points in Israel's critique against Jesus' teachings is that the realization of the moral teachings of the Prophets was to take place slowly and gradually, and within the present world of the Jewish state and nation. Although Jesus' teaching was "imbibed from the breast of Prophetic and, to some extent, Pharisaic Judaism,"[198] his orientation toward the kingdom of heaven isolated him from the needs of the Jewish state and nation. Consequently, he taught "nothing that [could] serve to the upkeep of the state or serve towards the maintenance of the existing world."[199] His commitment to the purely ethical and moral aspects of religious life--which he taught as the only requirements of the kingdom of heaven--created an extreme ethic which, though based wholly on Jewish literature and tradition, was non-Jewish in its extremity and otherworldliness.[200] The imminence of the kingdom and the radical demands of Jesus were precisely opposed to a gradual elevation of Israel's religious practices to the heights of Prophetic and Pharisaic ideals.

---

[197] Jesus, p. 371.

[198] Jesus, p. 376.

[199] Jesus, p. 376. G. B. Caird (Jesus and the Jewish Nation. London: Athlone Press, 1965, p. 11) agreed with this assessment of Jesus saying. Yet, according to Caird, this was entirely intentional. See post, pp. 78ff.

[200] Jesus, p. 376.

Probably the strongest argument for the rejection of Jesus by Israel was his failure to fulfill the messianic hope.[201] The kingdom of heaven remained in a transcendent realm, and neither Jesus' teachings nor his messiahship brought it to materialization. To be sure, he was not the only one who attempted, without success, to hale in the kingdom.[202] The repeated failures of messiahs caused more prudent men to shun messianic pretenders--and these skeptics were most notably the preservers of the established religio-national tradition. "Hence, in the older Talmudic literature...there is a certain wariness as touching the persons of the Messiahs, but a deep and enthusiastic belief in the Messianic hope itself."[203]

If messianic pretenders repeatedly created embarrassing situations for the Jewish nation, one might ask why the messianic hope was not phased out or, at least, drastically changed. Although details of the messianic belief were subject to change, it could not be eliminated. The reason, explained Klausner, was that the hope for the messianic age, linked as it was to the repentance of Israel, provided a vital, forward-looking perspective for the nation that "must march at the head of humanity on the road of personal and social progress, on the road to ethical perfection."[204] Klausner placed the messianic hope at the base of civilization, calling it "the seed of

---

[201] Jesus, p. 406.

[202] John the Baptist.

[203] Jesus, p. 402; my underline.

[204] Messianic Idea, p. 531.

progress."[205] The messianic hope was therefore indispensable to the continuity of Judaism as a personal and national ideal as well as for ethical and social ideals generally.

With the messianic hope propelling the nation forward, a belief in the dawn of the messianic age would bring an abrupt end to "the seed of progress." From this perspective Klausner stated that "the Pharisees dreaded the difficult consequences of the messianic belief in practice."[206] Indeed, the teachings of Jesus, based as they were on the presence of the kingdom,[207] undermined the social teachings of Judaism. In Judaism, the kingdom of heaven "is the fruit of long development and hard work."[208] Klausner believed that this outlook of hard work toward an ideal society was representative of "true socialism," a Jewish, not a Christian, idea.[209]

In contrast, "Jesus did not recognize at all the importance of bettering existing conditions, since 'the present world' is nothing but a state of transition to the Days of the Messiah and 'the world to come.'"[210]

---

[205] Messianic Idea, p. 531.

[206] Jesus, p. 402. One of the difficulties no doubt involved the belief in the temporary abrogation of the law as part of the travail (birth pangs) of the messianic age. But Klausner relegated this belief to the post-Hadrianic period (Messianic Idea, p. 450).

[207] "The kingdom of heaven, according to Jesus, is in the present" (Jesus, p. 406).

[208] Jesus, p. 406.

[209] Jesus, p. 406.

[210] From Jesus to Paul, p. 5.

PART II

In Part II Klausner's treatment of some issues will be viewed against modern scholars' explanations of these same issues, namely, Jesus' messiahship, his notion of the kingdom, his relationship to Israel, and Israel's rejection of him. The survey will include modern scholars chosen for their important and diverse contributions to life-of Jesus research. Included are Günther Bornkamm, Geza Vermes, C. H. Dodd, Joachim Jeremias, W. D. Davies, and G. B. Caird. Also included is Gershom Scholem for his indirect contribution to this area of research. The aim in this section will be to present the critical approaches and arguments of current New Testament scholars and to reveal both the discordance of their views and the points at which they corroborate Klausner's explanations; although only Dodd and Davies make direct reference to Klausner. The Conclusions will look at Klausner's historical method and at the underlying themes of his historical explanations.

THE MESSIAHSHIP OF JESUS AND ITS SIGNIFICANCE FOR ISRAEL'S REJECTION OF HIM

The Messiah Question in Modern Research

Klausner's certainty that Jesus considered himself to be the messiah has not been shared by all New Testament scholars. Indeed, many scholars have found the hypothesis of Jesus messianic consciousness

impossible to substantiate. Günther Bornkamm,[1] for instance considered the historical evidence for it to be "nebulous". Bornkamm distinguished two types of data: 1) the testimony of the church in the gospels that Jesus was the messiah and 2) the "all too psychological"[2] inferences of Jesus' messianic self-consciousness. The latter, according to Bornkamm, are not self-evident from any of Jesus' words;[3] and "it is the special character of his message and work that Jesus is to be found in his word and in his actions."[4]

Unlike Klausner, Bornkamm inferred no authentic messianic claim for the kerygma of the church. Neither did he infer the opposite, that Jesus had a "non-Messianic history before his death."[5] He preferred to view Jesus as "one who was hoped to be the Messiah, but who not only at the moment of failure, but in his entire message and ministry, disappointed the hopes which were placed on him."[6]

According to Bornkamm, the messianic passages interspersed throughout the gospels "should be regarded as the Credo of the believers, and as the theology of the early Church."[7] The story of Jesus'

---

[1] Jesus of Nazareth. Trns. I. and F. McCluskey with James M. Robinson (from 3rd ed., 1959). New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1960.

[2] Jesus of Nazareth, p. 169. See supra, p. 7 n. 17.

[3] Jesus of Nazareth, p. 178. "For this is the truly amazing thing, that there is in fact not one single certain proof of Jesus' claiming for himself one of the Messianic titles which tradition has ascribed him" (p. 172; see also p. 174).

[4] Jesus of Nazareth, p. 169.

[5] Jesus of Nazareth, p. 172.

[6] Jesus of Nazareth, p. 172.

[7] Jesus of Nazareth, p. 173.

baptism, for instance, which Klausner took as authentically indicating the origin of Jesus' messianic self-consciousness, Bornkamm deemed a product of the church. Though containing some "historical kernel" which is probably "slight", the baptism together with the transfiguration, according to Bornkamm, were mainly "illustrative tales" explaining Jesus' mission and person as they were conceived by the church.[8]

The "Son of man" sayings have also been variously interpreted with regard to Jesus' messiahship. Although the term "Son of man" occurs only in Jesus' words in the synoptic gospels, Bornkamm attributed its use to the church as well as to Jesus. The Church's use of the term was evident to Bornkamm particularly in the predictions of the suffering and resurrection of the Son of man (Mark 8:31; 9:31). Bornkamm stressed that when Jesus used the term he always maintained a distinction between himself and the Son of man even while linking himself to him: "And I tell you, everyone who acknowledges me before men, the Son of man also will acknowledge before the angels of God. But he who denies me before men will be denied before the angels of God" (Luke 12:8f.; cf. Mark 8:38).[9] Klausner had interpreted this saying as an enigmatic confession of Jesus' messiahship, but Bornkamm simply read it as Jesus' expression of the **then** typical apocalyptic hope of the coming Son of man and judge of the world.[10] Thus, Jesus

---

[8]Jesus of Nazareth, p. 173.

[9]Norman Perrin argued that Luke's version of the saying is the original Semitic one out of which the parallel sayings in Mark (8:38) and Matthew (16:27) evolved (Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus, p. 186).

[10]Jesus of Nazareth, pp. 176-77.

"did not give himself the title Son of man," neither did he see himself "as destined to be the heavenly judge of the world."[11]

Geza Vermes[12] has interpreted the term "son of man" in a non-doctrinal sense, an interpretation which Klausner also shared. Vermes noted that the term "son of man" in Galilean Aramaic (the language of Jesus) was employed both as a noun meaning simply "a man", "the man",[13] and sometimes as a circumlocutory reference to the personal pronoun "I"[14] used out of "awe, reserve, or humility."[15] "By contrast, no trace survives of its titular use, from which it must be inferred that there is no case to be made for an eschatological or Messianic office-holder generally known as 'the son of man.'"[16] And further, Vermes concluded that "the Gospel passages directly or indirectly referring to Daniel 7:13" cannot be traced back to Jesus.[17] Thus, Vermes, with the help of other arguments, concurs with the view such as that held by Bornkamm that Jesus did not consider himself to be the messiah. Although Klausner recognized the non-titular use of the term,[18] he did not

---

[11] Jesus of Nazareth, p. 177. It is worth noting that the underlying premise of Bornkamm's study is that Jesus' "Messianic character" is explainable through "no customary or current conception, no title or office which Jewish tradition and expectation held in readiness"--none of these "authenticate his mission or exhausts the secret of his being" (p. 178). In his view then the 'messiahship' of Jesus is in no sense a Jewish event, since it was incomprehensible to traditional Judaism.

[12] Jesus the Jew. London: William Collins Sons & Co., Ltd., 1973.

[13] Jesus the Jew, p. 162.

[14] Jesus the Jew, p. 163.

[15] Jesus the Jew, p. 186.

[16] Jesus the Jew, p. 168; 185-6. Vermes follows Norman Perrin on this point, p. 186.

[17] Jesus the Jew, p. 186.

[18] Jesus, p. 257.

Jesus would wish to conceal his messiahship from the simple-minded since his mission is largely directed to them.[24] Furthermore, the disciples in Mark appear not to have understood Jesus' messianic meaning in his use of the term (2:10; 2:28) before Peter confessed Jesus' messiahship at Caesara Philippi. In any case, Klausner included the important finding on the non-messianic use of term "son of man" in Aramaic without forfeiting his claim that Jesus also alluded to his own messiahship by his use of the term.

