

Copyright © 1972 by the Commission on  
Faith and Order of the National Council  
of Churches of Christ. All rights  
reserved.

## ISRAEL'S LAND PROMISES UNDER THE NEW COVENANT

John T. Townsend

Within the New Testament there is no discussion of the land promises made to Israel under the Old Covenant.<sup>1</sup> Such an omission, however, is not surprising. In the first place, Israel's land promises were of primary concern to the sons of Israel, but the New Testament in its present form seems largely addressed to gentiles. The mere fact that the books of the New Testament were written in Greek, suggests that its intended readers were either gentiles or hellenized Jews.

Secondly, during much of the New Testament period, the land promises would have presented little problem to many Jews because to a certain extent the Jews did possess the land. It was not until the final Jewish revolt against Rome (C. E. 132-135) that Jews were excluded from the Holy City, and there is evidence that even after the destruction of the Temple in C. E. 70 sacrifices continued to be offered on the holy site.<sup>2</sup> Of course, there were certain Jews who regarded foreign domination in any form as contrary to their religion,<sup>3</sup> but others were less nationalistic.<sup>4</sup> The Sadducees, for example, generally cooperated with the Roman occupation forces in Palestine; and even certain Pharisees, such as Yohannan ben Zakkai, were willing to reach at least a temporary settlement with Rome that left Palestine under foreign control.<sup>5</sup>

Thirdly, we should not expect the New Testament writers to stress the matter of land promises because to have done so would have invited Roman persecution. Of course, these writers could have rejected the land promises of the Old Covenant with Roman approval; but for a Christian to argue for Jewish rights in Palestine, especially Jewish political rights, would be seen as a deliberate provocation of Rome. Thus the silence of the New Testament on the matter of land promises might indicate a positive attitude toward them rather than simply a lack of interest.

Since the New Testament lacks significant positive evidence concerning the Old Testament land promises, any conclusions about early Christian attitudes toward them must be problematic. What we

can do, however, is show that at least certain parts of the New Testament reveal attitudes suggesting a certain acceptance of the land promises as a still valid heritage belonging to Israel katà sárka.

First let us look at the writings of Paul. The matter here appears to be settled. The Apostle explicitly states that it is not the Jews but the Christians who are the true heirs of Abraham and that therefore any blessings or promises given "to Abraham and his seed" apply to those who are "in Christ" because Christ is the seed of Abraham (Gal. 3:6-9, 16, 29; 4:21-31; Rom. 4). Logically, therefore, Paul must have concluded that the promises of land "to Abraham and his seed" (e.g., Gen. 12:7; 13:15; 17:8; 24:7) applied only to the Christians, probably in some spiritual manner.

This view, that the Church receives the blessings promised under the Old Covenant, seems confirmed by Gal. 6:16 where according to the usual interpretation,<sup>6</sup> Paul refers to the Church as "The Israel of God." Moreover, throughout the Pauline Corpus there are statements that in Christ the distinction between Jew and gentile exists no more. Typical of such statements is Gal. 3:28, according to which "there is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free man, there is neither male nor female; for you all are one in Christ Jesus" (cf. Rom. 10:12; I Cor. 12:13; Col. 3:11).

We must use caution, however, in drawing such "logical conclusions" from Paul's interpretation of scripture where, as in the case of land promises, the Apostle neglects to draw such conclusions himself. Ancient writers did not always follow our logic in assessing the import of their scriptural interpretations. An example of such a writer is Philo of Alexandria. The fact that he allegorized the sacrificial legislation in Torah,<sup>7</sup> the high priest,<sup>8</sup> and the temple<sup>9</sup> might lead one to conclude that this exegete did not intend the cultic sections of the Law to be understood literally;<sup>10</sup> nevertheless, contrary to such a "logical conclusion," Philo actually denounces those who were treating the literal observance of Torah with "easy-going neglect," and he specifically mentions those precepts that concern the sanctity of the temple as commandments which must be externally observed.<sup>11</sup> As for his own devotion to the sacrificial legislation in Torah, this devotion is clearly demonstrated in his De Legatione ad Gaium.<sup>12</sup>

Similarly the Apostle Paul does not always carry his arguments to what we might regard as "logical conclusions." Although in Gal. 3:28 he affirms that there is no distinction between Jew and Greek, between slave and freeman, between male and female; he does in fact expect such distinctions to be observed, at least in the present age. He clearly affirms the traditional, distinctive roles for men and women (I Cor. 11:2-16; 14:34; Col. 3:18f.); and he just as clearly accepts the traditional relation of master and slave (I Cor. 7:20-24; Col. 3:22-4:1; cf. Philemon 10-18). Thus we should not be surprised if Paul is somewhat inconsistent regarding the relationship of Jew and Greek, and in fact the Apostle does at times affirm that there remain certain significant distinctions between the two.

Paul discusses the relation between Jew and gentile most fully in his Epistle to the Romans. As early as chapter three he affirms that the Jew has much advantage over the gentile, at least because "the Jews have been entrusted with the oracles of God," even though both share the same bondage under Sin (vss. 1-2, 9). Then in chapters nine through eleven the place of Israel in God's plan for salvation becomes the major theme. Early in this section he again affirms Israel's special position as possessing "the sonship, the glory, the covenants, the giving of the law, the worship, the promises, . . . the patriarchs, . . . and the Christ tò katà sárka" (9:4f.). He also affirms that by "Israel" he means his kinsmen by race" (9:3) although he quickly cautions that not every son of Abraham (e.g. Esau) is an Israelite (9:6-14). Then, after twice declaring his anguished desire for Israel's salvation (9:1-3; 10:1f.), the Apostle outlines Israel's place in God's salvation plan in chapter eleven. He begins with the assurance that "God has not rejected his people whom he foreknew," a people to which Paul himself belongs (11:1ff.); but their salvation will not come apart from the gentiles. In fact the gentiles according to God's plan will be the means for saving Israel. The gentiles in sharing God's blessing will provoke Israel to jealousy and so insure salvation for the Jews (11:11f.), and Paul through his gentile mission is actively bringing this jealousy about (11:13f). In the allegory of the olive tree (11:17-21) and in the verses that follow, we see the full outline of God's salvation plan. In the Apostle's own words, "A partial hardening has come upon Israel until the full gentile world enters (into salvation), and in this way will Israel be saved." Thus it seems clear that for Paul, while both Jew and Gentile are equally in bondage under Sin and equally in need of salvation, they are treated quite distinctively in God's salvation plan.<sup>13</sup> Would not a similar separate-but-equal plan in regard to land promises for this age or the age to come be fully in agreement with Pauline theology? Under such a plan in the age to come might not Israel possess Canaan, and the gentiles, the world?

It is now necessary to return to Gal. 6:16 and the expression, "Israel of God." If the majority of commentators are correct in assuming that the expression refers exclusively to Christians, then it would seem that in Galatians Paul fails to preserve the careful distinctions between Israel and the gentiles which we find in Romans. However, it is by no means necessary to identify "Israel of God" with Christians. The whole of Galatians 6:16 reads as follows: "And for as many as walk by means of this rule, peace upon them and mercy also upon the Israel of God." This benediction concerns two divine blessings, peace and mercy, but we should expect them to be mentioned in the reverse order. Elsewhere in the New Testament "mercy" precedes "peace," and theologically God's peace should come after and result from his mercy. Moreover, we should expect that the two blessings apply to both "them" and "the Israel of God." However, if we assume that "the Israel of God" refers to Jews, the passage makes good sense. So understood, Paul in this verse is asking for peace upon Christians, who know God's peace, and mercy upon Jews, who have yet to know the fulness of divine peace. Thus Paul, in adding this verse to Galatians as part of the postscript in his own hand, would be correcting any impression from the body of the epistle that he regarded Israel as being outside God's plan for salvation.<sup>14</sup>



Since Paul's theology does not rule out the possibility that he regarded the Old Covenant land promises as still valid for Israel kata sarka, let us now look for some hint that he might actually have done so. Such a hint may be found in his use of the word "temple," (naós) because in Rabbinic thought all the Land of Israel was regarded in a sense as an extension of the courts of the Jerusalem Temple.<sup>15</sup> Thus, what Paul, who was educated in the Pharisaic-Rabbinic tradition,<sup>16</sup> says about the temple should indicate his attitude towards the whole territory. The Pauline corpus, including Ephesians, contains eight uses of the word naós (in I Cor. 3:16f., 6:19; II Cor. 6:16, Eph. 2:21, and II Thess 2:4).<sup>17</sup> Those writers who have discussed the subject of naós note that Paul generally uses the word metaphorically and argue that he thought of the Church as replacing the Jerusalem Temple.<sup>18</sup> However, there are certain errors in this assumption. In the first place, Paul is inconsistent in his metaphorical usage. While he certainly can speak of the Christian community as forming a temple, in I Cor. 6:19 he also speaks of the individual Christian as a temple. Furthermore, "temple" is but one metaphor used by Paul to describe the Church. Finally, while Paul uses naós metaphorically, he never uses it in a symbolic sense with the article (ho naós).<sup>19</sup>

The one significant place where Paul refers to the temple of Jerusalem is II Thess 2:4 where he can still call it "The temple of God."<sup>20</sup> A few commentators argue that the verse is mentioning a heavenly temple; but they offer little evidence, aside from the fact that the Old Testament mentions a heavenly temple and a heavenly throne.<sup>21</sup> Several other commentators argue that the temple here is the church on analogy with Paul's metaphorical usage,<sup>22</sup> but the exegesis is quite doubtful. In the first place, naós appears here with the article although the Apostle appears to avoid the article in metaphorical usage. Secondly, where Paul uses naós metaphorically elsewhere, he explains this usage to his readers. Thirdly, the words ton naón are grammatically governed by kathisai, a verb suggesting a definite place, not an institution. Finally one must consider that II Thess. 2:4 is part of a passage reflecting Dan. 11:31-36 (cf. Dan. 9:27; 12:11); and the temple mentioned in Dan. 11:31-36 could only be the temple at Jerusalem. It is doubtful whether Paul would have changed the meaning of the temple in II Thess. 2:4 without indicating that he had done so. Therefore, there seems little reason to doubt that the temple of II Thess. 2:4 is indeed the temple at Jerusalem.

This reference to the Jerusalem Temple falls within an apocalyptic context in which Paul is explaining what must take place before the parousia. Following the apocalyptic concept of history, Paul tells the Thessalonians that the forces of evil will become more and more powerful until they reach a climax in their iniquity, at which time the Lord Jesus will return. First the katéchōn will be removed; then the lawless one will be revealed; and, as the climax of his evil work, he will "take his seat in the temple of God, proclaiming himself to be God."<sup>23</sup> Since Paul sets the desecration of the temple at Jerusalem beside the ultimate blasphemy of proclaiming oneself to be God and since he regards these acts at the climax of the evil which is to precede the parousia, there can be little doubt of Paul's veneration for this temple.



What was the significance of Jerusalem temple? It was traditionally a temple, not only of the Jews, but to a certain extent of the gentiles as well.<sup>24</sup> This gentile participation was to be intensified in the age to come (cf. Is. 56:7 [cited in Mk. 11:17]; Zech. 14:16-19).<sup>25</sup> However, at least in this present age, Jews worshiped in a court separated from the court of the gentiles by the "dividing wall of partition" (cf. Eph. 2:14). Such a view of the temple would agree with Paul's general portrayal of the Jewish-gentile relationship, according to which both parties have significant, but different, roles in God's salvation plan.<sup>26</sup> In a similar manner the Apostle would view God's extended sanctuary on earth. For the present age Palestine remains the special province of Israel although the gentiles can share in its blessings; but in the imminent, coming age such distinctions will dissolve as will the distinctions between slave and free man, between male and female.

At the beginning of this essay we noted that the Jews themselves were in disagreement over the nature of the land promises. While some regarded any form of foreign domination as contrary to these promises, others were more flexible toward Roman rule. In regard to Paul, whatever his exact attitude to the land promises may have been, he was certainly no ultranationalist. His moderate position can be seen in Rom. 13:1-7; and however we interpret the passage as a whole,<sup>27</sup> verses six and seven clearly support the payment of taxes, presumably to Rome. While he is not speaking directly of Roman levies in Palestine, the general tone of these verses would have been anathema to those nationalists working for an end to the Roman domination of the promised land.

Although Paul was no ultranationalist, there have existed for many years a series of scholars who have insisted that Jesus himself was one.<sup>28</sup> In recent years this position has been identified with S. G. F. Brandon.<sup>29</sup> If Brandon is correct in his assessment of the historical Jesus, then clearly we ought to consider the implications of this assessment, that our Lord considered the political freedom of Israel a matter of some importance. Unfortunately, the works of Brandon and those of his predecessors lack any defined methodology.<sup>30</sup> Thus, while they present much evidence for their position, their conclusions are undermined.