Like Klausner, C. H. Dodd discussed the ambiguity of the Son of man sayings as Jesus' own "partially veiled assertion of his vocation"[25] as the messiah (albeit a new type of messiah).[26] In addition, Dodd took the Son of man sayings from Daniel 7:13-14 and Psalm 110:1 that appear in the gospels as authentically belonging to Jesus. He also understood them as Jesus' affirmation of his own participation in the kingdom of heaven.[27] Klausner and Dodd both viewed the sense of "Son of man" in Jesus' words as conditioned by the apocalyptic tradition. But here Klausner and Dodd diverged on two points. First, contrary to Klausner, Dodd held that there was "no sufficient evidence that in Jewish circles of the time of Jesus "son of man" was current as a

---

[24] Jesus, p. 225. Klausner stated that in comparison to Hillel who "drew around him simple folk," "Jesus, on the other hand, took pleasure in the boorish and every type of a 'am ha aretz'" (Jesus, p. 225).

[25] The Founder of Christianity. London: Collier-Macmillan Ltd., 1970, p. 112.

[26] Founder, pp. 112-113.

[27] Dodd, however, placed the consumation of the kingdom of heaven beyond history (The Founder, p. 117).

title equivalent or alternative to 'Messiah,' or indeed as a title at all."[28] Second, while Klausner regarded Jesus' use of the term in the Enoch and Ezra tradition[29] in which Son of man is the messiah, Dodd regarded it in the Daniel tradition in which it refers to Israel. Dodd argued, however, that the Son of man imagery, though "largely inherited...was applied differently by different people."[30] Thus, he held that Jesus modified the collective sense of the term in Daniel and thought of himself as the "inclusive representative" of Israel--"the new Israel."[31]

Dodd's solution to the enigma of Jesus' messiahship involved several steps. First he isolated Jesus' conception of his mission as the formation of a new covenant, the constitution of a new Israel under his leaderhip, and the laying down of the new law.[32] Second,

---

[28]Founder, p. 111.

[29]Vermes commented on IV Ezra 13 that it "does not employ son of man as a title. He also noted "that everything datable in IV Ezra is definitely later than AD 70, and is conditioned by the destruction of the Temple. Its evidence is consequently of more relevance to an understanding of the origins of Christianity than to Jesus and his time" (Jesus the Jew, pp. 172-3). The dating of Enoch, Section II (chapters 37-71) in which references to the Son of man are found, is indicated by its omission from Qumran literature. Vermes followed J. T. Milik (Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea, p. 33) who said that the Parables are "the work of a Jew or a Jewish Christian of the first or the second century AD," and that the composition of the book took place in the second half of the third century (Jesus the Jew, p. 176). See also Leonhard Rost who dates it no earlier than the first century BC (Judaism Outside the Hebrew Canon, trns. David E. Green, Nashville: Abingdon, 1976), pp. 138-9.

[30]The Founder, pp. 114-115; 42-43.

[31]The Founder, p. 117.

[32]The Founder, pp. 102-103.

he contrasted it to the contemporary idea of the messiah which was "the political and military role of the 'Son of David'".[33] Third, he noted that Jesus was perceived by his followers to be the messiah. Fourth, he interpreted Jesus' command to secrecy as evidence of his embarrassment on being called the messiah, for his own messianic idea was different and involved his suffering. Fifth, he supposed that Jesus could not entirely divorce the redemptive importance of his mission from the messianic idea, and therefore "he could not simply repudiate the title 'Messiah'".[34] Thus, Dodd implied that Jesus accepted the title by way of concession. He stressed, however, that Jesus consciously avoided such Jewish notions of the messiah which would cast him in the role of political hero.[35] In conclusion, Dodd's view of Jesus' messiahship partially agreed with Klausner's, in that Jesus was a consciously messianic figure (despite his reservations) with a "partially veiled assertion of his vocation" (p. 112), in whose mission suffering figured. Both Klausner and Dodd understood Jesus' mission as directed solely to Israel,[36] and both pictured him as attracting

---

[33]The Founder, p. 102.

[34]The Founder, p. 102.

[35]Aulen noted that "Dodd found no reason to doubt that Jesus entered the city upon an ass. If Jesus had the words of Zechariah in mind and accordingly sought an ass as his mount (which appears to have been the case, according to Matthew), the implication is that his intentions had nothing to do with nationalistic expectations and that the ass was in effect a protection against such interpretations. The cry that the kingdom of David was now at hand had clear implications concerning the national destiny: it bore witness to the fact that to the bitter end Jesus was haunted by interpretations which he wanted to reject" (Jesus in Contemporary, pp. 76-77).

[36]Dodd saw this in eschatological terms which involved transcendence of the Old Israel, but Klausner viewed it in practical terms with Israel being the target of the mission.

national and messianic hopes which he was doomed to disappoint. Finally, both Dodd and Klausner saw Jesus as the "founder of Christianity," albeit in different ways. Klausner protrayed Jesus as thoroughly Jewish, with a messianic conviction at the heart of his mission. The imminence of the kingdom together with his messianic role in it gave Jesus the reason and the authority to impose a radical ethic[37] which unintentionally drew him out of the sphere of Judaism and into a new anti-Jewish religion, Christianity.

Dodd, on the contrary, portrayed Jesus as the conscious founder of Christianity. He rooted his perception of Jesus as founder in the symbolic ritual of the Last Supper--Jesus' establishment of a new covenant which "formally install[ed] them [the apostles] as foundation members of the new people of God."[38] Thus, Dodd included in Jesus' messianic conception the establishment of a new covenant, a new law and a new sacrament, all of which separated him from the traditional messianic idea.

It is evident that the question of Jesus' messiahship is for some an investigation into the early Church,[39] and for others an

---

[37]The messiahship does not necessarily imply authority over the Law. Montefiore, for instance, favoured the view that Jesus held himself to be the messiah but noted that Jesus "did not appear to claim authority over the commands of the Law in virtue of his messiahship" (The Synoptic Gospels, 1909, p. 92).

[38]The Founder, p. 96.

[39]Herbert Braun (Jesus: Der Man aus Nazareth und seine Zeit, Stuttgart: Kreuz, 1969) viewed the titles "Messiah" and "Son of man" as deriving from the faith of the Church. Gustaf Aulen, paraphrasing Braun wrote: "The oldest formula of the text 'the Son of man who shall come in the glory of the Father' (Mark 8:38) refers to a person totally other than Jesus himself" (Jesus in Contemporary, p. 19). Aulen also noted that W. D. Davies did not hold that Jesus declared himself to be messiah, but that he was given this designation by the evangelists who sought to defend his words and actions (Jesus in Contemporary, p. 50).

exploration of Jesus' consciousness. Klausner's decision clearly favoured the latter and it formed the basis of his portrait of Jesus. With regard to the importance of Jesus' messiahship for the historical apprehension of Jesus, Bornkamm offered this general critique: "Many are of the opinion that its place is at the beginning and that without a definite answer to it, absolutely nothing in Jesus' message or history could be properly understood. Our answer is this: No, it should not be at the beginning and the place which we have assigned to it reveals a material decision to which Jesus' teaching and work compels us..."[40]

Despite the fact that the gospels do "not offer incontestable proof of the Messianic consciousness of Jesus,"[41] that is, "the sayings source does not contain an unequivocal Messianic designation,"[42] Klausner placed the messianic consciousness of Jesus at the beginning of his understanding of Jesus. It was a major determining factor in Jesus' career: it shaped his teaching; it caused his rejection by Israel; it contributed to his death; and it caused the rise of the Church. In addition to explaining particular incidents in Jesus' life, his messianic belief both linked him to his Jewish heritage and set him against it. Thus, two crucial characteristics are set forth: his traditionalism and his radicalism or, to put it in Klauserian terms, his Jewishness and his anti-Jewishness.

---

[40]Bornkamm did "not see in Jesus' message and work a special theme of his rank" (Jesus of Nazareth, p. 169).

[41]Gerhard Delling, "D. The Christ Statements of the New Testament, 1. Occurrence of χριστος in the New Testament," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, Vol. IX. G. Kittel (ed.). Trans., ed., Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 19 , p. 537.

[42]Theological Dictionary, p. 537.

In contrast to Bornkamm, Klausner understood Jesus, his rise and his message within the tradition of Judaism.[43] Jesus occupied a traditional role primarily as a messianic claimant. His messianic belief included a vision of the kingdom of heaven that included such traditional characteristics as penitents, judgement, material bounty, the resurrection of the dead, the return of the twelve tribes of Israel, and the restoration of Israel--ideas which were also found in prophetic, apocalyptic, and Tannaitic descriptions. Even Jesus' teachings were basically Pharisaic, both in method and substance, and he valued the ceremonial laws as well as the ethical laws.[44] Klausner took as authentic Luke 11:42, "Woe to you Pharisees, for ye tithe mint and rue and every herb and pass over judgement and the love of God, but these ought ye to have done, not to leave the other undone," and pointed out that "Jesus never thought of annulling the Law (or even the ceremonial laws which it contained), and setting up a new law of his own."[45]

Jesus' attitude to the Law notwithstanding, Klausner argued that Jesus' religious and moral demands were impossible and even dangerous for Israel. But how could Jesus' teachings be impossible

---

[43]Bornkamm's rejection of Judaism as a framework with which to understnad Jesus is reflective of Bultmann's dispute of the significance of Old Testament tradition to explain the miracles of Jesus, i.e., the Old Testament men of God, such as Moses (The History of the Synoptic Tradition. Oxford, 1963, p. 230; Otto Betz, What do We Know about Jesus? Trns. Margaret Kohn. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1968, p. 64). Bultmann generally overestimated Hellenistic influence in the Gospels' depiction of Jesus, e.g., Jesus as the 'divine man' (What Do We Know, pp. 64-5).

[44]Jesus, p. 367.

[45]Jesus, p. 367.

or dangerous to Israel if, as Klausner argued, his ideas embodied so much of traditional Judaism? How, indeed, could Jesus' Jewish ideas be considered "anti-Jewish?"[46]

The paradox that the messianic idea of Jesus contained radical elements unacceptable to traditional Judaism can be seen in his notion of the kingdom. As the messiah, Jesus held traditional ideas about the kingdom including the requisite repentance and righteousness of Israel. His belief that the kingdom was present compelled him to demand an extremely high level of righteousness evident in his rebukes of the Pharisees and his ethics from the Sermon on the Mount. Klausner asserted that Jesus' moral demands were so extreme that they effectively placed the kingdom out of reach. He remarked, "By this belief of Jesus his kingdom did, in reality, become 'not of this world'"[47]--that is, not in the realm of human possibility. This otherworldliness was unintentioned. In another context Klausner stated that "a kingdom not of this world," as opposed to an historical kingdom, was not a belief of Jesus.[48] Thus, the otherworldliness of the kingdom manifested itself even though Jesus believed in an historical kingdom. This appears to have been an inevitable consequence of the actualization of the messianic kingdom. Klausner contrasted the worldliness of the nation, burdened by its social and political problems, to the otherworldliness of the kingdom, apparent in its impossible ideals, and concluded

---

[46] J. Klausner, "A Rejoinder of Rabbi Klausner", Harvard Theological Review, p. 391.