In studying the historical Jesus the present author uses a method that stresses five criteria for separating what accurately depicts Jesus from what represents the evangelists or other early Christians who helped form our traditions about Jesus.<sup>31</sup> First we should recognize that we cannot determine what Jesus may have intended if his disciples misunderstood him. They knew him better than we. Therefore, we should ask how Jesus appeared to his contemporaries who personally encountered him and not try to reconstruct some hidden message that his contemporaries did not understand. Secondly, we should begin with what Paul tells us about Jesus instead of the Gospels. We know much more about this author and his biases than about any of the evangelists. Besides Paul wrote long before the earliest gospel, and he testifies that he knew some of Jesus' closest followers including Peter (Gal. 1:18-2:14). Thirdly, it is better to rely on the events in Jesus' life rather than on his sayings and

parables. Sayings and parables were handed down orally apart from the particular contexts in which Jesus may have used them. Therefore, such teaching, even where it may accurately represent the actual words of Jesus, can prove misleading.<sup>32</sup> A saying like, "Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth" (Mt. 5:5), tells us little about Jesus' message because, assuming the words are from Jesus, we do not know the use he made of them; however, events, such as the cleansing of the temple, have their contexts partly built into the account. Fourthly, it is preferable to use material attested by two or more unrelated sources. Examples of such material are the accounts of the Last Supper, which appear in the Synoptic Gospels, in John (without the Eucharist), and in I Corinthians; the feeding miracle, which appears twice in Mark as well as in John; and the fact that Jesus was a miracle worker, a matter attested many times in the biblical traditions about him. Fifthly, we should be able to relate what we find about Jesus to what we know about the early Church. For example, if Jesus taught his followers, who were Jews, that observance of the Jewish Law was unnecessary, it is difficult to explain why some who claimed to follow him expected such observance on the part of gentile Christians (cf. Gal. 2:2ff.); however, if Jesus expected his Jewish disciples to be observant of Torah, we can easily understand why there would be a division among his followers after his death concerning the relation of gentile Christians to the Jewish law.

There is one commonly-used criterion of gospel criticism that seems quite misleading, the criterion of dissimilarity.<sup>33</sup> This criterion assumes that no one would ever invent a teaching of Jesus contrary to what he or his contemporaries believed. Therefore, whatever in the Gospels can be distinguished from the teachings of the early Church, first-century Judaism, and hellenistic culture could not stem from any of these sources and must have arisen from Jesus himself. One reason that this criterion is untenable is that our knowledge of first-century Christianity, Judaism, and hellenism is too incomplete to decide what was not taught in such circles. Moreover, the knowledge that we do possess of them presents so varied a picture that it is doubtful whether anything in the Gospels can be called unique. Another criticism of this criterion is that, even if we succeed in isolating some remark of Jesus that differs from other first-century thought, we cannot assume that such a teaching is an important element in his message. Is it likely that a central element in any man's teaching is that which his followers choose not to adopt?

Following our five criteria, we first consider the historical Jesus as depicted in the Pauline Epistles. They report that he was a Jew (Gal. 3:16; 4:4) "of the seed of David" (Rom. 1:3);<sup>34</sup> that he ministered to his own people, the Jews (Rom. 15:8; Gal. 4:5); and that he had a brother named James, whom Paul had met in person (Gal. 1:19). The Apostle also records certain pieces of information relating to Jesus' death. These include an account of the Last Supper with the statement that "he was being handed over" by someone presumably to the authorities (I Cor. 11:23),<sup>35</sup> the repeated assertion that he died on a cross, and a charge that the Jews had killed him (I Thess. 2:15). In addition Paul mentions various titles by which Jesus was known in the early Church, some of which may have been used by Jesus during his lifetime.

The assertion that Jesus died by crucifixion appears to contradict the assertion that the Jews had killed him. Crucifixion was a Roman punishment inflicted by Roman authorities upon one guilty under Roman law. Jewish executions were by stoning, burning, or beheading, possibly by strangulation, but not by crucifixion.<sup>36</sup> Whether or not Roman authorities had to approve all death sentences in first-century Palestine,<sup>37</sup> Jesus would have suffered a Jewish punishment such as stoning had he merely been guilty of some Jewish crime such as blasphemy (cf. Lev. 24:16; Acts 6:11; 7:56-58).<sup>38</sup> Since the death of Jesus on a Roman cross is so strongly attested that it can scarcely be doubted, this execution must have resulted from some breach of Roman Law.

Why then does Paul blame the Jews for the crucifixion? In the first place, certain Jews probably did play a role in Jesus' death because certain Jews, such as the High Priest, were appointed by the Roman governor and owed allegiance to Rome. Moreover, Paul lived and preached in a world at the mercy of Roman power. To admit that Jesus had been guilty under Roman Law would have invited Roman persecution of the Apostle himself and of anyone else who followed Jesus. In fact from the earliest days of the Church until the conversion of Constantine three-hundred years later, Christians continued to shift the responsibility for the crucifixion from Roman to Jew. In some circles the wife of Pontius Pilate even became a Christian Saint.<sup>39</sup> Still, the fact that Jesus suffered a Roman punishment suggests that he died for an offence against Rome, not for some crime against the laws and customs of his fathers.

What that crime was we can deduce from the titles by which Jesus was known in Pauline circles. The two titles by which Paul commonly refers to Jesus are "Christ" and "Lord." *Kyrios*, or "Lord," was used by Greek-speaking Jews as the equivalent of *YHWH*. Thus to call Jesus "Lord" was to call him by God's name.<sup>40</sup> However, the Christological hymn in Phil. 2:6-11 indicates that for its author and probably for Paul the title "Lord" was given Jesus after his resurrection.<sup>41</sup>

The title which Paul most frequently applied to Jesus is "Christ," i.e. "Messiah" or "Anointed one."<sup>42</sup> In fact by the time that the Apostle was writing his epistles, "Christ" had become more a proper name than a title. Contrary to popular opinion, however, "Christ-Messiah" was not a common title in the Judaism of Jesus' day.<sup>43</sup> As far as we know, it was used by none of several so-called messianic pretenders who at various times tried to free Palestine from foreign rule. When the title is used it never designates someone superhuman or semidivine but a king or ruling high priest. This usage conforms to the use of "Messiah," "The Lord's Anointed," in the Hebrew Scriptures. There the title nearly always designates the ruler of God's people Israel (e.g., I Sam. 24:6, 10; II Sam. 22:51 // Ps. 18:50; Ps. 89:38).<sup>44</sup> Thus, "Messiah" in Jesus' day was a title associated closely with Jewish kingship; and such a title, applied to Jesus during his lifetime, would have been more than enough to cause his crucifixion by the Romans as someone aspiring to be "king of the Jews." Furthermore, since the title would have invited Roman persecution, it is unlikely that the early Church invented the title. Rather it seems that "Christ-Messiah" was so associated with Jesus during his lifetime that the early Church was stuck with it and could not avoid the title after the crucifixion and resurrection.



What in fact the Church did was to change the meaning of "Messiah-Christ." Thus, for example, the fourth evangelist composed a private dialogue between Jesus and Pilate in which Jesus maintains that his kingship is not of this world (18:36). However, if Jesus' kingship were really not of this world, we must ask why so dangerous a title was applied to him in the first place. Moreover, since the title was comparatively rare in the Judaism of Jesus' day, it would not have been applied to Jesus casually, but deliberately and with forethought. Therefore, it seems probable that the title would have carried much of its original, political meaning for Jesus and his followers. Certainly it would have carried such a meaning for most of Jesus' contemporaries.

From the Pauline epistles we can hypothesize that Jesus was crucified by the Romans for claiming to be "king of the Jews." This crucifixion was neither voluntary nor due to recklessness. Rather someone handed Jesus over to the authorities. Now when we turn to the gospels, the picture appears somewhat different. In spite of sayings like "I came not to bring peace but a sword" (Mt. 10:34), sayings about loving enemies and turning the other cheek, etc., appear predominant. We must remember, however, that Jesus' teachings, even when genuine, do not necessarily reflect the context in which they may have been spoken; and, if we concentrate on what the Gospels report Jesus did, then the gospel picture of Jesus matches more closely what we have learned from the Pauline Epistles.

First of all, the gospels agree that Jesus met his death on a Roman cross. Roman soldiers nailed him there (see Mk. 15:39 & //s); and Pontius Pilate, the Roman governor sentenced him (Mk. 15:15 & //s; Jn. 19:16). They also agree that the charge against him was claiming kingship (Mk. 15:2 & //s; Jn. 18:33), and they report that this very charge was nailed to his cross (Mk. 15:26 & //s; Jn. 19:19).

That Jesus was regarded as politically dangerous can be seen from his inquest. According to Mk. 14:55-59 (// Mt. 26:69-71) this hearing took place at the house of the High Priest. That man has gathered his council, perhaps a small group of advisers.<sup>45</sup> First they find witnesses who testify that Jesus had threatened to destroy and rebuild the Temple. In order to understand the significance of such testimony, we must realize that throughout the Ancient Near East generally and among the Jews in particular it was the king, and the king alone, who was responsible for a national shrine and its functioning.<sup>46</sup> Chief priests had authority to act only under Royal orders. In Jesus' day it was the Romans who ruled Israel, and the Roman governor represented Caesar. Pontius Pilate exercised his control over the temple, not only by appointing and deposing high priests at will,<sup>47</sup> but also by keeping the high priestly vestments in his own possession.<sup>48</sup> Thus any attempt by Jesus to interfere with the temple would have been seen as the usurping of royal authority.

The witnesses do not agree. Then the High Priest asks Jesus directly about his kingship: "Are you the Messiah, the son of the Blessed (= God)?" Jesus replies, "I am." Again the significance of the testimony is not obvious. For Christians the title, "Son of

God," had come to have a special divine meaning, but the words had a different implication during Jesus' lifetime. Like "Messiah," "Son of God" was also a title given to the kings of Israel. In the Hebrew Scriptures it is the king who is generally meant by the designation "Son of God" for it was he who represented God to his people.<sup>49</sup> Since the claim to be Son of God is more seditious than blasphemous, it is difficult to explain the High Priest's cry that Jesus has committed blasphemy. Nor can we find much that is blasphemous in the other elements of Jesus' answer. The words, "I am," simply indicate an affirmative answer,<sup>50</sup> and when Jesus adds the Son of Man prophecy from Dan. 7:13, he gives no indication that he is that Son of Man. A possible source for the cry of blasphemy may lie in a false assumption of the early Christian community. After the resurrection, Christians came to understand the title, "Son of God," in a far more literal sense than a mere designation of kingship. For a reader who understood Son of God in a divine literal sense, the High Priest's cry of blasphemy would have been expected. Therefore, it would not have been too long before some Christian changed the text to fit the expectation.

If we grant that Jesus was condemned for sedition against Rome, we must then ask whether he was guilty. Do the gospels preserve indications that Jesus really claimed the kind of kingship that was a threat to the Roman occupation of Palestine? Or did Jesus, as the Church came to believe, regard himself as the spiritual king of a non-earthly kingdom who deliberately chose the way of the cross? Certainly his actions on the night of his arrest do not suggest that the crucifixion was voluntary. If the events as reported in Mk. 14:23-52 appeared in a modern newspaper the account might read as follows:

#### "NOTED MESSIAH CAPTURED"

"Last night the Temple Police acting for Governor Pontius Pilate, carried out a surprise raid in Gethsemane. They were aided in finding the rebels by a former follower, Judas, alias Long Knife.<sup>51</sup> After surprising three sleeping guards, there was a short skirmish in which one of the Temple men was wounded; but the fighting ended when the royal pretender ordered his men to cease resisting against hopeless odds. It is expected that the rebel will be crucified sometime today."

While this report accurately records the Marcan events, we do not read the story in this way, perhaps because of a prayer added to the account in which Jesus indicates his willingness to die (14:36). However, the prayer cannot have come from Jesus because he was alone when he supposedly uttered it, and he died before he could have revealed the text. Since the authorities needed a traitor to find Jesus and "finger" him (14:44f.), we must assume that Jesus was unwilling to supply the needed information. Finally, the fact that Jesus had posted guards (14:23, 37f., 41), at least one of whom was armed (14:47), suggests that those closest to Jesus were prepared for action involving violence. Of course, these followers may have misunderstood Jesus; but, assuming they did, are we in a better position to unearth Jesus' "real intentions" with our own limited resources?

Two other events of significance for understanding Jesus' kingship appear in more than one strand of tradition: the cleansing of the Temple and the feeding of the multitude. At Jesus' inquest it was testified against him that he intended to replace the Jerusalem Temple and in doing so was claiming a royal prerogative. Both the Synoptic Gospels (Mk. 11:15f. & //s) and the Gospel of John report that beyond talking about temple reform, Jesus actually attempted to begin them and set about "cleansing" the Temple by overturning the tables of the money-changers and the seats of the dove-sellers. Mark adds that he also prohibited anyone from carrying a bundle through the temple court. Much of the significance in these acts lies not in the reforms themselves. Many Pharisees advocated similar reforms.<sup>52</sup> What was more important than the reforms themselves was that Jesus asserted his authority to make them and in doing so publically proclaimed his kingship.