[47] Jesus, p. 405.

[48] Messianic Idea, p. 392.

that the requirements of the kingdom according to Jesus were contradictory to the needs of the nation.

A similar paradox is evident in Jesus' attitude to the Law and his relationship to the Pharisees. Klausner stressed Jesus' loyalty to the Law. But he also noted that Jesus' messianic self-consciousness and his professed closeness to the Father gave him special authority to decree extreme ethical laws which set him against the Pharisaic tradition whence his laws derived.[49]

Klausner's apprehension of the dynamics of Jesus' messiahship and the conflict it perpetrated between Jesus and Israel parallel some of the insights of Gershom Scholem.[50] Scholem observed that the the Jewish messianic tradition contained contradictory elements. Being a longstanding tradition it contained hopes that were rooted in the past, such as the Davidic reign and the restoration of Israel.

---

[49]Klausner was careful in his treatment of Jesus' relationship to the Law vis-a-vis his messiahship. He did not argue that Jesus, as messiah, was above the Law (there was no current rabbinic tradition that claimed this except possibly a post-Hadrianic tradition that remotely suggested it), but that he exhibited certain laxity towards it at times. On the other hand, Klausner also argued that Jesus' critique of the Pharisees was based on both his eschatological awareness as well as his moralistic scruples. Indeed some of the Pharisees seemed to lack the latter. For Klausner, who viewed Jesus' coming of the kingdom as part of a Jewish tradition which required repentance, moralistic motives were not separable from his eschatological demands for the coming kingdom. Compare Jocz who argued that "Jesus' attitude to the Law was determined neither by humanisitc motives nor moralistic scruples... It is as the Servant of God, the King Messiah, that Jesus claimed the authority which he knew to be delegated to him by God" (The Jewish People and Jesus Christ. London: SPCK, 1962 reprint of a 1954 revised version of the 1949 original, p. 24.

[50]"The Crisis of Tradition in Jewish Messianism", The Messianic Idea in Judaism. New York: Schocken Books, 1971, pp. 49-77. Note that Scholem drew one. W. D. Davies, Torah in the Messianic Age, Philadelphia 1952.

On the other hand, as a utopian hope for perfection, it called for an unprecedented condition. According to Scholem, as long as the messianic tradition remained a hope, the contradictory elements would be rationalized by the imagination, which "seeks to create bridges and roads between them."[51] But, asserted Scholem, the present actualization of the messianic age in history is impossible since the conservative elements would come into conflict with the utopian elements. Indeed, the sudden "presence of redemption" threatens to annhilate "tradition of the past" generally.[52]

This conflict between the conservative and the utopian elements of the messianic idea was apparent in Klausner's understanding of Jesus' mission. Jesus harboured traditional expectations of the kingdom and of his position in it, together with a set of utopian ethics. As a Jewish messiah with a Jewish following, Jesus had failed to manifest the materialistic expectations which he was responsible for implanting.[53] Jesus' offering of ethics alone were out of place for people with historical-materialistic hopes of the kingdom. This situation was ultimately responsible for his rejection by Israel, since without the physical manifestation of the kingdom, his utopian demands not only clashed with the practising religious tradition but they had no foundation.

---

[51] The Messianic Idea in Judaism, p. 52.

[52] The Messianic Idea in Judaism, p. 52.

[53] Klausner has understood Jesus' notion of the kingdom in light of the cry from the cross "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" which proclaimed the failure of Jesus' purpose. This is also the view of H. Reimarus, Von dem Zwecke Jesu und Jünger: Noch Ein Fragment des Wolfenbuttelschun, Braunschweig, 1798. Partial translation, Fragments From Reimarus Consisting of Brief Critical Remarks on the Object of Jesus and his Disciples, ed. trns. C. Voysey. London: Williams and Norgate 1897; reprinted, Kentucky: American Theological Seminary Library Association, 1962.

Although Klausner's explanation of the conflict between Jesus and Israel hinged to a great extent on the Sermon on the Mount, which has been deemed by other scholars as a product of the later church, his estimate of Jesus has nevertheless been shared by many scholars. For instance, W. D. Davies's description of Jesus is not unlike Klausner's, yet Davies did not accept the authenticity of the Sermon on the Mount as did Klausner. Davies saw in the Sermon Matthew's intention to represent Jesus as the new Moses who, though loyal to the Law, came to add to it law which was intended to regulate life in the Matthaean church. Davies stressed, however, that "The marks of the life of Jesus are to be traceable in that of his followers...the ethical norm for Christians is not only the words but the life of him who uttered them. The shadow of Jesus' own life is over all the Sermon."[54] In other words, though the Sermon can be examined for the Matthaean church tradition, it is still representative of Jesus' own teaching. In fact, wrote Davies, "Matthew softened the radicalism in the ethics of Jesus."[55]

Davies's conception of Jesus, like Klausner's, is two-fold. The first is radical: "Jesus behaved...as an eschatological figure"[56] whose message that the kingdom of God is near caused a crisis in traditional Judaism involving the radical demand to politically imitate him.[57]

---

[54] The Sermon on the Mount, p. 28.

[55] The Sermon on the Mount, p. 114, my underline.

[56] Jesus in Contemporary, p. 37.

[57] Jesus in Contemporary, p. 36 (from W. D. Davies, Gospel and the Land. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of Clifornia Press, 1974, p. 353).

The second is traditional: "Jesus behaved...as a rabbi or ethical teacher"[58] which is evident in his expounding of the Scriptures and discussing of legal matters.[59] These two aspects are inseparably bound to one another in Davies's understanding of Jesus.[60]

Jesus' Notion of the Kingdom: Historical or Non-Historical?

Klausner's view that Jesus considered himself the messiah helped shape his understanding of the kingdom according to Jesus. Thus, he held that Jesus' conception of the kingdom of heaven "differed but little" from that of the Judaism of his time. The two differences were that the kingdom would come "without hands" and that it had in fact already dawned. Although these are two major differences which Klausner later used to emphasize the other-worldliness and non-political nature of Jesus' kingdom,[61] he nevertheless pointed to parallels between Jesus' materialistic expectations and those found in Talmudic literature. He stated that Jesus believed in "a worldly and even a political messiah,"[62] and that he spoke of the coming kingdom as an historical reality with materialistic qualities, such as the heavenly banquet and the bounty which entrants would receive. He also pointed out that Jesus envisioned the restoration of Israel and he clearly

---

[58] Jesus in Contemporary, p. 37.

[59] Jesus in Contemporary, p. 37.

[60] Jesus in Contemporary, p. 37.

[61] Jesus, pp. 236, 405.

[62] Jesus, p. 402.

anticipated the return of the twelve tribes in his choice of twelve disciples. These similarities presuppose the imminent or future materialization of the kingdom in history. According to Klausner, Jesus' proclamation indicated that the kingdom in all its glory was about to break into history--his radical ethical maxims were evidence of this.

Not surprisingly, Bornkamm detected nothing about Jesus' kingdom that aligned him to traditional messianic hopes. "Not a word does he say to either confirm or renew the national hopes of his people ...Not once does he speak of the restoration of the kingdom of David in power and majesty, and of the Messiah who will destroy enemies (Ps. Sol. xvii 21ff., 30ff.)."[63] Joachim Jeremias[64] opposed the view that Jesus held historical-materialistic notions of the kingdom: "Jesus is not the Messiah of Israel's expectation; it is not his business to set up the kingdom of Israel, but the Kingdom of God; he has not come to deliver his people from the yoke of Rome, but from Satan's bondage."[65]

Both Bornkamm and Jeremias presented Jesus' notion of the kingdom as non-historical, which ruled out traditional messianic conceptions of the kingdom. Bornkamm noted "that Jesus' eschatological sayings do not describe the future as a state of heavenly bliss nor indulge in broad descriptions of the terrors of the judgement."[66] The

---

[63]Jesus of Nazareth, p. 66.

[64]Joachim Jeremias, Jesus' Promise to the Nations, trns., S. H. HOoke. London: SCM Press, 1958.

[65]Jesus' Promise, p. 44.

[66]Jesus of Nazareth, p. 93.

decisive saying of Jesus for Bornkamm is "The kingdom of God is not coming with signs to be observed" (Luke 17:20). Instead, Bornkamm emphasized the present significance of the kingdom of God for the individual.[67] The present responsibility of the individual is understood by Bornkamm to be the point of Jesus' repeated instruction "Take heed, watch" or "Take heed to yourselves" (Mark 13:33; cf. 5, 9, 23, etc...Mark 13:9).[68] Jeremias also did away with the messianic conception of the kingdom as the historical restoration of Israel. The kingdom would take place, according to Jeremias, beyond history; and, being bound up with the judgement, it required the purification of Israel rather than the overthrow of her enemies.

Jeremias outlined Jesus' notion of the kingdom as containing a universal redemptive scheme that included Israel (to whom Jesus' mission was directed) and the Gentiles--the latter only after his death

---

[67]Otto Betz's critique of Bultmann, the teacher of Bornkamm, is of interest here. Betz observed that Bultmann's attack on Liberal exegesis did not prevent him from presenting a "stunted interpretation of Jesus' preaching" (What Do We Know, p. 45). Instead of relying on Kant, as did Liberal exegesis, which both "overlook[ed] the apocalyptic components which point[ed] toward the future" and held to be of permanent value the faith-founded ethic, the demand for righteousness and love of one's neighbour, as these are expressed in the parables, for instance, or in the Sermon on the Mount," Bultmann followed Heidegger. Bultmann, therefore, thought "that the coming of the kingdom was not really an event in time and that the kingdom of God is not an entity which begins in the present and is perfected in the future; it has neither a 'where' nor a 'when'. In this view the future of which Jesus speaks is whatever comes to meet man, whatever forces him to decision; and every hour when man is confronted with decision is the hour of judgement (pp. 45-6). Betz concluded that "The result of such an interpretation is similar to that of liberal theology, except that in the place of ethical demands we now have the call to decision and the realization of true existence" (p. 46). This is an equally pertinent assessment of Bornkamm's view.

[68]Jesus of Nazareth, p. 93.

and resurrection.[69] Jeremias exegeted the saying (Matthew 8:11-12) which Klausner deemed unauthentic, as referring to the eschatological world to come, in which the Gentiles would pilgrimage to Zion.[70] Jeremias saw this to be a unique idea of Jesus.[71] It reflected his consistant policy toward the Gentiles, which differed from the popular view. According to Jeremias, Jesus was aware of fulfilling Old Testament prophecy, particularly the three Isaian promises of the eschatological redemption (Isaiah 35:4; 29:20; 61:2). But he omitted from all

---

[69] Jesus' Promise, p. 39. Jeremias outlined a two-fold scheme "...first the call to Israel, and subsequently the redemptive incorporation of the Gentiles in the Kingdom of God" (Jesus' Promise, p. 71) which would occur at the dawn of God's eschatological day. It was also necessary, argued Jeremias, that Jesus should die and be resurrected. Especially in the Gospel of John, "The fact is repeatedly emphasized that the time of the Gentiles must follow the Cross." (Jesus' Promise, p. 73).

[70] Jesus' Promise, p. 62. Jeremias noted that the rabbinic literature rarely contained universalistic conceptions of the messianic age, but usually was exclusively nationalistic. The destruction of the Gentiles was a prevalent notion after the destruction of the Temple in AD 70. "But altogether apart from the fact that the destruction of Jerusalem in AD 70 and its effects lie outside the chronological limits of this study, it is unnecessary for our purpose to enter into the details of the treatment in the rabbinic literature of the conception of the eschatological pilgrimmage of the Gentiles, since Jesus was not influenced by late Jewish exegesis, but by the Old Testament itself" (pp. 61-62). This view contrasts to Klausner who saw Jesus as a Pharisee, and the Pharisees as precursors of the Rabbis; and therefore paralleled Jesus' teaching to early rabbinic literature. Jeremias based his argument for the authenticity of the saying on the Semitic style and language of the verse. But the discovery of semitisms in Jesus' language is not undisputable evidence of authenticity. For instance, Jeremias thought that Matthew 11:25-27 was characteristically Semitic, while Braun saw in it "Hellenistic-Oriental" language (Jesus in Contemporary, p. 118).

[71] Jeremias later stated that Matthew 8:11 was a "succint summary of the Old Testament utterances concerning the eschatological pilgrimmage of the Gentiles to the Mountain of God at the time of the Last Judgement" (Jesus' Promise, p. 62)--referring to Isaiah 49:12, 25:6f. It is not evident however, from the first passage that the prophet envisioned the salvation of the Gentiles; indeed, the context is clearly the salvation of "his people," "his afflicted," i.e. Israel.

three passages the references to God's vengeance toward the Gentiles.[72] Thus, the kingdom of God was not exclusive to Israel in Jesus' view, but would come with God's mercy to the Gentiles. All the nations, including Israel, would be brought to the throne of the Son of man who would judge all of them equally: "In the final judgement the distinction between Israel and the Gentiles will disappear."[73]

Bornkamm's and Jeremias's non-historical interpretation of the kingdom gave them great flexibility in dealing with the present and future aspects of the kingdom. Jeremias, for instance, did not rule out the present significance of the kingdom. In addition to the future consumation of the eschatological kingdom, he understood the kingdom as a "new life" under Jesus which the disciples were bound to express in the present: "You yourselves should be signs of the coming of the kingdom of God, signs that something has already happened."[74] The lives of individuals are to be "rounded in the basileia, the kingdom of God" and "should testify to the world that the kingdom of God is already dawning."[75]

Bornkamm also combined the future and present elements of the kingdom. He conceded that Jesus spoke of the kingdom as an event in

---

[72]Jesus' Promise, pp. 45-61. According to Jeremias, this was the reason for the people's anger at Jesus' words in Luke 4:16. He translated θαυμάζειν not as surprise but as "opposition to what is strange"; and he translated οἱ λόγοι τῆς χάριτος, not as "gracious words' but as "words of (God's) mercy" (Jesus' Promise, p. 45).

[73]Jesus' Promise, p. 49.

[74]Jeremias, The Sermon on the Mount, p. 33

[75]Jeremias, The Sermon on the Mount, p. 33.

the future,[76] but that "the future is always spoken of as unlocking and lighting up the present, and therefore revealing today as the day for decision."[77] "God's future is God's call to the present, and the present is the time of decision in the light of God's future."[78] Here, God's future is to be understood as the future kingdom of God which involves judgement and salvation. C. H. Dodd's interpretation of the kingdom is equally paradoxical. Dodd's view resembles that of Jeremias: "The kingdom of God, while it is present experience, remains also a hope, but a hope directed to a consummation beyond history."[79] The future consummation is stressed as a post-historical event; but again Dodd introduced the paradox, "This is the kingdom of God in the fullness of its meaning, and it lies beyond history. And yet it 'came' in history in the crucial episode of which Jesus is the active centre."[80]

Christian scholars commonly avoid such interpretations of Jesus as would limit his proclamation of the kingdom to a promised historical manifestation of a materialistic hope. This understanding of the kingdom would only reveal Jesus as a failrue. The coming of the kingdom is often interpreted as a post-historical event. Though the kingdom is described in materialistic terms it lies in the realm of

---

[76] Jesus of Nazareth, p. 92.

[77] Jesus of Nazareth, p. 92.

[78] Jesus of Nazareth, p. 93.

[79] The Founder, p. 115.

[80] The Founder, p. 115.

eschatology. Thus, the earthly ministry and tragic death of Jesus represent only the first stage in the greater plan of redemption which he initiated.

The second stage in the plan of redemption--the salvation of the world--gained its place in the eschatological redemption beyond history. Though both Jeremias and Dodd uphold this view, they necessarily retain an interpretation of the present kingdom that is expressed historically but is non-materialistic. Such a view rests on the ethical expression of the kingdom by those who are followers of Jesus. The kingdom, therefore, has significance for the present and is historically expressed by the individual in spiritual terms. From this perspective an evaluation of Jesus' success or failure to bring about the kingdom is irrelevant since the responsibility for the 'manifestation' of the kingdom has been transferred from Jesus to the individual believer. Eduard Grimm, a Christian apologist who Klausner observed in a footnote spoke clearly about the necessity to modify Jesus' dogma of the kingdom:

> The kingdom of heaven as it lived in the hopes of the people of Israel could not be otherwise than something actual and tangible, like other kingdoms. And Jesus himself was not far removed from such an idea. We find ourselves, therefore, in an unusual position; if the idea of the kingdom of heaven is to rule us today as a living power we must inevitably spiritualize it to such an extent that the greater part of its original character is taken from it. If, however, we would preserve the historic truth, the idea will be foreign to us and will no longer occupy a central position.[81]

Thus, the kingdom according to Jesus is not only different from modern

---

[81]Eduard Grimm, Die Ethik Jesu, 2 Aufl. Leipzig, 1917, p. 265.

day Christian interpretations, it is positively undesirable in the interest of soteriology.

Jesus' Relationship to Israel

One of the issues on which scholars are most divided is Jesus' political commitment.[82] It is closely linked with his notion of the kingdom and with his own role in it, since these would dictate the character of his mission. We have seen that Klausner interpreted Jesus' notion of the kingdom in Jewish messianic terms, which traditionally demanded political activity on the part of the messiah. But, owing to Jesus' belief that the kingdom would come "without hands", the active political aspect of the kingdom was all but eliminated. Klausner emphasized Jesus' lack of political activity but he did not rule it out entirely. He noted that Jesus neither, on the one hand, joined the Zealots nor did he, on the other hand, preach to the Gentiles. Nevertheless, as a messianic figure he possessed a traditional loyalty to Israel to whom his mission was directed. Indeed, Jesus' exclusive mission to Israel resembled the propehts' preoccupation with elevating Israel's ethical righteousness.[83] Yet, argued Klausner, in spite of

---

[82]The most representative work of Jesus as a political revolutionary is S. G. F. Brandon's Jesus and the Zealots, Manchester, 1967. But see the excellent critique of such a view by Martin Hengel Was Jesus a Revolutionist? Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971.

[83]Cf. T. W. Manson, Jesus and the Non-Jews. London (The University of London): The Athlone Press, 1955. Manson explained "why the activities of Jesus and his followers were to be confined within the narrow limits set by the phrase 'the lost sheep of the house of Israel,'" in terms of practical necessity. His mission, being carried out as a ministry "operating through personal encounter" and serving the needs of people "one at a time," "must inevitably begin in a small way," p. 15. Manson clearly envisaged a universal purpose in Jesus' mission which was severed from the traditional Jewish dogma of the land of Israel and its salvation.

Jesus' nationally directed message, he lacked the prophets' concern about the social and political life of the nation.[84] His mission was propelled instead by an apocalyptic consciousness--the coming of the kingdom.

G. B. Caird[85] has recently argued to the contrary--that Jesus' mission was motivated by political concerns. Against the view that Jesus "...felt no sorrow at the national sorrow,"[86] he showed that Jesus was concerned with the welfare of the Jewish nation. Caird accepted the gospel tradition that Jesus foresaw the destruction of Jerusalem.[87] Caird's portrayal of Jesus as a prophet[88] served him well in his explanation for the "hurried mission." Against the view of Albert Schweitzer who explained the hurried mission as Jesus' response to the imminent kingdom (a view also shared by Klausner), Caird understood the hurried mission as "Jesus...working against time to prevent the end of Israel's world,"[89] for "this generation was in imminent danger of being the last generation in Israel's history."[90] Thus, Jesus' prophetic

---

[84]Klausner seems to have been influenced by Joseph Jacobs, the probable author of As Others Saw Him: A Retrospect A.D. 54, London, 1895. See Jesus, p. 113.

[85]Jesus and the Jewish Nation. London (University of London): Athlone Press, 1965.

[86]As Others Saw Him, pp. 200-2, 218, cited in Jesus, p. 113.

[87]Jesus and the Jewish Nation, p. 11.

[88]Caird viewed Jesus' mission to bring about the restored nation of Israel as continuing from John the Baptist's national proclamation not as deriving from his messiahship, Jesus and the Jewish Nation, pp. 6-7.

[89]Jesus and the Jewish Nation, p. 8.