The miraculous feeding of a multitude appears in two versions in Mark (Mk. 6:23-44 & //s; Mk. 8:1-10 // Mt. 15:32-39), and in John (6:1-15) as well. The gospels have tended to stress various aspects of the actual feeding; but Roman authorities would have been far more concerned about several thousand males (Mk. 6:44; Jn. 6:10), divided into military companies of hundreds and fifties (Mk. 5:40),<sup>53</sup> gathered in the desert, the traditional place for Jewish revolutionaries to gather since the time of David. Only a few years earlier Pontius Pilate had surprised a far smaller band in Samaritan territory. Although they had committed no act of violence, Pilate's soldiers slaughtered them without mercy.<sup>54</sup> Fadus, Pilate's successor, similarly surprised another Jewish leader in the desert with only four hundred men.<sup>55</sup> Two centuries earlier the Maccabees had begun their successful war of liberation with only three thousand men.<sup>56</sup> Even today certain governments would oppose a few thousand men gathered in a remote place, say in the mountains of Cuba.

These are not the only acts of Jesus that would have had messianic significance to his contemporaries. Events like the triumphal entry (Mk. 11:1-10 & //s; Jn. 12:12-19),<sup>57</sup> and perhaps the anointing at Bethany (Mk. 14:3-9 // Mt. 26:6-13; cf. Lk. 7:36-50; Jn. 12:1-8) would have encouraged people to see in Jesus one who might free the land from Roman occupation. Even the simple story of Jesus and his disciples going through the wheat fields and plucking grain on the Sabbath was probably seen as a kingly act. According to the Marcan version (2:23, Greek text only) the main point of the story is that Jesus and his disciples made a way through the grain fields, and the part about plucking the grain is merely a participial phrase, perhaps indicating how the way was made. Since in the Ancient Near East generally and according to Jewish law in particular only a king might walk through someone's grain fields,<sup>58</sup> this act was another proclamation of kingship.<sup>59</sup>

Thus far we have been primarily concerned with what Jesus did rather than what tradition says he taught. There are, however, two areas of Jesus' teaching that we must consider because of their implication for Jesus' views regarding the Land of Israel. These areas are the teaching about the Kingdom of God (or Heaven) and the saying about payment of taxes to Caesar (Mk. 12:13-17 & //s).



The Gospels nowhere explain what Jesus meant by "Kingdom of God."<sup>60</sup> On the contrary, "Kingdom of God" seems to occur quite casually throughout the teachings of Jesus as a term readily understood by his hearers. Jesus, therefore, probably used the term in essentially the same way as his Jewish contemporaries. Had he not done so, his teaching would have been unintelligible to those who heard him.<sup>61</sup> Since there is no lack of evidence that the Jews of Jesus' day thought of the Kingdom at least partly in political terms<sup>62</sup> that included freedom from Rome,<sup>63</sup> we should expect that Jesus' use of the expression, "Kingdom of God," carried a similar connotation. Confirmation that Jesus' use of "Kingdom of God" carried political implications is found in what we have already learned of his messiahship. It seems unlikely that Jesus would have done so much to proclaim a kingship that included the political if he regarded his Kingdom as essentially nonpolitical.

Regarding taxation, the gospels seem to represent Jesus as having relatively moderate views. Taken at face value, the saying, "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's," seems to indicate that Jesus recognized certain Roman rights in Palestine, at least for the present age. However, such an interpretation does not seem to agree too well with the fact that the Romans executed Jesus for opposing their rule. We must also remember that we are uncertain that he uttered exactly these words in the same context as they appear in the Gospel. Even though as skeptical a critic as R. Bultmann appears to regard the immediate context (apart from vs. 13) as inseparable from the saying,<sup>64</sup> D. Daube has shown that the whole of Mk. 12:13-37 // Mt. 22:15-46 may well have been formed as part of an early Christian Passover Haggadah.<sup>65</sup>

We should probably interpret the saying on taxes to Caesar in light of the fact that the Gospels represent Jesus as intimate with tax collectors. That Jesus associated with such men is firmly planted in the tradition and would be hard to refute. In fact even the Twelve included one (Mk. 2:13-17 & //s; Mt. 10:3, cf. //s; cf. also Acts 1:13). Thus it seems clear that no matter what Jesus' attitude may have been toward Rome he welcomed tax collectors into his following. Therefore, even if we raise questions about the saying regarding paying taxes to Caesar, we must admit that Jesus probably was far more tolerant about paying Roman taxes than many of his more nationalistic contemporaries.

In summary, Jesus certainly acted in ways that encouraged his contemporaries to see in him one who would aid in fulfilling the land promises of the old covenant by restoring the land fully to Israel, and there is little reason to assume that Jesus must have been wholly out of sympathy with such an interpretation of his message. We must, however, also remember that Jesus never actually began any armed revolt as did many other nationalists. He even seemed willing, at least for the present, to take a moderate view of Roman taxation. Perhaps he was awaiting the appointed time when God would intervene to establish the fullness of his Kingdom.

Of course, Paul and the traditions about Jesus do not make up the whole New Testament, but there is a limit to what one paper can discuss even lightly. It is possible, however, to discuss briefly two further passages with relatively obvious implications about the land promises. First of all, the hymns in the first two chapters of Luke seem quite nationalistic in their view of the promises. They stress the restoration of the Davidic throne in Jesus and promise that his reign will last forever (1:32f.). They also affirm that Israel will be delivered from her enemies (1:71-74) and receive the glory (2:32) in accordance with God's promise to Abraham (1:55, 73) and in accordance with the prophets of old (1:70).

The Stephen Speech of Acts seven represents an alternate emphasis. While vs. 5 and 7 affirm that God promised the land to Abraham and his posterity and vs. 45 mentions that Israel received the land under Joshua, the rest of the speech appears hostile to Israel and to certain themes associated with the promises made to Abraham. The author reminds us that Abraham himself received none of the land (vs. 5), except for a single tomb (vs. 16), that the giving of the Law took place outside Canaan on Sinai (vs. 30), and that the holy sanctuary at Jerusalem is unnecessary (vss. 45-50). Apart from these verses the speech as a whole reads like a catalogue of Israel's sins. In order to understand the relation of the stress on Israel's sinfulness, we must understand that in early Rabbinic tradition certain of the scriptural promises were granted conditionally. God gave Israel the Book of Torah and the Aaronic covenant unconditionally; but the Temple, the land, and the Davidic Kingdom were given conditionally.<sup>66</sup> Against such a Jewish understanding of the promises, the Stephen speech seems to be declaring the temple and the land promises null and void.

What significance do the writings of the New Testament hold for us today on the subject of land promises? Of course the answer to this question must depend on our hermeneutic. However, in view of what has been said above, it will be difficult to claim the whole New Testament for any one viewpoint. The views range from the nationalistic statements in the Lucan birth narratives and what seems to be the somewhat less nationalistic views of Jesus to the relatively moderate views of Paul and the apparently anti-national view of the Stephen Speech. Although we have not discussed Hebrews and Revelation, it would seem that Hebrews regards the land promises as superceded while Revelation assumes a relatively nationalistic, certainly anti-Roman view. Thus on a scale reading from nationalistic views regarding the land promises to views that are antinationalistic we might rate the evidence of the New Testament as follows: the Lucan hymns (and Revelation), the historical Jesus, Paul, Acts seven (and Hebrews).

# FOOTNOTES

- 1) Cf. F-M Marquand, Die Bedeutung der biblischen Landverheissungen für die Christen ("Theologische Existenz heute," n. F. 116; München: Kaiser, 1964), p. 24.
- 2) K. W. Clark, "Worship in the Jerusalem Temple after A. D. 70," NTS, 6 (1960), pp. 269-280; H. Bietenhard, "Die Freiheitskriege der Juden unter des Kaisern Trajan und Hadrian und der messianische Tempelbau," Judaica, 4 (1948), pp. 57-77, 81-108, 161-185.
- 3) E.g. Josephus, BJ, ii. 118; S. G. F. Brandon, Jesus and the Zealots (New York: Scribner's, 1967; H. Hengel, Die Zeloten ("Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Spätjudentums und Urchristentums," 1; Leiden, 1961). Cf. M. Smith, "Zealots and Sicarii, Their Origins and Relation," HTR, 64 (1971), pp. 1-19, who warns against assuming that all Jewish extremists belonged to a single party.
- 4) Thus in the second century B. C. E. the Hasidim were not in sympathy with the Hasmonaeen intention of establishing political independence for Judaea. See I Macc. 7:13.
- 5) J. Neusner, A Life of Rabban Yohanan ben Zakkai (Leiden: Brill, 1962), 104ff.
- 6) So N. A. Dahl, Das Volk Gottes (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1963), p. 212, and the commentaries of Chrysostom, Theodoret, Luther, Calvin, J. B. Lightfoot, F. Sieffert, M.-J. Lagrange, G. S. Duncan, A. Oepke, and O. Kuss. Others would restrict the expression, "Israel of God," to Jewish Christians. So Ambrosiaster, G. Estius, M. L. deWette, E. Wörner, Th. Zahn, A. Schäfer, and E. de W. Burton.
- 7) H. A. Wolfson, Philo (Cambridge: Harvard, 1948), vol. 1, pp. 127f. E. R. Goodenough, Jewish Symbols, Vol. IV ("Bollingen Series," LXXVII; New York: Bollingen Foundation, 1954), pp. 82-88.
- 8) Misr. 18 (102; Heres 38 (185); Fug. 20f. (106-118): Wolfson, vol. 1, pp. 259f.
- 9) Cher. 29 (99-101), Sonn. 1:23 (149), 37 (215); Spec. 1:12 (66), Goodenough, By Light, Light (New Haven, 1935), p. 108; G. Schrenk, "to hieron," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, Vol. III (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1965), p. 241.
- 10) See, e.g., O. Schmitz, Die Opferanschauungen des spätern Judentums und die Opferaussagen des Neuen Testaments (Tübingen, 1910), pp. 133-175, 190, 193; G. F. Moore, "Sacrifice," Encyclopaedia Biblica, Vol. 4 (New York: Macmillan, 1903), col. 4223.



- 11) Migr. 16 (89-92); Goodenough, By Light, Light, p. 84; Wolfson, vol. 1, p. 127. Cf. also Spec. 1:12 (67); Wolfson, vol. 2, pp. 241ff.; Schrenk, pp. 241f.
- 12) 29 (192), 32 (230, 233-236), 39 (308).
- 13) For this interpretation of Romans 9-11, see J. Munck, Christ and Israel: An Interpretation of Romans 9-11 (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1967); idem, Paul and the Salvation of Mankind (Richmond: John Knox, 1959), pp. 42-49; idem, "Israel and the Gentiles in the New Testament," JTS, new series, 2 (1951), pp. 6-9; D. Judant, Les deux Israël (Paris, 1960). See also G. Lindeskog, "Israel in the New Testament," Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok, 26 (1961), pp. 59ff.
- 14) P. Richardson, Israel in the Apostolic Church ("SNTS Monograph Series," 10; (Cambridge: University Press, 1969), pp. 74-84. Richardson finds a parallel to Gal. 6:16 in the 19th benediction of the Babylonian Shemoneh Esreh, but the parallel is by no means close and is missing entirely from the version of the Shemoneh Esreh found in the Cairo Genizah. For further discussion of the verse, see Schrenk, "Was bedeutet 'Israel Gottes'?", Judaica, 5 (1949), pp. 81-94; idem, "Der Segenswunsch nach der Kampfepistel," Judaica, 6 (1950), pp. 170-190. Schrenk argues that Israel in Gal. 6:16 must find some identification with Das konkrete Israel. For a detailed restatement of the traditional view, see Dahl, "Zur Auslegung von Gal. 6:16," Judaica, 6 (1950), pp. 151-170.
- 15) See Kelim, 1:6-9. Cf. TKelim BQ, 1:12-14; Tan. (Buber) vol. 3, p. 78.
- 16) See my essay, "Ancient Education in the Time of the Early Roman Empire," in The Catacombs and the Colosseum, ed. S. Benko and J. J. O'Rourke (Valley Forge: Judson, 1971), especially pp. 154-157.
- 17) Paul uses the word hierón for "temple" only in I Cor. 9:13, where he uses the term only in a passing reference to the rights of temple workers.
- 18) So. H. Wenschewitz, Die Spiritualisierung der Kultusbegriffe ("Angelos-Beiheft," 4; Leipzig, 1932), pp. 111-116; H. Fraeyman, La Spiritualisation de l'idée du temple dans les écrits pauliniens ("Analecta Lov. Bibl. et Orient.," 2:5; Gembloux, 1948), pp. 13-30; B. Gärtner, The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament ("SNTS Monograph Series," 1; Cambridge: University Press, 1965), pp. 49-71.
- 19) I Cor. 3:17 is no exception, if we understand hágios, not naós, as the antecedent of hoítines. So understand, vss. 16-17 would be translated as follows: "Do you not know that you are a temple of God? If anyone destroys the temple of God (at Jerusalem), God will destroy him. For the temple of God is holy, and you are holy."

In regard to the use of articles with "temple" Gärtner is inaccurate. In dealing with Qumran documents he habitually adds the definite article to the word "temple" in his translations when there is none in the original text.

- 20) So P. Seidensticker, P. Lebendiges Opfer (Rom. 12, 1) ("Neutest. Abhandl.," 20:1/3; Münster, 1954), p. 135.  
  