[90]Jesus and the Jewish Nation, p. 10. See pp. 9-10 on Caird's treatment of the sayings directed against "this generation" which he interpreted as "Israel". Cf. Klausner who said of Jesus, "his toughts turned not to his people's future" (Jesus, p. 236).

awareness of the coming events that concerned the whole nation determined his mission. "The haste of the mission was directly connected to the many sayings which predict the fall of Jerusalem and the destruction of the temple."[91] Moreover, Caird inferred from Jesus' instructions to his disciples (i.e., "towns where they receive you,"[92] "towns where they don't receive you" [Matthew 10:14; Mark 6:11; Luke 9:5]) that he expected a mass response to his mission.[93]

From Caird's perspective, Jesus' mission was a nation-wide campaign for the public good, not, as Bornkamm described, directed to individuals for the salvation of their souls.[94] Indeed, said Caird, Jesus hoped to bring about a "national way of life" that would save the nation when it came to answer for itself at the last judgement.[95]

Despite Jesus' commitment to Israel, Caird admitted that "[Jesus] never offered security to man or nation."[96] This same observation was made by Klausner and it was central to his critique of Jesus. In Klausner's study Jesus' failure to offer security to Israel was an

---

[91] Jesus and the Jewish Nation, p. 8.

[92] I cannot find this phrase in either Matthew, Mark or Luke. Where the disciples are welcomed or admitted a house is specified. This is always juxtaposed to the statement about "those" (Luke 9:5) or "any place" (Mark 6:11) or "anyone" (Matthew 10:14) who does not receive them. Only Matthew adds the curse directed against "that town" (Matthew 10:15).

[93] Jesus and the Jewish Nation, p. 8.

[94] Jesus and the Jewish Nation, p. 10.

[95] Jesus and the Jewish Nation, pp. 11, 22.

[96] Jesus and the Jewish Nation, p. 11.

unintended drawback of his ethical teachings that prevented them from being accepted by Israel. Caird, on the other hand, interpreted Jesus' failure to offer security to Israel as consistent with his purpose. Although Jesus essentially agreed with the Pharisees that national security required a religiously united country, Jesus rejected the Pharisees' practices which were supposed to effect the national ideal. Caird summarized Jesus' critique: "The Pharisees, in particular, were bending every effort to maintain their national integrity, and...this was the one sure way of losing it."[97] According to Caird, Jesus wished to point out the paradox of contemporary religious practices that were supposed to ensure national security but actually prevented it from being realized. In place of the Pharisaic approach, Jesus himself offered a paradoxical teaching for national security: "If they wished to save their national life, they must lose it in the service of God's kingdom; offering to God a radical obedience in excess of anything contemplated by the Pharisees and leaving the results in the hands of God.[98] These, of course, are the words of Caird. He interpreted in a collective sense Jesus' saying concerning the requirements of one who is to be a disciple. Caird did so in order to arrive at a meaning consonant with his view of Jesus' purpose as the national redeemer of Israel. Hence, "For whoever would save his life will lose it, and whoever loses his life for my sake will find it" (Matthew 16:25) is "the nation that loses its life shall save it."

The title of Caird's book already suggested the importance of

---

[97] Jesus and the Jewish Nation, pp. 11-12.

[98] Jesus and the Jewish Nation, p. 12.

Jesus' relationship to Israel. According to Caird, Israel was the focal point of Jesus' message and mission. Thus, "[Jesus] intended to bring into existence the restored nation of Israel,"[99] an ideal that could be realized only if the "old Israel"[100] would accept his radical ethic. Klausner also realized that Israel was important to Jesus but he noted that as Jesus' mission began to fail his loyalty to Israel suffered: he pronounced terrible judgement on the towns that would not receive him[101] such as, Chorasin, Bethsaida and Capernaum (Matthew 11:20, 24; Luke 10:13-15).

The two assessments of Jesus' relationship to Israel differ fundamentally. While Caird spoke of Jesus' undying nationalism and loyalty to Israel, Klausner described Jesus neglect of his country.[102]

---

[99] Jesus and the Jewish Nation, p. 16.

[100] Jesus and the Jewish Nation, p. 22.

[101] Jesus, pp. 295, 410. Klausner attributed Jesus' change of attitude toward Israel to the increasing failure of his mission to gain followers. Cf. Schweitzer who attributed the change of attitude and his subsequent desparate efforts to "force the kingdom" to the nonfulfillment of his prediction (Matthew 10:23) that the Son of man would materialize before the disciples would complete their mission to Israel (The Quest of the Historical Jesus, trns. W. Montgomery from the first German edition, Von Reimerus zu Wrede. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1968, 8th reprint, p. 359.

[102] Sometimes Klausner emphasized this to such a degree that he contradicted other statements about Jesus' sense of nationalism. This emphasis was particularly evident when he compared Jesus to great Jewish figures, such as Hillel: "the rest of mankind was everything to Jesus but his own people, the national group, was nothing at all to him" (Jesus, p. 225). Compare the middle paragraph on p. 397 in which Klausner did not see Jesus' lack of interest in Israel as resulting from his greater concern for mankind, but saw it as symptomatic of a general detachment from "the world or civilization," and concluded that he was essentially anti-social or monastic. See Cadoux, "Dr. Klausner's Estimate of Jesus", London Quarterly and Holborn Review, July 1935, p. 313.

Their assessments rest on different conceptions of Israel. In Caird's portrait of Jesus, Israel is an ideal: Jesus was loyal to a vision of the restored Israel (in contrast to the "old Israel"), and to its realization all his energy was directed. Conversely, Klausner knew Israel only as the real, living nation. Though Jesus directed his mission to Israel he failed to bring about national sovereignty and threatened what security it had. Indeed, Jesus was uninterested in fighting against the Romans to secure Israel's sovereignty.[103] Thus, Jesus' nationalistic sentiments were not fruitful. The difference between the ideal Israel versus the real Israel also explains the discrepancy between Caird's view that Jesus was politically aware and active and Klausner's view that Jesus was politically passive or a-political. According to Caird, Jesus' ideal of a restored kingdom of Israel gave his mission political meaning. But from Klausner's political realist perspective, the only meaningful politics was realpolitik, and Jesus failed to exhibit it. For Klausner, the ideal was already materialized in the land of Israel (both in Jesus' time and in his own) and all that it required was the concrete assurance of its continuity.

A similar tendency toward the ideal characterization of Israel is evident in Dodd's understanding of Jesus' relationship to Israel. Though Dodd portrayed Jesus as loyal to Israel, he distinguished between the old and the new Israel. Jesus' mission, according to Dodd,

---

[103]"Klausner's enthusiastic nationalism led him to condone the forcible Judaizing of regions conquered and annexed by John Hyrcanus, Aristobulus, and Alexander Jannaeus to whom he things injustice has been uniformly doen by historians 'more interested in civilization than in nationality'" (G. F. Moore citing A. Kaminka in "A Jewish Life of Jesus", Menorah Journal, No. 33, Autumn, 1923, p. 61.

was dedicated to the emergence of a "new Israel" with himself as Messiah at its head. "The new Israel" was qualitatively different from the old Israel (practising as it would Jesus' new ethic) and was being constituted under a new set of criteria. Thus, the Israel of the Hebrew Biblical literature, who was under the mandate of Yahweh and who was signified by the land, was replaced by Jesus' conception of the "new," ideal Israel, under the mandate of a new ethic and signified by Jesus as the messiah.

W. D. Davies[104] and C. H. Dodd[105] partly drew on Klausner's book for their understanding of the relationship between Jesus and Israel. Consequently, they focused on Jesus' teachings as the primary threat to Judaism and the Jewish nation. Like Klausner, they explained the comparative extremism of Jesus' teachings as stemming from his apocalyptic belief that a "new order"[106] or "new era"[107] had come. Dodd called the maxims of Jesus utopian as did Klausner. In addition, Dodd and Davies alike viewed Jesus' teachings against "the integrity of Judaism as a system in which religion and national solidarity were inseparable."[108] And therein lay the cause of the breach between Jesus and Israel, since, in contrast to Judaism, "the land itself played a minor role in Jesus'

---

[104]The Gospel and the Land. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1974, p. 346.

[105]The Founder, pp. 75-78.

[106]The Gospel, p. 346.

[107]The Founder, p. 76.

[108]The Founder, p. 77.

mind."[109] Indeed, remarked Davies, "Jesus, as far as we can gather, paid little attention to the relationship between Yahweh, and Israel and the land."[110]

Despite the threat which Jesus posed to the nation, neither Davies nor Dodd portrayed him as an outright adversary of either the nation or Judaism. Like Klausner, Davies noted that "Jesus, too, knew the love of his native land"[111] but was generally alienated from the concerns of preserving the Jewish nation as a political entity.[112] Dodd reflectd Klausner's position regarding Jesus' relationshio to Judaism (the Law); he did not see Jesus as consciously undermining "the cherished customs of the people"[113] (except on some occasions). Nevertheless, argued Dodd, Jesus' predominant concern with the individual's relationship to God[114] contrasted to rabbinic Judaism's preoccupation with "minutiae of religious etiquette"[115] and resulted in a

---

[109]The Gospel, p. 354. Dodd noted the purely religious reaction, in addition to the politically edged response, that Jews may have had to Jesus--a sense of a "violation of sanctitites" (The Founder, p. 78).

[110]The Gospel, p. 365. "But we have seen indications that the Early Church was so concerned. This concern was part of the matrix which led that process, often treated, whereby Jesus was increasingly draped in an apocalyptic mantle and specifically Jewish expectations developed in the Christian form highly enhanced from that which they had assumed in Jesus' own teaching" (The Gospel, p. 365).

[111]The Gospel, p. 354.

[112]Davies cited Klausner on this point, The Gospel, p. 346.

[113]The Founder, p. 70. For the exceptions see p. 69.

[114]The Founder, p. 70.

[115]The Founder, p. 67.

conflict between Jesus and the representatives of Judaism.

Needless to say, both Davies and Dodd view Jesus' distance from the land in a positive sense as the consequence of both his "concentration on a loving universal community,"[116] and his dedication to the individual's daily imitation of "God's treatment of his children."[117] In contrast, Klausner viewed Jesus' alienation from the land in a negative sense with reference to his socially untenable demands and utopian ideals. However, both Davies and Klausner implicitly, if not explicitly, agree that it was Jesus' heightened eschatological awareness that proportionately lowered his concern for Israel, the land.[118]

This inverse equation appears to be built right into the notion of Jewish messianism. Davies drew this insight from Gershom Scholem who noted "that Jewish messianism incorporated both a restorative hope of Israel's re-establishment to a primordial condition and a utopian hope envisioning something "which has never before existed."[119] These two essential notions are contradictory and one is emphasized only at the expense of the other, as with Jesus. His eschatological belief, which both downplayed the assurance of Israel's redemption and envisioned the "eschatological pilgrimage of the Gentiles to the Mountain of God at Zion,"[120] was set against the "indestructible connection between

---

[116]The Gospel, p. 354.

[117]The Gospel, p. 354.

[118]The Founder, p. 67.

[119]The Messianic Idea in Judaism, p. 51, cited in The Gospel and the Land, pp. 370-1.

[120]This reflects the work of Jeremias, Jesus' Promise to the Nations, p. 62.

Yahweh and Israel." Davies concluded, as did Klausner, that the messianic activity which "dispensed with the Oral Law as unnecessary to salvation"[121] and which operated outside the 'dogma' of the land, could only be rejected as "dangerous" by traditional Judaism.[122]

Conclusions

Klusner's study of Jesus, though written in the early part of this century, attempted to answer questions which, as we have seen, are still being debated among New Testament scholars. For this reason alone Klausner has relevance for current research. Modern scholars occasionally converge with Klausner on certain issues,[123] such as Jesus' relationship to Israel, the reason for his rejection, his Jewishness, and even his self-conscious messiahship.

---

[121] The Gospel and the Land, p. 371.

[122] The Gospel and the Land, p. 371.

[123] Several Jewish scholars have appropriated Klausner's understanding of Jesus. Josef Kastein's chapter on "Jesus of Nazareth" in his work History and Destiny of the Jews (translated from the original 1931 German edition by Huntley Paterson, Garden City: Garden City Publishing Co., Inc. 1936) seems to have appropriated entirely the views expressed by Klausner, both in particular details (e.g., baptism as the catalyst of his mission and messiahship, p. 150) and in general arguments (e.g. Judaism was concerned with "real life", it was "a national Weltanschauung, a culture and philosophy, a solution to social problems, a system of natural science, a technology, and a practical morality," p. 145). Abba Hillel Silver's apologetic work, Where Judaism Differed, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1956, like Klausner's, centred on the question of why the Jews rejected Jesus. His arguments, particularly on pp. 85-99, are strongly reminiscient of Klausner's although he only once refers to him at the beginning of his work (p. 30). A more recent work, Links Between Judaism and Christianity (New York: Philosophical Library, 1966) by Samuel Umen characterizes Jesus as a Pharisee. Like Klausner, Umen pointed to Jesus' emphasis on the Kingdom of God and his negation of this world as the major points of disagreement between Jesus and the Pharisees (p. 103). Umen emphasized, as Klausner did, that "Jesus taught the essence of Judaism to his followers" (p. 102) but that its extremity would cause "the negation of national life" (p. 103).

Klausner's work rarely escaped harsh criticism on some points such as, his failure to adequately distinguish between Jesus' sayings and Church tradition in the gospels; but often the comments prove to be either of minor relevance to his thesis[124] or insensitive to the subtleties of his analysis of Jesus.[125]

One of the difficulties with a history of Jesus, his teachings and activities, is the task of presenting a fully integrated life of Jesus. Of course, the thorny problem of authenticity of the sayings and narratives of Jesus and the consequent inconsistency of the data hinders the effort. To achieve some level of integration of the data

---

[124]Solomon Zeitlin, "Studies in the Beginnings of Christianity", Jewish Quarterly Review, No. 14, 1923, pp. 132-139. Zeitlin charged Klausner with "an unscientific inclination to accept all the views he meets with" (p. 139). Zeitlin was particularly angered by Klausner's evaluation of Jesus as an "ethical man par excellence". Zeitlin not only denied this but also questioned the very existence of Jesus (p. 139). Samuel Sandmel (We Jews and Jesus. New York: Oxford University Press, 1965) whose criticisms were generally sound, made a redundant comment on Klausner's amateur psychologizing. He referred to Klausner's argument on the psychological impossibility of Jesus' saying from the cross: "Father forgive them for they know not what they do." Sandmel pointed out that the saying is missing from some of the best ancient mansucripts and is probably not authentic. This, I think, only proves Klausner's argument.

[125]For example, reference has been made by both Jocz (The Jewish People and Jesus Christ, p. 22) and Cadoux ("A Jewish Estimate of Jesus", p. 313) to Lindeskog's comment regarding Klausner's inconsistent portrayal of Jesus' attitude to the Law (Die Jesufrage in neuzeitlichen Judentum Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, Darmstadt, 1973, orig. 1938, p. 250). Jocz did not correctly represent Lindeskog's comment, which compared Jesus' nationalism and Jewish ethics to something new which was anti-Jewish, and implied that Klausner's view of Jesus (as one who was thoroughly Jewish yet was at times lax toward the law), was contradictory. Jocz seems to have missed the point of Klausner's analysis: that the problem of Jesus was precisely the contradiction inherent in messianic activity which embodies both the raditional and the radical aspects of Judaism. Klausner tried to portray Jesus' own inconsistency with regard to the Law, but Jocz appears to have understood it as the fault of Klausner.

hinders the effort. To achieve some level of integration of the data "the real intention or character of Jesus" can be employed as a criterion for determining the authenticity of the data.

Klausner's thesis that Jesus was a Pharisaic Jew who claimed for himself the title "messiah" was just such a criterion. As a Pharisaic Jew all of Jesus' laws and his rebukes of the Pharisees' laxity in moral obligations were explainable. As the messiah all miracle working and extraordinary demands and activities were explainable. Thus, a wide range of data was acceptable and verified either the traditional or the radical aspect of Jesus.

The problem with Klausner's approach is that he started out his study with assertions of Jesus' Jewish-Pharisaic character and his self-proclaimed messiahship that should have followed an evaluation of the sources.[126] The collection of supporting evidence was bound to result not only in a lack of scientific rigour in source criticism but also in the failure to notice inconsistencies in the data. What often resulted was an unconvincing argument, since a number of conflicting statements were used to verify the assertions.

Klausner was inconsistent in at least two aspects of Jesus' notion of the kingdom, namely, its timing and its nature. Klausner took full account of Jesus' sayings concerning the kingdom. They included references to its hiddenness and suddenness (Mark 13:32), its indication through signs (Matthew 11:12-15), its futureness (Matthew 24:35), and

---

[126]Note Klausner's conviction that Jesus is the messiah is found in a completely unverifiable statement that Jesus thought he was the messiah from the moment he was baptized. His supporting arguments for this assertion are equally weak: history cannot lie and Jesus could not have been an imposter.

its presentness (Luke 17:21). He also noted the preeminence Jesus gave to repentance as a prerequisite for entering the kingdom. In addition, Klausner deduced the time of commencement from the moment of Jesus' messiahship, and then from the appearance of John. Needless to say, when these sayings are taken together the commencement of the kingdom is ambiguous.[127] Klausner did not seem to recognize the contradictions in this group of sayings, but instead listed them as if they were 'one idea' held by Jesus. Even if the remote possibility that the collection of sayings from the three Gospels comprised 'one idea' was true, Klausner offered no explanation of how the apparent contradictions were integrated. Thus, Jesus' conception of the dawning of the kingdom remained uncertain throughout Klausner's work.[128]

The coming of the kingdom is intimately linked with the nature of the kingdom. For instance, had Jesus thought the kingdom was present during his time, he necessarily would have held a non-materialistic conception which excluded worldly splendour. Klausner, on the contrary, argued that Jesus held typically Jewish materialistic ideas of the

---

[127]Indeed these different sayings parallel the rabbinic arguments on the same issue. Some rabbis stressed varying degrees and conditions of repentance (Jer. Ta'anit, 63d, below); others calculated the end that would come in any case, such as R. Akiba (Sanh. 97b) and R. Ḥanina (Abodah Zarah 9b); but this practice was spurned and denied by some, such as R. Samuel bar Naḥman and R. Judah the Prince (Sanh. 97b). R. Joshuah's saying (Jer. Ta'anit, 63d) against those who said repentance brings in the kingdom is similar to the saying in Mark 13:32, 'only the Father knows'. He maintained that when the fixed time comes Israel will be delivered whether they repent or not, as it is said, "I, the Lord, in its time, I will hasten it" (Isaiah 60:22).

[128]Klausner understood Jesus' "extremist, aecetic, ethical teachings" as deriving from, on the one hand, "the nearness of the 'Days of the Messiah'" (Jesus, p. 405) and, on the other hand, the already existent kingdom of heaven in the world ("The kingdom of heaven, according to Jesus, is in the present") Jesus, p. 406 (my underlines).

kingdom--ideas which Klausner took to be more or less standardized in Judaism.[129] Thus "a kingdom not of this world" was neither possible for Judaism nor for Jesus. The 'impossibility' of this statement apparently rested both on Klausner's presumption that Jesus was speaking of the messianic kingdom and on his argument that the messianic notion of the (worldly) kingdom was quite separate from the eschatological kingdom of heaven.[130] Yet the freedom with which the Tannaim speculated about the natures of the world to come and the messianic age--occasionally 'confusing' the terms[131]--seems to argue against an 'orthodox' conception of these ideas by Jesus.

Recognizing the impossibility of keeping spiritual eschatology and materialistic messianism completely separate,[132] Klausner noted that Jesus' saying about the entirely spiritual existence of the resurrected was consonant with the Pharisaic notion of the kingdom. Clearly, this view undermines the verity of the first statement concerning the impossibility of an otherworldly kingdom. At the least, Klausner's understanding of both the Pharisees' and Jesus' conception of the kingdom was confused. Moreover, Klausner considered the collection of sayings in the Sermon on the Mount as evidence of Jesus' Pharisaic sentiments, but he did not integrate Jesus' anti-materialistic maxims found there with his so-called 'materialistic' notion of the kingdom. Actually,

---

[129] Supra, p. 26. Jesus, p. 103.

[130] Supra, p. 20 n. 29.

[131] Supra, p. 23.