On the question of the Pauline authorship of II Thess., see B. Rigaux, St. Paul: Les épîtres aux Thessaloniens ("Etudes bibliques"; Paris, 1956), pp. 124-152. In the past fifty years the great majority of scholars, including all the major commentators on II Thess. regard the epistle as Pauline.
- 21) E.g., J. E. Frame and W. Neil in their commentaries.
- 22) So A. Plummer. See Rigaux, p. 660, Frame, p. 257, and Neil, p. 164, who note that several of the older Protestant commentators found in this exegesis a means to equate the "man of lawlessness" with the papacy.
- 23) On the apocalyptic chronology in II Thess. 2, see J. Schmid, "Der Antichrist und die hemmende Macht (2 Thess. 2, 1-12)," Theol. Quartalschr., 129 (1949), pp. 323-343; J. W. Moran, "Is the Antichrist a Man?" Eccl. Rev., p. 579.
- 24) E. Schürer, Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes in Zeitalter Jesu Christi, zweiter Band (Leipzig, 1907), pp. 357-363.
- 25) Cf. TSuk. 3:13; RH 1:2; J. Jeremias, Golgotha ("Angelos-Beiheft," 1; Leipzig, 1926), pp. 51f., 60-64; SOiff. Moore, Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era (Cambridge: Harvard, 1954), vol. 2, pp. 44-46.
- 26) Of course, we must remember that this salvation plan is seen as nearing completion since the Messiah's return is imminent for Paul, at least in his earlier epistles. See Rom. 13:11f.; I Cor. 7: 26, 29. But cf. Phil. 1:23, where the Apostle suggests that he may not live to see this return.
- 27) For a good discussion of this difficult passage, see C. D. Morrison, The Powers That Be ("Studies in Bibl. Theol.," 29; London: SCM, 1960).
- 28) For a good discussion to this approach to the historical Jesus, see Hengel, Was Jesus a Revolutionist?, Trans. W. Klassen with an introduction by J. Reumann ("Facet Books, Biblical Series," 28; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971).
- 29) Brandon's main work on the subject is Jesus and the Zealots (Manchester: University Press, 1967). See also The Trial of Jesus of Nazareth (London, 1968); The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church (London, 1951); and various articles, including "Jesus and the Zealots," The Annual of Leeds University Oriental Society, 2 (1959-61), pp. 2-25; "The Jesus of History," History Today, 7 (1962), pp. 13-21; and "Further Quest for the Historical Jesus," Modern Churchman, 5 (1962), pp. 212-220.

- 30) See my review of Brandon's Jesus and the Zealots in JBL, 89 (1970), pp. 246f.
- 31) For a general discussion of the problem, see D. G. A. Calvert, "An Examination of the Criteria for Distinguishing the Authentic Words of Jesus," NTS, 18 (1971/72), pp. 209-219; M. D. Hooker, "Christology and Methodology," NTS, 17 (1970/71), pp. 480-487; the final chapter of M. Lehmann, Synoptische Quellenanalyse und die Frage nach dem historischen Jesus (ZNW Beiheft, 38; Berlin, 1970); H. Schürmann, "Die vorösterlichen Anfänge der Logientradition," Der historische Jesus und der kerygmatische Christus, ed. H. Ristow and K. Matthiae (Berlin, 1961), pp. 342-370.
- 32) See, e.g., K. Stendahl, "Hate, Non-retaliation, and Love," HTR, 55 (1962), pp. 343-355; and my note, "Matthew XXIII. 9," JTS, new series, 12 (1961), pp. 56-59.
- 33) The basic formulation of this criterion goes back to P. W. Schmiedel, "Gospels," Encyclopaedia Biblica, Vol. 2 (New York: Macmillan, 1901, cols. 1881ff. Against Schmiedel, see H. J. Cadbury, "Mixed Motives in the Gospels," Proceedings of the American Philological Society, 95 (1951), pp. 117-124. See also H. Palmer, The Logic of Gospel Criticism (London: Macmillan, 1968), pp. 190f.
- 34) This reference appears to be part of some creedal or liturgical formula. See W. Kramer, Christ, Lord, Son of God ("Studies in Bibl. Theol.," 50; Naperville: Allenson, 1966), pp. 108-114; O. J. F. Seitz, "Gospel Prologues: A Common Pattern," JBL, 83 (1964), pp. 265-268. Some scholars, e.g., H. S. Enslin, The Prophet from Nazareth (New York), 1961, pp. 135f., question Jesus' Davidic sonship because of an implied denial in Mk. 12:35-37 & //s. However, the fact that Paul is quoting a familiar source must be weighed against the fact that he was in a position to test its validity with those who knew Jesus intimately.
- 35) Again the Apostle is using a source. See Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, trans. N. Perrin (3rd ed. rev.; New York, 1966), pp. 101-105. See also the preceding note.
- 36) Lev. 20:14, 21:9; 24:16; Deut. 13:9f.; 17:5-7; 21:18-21; 22:20f; Jn. 8:5; Acts 7:58; Josephus, Antiquities, IV, 8, 6 (202), 23 (248), 24 (264). For a full discussion of Rabbinic and other sources, see P. Winter, On the Trial of Jesus ("Studia Judaica," 1; Berlin, 1961), pp. 62-74. Note that Deut. 21:22f. (cf. Gal. 3:13) does not refer to death by hanging but to the hanging of a corpse after execution.
- 37) In recent decades several scholars have concluded that in the time of Jesus, contrary to Jn. 18:31, Jewish authorities did in fact have authority to impose the death penalty for capital crimes against Jewish law. So T. A. Burkitt, "The Competence of the Sanhedrin," Vigiliae Christianae, 10 (1956), pp. 80-86; Winter, pp. 75-90. Against this view, see A. H. Sherwin-White, Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament ("Sarum Lectures," 1960-61; Oxford, 1963), pp. 1-48; followed by



F. C. Grant, "On the Trial of Jesus: A Review Article," Journ. of Rel. 44 (1964), pp. 230-237. For further defense by Winter of his position, see "The Trial of Jesus," Commentary, 38 (Sept., 1964), pp. 39f.; and "The Trial of Jesus and the Competence of the Sanhedrin," NTS, 10 (1963/64), pp. 494-499.