[132] Messianic Idea, pp. 414, 418, 414 n. 27.

has shown that one can only "affirm with certainty that [the term] prusim means Pharisees whenever it is juxtaposed to Sadducees.[137] In other texts (e.g. Tosefta Sotah 15:11-12, Baba Batra 60b, Pesaḥim 70b, Tosefta Berakot 3:25) the meaning of prusim is best translated as "ascetics" (Tosefta Sota 15:11-12), or "schismatics," (Pesaḥim 70b), or "heretics" (Tosefta Berakot 3:25). The latter application by the ḥakamim-sofrim of the term prusim to denote "heretics" (i.e. "anti-Pharisees, anti-ḥakamim," etc.)[138] indicates that the term prusim is at best ambiguous (since it can mean either Pharisees or anti-Pharisees), and its exact meaning "can be determined only by contextual criteria and not by the word itself."[139] Clearly then the tractate Sotah 22b, cited by Klausner, is an anti-Pharisaic text. E. P. Sanders notes that prusim in this "main 'anti-Pharisaic' text, Sotah 22b, should ...not be translated 'Pharisees.'"[140]

Other points remain vague in Klausner's work, such as his characterization of messiahship. His discussion of Jesus' messiahship was in part a rebuttal of the notion that Jesus regarded himself as the son of God in the later Trinitarian sense. Citing from the late work Dialogue With Trypho, Klausner stated that Jesus was "a man of the sons of men" possessing no "powers beyond the bounds of human nature."[141]

---

[137]"Defining the Pharisees", p. 234.

[138]"Defining the Pharisees", p. 238.

[139]"Defining the Pharisees", p. 238.

[140]Paul and Palestinian Judaism, p. 61.

[141]Messianic Idea, p. 465.

Klausner's argument that Jesus' kingdom was materialistic turned out to be of minor importance to his thesis, since it was not Jesus' particular notion of the kingdom that was unacceptable to Israel, but, stressed Klausner, the very realization of the kingdom in any form.

Another inconsistency exists in Klausner's explanation of the breach between Jesus and the Pharisees. Briefly, he stated that Jesus' extreme and ascetic expression of Pharisaic ethics posed a threat to normative Pharisaic Judaism, and was probably perceived by Israel as anti-Jewish. Klausner's explanation implied that Pharisaism had definite boundaries, the crossing of which resulted in Jesus' removal from the group. In another context, however, Klausner's definition of Pharisaism is less rigid. He cited[133] the "ancient Baraita", Sotah 22b which described seven types of "Pharisee"[134] ["prusim"] "most of them," stated Klausner, "finding no favour in the eyes of the Tannaim."[135] Yet the Rabbi's description of the extreme Pharisees carried with it no apparent excommunicatory decree from the Pharisaic group.

Klausner's inconsistent portrayal of the limits of Pharisaic tolerance stemmed from a basic textual problem of identifying just who the Pharisees were. Klausner was unaware that the term, prusim (literally, separatists), did not always refer to the distinct group the Pharisees, who were distinguished from the Sadducees. Elias Rivkin[136]

---

[133] Jesus, p. 214.

[134] Jesus, p. 214.

[135] Jesus, p. 214.

[136] "Defining the Pharisees," Hebrew Union College Annual, No. 40-41, 1969-70, pp. 205-249.

But "human nature", to be sure, remained a vague conception not only in Rabbinic literature but in Klausner's discussion. He observed, on the one hand, that the messiah's powers "surpass the ordinary standard of human powers" but, on the other hand, that "other righteous and pious persons could also perform signs and wonders."[142] Here Klausner acknowledged the messiah's supernatural powers but de-emphasized their uniqueness by comparing them to the equally auspicious powers of the pious. Yet, in another context, Klausner unequivocally argued against the supernatural characterization of the messiah: "For the Messiah--and this should be carefully noted!--is never mentioned in the Tannaitic literature as a wonder worker per se."[143] Nevertheless, when Klausner discussed the miracles of Jesus he viewed them as consistent with 'the contemporary belief which endowed the Messiah with supernatural powers."[144]

Klausner's argument for Jesus' messiahship had him battling for Jesus' Jewishness on two fronts: one, against the non-Jewish conceptions of the divine son of God, compelling Klausner to emphasize Jesus' non-supernatural powers as the human messiah designate; and two, against the non-messianic conception of Jesus, compelling him to point out Jesus' messianic-miraculous qualities. As a consequence of his dual purpose, Klausner was inconsistent in his conception of the messiah and thus of Jesus' messiahship.

---

[142] Messianic Idea, p. 465.

[143] Messianic Idea, p. 506.

[144] Jesus, p. 267. "It is, therefore, no matter of surprise that Jesus should practise miraculous cures like a Pharisee, or to an even greater extent than the oridnary Pharisee, since in his inmost thoughts, he regarded himself as the Messiah, and contemporary belief endowed the Messiah with supernatural powers" (Jesus, pp. 266-267).

Klausner's desire to portray Jesus as thoroughly Jewish is evident as well in his discussion of Matthew 8:11-12.[145] And again Klausner's conception of 'normative Jewish' beliefs remains inconsistent. It will be remembered that Klausner deemed as anti-Jewish and therefore inauthentic, the saying "I tell you, many shall come from east and west and sit at table with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven while the sons of the kingdom will be thrown into the outer darkness; there men will weep and gnash their teeth" (Matthew 8:11-12).

The saying, however, is not as anti-Jewish as Klausner perceived it to be since the premise of the saying is "Israel's privilege as the vessel of the promises (Matthew 8:12, οἱ νἱοι της βασιλέιας).[146] The Jewish messianic idea of the ingathering of the just or redeemed, seen in rabbinic tractates, is well represented in Jesus' saying in which his misgiving about Israel's desire to repent and to be gathered into the kingdom is temporarily evident. Moreover, Klausner himself noted that repentance was the deciding factor in the scheme of redemption prevalent at the time of Jesus: "The transgressors who refuse to repent whether they be of the Gentiles or Israel (though the numbers shall be greater among the Gentiles) them shall God consume in the fire of hell."[147] Thus, the saying of Jesus is more probably to be interpreted as a challenge to Israel (to whom his mission was directed) rather than as an anathema.

---

[145] Supra, p. 30.

[146] Jeremias, Jesus' Promise, p. 48 (my underline)

[147] Jesus, p. 399.

Klausner began his research into Jesus with a background in two main areas: messianism and nationalism. He had already published part of his dissertation on messianism by the time of his research into Jesus. And being an emigre to Israel in 1918, a year after the Balfour declaration, he was involved in both political Zionism and the advancement of Hebrew culture.[148] Thus, for him nationalism was a well established value as well as an occupation. The thesis of his book merged these two interests into one question in which a messianic event was set against the nation's survival. To his primary question, "Why did Israel reject Jesus?", Klausner already had the answer, conditioned both by years of research into the phenomenon of messianism in the history of Israel and by his own current involvement in the progress of the state of Israel: the nation of Israel would survive with realpolitik and Jewish culture; messianism disrupted both; Israel was bound to reject messianism in its historical form.

Klausner's apology for the Jewish national imperative ran through his book like a scarlet thread. That his work contained an apology for the necessity of Israel is not surprising so shortly after the Balfour Declaration in 1917--nor was it completely undesirable. Klausner's national interest gave him a peculiar sensitivity to the problems of Jesus' rise, which would not have been so readily attained before the modern existence of Israel. There were drawbacks, however, that arose from Klausner's perspective. The main drawback was Klausner's over-emphasis on the nation when discussing the interaction between Jesus and Israel. Klausner's central question presupposed a national

---

[148] Joseph Klausner, pp. 101-115.

response to Jesus which, it is safe to say, was impossible. He at times seems to have forgotten the rather small estimate he made of Jesus' following. Indeed, Jesus' following was selective and, according to Klausner, largely consisted of the am ha aretz whom he labelled the boorish and sinful. That Israel rejected Jesus is a misnomer since it reflects the later official position of Judaism, which represented all of Israel, rather than the historical encounter of Jesus with some individuals, including the priests and Pharisees who rejected him.

Jocz was correct to point out that one creates a false dichotomy when one portrays the Jews as rejecting Jesus en masse and the Gentiles as accepting him, since 1) it was an individualist movement[149] and 2) there was an indigeneous Jewish-Christian church.[150] Klausner's question presupposed a country that 1) had a normative definition of Judaism which prescribed a particular political stand; 2) was galvanized by a cultural and political nationalism;[151] and 3) engaged in an evaluative debate with Jesus and condemned him on grounds that were in the best political interests of the nation. There is no evidence of

---

[149]Cf. Caird's view.

[150]The Jewish People, p. 4.

[151]In his later book, From Jesus to Paul, Klausner carried the argument further when he implied that the Diaspora Jews were "pushovers for apostacy" (Milton R. Konvitz, "Historians' Romancing", Menorah Journal, No. 9, June 1923, p. 232). But he remained ambiguous in his estimation of Jewish assimilation in the Diaspora saying, on the one hand, that "deliberate Hellenizing affected only a very few Jews" (p. 25) and that superficial and shallow signs of assimilation such as, the changing of names were apparent and, on the other hand, that "there were also signs of a much deeper assimilationism" (p. 25) which affected "the innermost religious and cultural life of individual and community" (p. 26). Klausner concluded that "Jews like these were not sound in their faith like the Jews of Palestine" (p. 29).

these three points but, on the contrary, much evidence that the religion and politics of Israel contained a variety of discordant values and expressions.

Posing such an evaluative question at the base of historical research into Jesus, as did Klausner, increases the hazard of applying current values to measure an ancient situation. From Klausner's perspective history was static, since current values were the same as ancient ones;[152] idealistic, since it progressed by purposeful action toward the fulfillment of ideals; and, above all, providential, since the rise and rejection of Jesus "were natural, and both were inevitable in the process of human history--a history which is governed by a higher reason and whose only way is truth and justice."[153]

Klausner's view of history is extraordinarily optimistic, and can be contrasted to that of the Form Critical school. The hyper-criticism that is characteristic of form criticism continually distinguishes between the kerygma of the Church and the original sayings of Jesus. Although the extreme difficulty of isolating the data was recognized[154] the effort has continued. That the gospel testimony and Jesus' message are interwoven is the basic problem in the historical

---

[152]On this point Herbert Danby remarked that Klausner "thinks, writes and measures and weighs and praises and condemns as though the rank and file of Jewry in the time of our Lord had precisely the same nationalistic ideals and fears which move the most enthusiastic and fanatical nationalists of today" (The Jew and Christianity. London: The Sheldon Press, 1927, p. 97).

[153]Jesus, p. 407.