- 38) Even a Roman citizen, if he violated the Jerusalem Temple, might be executed by the Jews. So Josephus, War, VI, 2, 4 (126); see Philo, De Legatione ad Gaium, 31 (212). See also Winter, Trial, pp. 155f. (n. 37); Sherwin White, p. 38.
- 39) Winter, Trial, pp. 51-61; Enslin, pp. 183f.
- 40) Kramer, pp. 65-107, argues against this interpretation largely because Mar (cf. I Cor. 16:22), the Aramaic equivalent of "Lord," was not used in place of YHWH by Aramaic-speaking Jews. The targumim are not good evidence because they generally abbreviate YHWH to two or three letters and allow the reader to make an oral substitution. However, the Dead Sea Scrolls do show that this Aramaic title was used as a divine name in the first century (e.g., 1QApoc ii 4, xxi, 12-15, etc.).
- 41) This interpretation generally follows that of O. Cullmann, The Christology of the New Testament, rev. ed. (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963), although here and elsewhere the present writer has doubts about Cullmann's stress on the Isaian Suffering servant as a significant element in Pauline Christology.
- 42) In the one reference by Josephus to Jesus that is probably genuine (Antiquities, XX, 9, 1 [200]) that historian apparently regards the title as uniquely Jesus' own and gives no other information except that his brother was James.
- 43) See M. de Jonge, "The Word 'Anointed' in the time of Jesus," NT, 8 (1966), pp. 132-148. The title was in use at Qumran, but its significance there is still in doubt.
- 44) The exceptions are Is. 45:1, where the title designates the Persian king; Ps. 105:15, where it probably refers to the patriarchs as "kings" in their day; and Hab. 3:13, where it designates all Judah. In Lev. 4:3, 5, 16, 6:22 (see II 12cc. 1:10), "messiah" appears in the expression, "the anointed priest," but here the word is merely a descriptive adjective, not a title.
- 45) The word synédriion here translated "council" need not be a technical term. In the Graeco-Roman world the word was commonly applied to various kinds of gatherings. For example, at Ephesus there was a medical synédriion that sponsored a kind of medical Olympics each year. See my essay in The Catacombs and the Colosseum, p. 150.
- 46) Jeremias, Jesus als Weltvollender (Gütersloh, 1930), pp. 35-44. For a similar interpretation see O. Betz, "Die Frage nach dem messianischen Bewusstsein Jesu," NT, 6 (1963), pp. 34ff.
- 47) Josephus, Antiquities, XX, 10, 5 (247-250), cf. Jn. 18:13.

- 48) Josephus, Antiquities, XV, 11, 4 (403-408); VIII, 4, 3 (90-95); XX, 1, 1-2 (6-14).
- 49) See S. Mowinkel, He That Commeth, trans. G. W. Anderson (Oxford, 1956), pp. 76ff., 96ff., 368f.
- 50) The Hebrew or Aramaic equivalent of "I am," would not be the same form as the Hebrew "I am" of Exod. 3:14.
- 51) Several scholars regard Iscariot as coming from the Latin sacarius. So F. Schulthess, Das Problem der Sprache Jesu (Zurich, 1917), pp. 41, 54f. (n. 46); cf. H. Hirschberg, "Simon Bariona and the Ebionites," JBL, 61 (1942), pp. 182f.; Schulthess, "Zur Sprache der Evangelien," ZfN, 21 (1922), pp. 250-253. For other possible interpretation of Iscariot, see C. C. Torrey, "The Name 'Iscariot,'" HTR, 36 (1943), pp. 51-62.
- 52) Jer. 9:5; G. Dalman, Sacred Sites and Ways, trans. P. P. Levertoff (London, 1935), p. 290. On a successful cleansing of the Temple by a Pharisee, see Ker. 1:7; L. Finkelstein, Akiba: Scholar, Saint, and Martyr ("Meridian Books," JP25; Cleveland, 1962), pp. 50f.
- 53) Hebrew armies were normally divided and subdivided into groups of thousands, hundreds, and fifties. See Ex. 18:21; Deut. 1:15; I Macc. 3:55; Josephus, War, II, 20, 7 (578). For similar evidence from the Dead Sea Scrolls, see Y. Yadin, The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light Against the Sons of Darkness, trans. B. and Ch. Rabin (Oxford: University Press, 1962), pp. 38-64. Against the New English Bible's rejection of the present interpretation, see H. W. Montefiore, "Revolt in the Desert?" NIS, 3 (1962), p. 137.
- 54) Josephus, Antiquities, XVIII, 4, 1 (85-87).
- 55) Ibid., XX, 5, 1 (97-99); Acts 5:36.
- 56) I Macc. 4:6. Cf. II Macc. 8:16, where the number is doubled.
- 57) See W. Farmer, "The Palm Branches in John 12:13," JTS, 3 (1952), pp. 62-66.
- 58) See Sifre on Deut. 17:19 (Shophetim, 161, Horovitz-Finkelstein ed., p. 212); BB, 6:7; San., 2:4; BQ, 60b, citing R. Huna (c. C. E. 212-297).
- 59) B. Harnelstein, "Jesus Gang durch die Saatfelder," Angelos, 3 (1930), pp. 117f.

The vss. that follow Mk. 2:23 about David eating the bread of the Presence are intended as a justification for Jesus' action. In any case, they are irrelevant if we interpret Jesus' actions messianically; however, they are largely irrelevant to the problem of plucking grain on the Sabbath. These vss. about David probably owe their position to the early Church.

- 60) So H. S. Reimarus, "Von dem Zwecke Jesu und seiner Jünger," Fragmente des Wolfenbüttelschen Ungenannten, ed. G. E. Lessing (Berlin, 1895), p. 50.

For a review of modern interpretations of the Kingdom of God, see G. W. Buchanan, The Consequences of the Covenant ("Supplements to NT," 20; (Leiden: Brill, 1970), pp. 42-90; G. Lundström, The Kingdom of God in the Teaching of Jesus, trans. J. Bulman (Edinburgh, 1963); N. Perrin, The Kingdom of God in the Teaching of Jesus (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963).

- 61) Perrin, Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus (New York: Harper and Row, 1967), pp. 57-59, argues that Jesus' use of the expression differs from Jewish usage since Jesus, unlike the ancient Jews, speaks of the Kingdom as coming. Against this argument, see Buchanan, p. 67, n. 4, who finds suitable parallels in Targ. Micah 4:7-8; II Baruch 44:12; etc.
- 62) Buchanan, pp. 50-90.
- 63) Pes. 54b (bar., see Rashi) // Ber. R. 61:12 // Mekhilta, Vayyassa, (p. 171, ll. 13-15 of the Horovitz edition.)
- 64) K. Bultmann, The History of Synoptic Tradition, trans. J. Marsh (Oxford: Blackwell, 1963), p. 26, cf. pp. 40, 48.
- 65) In a paper delivered to the spring meeting of the SBL Middle Atlantic Section, 1962, at Drew University.
- 66) Mekhilta, Analeq (p. 201, ll. 1ff. of the Horovitz edition).