[154]Günther Bornkamm, "Faith and History in the Gospels", In Search of the Historical Jesus (ed. Harvey J. McArthur). New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1969, p. 42.

research into Jesus. The Form Critical school, most notably under its founder, Rudolf Bultmann, sought to overcome this problem by whittling away the kerygma from the historical data on Jesus. What remained was a diminished historical portrait and a large Church tradition. The latter was focused on as the eternally meaningful Christian message which was relevant for present day faith. For Bultmann the inevitable dialectic in New Testament studies was the almost unknowable historical Jesus contrasted to the knowable-though-faith, historic Christ. Faith was existential and had no particular historical confinements. The historical Jesus was therefore relegated to a category of academic curiosities which was ultimately unimportant for Christian faith. Bultmann's approach betrayed his purpose, namely to yield a positive solution to the problem of Christian faith's dependence on historical research. His answer was that faith transcended historical verification.

For Klausner the viability of Christian faith was not an issue; and the separation of historical data from Christian dogma was not a religious necessity, though he distinguished between them throughout his investigations. In contrast to Bultmann and Bornkamm, Klausner's usual method was to infer genuine historical derivation from the kerygma of the Church. From the perspective of form criticism, this view is naive. Klausner retained a much higher estimate of Jesus' historical impact, giving less credence to the notion of a dynamically creative apostolic church engaged almost entirely in apologetics.

Klausner's recognition of Jesus' great impact did not involve a Christian interpretation of his uniqueness. In accepting the claim to Jesus' messiahship as authentic, Klausner was able to view him as a product of the Jewish milieu and ground him in the historical context

of the late Second Temple period when Israel was a hotbed for religious movements. Although Klausner was aware of Jesus' uniqueness as a great ethical teacher who opened the way of salvation to the lowly and the Gentiles, he did not rely on it to explain Jesus' rise.

Like Schweitzer before him, Klausner diligently exposed numerous biographies of Jesus as creations intended to make Jesus relevant to the modern age as a teacher and saviour. These biographies did not distinguish between historic and historical interpretations of data--the former betraying modern beliefs and values. Nevertheless, Schweitzer's own understanding of Jesus did not avoid entirely the modernizing of Jesus. Likewise Klausner's characterization of Late Second Temple, Judaism betrayed modern Zionist values. He argued that the social and political values of Judaism in Antiquity and in his time centred on the maintenance of Israel. At least partially, he projected his values onto the past, deeming them the historic values of Judaism.

In Klausner's study the historic values of Judaism took on a modern relevance for the Jewish-Christian debate. This debate customarily took the form of a dialectic in which Judaism represented the social values of religion and Christianity the individual values of religion. Klausner's emphasis on the social values of Judaism and the anti-social or socially indifferent values of Jesus reflected the view which Asher Ginzberg, a contemporary of Klausner and the foremost representative of Cultural Zionism, notably summarized as the "familiar truth,"[155] namely, "that Judaism conceives its aim not as the salvation of the individual but as the well-being and perfection of the group..."[156]

---

[155] Essays, Letters, Memoirs, Oxford, East and West Library, 1946, p. 130.

[156] Essays, p. 130.

Klausner was aware that the antithesis of Judaism and Chrsitianity was too simplistic an explanation for the historical encounter of Jesus with Israel. He sought to overcome this simplification by stressing Jesus' Jewishness and even his Pharisaic nature. Ultimately, Klausner's Jewish characterization of Jesus was overshadowed by his portrait of Jesus as the proponent of individualism; and this characterization reflected Klausner's acceptance of the standard apologetic argument that polarized Judaism and Christianity. The polarization, however, of Jewish social values and Christian individual values overlooked the altruistic (social) morality of Christianity. Ginzberg had deflated the social significance of Christianity's altruistic morality by calling it "inverted egoism"[157] and grounding it in the individual's self consciousness rather than in a group consciousness. Thus, the polarity of Jewish socialism and Christian individualism remained intact; and Klausner appropriated it for the answer to his main question of why Israel rejected Jesus.

---

[157] Essays, p. 130.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aulen, Gustaf. Jesus in Contemporary Historical Research. Translated by Ingalill H. Hjelm. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976.

Betz, Otto. What Do We Know About Jesus? Translated by Margaret Kohl. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1968.

Caird, G. B. Jesus and the Jewish Nation. London; University of London: Athlone Press, 1965.

Case, Shirley Jackson. "The Life of Jesus During the Last Quarter Century." Journal of Religion, V, November 1925, No. 6, pp. 561-575.

Catchpole, David R. The Trial of Jesus. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1971.

Charles, R. H. Eschatology. New York: Schocken Books, 1963 (Reprinted from the 2nd edition, 1913).

Danby, Herbert. The Jew and Christianity. London: The Sheldon Press, 1927.

_____(Translator). The Mishnah. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933, pp. 446-461 ("The Chapters of the Fathers").

Davies, W. D. The Gospel and the Land. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1974.

Dodd, C. H. The Founder of Christianity. London: Collier-Macmillan, Ltd., 1970.

Enslin, Morton Scott. The Literature of the Christian Movement (Part III of Christian Beginnings). New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1938.

Finkel, Asher. The Pharisees and the Teacher of Nazareth. Leiden/ Köln: E. J. Brill, 1964.

Ginzberg, Asher. Essays, Letters, Memoirs: Ahad Ha-Am (pseud.). Edited by Leon Simon. Oxford: East and West Library, 1946.

Graham, Wm. Creighton. "The Jewish World in Which Jesus Lived." Journal of Religion, VIII, October, 1928, No. 4, pp. 566-580.

Graetz, Heinrich. The History of the Jews, Vol. II. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1893 (Chapter vi, pp. 141-173).

Gray, John. The Day of Yahweh in Cultic Experience and Eschatological Prospect. Lecture delivered at the Exegetical Day in Uppsala, September 26, 1973. Särtryck Ur Svensk Exegetisk, Arsbok, No. 39, 1974.

Greenstone, Julius H. The Messiah Idea in Jewish History. Reprint of the 1906 edition. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1973.

Guttman, Michael. "Dr. Joseph Klausner, Jesus von Nazareth." Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums, Vol. 75, 1931, pp. 250-257.

_____. "Schlusswort," Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums, Vol. 77, 1933, pp. 18-44.

Hengel, Martin. Was Jesus a Revolutionist? Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971.

Jeremias, Joachim. The Sermon on the Mount. Translated by Norman Perrin. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1963.

_____. The Problem of the Historical Jesus. Translated by Norman Perrin. Philadelphia: Fortress Press (revised edition), 1965.

_____. Jesus' Promise to the Nations. Translated by S. H. Hooke. London: SCM Press, 1958.

Jocz, Jacob. The Jewish People and Jesus Christ. London: SPCK (reprint of a 1954 revised version of the 1949 edition), 1962.

Kastein, Josef. History and Destiny of the Jews. Translated by Huntley Paterson from the 1931 German edition, Eine Geschichte der Juden. Garden City, New York: Garden City Publishing Co., 1933.

Kittel, G. (editor) (translater, editor Geoffrey Bromiley). Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, Vol. IX. "χριω". "The Question of the Messiah in the History of Jesus in the Synoptic Tradition", pp. 537-540.

Klausner, Joseph. Jesus of Nazareth: His Life, Times and Teachings. Translated by Herbert Danby. New York: Macmillan Company, 1925.

_____. From Jesus to Paul. Translated by W. F. Stinespring. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1943.

_____. The Messianic Idea in Israel. Translated W. F. Stinespring. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1955.

_____"A Rejoinder by Rabbi Klausner". Harvard Theological Review. Vol. IX, no. 4, 1923, pp. 391-92.

Kling, Simcha. Joseph Klausner. New York: T. Yoseloff, 1970.

Konvitz, Milton R. "Historian's Romancing." Menorah Journal, No. 9, June, 1923, pp. 231-235.

Kümmel, Werner Georg. The New Testament: The History of Investigation into its Problems. Translated by Howard Clark Kee. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1972.

Manson, T. W. Jesus and the Non-Jews. London, The University of London: The Athlone Press, 1955.

Moore, George Foot. Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era, Vol. II. New York: Schocken Books, 1971 (copyright 1927, 1930 by the President and Fellows of Harvard College).

_____. "A Jewish Life of Jesus." Menorah Journal, No. 33, Autumn, 1923. (or HTR, XVI, No. 1, January 1923, pp. 3-).

Rivkin, Ellis. "Defining the Pharisees: The Tannaitic Sources," Hebrew Union College Annual, Vol. XL, 1969, pp. 205-249.

Rost, Leonhard. Judaim Outside the Hebrew Canon. Translated by David E. Green. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1976.

Sanders, E. P. Paul and Palestinian Judaism. London/Philadelphia: SCM/Fortress Press, 1977.

Sandmel, Samuel. We Jews and Jesus. New York: Oxford University Press, 1965.

_____. "The Jewish Scholar and Early Christianity." The Seventy-fifth Anniversary Volume of the J.Q.R. Edited by A. A. Neuman and S. Zeitlin. Philadelphia: JQR, 1967.

Scholem, Gershom. The Messianic Idea in Judaism. New York: Schocken Books, 1971.

Schweitzer, Albert. The Quest of the Historical Jesus. Translated by W. Montgomery from the first German edition, Von Reimarus Zu Wrede, 1906. New York: Macmillan Company (eighth reprint) 1973.

Scott, E. F. "A Jewish Interpretation of Jesus." Journal of Religion, Vol. VI, January 1926, No. 1, pp. 91-95.

Silver, A. H. Where Judaism Differed. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1956.

_____. A History of Messianic Speculation in Israel. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1927.

Troeltsch, Ernst. The Social Teachings of the Christian Church. Translated by Olive Wyon. New York and Evanston: Harper and Row Publishers, 1960 (first published as Die Soziallehren der christlichen Kirchen und Gruppen, 1911).

Uman, Samuel. Links Between Judaism and Christianity. New York: Philosophical Library, 1966.

Vermes, Geza. The Dead Sea Scrolls in English. Harmonsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1972.

_____. Jesus the Jew. London: William Collins Sons & Co., 1973.

Walker, The Rev. Thomas. Jewish Views of Jesus. London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1931.

Weiss-Rosmarin, Trude (editor). Jewish Expressions on Jesus. New York: KTAV Publsihing House, 1977.

Wigoder, Geoffrey (editor). Encyclopaedia Dictionary of Judaica. Jerusalem: Keter Publishing House, 1974.

Zeitlin, Solomon. "Studies in the Beginnings of Chrsitianity." Jewish Quarterly Review, Vol. 14, 1923, pp. 111-139.

_____. "Beginnings of Christianity and Judaism." Jewish Quarterly Review, Vol. 27, 1937, pp. 385-398.

_____. "The Trial of Jesus." Jewish Quarterly Review, Vol. 53, 19 .